great concern to residents of parts of the city. And the fact is opportunities; and the potential long time. It now appears that a cheap campaign to discredit the 'Mideast Propaganda Reply' to the Editor:

Although this was a known fact, Mr. McNamee's comments - nor for his while I have by no means always great skills necessary to enter these new companies and have a chance of moving up.

Mr. Ross doesn't mention Mrs. Graham and her view. And, indeed, in his comments on statements, he cites by name only one Mr. McNamee. According to Ross, Mr. Velussi, who more than any other economist represents the working people of East Cambridge, has made a political career of publicly resisting Harvard and MIT.

Yet the fact is that Mr. Velussi voted for the Neighborhood Plan that MIT, among others, endorsed and which the Council from the Cambridge City Planning Department, followed generally accepted procedures, made careful cost-benefit analyses of several different proposals that emerged for the development of Kendall Square. And in these analyses the Neighborhood Plan was shown to provide the largest net future value.

There is no one more could write than that Mr. Velussi has his potential for Cambridge. But the essential point, I do believe, is that there is enough talent from the Harvard and Mir. And Mr. Velussi McNamee by a mile. He also missed, by a small margin, the great potential benefit for Cambridge from the Neighborhood Plan for Kendall Square.

Walter L. Milne

President for the

May 13, 1975

Reply to the Chaplains

An Open Letter to the MIT Chaplains:

You ask for a clear answer.

"Why does MIT choose to educate Jews in Nuclear Engineering?"

Go further. Why does MIT choose to educate anybody in any academic discipline? Who decides to continue to exist at all?

The funding and underwriting purpose of the Institute the clear answer. William Barton Rogers and those who have followed him have held the convention that the gaining and passing on of scientific and applied knowledge is a service to society, from the local to the international level.

It is not a matter of giving a clear answer beyond the above for a yes decision to the Iranian peace agreement. It is a matter of giving a clear answer for a no decision. Educating the Iranians is not a departure from policy; it is continuing in the underlying purpose of the Institute. Refuse to educate them would be the departure from policy and purpose that would require a clear reason. It appears that the administration feels none of the reasons that have been given for a no decision are enough to depart from MIT's present purpose.

Consider the reasons for saying no to Iran. One, the knowledge taught in the Nuclear Engineering Department is dangerous knowledge. It could be used to build bombs. To claim this paints a false picture of the Nuclear Engineering Department. Absolutely nothing is taught about bomb engineering or physical concepts (reactivity, criticality, promptness, promptness, and criticality) that might relate to bomb physics are taught and these are necessary to safely design nuclear power plants. All that has been widely has been shared in the international scientific and engineering communities for many years, dating back to President Eisenhower's 'Atoms for Peace' initiative in 1953.

Two, MIT could educate dangerous people or will work for dangerous people. If you believe this, then you must admit that there must be a lot of danger in just educating at MIT now. If the administration accepts this as reason enough, then MIT's consistency would demand that all future activity for the Iranians pay the actual cost per student. It is not a matter of giving a clear answer beyond the above for a yes decision to the Iranian peace agreement. It is a matter of giving a clear answer for a no decision. Educating the Iranians is not a departure from policy; it is continuing in the underlying purpose of the Institute. Refuse to educate them would be the departure from policy and purpose that would require a clear reason. It appears that the administration feels none of the reasons that have been given for a no decision are enough to depart from MIT's present purpose.