(Continued from page 1) In addition to discussing the report on international commitments, the Ad Hoc Committee reviewed a plan for cooperation with MIT's United Way fund drive, heard a report on the $225 million Leadership Campaign, and briefly discussed MIT's role on Boston's Phase II school desegregation plan.

Confusion and disagreements over the wording of two motions presented by the Ad Hoc Committee's chairman Professor of Economics Charles Kindleberger occupied most of the faculty's time and attention at the meeting. The two motions, the result of six months of work by the ten-member committee, proposed to establish a structure for review of educational, research, and service programs by MIT and MIT faculty when those programs involve foreign government or institutions (see Analysis, Page 1).

The motions were discussed for more than an hour, as faculty members debated whether the proposed process of review was political or educational and "political" - the committee suggested a two-tiered structure to deal with them. Educational issues would go to the committee already dealing with them, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and Graduate School Policy (GSP). "Political" issues - questions about the suitability of programs, about whether MIT should deal with a given country - would be referred to a new Committee on International Institutional Commitments (CIIC) for advice - but not approval. The Ad Hoc Committee has defined the membership of the CIIC, laid down the line of issues between the two tiers of organization, and was apparently satisfied with its result.

The faculty was not particularly pleased that a number of Kindelberger and other committee members to clarify, define, guide, just as they had laid down stricter standards for questions about standards for the CEP. The committee apparently preferred to leave these matters to the CEP.

What is an international program, they asked, and when did it become national instead of personal? How do you distinguish between educational programs and research programs if you aren't sure about the political? Can MIT avoid all political issues, as it has tried to do so many times in the past? What would be the effect of the committee's suggestions on the CEP and GSP, the individual faculty member, the ad hoc committee or symposium with foreign participants, the research contracts?

Disappointment seemed to be in the air. Professor of Electrical Engineering Louis Smullin, a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, admitted his own astonishment at the report: "I felt there are issues where one ought not take a neutral stand, where one should take some stand on this government or that program." And Professor Jerome Wiesner, who headed the committee, said, "I realize the impossibility of writing any kind of general guidelines into this report. But this document carefully skirts all political issues...and it disturbs me."

And Professor Jerome Wiesner, remarked that "MIT has never had a formal procedure for passing on political issues, we proposed a new Committee on International Institutional Commitments (CIIC) for advice - but not approval. The Ad Hoc Committee has defined the membership of the CIIC, laid down the line of issues between the two tiers of organization, and was apparently satisfied with its result.
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