rider’, ‘Restaurant’ reprieve
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rant of the song) and a young heroin addict trying to kick the habit, who is an odd sort of triangle. This might have made a good feature film by itself, for all anyone can tell in its present form, it’s too mangled to decide. In any case, it doesn’t star Arlo, whose voice still draws you in. However, like Easy Rider, there’s still something to be gained if you can ignore the faults. In that film, though, the total effect transcends some poor scenes; while here, just the reverse is true. Many of the individual scenes survive their jumbled setting, and the Alco’s Restaurant Masacre is still as funny as one story lines are shoved into too small a space, and some is resolved quite satisfactorily. It might also be noted that the movie isn’t quite contemporary, either—the parts about Arlo, at least, are a couple of years old. These days the crowds scream for “Alice” but he’d much rather try something new.

In the final analysis, it’s the subject matter, more than anything else, that makes this film so popular. People of all sorts want to know more—out of curiosity, or just personal experience—about the supposed new “youth culture” they portray, and they’re not being entirely cheated. Neither Alice’s Restaurant nor Easy Rider is anything unusual in form or structure—imagine them as westerns, and they seem quite ordinary. (Significantly, two westerns that opened this summer, The Wild Bunch and True Grit, were not nearly as popular as their rave reviews would normally indicate.) But as the front wave of what could become an important trend, they can’t help but attract attention.

So, then, are they worth the time and effort to justify a head and a wait in line? Compared to the average Boston triple, yes—but don’t expect a bum. –R.

UAP Albert, leftist students disrupt MIT Alumni dinner

With shouts of “Ho! Ho! Ho! Chi Minh!” a group of about fifteen students disrupted the Alumni Officers Conference dinner in the Sala de Puerto Rico on September 7. The students were interested in calling to the alumni’s attention two issues—war research and the non-use of student dining service employees in the dining area.

Alumni prepared
The alumni, however, were prepared for a disruption. They had already decided to ‘go limp’ if disturbed. Therefore, the microphones were switched off as the ‘chant’ shifted to ‘End War Research’.

This disruption precipitated a meeting the next afternoon among the principals. Among those attending were Mr. Lancaster, Dining Staff Manager, Snead, Mr. Bischof, Director of Housing and Dining Services, and Albert, Student Affairs Assistant, Nyhart, and Albert.

Lauricella said that he had made the decision not to use students in the dining area for two reasons. One was the complaints he had received—mainly from dining service customers about the grubliness of the students’ appearance. The other was a lack of student help. This latter reason proved false, although Lauricella was unable to find out because he was on vacation prior to the conference. He and Snead agreed that this would not happen in the future.

Albert and Nyhart then discussed the tactics that had been used to call attention to the problem. Albert claimed that although his group had been disruptive, it had accomplished something—the meeting and also a new awareness among the alumni. Nyhart replied that although something had come out of the action, he could not condone any disruption.