During the past term, much discussion of editorial responsibility has been aimed at American. In all this discussion, no one ever confronted the basic issue involved: What should the function of a student newspaper be? Last year in his volume VI, Mike Rodburg '68 stated that "our first duty as the official undergraduate newspaper is to provide our readers with clear, impartial, and accurate news and information." Does this mean that the newspaper has a function which possibly transcends that of presenting the news in a "clear, impartial and accurate" manner? That function is to make students aware of activities and movements in the outside world and to promote student discussion of these movements.

This is not meant to imply that unbiased reporting should not be continued. Rather, it means that the newspaper must present something more and beyond this in the way of contributing to discussion among the student body and faculty.

This means that the Editor is not functioning properly unless, at any given time, there is a noticeable portion of the student body and faculty who are unhappy with something he has said or done. And, in feeling this way, they may accuse him of irresponsible journalism, which in his haste to do in haste may continue a discussion of the issues involved.

It is our firm belief that a newspaper has a two primary, equally important, functions. They are unbiased reporting of the news and initiation of student discussion on affairs of both local and national importance. This is what we will attempt to continue in Volume 88.

...and Policy

With a new term comes a new Board of Directors to the Tech. However, in keeping with the traditions of a student newspaper, editorial policy will not change radically from that of the past.

We will still attempt to provide readers with a clear and accurate account of the news. We will also attempt to comment on issues of the day, presenting our own views and arguments for (or against) these policies.

Dissent is also a primary part of a newspaper. For this reason, we encourage letters to the editor. We would request, however, that they be concise and to the point, as well as being reasonably coherent. From time to time, we will print guest editorials from interested and concerned members of the MIT Community.

Unsigned editorials will, in general, represent the opinions of the Editor and the Board of Directors. It is impossible for the Editor to dictate and not be allowed to be dictated by any individual or group other than the Board.

We hope, with this volume, to begin discussion of some topics which would not otherwise find their way into the average Techman's sphere of existence, as well as presenting topics directly related to life at the Institute. This will, hopefully, make the average student more aware of activities outside the walls of MIT, thus forcing him to face the issues which will be confronting him when he graduates. We hope you will read and react.

Philosophy

By Michael Davorkin

...and Michael Rodburg.

(Ed. note: This introduces a new, regular column in The Tech. This column is intended to provide a wide range of issues which the authors deems relevant today. The ideas and views expressed here are solely those of the authors, and do not reflect those of the Board of Directors of The Tech.

The idea of a column in an educational newspaper seems often superficially: If an idea is new, it is said. And if a new idea is said, then it is new, and the idea of a column in an educational newspaper seems even more superficial. If an idea is new, it is said, then it is new, and the idea of a column in an educational newspaper seems even more superficial.

Before and after General Eisenhower's recent visit to a joint session of Congress, assuring all Americans that, "we are not the victor," tremendous officials at home and in Vietnam have sustained this "pipe dream" of magnanimous thinking. They have distorted and miscalculated the facts to present the more accurate story from history in all its full effect on the American public.

Are we winning?

We mean that by administrative claims and interpretations of the war, it would only be told which war everyone is talking about. As well as well reported, we don't seem to be winning the political, economic or social war. Corruption and inflation are rampant throughout the nation (not the nation of Vietnam, not the US). We must be speaking of the military war. The enemy may have been won, or near won, but is this the reality of 1968 and not some year of elation. One may only hope to be the truth is that what the long since dead Vietnamese Republic of South Vietnam and many other "neutral" states. Sections of Hanoi and other villages around Danang were held for long periods of time by the VC. Neither were they scattered, or isolated incidents; attacks were regular near the DMZ, to areas of the Mekong Delta in the South.

Is there a VC? Is there a VC? Is there a VC? This may well be the only indication that something is amiss with the current situation. The whole of the military, victory, was also widespread fighting in the heart of Saj would be my guess. To halt and many other "neutral" states have been declared in Saigon, and if many of these indications have been the most devastating impact on the American public.

Enemy mobility

Does not the high rate of integration of VC forces, the latest incident in fact that:
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