The decision by Harvard undergraduates to continue their strike indicates that the source of their dissatisfaction is more than the usual variety of "demands" which are the formal causes of the strike. The current crisis at Harvard dramatizes the depth of long-registered frustrations students feel with a society and education which seem slow to make needed change. The survival of police, in direct violation of a series of guidelines set down for the use of force the night before by a group of moderates may be viewed as a catalyst which facilitated the full expression of the enormous stored tension concerning the current state of our society which is characteristic of sensitive members of a generation.

Viewed in this context, the chief difference between "moderates" and "radicals" is the thickness of the shell of rationality and willingness to work with a complex system which is the superheated frustrations which nearly every member of the current generation of students feels. Brought up in a period in which his material wails are instantly satisfied, today's student finds it more frustrating to have his emotional needs so difficult to meet. The violence of his demonstration, accompanied by the extent of the faculty, products of the Depression and the War, are far more patient.

The shell of rationality has been fairly strong for most Harvard students until now. Most were willing to accept study committees and voting on changes as the way to make changes, because after all, one must try to make the best change and be sure that everyone's views are represented. From the student viewpoint, the process never moves fast enough. As university structure changes, it does not always appear to affect the basic issues: Vietnam, the draft, poverty, slums, inequality, lack of personal relationships, militarism in our society, governmental control over our lives, an educational organization which is so complex in structure which could be so much more if it tried, etc.

Within the shell of rationality, it is virtually impossible to maintain that conditions are so intolerable as to justify action such as school closing. Yet the inner pressures students feel are now continuing to grow as things seem to become worse. At Harvard the shell of rationality was broken.

When the Harvard administration called in the police without consulting the Harvard community with what is wrong with our society. Demands for specific changes were no longer important, though they were made out of habit.

The Harvard authorities were right when they said that there was no negotiable substance to the demands of the members of the strike. Even SDS may not understand the true nature of the reservoir of frustration they have tapped among the "moderates." Now that the administration has identified itself with the sources of long-gathered frustration, the students have a little chunk of what was wrong with our society that was their very own.

If the SDS does not comprehend the true nature of the situation, neither does the administration. Yet the administrators, whose shell of rationality is thicker than that of the faculty and far thicker than those of the students, is still trying to deal with the situations as though it were a rational situation, unlike labor-management negotiations on wages. What has really happened is that the administration has inadvertently acted so as to awaken irrational anger in the students, and in so doing, the administration has caused, within the students, the "issues" formally discussed. The administration, caught in the middle, is now seen as the local representative of many other evils and is being treated accordingly.

Can it happen here?

If we are to undertake a meaningful reevaluation of our campus climate before we grow far beyond our current levels, before the situation deteriorates further, we must generate an emotional and moral reaction to the magnitude of the events we now witness at Harvard.

We must generate this mobilization without violence or threat of violence comparable to what has been witnessed at Harvard. The interests of students and faculty are not contradictory in this matter; both groups are attempting to create a more academic community. The difference is that the students feel that the administration should not be underlain in an atmosphere of coercion; rather, both faculty and students should participate in the making of its own arts. This must be begun now, when it is important and worthwhile, rather than later, when it becomes merely expedient and unavoidable.

Letters to The Tech

To the Editor:

I urge the MIT faculty and administration to act promptly and vigorously, to use their political relationship to students. I argue that students be brought into the decision-making process, from admissions and details of curriculum to major Institute policy. One listens to Harvard's official catalog, and you will find many who have witnessed at Harvard. The interests of students and faculty are not contradictory in this matter; both groups are attempting to create a more academic community. The difference is that the students feel that the administration should not be underlain in an atmosphere of coercion; rather, both faculty and students should participate in the making of its own arts. This must be begun now, when it is important and worthwhile, rather than later, when it becomes merely expedient and unavoidable.

The time has come to acknowledge the moral leadership of the Tech's students, to add our strength to theirs, and to work with them-negotiate with them-toward a better society. A college has no other purpose.

Harold Freeman Professor, Course X14