Commentary:

**MIT may be a dangerous weapon to the world.**

By Wells Eddhman

Reading in the Boston Globe, I would seem that the strike at MIT is pointless and wrong. Given The Tech's normal level of intelligence, I must assume that the administration (i.e., what the administration tells you, please) is right.

But there is a reason to strike MIT: while protest noises and "academic freedom" are over-valued, MIT has been providing the technological tools vital to the US-Vietnam War without American ground troops.

MIT's Lincoln Labs have taken the income from the US military to detect anything on the ground, computer systems to direct bombs and ships to water, synthetic semi- transparent and ultra-transparent bomb materials to make sure your bombs hit the targets. (The US has a TV-guided bomb that reportedly can strike within six feet of a specified target.)

Monday, Jerome Winnie said that he, in 1965-66, was investigating ways to make the bombs get to the targets, and by the end of the Vietnam War would have provided the technology vital for making guided bombs, computer programs for making bombs get to the targets, etc. (This was confirmed by Dr. Donald Jones, director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, at the US Department of Defense.)

So when Jerry Winne is a director, MIT is doing what he has been doing. MIT's contributions have gone far beyond the obvious. It is MIT's contribution that its profits, income, and research programs have been great enough to make it one of the world's leading centers of technological activity.

As the March 29, 1972 issue of The Boston Globe, page 10, reported: "Russell was doing this work. He did not have "academic freedom" to discuss his work. MIT is "in the multidisciplinary field of secrecy.""

So MIT should not be allowed to continue its work until it is told what war-related contracts the Institute has done, and that it is investigating the question of academic freedom. The campus strike is a protest at MIT's refusal to do that.

The government should be told what work MIT is doing, and the Institute should be told what work it is doing.

The Institute has a right to determine its own course, but it has a responsibility to the community to show how its work relates to the war.

The government should require that MIT show what work it is doing, and the Institute should show what work it is doing.
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