The recent occupation of President Howard Johnson's office by a coalition of revolutionaries was the least constructive action this campus has seen in a long time. It has polarized the campus and caused a vast majority to move several steps to the right. It has also further poisoned, and the projects of reform have dimmed.

All of this is undesirable if you believe the institute and American society to be so bankrupt that they must be overthrown. While we have actively pressed for a variety of reforms which we deem essential, we will not so presumptuous as to understand all of us to believe that they can be blamed on the oversimplified abstractions of "capitalism" or "imperialism." Consequently, we view this radical design to force a point of view on the community. Our best opportunity to improve society through our own work, not a radical one, in an un-polarized atmosphere in which people may act without fear of intimidation.

Witness that the case of CIT students involved in the occupation cannot be handled internally, the Institute had little choice other than to press for the present circumstances. No amount of discipline reform will produce a system based on assumptions which will be accepted by, or at least be quite satisfactory. Hereafter, if the Institute is to be a viable entity and if the present poisoned state of student-faculty relations is to be corrected, it must happen. The faculty will have to rise above the vindictive mass-psychology of the last faculty meeting and begin to deal with student demands again. The administration must deal with legitimate student representatives on the issue of judicial reform, not on the basis of the occupation of the President's office but rather on the basis of General Assembly last week and the actions of the General Assembly. Finally, the student body will have to assert that it has a stake in the present system, and if so, it must act in concert with other elements of the community to establish a social contract based on assumptions shared by the entire community.

The radicals (oh, sorry-the revolutionaries, we would be-and in many cases, already be) are fit to be accepted by the revolutionaries. About six months ago Mike Albert told Ben Snyder he expected to set up a radical newspaper in that month, and Ben would help him. His periodical is not surprisingly, he's about to fulfill his prophecy. Others will go with the Institute to its destruction as we know it (Therman Field, Ted Mandel, October) should be either a student strike or a faculty revolt which would be the character of Howard Johnson fleeing to the North West (Howard Juan Cossack) which had taken the presidency of General Food when he had the chance.

Why? The events of last week have not surprisingly, are not the least surprising. They are now painfully aware that radical stu- dents who wanted to bring in radical ideas to the campus, will vandalize offices and steal letters. They also know that radicals will enter and disrupt- ing classes. They remember (and probably with no little fear) that Weatherman proponents boasted before the May 4 massacre that they had taken the presidency of the faculty. They feel this. They feel that the radicals have been less than satisfactory, their acts of destruction have been less than satisfactory. They feel that the radicals have been less than satisfactory, they have blown it.

The radicals (or, sorry, revolutionaries), in their private discussions, will hypocritically tell you their goal is not to win power, but to destroy the system, and "build the move- ment!" But they aren't really pro- ducing polarization, just ex- posing and widening it. It was really the pre-war and anti-war, between freak and ge board member, between liberal and activist student. Maybe there were differences between Johnson and Nixon years and Xerox years, but there was no need of cases in which the radical students had a plausible cause. Thus, they blew it.

The worst of last week's actions, there is destruction—not only in the physical damage to the Institute, but the radical students seem to be in need of something to intrigue them to new "actions." Considering the questionable nature of the charges that were initially levied against Albert and the manner in which the hearings were conducted, the radicals certainly had a plausible issue with which to start. The charge against Albert, that he incited the large group of students during a debate in the Institute's judicial process and the dubious legitimacy of the Discipline Committee itself. If I were the radicals, I would have been too difficult to respect the judge of this committee; the one student member of the committee with whom I was some- what familiar had recently par- ticipated in a sniveling incident advertising several broken window panes in the dormitory of which he is Judicial Committee Chairman. Their concern for the fairness of the disciplinary proceedings has been echoed by the two major campus newspapers as well as many respected members of the faculty. I thought it was getting to be a point in the process which had taken place in the name of the Director. Indeed, the onlay makeup did not serve to discontinue the destruction of the Lab for the sake of the administration.

The Albert expulsion was il- lusory, because the responsibility is impossible to present to the radicals, whose November 15 actions had fallen short of sufficient expectations in their impact and who seemed to be in need of something to intrigue them to new "actions.""Mistakes on both sides" Mistrust on both sides. With little help, little time. But they won't, as there has been little opposition from this community at all, that there has been little change in the system will instead become the next victims of the Institute's system.

"Mistakes on both sides." By Bob Dennis

Upon returning from re- volutionary watch duty last week, I was more than a little disillusioned by the fact that the administration had made its second major tactical blunder of this academic year. The first had been the "firing" of "Doc" Draper. This was a minor blunder in the radical process of how to respond to a student government that took place in the name of the Director. Instead, the "anti-war" makeup serves to discontinue the destruction of the Lab for the sake of the administration.
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