Column/Will Doherty

MIT treats resisters unfairly

During his office hours on Sept. 6, 1983, as well as on several other occasions, MIT President Paul E. Gray '54 informed me and other non-registrant students, that we are not eligible for MIT financial aid that would replace federal aid denied us by congressional legislation, specifically the so-called Solomon amendment.

"Why not?" we cried in anguish, because for many of us this statement meant the delay or termination of our MIT educations. Gray explained that MIT could not expect students who decided to register, or who did not have to register, to support our decision to resist registration. Gray wrote in a letter to non-registrants last summer that he thought the Solomon amendment was "bad policy," but added that "by choosing not to register or not to sign, you are making an individual decision; other students in similar financial circumstances will choose to comply with the legislation." He argued that, because we had decided not to register, we should realize the consequences of that decision.

His words echoed in my mind as I read the proposal from MIT Chairman (a sexist term) David S. Saxon '41 for a universal national service [Los Angeles Times, Nov. 16, 1983, p.2], a plan by which the federal government would require all youths to join the military or to perform civilian work in exchange for college benefits. Saxon was reported saying such a mandatory program would offer "a new method of attack" on social problems and lend purpose to the lives of young people adrift in the backwaters.

Then I read The Tech (Dec. 9, 1983), discovering that MIT subsidizes the operating expenses of the Reserve Officers Training Corps program in areas including space, office machines, and civilian staff, according to Charles H. Ball, assistant director of the MIT News Office. The MIT Re-