Federal support cutbacks still looming

The outlook for federal support of higher education is slightly brighter than it was a few weeks ago, but the academic community is still expressing concern over an apparent slowdown in U.S. funds and over some fundamental changes in the means of allocating those funds.

Commission to convene June 1

The first meeting of the newly named Presidential Commission on Admissions and Student Body Composition—scheduled for 2 p.m. next Monday (June 1)—will deal with organizational matters and with establishing some issues that the commission faces.

Ira Polley, director of the commission and former state superintendent of public instruction, said that the commission initially will focus on three areas: Graduate—undergraduate enrollment balance in MSU's colleges, undergraduate maximum or optimal and in-class ceilings. As it proceeds during the remainder of this year, he added, the commission will hold open hearings both on and off the campus. Its recommendations are expected during winter, 1971.

Faculty voting members appointed to the commission include: W. Vern Hicks, professor of elementary and special education, and Willard Warrington, professor of evaluation services, both from the University Educational Policies Committee; and Charles A. Blackman, professor of secondary education and curriculum, and James H. Pickering, professor of English, both from the Graduate Council.

From the Academic Council are: Norman Abeles, professor of psychology and Counseling Center; Daniel F. Daniel, assistant professor of human medicine; Mildred B. Erickson, assistant professor of American Thought and Language; Henry W. Kennedy, professor of teacher education; Mordcchaj Kreinin, professor of economics; Clifford J. Pollard, associate professor of botany and plant pathology; and Chitra M. Smith, assistant professor, James Madison College.

Faculty members-at-large include—James H. McMillan, chairman, of Equal Opportunities Programs; three representatives of the Council of Graduate Students (Stanyuk Sibluy, William Greene and Kwong-Yuan Chong); two alumni; five undergraduates; and a third at-large member (former State Sen. Frank Beadle, St. Clair). President Clifton R. Wharton Jr. is chairman, and Provost John Cantlon is vice chairman.

Non-voting and ex officio members include five persons designated from the public and the Board of Trustees and nine representatives of the University faculty, students, and staff and resource persons, both from the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils.

The case speaks of the role of outside agencies (the Air Force and Army) to determine curricula and supply instructors, and to prepare students for a single employer.

The administration's stance, as articulated in a May 1 statement by President Clifton R. Wharton Jr., is that, based on an AMSEU opinion survey last year and an investigation by the University Educational Policies and Curriculum Committees, the position of ROTC is warranted. But, he said, "if the Committee Against ROTC has additional evidence that the situation has changed materially or in any way in the past several months, then we will be pleased to consider that evidence in the light of our current policies and course offerings." He suggested two channels: The Military Education Advisory Committee, which held two open hearings last week, and the Academic Council.

And finally, the stance of those who oppose either abolishing ROTC or withdrawing university financial support and accreditation (as demanded by striking students) centers on academic freedom and what they say is the liberalizing effect of a University on ROTC commissioned officers.

As House, assistant provost and chairman of the Military Education Advisory Committee, said: "We are more concerned about the role of the University in military training than the role of military training in the University."

By BEVERLY TWITCHELL

The ROTC question: Is it compatible?

ATTACKS on offering Reserve Officers Training Corps programs at MSU have been along two fronts: Military and academic. Some students, particularly the Committee Against ROTC, have taken the military argument, with support for the continuation of ROTC because of its relationship to the military—industrial complex and particularly its relationship to (through supplying officers for) the Indochina war.

Some faculty have opposed offering ROTC here on academic grounds, opposing the role of outside agencies (the Air Force and Army) to determine curricula and supply instructors, and to prepare students for a single employer.

The administration's stance, as articulated in a May 1 statement by President Clifton R. Wharton Jr., is that, based on an AMSEU opinion survey last year and an investigation by the University Educational Policies and Curriculum Committees, the position of ROTC is warranted. But, he said, "if the Committee Against ROTC has additional evidence that the situation has changed materially or in any way in the past several months, then we will be pleased to consider that evidence in the light of our current policies and course offerings." He suggested two channels: The Military Education Advisory Committee, which held two open hearings last week, and the Academic Council.

And finally, the stance of those who oppose either abolishing ROTC or withdrawing university financial support and accreditation (as demanded by striking students) centers on academic freedom and what they say is the liberalizing effect of a University on ROTC commissioned officers.

As House, assistant provost and chairman of the Military Education Advisory Committee, said: "We are more concerned about the role of the University in military training than the role of military training in the University."

To ROTC or not to ROTC or how to ROTC—that is the question. Asked, discussed, shouted around campus for the last few weeks, and to be discussed today in a special Academic Council meeting at 3:15 p.m. in the Auditorium.

Attacks on offering Reserve Officers Training Corps programs at MSU have been along two fronts: Military and academic. Some students, particularly the Committee Against ROTC, have taken the military argument, with support for the continuation of ROTC because of its relationship to the military—industrial complex and particularly its relationship to (through supplying officers for) the Indochina war.

Some faculty have opposed offering ROTC here on academic grounds, opposing the role of outside agencies (the Air Force and Army) to determine curricula and supply instructors, and to prepare students for a single employer.
ARGUMENTS AGAINST ROTC: ACADEMIC

Robert Repas, professor of labor and industrial relations, said he was "astounded" by the statement of President Wharton that University channels had not been kept open to ROTC.

Repas headed a group of faculty members who worked from December, 1969, to April, 1970, to bring the ROTC issue through the University channels. They proposed an ROTCMilitary Education Advisory Committee to the University standing committee. The proposal was defeated at the April 13 Academic Council meeting.

Repas said his committee was object to "throwing it (ROTC) off campus altogether," or to stripping the program of academic credit and making it pay its own overhead. But if the program is to be kept on campus, he said, "I can't see how we can keep it as a part of the University."

The committee was formed in the 1964 ROTC Revitalization Act which requires that: "No unit may be established at an institution unless the senior commissioned officer of the armed force concerned who is assigned to the program at that institution is given the academic rank of professor..." and the institution adopts as part of its curriculum a four-year course of military instruction or a two-year course of advanced training in military instruction, or both, which the Secretary of the military department concerned prescribes and conducts." (Public Law 88-647, Oct. 13, 1964).

Repas also questions the system which requires the University to assign rank; it would be like the United Auto Workers providing the School of Labor and Industrial Relations with instructors, textbooks, and holding final say over curriculum.

"We pay for the privilege of offering ROTC," Repas says, by paying for secretarial help and overhead, and by providing free office facilities and a drill facility as well.

He also argues that the instructors are not career teachers and are "shuffled in and out" of the University by their respective military departments.

Repas also objects to the system which provides for ROTC programs (agreed to in the contracts with the Army and Air Force).

"Presumably," he says, "justification for department-stations is creation of new knowledge. No one has ever argued ROTC of that.

He also questions a "curriculum designed to train people for a single employer," and asks: "How do you justify academic credit for marksmanship?"

He rejects the notion of the liberalizing effect of University-based ROTC programs on military education because "when you enter the military, an organization, you conform to that organization, not transform it. Besides, second lieutenants do not make policy.

He described the student issue regarding abolishing ROTC (to cut off the officer supply to Vietnam) "also has no basis," for the same reason that he thinks an argument to keep ROTC for defense is wrong. He quotes figures from the New York Times, March 19, 1970, which showed that in the 1967-68 escalation of the Vietnam War, OCS turned out twice as many officers as ROTC while, in 1969-70, OCS turned out fewer officers than ROTC — which means that ROTC remains somewhat constant, but OCS fluctuates according to the demand for older men.

Repas cited the objects to the Military Education Advisory Committee because it does not report to the faculty and until recently most faculty were not aware of its existence.

ARGUMENTS FOR MAINTAINING ROTC

Considered support of ROTC react to the preceding arguments on the basis of academic freedom, on a contention that University-based ROTC provides a valuable liberalizing effect, and on the contention that abolishing ROTC would not particularly affect the Indochina war.

Herman King described as misleading the use of the quote of Harvard's Col. Pell (that "there is at present no acceptable alternative source of junior officer leadership if we are driven from the world's only belligerent source of officers, such as OCS, the military academies, field commissions, etc.," said King, but ROTC is the most acceptable program for a variety or reasons.

"I don't think abolishing ROTC would have any effect on Vietnam whatever," King said. "But it can have an effect in maintaining peace down the road."

The military influences civilian government — which prescribes war — through advising that government. ROTC officers could influence civilian decisions, King said, by occupying a majority of strategic positions.

"What does a bachelor's degree mean to a character?" King asks. "A conference a couple of years ago concluded that a bachelor's degree says nothing about a man's character; it says he had the intelligence to get through four years of college with appropriate credits, without getting caught at plagiarism, the only uninflatable sin at Army.

"If we aren't concerned about that, why get so excited about ROTC?"

The Military Education Advisory Committee does not want the ROTC graduate to have some strength of character. We have to do something to make sure he gets a more liberal education, a better education for his purposes than the average university graduate.

"It's just as important to stop the next war as this one, and to cut off ROTC is to cut off one outlet. They ought to have a chance to influence future decision-makers. We should not frustrate, not destroy, organizations, whether they be business, politics or the military."

For the same end, King said he "would like to see officers come from all over the country, with all sorts of education... to represent the well-educated citizens of the country..." Co-optation by the military is less likely to occur to those who enter with a college education and at a higher rank. King also mentions ROTC at West Point and asks those who say that they haven't seen any liberalizing effects during ROTC's 70-year existence, King responds that his committee hasn't been going very long and that in those 70 years "the University hasn't tried to do what we're trying to do through reorganization of the ROTC curriculum."

He points out that ROTC cadets are enrolling in growing variety of majors, from television and radio to political science to mathematics, rather than the majority enrolling in engineering as they did in the past.

Curriculum revisions in military science (effected last year: aerospace studies is currently under consideration) provide more opportunities for courses of an interdisciplinary nature. (Military science cadets are required to take courses in such fields as economics, geography, political science, history, and management.)

TO THE CHARGE that the military is racist, King answers that the Armed Forces will not contract for ROTC programs with segregated schools. He also said that there is "no evidence of the presence of the Vietnam War in ROTC that is off in the North, leaving it only in the South," where ROTC enrollment is high.

He said the argument that the University manipulates students into signing up for ROTC by providing a large and forceful political argument, or that the draft "could have some logic," but he pointed out that students at MSU have several choices for obtaining financial aid and are not forced into choosing ROTC scholarships.

King responds to the argument of an outside agency (the military) placing
requirements on the University by putting out that the state specifies that certain requirements be met by education majors in order to establish course content. For example, the Air Force may specify the goal "to become familiar with the subject matter of the particular courses up to meet that goal are established by the department faculty with the advice of the Military Education Advisory Committee. King points out that the ROTC Revitalization Act requires that military instruction prescribed and conducted by the secretary of the military department concerned be approved by the University as only part of its curriculum; thus the University has the option to set other course requirements. In response to the argument that ROTC prepares students for a single employer, King points out for comparison that the College of Education prepares most of its students for a single employer—public school teachers. The single employer for which ROTC cadets are prepared, King says, is the government, an extension of the people. I see nothing wrong with training people to serve the country. It is one employer.

King said he thought the rule required the assignment of professional rank so that the ROTC instructors could be considered part of the academic community. The university, he says, is "to pick those who are qualified for the rank." Regarding the argument of academic credentials of ROTC instructors, Col. Shaber says he "could care less" about the title of professor, "because the title and position go hand in hand. We do not have tenured professors on any campus governing committees. We're outsiders."

The military serves essentially as an employment bureau, King says, through its access to recruitment offices for ROTC instructor positions. Files of candidates for vacant positions are sent to the University to be examined, and the University has also recently begun to personally interview the candidates.

Federal support cuts likely

(Continued from page 1)

Higher Education, and both were originally scheduled for significant cuts in fiscal 1971. Administration assurances would mean that they would be funded next year at their present levels.

ONE OF THE President's proposals calls for a student aid package that would provide combined grants, work-study programs, and subsidized loans to students from families whose gross income is under $10,000. Students from a family with more than $10,000 a-year income would not receive direct aid, but could get loans at commercial rates.

To provide loans, President Nixon used a provision of the National Defense Education Act, which would purchase student loan "paper" from other lenders. These purchases would be financed by selling dividend-paying stock on the private market.

But this is not seen as a suitable alternative to the present NDEA Student Loan Program, according to Henry C. Dykema, MSU's director of financial aids. He says that the national group of financial aids officers is drafting proposals to be offered as legislation to reform and strengthen the present NDEA rotation plan.

MSU received $1.3 million in NDEA funds for 1969-70, compared to $1.6 million in 1968-69. Dykema says the University has just been awarded $220,000 in supplemental funds for the remainder of this year.

Next year, MSU anticipates about $1.4 million in NDEA loan funds, Dykema says, but this is barely more than half of the $2.7 million it requested, and for which it can show need.

The problem students face in trying to get loans on the commercial market, he says, is that not all of the private lending agencies participate in any federal plan. And NDEA student loans carry a much lower interest rate (up to only 3 per cent after graduation) than does a "guaranteed student loan program" proposed by the Administration (up to 7 per cent after graduation).

PRESENT AND projected cuts in federal spending are being felt in various areas at MSU. Mike King, assistant vice president for research development, notes that while the outlook changes from week to week, it now looks as if:

-Graduate student fellowship support for MSU from the NDEA (Title IV) has dropped from about $432,000 last year to $289,000, this year, with only $526,000 expected in 1970-71. The number of fellowships has dropped from a high of 70 in 1966-67 to 27 anticipated next year.

-As of March 1, the University had about $2 million in ongoing fellowship and traineeship support from the National Institutes of Health and the National Health Service and the National Institute of Mental Health. It looked for a time as if this support might be eliminated, but latest indications are that it will continue for another year at its 1969-70 level.

-Traineeships from the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will be eliminated. (NSF traineeships this year total 21; NASA trainees number five, down from a high of 12 in 1966-67.)

Muehle says that prospects are better than they were when he reported to the Board of Trustees in April. But he warns that federal support is by no means a source of optimism concerning future higher education.

"If the government invests another $500 million, we will no longer be a university," he says. "We will be a college." Muehle says that professor and chairman of entomology,王国维教授, says that he has been asked to keep the Institute of Biology and Medicine.

He estimates that nearly half of MSU's graduate students and faculty members in departments in the sciences (such as chemistry, pharmacy, biology, zoology) facing curtailed activities because of possible reductions in federal support.

Kniesly says he is particularly disturbed by the prospect of cuts in direct federal grants for health care facilities, and for health and medical education.

"The impact is very clear in the health professions," he says. "We talk about cutting back on teaching and the quality of health care, it's very obvious that if the universities have to borrow, then the students will have to pay these costs on to patient care— at a time when the federal government says it is trying to cut health care costs."

MANY PERSONS suggest that curtailed federal aid to higher education is simply a reflection of growing public resentment over campus unrest and student disruptions. But Kniesly maintains that "the safest way to destroy the university is to cut the support just as is being done and proposed. This is more effective than breaking windows. What the federal government says it doesn't want to happen will happen as a result of the current federal response to students."

Kniesly acknowledges that behavior of some students in many universities has been poor, and that such behavior has been noted off the campus. But he warns that it is "highly unlikely" that any of these students "guilty of fomenting campus revolution will lose any support as a result of federal cuts, because these students probably didn't have the support in the first place."

How one department is hit: Biochemistry down a third

"We have had at least five projects up for renewal in the past six months, and we have had none funded," according to A. L. Mathews, administrative assistant in MSU's biochemistry department. General leveling off of federal support — in the face of spiraling inflation — means that total funding this year for research development in biochemistry will be about 30 per cent below last year.

The results in that department are fewer graduate students accepted, fewer student assistants hired as part-time lab helpers, less equipment and supplies available in the laboratory, and fewer students accepted. For example, the University and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) are no longer concerned with the isolation of the same enzyme in human blood cells in rabbits. He has since gone on to steering group membership on the committee. Guyer, professor of literature, is an expert on the committee. Guyer, professor of literature, is an expert on the committee.

Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) makes a decision on funding. "We don't follow in their footsteps," says one student. "We do not think in their line, they are the only people to deal with our problem."

"I don't know where we stand," he says. "Under normal times it would have been funded," Morris says. He thinks this year's grant will be reduced.

A year ago, Morris discovered and isolated the enzyme responsible for the breakdown of lactose in human blood. He describes his work as "a search for a new metabolic pathway in red blood cells."

If the project loses funding, Morris will probably have to let his lab technician go and carry on with a smaller budget. "And it's questionable that I could support a graduate assistant," he says. "I think everyone is losing funds," he says.

Robert Kalverly, professor and chairman of agriculture, says that his department has been asked to keep the Institute of Agriculture and Merchandising.

He estimates that nearly half of MSU's graduate students take work in departments in the sciences (such as chemistry, pharmacy, biology, zoology) facing curtailed activities because of possible reductions in federal support.

How one department is hit: Biochemistry down a third

Two elected to steering group

Thomas H. Green and Gordon E. Greer have been elected to the Faculty Steering Committee, according to results of balloting conducted earlier this spring.

Greer, professor of humanities, is an incumbent on the committee. Greer, professor of humanities, is an incumbent on the committee. Guyer, professor and chairman of entomology, succeeds Dale E. Hathaway, professor and chairman of agricultural economics, who did not file for re-election. Both will serve two-year terms beginning July 1.

Other members of the Faculty Steering Committee are Wilton Johnson, professor of administration and higher education; Ridesa Kumut, professor of biology; and Arthur Adams, professor of history.