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siently criticised by the South African Government and others for mixing politics with religion. This is his reply:

"...and we are serious about affirming that God is the Lord of all life and that life cannot be compartmentalised, that life is not a vicious system - of injustice and exploitation - rather then going on suffering almost endlesly."

The softer answer is to say that blacks are not suffering. Blacks are suffering now, and I am yes, the suffering might be increased but I think there are those who say that we shall see that the whites have given them and that life cannot be compartmentalised, then observe new limits of our leaders have.

"Yes, you say you want to love me, but if you don't want to love me, then your particular stance has got to do with politics."
To the Editor:
The story by Frederic Wong, "Goldberger on Baxter" was well done and helpful, but a few questions remain.

Does President Goldberger think the Baxter Art Gallery is owned and operated by some non-Caltech agency? What is meant by the statement that "the administration has adopted the position to end affiliation with Baxter?"

If the gallery closes, a part of Caltech whose origins go back at least fifteen years will be terminated. As part of the Caltech Art Program, the Gallery was approved by two previous Caltech presidents and the Faculty Board. It is a part of the division of Humanities and the Social Sciences. Many Caltech faculty, students and alumni have spent a great deal of time tending the gallery and raising it to its current state. The Director, Jay Belloli, and his assistant, Barbara Alexander, are Caltech employees. There is, to be sure, a Board of Governors for the gallery, some of whose members come from the Pasadena community rather than directly from Caltech. Some have represented the Pasadena Art Alliance which has generously donated time and money to improve the exhibitions. They are to the gallery what the Associates are to Caltech as a whole. We are much in their debt, but they don't own or control the gallery.

Of the thirteen members of the Gallery Board, only three represent the Pasadena Art Alliance; four are Caltech faculty and one is an alumnus. The Baxter Art Gallery is as much a part of Caltech as, say, the Athenaeum or Beckman Auditorium and legally more a part than the Caltech Y, all of which have important off-campus support groups. If the gallery should close and the position of a tenured art historian should be terminated, a very important part of the Humanities at Caltech will be lost. The Humanities Art Program has done more than improve the quality of life of a few students. It has helped in our recruitment of applicants who seek a reasonably well rounded university. It has improved our relations with our alumni and our community. And the teaching of art has been a success even though less than 100 students have been affected. Would anyone deny the importance of a course about Shakespeare on the grounds that less than a majority of the student body signs up? If the contributions to undergraduate teaching of Jay Belloli and Marty Ward are to be measured by enrollments, the utility to Caltech of our first and second art faculty members would appear to be greater than, say, our fifteenth and sixteenth mathematical social scientists.

It is not too late to reassess a decision which may have been made in haste. If we can return to the status quo ante, we can discuss such issues as the kinds of exhibitions we should have and whether it is feasible and desirable to see an expanded facility. Let's find ways to improve rather than terminate our gallery.

Robert Oliver
Member, Board of Directors
Baxter Art Gallery
Notes from here

by Mike Clow

I've never seen a real nerd. But a few months ago, I saw some in Revenge of the Nerd, a movie which I think is still showing around here. My dictionary defines nerd as "a socially inept, foolish, or ineffectual person." Nerds are socially inept.

Everyone starts life with the same basic kit of social skills. Although there are many social skills books around, from Complete Etiquette, to How to Pick Up Girls, it seems that social skills are learned primarily by doing. Social skills are learned through experience.

I would suppose that the most important social skill is understanding the communications of other people: interpreting their words and actions, picking up their subconscious signals, and so on. An individual can learn social skills only to the extent that he or she can understand the results of his actions, and how other people feel.

Two synonyms of "nerd" are "improper" and "awkward." People who buy etiquette books worry about being improper. People who buy how-to books worry about being awkward. In the movie the nerds start out both improper and awkward. They were improper - they did not share the same football - beer - sex interests of others. They were awkward, almost as much physically as socially. But in the end they emerge victorious. They win the chair of the Greek council. Their leader gets the girl, a cheerleader who taunted him earlier.

It was never made obvious, but the main struggle in the film is over who is superior, what is "proper." In the end, the nerds become heroes and the football players become foolish losers. As for awkwardness, it seemed that everyone was awkward at some time during the film.

I don't think that awkwardness is the issue in the nerd stereotype. I do not think that people who are interested in science or engineering are more socially awkward than people in general. No, I think that the mistreatment of nerds is just another of society's little victimizations.

When a Polish cardinal became Pope John Paul II, the news networks interviewed people in Polish neighborhoods in this country. I was astonished to hear the sullen words of an elderly Polish-American: "Maybe they'll stop telling Polish jokes now." Yes, minor indignities add up.

But there is something strange about this kind of society - to individual mistreatment. People are still mistreated on the basis of race, class and gender. But in these cases, mistreatment has had a long historical sanction. Not so for Poles and nerds. Here the victimization, although comparatively trivial, is completely arbitrary.

Why are people mistreated by others who think that they're nerds? Why do such viclimizations take place? My guess is that everyone is, to an extent, insecure about his or her social ineptitude. People attack their own insecurities by projecting them on publicly proclaimed targets and mistreating them.

People so subjected to arbitrary victimization often respond with a natural defense: they become cynical and morose. As they become less responsive to others, their abilities to learn social skills diminish. They become increasingly cynical and insufferable. Some manage to break out of this cycle and find friends and happiness. Some manage to live lives of blissful arrogance. But some emerge with no faith in happiness. Some manage to break out of this cycle and find friends and happiness. Some manage to live lives of blissful arrogance. But some emerge with no faith in happiness. Some manage to break out of this cycle and find friends and happiness. Some manage to live lives of blissful arrogance. But some emerge with no faith in happiness.

One might guess that Caltech undergraduates, many of whom have suffered at least slightly from stereotypes, would be in the same boat. But often, it seems, the opposite is the case. Once subjected to a stereotype, it's as easy to belong to the group we were excluded from earlier.

Everyone is to a certain degree socially inept. But why worry about others' ideas of what is "proper"? Why accept stereotypes, which once abused us, to abuse others?

This isn't a "let's all be nice to each other" essay. People will like each other and not like each other. But people should always be treated like people. Revenge is good for a few laughs and a little liberation. It's worth seeing.
An examination of student life at Caltech: What's Up, BOC?

by Lily Wu

In every year that I've been at Caltech, one particular issue would come up which captures people's attention more than any other. Usually the problem is of long standing nature, so there is never any real resolution to it, but rather some more consciences every year.

At the end of each year, the issue fades, though the problems will remain until they are scrutinized again five or ten years in the future. By the end of the year of the women's issue and tolerance was the watchword for both women and the homosexual community at Caltech. In 1982-83, the very foundations of the Board of Control were questioned and rocked by students requesting more openness and honesty. In 1983-84 the housing system and rotation were questioned repeatedly in many letters to the editor, forums, and columns. This year is still up for grabs, 1984-85 may prove to be the year in which the system is given up. Or the cause for the attrition rate might be addressed. Then again, it might not be. Other ideas can include improvements in teaching quality or utilization in student social life. Maybe it will be the year in which the alpine club will try to overthrow the administration. Whatever it is, the odds are that it will NOT be the year of living dangerously at Caltech. It is disconcerting that the issues come and go like that, because nothing ever changes.

Of all these issues, the one which interested me the most was the question of the validity of the Board of Control. A very short attention span was devoted to it and yet, it is a very complex and pertinent issue. Here is what happened: In round one, letters to the Tech obtained questions that were raised immediately after they are reached. The question was also raised as to the limits of BOC authority. Were violations which broke laws to be reported to the BOC first? Or does that take unfair advantage of the victim? And should BOC decide on matters academic or otherwise? Finally, concern was expressed over possible unfairness towards defendants. It was thought that it was their prerogative to select jury trials, open trials, their own witnesses, evidence or even their own source of outside counsel. No complaints were leveled at the Honor System though, only towards the BOC's modus operandi.

A volley of letters thus ensued. Round two was rebuttal. Letters appeared from former and then current BOC members. They defended the lack of such activity by the letter writers of round one and went on to say that the very beauty of Caltech's honor system is that we can trust the BOC to do what is right and fair. The open and philosophically documented judicial system of the U.S. was founded on mistrust, so why do we need any elements from it? Racial corrections were made regarding a few specific details of BOC trials and numerous sources were made saying that the Board members go to great lengths to be fair. They feared open trials would deter future violation reports. Also, reputations had to be preserved. Ring. Ring. End round two.

More letters in support of openness poured in without any further BOC response. Finally, in the last issue of that school year, the BOC printed a questionnaire polling Techers for their opinion on possible by-law revisions which would allow for such things as open trials, and written case descriptions with each voting Board member's decision (as in the Supreme Court). And should BOC deal with all matters academic or otherwise? Of course, you may wish to sign or ask for further information. But, I am also a member of other, larger communities. My fresh talk representatives told me not to take advantage of any member of the Tech community. My doubts began when she added that she did not care if I took advantage of non-members. Of course it is not in her jurisdiction to govern my "outside" activity. She came up with examples like, it is an honor code violation to make free calls on the WAITTS line because Tech pays for it, but if you can get away with it on Ma Bell, feel free.

Caltech is merely one small subset of the outside world and whatever characteristics exist out there are in line with the same corresponding proportion. Those characteristics include such things as trust, honesty, and fairness, as well as dishonesty. No community can expect to be devoid of "bad apples". Caltech happens to be a happy breeding ground for them because their reputations are preserved and crimes concealed. Unhappily, homeworks and exams are stolen, money is stolen, property is stolen, homework policies are abused, serious interhouse RP's are committed, and the list goes on. If everything were more open and realistic, I would feel much safer and inclined to trust because I'd know I was told the full story and am free to protect myself from either future honor code violators or the BOC, for that matter.

Unfair from page 4 herein.

There is a petition circulating to change the patent agreement to guarantee the rights of a student to his own programs. Contact Peter Hughes in Ruddock, Castor Fu in Blacker, myself in Dabney, or one of a number of other persons around campus if you wish to sign or ask for further information.

— Albert Peterson

Unfair
Buckaroo Reviews by Matt Rowe

"If He Loved Me, He'd Vacuum"

La Cage Aux Folles at the Pantages Theatre is not what it purports to be. In any musical context, a title like this might be funny, but it wouldn't exactly bring down the house; in La Cage, however, it speaks volumes, and the audience unequivocally laughs at its prejudices. The two main characters in the show, Georges and Albin, are only for plot structure.

La Cage Aux Folles is an original play, not a musical comedy. What we are seeing is a translation of the original French play into a musical comedy in English. The sets and costumes are simple but lavish. The choreography is basic but the sets and costumes are lavishly produced, and the audience unknowingly laughs at their prejudices. The two main characters in the show, Georges and Albin, are only for plot structure.

Microsoft WILL BE ON CAMPUS

Microsoft Corporation develops the leading edge in microcomputer systems software. Our BASIC is world renowned. Our XENIX and MS-DOS operating systems have computer companies and others chomping at the bit. We design state of the art systems software.

We need programmers to work on Operating Systems, Compilers (FORTRAN, COBOL, Pascal, BASIC, C), Data Base Management Systems, Word Processing, Interactive Systems, Graphics and more.

Our OEM customer base is a Who's Who of the hardware business (IBM, Apple, Packard Bell). As new systems like the IBM PC and new processors like the 68000 are developed, Microsoft's programmers get their hands on the machines before they go into production. So your hardware suggestions and software innovations during R&D become part of the computer of the future.

Microsoft provides the best systems programming work environment

• all the high-level hardware (DEC-20, PDP 11, VAX, SUN 68000 machines) and software development tools you'll need, in O
• small company with lots of interaction and sharing of ideas and methods where you can develop your full potential.

And to make a good thing better, Microsoft is located in the Great Pacific Northwest

• mountains, skiing, ocean, desert, rain forest, rivers and lakes all with easy reach
• major cultural sports, social and commercial activities fifteen minutes away in Seattle.

We are looking for exceptional software design programmers — those with intelligence, drive, and a commitment to excellence.

We want programmers who will create Microsoft High Performance Software. Microsoft offers a competitive compensation package, 20% stock options, and a friendly, professional environment.

Ms. Jo Ann Ramal, Technical Recruiter, Dept. WZ, MICROSOFT CORPORATION, 10700 Northup Way, Box 97200, Bellevue, Washington 98009. We are an equal opportunity employer.

We will be interviewing on campus Monday, November 12, 1984. Please contact your career placement office for schedule information.
Oct 19, 1984
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Chris Hull

Chris Hull is a senior in Electrical Engineering and Chemistry.

Influencing Elections

FLASH—ABC announces on nationwide television that Ronald Reagan has been reelected President of the United States by a landslide margin. Not to be outdone, CBS and NBC follow moments later with the same prediction. This announcement came, not on the evening of Nov. 6 nor the next day but, three hours before the polls on the East coast opened. Places where it was close, were too close to call for most of the night. Finally, when the results come in, but they do not go as the television media predicted they would. Places where it was anticipated that Reagan would be an easy winner, did not materialize. Traditionally Republican states voted Democratic. Places where no exit polls were conducted, cast deciding votes. Districts where the Presidential race was not supposed to be close, were too close to call for most of the night. Finally, when all the votes were tallied, indeed, Mr. Reagan had won, not by a landslide, but by the slimmest of margins, one electoral vote. Millions of registered Democratic voters kicked themselves and cursed the news media because in some places, a few hundred votes in favor of their candidate and everyone would be calling Walter Mondale, Mr. President.

Although this scenario is fictional, it is not entirely improbable. In the last Presidential election, it was announced before the polls in the West had closed, that Ronald Reagan had clinched enough electoral votes; voter turnout in California dropped noticeably, particularly among Democrats who felt that their vote was now meaningless. For the office of President that was true, but also on the ballot was all the offices of California's Congressional Representatives, and one of its Senators, furthermore several important initiatives were still undetermined.

By forecasting the outcome of the elections before the polls are closed, the television media reports the results of an election, influences the election. This problem has not gone unnoticed by those whom it could directly affect, namely those in Congress. In the latter half of 1984, Congress looked into the problem of exit polling by the media and the use of that information to project outcomes before the actual vote count. They also looked into possible solutions like a nationwide opening and closing time for the polls, two day elections, and banning of exit polling, but could not come up with a feasible solution. In the end, they just asked the television networks to refrain from broadcasting the results until everyone had gotten a chance to vote. In supreme arrogance, one of the networks refused to do so, standing behind the first amendment and the public's right to know.

Now, I have another liberal interpretation of the first amendment and believe in the value of a free press but when they are no longer a passive observer, it is time to step in and set down some guidelines. What kind of press do we want, one that reports the news or one that creates it? Something to think about.

Chris Hull

The Polemic is edited for The California Tech by Lawrence Anthony, Michael Cwe, Nadeem Ghani, Rajeev Krishnamoorthy, Santosh Krishnan, Mike Kulickaas, and Behzad Sadeghi.

We hope you like this, the second issue of The Polemic. If you don't, write and help us make the next issue better. If you do, write and help us make the next issue even better. The Polemic could be your voice.

What kind of press do we want?

one's own opinion is part of public opinion

Superficial Doublespeak

Last Sunday, Walter Mondale debated Ronald Reagan. Mondale showed a better command of the facts, presented workable solutions to real problems, and generally demonstrated his ability to be a better president. Experts in the field of debate agreed that Mondale won decisively. Nationally syndicated columnists, including all but the most loyal Reagan supporters, thought Mondale won. According to such worthy sources as Newsweek and the L.A. Times, none of this is really important.

Analysis in the media seems to center around whether Mondale's performance had sufficient impact on voter opinion. There are two major fallacies (to use polite terms) in this view. First, cause and effect are switched. If Mondale will make a better president, then according to high school civics, we will informed and rational voters will prefer him. But it is ludicrous to start with the assumption that everyone watching the debate went in with an open mind, took notes, knew right off the bat which candidate was misstating the facts, and then carefully weighted what each side said. In the real world, it may take until after the election for the voters to figure out who's right. The right idea. It doesn't help to decide the winner by opinion polls instead of what the candidates said.

The second fallacy is seen in a lot of different disguises. For example "I won't vote for him because he can't win" (think about that one). It shows up in the idea that votes cast later on election day mean more or less than ones cast earlier (the proverbial deciding vote—quick, which vote decided the race?). The most dangerous form is the bandwagon effect. If an idea catches on a little bit, people will start to assume that if someone likes it, it must be good. In most cases, "someone" is a small minority. Everyone else is going along for the ride. The media are a frighteningly powerful amplifier in such situations. Usually, it's something harmless, a fad. But in an election, the results are for keeps.

The media/opinion poll system likes to pretend that it is always objective, and that it cannot affect the world it reports on. "We just print the facts, we keep our opinions on the Op-Ed page where they belong." Yeah right. How many times have you seen this on the news pages?!

We don't have to do this. Why? That's what is expected. Who expects it? The public does. (Hi! I'm a member of the public. I didn't know I expected that. You do now.)

After a while you start reading the paper to find out what you think. It's all based on the idea that public opinion is this sacred, infallible, immutable law, handed down from on high. It shouldn't be too hard to remember that one's own opinion is part of public opinion, but people forget all the time.

Anderson couldn't win because, well, he couldn't win. Did it matter what he said? No, he couldn't win anyway. Were Hart's ideas any good? That wasn't important. What mattered was who would win, whether they were really new. Mondale's debate victory is said to be meaningless because "it won't make a difference."

Keep up this superficial doublespeak, keep emphasizing appearances, and you get what we have now: the appearance of a presidency, the appearance of foreign and domestic policy. Or was that last remark too pointed? The public is in a patriotic mood these days. Best not to criticize the status quo. Hey, I love the USA as much as the next guy. That's why I want Mondale-Ferraro in office.

David Hull

David Hull is a junior in Mathematics.

We hope you like this, the second issue of The Polemic. If you don't, write and help us make the next issue better. If you do, write and help us make the next issue even better. The Polemic could be your voice.
The tragic deaths of several British MPs and Conservative party officials has pointed out once again the urgency of the situation in Northern Ireland. The point is not that Irish freedom fighters are struggling to gain independence from an oppressive colonial government. Nearly everyone in Britain may be against it in fact that they may be some solution to the "Irish problem." Much to the chagrin of the IRA, however, that solution is not simply to hand Ulster over to the Republican government. That would mean abandoning the majority of Northern Ireland who are British citizens and harbor to remain so. It would mean, for instance, handing hundreds of thousands of Protestant women over to a government which recently made abortion constitutionally illegal—under any circumstances. Americans should certainly understand the nature of this point, since they are about to doom the world to four more years of Ronald Reagan over much the same issue. Neither is the solution to attempt yet another subdivision of Ireland and return only part of Ulster to the Republic. The reality is that the Catholics and Protestants live together in every city and every village in the province, and there is no practical way to separate the two. This is an analogous situation to that which existed on the Indian subcontinent prior to independence. The bloody Hindu-Muslim fighting which broke out there might well have been averted had Mahatma Gandhi and Lord Mountbatten been able to avert the split into India and Pakistan. The IRA should have studied that bit of history more carefully before deciding to murder Mountbatten in 1979. They might take some other lessons from recent history as well. The accords reached over Hong Kong this year demonstrate that the British can be the most reasonable negotiators in the world if treated properly. Similarly, the war over the Falklands should prove that Westminster cannot be expected to back down under unreasonable pressure. The modern wave of violence in Ulster began in the early seventies. This is somewhat unfathomable since both Britain and Ireland have been members of the European Community since 1973. In principle, at least, this means that Ulster will eventually be governed from Brussels (Luxembourg would be better)—along with all the rest of the islands. In this eventuality, Ireland would be united under a single government again. And it would be a government with proper respect for religious minorities. This is true for two reasons. Firstly, any democratic nation of that size (300 million) would be so diverse as to make intolerance impossible. Secondly, and perhaps more convincingly for the IRA, the northern Protestants—British, Dutch and Germans—would be effectively neutralized by the southern Catholics—French, Spanish and Italians. Let's not let this opportunity slip away. Let's preserve our constitution, our Supreme Court, and our precious liberties. I urge each and every one of you to go out this November 6 and vote against Reagan, and Congressmen who hold similar views. Every vote counts. I missed voting in only one election since I turned eighteen, and that one turned out to be an exact tie.

Julian West is a senior in Mathematics and Literature.
Brian Toby

Environment

Mondale will treat acid rain as a national problem and will work to restore protections for our national parks. Reagan's administration has treated environmental issues with very little interest and in some cases negligence. James Watt and Anne Burford are two former Reagan administration officials noted for their failure to protect our national environmental heritage. (Both were praised by Reagan, even after being forced to resign.)

Women’s Rights and Civil Rights

Mondale has worked hard for equal rights under the law for everyone. In the Senate he worked toward the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and fair housing legislation. He authored a bill to establish a nationwide net of day care centers and argued for reducing or eliminating federal aid to schools as a way of providing parents with the freedom to choose their children’s education. Mondale has worked for equal rights under the law for women and has been even less friendly to minorities. Women, children, minorities and the elderly have been hardest hit by his budget cuts. 15% of the U.S. population now lives below the poverty line. Reagan's administration has succeeded in driving a former ally to the Soviets for support. Another major distinction between Mondale and Reagan is on farm policy, of interest to those of us who eat. Mondale opposes Reagan's big-business bias over small business. The candidates have very different views on education, foreign trade and many other issues, but you will have to find the information to make up your own mind. Watch the debate on Sunday and think carefully on the issues—the next four years may be very important.

Brian Toby is a graduate student in Chemistry.

The Economy

It is interesting to note, in times of reelection, the absurd claim of many incumbent politicians, of their own personal great and beneficial effect on the economy, when, in actuality, progress is achieved only to the extent that they have NO effect. This idea, that government interference in the economy, or in any part of an individual’s life, is harmful, is called a libertarian idea. Persons holding such beliefs are called libertarians.

Libertarians base their beliefs on a very simple principle: the only proper and moral purpose of government in a free society is the protection of the rights of individuals in that society from violation on the part of others. It is not to protect the individual from himself, nor is it to benefit him by violating the rights of others. This principle, when combined with the correct definition of the fundamental rights of man, namely, the rights to life, liberty, and property, leads to a comprehensive conclusion of the proper sphere of government.

First and foremost, government must not abridge civil rights:
A. It must not censor or restrict the rights of free speech of the press in any manner. Regulations in the broadcast industry, the “fairness doctrine” or “equal time” provisions in particular, are blatant examples of such censorship, as are court gag orders, and bans on certain types of advertising, such as cigarette commercials.

B. It must not violate the rights of freedom of religion and education. Separation of education and state, just as separation of church and state, must be strictly adhered to, and all individuals must be allowed to choose their own religion, and their own form of education. Tax funding or subsidy of any religions institution must end, and public ownership of schools must be abolished.

C. It must not violate the rights of the criminally accused. An individual must be treated as innocent until proven guilty, and accordingly must not be submitted to pretrial detention, nor forbidden fair appeal. Guilty persons must be accountable for restitution to the victims of their crimes. Criminal law must for-
A conspicuous lack of balance

Reagan and Arms Control

Peter Hughes

A good deal of attention has been focussed on President Reagan's foreign policy and his general attitude towards arms control and superpower relations. His belligerent attitude towards such issues is well known, and recent remarks have not helped his trigger-happy image. It is necessary, in view of the upcoming elections, to discuss just what this country will be getting should he be re-elected, and to determine how the cause of peace will be served by "Four more years?"

President Reagan assumed office at a time when relations between super-powers were on shaky ground. Afghanistan and the politicization of the Olympics had effectively cut off any sympathetic communication between the powers. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was taken by many as a betrayal of the spirit, if not the letter of detente. Coming on the heels of apparent U.S. helplessness in the Iranian hostage crisis, the invasion added credibility to presidential candidate Reagan's attacks on the policy of detente, and weakened President Jimmy Carter's defense of it.

Two weeks before the 1980 election, in a paid broadcast over CBS, Reagan had said:

As President, I will immediately open negotiations on a SALT III treaty. My goal is to begin arms reduction. My energies will be directed at reducing destructive nuclear weaponry in the world and doing it in such a way as to protect fully the critical security requirements of our nation.

However, upon becoming President, Reagan staffed his administration with hawks and neo-hawks, who had never been at ease with the arms control efforts of the Nixon, Ford and Carter administrations. Their basic contention is the rejection of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union as it is now constituted, and an attempt to change its society and government through the use of economic, political and military pressure. In an article in the L.A. Times on March 29, 1981, Richard Pipes, Reagan's Soviet expert, is reported to have said that "Soviet leaders would have to choose between peacefully changing their Communist system... or going to war."

To start off, Reagan appointed Eugene Victor Debs Rostow as the head of the Arms Control & Disarmament Agency. This is the same man who, on December 4, 1981, said in the New York Times:

The greatest risk we face is not nuclear war, but political coercion based on the credible threat of nuclear war implicit in overwhelming Soviet nuclear and conventional force superiority.

The appointment of a hawk, and an obvious opponent of arms control, to the head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, was a signal that this administration was not committed to arms control.

Indeed, during the first couple of years, several members of the Reagan Administration made irresponsible remarks about the likelihood and winnability of a nuclear war. To quote Eugene Rostow again, "We are living a pre-war and not a post-war world..."

In May, 1980, the New York Times reported that Defense Department-policy-makers, in a new five-year defense plan, had accepted the premise that nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union could be protracted and had drawn up their first strategy for fighting a war. The document had been signed by Weinberger.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency, which deals with the management of disasters, released a publication ("Handout to Emergency Managers", December, 1980), in which is stated: "With reasonable protective measures, the United States could survive nuclear attack and go on to recovery within a relatively few years."

But by mid-1982, the administration had realized the trouble it had gotten into with this attitude, and began to try to change the public's perception of its stand. It was then that President Reagan put up the so-called START proposal.

However, START only reinforced the belief that Reagan did not really care about arms control and was in fact making this attempt to cover up this. The cuts in arms that it called for were designed mainly to effect enormous reductions in land-based missiles, where the Soviet Union is clearly superior, without affecting bombers and submarine-launched missiles, where the U.S. has an edge. The President's zero-zero option was similarly unrealistic, as it called for far greater cuts on the part of the Soviets.

The intended U.S. deployment of Pershing II and Ground Launched Cruise Missiles became a growing problem, as the Soviets threatened to cut off the arms control negotiations if the U.S. deployed the weapons. The Soviet Union felt that the Warsaw Pact and NATO forces roughly balanced each other, and that the intrusion of American missiles would upset the parity. Indeed, during the first couple of years, several members of the Reagan Administration made irresponsible remarks about the likelihood and winnability of a nuclear war. To quote Eugene Rostow again, "We are living a pre-war and not a post-war world..."

In May, 1980, the New York Times reported that Defense Department-policy-makers, in a new five-year defense plan, had accepted the premise that nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union could be protracted and had drawn up their first strategy for fighting a war. The document had been signed by Weinberger.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency, which deals with the management of disasters, released a publication ("Handout to Emergency Managers", December, 1980), in which is stated: "With reasonable protective measures, the United States could survive nuclear attack and go on to recovery within a relatively few years."

By mid-1982, the administration had realized the trouble it had gotten into with this attitude, and began to try to change the public's perception of its stand. It was then that President Reagan put up the so-called START proposal.

However, START only reinforced the belief that Reagan did not really care about arms control and was in fact making this attempt to cover up this. The cuts in arms that it called for were designed mainly to effect enormous reductions in land-based missiles, where the Soviet Union is clearly superior, without affecting bombers and submarine-launched missiles, where the U.S. has an edge. The President's zero-zero option was similarly unrealistic, as it called for far greater cuts on the part of the Soviets.

The intended U.S. deployment of Pershing II and Ground Launched Cruise Missiles became a growing problem, as the Soviets threatened to cut off the arms control negotiations if the U.S. deployed the weapons. The Soviet Union felt that the Warsaw Pact and NATO forces roughly balanced each other, and that the intrusion of American missiles would upset the parity. Indeed, during the first couple of years, several members of the Reagan Administration made irresponsible remarks about the likelihood and winnability of a nuclear war. To quote Eugene Rostow again, "We are living a pre-war and not a post-war world..."

In May, 1980, the New York Times reported that Defense Department-policy-makers, in a new five-year defense plan, had accepted the premise that nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union could be protracted and had drawn up their first strategy for fighting a war. The document had been signed by Weinberger.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency, which deals with the management of disasters, released a publication ("Handout to Emergency Managers", December, 1980), in which is stated: "With reasonable protective measures, the United States could survive nuclear attack and go on to recovery within a relatively few years."

By mid-1982, the administration had realized the trouble it had gotten into with this attitude, and began to try to change the public's perception of its stand. It was then that President Reagan put up the so-called START proposal.

However, START only reinforced the belief that Reagan did not really care about arms control and was in fact making this attempt to cover up this. The cuts in arms that it called for were designed mainly to effect enormous reductions in land-based missiles, where the Soviet Union is clearly superior, without affecting bombers and submarine-launched missiles, where the U.S. has an edge. The President's zero-zero option was similarly unrealistic, as it called for far greater cuts on the part of the Soviets.

The intended U.S. deployment of Pershing II and Ground Launched Cruise Missiles became a growing problem, as the Soviets threatened to cut off the arms control negotiations if the U.S. deployed the weapons. The Soviet Union felt that the Warsaw Pact and NATO forces roughly balanced each other, and that the intrusion of American missiles would upset the parity. Indeed, during the first couple of years, several members of the Reagan Administration made irresponsible remarks about the likelihood and winnability of a nuclear war. To quote Eugene Rostow again, "We are living a pre-war and not a post-war world..."
**Propaganda Wars**

Many experts now agree that Soviet-American relations are currently at their worst point in thirty years. The distinguished diplomat George F. Keenan recently said that the superpowers were behaving like homosexuals dashing the sea.

On the respective homefronts it would seem that both sides are heavily involved in public relations efforts to engender as much fear and hatred of the other side as possible. In the Soviet Union this has taken the form of a government sponsored and produced Television Miniseries (Yes, the Russians have had taste too), which according to reports is modeled somewhat on the famous James Bond series of films (more bad taste, I suppose), with the notable exception that the Russian KGB men are seen as the good guys, the protector of the average Soviet citizen, and guardian of international peace, while American CIA men are portrayed as decadent, alcoholic, evil and dangerous.

Here in the United States, we have a different system. Our government does not publish and promote propaganda; rather, they let the private sector, beloved of Ronald Reagan, take care of that most mundane of tasks. So what we have is a film, currently billed as “America’s Movie” concerning the first ever invasion and occupation of the United States by a Foreign Power, namely, the Soviet Union. The movie is entitled “Red Dawn.”

Judging from the reactions of the audience with which I saw the film, the effort is a fairly successful one. Talk about engendering hatred. This movie should have been shown to the Nazis at Stalingrad. It tends to bring out the most expeditious of people, one point in the film, when there is a question of whether a Communist prisoner should be shot, one of the boys says, “but he’s a human being” (or words to that effect), to which a viewer in the row behind me declared, “He ain’t human, he’s a COMMUNIST! Shoot ’em!” Even I, aware from the beginning that the film, the effort is a fairly successful one. Talk about engendering hatred. This movie should have been shown to the people of the United States a couple of lessons: 1) never completely trust your government or what it says are our (meaning in) “National Interests”, 2) war is a terrible thing, which most people (excluding the military) can do fine without, thank you, and 3) there won’t ever be wars any more where right is right and wrong is wrong, where all the issues are black and white; the people (excluding the military) can do fine without, thank you, and 3) there won’t ever be wars any more where right is right and wrong is wrong, where all the issues are black and white; the world of today is a much more complicated place than it was when we fought World War II; that we live in a nuclear age; that war has come to mean not many men dying, but perhaps millions dying. But, as some journalists are fond of saying, the collective memory (and intelligence, I might add) of the American public is short indeed.

**Arms Control continued from page 10**

In Carter’s administration, for example, a hawk like Brezinski was balanced by a dove like Cyrus Vance. There is a conspicuous lack of this kind of balance in the present administration.

The last four years have been disastrous for the cause of arms control and peaceful relations with the Soviet Union. Four extra years of the Reagan presidency will bring us more of the same, only worse. After Reagan realised that calling seventy percent of the American people “Communist dupes” (for supporting a bilateral nuclear freeze) was not helping his popularity, he softened his rhetoric. And in these last couple of months before the elections he has softened it still more. But his softening rhetoric has not changed the way his administration operates. As recently as last May, while supporting the supporters of the MX who were telling congressmen how the MX was necessary to use as a bargaining chip with the Soviets, an excuse that Reagan has repeated many times, Ambassador Rowney, Reagan’s negotiator on strategic weapons and the MX, said during the

**Omnipotent State continued from page 9**

exist, must protect individual rights and do no more, can be seen in any of the above statements. Libertarian ideas, seemingly radical, are the same as those held by the founding fathers of our nation. Thomas Jefferson, were he alive today, would be a libertarian.

The Libertarian Party was founded in 1972, and has enjoyed increasing support ever since. Ed Clark, the 1980 presidential candidate of the party, attained ballot status in all 50 states, and since then, dozens of libertarians have been elected to office. The campaign of David Bergland, this year’s presidential candidate, is rolling along nicely, and it appears he will have a strong showing in November.

**Write for The Polemic**

Next issue November 16

Send articles to:

The Polemic 107-51

by November 7
TACIT: 13 Clocks

"Once upon a time" quotes the Wizard. "Wait a minute," interrupts the Minstrel, "must we begin at the beginning?" From the very first words of the play it is obvious that this is not going to be your standard issue, run of the mill, plain, boring, old, prince-slaying dragon-and-get-the-princess fairy tale; goodness me, no! But then, what did you expect from James Thurber, that dry American wit—or from Caltech's Theater Arts Program, for that matter?

Did I hear someone say "Special Effects"? Don't be shy. Speak up. Explain it! This show does indeed have technical as well as verbal sorcery. What is the secret of the 13th clock? Of the locked trunk? Or the Thing without a Head? Add an original musical score by graduate student Arie Michelsohn, a thunderstorm, some spirited swordplay, dances, a flock of man-eating geese, dark dungeons, harrowing escapes, and a "son-of-a-witch who is not a mere Device."

And yet, even with the Thurberian twists and the high-tech-jinks, the story still retains all the traditional ingredients: one noble prince, one beautiful princess, one really aggressive, anal-retentive and totally gross villain, magic spells and creepy thing that GLEEP! in the dark...

Starts Friday October 19th, Dabney Hall Lounge at 8 pm. Also plays October 20, 21, 26 & 27 with a 2 pm matinee on Saturday October 27th. Tickets are from $3.00 to $6.00 at the Public Events Ticket Office, 332 South Michigan Avenue, or at the Box Office the nights of performance. P.S. There may even be a happy ending, but that would be telling...

This Is Not A Prince Song

by Deirdre McClure

To cast the female lead in his rock opera Purple Rain, Prince held an open casting call, and when the dust cleared, out popped Apollonia Kotero. Along with the part came the Minstrel, "must lead spot in Prince's own "girl group", formerly called Vanity 6 and The Starr Company, which is credited to female members of Prince's entourage (Le. Wendy, Lisa Coleman, Sheila E.) and although his name never appears in any performance credits, it is obvious that Prince even plays the lead role in the music himself. Yet this is certainly not the stuff of any Prince album. Yes, the music is listenable and yes, you could dance to it till you drop, but the content is shallow and there is an underlying air of sexual exploitation, pure and simple. Side A, labelled the "electric" side, starts with a misguided but interesting-sounding tale of teacher-student "romance" called "Happy Birthday, Mr. Christian," then kicks into the song from Purple Rain, "Sex Shooter." This is the best dance cut on the album, and is centered around a classic Prince-style hook, "Come on, kiss the gun, guaranteed for fun." The side finishes up with the uneventful "Blue Limousine," with music by Sheila E.

The B side, the acoustic side, starts with the very promising "A Million Miles (I Love You)." The lyrics on this song are quite good, certainly the best on this album: "Where's the dawn? / Darkness is death/Don't die/Live forever/ Say you love him." Susan tries to sing the cute "Oh She She Wa Wa," but fails miserably, then Brenda treats us to the least-convincing audio orgasm in recent memory on "Some Kinda Lover." The album ends on an interesting note with the slow, moody piece "In a Spanish Villa," with entirely Spanish lyrics.

You may have noticed that this really isn't a full album's worth of music at all. Many of the boring songs seem stretched out to fill up space (though the good "Sex Shooter" seems too short), and the second side is even filled between tracks with silly chitchat and giggles, which is very annoying. Every interesting musical idea here could go on a 3 or 4 song EP. Overall, the songs are fun but unsatisfying. I wish I liked this more, but that's about all it has going for it. My recommendation, unless you're a real Prince fan, is to buy the single "Sex Shooter," and spend your money on an old copy of "Vanity 6" or the new album by Sheila E., In the Glamorous Life.

Folk Music Tonight

In Winnett

by Brian Toby

Tonight (Friday) at 8 pm in the Winnett Lounge, the Caltech Folk Music Society presents its second concert of the year featuring harpist Kim Skacky. When Carla Sciky performed here almost exactly one year ago, in her first L.A. area solo concert, she surprised everyone, (except perhaps Carla's mother) with a sold out concert. Carla performs a wide range of musical styles. She sings, accompanying herself on guitar and plays tunes on a number of instruments including the fiddle and the psaltery. Carla also weaves her own original compositions tastefully among traditional songs and tunes. Carla has a wide music background that includes performances as a featured soloist with the Aman folk ensemble and a Carnegie Hall recital.

Opening for Carla will be her new neighbor, Kim Skacky, who performs Irish and original tunes on the Celtic harp. Among her specialties is the music of Carolan, the revered blind Irish harper.

The concert will take place tonight (10/19) at 8 pm in Winnett. Tickets for the public are $5 if purchased in advance and $6 at the door. However there are a limited number of GSC-subsidized $3 tickets available to Caltech students (maximum of 2 tickets per student). Tickets and additional information are available from the Caltech Ticket Office (356-4652).
Chess Tech
King's Indian Attack
by Doug Dekker
This mission inaugurates a new semi-regular feature in the California Tech: a column devoted to chess activity at the Institute. The Caltech Chess Club will conduct regular tournaments this year, played on Saturday afternoons at the rate of one game per week, and we will here feature "annotated games" between the tourney leaders. (See the accompanying article for details of the upcoming events.)

Today's game was played in the first round of last year's tournament, the "Tim Smith Concept Switz." (Check with Tim Smith of Ricketts for an explanation.) Scott Lewicki (Page) is a talented, developing player; based on our rating difference, he might have expected to lose this game, but played tenaciously nonetheless. The notes below are necessarily brief (except after move 19!); I welcome your comments or questions.

Dekker (2142) - Lewicki (1556)
1-800-621-0095
(818) 673 page hardcover book with
12,500 informative quotations
offering the reader a deeper
insight into self and life in
general. Sixties of leisure
leisure time reading, spent compiling
titles. $10.00 post paid. If not
satisfied, return book within 30
days for refund. (Find it!)

Peter Meineck 127 S. Ave 55
L.A. CA 90042

GrADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
The University of Rochester
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT
THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER
Rochester, NY

At the University of Rochester's Graduate School of Management you can manage your career with a highly respected M.B.A.
With our wide variety of financial aid and loan programs, you can manage your finances, too.
So, take charge, and manage your way to a top quality management education.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CALL TOLL FREE:
From anywhere in the U.S.
outside N.Y. State call: 1-800-621-0095
From within N.Y. State call: 1-800-462-0073

THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT
Rochester, NY 14627

Any undergraduate major can qualify you as an M.B.A. candidate.
Loud Shorts, Rude Fans

by Busy Sue

Last Friday, the women's volleyball team played Claremont-Mudd-Scripps again. The game was a burner. Everyone was in a pretty shitty mood, especially by the end of the game (CAM is a good team; they hit down, set up a huge block, and play ok defense (that is, if someone were to get the ball past their block, they'd probably play ok defense).

We lost, but there were holes in their defense, but we never took advantage of them. We lost quietly and went home.

Monday evening we played PC. You know, Christian Whatever. They showed up for the game wearing these boxy shorts with amazingly red stripes and black - looked to me like something my grandad wore back in the sixties when he was trying his best to be a hippie. Really, those shorts lit up the whole gym.

Since PCC wanted to, we played the best three out of five sort of match. The first few games were ok but not super-exciting: we won them both from behind, everyone played well, ho-hum let's do something exciting. So, we changed the lineup. We lost the game, but still, we were looking for some Thrills. So, we screwed up the lineup. No problem, we've done it before. We lost that game, too. Then, we got serious: I mean, last year every time we played them, we lost the match in five. Not a good pattern to repeat, at all. So we won it. And next time we play them we are really going to kick their boxer shorts.

Score With Santosh

by Santosh Krishnan

AFC

LA Raiders(6-1) at San Diego(4-3): A map of perhaps the most exciting teams in the league. Last time they met, it took an 18 foot leap by Marcus Allen to win it for the Raiders. The Raiders made last Sunday's game against the Vikings lackluster. However, it lacked style, but they were in control all the time. San Diego still has no defense to speak of, while the Raiders have the best around. Still, it should be a good game to watch. Prediction: Raiders by 3½.

Denver(6-1) at Buffalo(6-7): It was only the snow that made the Packers-Broncos game close. Buffalo will not be so cold and losing by 3½ to the Billies, Prediction: Denver by 4½.

NFC

LA Rams(4-3) at Atlanta(3-4): The Rams have another QB controversy with Kemp performing well. Atlanta did not beat the Giants as they should have. A big NFC West game. Prediction: Rams by 2½.

There's Always Space for the New Expressionist.

At TRW's Electronics and Defense Sector, we recognize the value of new ideas. We provide an environment with space for free thought and expression. To us, you are tomorrow's source of talent and creative energy. With us, you can reach deep into the expanses of your imagination and help to develop technologies that literally reach beyond the stars.

Our informal and encouraging atmosphere has produced a galaxy of opportunities - encompassing large software computer systems, communications and scientific spacecraft; alternative energy sources, high energy lasers, and microelectronics development. These opportunities are open to you.

Take advantage of this opportunity now. Join a company that gladly makes space for the new expressionist. Tomorrow is taking shape at a company call TRW.

Equal Opportunity Employer

to see your placement office for details
Basketball Season Looks Promising

by Athman

After a moderately successful season last year, this year’s Caltech basketball team just might do even better. A talented frosh contingent as well as promising Junior transfers could help the Varsity squad achieve a league victory; something that has not been accomplished in 6 years.

The returnees from last year include Jim Helgren, 2-year starting forward, starters Bill Gustafson, Chris Kyriakis, Ed Zanelli, and last year’s supersub Chris Cottered. Jeff Lester will give it another try and remains uninjured after the second day of practice.

The key to success for the basketball team this year is re-bound ing. Sophomore Brett Bush seems ready, willing, and able to fill the shoes of the immortal Steeble and them some.

This year’s season features a trip to St. Louis to play in a tournament with MIT. We’re gonna kick some ass!

Weekly Sports Calendar

Intercollegiate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SPORT</th>
<th>OPPONENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sat.</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>9:30 am</td>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>CSS &amp; Christ College</td>
<td>Caltech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat.</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td>Caltech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat.</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Water Polo</td>
<td>Cal State Long Beach</td>
<td>Cal State LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat.</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>Valley Nomads</td>
<td>Caltech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat.</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Christ College</td>
<td>Caltech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon.</td>
<td>10-23</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>Women’s Volleyball</td>
<td>Occidental JV</td>
<td>Claremont-Mudd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>Occidental</td>
<td>Clare-Mudd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>Water Polo</td>
<td>Caltech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interhouse (Softball)

Fri. 10-19
4:00 pm Page
Blacker
Dunaway

G.S.C. Volleyball

A League

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SPORT</th>
<th>OPPONENT</th>
<th>COURT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun.</td>
<td>10-21</td>
<td>10-11 am</td>
<td>Bump n Grind vs. Fleming</td>
<td>TAPIR</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun.</td>
<td>10-21</td>
<td>11-12 pm</td>
<td>Tammy’s Team vs. Joy of Sets</td>
<td>Bump n Grind</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue.</td>
<td>10-16</td>
<td>6:15 pm</td>
<td>H/per’s vs. Ricketts</td>
<td>Ricketts</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-16</td>
<td>7:15 pm</td>
<td>Ricketts vs. Ricketts</td>
<td>Ricketts</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-16</td>
<td>8:15 pm</td>
<td>Derelicts vs. Overpaid Amateurs</td>
<td>Ricketts</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-16</td>
<td>9:15 pm</td>
<td>McGill Mean vs.</td>
<td>Lloyd Juggernaut</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-16</td>
<td>10:15 pm</td>
<td>Smashers vs. Nice Guys</td>
<td>McMill Meansies</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B1 League

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SPORT</th>
<th>OPPONENT</th>
<th>COURT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tue.</td>
<td>10-23</td>
<td>10-11 pm</td>
<td>H/per’s vs. Ricketts</td>
<td>Ricketts</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>6:15 pm</td>
<td>H/per’s vs. Coherent Spikers</td>
<td>Ricketts</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>7:15 pm</td>
<td>Ricketts vs. Ricketts</td>
<td>Coherent Spikers</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>8:15 pm</td>
<td>Derelicts vs. Overpaid Amateurs</td>
<td>Ricketts</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>9:15 pm</td>
<td>McGill Mean vs.</td>
<td>Lloyd Juggernaut</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>10:15 pm</td>
<td>Smashers vs. X-Men</td>
<td>McMill Meansies</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>11-12 pm</td>
<td>Upsetters vs. TAPIR</td>
<td>McMill Meansies</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B2 League

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SPORT</th>
<th>OPPONENT</th>
<th>COURT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tue.</td>
<td>10-23</td>
<td>11:12 pm</td>
<td>Kinetics vs. Eh? Team</td>
<td>Jerry’s Kids II</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>6:15 pm</td>
<td>Natural Satellite vs. Sops</td>
<td>Sops</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>7:15 pm</td>
<td>Eh? Team vs. Jerry’s Kids</td>
<td>Eh? Team</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>8:15 pm</td>
<td>Ruddock vs. Astronomy</td>
<td>Not Yet Known</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>9:15 pm</td>
<td>Cubbies vs. X-Men</td>
<td>Cubbies</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>10:15 pm</td>
<td>Not Yet Known vs. Brains not Braun</td>
<td>Cubbies</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Runners Outdo Themselves

by Big Mo

At Pomona on Friday, Caltech took on Whittier and Pomona on a mostly flat, fast 5 mile course. With a tremendous team effort, the exciting tour of the Claremont College area, including a mile of "the jungle," was over much faster than expected. All of the runners achieved best times for the season, while a few really broke loose, shattering lifetime records.

Sean Moriarity at 27:44, followed by Darin Acosta at 28:35, led the rest of the Caltech scoring runners (Mike Jens, John Gehring, and Dan Bilkie) to an easy victory over Whittier 19-42.

The rest of the men's team also did a tremendous job defending our school's fine name battling furiously down the last few hundred yards to deny Whittier a chance of a single point. Training, it seems, really does help. In the women's race, Jenny Haase was second despite her ability to run under six minutes per mile.

And Clea Bures forged on despite illness to remind us all that Caltech does have a gutsy women's team (although it lacks depth).

It was a day that will be savored for years as how a race should be run. Coach Neal was flabbergasted. It would have been perfect except that Pomona squealed us 15-49. Maybe next year?

Soccer at Irvine

by Sam Weaver

The Caltech Soccer Team, captained by Manny Acevedo-Ruiz, opened its season on Sept. 19 with a win over Christ College - Irvine. Since then, the team has faced 9 opponents, 7 of them in league competition. The team's record stands at 2-8, including last minute losses to Whittier and Southern California College.

In the Whittier game, Caltech led 1-0, with 5 minutes remaining in the game. A breakaway goal and a missed call by the official, however, put Whittier on top 2-1 with a minute left. Time ran out before Caltech could remedy the situation.

Many, captain and sweeper, is the team's defensive anchor, patrolling the backfield and covering for other defenders. Up front, Stefan Fuerabendt leads the attack as center forward. Paul Furrh, the starting goalie, has had a rough season, beginning with an injury in the third game which has forced him to miss four games. The team has many freshmen, including Doug Roberts and Paul Cofrari, starting fullbacks, and Sam Weaver, starting goalie. The team looks forward to a productive second half of the season.
**Material for the announce-**
**ment section of the Califor-**
**nia Institute of Technology**

**Student Shop Robbed**

Someone broke into a locked cabinet during this past weekend at the Caltech Student Shop. Someone broke into the shop and stole over $100 in cash along with numerous tools. Also stolen were keys to a locked cabinet and to the shop itself. If anyone has any information or the theft please contact a shop committee member or security.

**Debate Party**

Watch the final presidential debate and enjoy a party at the headquarters of the Democratic Party on Sunday (10/21). The debate will start at 5:30 p.m. and run until the debate's end at 6:30. The party is invited and there will be free typing by executive secretary.

**Music Society**

Gay Society will meet this Sunday at 2:00 pm in 210 Baxter to discuss the upcoming Palestine-Israel week and to plan a trip to Disneyland in the form of our annual Shabbatat Disneyland flick that we ourselves didn't have any advance notice.

**Recruiting**

The recruiting schedules going up on Monday, Oct. 22 in the Career Development Center, Room 8, Parsons-Gates, will be for the week of Oct. 29. Don't forget to bring these two in each interview you plan to pay them.

**Support Soviet Jews**

Deli dinner and letter-writing campaign to help free the refusenik Khassim family. This Sunday, Oct. 5, at 1 p.m. in 578-6013, ev. 796-7551.

**Like Getting High?**

Are you an acrophile? Do you get off on rocks? The Caltech Climbing Club will hold its first meeting on Saturday, October 27 at 11:00 p.m. in the Ricketts dining room. For further information, see Steve Waldman, Ri. 27.

**The Jerusalem Fellowship**

Because we feel our community must strive to develop leadership for the future.

**ASCIT Minutes**

ASCIT Minutes should send a notice to Joy Dabney. For more information call x3815.

**The California Tech**

**Friday, October 19, 1984**