To the Editor:

If it is your intent, I would like to thank The Tech for providing such great comedy in the form of recent articles by Mr. Simon L. Garfinkel. I fear, however, that Mr. Garfinkel actually believes the rhetoric he has produced of late. To remedy this situation, I suggest that, just once, he try thinking and writing at the same time.

In all fairness, Mr. Garfinkel's articles have been enlightening. Without them I would have never realized that by accepting financial aid, I am a begger — I thought I was just poor. He has also helped me gain insight into one of MIT's graduation requirements. After reading Mr. Garfinkel's articles in The Tech, I now understand why the new Freshman Writing Requirement is so urgently necessary.

Mr. Garfinkel's series of articles on education at MIT (?) seems to be based on the premise that MIT, as it stands today, is grossly mismanaged, inefficient, and practically detrimental to an education. I quote, MIT should be teaching its students three times faster than it currently is. MIT students should remember what they learn, in the smallest detail, forever. Accompanying these changes should be an increase in the amount of free, non-academic time, at the disposal of every student.

In all fairness, Mr. Garfinkel's articles have been enlightening. Without them I would have never realized that by accepting financial aid, I am a begger — I thought I was just poor. He has also helped me gain insight into one of MIT's graduation requirements. After reading Mr. Garfinkel's articles in The Tech, I now understand why the new Freshman Writing Requirement is so urgently necessary. Mr. Garfinkel's series of articles on education at MIT (?) seems to be based on the premise that MIT, as it stands today, is grossly mismanaged, inefficient, and practically detrimental to an education. I quote, MIT should be teaching its students three times faster than it currently is. MIT students should remember what they learn, in the smallest detail, forever. Accompanying these changes should be an increase in the amount of free, non-academic time, at the disposal of every student.

These three sentences are sufficiently ludicrous to make my point without further comment. I am, however, disheartened to learn that The Tech is so desperate to attract contributors, that anyone who is willing to sit at a typewriter twice a week is automatically elevated to the position of featured columnist.

As for Mr. Garfinkel, I can't help wondering why, if he has all the answers, he is at MIT now, instead of at his own school, learning the right way. Fear not, Americans, I'm sure another five-part series explaining this phenomenon will be forthcoming from you-know-who.

Mark E. Thurston '86

Marketing, teaching incompatible

To the Editor:
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