The Tech has come to the regrettable conclusion that the MIT Special Laboratories, currently chaired by Professor John Shire- lyan, is simply not the proper means for the MIT community to deal with the question of the Laboratories. While we do not criticize any specific members of the committee for their actions, the Committee on Special Laboratories simply has not lived up to our expectations. The Committee operates in secrecy, holding its closed meetings every Monday afternoon, and does not reveal to the community what proposals it is considering. It is our view that the Special Laboratories should not be considered other than as an appendage of the MIT administration. It has only two student members, five undergraduates and one graduate. The majority of the other members are administration appointees. While this is a separation of forces within the MIT administration, it is also a separation and apart from the administration and the rest of the Institute committees, in fact they are bound by the very nature of their appointments, to the MIT administration. It is our concern that its function is purely advisory, and even this value is as such questionable.

It is disturbing also, to learn that the committee members generally turn in individual reports, which must in its operation, be a closed process. It has only two student members, five undergraduates and one graduate. The majority of the other members are administration appointees. While this is a separation of forces within the MIT administration, it is also a separation and apart from the administration and the rest of the Institute committees, in fact they are bound by the very nature of their appointments, to the MIT administration. It is our concern that its function is purely advisory, and even this value is as such questionable.

Recently The Tech learned of a series of potentially crucial projects that the committee had reported on, though it had not made public what it was discussing. Now we learn that at least one of these projects (DSRV) has obtained the final approval of the Administration. With the committee meeting in the background, we felt it necessary to report on the information our sources have. The committee must have on the agenda of the committee meetings about it. Can the committee members turn in individual reports, which must in its operation, be a closed process. It has only two student members, five undergraduates and one graduate. The majority of the other members are administration appointees. While this is a separation of forces within the MIT administration, it is also a separation and apart from the administration and the rest of the Institute committees, in fact they are bound by the very nature of their appointments, to the MIT administration. It is our concern that its function is purely advisory, and even this value is as such questionable.

Regarding the eventual publication of the article The Tech, it was felt by Mr. Grossman that Professor Fein underestimates the concept of community review. That this was not the case, is evidently, a characteristically MIT failure. The concept of community review must be redefined. Its primary focus is on present on it is essential to do so. Contracts must be reviewed in light of the articles in the course. While we do not criticize any specific members of the committee for their actions, the Committee on Special Laboratories simply has not lived up to our expectations. The Committee operates in secrecy, holding its closed meetings every Monday afternoon, and does not reveal to the community what proposals it is considering. It is our view that the Special Laboratories should not be considered other than as an appendage of the MIT administration. It has only two student members, five undergraduates and one graduate. The majority of the other members are administration appointees. While this is a separation of forces within the MIT administration, it is also a separation and apart from the administration and the rest of the Institute committees, in fact they are bound by the very nature of their appointments, to the MIT administration. It is our concern that its function is purely advisory, and even this value is as such questionable.

Letters to The Tech

Fein Rebuttal

(Ed. note: The following letter resulted from a series run by The Tech on the subject of the implications of the resignation of Professors Salome, Fein, and Johnson in the Department of Political Science. In reporting the tenure decision and the process it involves, we felt it necessary to report on the information our sources have. The committee must have on the agenda of the committee meetings about it. Can the committee members turn in individual reports, which must in its operation, be a closed process. It has only two student members, five undergraduates and one graduate. The majority of the other members are administration appointees. While this is a separation of forces within the MIT administration, it is also a separation and apart from the administration and the rest of the Institute committees, in fact they are bound by the very nature of their appointments, to the MIT administration. It is our concern that its function is purely advisory, and even this value is as such questionable.
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