House bill threat to MIT

Commission must decide on definition of scientist

(Continued from page 3) stated that he was optimistic about the commission's recommendations would take effect very soon.

Hoffman expressed pleasure that the commission is composed of people who, he believes, are willing to give the commission the views of the future of MIT.

Members of the commission Charlie Mann '72 stated that he is unhappy with the decision to have two undergraduates on the commission rather than three. Wells Eddeleman '71 is expected to bring this up at the next General Assembly meeting.

Hoffman concluded that due to the lack of participation the commission offers the issue may not be of great consequence.

Hoffman will work full time on the commission for the next two years, and is relieved of all responsibilities in the Department of Mathematics. He was formerly Chairman of the Committee of Pure Mathematics.

Defining science

Indication was given of some specific items the committee would take up. Hoffman said a main point to be established is the definition of a scientist or engineer. In view of the importance of technology in society scientists and engineers must be made competent in the decision making process. Stronger, broader people are needed. How to provide this without sacrificing scientific training Hoffman recognizes as a tough problem.

A long term question is whether MIT should continue to require science and engineering. This has been a debated question in the past.

Man is concerned that MIT professional education is divorced from practical practice of a profession. Some integrated job-type experience may be in order.

The commission starts with an indoctrination period during which the meeting schedule will be dense. Later there will be more task force and subcommittee work. The people on the commission will go out into the MIT community to talk with people.

Hoffman says the commission has no intention of displacing existing structures it intends to work with the CEP.

The commission met from 9:30 am to 3:30 pm. Its first meeting was a somewhat rambling discussion on what to get down to the first in the indoctrination series, but Hoffman expects to begin acting soon.

Prof. William T. Martin, Chairman of the Faculty, and Chairman of the Planning Committee, presented the Planning Committee report, with the comment, "Use it as you wish.

The form of the commission's reports is currently undecided. Hoffman speculated they may be periodic short reports or recommendations for action.

(Continued from page 4) related research on a university campus could have done so by disrupting NOTC drills or a reviewer's visit. The 60 day waiting period would have meant that individual researchers would have had to start writing a proposal for new work almost nine months in advance of the end of a project and would in advance of enough results to make a proposal for continued support realistic.

The bill, with riders attached, was reported out of committee on September 26 and was passed by the House on October 1. The National Council on Education (NCE), an organization in Washington which watched for bills which might affect universities and colleges, found out about the riders about the 29th of September and started making phone calls and sending letters to their clients.

At least two of these calls were to MIT. The lobbyists in Washington decided that their best chance to stop the riders was in the Senate-House conference committee which was convened to iron out differences between the two versions of the bill. People in the university organizations who knew possible members of the committee were assigned them, and provided with facts and arguments by the NCE and their own staffs.

At MIT, both Dr. Wiener and Jack Ruina, Vice-President for Special Laboratories, were calling their old acquaintances in Congress. According to a reliable source, Wiener was coordinating the approach being made to Sen. Stuart Symington.

And the lobbying pulled through. At this writing Section 401 was dead, and at the very least Section 401 was due to be watered down and clarified as to what type of research is forbidden. Which all goes to show how American representitive (elected or no) democracy can make the world safe for a little dumbed down university research.

You might think that if you come to work for us we'll stick you behind a desk making phones for the rest of your life. Uh-huh.

Don't be misled by the word Telephone in our name.

Frankly we're a group of over 60 companies and some of them happen to be in the telephone business. They're in our General Telephone group and are involved in developing new ways for man to communicate.

So if you want to work for our phone group, you can.

But if your interest lies in other things, you might prefer working for another of our companies, like Sylvania.

Sylvania manufactures over 10,000 products alone, knocking out everything from Micro-Electronic Semi-Conductor Devices to Educational Communications Systems.

The communications field is one of the fastest-growing industries around. The more it grows, the more we will have to stretch within us.

We're looking for Scientists and Engineers with ambition and ideas. Together we can discover new worlds.

Or make an old one easier to live in.

General Telephone & Electronics