Faculty okays campus ROTC

By Duff McRoberts

ROTC will remain on the MIT campus, but all changes proposed in the program will go further, the Faculty decided Wednesday.

Prof. Richard W. Watson's (XXI) motion to abolish ROTC failed by an overwhelming margin in a vote Wednesday afternoon.

The other proposals and amendments thereto will be considered on another occasion, the Faculty decided Wednesday.

PROF. SHeldon Penman (VIII) delivers a caustic attack on the CEP proposal, faulting its hasty preparation and lack of supporting evidence.

Pounds commission reviews opinions of noted scientists

By Larry Klein

The Review Panel appointed by Prof. Paul Samuelson to investigate MIT's special labs is hard at work.

For questioned by Professor William Pounds, Dean of the Sloan School of Management, the Panel has been meeting seven days a week. Sessions have lasted as long as nine hours.

For the last three weeks the committee has devoted itself to "collecting information—ethical, political, moral..." Pounds explained in an interview with The Tech. This committee visited the Lincoln and Instrumentation Laboratories, held an open session in 9-15 to solicit opinions from the MIT community, read numerous position papers, talked with numerous individuals, and consulted officials in Washington.

The Panel has questioned a wide range of individuals, including Senator John F. Kennedy, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Dr. George Kistiakowsky, former President of MIT, and former director of Lincoln Lab; Dr. Vannevar Bush, honorary Chairman of the MIT Corporation; and members of SACC. These men have come before the committee both at that Panel's request and by their own petition.

Next, the current stage of the committee's endeavors is giving way to the gathering of information on the question. Phase, May 31 is the deadline for the Panel's first report; it must begin to consider its newly-gained information and form an opinion.

Pounds is now positing to his committee the question of what the body is to say in May. Although the committee is not yet prepared to come to any conclusions, it is trying to formulate "positive" concept—opinions.

Finally, the Panel's immediate task is clear. It must make value judgments based on its findings from proceedings and reports which now stack eight inches high. The Panel must consider personal and organizational obligations, educational and political priorities, and then offer its recommendations.

The Panel's future endeavors are less clear. Its final report will be handed to President Investigator in October; from then on Pounds cannot say with assurance what form that report will take.

By Alex Mokoski

Finboards policy of authorizing big weekends at MIT came under fire Wednesday when member Owen Franken and others at Tuesday's General Assembly meeting questioned the issue of ROTC and war-related research to center on issues more closely connected to ROTC.

Bogged down for most of the night discussing constitutional amendments, the assembly was too exhausted to respond to Mike Albert's call for debate on ROTC before the next day's faculty meeting. The only action elicited was a move to table the motion.

The $5,500 loss from Spring Weekend and the $33,500, budgeted for next fall's Junior Prom moved Franken to demand some positive show of support before the student government backed another weekend. Although his suggestion of a series of numbers was ignored, others agreed that a serious review of entertainment funding was necessary.

Albert asked that the amount of weekend funding not cloud the broader issue of Fishbord's $100,000 budget. There is a real need, he argued, to consider how much money the university should spend on entertainment. Friedland, however, was less clear. Its final report will be offered for the commission both at the end of the current stage of the commission's endeavors are less clear. Its final report will be handed to President Investigator in October; from then on Pounds cannot say with assurance what form that report will take.

By Peter Peckarsky

Special to The Tech

WASHINGTON (May 14) — In testimony before the Senate Committee on Capitol Hill before the Subcommittee on International Organization and Department of State, the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, Prof. Jerome B. Wiesner, Provost of MIT, argued that the Safeguard ABM system, could be produced with sufficient reliability to make the system operationally effective.

In addition, he asserted that even if the hardware were available, the system was not "a hit and miss affair since it is possible to greatly enhance our security by halting the arms race.

"I believe that the Safeguard ABM system is a prime example of a weapon system that at best will do very little good, most likely will accelerate the arms race, and either way, waste large sums of money."

After Wiesner concluded with a technical discussion of the Safeguard and related matters, President Charles M. Vest (R.O.) summed up a discussion of the way in which a Safeguard deployment would escalate the arms race.

During the course of Wiesner's answer, Casey's eyes widened while Wiesner answered the question with
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