By Steve Carhart

Events of the last week left the campus gasping for breath and trying to figure out what has happened. A number of events have provided impetus for the current of tension and concern. (Among them are:
1.) the recent upheavals at Harvard;
2.) SACC's increasing militance;
3.) efforts by a seminar group by Professor Jerold Zarahies to mobilize Institute-wide concern for issues at the interface between politics and education;
4.) the efforts of an ad hoc group to organize a "day of concern" which will involve the entire Institute.

The efforts of MIT's leaders to focus attention on a variety of political issues are well known. In the past, the left has insisted that a variety of matters as the group has dealt with a series of issues. Two years ago we had the committee to end the war in Vietnam and the SDS; these were succeeded by the New University Coalition (NUC). Of concern for issues at the interface between politics and education, which MIT has occupied in the military-industrial-university complex which MIT has occupied in the military-industrial-university complex and its approach of educating people to an awareness of the issues. While many people at the Institute do not agree with all of SACC's conclusions, the current politics of the government have convinced them that a review of MIT's position in this context is long overdue.

Another important concept of the current situation is the recent upsurge of activist groups which was organized by Peter Q. Harris '69, former SSCP (Science Action Co-ordinating Committee, and in the process the radical left has picked up a number of new active members. They have also gained some degree of faculty support, from such organizations as the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) and the New University Coalition (NUC).

In the letter to SACC from S. P. Williams, Assistant Academic Dean, it was said that "there should be Thursday and the "day of concern.""

There were questions as to the date of the meeting, which lasted approximately five hours from 1:30 pm to 6:30 pm, was long and frustratingly similar to the previous week. The group also could not agree on a specific proposal to be written. It was generally agreed that no solution had been reached, yet the meeting was adjourned until 4 pm when there would be written proposals. Mike Albert that the convocation committee would "take ten minutes to ratify a proposal," as the group broke up.

Two proposals were presented to the group and a third was suggested. One was prepared by Albert, Miss Shaffe and Kauffman, and the other by this reporter. A third proposal was suggested by a subcommittee of Saloma's committee. Briefly, the proposals were:

Joint: Panel Wednesday afternoon including Albert, Howard Johnson, in Rubenzahl (SACC) and Vice President for Special Labs and Science. The committee was to meet with each, questions from floor, Thursday. Workshop: Discussion of issues raised on Wednesday. The meeting, which lasted approximately five hours from 1:30 pm to 6:30 pm, was long and frustratingly similar to the previous week. The group also could not agree on a specific proposal to be written. It was generally agreed that no solution had been reached, yet the meeting was adjourned until 4 pm when there would be written proposals. Mike Albert that the convocation committee would "take ten minutes to ratify a proposal," as the group broke up.

Late afternoon:

Two proposals were presented to the group and a third was suggested. One was prepared by Albert, Miss Shaffe and Kauffman, and the other by this reporter. A third proposal was suggested by a subcommittee of Saloma's committee. Briefly, the proposals were: