Building 4 mural is disturbing, inappropriate

To the Editor:

I was somewhat incomprehensioned by the format in which The Tech chose to run the article entitled "Student shows X-rated film," in last Friday's issue. By using the boxed format normally reserved for the reporting of student tragedies, I felt somewhat manipulatively induced into reading the article, under a somewhat false pretense.

In addition, a number of my friends and I experienced similar sensations of alarm upon first glance (from afar) at the bottom of Friday's issue. This anxiety was of course not alleviated until we discovered that the article was unrelated to anything presented in this manner in the last three years. I was of course not allayed until a glance (from afar) at the bottom of the front page of Saturday's issue revealed the necessity of the article itself—no further unnecessary attention to story. The Tech should develop its layout skills to foster undue alarm among the readership.

David Saslav '87

(Editors' note: This item appeared in Friday's issue under a box surrounded by a four-point border. This format has been used for news items, graphics, re- reas, and boxed photographs for several years. Obviou this is surrounded by a four-point border.)

Economics department fails to present alternative views

To the Editor:

MIT's economics department has the distinction of being to the "left" of much of the economics profession in this country. For example, many MIT economics professors—a number of MIT economics professors—hold the starting view that unemployment is involuntary—unemployed workers are not just taking a rest, but actually want a job. Even so, the MIT economics curriculum leaves much to be desired. The basic economics courses teach models stripped of institutional or historical specificity. Microeconomics courses teach that perfect competition leads to the greatest welfare of all. Macroeconomics courses teach one basic macroeconomic model, ignoring models proposed by Karl Marx, Kaajar, and even Keynes. In general, the courses teach models stripped of institutional or historical specificity.

Radical, institutionalist, and structuralist economics offer an antidote to these limits in the standard economics curriculum. There should be more alternative economics classes taught, especially on the undergraduate level. MIT should make a more permanent commitment to teaching alternative views of economics.

Chris Tilley G
Department of Economics

opinion

Supporters should bear impact of divestment

To the Editor:

I personally do not support the principle of apartheid, but I am strongly opposed to the divestment movement for reasons too numerous to list here. After a year of protests, I am getting very tired of reading articles of columnists, letters, giving a near infinitesimal number of arguments for divestiture, most of which make very little sense and are based more on emotion than fact or reason.

In an effort to avoid further unpleasantness over this topic, I have formulated a remarkably simple solution which should make everyone happy. After extensive thought and deliberation (at least five minutes), I came up with the following plan:

Each student, upon admission to MIT, should express his (or her, of course) preference concerning the investment by the MIT corporation of the money he or she will pay. If the student is opposed to having his (or her, or she) share of the overall investment by the MIT corporation of the money he or she will pay. If the student has the misfortune to view off of construction which I have trenched in the sexist and satanic vestiture, most of which make very little sense and are based more on emotion than fact or reason.

Under this plan, everyone would be happy. Those heartless capitalists of the MIT corporation would have no worries of losing money in inferior investments, as any losses would be made up by the protesting students.

The protesters would also be happy, because divestment (or at least their share of it) would have been brought about with only a moderate financial loss to themselves and, as they have said so many times in the past, they value humanitarian considerations much more highly than mere monetary matters.

Lastly, I would be happy, because I would no longer be subjected to the insufferable ranting of the protesters... at least until they find another popular cause to join.

William T. Johnson '88

Box draws unnecessary attention to story

To the Editor:

I was somewhat perplexed by the format in which The Tech chose to run the article entitled "Student shows X-rated film," in last Friday's issue. By using the boxed format normally reserved for the reporting of student tragedies, I felt somewhat manipulatively induced into reading the article, under a somewhat false pretense.

In addition, a number of my friends and I experienced similar sensations of alarm upon first glance (from afar) at the bottom of Friday's issue. This anxiety was of course not alleviated until we discovered that the article was unrelated to anything presented in this manner in the last three years. I was of course not allayed until a glance (from afar) at the bottom of the front page of Saturday's issue revealed the necessity of the article itself—no further unnecessary attention to story. The Tech should develop its layout skills to foster undue alarm among the readership.

David Saslav '87

(Editors' note: This item appeared in Friday's issue under a box surrounded by a two-point border. This format has been used for news items, graphics, re- reas, and boxed photographs for several years. Obviou this is surrounded by a four-point border.)