defending himself against Coppe- smith's charge that he was a self-styled prophet, Thomas was portrayed as a gray-haired prophet who said, "So be an expert television critic." Linsky was a virtual nonentity. Diamond made one accurate observation, that the show was not "TV On Trial." It was the last elemenit of the evening, the only one to call attention to the real nature of the show, and the only example which contradicts my thesis. The editing, furthermore, made Diamond's point clearer than it was when he said it.

The show's bias becomes most blatant when one considers the amount of time devoted to each individual and segment on the show. I listed each of the possible categories. A panelist was booked for times when he or she spoke, except for questions directed to specific other panelists. Such questions were credited to the second panelist's time. These were the times:

- Linsky: 0:13
- Baker: 0:51
- Thomas: 2:17
- Miller: 2:28
- questions: 3:16
- answers: 3:06
- offair: 4:15
- Keppel: 5:46
- Goodgame: 5:47
- Yonfeld: 6:02
- commercials: 10:00
- Coppe smith: 11:20

"Questions" represents the time audience members spent asking questions to a group of panelists. "Other" represents times for intros and outros, credits, and for when several people talked at once. "Commercials" is self-explanatory. There is a five percent error of plus or minus three seconds per minute, except on commercials.

"TV On Trial" was less a pol- icy-oriented forum than a self-in- terest forum. The general manag- ers were the focus for almost half the non-commercial time. WCVB's Coppe smith consumed almost twice as much time as any other panelist, and the rest of the times for introductions, comedies all went into the WCVB kitty.

It is not the self-serving nature of WCVB that is bothersome; it is the insidiousness of its meth- ods. If Coppe smith spent time one evening extolling the virtues of his station, no one could com- plain. It is his perversion of the ideal of a public-interest forum to his business's ends that is so offensive.

It is unlikely that such prac- tices will change. It will always be easier to produce style over sub- ject matter, to discuss matters rather than to create, to appeal to the lowest common denominator instead of the high- est values. It is up to "you, the public" to recognize such de- misions for what they are, and if you disagree, reject them with a tur of your television's dial.

Circuit viewer.

Job anxiety leads to victimization (Continued from page 4)

breakfast?"

If it did not seem to have occurred to the senior that there were deviant interviewing prac- tices and did not eat to put up with them. She could have re- fused point blank to go into the bar. She could have refused to drive with someone who had been drinking. She could have re- ported the interviewers to their personal departments and to the Career Planning and Placement Office. She could then have re- quested further, non-harassing interviews — if she still wanted to work for the firm.

But the second firm, the one with the engineer who drinks vodka highballs for breakfast, gave her an office, and the senior — like quite a few recent gradu- ates — hasn't had many offers. In an interview with The Tech, Director of Admissions Peter H. Richardson described MIT students as "a group of people that are really anxious and worried about how they're going to get food in their mouths. That's the level of anxiety that exists, and I think it probably exists right over in Baker and McCormick and the other firms," Richardson stated.

Of course he is right. As chil- dren of the recession, we grew up reading about double-digit un- employment wondering how we were going to find jobs — any jobs. Many of us came to MIT in the hope of increasing our chances of employment.

"If anybody in this world is going to get a job, it's going to be you guys," Richardson assen- ted. He may be right, but we won't believe it until we see it.

It is tragic — and understand- able — when the fear of unem- ployment forces someone to put up with the kind of nonsense the MIT senior in the placement of- fice was putting up with. Yet we are hardly at the stage where we must waive our human rights and put ourselves at the mercy of the seller's market. If we are like vic- tims — in any of our dealings in the adult world — we will be vic- tims.