Backlash

President Richard Nixon's latest blast against campus dissent is an illness for all institutions of higher learning.

Those who read his statement carefully will recall that it was directed specifically at students who practice violence as a means of accomplishing change. For students who want to be heard or will condone bombings in 10-250. However, the public at large, and particularly Nixon's constituency, will not be able to differentiate among the different tactics of campus dissent. We fear that there is a very real danger that too much of the general public will equate any attempts to gain necessary reassessment of policies with such new attempts at the Institute with the violent tactics employed by those who are against the Vietnam war.

The way in which the press and public are likely to interpret the current mood as a clashing of interest in general on campus is suggested by the headline in one Boston paper, "Nixon tells universities to use some 'backbone.'" This call from the White House, which will undoubtedly be echoed and carried to greater extremes elsewhere, will require a new degree of sophistication in the tactics of student unrest. Change, like it or not, involves a very undesirable situation currently exists, in which even private universities such as the Institute are at the mercy of the federal government. If actions in behalf of change transcend a certain level (there is reason to hope that we have not yet reached that level, though we may be fast approaching it), it is entirely possible that the vast "unshackled" masses outside academia which (fortunately) are paying our bills, may rear up and withdraw their financial support through Washington.

Student activists must recognize that if they are serious about bringing about change, their objective must be to maximize effectiveness. Militancy for the sake of militancy is not the way to a better university.

Informal education

Tuesday's conference on informal education at MIT may be the beginning of a major effort to improve the breadth of education available at MIT. The problem which lies before us now is how to transfer some of the constructive suggestions made at that meeting into reality. It is in this area that the Institute has always fallen down in the past; we have seen many conferences, but the implementation of new ideas has been slow.

Two steps to improve the advisory system were suggested at the conference; these can be implemented almost immediately and stem from a realization that students want and need something more than merely answers to specific questions. That something is some major nature comes up, the student often does not have a non-personal question. The result is that when something of a more executive decision. Cost extra money and they can be implemented virtually by department chairmen will consider these suggestions. They will not down in the past; we have seen many conferences, but- the department; and b) that every effort be made to allow successful opposition to the ABM, mentioned in our editorial of April 22.

The first of these would ensure that the student had confidence in our students and to our country to M. I. I. I. .......... I. I. Reid

The two changes we would suggest are these: a) that any student be considered "yes" as evidenced by the overwhelming faculty vote for "Diane W washed's proposal to establish a group to facilitate community participation, and b) that every effort be made to allow successful opposition to the ABM, mentioned in our editorial of April 22.

Militancy for the sake of militancy is not the way to a better university.

Faculty meeting

To the Editor:

I wish to take exception to some of the attitudes expressed in the editorial "What in the name of the Army?" which appeared in The Tech on April 29th.

I feel that the editorial has focused first on a most unusual meeting of faculty, students, administration and ROTC officers so that no effective and too important a meeting for the phrase "innovative support" appears anywhere is characteristically:

You ask, "Will MIT address itself to the non-academic issues and is this even in the present mind of the administration of MIT as indicated by the position paper presented by the faculty?"

The position paper does not address itself to this point, but merely points to a circumstance whose consequences need to be honestly appraised in any reasonable considerations of the issues. If de- terminant consequences are found, then we have also found a real problem.

4) The writers indicated that MIT's current agreement concerning officer output and level of ROTC basic course enrollment is in practice not binding. The university is not agreed to change anything to its quota level or above, and thus being of the armed forces conducted by the university taps no tangential interests which. answer the question at the quota level or above, and this is done to the best of the Army ROTC. The quota clause of the law has no impact on MIT; the university takes no steps to increase enrollment at the quota level or above, and this is done to the best of the Army ROTC.

J. J. Stone, Professor Emeritus

ROTC-The other side to the Editor:

I would like to comment, as part of the position paper presented by Professor Watson, Jonathan Kahn, and Gerry Sheehan in the April issue of The Tech. My intent is that this letter will be in accord with the charge for solid reasoning set forth at the faculty and administration by Professor Wat- son, et al. "We have a responsibility to our students and to our country to see that this university is in practice not above all of its contexts and in all of its practical efforts."

Artificial recognition in the position paper is the real issue is not academic relevance. The problem of the current issues, the writers list three number of arguments to the form of the artific with the others there is no proof that they are not real issues.

1) There is the president of the faculty to appoint the faculty of the military science department. In the law and prac- tice, the appointment is totally subject to the approval of the university. MIT could require that any candidate be a Ph.D., a degree from Fne Arts Form 918. Application and agreement for Establishment of Military Science Training Corps Unit (the Army-MIT contract). That no Army officer shall be assigned to the Department of Military Science without prior written approval of the authori- ties of this institution, and no Army officer will be continued on duty after the expiration of the last year of the relief for "cause." Not only can the Army remove a faculty member at any time, but so can MIT.

2) The present law does require the ranking officer of each ROTC unit. This cannot be done in the way that it is currently done. It seems to depend too often on the whims of the President of the United States of the "military." Profound prejudice has it that the military is monolithic in its loyalty to the President. In fact, it is not the case, but if may be in practice. If my memory serves me correctly, ROTC that the "military" by Army ROTC can be incapacitated to the "military" as a whole, it is something which is impossible to assess the reality of.

In my opinion some description of MIT ROTC courses as having "a clear program of education for Army ROTC students," while others were described as titillating and challenging.

My point is that the courses have a pronounced science-oriented bias. Political issues are generally seen, identified as such by students and instructors alike.

"Strategy in the Middle Age by Bernard Steidle is a RAND Corporation study and required for sophomores in Army ROTC students. While discussing the 19th century military drafte Karl von Clausewitz, Dr. Steidle presents his prediction that war should always be an arm of national policy. Pursuing victo- racy for victory's sake is immoral, inac- cessible, and a waste of our men and resources. Consider the temperatawe, for example, in Vietnam, which was supported by Steidle in these excerpts: "must be taken. At the University of Illinois, men (WWI military leaders) after that they were willing to pay so high a price for war in Vietnam. The history of other sides in World War I have often been characterized by the fact that the American military leaders were aware of the great forces conducted according to its own standards and policy for its special economic, political, and social goals."

Whether a person believes the "mili- tary" is capable of offering courses at the same level of rigor and with the same depth of inquiry as do other courses seems to depend too often on the whims of the President of the United States of the "military." Profound prejudice has it that the military is monolithic in its loyalty to the President. In fact, it is not the case, but if may be in practice. If my memory serves me correctly, ROTC by Army ROTC can be incapacitated to the "military" as a whole, it is something which is impossible to assess the reality of.

(Continued on page 3)

Footnotes

A letter by Karen Wattle

65. Students taking an 84 hour per week Monday morning course with the unique course with the institution had a blank notebook to signal the start of the exam in 50-74. They were then to write a story with the title "What was the story at the end of the hour. Why, should the students of the time have their hands on." The most important thing is the story, not the "answer" in the top left hand corner of the page. This story was not supposed to have any special name. The "week's score grade award goes to ... " The author is the "author of the story".

66. The Metaplace Tribune, Boston, June 20, 1969, page 1, entitled as an issue of the issue. One article special- ized in the college a short article was their response:

"This week's score grade award goes to..." The author of the story, "The Winter of '69," is not at

To the Lawman, that is it?"