Certainly, there are none in the Department at MIT. Indeed, to call such work academic in a loose and popular use of the term 'analytic philosophy' is to refer to a kind of philosophical work which exhibits a manifest concern for clarity and rigor in expression techniques. Members of the Department are 'analytic philosophers.' That would put us in the excellent company of Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, Kant, Marx, Hegel, and (indeed, every major philosopher whose work I can think of today). Mr. Makowski seems to think that there are no objective standards by which the quality of this philosophical work can be assessed. Work that is shoddy, careless, or insufficiency evaluated in some objective manner. Nothing on any grounds, simply and straightforwardly bad philosophy.

(2) In light of the above, it is difficult to make sense of the claim that a small number of senior members of the Department teach philosophy. First, senior members of the Department offer courses in every one of the branches of philosophy. We have, incidentally, found Mr. Patricia Graff to be the only member who teaches what is called 'analytic' subjects in the fields of logic and linguistics. One other thing that needs to be said about some of the senior members of the faculty is, in my opinion, that they are better at being misled by "officers of the law" while the rest of us were pelted by a few students with beer bottles.

Steven S. Nome, VII, '73

Graves

Graves: the editor.

In the last several weeks, The Tech has covered the events on campus and on the streets. In fact, the whole problem of jurisdiction is definitely a matter of tenure for Professor John Mackay. We may, therefore, make a number of issues, some of which (notably a question of Professor Graves' remarks on the afternoon's events) are both unseemly and unsavory for us to voice in a public forum. Other questions which may be raised concern the character and composition of the Department of Philosophy and the MIT community at large. We said little to address ourselves to these issues.

In several of the communications, it is alleged that the Department is somehow or other opposed to the students' movement. We confess with that of most of the members of the Department in that we do not want to be converted to any political philosophy or political program. We do not want to be converted to any political philosophy or political program.

(1) Politics divides us into two or less well-defined classes; traditionally listed among these are, for example, political parties, the class of knowledge, and the political philosophy. (2) And while the Tech (April 1972) seem to think that 'analytic' philosophy is a type of philosophy, which is not the case. (3) The character of philosophy is that of professional training.

Finally, concern has been expressed over the future direction of the Department of Philosophy. Our comments on the Graves case have been directed towards maintaining a continuing commitment to the philosophy of science at MIT. This is a more fundamental matter than the mere number of courses and number of credits in the program. MIT has always provided a number of courses in philosophy of science, as well as in history of philosophy, and continues to do so.

(3) Graves’ work is that of philosophy of special sciences. In gratitude, he has contributed to our understanding of the special sciences, such as those dealing with the structure of scientific theories and the nature of scientific explanation, probability, and induction. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that there are certain problems concerning the Department of Philosophy.

(Graves) Work is in progress on the question of specializing in philosophy of science. It is important to note that the present character of the Department is the result of a conscious decision of the faculty as a whole, and is not the result of any single individual’s actions.

At 11 pm, sufficient outside support had gathered to make any more of the demonstrators (at least those who were in possession of the windows) feel that the windows could be used as a means of escape from the police chickadees and cows. Some of the demonstrators were heard to say the police chickadees and cows were moving in a group, in order to create as much confusion as possible. The demonstrators were asked to move to the Student Center, where the staff at the Student Center was prepared to provide assistance.

The chief effort the demonstrators made in the evening was to identify and separate the group of demonstrators into two categories: the "activists," and the "stroke." The "activists" voice resembles nothing so much as the voice of the government. In their enthusiasm to get a "rousing tune" into the streets, they were divided between "hippies" and "stroke." The "activists" were made up of students with garrulous demonstrations, and "stroke" was the same as "happy." The "activists" were made up of students with garrulous demonstrations, and "stroke" was the same as "happy.

"Happy," then read the menu. "Happy, then read the menu." (Continued from page 4)