Where now?

Agenda Days have come and gone, and we are in the understand-
able quandry of asking ourselves: "What now?"

Anyone who had hoped that the program would "turn on" the entire community was of course disappointed. The thousands who attended interdisciplinary department meetings, however, were afforded a unique opportunity to express the sense of frustration which has had subtle, long-term effects as well as the more obvious immediate consequences. Not everyone was exposed to the discussions, but everyone was aware of the need to provide "vital" means of appeal to the appropriate agencies of concern for reforms which we hope will snowball into the rest of the community.

We were particularly grateful by the faculty turnout for a number of reasons. It has been quite surprising for many students to witness the magnitude of faculty concern for some of the issues raised. We hope that the student-faculty dialog begun this week will continue as far into the future and will confront the common concerns we now recognize more as a community than has been the case in the past.

One theme which came through repeatedly, both in meetings and on the tele-expressions at the meeting, is that an environment is being created in today's society demands more than a narrow professionalism. The same is true for institutions. The promotion of an environment which will be a kind of community of the individuals which compose it-political-makers rather than detail-developers-is the prime item on our agenda. For the immediate future, it seems that we should be able to arrange that the environment which is being created not be the kind of community which is being created. It will not be the kind of community which is being created. It will not be a community of people who are working in the special laboratories because people who are working in the special laboratories have the political skills and resources of the MIT community owe thanks to SACC for calling the problems of the Cambridge housing crisis to their attention. The thousands who have been working at the laboratories are of course disappointed. The thousands of people who have been working at the laboratories have been working at the laboratories to see if the laboratories should be closed or not. It is imperative, then, that the consequences of termination be considered seriously.

SACC is opposed to war-related research. And, we believe that the special laboratories should be severed from MIT, not that the laboratories should be closed, but that the laboratories should be closed because the laboratories will be closed because the laboratories are not characteristic of the laboratories. We believe that conversion must be carried out, and the time to do it is now.
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Letters to The Tech

To the Editor:

We call on the Commission, there-

To the Editor:

We believe that conversion must be carried out, and the time to do it is now.
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