A recent Activities Council decision gave Class B status to the "Fair Play For Cuba" group now in the process of organization. Although we must specifically reserve judgment on this particular activity, at least until it is organized and functioning, we can't help but draw a parallel between this group and last year's EPIC. Both are ad hoc groups, formed by MIT men in answer to a specific national political problem. Both bear out the hypothesis that MIT students are becoming more and more politically aware, albeit slowly. Viewed in the light of last week's editorial, this is heartening news.

Several factors on the MIT scene combine to encourage this tendency of the Techman to think about and involve himself in the political world. The presence and activity of the economic and political science departments, particularly the Center for International Studies, is part of the answer. The involvement of well-known faculty members in the Washington political scene - Dr. Killian, Professors Samuelson and Rosow, and now Dr. Wiesner - is another part. We might also cite the return to a freer atmosphere of discussion and action as memories of the McCarthy Era fade.

Although one may not approve of a specific group or its actions, this general situation seems to us to be a healthy one. It represents an extra-classroom step in the right direction; namely, toward educating and involving the engineer and scientist in the world "outside his laboratory" - the world of the humanities.

Of course there are inconsistencies and stop along the way. Inscomm's decision to leave the group with ideals more closely akin to our own, by little or no progress toward affiliation with a classroom step in the right direction; namely, toward educating and involving the engineer and scientist in the world "outside his laboratory" - the world of the humanities.

Naturally a year ago we opened Volume Eighty of The Tech by stating that our desire was to dis- the major issues that beset MIT. Since then our considerations have ranged far and wide in "Space junk" in Building Seven, research vs. teaching, MIT architecture, B.U. needs in the Library, intramural athletics, Rush Week, the time necessary to procure a hamburger in Pritchett - all these and more have passed in review. On some, our comment has stood alone; on others we have been joined or attacked by various members of the community. Suddenly we find ourselves with just one last set of makeup sheets to lay out; only twenty more column inches in which to express our editorial views.

The feeling of nostalgia is strong, but hardly unconquerable. Volume Eighty-one is already on its way. Incomman's decision to leave the National Student Association, followed as it was by little or no progress toward affiliation with a group with ideals more closely akin to our own, is one. The indifference commonly displayed toward student politics is another.

Why are MIT students interested in national but not student politics? At first glance the answer would seem to lie in the fact that the former involves clashes between groups, and clashes of ideas, while the latter involves neither. We would add, however, that a genuine interest in political affairs also must be accompanied by some feeling of responsibility or personal involvement. This feeling should extend to the local political scene, however far removed it may seem. One cannot expect to be a citizen of a nation without first being a citizen of a community. If student politics at MIT lack color, ideas, and real conflict it is because the very ones who deride them, refuse to be involved.

If an increasing interest among undergraduates in politics and government on the national level is noted, this is encouraging. Accompanied by widespread disinterest in student politics, it is somewhat anomalous. We ask you to consider the anomaly.
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