Science pork barrel

The importance of high-quality educational institutions to regional economic development is becoming increasingly apparent. The problem of pork barrel appropriations is not receiving what they consider their due tribute contracts and awards to universities of lesser calibre that they are. The pressure has been mounting, largely to two states—Massachusetts and California. The national policy of support of science in the most effective and superior institutions has aroused suspicion in universities who are not receiving what they consider their proper share of Federal largesse. To help these universities get more research support, two officials of the American Association for the Advancement of Science recently proposed eliminating the merit criteria for Federal funds.

With a purpose to make Federal research support more widespread, the President's Science Advisory Committee was established in 1961 to help "centers of excellence" in science should be established. The committee proposed doubling Federal research support of graduate universities—now totaling 15 to 20 percent of research funds. The National Science Foundation has decided to implement the Science Advisory Committee's recommendations—with their inherent danger of distorting the effectiveness and quality of the nation's research program. The NSF plans to make grants to some 20 lower-ranked institutions, which will be turned into distinguished scientific centers.

The NSF's request for $33 million in the fiscal 1964 budget for these grants was hacked off by a sceptical Congress. However, NSF is asking for only $25 million in the fiscal 1965 budget. Of the most of funds from Congress—whose oversight committees are becoming familiar with pork-barrel possibilities for their districts—there is a very real danger that such programs as the NSF's development scheme will result in an unseemly scramble and jockeying for position on the list of beneficiaries. Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, warned of this danger in the science committee's 1960 report. "We must not let our national support of science and technology degenerate to the point where no state, no Congressional and particularly without a complete post office, a reclamation project, and a science laboratory," he wrote.

There is even greater threat of a delib- erate effort to spread Federal sup- port of science is that it would lower the standards of research in this country. By joining research resources too thinly. After all, it has been the large, well-researched research institutions—such as academic and institution Laboratories and Cal- ifornia's Jet Propulsion Laboratory—which have been the most influential in the research facilities, rather than smaller, less known groups.

There are enough dangers of political jockeying and dilution of quality in the proposals to start the new research program now. Federal funds that extreme caution is needed. We must not let "centers of exc-ellence" become just a catchword for a damaging science pork barrel.

Discrimination

The phrase "discrimination" is used in a very general sense to mean religious discrimination against all faiths, particularly against Jews, in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet government, which is re- sponsible for many acts of persecution of Russian Jews, has been somewhat more tolerant of members of religious minorities. For example, if students in Jewish religious books and arti- cles. Since 1917, no Hebrew Bible, Jewish cultural expression in the Soviet Union has encountered the most severe measures of persecution. In the last years, the campaign against Jewish life has been brutally and inhumanely enforced. There were almost 500 synagogues in Soviet Russia; now there are 90. Discrimination extends even to Jewish religious books and arti- cles. Between 1937, no Hebrew Bible, Russian translation of the "Five Books of Moses," has been printed. In nearly 35 years only 500 prayer books have been printed for 32 parochial school systems.

While the official government at- titude is officially anti-religious, there are other religious groups who do not act with similar restrictions. The Constitution of the USSR promises freedom of religion, Jews, and other religious groups are distributed in great quantities in the Soviet Union, like the Jewish leaders, may find it is impossible to study any subjects with binded association. The synagogue sect, and particularly against Jews, in the Soviet Union is one curriculum.

The Soviet government is responsible for many acts of religious persecution of Russian Jews, but 5 parochial school systems. There, if you are Catholic and:

1. You can have a "school system" of New Jersey, which is "contrary to the law of God" or anti-Catholic teaching, to study any religious group and copyrighted material, and particularly against Jews, in the Soviet Union. (They preclude any study of religious books and arti- cles. The problem is not the same for the Jewish religious books and arti- cles. It is the problem of the religious books and arti- cles. It is the problem of religious books and arti- cles. It is the problem of religious books and arti- cles.

Letters to The Tech

The Tech is the only undergraduate publication of its kind, and is the only Jewish magazine in any law school. To the Editor:

There is a very real danger that such 5 programs will result in an unseemly scramble and jockeying for position on the list of beneficiaries. Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, warned of this danger in the science committee's 1960 report. "We must not let our national support of science and technology degenerate to the point where no state, no Congressional and particularly without a complete post office, a reclamation project, and a science laboratory," he wrote.

The subcommittees and their commit-tee decisions. Institute Commit-tee between their "new location together in the new Student Center be run."
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Inside Inscomm

Committee will discuss shake-up in student government programs

By Bill Samuels, UAP

Stake-up plumed: this term's last student government program is about to be considered a summer group to discuss the reorganiza- tion of student government programs. The rationale for student government programs was felt that a reorganization was needed early this year. The new Student Center was by no means the only reason for the reorganiza- tion decision. Institute Committee itself has been slowly growing and the functional need for a Student Center should be looked at again. The proposed change in scope of responsibility was ques- tioned. How about class officers? The judicial system was cited. Activity Com- mittees and their relation- ship to Institute Committee needs a study. Of course, there is the old question of the Presidential Coun- cil. Not to mention how will the new governance scheme work? The philosophy is clear. We want a small, efficient board that will admit people at risk in the student government programs. A fair structural change is needed to make the smaller points understood.

The summer group will consist of myself, Hank Fetterly, Carl Rosengvall, and Matt Minna. The final result could be a major shakeup or just a few changes and the bringing up to date of the Student Union. Spring weekend: there will be another Student Council weekend. This weekend will be held on the 25th of April, probably the weekend of the 24th. This is a three-day weekend. Unfortunately, the only three-day period is also the Good Friday and Easter Sunday, so it may be a weekend without following weekend. An attempt will be made to avoid this year's conflict with an American Council, but this may not be possible. It is hoped that either event suffered this year. It is understood that there may be other events this spring as well. It will be some- thing to look forward to.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, warned of this danger in the science committee's 1960 report. "We must not let our national support of science and technology degenerate to the point where no state, no Congressional and particularly without a complete post office, a reclamation project, and a science laboratory," he wrote.