25 April 1968

FACULTY FORUM PAPERS
Oregon State University

Dear Colleagues:

The paper by Messrs. Wilkins and Hull sought reactions to a proposed amalgamation of Science with Humanities and Social Sciences. My reactions are admittedly unpolished, but I feel they are cogent.

For the proposed College to succeed, we must FIRST have one, and preferably two, preexisting conditions.

First, a Dean willing to accept the post, who is endowed with proper aggressiveness and a suitably broad academic outlook. The aggressiveness must be tenacious without belligerence. The breadth must be across lines of professional traditionalism, across lines of teaching and research, and across lines of graduate and undergraduate emphasis.

Second, we need a much more substantial University commitment to the Honors Program already in existence. Until we can show the little College will work, leave the big one alone.

I am delighted the Faculty Forum Papers have come to be. On with the debate.

WILLIAM F. LOWRY
Student Draft Deferment

Should college men have a draft deferment?

A Presidential candidate speaking to OSU students recently questioned their right to deferments and broadly charged discrimination on the basis of wealth or race. Having "let them have it", according to the press report, he called for a "lottery to replace the present deferment system". Thus, many college men students got unsettled in their confidence that their deferments really have the justification of future, more needed, and effective national service than they could have rendered upon graduation from high school. His verbal battering of the student deferrees here at OSU and elsewhere shoved onto these young men a burden of implied guilt for social "imbalance" in uniform caused by factors (like reenlistment) beyond the control of influence of the individual students struggling to find themselves and to attain excellence in their own callings.

We on the committees which sponsor convocation speakers, needless to say, cannot take responsibility for all that such speakers say. But all of us on the faculty do have to prepare ourselves to advise students to avoid impulsive responses to such flights of purple rhetoric as that of the speaker cited above.

In time of war any deferred man might feel pangs of self-doubt because of his status. But the entire concept of deferments supposes that they will largely result in maximizing the direct or supporting military effectiveness of the nation's manpower, either in uniformed or in civilian roles. We cannot afford to play roulette with the nation's brainpower, which should study first and serve later.

The draft does not pretend equality of peril, comfort, or glory. Intended as selective service, the draft system aims at a war-time need for each man to serve where and when the national needs and his personal qualifications best place him.

Non-shirking college students need the steadying influence of faculty advisors to offset florid oratory of visiting politicos. We have the opportunity to encourage the successful student in his accomplishment and also to help the uncertain student find the area in which education can enhance his ability for later service. Many of us have steered young men into alternative programs when they got discouraged about their academic accomplishment and felt inclined to "enlist and get it over with". We as faculty members render a tangible national service when we thereby keep these young men advancing toward higher service functions.
One can hope that individual students will get deferred to study as either undergraduate or graduate students so long as they advance in needed categories, and we can hope that no arbitrary cut-off will force all of them, ready or not, into uniform without regard to the nation's defense need for some men of the most highly advanced education.

Each OSU commencement sees many graduates doffing academic regalia and assuming the uniformed responsibilities for which they prepared while deferred. Many OSU alumni serve today more effectively in either the active or the reserve forces because of their preparation to do so while attending OSU.

We can all raise some valid questions about the draft and national policy, such as the matter of trade and aid for nations which materially support the enemy who kills our draftees and volunteers. But let us on the faculty bolster the morale and constructively advise the young men who conscientiously improve themselves to serve America while deferred to attend college.

Fred W. Decker  
Associate Professor of Physics  
Member, Convocations and Lectures Committee and Pre-Medical Advisory Committee

Fred W. Decker
Why Work at Teaching?  G. W. Maloof

With more emphasis each year on research activities on campus, should a corresponding de-emphasis on teaching and advising be a consequence? One is tempted to state a flat "no" and argue, if pressed, that research is "learning" and "keeping up". Certainly this view is valid, when kept in context.

But the current policies of one of our larger schools seem to go much beyond simply recognizing the value of research with reference to the basic responsibility of this University: to teach its students.

Despite the large and growing research budget, most of the support for this institution still comes from the Oregon taxpayer, who thinks his money is going to buy the best possible teaching for our students. Moreover, our students are still mostly undergraduates. Whatever else, the Mosser awards were a clear statement of the views of the Oregon Legislature on this point.

How, then, does an administrator discharge his obligation to evaluate and promote teaching?

Does he deny a professor tenure who has received multiple awards and recognition for teaching?

Does he refuse to promote several others even when they have professional stature and current publications in "good" journals?

Does he substitute number for quality in evaluating publication records?

I feel that it is partly because of "administration" like this that students across the nation have begun to feel that only the students can save our Universities.

I agree that we want people primarily interested in research; I say only that we also need people primarily interested in teaching. Above all, we need administrators sensitive to the difference, who respect both talents.

Giles Wilson Maloof
Assistant Professor of Mathematics
School of Science