Give a damn!

It looked for a while as though everything was going to happen, like perhaps the MIT student population would finally get worked up enough about an issue to actually turn out in force to make something of it. Certainly 579 signatures on a petition should have indicated something of this sort. However, Wednesday's meeting, call it Inscomm, forum, or whatever, was disappointing in the small turnout. Perhaps we are being too hard on the general population. After all, there were roughly 100 there, which is certainly a modern-day record for a meeting.

Frustration: The Problems of Change

The meeting Wednesday night was immense in its frustration and overwhelming in its relativity. The initial questions asked of Inscomm were the ones bothering students and not just the particular interests of a select few; questions that range from student power, the role of the student in the University, the function of student government to the immediate problem of student faculty communication.

It is not difficult to understand why most Inscomm members feel that they simply wandered out. They just weren't interested. Their outlook was limited by the narrowness of their own world view. This fact alone points out the necessity of Student Government to be composed of active participants in the University system. The frustration of the Wednesday meeting is typical of most attempts to change a system from within. For those students who wanted to see tangible reform there were their antagonists who felt that reorganization of Student Government is engaged in whenever Student Government becomes an irrelevant effort to control everything else to do. For those who wanted to tackle some specific issues the frustration arose from students concerned with structure. Some wanted to talk about basis of power and the role of the student in the University, while others wanted to use the power to affect the student's role.

However, it was apparent for once that there was a group of students who wanted to see tangible reform and frustration to attain a significant goal. For many the goal was very different, but the common basis of wanting to take an active part in their University kept the group together in a struggle. It was an open forum November third represents a commitment to change that is far greater than any Inscomm has made in the past. It is unfortunate that the students and members of the administration did not take part Wednesday. Their opinions will be essential if we expect to get a complete list of proposals to be brought to the next meeting.

We can only hope that in the week to come that all individuals seriously think about the role of the student in the University and come to the Forum prepared to engage in a lively and perhaps frustrating debate of relevant issues.

Maria Kivisild '69, UAP

To the Editor:

I question one of the basic assumptions of the News' editorial in Tuesday's issue, to the effect that "The effectiveness of any body can only be sum of the effectiveness of its members." Therefore, can a change in structure be effective if it is not effective, false, but also irrelevant.

A look at the analyst's environment would be revealing, but starting with the effectiveness, the (false) notion that an organization can be changed by changing its structure. Both the structure and the people in it are changing. The Harvard Bridge, for example, would change if the organization commutates, how work is delegated, and how new information is absorbed by the system. When the assumptions are corrected, the system could consist of all the particularity, each of whose part his particular "thing", assembly plants would forget Henry Ford, and articles of The Tech would result this time. In the efforts of those who have written in the past.

When I spoke with Larry Bishop last fall, he explained that the hallways had not been painted as promised and that the opening of communications and the role of the student in the University, while others wanted to use the power to affect the student's role.
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To the Editor:

Thank you for the article last issue drawing attention to the repairs needed in the Pasteur "split". I would, however, like to point out some more aspects missed in the discussion.
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