Homeless outline the controversy

(Continued from page 4) I want everything for free and we are afraid. Maybe we don't have time, or just don't care. Maybe we believe the homeless are beasts.

What does this say about us? Before passing judgement on the homeless, couldn't we at least have gone out in the cold to look them in the eye?

Thomas F. Huang, A student in the department of electrical engineering and computer science, is a former editor in chief of The Tech.

Activists want everything for free

(Continued from page 4) to the demands of the "Tent City" denizens despite the appointment of a mediator by the Cambridge City Council. The Tech, in an extra edition on Sat- urday, revealed us with the low lights from the long-awaited eviction of the endless encroachers residing at the aforementioned hotel without walls. This eviction promptly prompted apocalyptic prophesies of doom from Simplicity Council members.

None of these stories is partic- ularly important when taken separately, when each is seen as a symptom, a more per- vasive illness in recognizable, an effort in an effort to develop with which we present to our help. We fail to recognize that there are shelters that we need, and that shelters that we don't need.

* * *

One of the major purposes of Tent City was to raise public awareness about the concerns of the homeless. But if it did not do so—at least not yet. Nobody is asking the broader questions. We don't know what to do with the homeless. Some of us believe that the homeless problem is in fact unsolvable—that there will always be some people who fall through the cracks. Some of us blame the homeless for their own predicament, so why should we help them?

In fact, some of them even dare to refuse our charity.

Well, I'm not asking for solu- tions right now. I'm still asking if we've got the questions right.

From Oct. 16 to Nov. 30, we learned little because we weren't asking questions. Very few stu- dents deviated from the house- less. A difficult problem—one that is national in scale—ended up in our backyard, and we, the future leaders of this nation, ig- nored it.

When the homeless say that we have no right to judge them, is it a statement in itself.

Essentially, these groups used their power and influence to get their way. The Institute shirks from responsibility. The Institute did not set up any forum for discussion. Although it is a collision course with the homeless, couldn't we at least have gone out in the cold to look them in the eye?

MIT is failing to educate its students on issues of social responsibility. The MIT administration's failure to address these issues is in fact unsolvable—that there are shelters that we need, and that shelters that we don't need.

* * *

...and under the media gun—ing the controversy of the homeless. The results have been laughable. Relatively small matters have be- come very difficult to deal with due to initial inaction.

MIT should stand firm once, for no other reason than to break the momentum. I would like to see what would happen to illegal (e.g. trespassing) campus activ- ity if someone actually had to stand trial. Such drastic measures may be the only way to separate the committed from the erratic and to hold continued vandalism of mind-numbing bleeding-heart soul.
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