The Tech
Bundy discusses possibilities for implementing end to war

By Charlie Mann
McGeorge Bundy ran head on into the formidable Nun's Chance during a discussion of our Viet Nam policy in Kresge Auditorium Wednesday night. The clash between two different approaches to the problem of the war was striking in its clarity even though Bundy has now modified his views toward the advocacy of a swift withdraw. Also on the panel were Professor Biehl Pool, head of the Department of Political Science, and Professor Eric Haugen of the Department of Economics. Bundy, as the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the International Studies, moderated.

Bundy quickly defected from the planned topic. "The formation of American Foreign Policy," and discussed the problems involved in the implementation of a plan as well as be presented last week at dePau University in Indiana, including the value of the American effort in Viet Nam by a factor of about five in the encouragement of negotiations.

Bundy's argument
The primary purpose of this plan is that the war at present is destroying the economy of the country, that it is intended to preserve, and that this alternative does prevail without the stress and strain of Viet Nam and the United States that the war is causing. Bundy pointed out that it would be easier to destroy the ground and thus would not have the disadvantages of a complete pull out. Given that this is the least understandable of all possible solutions and that a change such as this has never been deemed possible to cause the movement toward that this was workable solution.

This led into the second portion of Bundy's talk in which he enumerated the difficulties encountered in putting into effect good proposals. In addition to the complexity of the situation, those who are now involved have to be involved in the fall of 1972 of the President.

Bundy finished by presenting a plan for war. Bundy's implementation of Mr. Bundy's plan this coming year would be to slow down implies restraint and control which must be voluntary. Assuming that a government would come in and insist the next step would then be to coordinate other countries, especially our allies, and there are not likely to have unfounded reparations for them.

Experts comment
Mr. Benjamin Beach, an expert on the situation, those who are now involved have to be involved in the fall of 1972 of the President.

The next step is to assist the cooperation of the President. For the implementation of Mr. Bundy's plan this coming year would be to slow down or force a rapid pull out.

The last and most difficult part in Bundy's argument by showing that his plan is more persuasive and hence could be implemented.

Connelly attacks
Professor James Connelly, the Institute's best known proponent of the "get out now" philosophy then presented his plan for the rapid termination of the war. Professor Connelly proposed that we conduct an immediate pull out and that we hope that an immediate pull out and that we hope that an immediate pull out would be a tactical success.

Bundy or Connelly?
It is not the purpose of this plan to come an ability to communicate the results to the people to make a decision. Bundy's plan is to come an ability to communicate the results to the people to make a decision.

Regardless of whose plan is correct, Bundy's plan is correct.

Residents press housing demands
By Bob Daniels
The dinner of complimentary meal for those who have just moved into the new residence halls is an event that is eagerly anticipated by all members of the student body. The student residents of the residence halls are now only a few days old, and already the residents have begun to voice their concerns.

In a meeting with a group of residents who have been allocated to the new residence halls, Mr. Daniel Bishoff, Director of Housing Administration, brought up the topic of housing demands. The residents expressed their concerns regarding the administration's handling of the housing crisis.

Several members of the Union, however, noted that the Institute had been doing a satisfactory job of housing the students. In an effort to correct this, the residents are pressing for an expanded program to help students who come from poor housing backgrounds. They believe that many low-income families are overlooked because they are not seen as potential customers.

Another concern voiced by the residents was the lack of representation for Black students. The Black Student Union should be an integral part of the admissions and financial aid offices. In response to these charges, Mr. Daniel Bishoff, Director of Housing Administration, acknowledged the importance of the Black Student Union and stated that it would be included in the admissions process.

Jim Blomberg, the Director of Housing and Financial Aid, stated that the Institute has been making an effort to improve the housing situation. He noted that the Institute's plan to end the war, is correct.

McGeorge Bundy at Kresge
Promised to give some history of his involvement in the war with the Vietnamese. His position is that we have to get out now. The Institute's best known proponent of the "get out now" philosophy,

In response to these charges, Mr. Daniel Bishoff, Director of Housing and Dining Services for the Institute, offered the following reasons for the probable continuance of compulsory room contracts:

1. The residents of the new residence halls are not accustomed to living in dormitories with shared facilities, and many of them are accustomed to having their own private space.
2. The residents believe that compulsory room contracts are necessary to ensure a respectful living environment.
3. The residents are concerned about the high cost of living in the new residence halls and feel that compulsory room contracts are a way to keep costs down.

In conclusion, Mr. Daniel Bishoff stated that the Institute is committed to providing a comfortable and safe living environment for all students, and that they are working hard to address the concerns of the new residence hall residents.

Bishoff rejects request for voluntary commons
By Joseph Szabo
Compulsory common meals contracts for the residents of Baker House, Burton House and McCreesh Hall have created a storm of controversy. The Board of Advisors recently voted to implement a compulsory common meals contract for the residents of these houses.

The Analyzer, published by the Associated Students of MIT, reported that the decision was made after a long and heated discussion on the issue. The motion to implement the compulsory common meals contract was presented by the President of the Board of Advisors. The motion was passed by a vote of 7 to 2.

The compulsory common meals contract requires all residents of the houses to purchase a meal plan at the time of admission. The meal plans are administered by the Stouffer Food Service Corporation, and all houses have the option of offering voluntary common meals.

The residents of the houses have been divided on the issue. Some residents support the compulsory common meals contract, arguing that it is a way to ensure a consistent and high-quality dining experience. Others are opposed, arguing that it is an unfair burden on low-income students.

In response to the opposition, the Board of Advisors noted that the compulsory common meals contract is necessary to ensure a consistent and high-quality dining experience. They also noted that the contract provides a way to reduce the cost of living for all residents.

Residents are concerned about the cost of the compulsory common meals contract. They argue that it is an unfair burden on low-income students, and that it is not necessary to ensure a consistent and high-quality dining experience.

The residents are currently in the process of appealing the decision to the Board of Advisors. They are hoping to have the compulsory common meals contract overturned.

In conclusion, the Board of Advisors has made a decision that is controversial and has been met with opposition. The residents of the houses are currently in the process of appealing the decision, and the outcome is uncertain.