**Editorials**

**Gray's premature solicitation**

President Gray advertised in last Sunday's *New York Times* for corporations seeking to invest in university research.

The solicitation was not a "Help Wanted" classified ad, but an article in the business section entitled, "MIT Wants Closer Ties With Business." While noting that corporations have been raised to the use of increased corporate contributions to fill the gap left by shrinking Federal funding, the article left the impression that the problems have been solved and checks were gladly being accepted.

The article reflected a problem similar to that raised by earlier Congressional testimony by Gray which endorses increased Department of Defense spending on campus and assured concerned Congressmen that students would not object. Both statements were made without open consultation with students and faculty members.

Contrary to Gray's assertions, many different problems remain to be solved before increased corporate contributions without increased corporate interference in the free exchange of information can become a reality. Some questions have barely been raised: what effect will the increased contact with industry have on the integrity of student views and research? What effects will arise from allowing corporations to dominate? Now is the time for studied debate, not hurried appeals.

Many faculty members and students are willing to discuss the answers even if MIT is not willing to ask the questions. All who are concerned should take the initiative and make their views known: circulate petitions, write letters, make use of Gray's open office hours. While MIT should attempt to solicit a wide range of views, past experience teaches that awaiting such an action may be futile.

To what end does the money donated by these Sustaining Fellows to hire a caterer mean it's impossible for LSC to sell me a seat, it is not LSC's fault. The important thing about the situation is how it differs from an everyday situation. Her words are indicative of her attitude. First she said, "It's your fault that you're late." Then, she asked us to consider our situation just like an overflow. The important thing about the situation is how it differs from an everyday situation. Her words are indicative of her attitude. First she said, "It's your fault that you're late." Then, she asked us to consider our situation just like an overflow. The important thing about the situation is how it differs from an everyday situation. Her words are indicative of her attitude. First she said, "It's your fault that you're late."

LSC should let latecomers in

To the Editor:

Today I tried to see the movie "Tests," but I was turned away at the door because I was late. The hall was not full.

The usher said, "I can't let you in because you haven't paid." I can't let you pay because I'm not supposed to take your money."

This sounds like Catch-22 to me. I was willing and expecting to pay, but if I couldn't enable me to do so, he could have let me in free. He was being a dog in the manger, and he wasn't decent enough to be ashamed of it.

An official eventually happened by (coincidentally) and talked to me and the several other would-be customers in the same situation. Her words are indicative of her attitude. First she said, "It's your fault that you're late." Truly, nobody but me caused that, but being late doesn't mean it's impossible for LSC to let me see the movie. It doesn't cause me to miss it. Her decision does, and for that, she is responsible and to blame.

As it happens, some of the other people were late because they went to 26-100 by mistake. I suppose LSC's attitude is, "if you make any mistakes, you deserve any bad thing we can do to you."

When we mentioned that LSC had always sold us tickets in the past, if we were late. This refusal was a surprise to us. She said that it was always at the director's discretion. I suppose this is true, but LSC had never done anything to inform us of it. That is said, and she said, "We have done this as a few movies before." I said I must have gone to those movies, and she said, "Well, now you have!"

It seems that she considers it a satisfactory way of informing our public about their policy, to let each member of the public trip over it by surprise! After all, once surprised, we have been informed. She asked us to consider our situation just like an overflow. The important thing about the situation is how it differs from an everyday situation. Her words are indicative of her attitude. First she said, "It's your fault that you're late."

LSC's attitude is the natural result of their monopoly on showing films. We need them, they don't need to be friendly. I think their monopoly ought to be taken away. But until that happens, we can play their game, and give them a taste of their own medicine:

"I'm sorry but I'm not allowed to pretend that he has no responsibility. The person who is refusing to be helpful is the one who is unwilling. The responsibility falls on both sides of the equation. It is not LSC's fault. This time LSC was perfectly able to let me in, but it was not the same situation. Her words are indicative of her attitude. First she said, "It's your fault that you're late."

LSC should let latecomers in
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