Don’t panic, there’s always law school

After four wonderful years here at Charles River Community College, many seniors will be taking the dreaded leap into the Real World, but not before facing one final ordeal: the job interview.

The job interview is similar to most activities pursued by MIT undergraduates in one important respect: One can fake a job interview just as easily as one can fake a required course in senior year.

Signing up for the interview (registering for the course), credibly embellishing the resume (submitting recycled problem sets), and arriving ten minutes early to read the company (reading ten chapters of thermo) are not likely to have any effect on your performance.

Unlike problem sets and exams, interviews such as the latter cannot be punished once they have begun. Apolgistic mumbling, sweaty silences and general agony will characterize the remainder of your chance at big bucks.

A good trick to use in tight spots is to get the interviewers to talk about themselves. They won’t remember much about you in particular, but will remember having a marvelous time interviewing you, which is all that matters. It is a good idea to go into minute detail about your extra-curricular activities, such as membership in the Davis Douglas Baseball Club, if you are at a loss for words.

Any of this sound familiar? Do not panic, seniors. Work is boring and there is always law school. More likely than not, you will get that lonely little letter with all the big numbers in it before graduation.

So don’t sweat your next interview. Who cares if you make a fool of yourself in front of somebody with your exotic future in their hands? James Watt did the same in front of millions of people every day, and he’ll probably have a job before you do.

One would think that, at an institution like MIT, everyone would understand technology: not the hardware, but the engineering, but the philosophy of technology. Unfortunately, as the running debate about the referendum on the Nuclear Free Cambridge Act shows, such is not the case.

There is a proposal on the Nov. 8 ballot in Cambridge to make the city of Cambridge a "nuclear-free zone." The act would prohibit "the research, development, testing, evaluation, production, maintenance, storage, transportation, and/or disposal of nuclear weapons or the components of nuclear weapons" in Cambridge.

The act appears to be aimed primarily at getting the Draper Laboratory — which designs, among other things, guidance systems for nuclear missiles — out of Cambridge.

The idea behind the act is that nuclear weapons and the technologies they employ, are immoral and therefore can and should be banned from Cambridge. This is obviously fallacious. Technologies by themselves are neither moral or immoral. Morality applies only to the actions of human beings.

"The quotation above this column, popularized by the Nation, was a concrete statement of the principle that technology per se is amoral. This quotation has often been ridiculed by knee-jerk liberals; nevertheless, it is true. A gun is a tool for delivering kinetic energy. That energy may be used to blow the tires off a car, to blow a man’s brains through the back of his head. That energy is a product of the hammer. The hammer is a tool he uses to carry out his actions. The gun is merely a tool he uses to carry out his actions. That energy may be used to blow the tires off a car, to blow a man’s brains through the back of his head. That energy is a product of the hammer. The hammer is a tool he uses to carry out his actions. The gun is merely a tool he uses to carry out his actions.

A target is selected, not by the engineer, but by the people of the nation. Those technologies should be prohibited ‘the research, development, maintenance, production, testing, evaluation, transportation, and/or disposal of nuclear weapons or the components of nuclear weapons’ in Cambridge.

A target is selected, not by the engineer, but by the people of the nation. Those technologies should be prohibited; hence those technologies should be banned from Cambridge.

One can think that, at an institution like MIT, everyone would understand technology: not the hardware, but the engineering, but the philosophy of technology. Unfortunately, as the running debate about the referendum on the Nuclear Free Cambridge Act shows, such is not the case.
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