Tough questions

We have long been uneasy with some of the opposing certain projects is to make a symbolic research which is done at the Institute. However, gesture, then discussion should center on the role when it comes to advocating elimination of certain projects merits and costs of making such a gesture. research is which is done at the Institute. However, gesture, then discussion should center on the role

Finally, if we are to consider doing away with the projects that support the slogans or an opposing policy would misrepresent a far greater corp of us. We can only hope that such gestures, except in terms of what one “feels” is appropriate for this institution.

If, on the other hand, the objective of these letters is to be apolitical?

In sum, there is a growing consensus that the current policy is disastrous and must be changed. "Not everyone is convinced that immediate withdrawal or victory to the NLF is the answer; many professor only confusion, disgust, and ignorance of a neat way to extricate ourselves from the quagmire. The Moratorium is for them as well. It is a means to show a government which apparently has not yet understood that the years that five of those “turning corners” is too much.

To those who say that “an institutional stand in favor of the Moratorium would misrepresent them we can only say that the time has come at which not taking an institutional stand against the present policy will misrepresent a far greater consensus among us.

There are no divisions among students, faculty, and administration on this issue. We must stand as a community committed to an early end to this awful war. October 15 is our best chance to do so.

Letters to The Tech

To the editor:

Author’s note. This is an excerpt from my private journal; it was written in May of this year. I was somewhat hesitant to submit this piece for publication, since there are so many other issues that must be addressed.

If groups which favor the elimination of certain projects hope to materially influence the conduct of government policy by depriving the government of MIT’s experience (which includes, in our certain “experts” minds) have not been adequately answered.

Specifically, what do we hope to accomplish by the Moratorium? So we are left with: a) the hope of de concentrating a specific government policy; such as (MIT does not do CBW work, for instance), How- there is no general consensus on the issue of Mor- IRV deployment? Are we looking to make a clear, MIT has historically had a somewhat different symbolic gesture of disagreement of certain policies? I see no sense of propriety concerning its research. Or are we trying to “purify” the Institute? I think the answer to the latter is that it has no such historical institutions. Should we keep to this one, and we are going to be only repetition of last year’s and the year before. The government has sufficient funds to whether its actions will have the desired effect; if we make long-term adjustments to campus unrest by it for the sake of the former group, we should simply the faculty and administration on this issue. We must consider not only the cost of making such a gesture, but also the moral implications.

ProjectPoseidon project could spin off if necessary. making long-term adjustments to campus unrest by it for the sake of the former group, we should simply
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Commnunity responsibility?

President Howard Johnson has said that the problems associated with discipline, disruption, and the maintenance of the rights of all members of the MIT community in a community problem. We agree. However, we must be certain that the way in which this community responsibility is discharged is not dictated by all segments of the community. Last year, through the efforts of SESP chairman Peter Q. Harris, students token representation on the Committee on Discipline. In light of the apparent emphasis which Johnson has placed on the operation of this committee (which, like it or not, will probably have a byzantian role), it is essential that student representation and participation in the work of this group be real and meaningful.

Specifically, it is vital that the students (and their parents if they desire) are more than one student member this year) who participate in the operation of the committee be allowed to formulate guidelines and policies for handling cases. It can hardly be considered meaningful participation for a student to be called upon to judge another student (or faculty member) according to rules which were formulated solely by the faculty and administration.

We feel that, in the interest of the students, it should be noted that student participation on faculty committees is still insufficient. We think that this time has come for formal recognition of the role which students play in the running of the Institute.

Vandalism

The recent acts of vandalism which have resulted in the defacement of Walker Memorial and various sidewalks around the Institute with various graffiti, slogans are entirely inexcusable. I do not believe that any such acts would be (even if the noise generated there and at Harvard, nothing seems to have changed and probably nothing will, and that instead, Nixon is going to go further down the path of LBJ and the nation is going to be

What should MIT do on October 15?

It is extremely important that the Institute take some sort of institutional stand in favor of the Moratorium. Much has been said about the dangers of politicizing the educational process, and certainly there should in general not be a political organization. However, we would also argue that it is impossible for the Institute to be apolitical. In the faculty meeting Wednesday, President Johnson described the administration’s effort to change the draft laws and prevent changes in tax laws which might hurt the Institute. We ask, is there any other issue which is of such overriding importance to so many members of the MIT community as the continuation of the Vietnam war? Is there any other issue which has so disrupted the educational process, or contributed to so much inflation? When an institution, which has so disrupted the educational process, or contributed to so much inflation? When an institution a student considers his life in...