3. To convey to our students the hope that they will devise themselves to bring the benefits of science and technology to mankind, and to ask them to scrutinize the issues raised here before participating in the construction of destructive weapons.

4. To express our determined opposition to all-armed and hazardous projects such as the ABM system, the enlargement of our nuclear arsenal, and the development of chemical and biological weapons.

5. To explore the feasibility of organizing scientists and engineers so that their desire for a more humane and civilized world can be translated into effective political action.
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Our program into effective political action.
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As a first step towards reaching the goals of this program, we propose to engage in intensive public discussions and planning for future actions along the lines suggested above.

If you share our profound apprehension, and are seeking a mode of expression which is at once practical and symbolic, join us on March 4.

Warren Ambrose
Gene M. Brown
John W. Cahn
Jade G. Charney
Nan S. Chemosky
Stephen L. Ciochon
Martin Druschel
Michael S. Darmstadt
Murray Eden
Peter Elias
James A. Fay
Bernard T. Feld

Department of Nutrition and Food Science Statement of Feb. 3, 1969:

Certain faculty and student members of the MIT community have proposed that a "research strike" or "work stoppage" be held on March 4, 1969, in association with discussions of the social consequences of research and international policies.

We, the undersigned members of the Department of Nutrition and Food Science, oppose, in principle, discussions of these important issues within an atmosphere of organized protest which not only precludes objective and reasoned debate, but rather, by its nature, implies prejudgment of the issues by its participants. We further oppose the concept of a "work stoppage" that, by implication, would suggest commitment of the right of faculty members to conduct open research of their own choice regardless of source of support.

We support objective discussion, held outside of institute working hours, on how to develop national and international policies which will ensure that research discoveries are used constructively for the benefit of mankind.

We, the undersigned members of the Department of Nutrition and Food Science, oppose, in principle, the proposal to engage in intensive public discussions and planning for future actions along the lines suggested above.

If you share our profound apprehension, and are seeking a mode of expression which is at once practical and symbolic, join us on March 4.

Warren Ambrose
Gene M. Brown
John W. Cahn
Jade G. Charney
Nan S. Chemosky
Stephen L. Ciochon
Martin Druschel
Michael S. Darmstadt
Murray Eden
Peter Elias
James A. Fay
Bernard T. Feld

Have your day in the butcher's market.
Then check with the man from LTV Aerospace.

As a man, you've got ideas and ambitions and values that won't show up on anybody's version of the butcher's chart. You know it and we know it.

As an engineer, you want something more than your daily bread. And we know that, too.

At LTV Aerospace, we have something pretty special to offer you -- as a man, as an engineer.

We've got scope. Engineering scope that can take you from the bottom of the ocean to the outer reaches of space. Opportunity scope that extends to the top levels of management.

Figure it out. LTV Aerospace is one of the fastest growing companies in America, and we grow on an international basis.

They're the kind of people who are concerned about the roles of science and technology in today's world, and who wish to make it clear that the name and reputation of MIT is itself antisocial, whereas it is ample testimony to this. Second, it implies prejudgment of the questions at issue. The fact that the public press innocuously identified this as a "strik" is ample testimony to this Second, it encourages the inference that the researh for which the halt is being called at MIT is itself antisocial, whereas it is overwhelmingly the role of pure research, of long-range social impact, or research directed toward clearly identified sociologically desirable ends (such as urban systems, pollution control, medical technology, transmutation, and aid to developing nations). Lastly, it misrepresents the spirit and character of research in a free academic community.

Research is not something to be turned on or off like a facet. It is a matter of continuing involvement, and its time-scale is years and decades, not days.

We expect the stories of our colleagues in the U.S. in setting up the March 4 program. We are certainly not proposing any kind of boycott of the meetings. But we feel bound to declare during the serious and constructive purposes of the occasion are to make it known that we speak for a majority of the MIT faculty and students in expressing a strong dissent from the concept of such research stoppage in this connection.

We object to the call for a one-day research stoppage on any main grounds. First, its most obvious interpetation is as an act of protest with an implicit prejudgment of the questions at issue. The fact that the public press innocuously identified this as a "strik" is ample testimony to this Second, it encourages the inference that the research for which the halt is being called at MIT is itself antisocial, whereas it is overwhelmingly the role of pure research, of long-range social impact, or research directed toward clearly identified sociologically desirable ends (such as urban systems, pollution control, medical technology, transmutation, and aid to developing nations). Lastly, it misrepresents the spirit and character of research in a free academic community.
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