SACC presents final proposals for March 4

(Ed. note: For an excellent in-depth survey of the issues and events leading up to ground-fighting today's events, we highly recommend the special issue of The Chestnut, the Graduate Student Council Newsletter.)

There has been some confusion regarding the terminology used to describe the protest occurring at MIT and at every other school on March 4. As the group that conceived of March 4, we write to provide a working lesson. Some scientists consider their activity to be a strike; by this they signify a vote of no confidence in the ability of the government to make wise and humane use of science and technical knowledge. They are temporarily withholding their services much in the manner of a French general strike. Implicit is the possibility of greater non-co-operation if the government continues to develop and deploy such weapons as ABRM, MRV, SCAS, and chemical and biological weapons while neglecting pressing social and environmental problems. Distinctions of this sort are also protecting the involvement of their universities in defense projects or their over-dependence on DOD funding mechanisms.

Other scientists consider their action a research stoppage. This has come to mean a withholding of distinct from strike. Scientists who subscribe to this device are consciously stepping their research (which may be of great social value) in order to make a symbolic personal commitment toward formulating a set of government policies that has resulted in the growing power and influence of the military-industrial complex.

Finally, some scientists emphasize the use of March 4 as an all day discussion of the interaction of government support with scientific research at the universities. (They will of course have to postpone their scientific research on that Tuesday in order to participate.)

SACC feels that all of these purposes are valid and trues to the individual the choice of which phrase to use.

These proposals were adopted by SACC February 22, 1969, in order to stimulate discussion on and before March 4. They will be brought before the MIT audience for discussion on March 4 at 3:30-4:30.

Proposals to MIT:

I. That the cooperative programs (course 6A or 16B) be terminated with military related research projects such as:

1) "incentive military defense" (ABRM with AVCO 6A) or 2) "assignments...for...military research and development" (ABRM with AVCO 6A)

B. That the cooperative program disassociates itself entirely from any institution that is involved extensively in war related research such as: 1) Naval Ordnance laboratory 2) Air Force Cambridge laboratory (6A) 3) AVCO (6A) which does chemical and biological war-fare research under the U.S. Army's National Alcohol and Drug Abuse research program.

"Incentive military defense" has resulted in the growing power and influence of the military-industrial complex.

II. That MIT adopt the following policy:

1) no credit shall be given for any classified thesis
2) no credit shall be given for any classified courses or for classified research
3) no classified or otherwise restricted courses shall be conducted at MIT.

Admission to course XIII-A is subject to approval of the U.S. Navy. Courses 13.25, 13.44 and 13.46 are restricted to selected officers of the U.S. Navy and development according to Prof. Jack Ruina, vice-president in charge of special activities. 50% of the work done at the Instrumentation and Lincoln laboratories is classified, including a number of graduate theses which are done there.

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

IV. That ROTC be abolished at MIT. By this we mean that ROTC not be offered at MIT, either as a corollary or extra-curricular activity.

V. That all war related research at MIT be replaced with socially constructive research. By MIT we include the special laboratories, Instrumentation and Lincoln laboratories. MIT should continue to operate these laboratories so that they "play a significant role in the academic and educational pursuits of the Institute." What we are asking for is not that MIT disassociate itself from these laboratories, but, on the contrary, that MIT assume responsibility for the research that is conducted there. For a discussion of research at the special laboratories see SACC's information sheet II.

Proposals to the Federal government:

That the government together with the scientific community establish mechanisms for planning and funding in a coherent way non-military research and development. Criteria for awarding funds should be based on:

1) social and humanitarian necessity
2) scientific standards established within each discipline.
3) long range planning before embarking on research and training.

That in the preparation of the National budget for fiscal 1970, all research funds for university research be allocated by NSF, NIMH, NASA, and the departments of HEW, HUD, and the armed forces.

That the department of defense (DOD) justify each of its contracts on the basis of its direct relation to military necessity. (As the Highlight Study indicates only some military research is efficient in producing weapons.) Each practitioner of DOD work must accept DOD contracts with this understanding.

IFC admits PKA as 29th fraternity

(continued from page 1) Englander also gave PKA's reasons for wanting to found a chapter at MIT. He said, "PKA considers MIT a strong fraternity school. The fraternities here represent the fraternity system at its most progressive. PiKA hopes to establish a forward-looking chapter at MIT in other action, the IFC went on record as opposing the early (before spring vacation) release of names of admitted freshmen of the class of 1973.