

ROTC plan hard to recognize

The ROTC Standing Advisory Committee's 14-part plan to revise—if not expand—ROTC at the University ran into the faculty Wednesday. The resulting wreckage—so twisted from its original shape—may be a bit hard to recognize.

In short, the faculty refused to form a war and peace studies curriculum, created added requirements for ROTC cadets in history and political science, and endorsed the concept of opening ROTC teaching positions to civilians.

The faculty has steadfastly refused to eliminate ROTC entirely. The advisory committee was originally established to study alternatives to the program, short of outright elimination. There was hope among opponents that the program would be cut-back or partially taken out of the hands of the military. But the final majority report of the committee went in the opposite direction, supporting an expansion of the program into civilian liberal arts branches of the University.

Minority reports calling once again for abolition of the program or its watering down were defeated by the faculty before the majority expansionist report was considered.

Opponents of expansion lost a first-round battle when the faculty narrowly approved requiring cadets to take one military history and one international relations course as part of their ROTC curriculum.

Bernd Crasemann, chairman of the Faculty Senate, opposed the requirements on the grounds the University would be creating a "little military academy" within the University.

A majority of members present at the meeting didn't accept that notion.

A few minutes later, however, the

proposed war and peace studies curriculum was squelched, ostensibly for financial reasons.

Underlying financial considerations, however, was the firm feeling among many faculty members that such a curriculum would provide a solid military inroad into the civilian university establishment.

Subsequently the faculty narrowly approved a motion presented by law professor Herb Titus endorsing the concept of opening ROTC instructor positions to civilians.

The faculty also came within a whisper of placing control of ROTC under the college of Liberal Arts—a definite liberalizing influence. But that move was smelled out and squashed when one member called such a union an "intellectual non-sequitur."

Final passage of the mangled advisory report was certainly no consolation to those who had steadfastly sought a complete end to ROTC at the university.

But those in favor of an expanded ROTC could not be satisfied with Wednesday's vote either. To them the revisions in ROTC must seem half-hearted at best.

The real loser, of course, remains the spirit of academic freedom. ROTC is the only branch of the University establishment subject to outside control. The U.S. Department of Defense calls the shots and the University generally follows along.

The one gratifying action taken by the faculty is the retention of the advisory committee to fulfill a "watchdog" role.

Until the faculty decides to end University complicity with the Army and Air Force that is the best we can hope for.

Meeting attendance shoddy

Only 100 or so faculty members took the time to attend Wednesday's faculty meeting. That is a discouraging turnout when one considers over 800 are eligible to participate.

The subject matter may have had something to do with attendance. After all, the faculty has been playing legislative volleyball with ROTC for five years. But the standing ROTC Advisory Committee report deserved more complete consideration.

The trend in recent meetings has been away from strong faculty attendance. With ROTC finally out of the way—at least for

this year—it will be interesting to note if the trend reverses.

In the same vein, University students may well ask for some accounting from ASUO officials whose attendance at recent faculty and faculty senate meetings has been less than impressive.

There were no representatives from the ASUO at Wednesday's faculty meeting. Representatives of the ASUO executive and senate attended the last faculty senate meeting—briefly—but left before consideration was given to a number of issues relevant to students, including proposed changes in the Student Conduct Code.

Letters

Grave twitching

It's a funny age we live in when someone is demoted because he made a reference to a past President "twitching in his grave," while the current President is sending thousands to their graves by his insane bombing policy.

Not to belabor the point, but I wonder what the founding fathers of our Constitution are presently doing as Congress refuses to exercise their responsibility as a check on the Executive branch. We hear a lot of noise coming from those hallowed halls in Washington, D.C., but the time for meaningless rhetoric is past. I just wonder if those who are supposed to represent the people has the backbone to reclaim its lost power?

If everyone takes the time to let our esteemed (?) Congressmen know their views, maybe it will give them the needed courage to do more than just talk. Maybe.

Richard Sanchez
Student

Not simplistic

Dr. Buckminster Fuller has been portrayed by the media as a brilliant, but eccentric old engineer who has all but outlived his usefulness. The general attitude is that while he serves as good entertainment—a trip, of sorts—practical-minded people can find little that is coherent and useful in his ideas. Your report on page one of the Jan. 10 issue continues in this tradition. On the basis of his MacArthur Court speech, I believe your attitude is unwarranted.

Evidently unable to comprehend the moral philosophy of Dr. Fuller, your reporter focused on engineering concepts which he described as simplistic. I found Oregon Daily Emerald

Dr. Fuller's ideas challenging. The central theme of his message, as I deciphered it, was that the technology and resources for solving the fundamental problems of mankind are available. Whether or not we use them for these purposes is a moral question.

But no longer can we escape the responsibility of solving our social and economic problems on the basis of lack or resources. No longer can we seriously defend the idea of resource scarcity, when we consider the tremendous amount of resources now allocated to socially useless activities.

Despite the availability of resources and technology, social and political arrangements prevent us from bringing them to bear on our most pressing problems. Artificial divisions between people create unnecessarily large disparities in their ability to participate in economic and social activities. Specifically, Dr. Fuller pointed out that concepts of race and class, though they have no biological basis, have been used to create and perpetuate serious economic inequities.

Fuller challenged us to analyze our situation and realize that these artificial

concepts of race, caste and class really belong to a pre-industrial era. They are anachronisms. They belong to a time when the combine and the tractor were un-invented. Man must take charge of his social and moral evolution. In short, Buckminster Fuller challenges us to realize that man must now make decisions from an existential base.

Pardon me, but I do not find this simplistic.

Desmond A. Jolly
Ph.D. Cand., Economics



'YES, YOU COULD SAY I'VE NOTICED SOME HOSTILITY IN THE BUREAU . . '