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BRAVE NEW MSU
University Planners Face The Future

By CHAR JOLLES

A moratorium on all university activities, during which time the university would reflect on its present state of being, was imposed in "The Paper" last term by Robert L. Wright, the former university president.

The committee's report cleared the ground for nothing short of revolution. Published in summer, 1959, the committee's report "was received with enthusiasm by the faculty," according to an administrative bulletin.

According to an administrative bulletin, the report dealt with the problems of increased enrollment, limited faculty and financial resources, and the "explosion of knowledge." Although the report itself did not propose concrete solutions, it triggered a series of curricular guidelines that eventually wound up under the title of Educational Development Program (EDP).

EDP, a division of the provost's office, is designed to cope with these problems of mass education. When EDP first appeared in February, 1963, it was not so well-received by the faculty, according to an EDP report. The Ford Foundation, on the other hand, applauded EDP and in July, 1964, granted a modest $440,000 for a three-year continuation of MSU's efforts to cope with a projected 40,000 undergraduates.

(Ford grants usually reach into the millions, but only for private or church-related institutions.)

The MSU grant came out of the foundation's Special Program in Education, which was established six years ago, to encourage long-range planning in universities and colleges.

Potential recipients of the Ford grants are asked to "prepare far-reaching improvement plans encompassing the total institution." These plans include 10-year budgets, the improvement of the caliber of students, faculty and research, the physical plant and its relation to the project

ed academic program.

"The planning by each of the recipient universities has been characterized as one of the most thorough and severe processes in the history of higher education." (from a report from the Ford Foundation, December, 1964.)

This thorough and severe process is nothing short of classroom revolution, experimentation caused by the pressure of numbers. Terry Ferrer, education editor for the New York Herald Tribune, wrote last year:

"This burgeoning student organization and shrinking college faculty makes it imperative—and more or less inevitable—that the colleges and universities try new methods of solving their crisis. Whether by more use of such hardware as television and teaching machines, new colleges and new college organizations, more independent study, or a longer academic year plus a shorter academic life for each student, higher education will be pushed into new experiments at an accelerating pace."

Thus MSU's "moratorium" of 1959 cleared the ground for radical educational changes, some already realized, some yet projected; specifically, a 100 per cent increase in the use of televised instruction by 1967; more and more student contact with technological self-teaching devices; more graduate assistants to serve as liaison between faculty members and students; standardized machine-graded examinations wherever feasible; more credits attainable by examination; more credits for fewer class meetings.

Mounting numbers of high school graduates—which almost doubled in Michigan between 1962 and 1965—necessitate these new directions in higher education. What could possibly justify the admission of hordes of students and subsequent standardization and overcrowding?

President Hannah and the Ford Foundation have repeatedly answered, "society's demands."

"This is a very complicated society that we've developed, and it not only takes more nuclear engineers and physicists and chemists and mathematicians and teachers, but it also takes a great many more people with the kinds of training that colleges and universities provide to make this complicated society function.

As President Hannah said in an interview printed in U.S. News and World Report (Jan. 21, 1963)."

Aspiration toward a fat Gross National Product and a smoothly running bureaucracy, then, are the forces behind higher education in America today. These aims, accepted without question as "society's needs," justify EDP.

Added Henry T. Heald, president of the Ford Foundation, "The needs of American society, together with the demands placed on the United States by nations looking to it for leadership, call for uncommon advance in the number and quality of educated men and women. Each region of the nation needs more universities of excellence and national stature."

Science and technology are wiping out unskilled jobs and creating...
EDITORIAL

Publications Board: Not Doing The Job

Continuing its intermittent practice of exposing bureaucratic tangles at Michigan State, "The Paper" this week will consider the Board of Student Publications. One of the lesser-known of the bureaucratic bottlenecks of the university, the Board of Student Publications nevertheless exercises a large and growing influence over a topic of concern to many.

Relatively new to the debate on campus behavior and freedom, the Board of Student Publications until recently did little more than meet once a year to name editors of the State News and the Wolverine. But then, it seems, someone high up in the administration realized the potential import of a body claiming authority over nearly all publication by students. Things haven't been the same for the "pub board" since.

During this year, the board has met once each month, to review the financial, and, it would seem, editorial, condition of the State News and Wolverine. But things haven't stopped there. Our pub board is a busy body this year, apparently attempting a general review of the entire publications scene at the university. Zeitgeist has been before it, and has left in a huff, clearly not seeing eye to eye with the board on who runs the business of publishing at MSU. "The Paper," too, has been before the board more than once, to test feelings about independent newspapers.

The board members—three administrators, three faculty and three students, chaired by the chairman of the School of Journalism—have had a lot to do this year. They've even had to publish a set of operating rules, apparently for the first time.

The dittoed rules—"Authorized and Non-Authorized Student Publications"—make it clear that the board hasn't had to operate even this formally before. The rules begin by saying merely:

"Most student publications circulating on campus, but not all, require authorization by the Board of Student Publications.

There follow definitions of "authorized publications" and "non-authorized publications," which say essentially that all authorized publications are authorized and all non-authorized publications are not. The board, appearing very new to this business of stating a procedure and then following it, doesn't even include in its listing a definition of the term "authorized." Nor does the board remember to include a listing of the privileges which authorization brings. It does point out, however, that authorization involves complete surrender of a publication's business operation to the board, and thus to the university, and that editors and advisers must all be approved by the board.

But there is no mention of what being authorized means to the publication or of the implications of remaining a non-authorized publication. No attempt is made, either in the written rules or, it turns out, in an encounter with board members, to portray authorization as the only means of publishing in the university, even though the introduction to the rules quoted above sounds as though all publications must submit to authorization.

One exception; the rules say that non-authorized publications "may be sold on campus only in compliance with Sec. 30.02 et al of MSU ordinances covering distribution of such materials." The pub board doesn't seem to realize that the confusing wording of Sec. 30.02 is exactly what the whole university has been fighting about for the past year regarding literature distribution. No attempt is made to clarify.

The pub board leaves it strictly up to the individual publication to decide whether to even to face the board; it does not set out a publication and inform it of the rules. Only university-initiated publications seem to be authorized, but this is not conclusive evidence. Whether or not a publication is authorized, however, seems to be in the board's eyes to have little real effect on whether it continues publishing and selling on campus, even though it is according to the board's own rules that the publication must come under the board's jurisdiction.

A conversation with the Board of Student Publications is like a conversation with a computer with plug pulled out. The rules are there, the bureaucratic meanderings are there, but there is no evidence that any of this is related to the rest of the university.

A much better system would be to have either no board at all or a board of publications which supervised the unrestricted distribution of publications, student or otherwise, around a campus increasingly difficult to reach by normal communications methods. For the moment we have merely a board that seems to content itself with simply making arbitrary rules which it plans neither to follow nor to follow through.

M.K.
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THE ABDUCTION DEBATE: A Study in Moral Misdirection

By RICHARD A. OGAR

It has been several months now since those university administrators to whom the twentieth century has remained a revelatory mystery took on the robes of the Old Testament prophet and Cerritino was left to fight against the impending rise of Berkeleyism. Whether the International Student Council at Michigan State University has somehow managed to keep itself remarkably free of serious controversy, Cerritino, but when I looked at the crust for this laudably clean record goes to the student body, which has itself remained oblivious of serious thought, but one must also acknowledge the example set by the university to such an extent that it would be a position on any question to which there is no answer.

Nevertheless, a few students--no doubt sharing the administration's belief in a good image, however devoid of content--have felt themselves compelled to simulate intellectual fervor by deciding to call a horoscope in the letter column of the "State News." But among all possible topics for discussion, only one—the question of abortion—has established itself as a hardly perennial, but from personal experience has shown that one ought to be thankful even for hallowed-aives, I might be able to work up some enthusiasm for these tea-party debates, where it is not for the fact that none of the arguments for either side is really to the point, or, more exactly, to the right point. In the case of abortion, for example, the most recent exchange of letters has been devoted to the notion of legalized abortion has argued that the fetus is simply a blob of specialized tissue and that excising it is no more murdering than removing an appendix, while the opponents maintain that the fetus is human from the moment of conception (the point gains validity when one observes that most women seem to have developed little beyond this point and therefore equate abortion with homicide. Now I'm not enough of a meta-physician to be able to affirm either position with surety, but I think I'm pragmatic enough to realize that the time has come to introduce the notion of contraception. It seems quite obvious that if everyone is provided with the necessary means of birth control, the number of unwanted pregnancies will decrease considerably, and as abortion an undergirdment institution will become obsolete. And if there are those tender-hearted enough to lament the demise of a six-week old fetus, surely no one but Norman Mailer would shed tears on the grave of a departed spermat-ozone.

I am well aware of the fact that by introducing contraception, I have run smack into another wall of public opposition, but it is behind this wall that the real answer to the question of abortion lies. For, despite all the religious hollowness, the opposition to contraception arises solely from the fear of human sexuality which is so deeply embedded in the traditions of this supposedly happy-go-lucky nation. Disregarding the fact that the Abortion of the New is supposedly a cardinal tenet of the American Dream, the United States has never quite recovered from the word "nudist." Paul and Queen Victoria to make parthenogenesis a way of life. (In fact, were it not that national pride has demanded that we continue producing good Americans to whom we may pass the smoldering torch of freedom, I am sure that contraception would have supplanted circumcision long ago.) Unabashed sexuality has never taken root in our Puritan soil, and while we look somewhat uneasily upon Europe's Ovids, Chaucers, and Bal­ladeurs, we can still make do with Ben Franklin, Katy Winters and Lady Clair.
Why Television Drives Me Bats

By JIM BUSCHMAN

The success of a new television show invariably wreaks havoc on the TV industry itself, as one program after another tries to imitate the original triumph. The rise of "Batman" will undoubtedly initiate a chain reaction of Batlike shows on the airwaves. Some current shows may change their format somewhat:

"The Bat From UNCLE?"
Solo: Here we are, sir--the Tenacious Twosome, Napoleon and Golden Boy. We came as soon as we could.
Waverly: Thank God you're here, Napoleon. You're the only man in the world who can stop THRUSH's guest villain this week--The Spider!
Kuryakin: Almighty Arachnoid! You mean that heinous fiend who scales bare walls, breaks into top-security offices and steals atomic secrets without a trace?
Kuryakin: Gleeps! Solo: I've read about The Spider, He's the trickiest villain alive. All efforts so far have failed to trap him.
Waverly: Where did you read that, Napoleon? Solo: Detective Comics, Kuryakin: Galloping Gunshoes... Waverly: Hold on, Golden Boy, we've uncovered the biggest clue yet in tracking The Spider behind bars. We've discovered his secret identity.
Solo: That's all we need sir, You can count on us. Who is that dastardly devil?
Waverly: I knew I could count on you, Napoleon. The dastardly devil is an Englishman named Wellington. His headquarters are in Waterloo, England.

"The Bat From UNCLE?"
Solo: You're booked on a plane for London leaving at...
Kuryakin: But Holy History... Solo: Shut up, Golden Boy.
Or old shows may be resurrected with a new approach:

"The Bat Ranger"
(Talking vision) Tonto: um make camp here, Kemo Sabe?
Bat Ranger: What a brilliant idea, Tonto. With keen perception you noticed that here there are no cliffs or trees to obstruct our view of the sky in case someone should flash the Bat-Ranger signal. You also cleverly located us near the road, where we can hear gunshots or calls for help from people in distress. You're an invaluable aid, Tonto.
Tonto: Gob-um Tonto: Holy Heartburn-um... Bat Ranger: It was a 25-cent gold-leaf valentine. I guessed his next crime would be... I am his crime would pertain to a stagecoach.
Tonto: How-um you know about $25,000 in gold, Masked Miracle? Bat Ranger: He's the trickiest villain alive. All efforts so far have failed to trap him.
Waverly: Where did you read that, Napoleon?
Solo: Detective Comics, Kuryakin: Galloping Gunshoes... Waverly: Hold on, Golden Boy, we've uncovered the biggest clue yet in tracking The Spider behind bars. We've discovered his secret identity.
Solo: That's all we need sir, You can count on us. Who is that dastardly devil?
Waverly: I knew I could count on you, Napoleon. The dastardly devil is an Englishman named Wellington. His headquarters are in Waterloo, England.

The Words-of-the-Prophets Award goes to whoever touches up the writings on the walls of the library jocks, creating such extraordinary graffiti as "BOOK YOU" or "Sue X, Really Rooks?"

NOBODY LOVES AN EDITOR
In the last issue of "The Paper," the editors ran a kind of classified ad:

"The Paper" is friendly, clean, housebroken, energetic and exciting, and it needs a roommate. If you want to join, please call 351-6516 and be prepared to trade $5 a month for the thrill of your lifetime.

Not only did it not get us a roommate; now we're looking for two roommates. We've learned to be philosophic about these things. After all, we did get a lot of unusual calls.

Everybody who advertises in "The Paper" seems to get a lot of calls. Everybody except us seems to get results, too. Well, maybe this week.

"The Paper" has classified sections for announcements of coming events, for sounding off, for all the usual things (apartments, employment, etc.).
Just $1 an item for any of these, up to 50 words. Call 351-5679 or 351-6516 almost anytime, or sent to 1750 Haslett Road, East Lansing.

The deadline is midnight, the Monday before publication. Unless you're us, "The Paper" classifieds get results.

"Mr. Moyers, would you elucidate on your statement that 'The President is constantly endeavoring to keep his image within the current dictates of the public ideal?'"
A white back, someone was gently chiding me for my review of "Ham-let," arguing that I had been too hard on a bunch of poor amateurs. "Well, I have certain standards..." (I began. "Yes," he said, "but are they cap-able of meeting your standards?"") Without hesitation I said yes, they were. End of conversation.

Within a week, the Arena production of "The Lovers" arrived to back up my assertion. It was not a perfect evening of theatre, but it was a very good one, and I left it feeling exhil­arated.

Basiclly, the play is a comic char­acter study of considerable subtlety. It depends on the conceit that Ful­gonzio and Eugenia, two young lovers with so serious obstacle to their love, are jealous, suspicious, volatile and silly enough to create that almost separate them forever.

The only real subplot, and it isn't much of one, involves Eugenia's uncle and his efforts to enhance his social position and arrange a good marriage for his niece.

In the delightful first act, exposition is smoothly presented, and the characters are introduced. Prepara­tions for a crucial dinner party are instigated, and the act reaches a comic climax in the first lovers' quarrel. The flatter second act is fuzzy in my mind, but it ends at the beginning of the dinner party, and includes a lot of the uncle's machinations and an­other long lovers' quarrel.

The third act gets off badly with the dinner party of goes, progresses to another quarrel and a long self­analysis by Eugenia, and ends well with still another quarrel and the fin­al reconciliation.

Including intermissions, the per­formance ran a little over two hours, which is a good half-hour too long. Too little material is stretched too far, and at certain points in the sec­ond and third acts, the sense of deja vu set in with a vengeance.

The author, Carlo Goldoni, says explicitly that he wants us to see ourselves in these lovers, but by dragging the situation out, he at mo­ments turns recognition into exasper­ation and blunts his point.

Beyond that, the play is a gem. Each character is brightly and ac­curately observed; the universal emerges directly out of the partic­ular. The "love, vanity, fear and sus­picion" of Eugenia and Fulgonzio are hardly limited to eighteenth century Italy or to Latin temperaments.

Eberle Thomas translated the play and directed it. The translation ef­fectively combines certain faintly char­acteristic, faintly parodied lines (*"Oh, heaven, I foresee a new disaster!") with, for example, the constant, very modern­sounding use of "damn." As director, Thomas drew consistently good performances from the actors and (I assume) collaborated with them in the continually lively (and never vulgar) use of stage business.

A repeated device (apparently growing out of the translation) was the sudden, hilarious deflating of some­thing flowery by a not­at­all­flowery comic thrust. ("Eugenia can mine."") *"Why CAN'T she be yours?"") The performance was no museum piece; there may have been little sense of eighteenth­cen­tury Italy, but there was a real sense of living people. The actors, in the first place, managed to cope with dialogue well out of the modern real­ity and not come off as silly enough to create the obstacles which was disappointing, but the stu­dents were thrilled at every moment.

Their technique was consistent and nearly flawless; their selections were tasteful, balanced and varied; their interpretation never allowed the or­chestra to obtrude upon the individual qualities of the music itself.

In addition, Max Rudolf was mag­nificant, in absolute control of the slightest nuance, at every moment, He "played" the orchestra, to an extreme rarely seen. His first bow. As for the boors who left in fury, one could still get main floor seats for this which was disappointing, but the stu­dents were thrilled at every moment.
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A Response To Douglas Lackey's "Hollow Crown"

By JOHN P. DELLERA


Douglas Lackey would have us believe that all kinds of awful, generally unforeseen consequences shall issue from the American involvement in Vietnam. The "first line of defense of democratic freedoms" is seriously challenged by Mr. Johnson's "illegal" use of force, he says, and we stand in "need of authoritative government" caused by Johnson's "lack of respect for the people." The "public officials, including the President, are subservient to the law." Moreover, "the actions of the United States may constitute a violation of the law, and it is completely emasculated (the U.N.) as to its neutrality."

He neglected it altogether, defied its primacy, he charges, and continued the Truman-Eisenhower-Vietnam war after the U.S. issued the "American honor" and even contributed to a "deep-seated loss of the moral fiber.

Mr. Lackey apparently believes these things because his reading of "SALT OF THE EARTH." Only 13 U.S. theatres dared play it. A drama of the struggle of the Mexican-American zinc miners and their wives for equality, Winner of France's (International) Grand Prize for best film of 1955. At Lansing's Unitarian Universalist Church, 129 Prowsep St., Feb. 12, at 8 p.m. All admissions $1. A presentation of the EXPLORING CINEMA SOCIETY.

Wanted

WANTED: Young woman to sublet male grotto. Must be neat! Phone 351-5529.

WANTED—Good-looking Scorpio or Aquarius genius. Must be neat! Phone 351-5529.

WANTED—One or two male roommates for new three-bedroom duplex. $50-55/month. Phone 351-5529.

WANTED: One or two roommates for new two-bedroom apartment in Isabella. Call 351-0610, 1723 Hassert Road. In case anyone cares, this is where the editors live.)

Service

PAUL ANN HAUCKEY, Typist, IBM Selective and Executive, Multifit Offset Printing, personal data typing etc. Next campus. 3537-3527.

USED ROCK AND ROLL band, priced to play, Eddy X, For bookings: Ronnie Enke, 47-6321.

PHOTO PORTRAITS by Justin Keesthema, Call 352-3525.

Abortion

If you oppose bombing North Vietnam, or the "political opinion" telegram to Morse, senator of your choice, urging, that he step up the fight for peace.

Also, Article 4(2) states: "If, in the opinion of any of the parties, the inadmissibility or the inactivity of the Security Council in exercising its functions under any of the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article for a period of any time or in any way other than by armed attack or is affected by any other public or international situation which might endanger the peace of the world or a situation which might shall consult immediately in order to agree upon the course of action which should be taken for the common defense."

South Vietnam was designated a "protected zone" within the meaning of Article 4(1), and since its territory has been under direct attack from the North, it is a legal state. The United States military aid is completely legitimized by both the terms of the SEATO treaty and by the U.N. Charter. Mr. Lackey might object to this analysis on the dubious grounds that "South Vietnam is not a legal state" and so, therefore, could not enter into any international agreement other than SEATO. What constitutes a "legal state" is a highly tentative question which, if explored, is beyond the world today reveals the complete analytical confusion and has caused much difference of opinion.

The "People's Republic of China," it is rather legal in the United States, but it is no "legal state" in London or Paris. The Government of South Vietnam has "legal power" over all of the country "from the 4th of July to the gate of Nam-Quan," and the United Nations with the exchange of ambassadors, etc., has the ability to at least the southern jurisdiction.

But secondly, Mr. Lackey might disrupt an approach to offensive measures on the grounds that "no vote on the question has been taken and I do not know of anyone who has ever said that..."

Mr. Lackey's reading of "two exceptions" to Article 4(2) appears to support the "use of force," in an acceptable case for the legality of U.S. actions. Article 51(2) provides:

Nothing in the preceding Charter precludes the establishment of regional arrangements or schemes for dealing with matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action. The organs of the United Nations and other international agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.

It is clear that U.S. assistance to South Vietnam is both within the "legal power" and the spirit of Article 51(2) to the extent that our direct military actions are taken through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Mr. Lackey observes, however, that SEATO included the territories of all parties to the treaty, the North Vietnamese, and he reads the treaty specifically refers only to the "treaties" which is defined by Article 8:

As used in this Treaty, the "treaty area" is the general area of Southeast Asia, including the territories of the parties to the treaty, and the general area of the Southeast Pacific. The term includes the Pacific Ocean to a distance of 21 degrees 30 minutes north latitude..."}

The justification of activity taken in Vietnam can be seen in Article 4(1) of the treaty:

Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area is an act of any State or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate as the "area in which the force may be applied."

If a woman dies on the abortionist's tard (moralists have rather a strange idea of the "tard") —then there is no reason to exist. The abortionist would have no reason to exist. Freedom and birth to him.

Thisthrough abortion is nothing more than a tool of sexual repression wielded against women. It is not to give birth to a person, but to have a feeling that upon which is one of the most tiresome cliches of the war: "The Saigon government does not have the power..."

The reading of an objective history reveals that while the Saigon government may not have the power to "puppets," they do have some basis in levity, and, they could be more credible than the 1961 vote in New Guinea which no one ever complained about, and both President Diem and his many successors have been even more seriously different with the U.S. if they could be...
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