




MARCH

4th



stop research

Mit, d.o.d., and you

"MIT is, and should continue to be, a student-centered institution of learning...." (From the Report of the President of MIT, 1968).

According to the same report, only 25% of MIT's total expenses went to educational and general needs. 75% of the \$202.9 million total went elsewhere, three quarters of it directly to the Lincoln and Instrumentation Labs.

HALF CLASSIFIED

In 1967 MIT had \$94.9 million in contracts from the Department of Defense. Classified contracts accounted for \$46 million. These made MIT the country's 14th largest military contractor for research, development and testing, and the 62nd largest defense contractor among all US corporations.

MIT's Lincoln Laboratory in Lexington does work mainly for the Air Force. Asked recently whether work on the ABM was done there, MIT Vice President Jack Ruina said: "Yes it is. No question about it."

The Instrumentation Lab at MIT does mainly DoD research and has developed inertial guidance systems for the Polaris, Poseidon, and Titan missiles.

MIT is an important member of the Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA), a defense research consortium, and of Associated Universities at Brookhaven, which

does chemical and biological warfare research for the DoD.

MIT's Center for International Studies was founded in 1951 with a \$300,000 grant from the CIA. Its director since 1952, Max Millikan, was formerly assistant director of the CIA. The Center announced an end to CIA funding in June, 1966, but Millikan now says he "doesn't know" if any professors still work for the Agency.

Academic credit is given at MIT for ROTC, which has a special volunteer Black Beret unit for training in counter-guerrilla techniques

WAR CREDITS

Students receive credit for classified research; twenty classified theses are submitted each year. In 1965 one student earned a Masters degree for writing a thesis on 'Q Guidance for the Multi-Warhead IRBM.' Students in certain classes and working in certain labs must have security clearance, and thirteen areas on campus are off limits to students and other unauthorized persons.

The members of the MIT Corporation are primarily executives with deep ties in the military-industrial establishment. Of the Corporation's Executive Committee, four have positions at AT&T, two are trustees of the Rand Corporation, and two are trustees of MITRE.

WHY STOP?

Almost everyone at MIT is in favor of the program outlined by SACC, but a great many hesitate to endorse the related actions. Most often people defer because of a disagreement about tactics. Those whose research does not aid the war reason that the strike and the activities around it are not their concern. But the issues at hand — the war and our scientific policies — are the direct concern of every citizen. It will not do for us to leave the decisions concerning defense to those who build or design weapons, for their interests are frequently different from our own. Professor Feld of MIT, in discussing the development of the Atomic Bomb, addresses part of the problem. Speaking for the scientists involved, he said:

"We worked hard to make it work even if we wished it wouldn't. The question of employing the bomb arose when the scientists involved were victims of a kind of mass mesmerization. In the future, decisions of this kind should not be made by people on the inside. The last people to ask about deploying the anti-ballistic missile are the people working on it."

If those of us engaged in 'good' research think only of our own work, we will be leaving the decisions concerning scientific policy to those who have the most direct interest in the extension of the military. When a scientist — or any other citizen — claims political detachment and non-involvement his decision perpetuates militarism and waste, for that is the thrust of America's status quo.

the need for dramatic action

Why not a day of discussion instead of a stoppage? Discussions have been held time and again. SACC's new approach reflects the belief that it is necessary to bring the issues into more widespread focus by engaging in a more dramatic form of action. The strike is a means through which all scientists can show their disaffection with the government's current policies. Because of the nature of the action their views will reach a wide audience, providing to the public information which is relevant to questions of scientific policy.

Some will argue that while they see the value of the strike, they feel some small disagreement — they feel that some other preparatory work should have been done, some steps added, some statements more nicely put. There are many instances when all the actions open to us are in some way imperfect. In such times we must adopt the actions which lie closest in their goals and effects to the ones we would ideally choose. Surely for anyone who might have chosen a slightly different way to dramatize his dissent, the choice between inaction on March 4th and joining the strike is a simple one. One is caught, in times like these, either as part of the solution or part of the problem.

the next step

The OLD MOLE supports the aims and tactics of March 4th. We predict, however, that even these tactics will not be sufficient. Science is misused by men, but men who function within an institutional framework. These institutions are not about to endorse changes that would go against their interests. The pressures upon the men who make policy flow from deep within the structure of this society. The limits on their actions are not solely the boundaries of pure reason. The men who rule have been screened again and again, at each step of advancement, so that those who agree with the status quo are chosen, while those who might rebel are weeded out. Those who are chosen find that their way of life, their livelihood, their very lives come to depend on the maintenance of the established order. They become spokesmen for the interests of the status quo. In this case the existing order is dominated by the military industrial complex, whose survival depends on the perpetuation and enlargement of the military. Set against the forces of self interest, acculturation, pressure from peers and threats from higher up, we predict that reasonable arguments will not alone suffice. The question is one of power as well as reason.

It is fine to make proposals. But if they are not accepted, and the existing order is inhumane, then men of good conscience must make demands. They have no choice but to back their demands to the full extent of their power.

In the present situation, this means that the program of SACC will need to be put in the form of demands. Then it will not be a question of asking authorities to grant a favor, but of asserting the necessity for the application of justice to the uses of knowledge and application of democratic principles to the making of decisions.

PROPOSALS

The March 4th work stoppage is directed:

- 1) AGAINST: the pervasive influence of the military in shaping our foreign and domestic policies.
- 2) AGAINST: the continued use of science to pursue unwise policies and unjust causes (napalm and biological agents for the war in Vietnam, missiles for an escalation of the cold war).
- 3) TOWARD: the assumption of responsibility by the scientific community for the uses of their work.

The protest is not against research in general. It attacks work at the Institute on missile guidance systems while reserving support for endeavors to understand health problems. It opposes the existence of ties between the university and the Department of Defense because such an alliance is detrimental to the freedom of the university and the larger community. It asks for scientists to take more responsibility for the applications of their research and knowledge, and to accept the role of responsible critics of government policy.

These are the proposals issued by SACC, the Science Action Coordinating Committee:

- 1) A. That the cooperative programs, courses 6A and 16B, be terminated with military related research projects such as:
 - 1) "re-entry missile defense" (ABM) with AVCO (6A).
 - 2) "assignments for . . . military" at Honeywell (6A).
- B. That the cooperative program dissociate itself entirely from any institution that is involved extensively in war related research, such as:
 - 1) Naval Ordnance Laboratory (6A).
 - 2) Air Force Cambridge Laboratory (6A).
 - 3) AVCO (6A), which does chemical and biological warfare research under USAF Lab contracts AF-08(635)-4396 and 4679; "binary biological weapons concepts" and "An investigation and evaluation of concepts for determining and disposition of submarginal biological weapons containing either anti-personnel or anticrop agents."

- II) That MIT adopt the following academic policies:
 - 1) No credit shall be given for any classified thesis
 - 2) No credit shall be given for any classified course or for classified research.
 - 3) No classified or otherwise restricted course shall be given at MIT.

Admission to course XIII-A is subject to approval of the U.S. Navy. 13.25, 13.44, 13.45, and 13.46 are restricted to selected officers of the US Navy and Coast Guard. According to Prof. Jack Ruina, Vice President in charge of special laboratories, 50% of the work done at the Instrumentation and Lincoln Laboratories is classified, including a number of graduate thesis which are done there.

- III) That a board be established at MIT to help faculty, staff, and students locate research and employment in non-military areas.

- IV) That ROTC be abolished at MIT. It shall not be offered either as a curricular or extra-curricular activity.

- V) That all war related research at MIT be replaced with socially constructive research. MIT includes the special laboratories, the Instrumentation and Lincoln Labs. MIT should continue to operate these laboratories since they "play a significant role in the academic and educational pursuits of the Institute. What we are asking is not that MIT dissociate itself from these labs but, on the contrary, that MIT assume responsibility for the research that is conducted there. For a description of research at the special laboratories see SACC's information sheet II, excerpted elsewhere on this page.

- VI) Proposals for the Federal government:
 - A. That the government together with the scientific community establish mechanisms for planning and funding non-military research and development in a coherent way. Criteria should be based on:
 - a) social and humanitarian necessity
 - b) scientific standards established within each discipline
 - c) long range planning before embarking on research or training students in a given field
 - B. That in the preparation of the National budget for fiscal 1970 all research funds for university research be allocated by the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Health, and the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and the Interior.

from a statement by SACC,
the Science Action Coordinating Committee

The research stoppage is a strike in the European sense; a one day strike to dramatize discontent with the conduct of affairs in our country, in our case specifically to protest the misuse of technology and the complicity of the scientific and technological community with the growing power and influence of the military-industrial complex. The research stoppage does not claim to stop production. The work stoppage is a vote of no confidence in the dangerous and inhumane policies of our government.

How It All Began

The research stoppage grew out of opposition to the war in Vietnam, specifically to the use of science in such an unjust cause: the development of napalm, chemical and biological agents, guidance systems and other ordnance.

The graduate students who made up the Science Action Coordinating Committee in its early days broadened the strike's focus to include the use of science unjustly or unwisely in other areas when the idea was taken up by senior faculty of the Institute. Forty-seven faculty members formed the Union of Concerned Scientists and issued a call for the stoppage. SACC later issued its own statement, and a set of proposals for Institute and government policy.

SACC's initiative has been taken up on other campuses. Students at Columbia University will be on strike, research will be stopped at Johns Hopkins, and

the University of Pennsylvania will be closed for the day. Research strikes will also occur at NYU and Yeshiva University. Yale and Brooklyn Polytech will hold day-long discussions.

On March 4th at MIT, SACC and UCS will co-sponsor a symposium. Before that date SACC hopes to have canvassed all graduate and undergraduate students to 'discuss channelling of science and engineering students into defense-oriented jobs.'

Prior to undertaking the current action SACC drafted and circulated an open letter to President Nixon's science advisor, Dr. Lee Dubridge, attacking the complicity of the universities in the military-industrial complex, and recommending increased emphasis on scientific contributions to socially constructive areas. The letter was signed by 182 faculty and graduate students at MIT.

Edited as a special project of THE OLD MOLE, after consultation with the Science Action Coordinating Committee (SACC) at MIT. Produced at the office of THE OLD MOLE newspaper, 2 Brookline Street, Cambridge, 491-9182. Project staff: Trude Bennett, Nick Egleson. Printed by the New England Free Press.

Schedule: March 4th

Monday evening, March 3rd, 8:00 PM, Rindge Technical High School Auditorium, Irving and Broadway, Cambridge.
THE RESPONSIBILITY OF INTELLECTUALS: Profs. Low, Chomsky, and Weisskopf (MIT), and Prof. Wm. McMillan, UCLA and RAND.

Tuesday, March 4th, Kresge Auditorium, MIT
9:00 - 10:30 Panel: Reconversion and non-military research
10:45 - 12:30 Panel: The academic community and government
1:15 - 3:15 Discussion of student problems

Tuesday evening, March 4th, 8:00 PM, Rindge Tech Auditorium
ARMS CONTROL, DISARMAMENT, AND NATIONAL SECURITY: Profs. Alperovitz, Bethe, and Meselman

Further information from SACC, Room 14 N 218, MIT ext. 4775