March 4

We support the aims and means of March 4 activities, as stated in the faculty statement of the Union of Concerned Scientists. There has been, of course, considerable discussion on campus concerning the merits of March 4, which has been precipitated by a newspaper article. It is not our purpose to evaluate the activities planned for that day or to consider the extent to which the problems discussed are sufficiently important that other work can be postponed.

While some people may have sought to attain specific goals through the activities, the UCS organizers emphasize that March 4 will be a "day devoted to examination of the present situation and its alternatives." We find it difficult to see how one can disagree with this purpose. We also feel that, regardless of what other influences may be at work, March 4 activities should be conducted in a spirit of the institutes. All members of the Institute community, regardless of political persuasion, should feel that their attendance is appropriate.

March 4 is the need for scientists to exercise responsibility for the manner in which their work is used. There is a further issue here, however, which is more elusive: the extent to which it is possible today for a scientist to control the way in which his research is used. As press coverage of research done at the Institute is funded by government agencies, according to the administration. Not all of this defense-oriented, of course, nor is that which is sponsored by the Department of Defense entirely directed toward weapons development. What does happen, however, is that the Department of Defense, through its various agencies, makes funds available for pure research in those areas which are likely to have long-term applications on defense and the new alloy developed by a metallurgist without any defense application in mind, might find its way into atomic weapons. Techniques developed here may be used in the laboratory or elsewhere by scientists who are interested in non-military applications of the work. We hope that the discussions of March 4 (and the creation of the scientific community thereafter) will be directed toward finding workable means for meeting the acknowledged need to monitor the use of technological progress.

Mr. Kunin begins by stating that he expects "members of an academic community to stoppage. The associated idea, that one of the original 47 signers of the statement. All members of the Institute community, regardless of political persuasion, should feel that their attendance is appropriate.

The opposition mentioned in the first paragraph seems to me to be more of a discussion of the social context of the "strike." Mr. Kunin goes on to point out that there has been a plethora of symptoms, ranging from the fact that the faculty who were present during the initial planning phase are still collaborating. No group has "taken over" the planning and program of the day. The purposes are most neatly stated in the "Faculty Statement" of the Union of Concerned Scientists. We enclose a copy of this statement which we hope you will be interested to read if firsthand.

Francis Low Chairman, UCS

March 4

To the Editor:
The article by News Editor Jay Kunin which appeared under the auspices of "News Analysis" in The Tech February 18) your reporter, Jay Kunin, voiced certain opinions that are, in fact, mine. The group has "taken over" the planning and program of the day. The purposes are most neatly stated in the "Faculty Statement" of the Union of Concerned Scientists. We enclose a copy of this statement which we hope you will be interested to read if firsthand.

March 4

To the Editor:
In his "Analysis" (The Tech Febrary 18) your reporter, Jay Kunin, voiced certain opinions that are, in fact, mine. The group has "taken over" the planning and program of the day. The purposes are most neatly stated in the "Faculty Statement" of the Union of Concerned Scientists. We enclose a copy of this statement which we hope you will be interested to read if firsthand.

Francis Low Chairman, UCS

U.S.C. Reply to the Editor:
In your "Analysis" (The Tech February 18) your reporter, Jay Kunin, voiced certain opinions that are, in fact, mine. The group has "taken over" the planning and program of the day. The purposes are most neatly stated in the "Faculty Statement" of the Union of Concerned Scientists. We enclose a copy of this statement which we hope you will be interested to read if firsthand.
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