Pounds report released: panel suggested

By Lee Giguerie

The Pounds Panel, in its final report released Wednesday, called for the formation of a special laboratories committee to advise the administration in the running of the special labs.

An additional recommendation, added to the first report of a panel, was that the panel would be changed to a "natural" or "regular" body by a group or committee from the standing committee.

The report is the result of an investigation by the group with the aim of changing the composition of the special laboratories.

The action taken by the panel would be determined by the administration of the MIT.

The panel's recommendations:

1. "The laboratories and MIT Administration should be established to provide a more balanced research program.

2. "The educational interaction between the special laboratories and the campus should be expanded.

3. "There should be intensive plans to reduce classification and clearance barriers in the laboratories.

4. "A Standing Committee on the special laboratories should be formed.

As envisioned in the panel's report, the special laboratories committee would consist of ten members: four faculty, two students, two administrators, and one staff member from each of the laboratories.

The final report for the panel on education, principles for decision concerning lab contracts would remain with the department. The panel would serve in an advisory capacity to discuss the policies of the MIT community.

A national problem:

Professor Hans Chomsky of the Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics, in a special address to the report, stressed that the "use of technology should be of concern to the scientists and engineers who develop it.

In his report, Jonathan Katz, a member of the panel, said that the corps of scientists and engineers who develop close ties with the special laboratories should consider their importance in defense work.

The problem is indeed a national one, part of a growing concern.

By Alex Makowski

The administration today as I believe it to be particularly serious: the special labs and their personnel, and the issue of whether the panel was to be discussed at all. There are several possibilities, but all are pretty obvious.

The major policy change in the direction of the labs and that extensive efforts have been underway to obtain funds from the military sources. He further stated that MIT was aware of the interest of the labs to maintain their "psychological connection" to the Institute.

In discussing the issue of the special labs, the panel said that the Institute was at a point of "crucial to the election's outcome in high technology to face the challenge of the labs and that extentional efforts have been underway.

I have on several occasions, stated what I believe to be the policy of this campus, which is to believe in "a real policy of free expression, including dissent and protest.

I have, in the past, rejected many of these claims, but I continue to believe in "a real policy of free expression, including dissent and protest.
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