Robert E. Malchman

Real-life romance in foreign countries

"Never divorce a writer."
- Rule Number Three, Saratoga's Rules for Life

Graig and I were getting-off town in the morning. I was pretty sure I could get us to the train station, but we stopped on our way to dinner to double check the route at the pedestrian desk. The desk has several train stations and we wanted to end up at the Rathausbahnhof on our way to Munich, not at the Ostbahnhof on one for Budapest. The woman we were speaking on the phone, so we waited for a moment. While we were waiting, a short, round, young woman came out of one of the rooms, hurried us over in German and asked, "Do you know how to use the phone?"

The question was not ridiculous as it might seem. Viennese phone booths sit on the sidewalk, you push at a certain time in order to make the call go through. I still do not understand the phone system, so how else could I explain?

We were discussing the usual Americans-meeting abroad talk. Her name was Rachel, and it turned out that she had grown up in New York City. We knew some of her old high schools, and even had a few acquaintances in common. She was going to college in upstate New York and had just spent a month at the Sorbonne studying French. Now she was travelling around Europe with a girl she met there.

"I just related the story of our five-week European excursion, Rachel excused herself to the ladies room. "Would you like to come with me and see what it is like?"

I asked Graig. We had planned to the suburb of Grinzing for dinner with two people we met on the train. We could all go together.

Graig and I shot one another a glance. Had they picked up two guys on a train and now collected us for insurance? I was not sure, but it seemed intriguing, not unsual. What would these two people say when they saw us?

"Sure," I said. "Let's go."

"I can't imagine our surprise when the two approached turned out to be a handsome young man and a gorgeous redheaded woman. They introduced themselves as Mike and April, Canadians, brother and sister.

Dinner in Grinzing was fun. The six of us sat in a beer garden feasting on rich Viennese food and singing with the oom-pah band. We were struck by how lovely Rachel's voice was.

Walking back to our hotel, Mike said, "Perhaps you were going to Prater, the amusement park, next day to ride on its worldfamous ferris wheel. Rachel expressed a fear of heights and a desire to have me there to hold her hand.

"Well, we were planning to leave tomorrow morning," I said, glancing over at Graig, who was walking with April. He grinned. "But I guess Munich can wait."

The next day we walked around Vien's streets, and then went to Prater in the evening. Rachel had a key chain with my bean bag pinching prowess, and as promised, I held her hand on the ferris wheel. Graig was still working on April, so we decided to stay one more day.

Back in town, the route at the amusement park Rachel knocked me over. "Did you say something so Ali son about my going with you and Graig to Munich?"

"No, not at all," the thought had really never occurred to me. "Okay, why not? Would you like to go?" "Would you like me to?"

"Something like that," I thought. "Sure, I think it would be fun."

"I'm not one for snap decisions, but I know I would regret passing up Baker street with Europe with Rachel for the rest of my life."

A week was the closest we could get to Munich. We were discussing the statement that day six of the statement that we worked on the logic- calfractical relationship of the points in Monte Carlo in three days. We decided Rachel and I would take the train up to Munich, because I wanted to see Caeus (another story) in Paris, and,to get Rachel's extra luggage from her dorm, and then to Monte Carlo. The other four would go off together, and Graig and I would go to Monte Carlo.

The three straight overnights.

(Permit to page 10)

Opinion

MIT's sculptures serve useful purposes, too

(Continued from page 4)

As you probably guessed, it doesn't.

Of course, not all of the sculpture around here is just a tangled mess of rusting metal. A couple of the sculptures serve useful purposes.

"La Grande Vole" (The Big Sall) serves as a windbreak for the Great Building. Northwest in Killian Court is a great place to sit upon. In the spring, some professors have even been known to use it as a lecture platform, with their classes spread out on the grass below. I have left its pink marble, too. Bad, it's only on loan from the Metropoli
tum Museum of Art.

I kind of like the Picasso re- production in front of the Heim
tan Building, too. Picassos are always fun because they look like a lot of different things to differ-

elements, without anybody having to think too hard. There's a famous one in Chicago that many people think a man with an interesting life. He's an orangutan. No one knows for sure.

I should have guessed no such uncertainty would be permitted at MIT. If puzzles without unique solutions frighten you, the CVA has come to your rescue. I always thought the Picasso at MIT, "F'igur de decoued" (Cut-Out Figure) portrayed couplet-fish, but the authors of the CVA book claim to have the definitive answer.

I'm not sure whether to be relieved or dismayed to know that there is one answer. Well, I'll leave you to decide what it is for yourself. It's more fun that way, isn't it?

The Tech

Feedback

Task force chief rebuts letter

Editor's note: Associate Provost Frank E. Perkins '55, chairman of the Academic Council, wrote a financial aid policy, since The Tech a copy of this letter is, his re-

response is in a letter written by Lisa Nauny '84,

Dear Ms. Nauny,

Your letter of January 28, 1983 expresses strong disagreement with a statement attributed to me in an article titled, "Task Force Talks on Financial Aid" that appeared in The Tech of January 26, 1983. The essence of the statement is, in your words, "the incentive to apply for scholarships would not increase if MIT's policy of reducing internal scholarship aid by the amount of scholarships received from external sources."

It is easy to understand why you were upset by that statement. I am upset by it as well, since I disagree with it and have never made such a statement. It appears that you did not attend the January 19 open forum on financial aid and have based your interpretation of my position solely on The Tech article. The points that I tried to make at the open forum were not clearly captured in that article; therefore, let me restate my position for you.

1. A change in MIT's policy, such that some portion of external scholarship aid would be received by the recipient in excess of need, would provide an incentive for some students to seek additional aid more aggressively.

2. For each dollar of external support that flows to a student in excess of his or her official need, there is one dollar less available to meet the need of other students. Unless the new external support is sufficiently large, there will be a net loss of scholarship money available to meet need.

3. It has been argued that the amount of new scholarship money generated by a change in MIT's policy would more off-set that which is lost by the remaining needy students and that all students would benefit. All evidence that I have seen suggests that the opposite is true. Clearly, some students would benefit and some students would lose aid in excess of need. I believe this would be at the expense of a reduction in available scholarship support with which to meet the official need of other students. I find this to be an unacceptable consequence of the proposed policy change.

Your letter addressed itself to item 1 above. However, there is nothing there to discuss since we are in agreement on that issue. Perhaps you really meant to disagree with me on items 2 and 3. If so, please feel free to communicate your thoughts to me. You should know that the task force has asked for more data on this issue and has not yet taken any official position on it.

I was sorry that you found it necessary in your original letter (the last portion of which was not published by The Tech) to present your concerns in the form of a personal attack. (Editor's note: Nauny submitted a revised letter, which did not include the last portion of the original letter for publication. She indicated she would submit only the text relevant to Perkins.) I have not forgotten what it is like to be a student heavily dependent on both internal and external sources of financial aid, and I do not think of today's students as "abstract formulas governed by pure economics." I strongly resent being accused of "indifference and hypocrisy," especially by someone who obviously has no firsthand knowledge of me as a person and is not versed in professional opinions. I believe the record will show that I am qualified to comment on any student who wishes to engage in serious discussion of educational policy. I have not taken any position on that approach in the future.

Frank E. Perkins '55
Associate Provost

Oru’s View

Gray: Tech judgment was poor

To the Editor:

I would simply say that the publication of the cartoon referring to the change in NCA-A standards for athletic scholarships (Jan. 26) represents — at best — an extraneous lapse of judgment by The Tech editors. It speaks, too, of the need for better comment among people of various cultures and races on this campus. I believe that if we had a truly integrated community here — one in which diverse back- grounds were welcome, welcomed, valued, and shared — that such a cartoon would not be found on an editorial page of that approach in the future.

Paul E. Gray '54
President