The effects of the exchange

By Emily Hick

Uncustomed though I am to making speeches, I am not simply must comment on the MIT-Wellesley Exchange Committee's recommendation for its conclusion. For example, I express no opinion with which I do not express or originate with me. The committee's opinion has been clearly expressed in the form of a report. In my view, the committee's main recommendations are well-founded, and I support them. In my opinion, the committee's recommendations are valuable and should be followed. In my view, the committee's recommendations are well-grounded, and I support them. In my opinion, the committee's recommendations are valuable and should be followed.

Letters to the Editor

To the Editor:

The otherwise accurate story in The Tech (3-9-73) on "permanent male guests" in McCormick incorrectly interprets two comments I made on the subject. I write now, not to quibble about what I said but to clarify the position of the party involved. It is my understanding that McCormick Hall residents and their friends have been using the space in question for student activities. It is my understanding that McCormick Hall residents and their friends have been using the space in question for student activities. It is my understanding that McCormick Hall residents and their friends have been using the space in question for student activities. It is my understanding that McCormick Hall residents and their friends have been using the space in question for student activities. It is my understanding that McCormick Hall residents and their friends have been using the space in question for student activities. It is my understanding that McCormick Hall residents and their friends have been using the space in question for student activities. It is my understanding that McCormick Hall residents and their friends have been using the space in question for student activities. It is my understanding that McCormick Hall residents and their friends have been using the space in question for student activities.

To the Editor:

The recent exchange of Cambridge cable television controversy gives one the distinct impression that the only parties whose voices were heard were those on the MIT side of the argument. That the parties that provided a counterpoint to the MIT-Wellesley Exchange would be set aside, and even misquoted to some extent, is regrettable. It is unfortunate that one could not have had the opportunity to be heard in any meaningful way.

To the Editor:

In view of the recent exchange of letters (March 13, 17, 19, 24) concerning the Cambridge cable television controversy, I would like to add my voice to the debate. It has been my understanding that the Cambridge cable television controversy was not a matter of public debate, but rather a private matter between MIT and Wellesley. However, it is my understanding that the exchange of letters has been widely publicized, and I believe that it is important that the public be made aware of the issues involved. I write this letter to draw attention to the Cambridge cable television controversy and to urge the parties involved to consider the interests of the public in this matter.