Richard Nixon has gone too far in his role as the executive war-maker. His reckless policies are reprehensible and indicate a gross misjudgment of the mandate he received on election day.

That mandate, one of the largest awarded to a presidential candidate in this century, gave Mr. Nixon another four years as president, based on his fine wartime performance. It was not a blind nod of approval from the American public for him to proceed on the course of devastation this country is pursuing in Indochina.

On December 18, 1972, on orders from the commander-in-chief, US bombers began the assault by bombing the North Vietnamese anti-aircraft fire. The American forces progressed in Washington shortly after New Year's, apparently ready to take on the President and call a halt to the Nixon Vietnam tactic. However, now it has become clear that it will be the American people, not Congress, who will be the first to challenge the President's continuation of the war — on Inauguration Day, January 20.

With this intangible mission, Mr. Nixon has succeeded in uniting a large section of the American public into opposing the war, and The Tech supports the actions of those groups and individuals organizing massive demonstrations to coincide with the President's inauguration ceremony in Washington this Saturday, and encourages people to attend.

For quite some time, Mr. Nixon has been challenging public opinion over the war, and has believed that the American public is no longer interested in a war which he asserts is nearly over. This time, we're going to call his bluff.

What's Wiensner's Job?

These three job definitions were prepared for a 1974 study on management responsibilities at MIT. In this regard, the Provost and Vice Presidents report, in the first instance, to the President, and, through the President, to the Chancellor.

For the next year the Chancellor will have all of the general management responsibilities for the Institute, including the academic and administrative activities. He will work through the Provost and the President on the planning program and Faculty appointments and with the Vice Presidents on administrative matters.

President

The President has overall responsibility for all of the Institute's policies and operations.

He provides initiative and leadership in the shaping of goals and priorities and plans for the long-term growth of the Institute. He exercises these functions in the context of a university structure - that is, in the context of the division of power in the academic year 1971-72: the descriptions are printed in full here for the benefit of people who are interested in the recent changes that are involved in the division of power at the top. — Editor

Chancellor

The Chancellor is the President's deputy on all matters and shares the executive responsibility for Institute policies and operations.

He, working with the President, is responsible for the implementation of plans for the development of MIT, delegating to the Chancellor the general management functions of the President's activities will continue with the President and the President's responsibilities for fund-raising activity, and the Chancellor will maintain the Institute to the alumni and to the general public.

In the next year the President will be primarily concerned with formulation of policy for the long-term development of MIT, delegating to the Chancellor the general management functions of the President's responsibilities for endowment which can only be used for certain purposes. General money is available, but the amount of money the Institute receives for overall support of Institute departments. Sources of these funds have been untapped. The net amount available for the year ending May 31, 1973, is $5,570,000.

The second question, within the context of what proportion of "pure" research is sponsored by government agencies, is this the best possible way to go about obtaining funds for MIT? What is the best possible way to go about obtaining funds for MIT? The question of how the Institute's budget is divided is critical in drawing a line between what is general money and what is special money. The question of how the Institute's budget is divided is critical in drawing a line between what is general money and what is special money. The question of how the Institute's budget is divided is critical in drawing a line between what is general money and what is special money. The question of how the Institute's budget is divided is critical in drawing a line between what is general money and what is special money.