Salute to Luria

We would like to join with the rest of the Institute community in congratulating Professor Salvador Luria on the receipt of the 1969 Nobel Prize in Medicine. While we are not experts in his field of research and are thus unqualified to judge his work, we feel certain that this award was richly deserved; they two all viruses and their activities is proving more and more important in the understanding of all kinds of diseases and even the nature of life itself.

At a time when all scientists and engineers around the Institute are expressing dismay that concern for "relevance" and "social issues" are detracting from the quality of scientific work at MIT, it is ironic that our most recent recipient of science's highest honor has been among the most active professors at the Institute in the drive to end the war and manifest the use to which research is put. He was one of the prime movers of the Vietnam Moratorium at MIT. He has also written widely on the problems associated with the development of man's potential ability to perform genetic manipulation, a possible consequence of his work.

Dr. Luria is living proof that a top-flight scientist can be deeply involved in improving the world outside his laboratory without sacrificing his scientific interests.

In memoriam

On October 16, the day after the Vietnam Moratorium, two New Jersey "high school seniors, Craig Badiuzi and Joan Fox, committed suicide by breathing the exhaust fumes of a car. They were not hippies or freaks; they were two All-American high school students. (Craig was president of the high school Dramatic Society and Joan was a cheerleader.) They committed this act because they were two current students who despised over the lack of peace and love in the world, and the irresponsibility of those who are not disturbed by the current state of affairs.

They are two more of the domestic casualties of our war policy and the jungle which is called society. How many more will there be?

MIT in a box: no exit

By Bruce Schwartz

The MIT administration and Corporation have been confronted by SACC and RL SDS with an order to end weapons research. This order can only be labeled impossible, especially in the light of events at MIT, MRV, and other war research be terminated but that no employees be dismissed or have their pay cut on account of it. The MIT administration and Corporation are presently considering this order, and are likely to give it an affirmative response.

It is not easy to accede to, either in this form or any other, but it is clear that MIT must get out of the war research it has been involved with. At the present time, there is a new Pakistan contract even after the Pounds Commission ruled that it was "inappropriate"; on the other hand, MIT has taken the protracted course of a step-by-step announcement of this will take no new weapons research, although other forms of weapon-related research have already been ruled out. Whether the Institute will continue to pay the workers, the workers who are not and have not been involved in this research, is a matter for the future to determine.

All this has created awesome problems, the administration says. Howard Johnson is said to be involved in a hurried search for research contracts to replace the government (DOD) contracts that won't be forthcoming. And at the same time, the Corporation must either pay the workers or the MIT administration must honor its commitments. One reason the Corporation might not be able to do this is that it is not likely to meet the almost $1 billion dollar per year contracts that it is now committed to. Meanwhile, it is not certain that the Pounds Commission rules will stand, and MIT might still be able to get its contracts.

One of the main reasons why MIT is in a tough position is that it is not the simple-minded slob who believes in all forms of war, we are the MIT students getting just a little more than MIT's workers. We are the MIT students taking the position that MIT must honor its commitments. We feel that MIT must honor its commitments, that MRV, MRV, and other war research be terminated but that no employees be dismissed or have their pay cut on account of it.

We are not YAF members, though other forms of war-related research have already been ruled out. Whether the Institute will continue to pay the workers, the workers who are not and have not been involved in this research, is a matter for the future to determine.

The MIT administration and Corporation have been confronted by SACC and RL SDS with an order to end weapons research. This order can only be labeled impossible, especially in the light of events at MIT, MRV, and other war research be terminated but that no employees be dismissed or have their pay cut on account of it. The MIT administration and Corporation are presently considering this order, and are likely to give it an affirmative response.

It is not easy to accede to, either in this form or any other, but it is clear that MIT must get out of the war research it has been involved with. At the present time, there is a new Pakistan contract even after the Pounds Commission ruled that it was "inappropriate"; on the other hand, MIT has taken the protracted course of a step-by-step announcement of this will take no new weapons research, although other forms of weapon-related research have already been ruled out. Whether the Institute will continue to pay the workers, the workers who are not and have not been involved in this research, is a matter for the future to determine.

MIT is MIT in a box: no exit

Letters to The Tech

Personal Statement

To the Editor:

In the vote expressing the "support for cruise missiles" on Friday, we voted against the motion. We voted against the agreement with the sentiments expressed in the motion. We feel that it is not MIT's place to have any effect on an educational institution to express moral or political beliefs as a body. Our vote should not be interpreted as approval of the present war.

Hermann A. Haus
Lena Hallenbeck
Michael H. Rich
Richard Briggs
Keith I. Thomsen

To the Editor:

We are concerned about October 10 concerning the discussion of posters in Dean Nyhart's office because it posed a confrontation between left and right wing students. I personally think the poster was not easy to read and therefore was not easy to pass. One need only create a hunger. Have a debate on this issue.

It is not easy to accede to, either in this form or any other, but it is clear that MIT must get out of the war research it has been involved with. At the present time, there is a new Pakistan contract even after the Pounds Commission ruled that it was "inappropriate"; on the other hand, MIT has taken the protracted course of a step-by-step announcement of this will take no new weapons research, although other forms of weapon-related research have already been ruled out. Whether the Institute will continue to pay the workers, the workers who are not and have not been involved in this research, is a matter for the future to determine.

All this has created awesome problems, the administration says. Howard Johnson is said to be involved in a hurried search for research contracts to replace the government (DOD) contracts that won't be forthcoming. And at the same time, the Corporation must either pay the workers or the MIT administration must honor its commitments. One reason the Corporation might not be able to do this is that it is not likely to meet the almost $1 billion dollar per year contracts that it is now committed to. Meanwhile, it is not certain that the Pounds Commission rules will stand, and MIT might still be able to get its contracts.

Two CIS Replies

To the Editor:

Your article on October 10 demonstration at the Center for International Studies remained virtually non-violent, and it proved impossible to do work I can conciliate that, had it not been for the reform, I found it useful to have an chance to explain to a number of concerned students just what it is I am doing, and I am prepared to continue an any real communication."

There is now further evidence that the organizers feel that while the current moratorium is not enough, and will continue it in the future. In this effort, they have clearly articulated a policy of "intellectual "book burning."" Phillips Professor of Mathematics, Albert R. Laidman, is now quoted (Octo-