Maharishi thought spreads

By John Kavanajian

With rising tuition, closing NASA centers, and dwindling government contracts, all testifying to a shortage of research money MIT faces a financial squeeze from still another direction. The source of this squeeze is the latest Senate version of the Mansfield Amendment.

Specifically, the problem involves section 203 of the research and development appropriations bill, the so-called Mansfield Amendment.

"None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this act may be used to carry out any research project or study unless such project or study has a direct and apparent relationship to a specific military function or purpose.

In essence, DOD sponsorship of research contracts will have to be tied to a direct and apparent military project. Thus, any nondefense-oriented research could be cut off. One important fact is clear: for this year, at least, none of the funds once allocated to non-military defense spending will find their way into the department of Transportation, HEW, or other social research oriented organizations. Stimulation of the back will be taken up by redirection of research, but a good deal of the funds will find their way into research and development contracts on the Safeguard and other fighter systems.

As is the MIT is concerned, a major part of the squeeze will come to the area of noninvolvement in DOD sponsored research grants. For example, during the summer of 1969 MIT accepted or extended approximately 1.75 million dollars in research contracts. Of this amount, about $42,000 was provided by the Army, Navy, and Air Force research sections. Under direct enforcement of the Mansfield Amendment, almost half of this amount would be jeopardized.

A basic question to be re solved concerns now strictly this provision will be enforced. At this time, plans call for self enforcement by a Defense Department committee which would review any non-defense or DOD sponsored research contracts, though presumably within a new context. As in the past, the Senate Appropriations committee has the final say. Unless each of these bodies abandons responsibility and chooses to ignore the amendment, there will dual enforcement per
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