Iitations which set the tone. The budget is a national and institutional concern. For example, MIT's 1985 budget was $237 million, and it's likely that a new budget will be set up to reinforce the system. There are she'llves full of literature on how corporations can maintain their nuclear contingencies in Congress, but it will have little effect on international politics.

The real purpose of the space station is now clear. SSI may be a commercial company, but its main customer will probably be the Pentagon. MIT has converted its main entrance into a monument for Star Wars.

The worship of these dogmas is a barrier to political change. Making these barriers visible is a barrier to political change. Getting the candidates elected who believe that nuclear war is inevitable will add a voice to the anti-missile movement. The worship of these dogmas is a barrier to political change.

The question "Is MIT doing all these things?" must be challenged. The question "Is MIT doing all these things?" must be challenged. It politicizes people.

This even includes the number of students with security clearances who are bound to a career within the military-industrial complex. From within such people will not be able to change things, but they can influence the political role of institutions. The inhibitions on political discussion imposed within institutions must be challenged.

There are even corporate heads and university presidents who support disarmament that might speak out if pressured to do so by employees or students. If they do speak out, it sends a signal that "the establishment" is changing course, and the mainstream press will be more inclined to investigate the issue.

Don't get me wrong: activists who maintain their independence by remaining totally outside the system are necessary. The political debate must also include people within the system. Otherwise, potential solutions such as disarmament or economic conversion will always appear radical and be immediately dismissed because they reach the public eye.
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