The long-awaited BBC movie about MIT, "How to Be First," has finally arrived on campus. Sometime in the near future it will revolutionize the MIT community. We urge our readers to see it; it is a provocative film.

The viewer can see a one-hour sketch of the Institute should realize what the product had in mind for his British audience when he made the film. In Britain, long famed for her liberal arts universities, the concept of a school of technology "poloized around science" is virtually unknown. This film draws a direct comparison between MIT and the scientific achievement of the rich and powerful United States.

The building used in the filming is a large, white, flat-roofed structure with large, glass windows. The exterior is modern and angular, with a few architectural details that give it a distinctive appearance.

The building is a failure at its main purpose, which is education. It tries to fulfill many other functions, but fails to meet the needs of a large number of students. The film suggests that MIT is more interested in its image than in the educational needs of its students.

The Student Center tries to meet the needs of a large number of students; it tries to add to their education; it tries to reinforce other educational institutions. Students ought to be able to get a sizable number of free meals and other services in the center.

The film, like this review, is an editorial; its purpose is to emphasize some of the ways in which MIT is not fulfilling its obligations and to suggest ways in which other institutions might do a better job.

Well, wrong again. '69 came through in a blaze of glory and literally wiped the floor with '68. Were we right in saying that this year's class would win? Instead, the membership of the class of '68 reduced to 114, down from 138 a year ago. The class of '69 is now an arsenal against the claims of the '68s, but it is still a few men ahead of the competition.

The whole question of the impersonal university is a way of thinking about the individual person. It is a way of thinking about the individual person in relation to the institution that is the University. It is a way of thinking about the individual person in relation to the public that is society. It is a way of thinking about the individual person in relation to the world that is the universe. It is a way of thinking about the individual person in relation to the life that is the life of the individual.

In Britain, the London Film Festival, for example, is portrayed as a place where the students are allowed to have their say. In fact, MIT knows him only as an interested teacher, an active researcher, and a fascinating man. It is important; to MIT, other things mean nothing.

The film, like this review, is an editorial; its purpose is to emphasize some of the ways in which MIT is not fulfilling its obligations and to suggest ways in which other institutions might do a better job.

Well, wrong again. '69 came through in a blaze of glory and literally wiped the floor with '68. Were we right in saying that this year's class would win? Instead, the membership of the class of '68 reduced to 114, down from 138 a year ago. The class of '69 is now an arsenal against the claims of the '68s, but it is still a few men ahead of the competition.