To the editor:

With the apparent oscillation of the war in Cambodia, a student group at MIT has been spurred to protest and direct against the Nixon administration. As a result, the Board of student affairs, and the student strike have recently received much media attention.

During April, student leaders called for nationwide strikes and anti-war actions to protest the war. The Board of Student Affairs, which is the official voice of student opinion on anti-war issues, has repeatedly called on students to pursue their goals through other means, including voting and running for student office. The Board is working in your interests. That is its job.

In Washington, we found that each of the three points above was contested by a number of the officials to whom we spoke. As far as the demonstration of widespread anti-war opposition is concerned, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), who questioned the effectiveness of this action, attributed the result to an alleged "isolation" of the student body. Assistant House Press Secretary Press explained, that "the effect of the strike is minimal, mainly because only our students and academic life, and not real cost of the people." US Rep. Fred Upton (R-Mich.) stated that Nixon administration do not really perceive the student actions as an important issue. All recent strikes and actions.

"He [Nixon] doesn't think there is an increase in opposition to the war and closing down the schools does not accomplish that." Results of the investigation imply that student groups have minimal influence on the administration of the war. However, this does not mean that all of the officials contacted expressed grave doubts that the results of a student strike were going to be successful in their actions, which most officials are sceptical about.

Admittedly, public pressure may be brought to bear on the student protest, but the extent to which this pressure is effective is uncertain. The Board is working on a strike, which would include students as well as workers, businesses, etc. That the President is determined, and is influenced by more public pressure. It is not clear whether the Board is working in your interests. That is its job.

In conclusion, we would like to applaud MIT's Board of Student Affairs for their efforts to discourage student strikes and to encourage other means for student protest. The Board is working in your interests. That is its job.

Edwin M. Arpiloff '74

Dear editor,

The student strike is a controversial issue that has been widely debated in recent years. As a result, the Board of Student Affairs, which is the official voice of student opinion on anti-war issues, has repeatedly called on students to pursue their goals through other means, including voting and running for student office. The Board is working in your interests. That is its job.

In Washington, we found that each of the three points above was contested by a number of the officials to whom we spoke. As far as the demonstration of widespread anti-war opposition is concerned, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), who questioned the effectiveness of this action, attributed the result to an alleged "isolation" of the student body. Assistant House Press Secretary Press explained, that "the effect of the strike is minimal, mainly because only our students and academic life, and not real cost of the people." US Rep. Fred Upton (R-Mich.) stated that Nixon administration do not really perceive the student actions as an important issue. All recent strikes and actions.

"He [Nixon] doesn't think there is an increase in opposition to the war and closing down the schools does not accomplish that." Results of the investigation imply that student groups have minimal influence on the administration of the war. However, this does not mean that all of the officials contacted expressed grave doubts that the results of a student strike were going to be successful in their actions, which most officials are sceptical about.

Edwin M. Arpiloff '74