It would seem almost pointless to write an anti-bombing editorial.

What could be more obvious than the need to protect the university community from violence? Who could argue with an appeal to respect for human life? What morality could possibly sanction this terrorism?

The stock radical rhetoric provides no justification. It is not legible as a piece of research and execute a sentence. No extremist element is qualified to decide that some professor's work must be halted. Coercion has no place on a university campus dedicated to peaceful, objective investigation.

And universities are so frightfully vulnerable to this method of attack. Large corporations can protect their research facilities with chain link fences and personnel checks; government specialists seek refuge behind secrecy and armed guards. But an institution committed to the free exchange of ideas must find these devices alien and unwelcome. One of our campus' special virtues has always been its easy access. We find it disheartening that such an asset now works to the detriment of the Institute's safety.

What will result from these wanton acts? Certainly no meaningful social change. The effort to quell the bombing will get sufficient research done somewhere—short of outright murder, there is no way to prevent technicians from working for the present government. But the bombing will provide an excuse to government pressuring universities. Already our nation's campuses have absorbed an extra 1,000 FBI agents; their presence constitutes an affront to a university's ideals. And candidates now find an association with university liberals or students detrimental to their chances of reaching office.

The wonder of the recent Harvard incident has been the casual attitude of our own community. We can only urge a change of currency. A few people dedicate themselves to the conviction that MIT must remain an open institution.

Analysis

On student government

By Steve Ehrman

Sometimes trends can be spotted by paying attention to one set of facts while ignoring the surrounding noise. I think the following provides one such interesting trend.

Items - At Tuesday's meeting, the General Assembly's Agenda Committee discussed control of the Student Center, compulsory accounting, and the lack of preparation for the January Independent Study Period. The committee began to examine the work of the Student Committee on Environment as it relates to the Assembly.

Item - Andy Himmelblau (GA Executive Committee) is pushing in serious amounts of time trying to untangle the problems of communications between the active committees and the General Assembly representatives. GA members have been meeting regularly throughout the week to work on this problem.

My conclusion is that the General Assembly may be finding itself as an organization and as a government. It is a good thing to see.

Last year, the GA was one of the more kicked-around organizations on campus. Although its track record was considerably better than it seemed, what was visible looked pretty diurnal. What successes there were were obscured in the clutter of noisy failure. I remember that the General Assembly Corporation was passing a motion condemning the war. How many people know what role the Student Committee on Educational Policy played in instituting the pass-no pass grading system?

What is most remembered is that last year was marked by ambitious motions and rebuff. The GA tried to revolutionary schemes, but its own power and found its turf to be quite limited.

I am a bit early to tell for sure, but it seems to me that we are near the ending of a long range goal, some short range tasks and working definitions, and at least some small sense of identity and purpose.

Let me first make a few gaudy generalizations and then grab some facts. You tell me if I'm making sense.

1.) A program for the rest of the year seems to forming. It's quite a polyglot at this point with emphasis nowhere by nowhere. By this time of year the GA's agenda has been filled with several issues of educational policy, the Corporation, a new system of Institute governance, a new judicial system, the Student Committee on Environment, and the budgeting system for government and activities.

2.) One of the characteristics of student government has been a serious split between the members of the governing body (first floor, then the GA) and the student members of the various committees. This year, few committee representatives have begun to report, Nominations Committees are functioning smoothly, and we will be initiating some summations between GA reps and committee representatives centering around issues.

3.) The whole communications system has been in disarray ever since the General Assembly was founded. Some slight order may be emerging from this chaos. A bimonthly announcement sheet is being produced and there is talk of a newsletter. The cold pressure of people for work in this area is beginning, based on the premise that if anyone wants to really know how the Institute works, it's got to be done in our own community center. The idea is to get hordes of interested people so any individual need work with the Communications Board only for a few months, long enough to learn, not so long that it becomes backwork. We shall see.

4.) The Assembly seems to be gaining some cohesiveness. Although there are quite a few new members, many have taken assurance for a while and seen most stupid mistakes made several times. These veterans seem to be steadily the organization. It is beginning to look like a number of people who did time in last year's GA have now decided to participate in the student government to make the thing work better.

5.) The attitude that the General Assembly is not just 'student politics' seems to be developing. The Assembly is beginning to take the view that people in undergraduate government ought to be concerned and ready to help any committee organization, working with activities, and generally furthering the ideals that are the GA's prime concern.

6.) It's question of attitudes (Please turn to page 5)