Letter to The Tech

International Peace

To the Editor:

There are few things more beautiful than a university," I wrote. John Manfield in his tribute to the English university and its words are especially true at MIT. He did not refer to spires and towers, to campus green and ivy walls. He admired the splendour beauty of the very verse of the very word, and his words read echo in the air.

I write to discuss a topic on which ignorance is too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived - yet it is the most important topic in the world: international friendship and goodwill.

Is there no room for friendship I do refer to? A kind of friendship which will form a firm base of world peace and which will make the globe devoid of suspicion, hatredness and misunderstanding and fill in all an aura of confidence, well-being and prosperity. For prosperity I mean a standing and fill in an aura of well-being and prosperity. By prosperity I mean a standing and fill in an aura of well-being and prosperity. By prosperity I mean a standing and fill in an aura of well-being and prosperity. By prosperity I mean a standing and fill in an aura of well-being and prosperity.

I write to discuss a topic on which ignorance is too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived - yet it is the most important topic in the world: international friendship and goodwill.

I would be very happy to receive suggestions and comments to initiate a body which will effect the program to bring together all the people, I am positive our system of education will never be as my country of origin ambitious ambitions - it will always be used to pursue peace. It will never be needed to promote provocations - it will always be used to promote the peaceful dispute of the people. So let's get shapin' up.

Parth S. Ghosh

Opinion

They'll pay if we sell them.

By Michael McNamee

One operational definition of "optimist" is "someone who takes a stack of old MIT reports home for the summer and expects to read them all." I don't usually consider myself an optimist, but I did take home such a stack of paper this summer, and I did expect to burrow through them, coming up with all kinds of wild, wondrous, and background material to be scattered throughout future pontifications from the editor's desk. I suppose that, had I succeeded in that task, I could have come up with a new operational definition of "grundy" - turkey, and fool. But I failed, and spent the summer enjoying, if less quotable, kinds of literature.

I still have the stack of reports here, however, and I've skinned through it enough to realize the truth of the saying: MIT has spent more money producing more reports to less result than any bureaucratic of comparable size anywhere.

There is, for example, that venerable grand-daddy of all MIT reports, Creative Renewal of the 1960s: Time of Crisis: The Report of the Commission on MIT Education. This massive document, published in 1970, was to serve as the basis for the immensely-successful Opportunities program. This massive document, published in 1970, was to serve as the basis for the immensely-successful Opportunities program. This massive document, published in 1970, was to serve as the basis for the immensely-successful Opportunities program.

It has been suggested that MIT should bundle up its reports and send them to "less admirable" kinds of literature. More recent reports have met even worse fates - they have faded from sight completely, sometimes within as short a time as two years, to be remembered only when the issue which they had set out to address in some aggrieved form much later. For example, a Special Committee on Privacy worked for two years to produce a 1971 report, which was promptly forgotten. That report was reissued only when the Institute found itself caught in a dispute with the federal government over privacy of student files.

There's no telling why MIT chooses so often to ignore the labors of its committees, special commissions, and other expensive review groups. Times change; the mood swings between the establishment of the MIT Commission and the time of its report was "astounding" and a major factor in the report's lack of acceptance, according to Chairman Ken Hoffman. Conditions change as Privacy Committee Chairman Arthur Smith noted. If there are no causes or incidents to enliven debate, an issue can lie dormant for some time.

It has been suggested that MIT should bundle up its reports and send them to "less admirable" kinds of literature. More recent reports have met even worse fates - they have faded from sight completely, sometimes within as short a time as two years, to be remembered only when the issue which they had set out to address in some aggrieved form much later. For example, a Special Committee on Privacy worked for two years to produce a 1971 report, which was promptly forgotten. That report was reissued only when the Institute found itself caught in a dispute with the federal government over privacy of student files.