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First, he said, we require a larger commitment to South Vietnam, possibly 30,000 by July 1965. Prof. Kaufmann said a combination of activities. He would like a new definition at the bottom of his list, and at the top put a "meaningful program," recognizing the need for better intelligence information from the people themselves, each of whom, if guaranteed secrecy, could provide significant information. In this way, Prof. Kaufmann feels that the war in Vietnam can be effectively won, and the probability of another firebreak will be decreased.

After a short question and answer period, the podium was given to Prof. Fred C. Ikle, who discussed his talk on the problem of negotiating with Hanoi and the Viet Cong.

First Prof. Ikle pointed out that the debate here in the US, particularly among the students, often leaves unclear exactly what people disagree upon. Throughout his talk, however, Prof. Ikle reaffirmed his approval of student concerns over the issue, and expressed hope that if Americans as a whole would devote the topic "very much."

As for the negotiation itself, Prof. Ikle dispelled first the thought that negotiation is the solution to the war. For war, he said, is stopped not through negotiation; it is not stopped for negotiation or negotiations would not be needed in the first place. One way to stop the war in Vietnam is to make it irreparable, and obviously, and then no negotiation would be needed, and in fact probably not be desirable. But this is out of the question, since the United States is not about to pull out of Vietnam without a victory.

The basic problem in bringing Hanoi to the conference table has been our failure to show that North Vietnam has more to lose by not negotiating. It is the US realization of this situation that has prompted the escalation of the war.

In closing, Prof. Ikle said that we don't ask the surrender of gaining more power and more territory; it is not stopped for negotiation officially call themselves the National Liberation Front and have to reorganize their government. To take the crown.
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At the Tech, Thursday, Dec. 2, with the 200 yd. freestyle relay, 50 yd. backstroke, 100 yd. freestyle swimming, "Tuesday's trials included the 500 yd. medley relay, 35 yd. freestyle, 30 yd. butterfly, at the finish they were even."

In an official volleyball tournament, a total of 31 teams participated. Both games won by rain on a muddy field which tended to make the play slippery, but in the "B" game, John Ocora '65 scored a try on a beautiful play. Both games played in rain.
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