**Signer outlines conference**

By Paul Schindler

Dr. Ethan Signer, Professor of Biology, and President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, pointed out that the MIT Educational Conference paper takes a look at MIT education.

"The annual Christmas Convocation will be held next Tuesday, December 11, at 11 a.m. in Kresge Auditorium. Contrary to previous announcements, however, classes will officially be held during the time period of the overwhelming. The ceremony will feature Dr. Warren Biederman as speaker."
WTBS workshop to revive radio theater

By Leon Fero

Why would anyone want to experiment with a nearly-dead art form such as radio theater? After all, the audience migrated to TV years ago. Successful radio formats today are limited almost exclusively to news, talk and music. So why bother producing radio plays?

WTBS’ second IAP Radio Theatre Workshop will grapple with those questions, but primarily it will be actively producing radio scripts — some by student authors.

Paul Schindler ’74 and Bruce Schwartz ’72 are organizing the venture; they have not yet logged enough to give themselves titles. However, Schindler will fill an executive producer role, managing the engineering and other physical aspects of the productions; Schwartz will coordinate writing and directing.

Engineering will be provided by WTBS staff; the most promising work so far, explained Schwartz, is for scripts, writers and voice actors who have their own shows. The Radio Theatre Workshop will be a somewhat expanded version of last year’s “Winter Presents,” which produced four plays for broadcast in March and April. They were “Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde,” Ibsen’s “The Wild Duck,” “Sam Patch,” an original farce written by John Synges “Riders to the Sea,” which was performed by group from Ullass Boston. They received mixed reviews.

Schwartz and Schindler want to produce as many shows as possible, “within the time available and the standards we hope to establish.” Probably this winter four or five production slots will be allotted. “We want to try a variety of styles, and we want to experiment with music and sound,” said Schwartz. “We also want scripts — any length, any subject.”

An organizational meeting of WTBS Radio Theatre Workshop will be held Monday night, December 13, in Student Center room 412; all interested are invited to attend. People with scripts (either for radio or adaptable) can submit copies at WTBS, 50-030 (Wald Memorial).

PICTURE YOURSELF AS A PAULIST.

First, picture a religious Community. A community founded by an American convert, and for the benefit of North Americans.

Picture a founder who was a century ahead of his time. A man with a vision and flexible enough to meet the needs of the Church in every age and for the future. A Community to communicate through the spoken and printed word and one that wouldn’t be hampered by specific activities when new needs arise.

Next, picture the men in this new Community. They would be free. Each one could use his own individual talents in his own way and would be given the freedom to do so.

These are the Paulists, the modern religious Community. Keeping pace with the times.

Concerned. Involved.

If you can picture yourself as a Paulist, why not write for more information to: Rev. Donald C. Campbell, C.S.P., Vocation Director, Room 400, 415 West 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019.
Power consumption drops

The effort to conserve energy and energy costs by the MIT. Corporation over the last seven months has shown outstanding results, notes Donald Whiston, in a new technical report on Plant Systems Development.

According to Whiston, during its first four months of this fiscal year (1971-72), there has been a decreased use of more than one million kilowatt hours of electric power under that for the same period of the previous fiscal year (1970-71). This represents a decrease of 3.1 percent, despite the increased budget of plant power consumption. At current unit prices, this indicates a savings of fifteen thousand dollars per year. This will be converted into actual savings of fifteen thousand dollars per year. The result is that the current unit power cost will be 2.3 percent higher than a year ago. This reflects increased fuel costs to the power company as well as the effect of increased costs from use of fuel having a lower content of sulfur. This price increase amplifies the importance of the reduced energy consumption.

With the earlier advent of earned money, it is urged that the last three years of the last three years continue their efforts and be even more aggressive in their use of fuels and other electrical appliances. Even though in leaving your office in darkens, your visitor may think you have left for the day, the fact that your office was dark indicates your concern for energy conservation.

Efforts are presently being directed by the Physical Plant Department toward saving fuel heating costs by control of air ventilation after hours and weekends in buildings where such procedures are feasible. The community can assist in this endeavour and contribute to substantial savings by operating laboratories and office space at a cooler temperature than in the past.

Whiston also mentioned that he and his office are open and welcome receiving any comments and suggestions on this program from the MIT community.

GREEK FOOD AT ITS BEST

The Parthenon Restaurant

New authentic Greek restaurant, Modern prices, superb European wines, variety of liquors. Open 11 a.m. - 11 p.m. Daily
924 Mass. Ave. in Cambridge Phone 491-9592

Technology and Culture

Qualitative and Quantitative Thoughts on the Relations Between Science, Technology, and Society

Derrick deSola Price
Yale University

Friday, December 10

5 SIGNIFICANT RANDOM HOUSE BOOKS

WRITTEN BY HARVARD and M.I.T. FACULTY MEMBERS

Beyond Freedom and Dignity
By B.F. Skinner, Harvard

In this profoundly disturbing new book, the most influential and controversial psychologist of our time, the author, sets forth his analysis of the human condition and the need to remove the demonstrably antiscientific-and unworkable-concepts of liberal humanism that are preventing the achievement of a rational organization of human society.

Bay beyond the Stable State
By Donald A. Schon, M.I.T.

"An intellectual time bomb," said the Observer. "He sets out to examine the impact on society of modern technology...he ends by exploding almost every established concept of government administration and business management." If it is to survive, government must learn to cope with the permanent instability that has replaced the stable state.

Discovery of our Galaxy
By Charles A. Whitney, Harvard

A book about the mystery, passion, imagination, margin philosophy, and the people who have created the science of astronomy. With authority and charm, the distinguished Harvard astronomer Charles A. Whitney re-creates the personalities of the great astronomers and retraces the arguments by which they have strived to an understanding of our place in the universe.

A professional ABORTION that is safe, legal & inexpensive

can be set up on an outpatient basis by calling
The Problem Pregnancy Educational Service
(215) 722-5360

Problems of Knowledge and Freedom
By Noam Chomsky, M.I.T.

Invited by Trinity College, Cambridge, Noam Chomsky gave the first lectures in honor of Bertrand Russell. The lectures, published with a new introduction, not only offer Professor Chomsky's thoughts on Russell, but a lucid and succinct introduction to the linguistic and political aspects of Chomsky's thought. A masterly work of exceptional interest to the general reader.

Harvard Square Coop
OPEN TO 9 P.M., MON. thru SAT.
Now 'til Christmas

The Myth of the Guerrilla
By J. Bowyer Bell, Harvard

Dr. Bell, of Harvard's Center for International Affairs, analyzes the mythique of guerrilla-revolution. Justifying the experiences of African, Palestinian, Bolivian, and other guerrillas with the revolutionary theorists of Mao, Giap, and Ho Chi Minh, the author provides an eye-opening and controversial debunking of one of the primary myths of contemporary political thought.
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By Robert Fouser

"Cram notes for Rogers Report" ran the headline on a front-page article in our issue last summer, and again in our first paper of this fall. The report was formally the "Report of the Special Task Force to the Committee on Athletics". The chairman of the Task Force, Michael Rogers, Jr., had been the subject of intense work during the previous spring and summer. The essentials of its proposals were already known. In fact, the previous spring, the Task Force's charge, proposals were to "be brought to the faculty early in the fall term so that the faculty could "had to be decided on."

Needless to say, our story was a bit premature. The Task Force report really appeared in Tech Talk last Wednesday, fall was only two weeks from winter. The content seems, no more exotic than our overwork. Problems do have other duties besides writing and revising reports, but in any case the matter is no longer a report about the report. The report and anyone whose daily routine depends to some degree on what MIT chooses to label "courses" might well be good to read it.

Unfortunately, it is likely to put people off. For despite the forcefulness of its general recommendations it leaves many issues of detail--the definition of "credit," for example--in the hands of a jargon which must be pondered over for a while before its implications can be fully understood. The student at the end of the end-of-term rush is likely to preclude much serious consideration on anyone's part beyond "too bad for them.

There will not be a Tech Model Railroad Club open house on Dec. 21 as announced in Tech Talk. The date was, it seems, no more exotic than our overwork. Problems do have other duties besides writing and revising reports, but in any case the matter is no longer a report about the report. The report and anyone whose daily routine depends to some degree on what MIT chooses to label "courses" might well be good to read it.

Unfortunately, it is likely to put people off. For despite the forcefulness of its general recommendations it leaves many issues of detail--the definition of "credit," for example--in the hands of a jargon which must be pondered over for a while before its implications can be fully understood. The student at the end of the end-of-term rush is likely to preclude much serious consideration on anyone's part beyond "too bad for them.

There will not be a Tech Model Railroad Club open house on Dec. 21 as announced in Tech Talk. The date was, it seems, no more exotic than our overwork. Problems do have other duties besides writing and revising reports, but in any case the matter is no longer a report about the report. The report and anyone whose daily routine depends to some degree on what MIT chooses to label "courses" might well be good to read it.
Battering Ram—II

By Michael Feirtag
Copyright © 1971 by Michael Feirtag

The Faculty met at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, January 16, after the takeover. Calling together a large group in a crisis, when such a group will not be allowed to dictate a detailed course of action, is a curious matter. For some, the reason behind that meeting is simple enough. In the view of President Johnson, "the Faculty is the one entity that will have to provide support for the faculty to provide them with accurate information, and have the faculty approve a set of principles which will guide the relatively small administrative group that assumes responsibility for handling a crisis. Among these principles, presumably, are unstated notions of academic and intellectual freedom in the university. It is this set of guiding principles that Johnson asks the faculty to affirm, and it is this virtually universally accepted set that somehow guides any decisions made to deal with a threat to the university structure.

What actually happened is rather different.

Exactly what the president was requesting from the faculty, both in January, and in the meetings of November 3, 4, and 6, 1969, during the November Actions, was kept, perhaps purposefully, rather nebulous. No explicit appeal was made for support by the faculty of a set of principles. In fact, the only principle ever mentioned was the declaration that the president would not negotiate with a group that presented ultimatums and used force and violence, and this was not stated as a proposition for the faculty to affirm: Johnson simply announced that he would not talk with the office occupiers.

The minutes of the faculty meetings for November 3, 4, and 6 and January 15 never express explicitly that the president requested any manner of support by the faculty. In the minutes for November 3, for example, it is an obliging Prof. French who, persuading that all this (the November Actions) is a blow at the university and a complex problem in a civilized way, and believing that the officers of the Institute must have the support of the faculty and the community in taking steps to counter a direct, symbolic threat to the principles of our society, asks the president in the actions that he announced today.'

Those actions had consisted largely in obtaining a temporary restraining order against the November Action Coalition. The minutes of the November 3 meeting continued: "To a question as to the meaning of the restraining order, the measure of our co-operation over its application, and faculty jurisdiction in the matter, the president said that it was specifically temporary and slow in its specifications of particular acts; that the reporting reporting responsibility is ours but the court could act on its own if we chose not to report, but that if the faculty said it did not approve, he would be in an awkward position but violence and coercion cannot be tolerated. [Blank entry.]"

The president himself was finally implicitly requesting support of an action he had already taken.

After a report on a confrontation at the Placement Office involving recruiters for the General Electric Corporation who had come on campus during a GE strike, Professor Greenspan declared that the time had come to stop talking. This was and are dealing with faculties to whom our record of appeasement cannot but have given encouragement. Stressing the need to counter a barbaric mindset from the left, he concluded with an expression of hope that we have the courage to act. Professor Greenspan, per curiam, pointed out that this is a university and the power of the university has lain not in adopting the course of the state, but in urging, discouraging, exercising the institutional lessons (in the context of getting an injunction, he urged on the following day we strive to do precisely this.

In fact, Lottin had said considerably more, but the Secretary of the Faculty, Prof. E. Neal Harley, had not so indicated in the minutes. (Similarly, Johnson's pleas that he needed to have the faculty behind him had been eliminated or hidden, leaving in the minutes the pleasant illusion that faculty members had spontaneously risen to propose motions of support for their besieged administration. For, he Procus Jerome Wiener insisted, "humiliation of the president [was] humiliation of the Institute.")

Lettin had expressed himself as fearful of giving administrators a blank check, of affirming the administration's power to make the decisions in a crisis—power the administration doubted had regard-

less. And in a slow monotone, he had mentioned historical examples of leaders given mandates to exercise the powers they were aware they would already exercise. He had named some Medieval pope, and a soft groan had been heard, the groan expressed by the colleagues of a man whose rambling peroration has wandered just a bit further from the point than is tolerable. And then the largely uninterested group of 428 members of the faculty heard Lettin say "Gulf of Tonkin." Another subdued sound issued from the group, this time an angry roar."

(On August 2, 1964, the destroyer USS Maddox was ostensibly attacked in Tonkin Gulf by North Vietnamese patrol boats; a similar attack allegedly followed on the C. Turner Joy and the Maddox. President Lyndon B. Johnson authorized air strikes against patrol boat bases, a considerable escalation of the war; these strikes were carried out on August 7, 1964. The President briefed the leaders of Congress on the supposed attacks, "and had a resolution of support for US policy introduced," as the chronology given in the Pentagon Papers phrases it. On August 7, 1964, "it is passed with near-unanimity by both houses." The President would later interpret the Tonkin Gulf resolution as giving him broad powers to conduct an undeclared war against North Vietnam.)

It had occurred to some of the faculty in November that what they were being asked to affirm was in some sense similar to the Tonkin Gulf resolution. After all, the administration obviously had no intention of appealing—any injunction—they had already done so before the November 3 faculty meeting—and could similarly act in any manner they chose to meet a crisis. What they were apparently requesting—some sort of vote of confidence—would, in the minds of some faculty members present at that meeting, cripple the only real power the faculty had to maintain its nebulous influence in crisis management. All talk of the patience of the faculty aide, this power consisted only in the administration's knowing that bitter debate, and public schism in the faculty, might follow the execution of administrators' decisions. But the faculty would look rather feeble questioning the use of police, for example, after they had offered some vague expression of confidence to the administration in the midst of a crisis.

And it appeared that a vague expression of confidence was what the administration was seeking, though their stated reasons seemed honest enough: their continued appeals for a united faculty in the face of a challenge, their plea that they needed—What were they so vague?

Howard Johnson:

I think Prof. Lottin was very helpful, and I think that question of "Was I taking for a blank check"—that's a reasonable point to raise. Was I or was I not? I didn't think I was, I think we had a very clear understanding. He may have added a reasonable point to raise. And I don't think many people agreed with him, but that's another story..."

Committee on Faculty Affairs

Photo: Howard Johnson and Jerome Wiener at an academic council meeting, from footage shot by Richard Leacock during the November Actions.
The faculty meeting of November 3, 1969 had continued:

Professor Gray, observing that professor Lettew's remarks had left him troubled, ran through a record, beginning with statement by those who considered a commitment to militancy rather than to dialogue. Several days later, he sat down.

Having determined by show of hands that the faculty was ready to proceed and that the minutes were to be taken as a basis against to present his motion. Post to vote... the minutes carried by voice of 344 to 41.

Policing to a record of tolerance of dissent and willingness to change, he noticed that the latter motion came from a rational and justifiable position, though the language used was not that of a group. The occupation was over, and that those involved had been removed to the extent for trespass and liability to disciplinary action.

He requested a summary of events from the provost.

All this time, Eddleman was haranguing Johnson. He repeatedly stood up and asked the provost to Johnson to ask him if students could speak, if ex-students could speak. Initially he received a sort of gruff as answer from Johnson, and returned to his "arid"-lying down the paper that he was presenting.

Soon he rose again and came back. Yes, Johnson muttered now, he would allow some students to speak. Which ones? Richman was there, and Engeels and Scorsors. A grime, signifying a breakdown in communication, as if for Johnson the word "students" did not, could not, include those students. The lack of mutual understanding of the issues here comes, when translated into a common language, a refusal.

Finally Johnson told Eddleman to go away, that he could speak to the faculty later.

Wiesner had been at the podium, summarising events. At some point in his delivery, doubtless in reference to the length of his lecture on radical activities, he remarked in laid-back voice, the usual grin playing on his lips, that he was not a poet—this a reference to an incident from the faculty meeting held the previous November 6, the wake of the November Actions. From the minutes of the November 6 meeting:

Denise Lecocq, writing professor in the humanities department, was recognized and received the chair's permission to read, in effect, a statement of President Johnson. "Departments and occasional voices of protest from students were taken into account."

At the conclusion Professor Lecocq indicated that the faculty had only just heard this morning of the wisdom of the faculty's having chosen not to hear students. The "occasional voices of protest" had consisted of louty shouts of "shut up!" from one or another of the scholars in the meeting, while others squirmed with chagrin and protest at the interjection.

Returning to the minutes of the January 15 meeting on the takeover:

Professor Kempf, rating on a point of personal privilege... took exception to a refer of a visiting professor who is a distinguished scholar...

Johnson spoke again after Wiesner's summary. The minutes choose to state explicitly only that Johnson had denounced the protest:

The discussion, seeing that in the past we have grated studies to students, that the course of action, and student body as well as his the administration, and as meeting toward further pacification. He asked for people's considered views on the matter. He said we will not renegotiate on the basis of an ultimatum or the occupation of an office.

Three professors had given only "considered views"—Chomsky, to the effect that students had been taken off the office should be heard before anyone could come to any conclusions; Schein, that the group of four who broke down the president's door was made up of people who felt the issue by to begin considering "the basic question of how to respond to threats, to blackmail"—when Professor Baddour (head of the assembly of students) said. He sat close to the front of the hall in the center group in a loose group that included several department heads. He added that those MIT students who could be identified as those involved would be expelled from the university.

The minutes may be mistaken in the choice of the word "students." Some were at the meeting remember that Baddour used words whose meaning was meant to be interpreted to MIT who were connected with the takeover.

Professor Kempf was immediately heard on a point of information... it is clear that there were people connected with the takeover included expulsion of the discipline committee. The incident is not reported in the minutes of the meeting.

At the lectern, Johnson promptly indicated that the Baddour motion was "inappropriate in view of the state of the disciplinary committee." A dissenting motion, that the committee could functionally divide the faculty, perhaps bitterly. And such a situation would be intolerable during this crisis.

Professor Lamson, chairman of the discipline committee, read a statement from "students" and his committee had prepared.

Eddleman was becoming distressing. It was not so much that the chairperson thought that the discipline committee chairman was speaking. In fact, Lamson was reading a lengthy statement that essentially just as every time Lamson had been appointed to the position of provost.

Although Johnson had claimed that he was interested only in the immediate crisis, one side, and one side only, of the events which precipitated the takeover was being heard.

Baddour had been sitting with his hand straight up for the duration of Lamson's speech. He thinks perhaps Ehrmann finality went over to Johnson and asked that Eddleman be recognized. Johnson had been managing to maintain his public persona; he might perhaps forget five minutes away from him for fifteen minutes.

After Lamson's exposition and a discussion centering on the ethics of the mood and the mood, Johnson finally recognized him.

Eddleman rose and moved to the newer microphone—Johnson's. Why don't you see the other microphones go.

Eddleman went to the other microphone. He said that he and do not believe a number of students were upset that the faculty was discussing the fact that the officer was overstepping his authority. The officer was occupied. The expression of Did not look defendable. Eddleman recited the GA resolution from manuscript. The resolution undecided, and it should not be decided by administrative fast or an emergency faculty meeting.

What, Johnson interrupted from the microphone he was holding. He whispered to the other microphone. He said that the faculty had disagreed with the words that he thought the faculty was discussing the fact that the officer was overstepping his authority. Eddleman recited the GA resolution from manuscript. The resolution undecided, and it should not be decided by administrative fast or an emergency faculty meeting.

Some students viewed the proceeding differently. If one did not respect the chairman of a committee that represented an institution, that said, in particular the chairperson of the committee, that represented an institution, that said, in particular the chairperson of the committee, that represented an institution.

In the end, Eddleman stood up and asked the provost to call for the next meeting to be held on the evening of December 15, 1969, which was the last meeting of the semester. He was told that the meeting would be held on the evening of December 15, 1969, which was the last meeting of the semester.

Some students viewed the proceedings differently. If one did not respect the chairman of a committee that represented an institution, that said, in particular the chairperson of the committee, that represented an institution.

In the end, Eddleman stood up and asked the provost to call for the next meeting to be held on the evening of December 15, 1969, which was the last meeting of the semester. He was told that the meeting would be held on the evening of December 15, 1969, which was the last meeting of the semester.
From the committee's statement, read at the faculty meeting by Lamson:

The committee met again on December 23 to consider the new case. The chairperson turned the floor over to Albert and the charges regarding the meeting of December 17 were repeated. Lamson then went on to quote and summarize the content of the December 17 meeting. Lamson also reported that of the two other students at the hearing of December 17, one was in the room, and the other was not.

In hearing the charges and making its decision, the committee believed that the three students mentioned above had, by bringing immediate charges, forced the committee to take action for the benefit of the entire student body. It was decided that the matter be referred to a faculty committee, and the rules of the university would be followed in this matter. The committee believed that the action of the students in bringing this matter to the attention of the faculty was in the best interest of the university's community. The committee also believed that the students in question had achieved a sense of dignity, and it was important that this be recognized.

Perhaps the majority of the undergraduates had expected Albert to be expelled eventually. But it was, if anything, the nature of the circumstances that actually got him expelled which angered them.

The most disconcerting fact in the entire situation was that Albert was expelled largely for not showing up on the day the faculty上了a decision to expel him. Further, it seemed that in prosecuting for lack of respect, Lamson had violated (among other things, some claimed) the first of the committee's "procedural rules," quoted above.

From a letter sent by Albert's father to Johnson, made public by the father:

The defendant is legal term used by professor Lamson, the chairperson of the committee, and is referred to as Professor Lamson. When challenged to dispute himself... professor Lamson succumbed only his position as chairperson, but maintained that it would be "both unnecessary and unwise to adhere to the maxim of the principle and the rule that students appear in person to answer the charges. Such a doctrine is null because it is contrary to the very nature of the proceeding. Lamson is bound by it, if you do not, he will not dismiss the improper act of not appearing.

The list of procedures of the disciplinary process that Lamson read to the faculty on January 15 included:

1. The committee acts with power in the case of admonition or disciplinary probation. In the case of recommendation for disciplinary probation, the recommendation is made by the dean or by the provost, with whom the student may appeal.

2. Johnson recently commented on his review of the committee's decision:

That wasn't the first discipline case, and it wasn't the least. It was the first case of a kind in which the administration of Michael Albert in the middle of it, and because of the whole concept of the莹game of life on what had happened before that the purpose of my review was to see that all of the procedures were carried out and that there were some reasonable ones, and in that the person involved, if he expressed strong feelings on this subject, then I would take it into account. In other words, it's difficult to have at this kind of review level a restate of the case.

And even if I did, I think it's a number of the members of the discipline committee, I talked to other people who were there, and I would assume that the discussion involved and that the procedures followed were reasonable and that the procedures followed were important enough to make a difference.

There is a very simple political way in which the presidential review of the discipline committee's decisions can be considered. An administrator is not in a very good position to see the larger picture of a particular case, and the faculty in calm times, much less during a crisis. When a case led by a professor whose motion was considered, the committee, and the faculty were centered more on concepts of dignity than of freedom, and the committee was more interested in seeing the dignity of the faculty, than in seeing the dignity of the student. The decision was made to expel the student, and the decision was made without the student's presence.
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in this way would remain on the magnetic cards after the readout, until erased by its replacement with a new encoding.

In the Faculty Club, Wiener and Simonides thought only the worst of the situation. Returning to the buffer zone, Johnson's office, Simonides advanced to the door occupied territory, only to be rebuffed. He returned to Wiener's side. Wiener was not impressed.

The machine was in fact being used. For a while, it had been the playingthing of a small group of youths, friends of Kalinka and another RL member, Pete Bohmer, who had been amusing themselves by a running waterfright through the offices until they came upon the device...

Gleefully, others decided the apparatus had potential for turning out error-free leaflets (originals for offset printing), and had taken over the exploration of the device. They discovered a few cards that seemed dedicated to immoral ends, and, after hours of machine, and MIT students, rapidly figured out how to operate it. A few bureaus pressed, the IBM machine dutifully began typing out Howard Johnson's personal correspondence, to the delight of those who toyed with it.

Outside, in Johnson's office, Simonides and Wiener could hear the machine loudly typing.

And, as inevitably, Wiener, a campus patrolman behind him, forced his way into the offices and to the machine, which he somehow disabled by removing a panel in the front of it, and said something, pulling the plug, you take your damned machine. Wiener wheeled it into Johnson's office. Everyone-in the occupied offices and in Johnson's—was about to leave.

Wiener absently handed the part he had removed from the IBM machinery to Benson Snyder. Snyder, in turn, was about to leave on his desk, amidst a confusion of art objects and bricks—here, it would sit unrecognized for a month.

On the following Friday, January 16, 1970, there was the usual social issue, on which there would appear three letters signed by Howard W. Johnson. It appears that they were genuine: "The trespassers removed card files and correspondence," written by "Members of the MIT November 26 Committee" distributed on January 18, "and three stolen letters were published by Thursday...." And he included a few page changes to be brought against the occupiers who could be identified: "Theft and publication of Industrial files."

From the Thursday text of a letter dated, curiously, December 17 and another dated, preposterously, December 21 before it, it would be clear that they knew about the takeover—unless, the IBM magnetic card had lain unused for a year, or a copy of the letter was found elsewhere in the offices:

I am of course deeply sorry that you have come to the conclusion that the people in your recent letter that you mention are right. I must think that you will find that the loyalty of MIT students and faculty is an important fact in our country. Your letter has been. You should be aware that the level of research and support of the entire country is not by MIT is higher than has ever been in its history....

This letter was apparently intended to pacify some irate patriotic citizens, as were the other two. This one goes to the Catholic Archdiocese of Boston.

On the issue of the AWOL soldier, who was present in the Student Center for several weeks, I would make only a few points. The first is that the buffer zone was never more than two or three percent of the student body. They brought in and attracted a good many hippies or radicals to this part of the area. The second point which must remain is that the Student Center is a 'social buffer zone'...

We informed the FBI and the military and civil authorities involved that the Student Center had been occupied and...

If we had moved to throw out the people surrounding him, we did not have to worry about the other students. Instead, this group dwindled to a pathetic few, and eventually they left and picked up their new-look wave of self-doubt and...

We are required to report to the public as to the number of students who were involved in the current activity. It should be known that the Johnson's letter was mistimed there is no word, however, that was true—all those involved involved. Their numbers were augmented by the presence of, among others, Simonides, Nyhart and Snyder.

The meeting began with lengthy statements—the appropriate statements. Everyone wished to express how awful all these things were, but it had been happening for a long time. You all know what is involved: what was that true—everyone did—but he told them otherwise. These preliminary statements lasted some ten minutes.

Three meetings took place this week. Ian Gutt, Marvin Sirby had developed a three-point proposal over dinner at Twenty Chimmies in the student center: Nothing should be done about the people in the office; leave them alone and they would go away. The discipline committee's activities should be immediately suspended, and a thorough revision of the judicial process begun immediately. Albert should be reinstated and given a fair hearing.

Early in the meeting, these three points were chalked on a blackboard.

Somehow, point one—the immediate crisis—was not much discussed. The group moved rapidly to the second point: the judicial process. For at least three hours, the discussion centered on the judicial process, and an injunction was sought. Why it should be remade. Faculty members were defensive: their committee had acted justly against those who had occupied the principal and administrative offices. Johnson believed that students must understand these good men and good principles? The discussion became largely a debate between faculty and students, one of which was moderating. As the meeting went on, the discussion was chauvinistic, more or less—by Simonides and Snyder.

This discussion was what some of the students on SAG had desired, a discussion of the causes of the current situation, and its disaffection. The discussion was in a sense counter to Johnson's wishes, since Johnson had made an emphatic point of refusing to discuss any issues of this sort which are of the radicals occupied offices. Here, they were discussing one of the points that had been on the ultimatum.

From the standpoint of the student politicians, the matter of overriding importance in all this was the inequity of the discipline committee. From a radical view, the student politicians had missed the point entirely, the discipline committee and its actions were piddling, evil, but representative of a university that, hiding behind "the spirit of free, open inquiry,"

"national discussion," and the "dignity of men," upheld a murderous, repressive status quo, and meant to continue to uphold it. The university was a mockery of freedom and humanism.

It was the sober politicians who spoke here, who had been brought in to participate in decision making, and whose perceptions would be considered here. And their perceptions were that the discipline committee was the nexus of the student body, and that the police came (or might have come, but did not) on their own volition. It was a student who managed to be first to speak. As there were few students in the meeting at all, Johnson was asked to do a disproportionately large share of the talking.

What were they to do? Why. Nothing. The demonstrators had no power; they would evacuate eventually.

No, said Johnson, I don't think I can do that.

The discussion of tactics which he had requested followed. According to the moderates, with faculty members in large numbers wishing to express their opinions, very little concrete could be said. Someone was sure to open this with a political observation on the general situation. Everyone wished to see violence avoided. Someone did.

During the November Actions, no one could have predicted that the police would come (or might have come, but did not) on their own volition. And no, everyone wished to see violence avoided. Someone did.
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Theatre:

The Godspell of St. Matthew

By P.E. Schindler

Godspell is a positively unique theatrical experience which should not be missed.

There, it had to be said, is definitely the freshest, most delightful musical to hit Boston quite a while.

The story of this play is the story of the Gospel according to Matthew, and was begun as a student's thesis at Carnegie Mellon (in Pittsburgh) by John and Teddeshk. He took the gospel story and wove it together into a fascinating play-stage piece which book is the Cafe LaMama in Greenwich Village.

The last few years have seen pictures, two time Broadway producers including such promising young folk as doing for a full-edged off-broadway production. Edgar Antony and Stuart Duncan brought in Stephen Schwartz to write new lyrics for the play but did not tamper with much of Tedeshk's cast, which was made up largely of his classmates from Carnegie.

The critics have been nearly unanimous as it is possible for them to be in their praise of this musical, and with good cause. It was an amiable production to start with, and it has managed to maintain many of its amateurish good points while developing the gloss of a professional show.

It cannot be easily categorized, but it does make use of the whole theatre as a stage, and there are several scenes during which the cast attempts to get the audience involved. This is done by talking to the audience walking and talking and singing in the aisles, and generally acknowledging the existence of a group of interested observers.

The play itself is a series of vignettes taken from Matthew's story of the life of Christ. All of them are familiar, indeed, sometimes too familiar, but they have certainly not been told as well in recent times as they are told here.

Several styles are used to tell the stories including the Story Theatre style of having actors wear both as narrators and characters in the story. Another method used by the young, enthusiastic cast in the telling of the story of the good samaritan, was similar to hand puppet, without the puppets. It must be seen to be believed, but it is entertaining, and it works, and that is all that one must ask of theatre.

There are occasions when it seems as though Godspell does not work. At the very start of the play, it is a little hard to accept Jesus and the disciples dressed as clowns. But, as the play progresses, the audience comes to accept this as the convention within which the story is told. The story, on occasion, is hard to take however: the transitions might work well as jump cuts in a film, but on the stage, they are ragged and abrupt, and occasionally the audience gasps when, instead of slipping from story to story, they are dragged, heels first.

The set is visually intriguing: it is a chain link fence, filling center stage. There are no curtains or backdrops behind it, so one can see the back wall of the Wilbur Theatre behind it. It is (Thorton Wilder and Our Town) with much of the semi-transparent nature of the chain link fence, stage hands can be seen at work behind it, adding a note of the unusual to the presentation.

The performances are all outstanding, but even among the great, there are those who are greater, and two of the men in this play deserve special credit. Ryan Hilliard, who plays Jesus, is put through the largest range of emotions, and handles the central role with the aplomb of a seasoned professional, which he is. Jerry Sroka, as a man of many voices, could give Mel Blanc a run for his money. Time, and again, he proves his versatility during the play. The two of them are a pleasure to watch, and the entire cast is unusual in its uniform quality.

The sound system on occasion leaves something to be desired, but it will hopefully be shaped up by the time the preview is over, and "re" performance begins. Happy day will be tomorrow.

By Alan Razak

The astonishing thing about Joe Hill, anyway, is not a biopic, in that it is true as a Swedish immigrant became involved in the short-lived Industrial Workers of the World movement around 1910, after moving to the United States from Sweden; that explains it. As a Swedish director, Swedish actor, Swedish; that explains it; there's an interesting story-a Swedish immigrant becomes involved in the short-lived movement around 1910, after moving to the United States from Sweden; that explains it. It's a film with a moral, but it's not a bio-pic completely.

Well, there's an interesting lightness on a cultural awakening. Nobody's always singing a Swedish melody, but even among the most outstanding, most memorable of songs, one finds his one true brown-eyed love at the opera (La Traviata). A "hobo" decorationally their tea ritual. Interesting, but not carried through.

There; It had to be said-There's a Swedish immigrant at the beginning and Joe is a Swedish immigrant at the end or might as well be (He's just been around for a while). Wide World provides no insight—it seems as though we know nothing about Joe as a person, only as a means for a purpose, and so there is no real commitment from us in his marred. Indeed, there is so much more. Joan Baez tells us in the title song:

I dreamed I saw Joe Hill

last night

Allie as you or me.

Says I, but Joe

You're ten years dead.

I never died, says he...

Yup, Joe's dead. Joan sings.

So does Luigi. Hi, Luigi, Joe Hill is dead, I don't care what he says. As a cinematic effort, it was never really alive.

Film:

Joe Hill: DOA

By Ryan Hilliard

The famous scene in which Joe Hill's death is announced to the audience is brought to life in Ryan Hilliard's portrayal of the Swedish immigrant who dedicated his life to the cause of the working man.

The play, directed by Bo Widerberg, is a powerful depiction of the life and times of Joe Hill. Set in the early 20th century, the play takes the audience on a journey through the life of this legendary figure who stood up for the rights of the working class.

The cast is led by Ryan Hilliard, who plays Joe Hill, giving a powerful performance that captures the spirit of the man. The supporting cast also delivers strong performances, bringing the story to life in a way that is both moving and inspiring.

The set design is simple yet effective, with the stage set up to look like the inside of a working-class home. The costumes are authentic and add to the realism of the production.

Overall, Joe Hill: DOA is a moving and thought-provoking play that serves as a reminder of the importance of standing up for what is right. Through the powerful performances and compelling story, this production will leave the audience inspired and moved.
Chomsky: again the attacks

By Alex Makowski

Noam Chomsky, along with the rest of MIT's once-noted radicals, has become an imposing figure on the MIT campus. Student (and faculty) interest in political affairs had been limited to the MIT campus two years ago. Chomsky hasn't sharpened the important issues, and with it has gone interest in political affairs. Student (and faculty) imposing figure on the MIT campus (my father first discovered him on the NBC Today Show) and early this year by invitation he went to England's Cambridge University. Chomsky was sufficiently confident in his lecture series. Random House, preparing evidence, suitably footnoted for the skeptical, and always including the one incident or quote so ludicrous or incriminating as to destroy any semblance of sympathy for the Establishment position.

For those already convinced of the hypocrisy or foolishness of our country's policy, Chomsky's attack fails to be entertaining. For those who not yet swayed in his point of view, the material can be a powerful proselytizing agent.

Every Friday & Sunday
From 4:30
Chinese Food Buffet
EGG ROLLS, SAMOE RIBS, NOODLES, KEEF, FRIED RICE, LIVE ROCK ENTERTAINMENT
Monday Nights
The best Happy Hour in the City
Beer: 2-For-1 Rock Music Continous Entertainment Casual Attire

ALL THIS AND MORE AT... KISS KATY KENMORE CLUB

Remember these ads?

We ran them in a lot of college newspapers last year. Their purpose was to incorporate some of the critical questions students were asking about our company. May they also help you. A lot of students did. And a lot wrote to us about them. In many cases the ads triggered additional question, questions so provocative that we never thought we'd expand our communications with college students.

We're doing it in several ways. We've already started to have conferences of student opinion leaders and GE people at our various plant locations. These conference permit deep probing of sticky questions. They help us to understand the concerns of students. But they involve relatively few students and GE people.

So we're going to share some of the questions and answers (like the ones above) with you by continuing to run ads in college newspapers.

And we'll make sure our people see your questions, too, through company magazines and plant newspapers.

We think your opinions are important. And we think you should know how seriously we take them.
Brandeis nips cagers; Hudson top rebounnder

MIT suffered its first setback of the season Tuesday night in Rockwell Cage, in a heart-breaking 91-86 overtime loss to Brandeis. The Techmen got off to a slow start against the Brandeis 2-1, but the team played well in the second half and showed promise for a winning season - Brandeis may well be the toughest college division team MIT will face this year.

The Techmen got off to a slow start against the Brandeis 2-3 half-court press, slipping behind 17-8 in the first five minutes. Co-captain Hal Brown '72 then got a hot hand and poured in three field goals in fourteen attempts in the first half. Brandeis guards in the well-populated stands must have thought Brown was using radar, hitting 30-foot shots over the outstretched arms of amazed defenders. Hal's 23-point outburst lifted MIT down only two at halftime, 42-40.

After a slow start in the first minutes of the second period, MIT began to match baskets with Brandeis, staying within five points midway through the period. Balance was the key as Jerry Hudson '73 and Bill Godfrey '72 scored when Brandeis adjusted to try to stop Brown. Vira Brandeis could prevent the front-court men from getting the ball. Minot Cleveland '72 hit from way out.

Brandeis finally began to pull away as their hot-shooting guards got the best of their feint-laden opponents. With about six minutes remaining, MIT was down 77-66 when Hal Brown came up with an inspired steal which he converted into five points. By the two minute mark, MIT was in the lead, 98-78. Brandeis sent the Engineers to the penalty shots several times during the next minute but the free throws wouldn't go in. With about twenty seconds remaining, Brandeis tied it 101-101. When MIT missed its chance for a last-second bucket the game went into overtime.

After both clubs failed to find the range early in OT, Brandeis took command as each of their guards caused fits. The Brandeis zone contained the young Engineers who were able to muster only two field goals in five minutes overtime period. The last minute saw Brandeis prevailing to the line as MIT failed in a desperate effort to tie the ball and score.

You worked hard for that new car of yours. Now all you've got to do is take care of it. Part of it's using the right gasoline. Amoco. The type most new car owner manuals recommend.

Amoco is specially formulated for your new car's anti-pollution engine. Made to help it run better, longer. And Amoco can double the life of your tail pipe and muffler compared to fully leaded-gasolines; spark plugs last longer, too.

Amoco Super-Premium gives you all these benefits plus better mileage than other premiums. It's only the anti-pollution premium gasoline you can buy.

That's one reason why more new car buyers switch to Amoco and other gasolines at American than any other brand.

So now that you've got that new car, use the gasoline you can count on.

You've got a new car. We've got a new car gasoline.

### Brandeis vs. MIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FG</th>
<th>FT</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And Greg Rothman '73 each picked up one victory. In overtime, Jon Abrahamsen '72 went 2-0, with John Tang '73 and Mike Wong winning two each. Freshman Dom Park fenced very nicely to win his only bout. In overtime, Marty Freeman '75 went 2-0, with Bill Rae also picking up two wins. Bob Lukans '73, Pete Cooper '75, and Ed Deltos '72 all won one bout each.

---

**CHINA CINEMA**

Featuring Chinese Films (With English Subtitles)

- Mon - Fri: 2:30, 3:40, 6:30, 8:30, 10:30
- Sat: 12:30, 2:30, 3:40, 6:30, 8:30, 10:30
- Sun: 1:00, 2:45, 4:30, 6:30, 8:30, 10:30
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":'I worked hard all summer

to get enough bread for a down payment on my

new bug. So I'm going to baby it."
Shenkies plugs MIT; sports attitude lauded

By S. Hollinger

MIT sports received some unolicited national publicity on the strength of student performances during the television broadcast of the Army-Navy football game. During the halftime intermission, "Sportscaster of the Year" Chris Berman, of Sports Illustrated, was discussing the varied athletic opportunities that colleges provide. When asked for examples, the National Collegiate Athletic Association provided for him, and Berman pointed out that MIT leads the nation in the number of men's varsity sports teams with 21, followed by UCLA and Stanford, who have 19 each. Since the Army-Navy game is seen nation-wide with millions of viewers, and the number of viewers is in excess of 30 million, this was probably the biggest plug ever for MIT athletics.
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