Shepard Fund Allows Student to Skydive

Skydiving: ("Isn't that really dangerous?!") the sport of jumping out of a perfectly sound airplane, ("I would never do that.") reaching a terminal velocity of 130 miles per hour, ("Aren't you scared or nervous?") with the expectation that 300 square feet of cloth will save your life. ("What if your parachute doesn't open?").

After a few hours of hearing comments like those, even I was beginning to doubt my sanity. I couldn't believe that I was actually going to do it. Back when Matt Dunsoff and I entered the Don Shepard Essay Contest, I hadn't contemplated the reality of what skydiving entails. But the money had been paid, and the night before we jumped out of a plane, all I could say to Matt was, "We're crazy!"

The next morning was fine and clear, and it promised to be a hot, sunny day. Matt and I were at the Perris Valley Parachute School by 7 a.m., and were registered, paid up, weighed in, and assigned a class by 9 a.m. There are two types of jumps that the school offers: Tandem and Advanced Freefall. On a tandem jump, you are strapped to a qualified skydiver ("jumpmaster"); he carries one parachute for the both of you and basically takes care of everything. Advanced Freefall is actually an eight-level course designed to make you a solo skydiver. Matt and I were going to attempt Level One. There were six of us in the class that day: Matt and myself, a blonde-type couple named Heather and Jeff, combat boot-wearing Mike (who, coincidentally, went to the same high school as Jennifer Miller and Rob Underwood), and another guy who lost his nerve and dropped out of the class after lunch. Our instructor du jour was pixie-like Jennifer, ninety pounds of serious skydiver. After we had gathered in the small, stuffy classroom and exchanged nervous banter about what we were about to do, Jennifer flashed a ferocious smile and proceeded to tell us that, yes, it is possible to die while skydiving.

We spent the next six hours learning how to save our lives. We did mock jumps on the ground to learn the sequence of events, and practiced in fake harness in order to familiarize ourselves with the equipment. We were drilled for hours on emergency procedures. Jennifer admitted that she was trying to scare us into learning and, more importantly, remembering. In spite of all the precautions, however, we were assured that parachute jumping is safer than it sounds; in Jennifer's history of over two thousand jumps, she only had to use her reserve chute twice. But all in all, it's completely up to you to pull the cord. When we finished training, Jennifer looked each of us in the eye and asked us with total seriousness, "Do you think that you can save a life in the air while jumpmasters Jerry (left) and Larry (right) look down."

Beckman Hosts the Aman International Dancers

Aman International Music and Dance launches Caltech Public Events' 1992-93 season on Saturday Oct. 10 at 8 p.m. in Beckman Auditorium. At 4 p.m., prior to their performance, members of the company will participate in a "Dance with Aman American" where they will give instruction in the art of folkdance. Patrons are encouraged to bring picnic dinners to enjoy on the Beckman Mall before the performance. Included in Aman's full-length performance will be the Chinese dance of Central China, Dalinbali, Tadjikistan, Mexico, Northern Ukraine, Macedonia, Appalachia and other regions.

Aman was founded in Los Angeles in 1964 for the purpose of preserving and presenting America's multicultural heritage as it is expressed through music, song and dance. Caltech students can purchase $7.50 Rush Tickets, and faculty can buy tickets at half price. Tickets can be purchased at the Caltech Ticket Office. For information call x4652.
A Response to “No More Years”

Bill Goodwine

The October 2, 1992, Beck Opinion Column, “No More Years,” makes several inaccurate factual assertions and grossly mischaracterizes Republican ideological aims. With respect to trickle-down economics, data contained in The Statistical Abstract of the United States, available in Millikan, confirms the fact that Americans from all economic circumstances benefited from the economic policies of Presidents Reagan and Bush. Table No. 762, for example, illustrates that from 1980 to 1989, the distribution of families by income level (in constant dollars), shifted upward, i.e., there was a significant trend in families in the lower income distributions to move up to higher brackets. (Note that the revised processing procedures were adopted in 1987; therefore only trends, as opposed to absolute values, before and after 1987 are legitimate in comparing data which straddles that date). Of this the wealthy had benefited from the 1980’s, there would have been no change in the distribution of families by income since all of the change would have occurred within the highest income distribution bracket. Contrary to popular, liberal opinion, therefore, the poor, middle class and rich together benefited from the economic gains of the 1980’s.

The assertion that people making over $1,000,000 have enjoyed a 2,184% increase in salary is ridiculous on its face. Personal experience dictates that the average person making $1 million today did not make $44 thousand in 1980. A salary of $44 thousand per year is certainly above average, but it would satisfy few people’s definition of “affluent.” Even if the assertion is true, we should applaud and encourage such a successful outcome of the American dream, rather than despise and attempt to stifle it.

The assertion that the wealthiest 1% of the population controls 90% of “our” assets is also incorrect. Intuitively, such a pronouncement is an obvious exaggeration and a simple calculation further illustrates and confirms this fact. Using Tables 762 and 763 from the Statistical Abstract, the total assets of the wealthiest 2,488 million (approximately 1% of the U.S. population) “wealthholders” in 1986 were worth about $3.9 trillion. The total gross stock of fixed, reproducible, tangible wealth in 1986 was valued at $19.7 trillion; therefore, the wealthiest 1% controlled 19.7% of such assets. Even this figure is misleadingly high since the analysis is not to account for the distribution of wealth by age, but even this exaggerated figure is a far cry from the 90% asserted in “No More Years.”

Tom Annau Responds

Tom Annau

The following is a point by point rebuttal of Bill Goodwine’s critique of my opinion piece in the last Tech:

In his first paragraph, Mr. Goodwine asserts that “the poor, middle class and rich together benefited from the economic gains of the 1980’s” without providing any actual figures. The January 11, 1991 New York Times carried a front page story which stated that “The wealth of all people grew substantially in the 1980’s while the assets of other Americans barely kept pace with inflation,” the Census Bureau reported today... for the most affluent fifth of all families, average income grew 14% from 1984 to 1988, after adjusting for inflation. For other households, wealth was not significantly different in 1984 and 1985, the bureau said.

This year, on May 11, the Times reported that “The Government’s... of the American family, illustrates... illustrates... households, rose of 72% in 1980 to 1989, the...” The government’s... to adjust for inflation. For other households, wealth was not significantly different in 1984 and 1985, the bureau said.

That was on May 11, the Times reported that “The Government’s... of the American family, illustrates... illustrates... households, rose of 72% in 1980 to 1989, the...” The government’s... to adjust for inflation. For other households, wealth was not significantly different in 1984 and 1985, the bureau said.

If Donald Barlett and James B. Steele cite in their book, “America: What Went Wrong?”, “between 1980 and 1989, that average wage earned by those in the under-$20,000 income category [49% all employed Americans] rose from $8,528 to $8,651. That was an increase of 1.4%.” I hate to disappoint Mr. Goodwine, who spent an entire afternoon of diligent research in Millikan attempting to dispute the findings of leading economists and government studies, but the sad fact is that the Reagan revolution was a victory only for the rich.

—Tom Annau
continued from page 2

**Goodwine**

*More Years.*

The notion that the economic policies of Presidents Reagan and Bush "caused" the recent recession is also absurd. No macroeconomic theory was presented to support such a claim and historical economic precedent provides no indication that recessions are triggered by the adoption of supply-side economic policies. Even John F. Kennedy recognized the economic benefits of supply-side economic policies, and advocated a tax cut during his Presidency to improve the economic performance of the United States. Cyclical economic performance is an economic fact of life, and the view that the economic policies of Presidents Reagan and Bush somehow "caused" the recent recession is illogical and incorrect.

"No More Years" also grossly mischaracterizes Republican ideological goals, and furthermore, adapts the style of argument most favored by liberals when their ideology fails to sway public opinion: attacking the character and morality of their opponents by adopting convenient, yet inaccurate "labels" for their positions. Such "labels" are often designed to give the impression that conservatives are motivated by malevolent intent. Although "No More Years" provides a brilliant display of the usefulness of a thesaurus, beyond its incorrect factual assertions regarding economic circumstances, it amounts to nothing more than an attack on the character and morality of those whose views differ from that expressed in the column. Rather than "extremist" or "ultraliberal dogmatists" motivated by "fear," "intolerance," "racism," "irresponsibility" and "waste" to impose a "con job" and "cynically" "conspire" to dictate the morality of us all in an attempt to help only the "affluent," Republicans and conservatives in general are genuinely concerned for the well-being and betterment of all Americans. Unlike liberal Democrats who view the government as the solution to all problems, conservative Republicans recognize the Constitutional and practical limitations of our government, and believe that the individual, rather than the government, is often more effective in dealing with any social and economic issues. Unlike liberal Supreme Court Justices who view the Constitution as an object into which they inject their personal political views, conservative Supreme Court Justices view the Constitution for what it is: a document which itself must provide the ultimate foundation for any Supreme Court decision.

It is time that the Democrats end their baseless finger-pointing regarding the budget deficit. The Democratic Congress is equally, if not more to blame than the President for the national debt. Clinton's election will serve only to remove the check provided by a Republican President on an irresponsible Democratic Congress. Those who have "unsanitized disasters" should recall the state of the economy and foreign policy at last time a Democratic President held office with a Democratic House. The only clear accomplishment of the Carter administration was the precipitation of the Reagan Revolution.

**Annau**

*What West Wrong?*, p. 4] I do not oppose success and opportunity, as Mr. Goodwine implies; what troubles me is such staggering economic disparity.

I would like to thank Mr. Goodwine for pointing out a misstated statistic in my article. I claimed that "the wealthiest 1% of the population... now control 90% of our assets." This is incorrect. It should have read, "the wealthiest 1% of the population now own more assets than the bottom 90%." The April 21, 1992 *NY Times* reported that Federal Reserve's triennial Survey of Consumer Finances found that, "The very rich increased their share of the nation's total pool of privately held property during the 1980's economic boom." According to the Fed's survey, the wealth of the top 1% increased from 31% of all assets in 1983 to 37% in 1989; for the bottom 90%, their share went down slightly from 39% of all assets in 1983 to 32% in 1989.

Mr. Goodwine goes on to claim that "historical economic precedent provides no indication that recessions are triggered by the adoption of supply-side economic policies." To the contrary, there are striking parallels between the policies of President Calvin Coolidge (1921-1929) and President Reagan. As historian Charles Beard wrote of Coolidge's trickle-down economic philosophy, "Taxes were to be reduced — not indeed on goods consumed by the masses but certainly on the incomes of those who sat highest at the American feast. This was to be done, he urged, with a view to leaving more money in the hands of the rich for investment, so that the opportunities of the poor to gain profitable employment might be multiplied." Sound familiar? Interestingly enough, George Bush's economic record is the worst since Herbert Hoover, Coolidge's immediate successor. I enjoyed Mr. Goodwine's textual analysis of my article, and particularly his revisionary, patchwork summary of my arguments. With respect to his critique of my writing style, I can only suppose that he perceives the liberal fragmen-
ted that are the hallmarks of President Bush's unsupervised remarks. I must differ, however, with his in-
genuous belief that conservative judicialists are somehow more objective than their liberal colleagues. Judicial activists on both sides of the political spectrum bring a personal agenda to the bench. I simply prefer an activist court such as the Warren Court, which greatly strengthened civil rights, to the Rhequist Court, which seeks to restrict individual liberty in favor of state power, the Constitution notwithstanding.

Finally, I would like to substantiate my claim that Republican policies led to the unprecedented deficits burdening the economy today. The Reagan policy of decreasing tax revenue while sharply raising government spending, a package which he passed through a Republican Senate, is an obvious formula for increasing the deficit. The nation's first deficit over $100 billion occurred in 1982, at $120 billion, a 62% increase over the last Carter deficit; the next year, the figure practically doubled to $208 billion.

This poll reflects that a substantial majority feel that America needs new leadership. As columnist Mark Shields remarked, this month we are beginning to hear the distant rumblings of an approaching land-side.
CANDIDATES
California if Roe vs. Wade is overturned by the Supreme Court, she stated that though California's Constitution guarantees the right to privacy, legislation guaranteeing that that includes abortion should be passed by the legislature to protect it explicitly. Another questioner asked her opinion on the death penalty, Dewey said she was opposed to it.

Doug Kahn, who owns and runs a typesetting business in Alameda, strongly attacked his opponent Carlos Moorehead. Calling Moorehead, "the dumbest person in Congress" and a member of "a rotten core of spineless do-nothings Congresspeople," Kahn criticized Moorehead's opposition to the Family Leave Bill, and Moorehead's role in 1986 in the deregulation of the cable industry, whom he claims gave Moorehead two five-day vacations to St. Marks and Hawaii.

On the issue of national health-care, Kahn, saying "health-care is a right... we need a system which is seamless," called for a single-payer system such as that used in Canada and many other countries. Asked about his environmental views, Kahn said he saw no opposition between jobs and the environment and that environmental technology was a growth industry which could help the region's economy. He also said that he supported renewal of the Endangered Species Act, which expires this year, and criticized the National Forest Service's logging program saying "we are giving away our natural resources for nothing."

He favors withdrawal of American troops from Europe and Asia. In Yugoslavia and Armenia he favored immediate UN armed intervention to empty the concentration camps, comparing the events in Bosnia and Croatia to the Nazi atrocities in WWII. The question of US aid to Israel, Kahn wanted the Israeli loan guarantees to have been made available without any preconditions, a reference to the President's witholding of the guarantees, on fears that the former Shamir government would use them to build more settlements in the occupied areas.

Kahn called the Manned Space Station a huge boondoggle, wishing instead to fund unmanned probes. He also came out against the proposed $2 billion dollar Superconducting Super Collider, saying that the research funds should go instead to medium and small-size research.

Kenneth Sauereman, the Libertarian candidate, spoke last. He criticized government regulation, and many government programs, saying that they were stifling innovation and development. The audience gave him a rather chilly reception.

The election is on November 3, and its important that you find out about all the candidates, not just the Presidential and Senate candidates. As the election grinds through this last month, we will try to let you hear more from the candidates running for locally-elected offices, many of which can have a direct impact on your life.

Attention ALL students...

COME HEAR...

PAUL ORFALAE
founder and chairperson
of Kinko's Copy Centers

ENTREPRENEURIALISM
at the Hall of Associates in the Athenaeum
on Monday, October 19th
4 pm

Refreshments served on east patio following the talk where you will have the opportunity to speak with Paul Orfalea informally.

Casual dress is a must!

If you have any questions about the event, please contact the Annual Fund office at 356-5323.
To the Class of 1996:

We wanted to Thank You for sharing your lives with us.

We read every single word you wrote...

We laughed with you because of your humor,

We cheered for you as you triumphed,

We stood beside you as you reached for your dreams,

May you find ways to use the talents and gifts,
That make each of you special,
In your quest for the truth.

With all of our hopes and best wishes,

- The Undergraduate Admissions Office

ps: Live it up now (before you have to take 95).
Bridge Without Sam

Jeff Goldsmith

And Underruffing

Playing in the first round of a Midnight Swim with five-minute boards, we draw probably the second best team in the event. We have started late, so I have little time to think when I pick up this gem:

North

1. 190976
2. 29403
0
876
0

South

1. AQ
2. AQ75
3. J10
4. 0
0

The bidding is as brief as it is inaccurate. I open 1Ø, and my partner jumps to 2. 4 looks a lot better as in normal the case when a weak hand has a long suit, but 4Ø is certainly playble, and getting to game is a triumph, provided, of course, that I make it.

The bad guys lead a diamond, which I think is good for them. Tapping dummy may make the spades useless, but I must win the first trick with a low trump on the board. This is as good a time as any to take the spade finesse. Who knows, those things don't always work. Surprise! This time the Queen holds. I cash the Ace and unfortunately, the King does not drop. It must be right to ruff a diamond to dummy and set up spades, I ruff the third spade with the Queen, hoping to be overruffed, because I might have reentry to dummy then with trumps, but the Queen holds.

I can now ruff a diamond and lead a good spade from dummy, but I think that will mess up my planned end position, so I exit with a club. They take their two clubs and continue with a third, which I ruff in hand.

Now I ruff a diamond and ruff another spade with the seven. If it holds, I am cold by continuing with a low heart, but LHO overruffs and goes into the tank with these cards remaining:

North

1. J10
2. 0
3. 0
4. 0

South

1. 0
2. J10
3. 0
4. 0

He finally plays a club which I ruff in dummy and underruff in hand with the five. The lead of a spade from dummy allows me to take the trump finesse successfully one more time and I manage 10 tricks for a big swing on the board and a close win in the match.

This position of the underruffing grand coups at trick 11 is very rare.

I had only seen it before in Terence Reese's classic Master Play at Bridge and feel very lucky to encounter one in real life.

The Caltech Bridge Club meets every Monday night at 7:15 in Winnett Lounge. Everybody is welcome; call Jeff Goldsmith at x2818 for details.

Finally some notes you won't mind taking

PROJECT

EXPLORER

An extra $500

For College Students

aren't it time all those years of note-taking paid off? Here's your chance. An extra $500 to Ford and Mercury when you buy or lease any eligible '91, '92, or '93 Ford or Mercury car or Ford light truck. You can use your $500 cash back towards the purchase or lease, or you can take it as cash. College Program benefits are over and above consumer incentives, except other Ford private offers, like the First Time Buyer Program.

As an undergraduate, you’re eligible for this $500 cash back if you’re currently enrolled in an accredited 4-year undergraduate program at this school and take new vehicle retail delivery between April 1 and December 31, 1992. You are also eligible if you're currently enrolled in graduate school between October 1, 1990 and December 31, 1992, and take new vehicle retail delivery between January 1 and December 31, 1992.

During the program period, qualified applicants may also enjoy the benefit of Ford Credit Financing. In addition, graduating college seniors and graduate students may qualify for pre-approved credit levels through Ford Credit, which could mean no down payment.

Buying a new vehicle has never been simpler. For more information, call the Ford/Mercury College Program Headquarters at 1-800-321-1536 or visit your Ford or Mercury dealer.
Skydiving

The Sweaty Smell of Victory
Jennifer Yu

Ah, the sweet (or rather sweaty) smell of victory. The Caltech Women's Volleyball Team won their first match of the season against the La Sierra Eagles Tuesday night under new head coach Cathy Monteroso.

We drove to La Sierra (in rush hour traffic), we saw the other team (in their dimly lit gym), and we proceeded to CRUSH them... but not until the second game. Unanswered La Sierra points stacked up in game one due to poor Caltech passing, a problem which has plagued us in past matches. Yet, over the roar of the Eagles' home crowd, you could hear Katie Coughlin's serves whiz past our befuddled opponents. AC! The Beavers began to make a comeback - but a little too late. Game one ended 8-15 La Sierra.

So Iike, Taelea has this theory that the team to score the first five points in a game will get that game. We tried it out and found the theory held true. Game two: 15-6 Caltech. Wow... Everyone huddled around Coach Monteroso and the team decided to test that theory again.

Game three: 15-10 Caltech. T. Katie and Amy were digging those balls left and right... Katie and I had quite a few kills (and they felt sooo good!) thanks to Angie's FAST-TAC setting. Cherity was an animal, an ace here, an ace there, a block here and kill there. Shazam! Then all of a sudden, BOOM - game four. It was that same old passing problem creeping up on us, sort of like underwear creeping up on you in a game... Our bench was so incredibly supportive, full of energy and LOUD! - their bench was desolate, and fearful. We despite excellent efforts on the part of the whole team (and the fact that our shorts much more the sweet (or rather sweaty) smell of The Caltech Women's Over 50,000 topics and clippings. Materials for research assistance use only!! 14515 Ventura Blvd., 2nd Floor, Room 209 Los Angeles, CA 90028 Mon-Fri 10:30-6:00 * Sat 11:00-4:00 Custom Research Available AmEx VISA MasterCard Fax Call Today! (800) 356-9001 owner of the voice, who was directing both me and Matt, occasionally told me to turn some number of degrees in a given direction. The rest of the time I enjoyed the scenery, looking at the mountains or watching the sunset, picking out the buildings and we had been taught to recognize as landmarks. It took about ten minutes to float down. I landed hard and stumbled, getting dusty, but I got up and thought, "Yes! I didn't break anything!" as I began to collect my chute before the wind could catch it and blow me over. It was only then that I realized that my parachute was bright red.

This Week In Caltech Sports

Womens' Volleyball
10/10 7:00 PM vs. Pacific Christian
Mens' Soccer
10/14 4:00 PM @ Claremont-Mudd
Mens' Football
10/11 1:00 PM @ U.C. San Diego
Mens' Water Polo
10/10 TBA @ Cal Maritime
10/11 TBA @ Cal Maritime

Down to the last game - sweaty palms syndrome set in...
"You can do this, you can beat this team - YOu're better than them."
Coach always had encouraging words - with that Southern twang.
"Go for the whole team shouted and we broke the huddle to five.
is what haplpeled, BOOM - one excellent Caltech serve after on 8-15 La Sierra.
The U.S. space agency NASA is establishing a new scholarship and fellowship program that will provide funding for graduate students and postdoctoral researchers across a wide range of disciplines.

The program, called the NASA Postdoctoral Program, will provide up to $100,000 in fellowship awards and up to $40,000 in two-year research awards each year. The program is open to U.S. citizens and permanent residents of the U.S.

The program will support research in areas such as astrophysics, planetary science, heliophysics, and space weather, as well as in areas such as engineering, computer science, and mathematics.

Applicants must have a doctoral degree in a relevant field and must be working in a U.S. institution of higher education or a non-profit research institution.

The program will be managed by the NASA Postdoctoral Program Office, which is located at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Maryland.

Applications for the first fellowship year will be accepted from October 1, 2022, to December 1, 2022, and will be open to all U.S. citizens and permanent residents who meet the eligibility criteria.

Applicants are encouraged to apply online at the NASA Postdoctoral Program website, which provides more information about the program and the application process.

The fellowship year will begin on October 1, 2023, and will last for two years, with the possibility of renewal for a third year.

The deadline for applications is February 15, 2023.