**Student starts trash fire in MacGregor**

**By Bert S. Kafliki**

A fire broke out in MacGregor House shortly after 7pm Sunday, because a student threw a flaming piece of paper down the trash chute of the high-rise building, starting a fire in a basement rubbish room, according to Chief of Campus Police James Oliveri.

"We had to evacuate the building because of the smoke," Depuy Chief Cornelius O'Brien of the Cambridge Fire Department said. Firefighters had little cooperation in evacuating students from the dormitory, he commented. "The students think it is a joke."

The fire was controlled by sprinkler systems and auxiliary water lines in the basement, O'Brien said.

The offending student immediately told Campus Police Sergeant Vincent S. Goodridge, the first officer to arrive at the building, how the fire started, Oliveri said. The confession, Oliveri continued, showed a "great degree of responsibility and concern."

The Office of the Dean for Student Affairs (ODSA), the MacGregor House Faculty Committee, and faculty resident Professor Nathan M. Cook '50 will review the case, Oliveri said. Police action is not necessary, he added, because the student did not perform a "malicious act."

Smoke spread through the basement into J-Entry in the low-rise portion of the building, and into the first floors of the high-rise. No one was hurt, O'Brien added.

A resident said he saw smoke and flames in the rubbish room and called senior tutor Associate Professor Derek Rowell. Rowell then contacted Campus Police from the MacGregor desk.

Goodridge said the house fire alarm was not ringing when he arrived, and the alarm box near the desk did not work. He activated another alarm box on the first floor of the building.

The fire was controlled by sprinkler in the rubbish room, which should have caused an alarm to start, according to O'Brien.

The alarm did not ring long enough to convince residents there was a fire. Goodridge explained.

In the first floor of the building.

The first fire set off a sprinkler in the rubbish room, which should have caused an alarm to start, according to O'Brien.

The alarm did not ring long enough to convince residents there was a fire. Goodridge explained.
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**Police recover MIT microscope**

*By Thomas Huang*

Boston police recovered a stolen MIT microscope in a raid in mid-January, according to Lieutenant Joseph F. McCluskey of the MIT Campus Police.

"The microscope was found in a shop in the center of the city, along with other stolen goods," said McCluskey. "The Boston police notified us on January 28."

The microscope, worth $7000, had been stolen from a lab in the MIT Center for Cancer Research. The theft was reported early on the morning of December 20, according to Theresa Imanishi-Kari, Assistant Professor of Immunology.

"It was last seen on Sunday (Dec. 19), because some of my students were still working at the lab," Imanishi-Kari explained. "At five o'clock the next morning, a cleaning lady came and unlocked the lab door. She cleaned the room, switched off the lights, and then left the door unlocked. When she came back at six o'clock, she found the lights on."

Imanishi-Kari said she did not know if the microscope was taken at that time or the night before, "It's amazing that they found it," she continued. "We really need the instrument for our research in cell fusion."

It took police several days to verify the microscope was MIT property, according to McCluskey. "There was a mix-up when we tried to match identification numbers," he said.

Imanishi-Kari reported the theft to Campus Police the day it was found missing. "However, I do not think the Campus Police notified the Boston police," she said.

"The Campus Police were not even the first to notify us that the microscope had been found," she continued. "It turns out that when the Boston police got the microscope, they asked Harvard if it belonged to them."

"I called the police to ask how the microscope was found, and at that time or the night before, "It's amazing that they found it," she continued. "We really need the instrument for our research in cell fusion."

It took police several days to verify the microscope was MIT property, according to McCluskey. "There was a mix-up when we tried to match identification numbers," he said.

Imanishi-Kari reported the theft to Campus Police the day it was found missing. "However, I do not think the Campus Police notified the Boston police," she said.

"The Campus Police were not even the first to notify us that the microscope had been found," she continued. "It turns out that when the Boston police got the microscope, they asked Harvard if it belonged to them."

"I called the police to ask how the microscope was found, and when the Boston police got the microscope, they asked Harvard if it belonged to them."

"I called the police to ask how the microscope was found, and when the Boston police got the microscope, they asked Harvard if it belonged to them."
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**2700 sign nuke freeze petition**

*By Daniel Crean*

The MIT Disarmament Study Group (DSG) has collected over 2700 signatures on its open letter to Congress and has "a shot at breaking 3000," when all signatures are in, according to Jerry S. Front '86, a DSG member.

"We urge all members of Congress to move toward reducing the risk of nuclear war in any part of the world," the DSG letter states, "and toward the eventual abolition of nuclear weapons."

The letter, which DSG plans to present to Congress in late February or early March, urges Congress not to appropriate funds for nuclear tests and, instead, to cooperate with other nuclear powers to stop the further spread of nuclear weapons.

The group solicited signatures from MIT students, faculty members, and staff members, according to Front. Faculty members who have signed the letter include former MIT president Jerome B. Wiesner and all eleven participants in the World War II Manhattan Project currently at MIT.

"Because of MIT's national and international reputation, we hope to bring a lot of attention to the anti-nuclear cause," Frost said. DSG plans to have a congressmen read the letter on the floor of the House of Representatives.

The group has contacted Speaker of the House Thomas P. O'Neill Jr., who represents the district that includes MIT, Democratic Senators Edward M. Kennedy and Paul E. Tsongas of Massachusetts, six congressmen who are MIT alumni, and Democratic Representatives Edward J. Markey and Silvio O. Conte, who sponsored last year's nuclear freeze resolution. Five representatives have accepted and one has declined DSG request to read the letter so far, according to Frost.

None of the Massachusetts congressmen contacted have yet replied, Frost said, but all have expressed interest in the letter.

Kennedy has already offered the use of his office for the presentation of the letter to the sponsoring congressmen, he added.

United Campuses Against Nuclear War (UCAM) will collect signatures for its letter at approximately 550 colleges, according to Frost. UCAM sponsored last year's series of anti-nuclear rallies across the United States in which DSG participated.

**Legislation to be proposed, creating commission to study DNA guidelines**

*By James F. List*

Legislation to create an oversight body to examine all aspects of human genetic engineering is likely to be introduced in the US Congress this year in accordance with recommendations made by a presidential commission.

Representative Albert Gorrr Jr., D-Tenn., chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight of the House Science and Technology Committee is expected to introduce the legislation.

President Jimmy Carter created the President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research in 1980 after three prominent religious groups expressed their concern that moral, ethical, and religious issues associated with human genetic engineering were not receiving adequate examination.

Although the commission could find no grounds for concluding that any current or planned forms of genetic engineering are "intrinsically wrong or irrelevant per se," the commission stated in its November report that an oversight group should determine "by what standards, and toward what objectives, should the great new powers of genetic engineering be guided."

The presidential commission recommended the proposed oversight body "not only the Congress and executive branch agencies but also scientific and academic associations, industrial and commercial groups, ethicists, lawyers, religious and educational leaders, and members of the general public."

The commission also recommended the proposed oversight body be separate from research funding agencies to avoid conflicts of interest.

The proposed oversight body (please turn to page 2)