

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting, November 16, 1981

ATTENDANCE

Present: Ackley, Bailey, Barnard, Barritt, Beck, Bishop, Brooks, D. Brown, Martin, Caffesse, Cares, Carter, Cassidy, Cooper, Crane, Dixon, Stephenson, Easley, Esteban, Evans, Frost, Gray, Green, Groves, Hildebrandt, Hollinger, Hultquist, T. Green for Kahn, Keren, Kirkpatrick, Loup, Meyer, Millard, Morash, Mosher, Nagy, O'Meara, Regezi, Rinne, Senior, Smith, Tek, Tentler, White, Wieland, Hagen, Wynne.

Absent: Burdi, Carpenter, Dahl, De Kornfeld, Dobel, Abdel-Massih, Friedman, Haddock, Hilbert, Kesling, Liepman, Lockwood, Lynch, Maassab, Pollock, Ringler, Romani, Root, Vinter, Weiner, Young.

MINUTES

The Minutes of October 19 were approved.

ANNOUNCE-
MENTS

Chairman M. Brown called the meeting to order at 3:17 p.m. After approval of the minutes, Professor Brown introduced Judith Nowack, executive assistant to SACUA.

REVISION OF
REGENTS'
BYLAW 11.214

The proposed revision would permit the president to choose two Executive Officers to serve as ex officio members of the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics; the current bylaw specifies two particular vice presidents. Professor Bishop asked whether "ex officio" in this context means simply "without vote." Professor Brown replied that this was his understanding. Professor Bishop added that the bylaw also describes the faculty representative to the Big 10 conference as "ex officio without vote." Professor Barrett asked why the change was proposed, why SACUA had met with Professor Anton, and whether it is true that student nominations to the Board in Control go directly to the regents while faculty nominations go first to the president. Professor Brown replied that the purpose of the change is to give the president greater flexibility in making appointments and that faculty representatives are chosen, in closed session, by the regents, from a slate, nominated by SACUA, containing twice as many candidates as there are positions to be filled.

DEFENSE-
RELATED
RESEARCH

Professor R. Kahn presented the report of the Research Policies Committee on research sponsored by the Department of Defense. He reported that 3.5% of the University's research money comes from the Defense Department; 16% of this (approximately 1/2% of the total) is for classified research. All research at the University must comply with a 1976 regental policy prohibiting (a) restrictions on publication for more than one year and (b) any research whose clearly foreseeable result is the destruction of human life. In view of (a), research at the University can be classified only in the sense that the researchers have access to classified information. All proposals for classified research require the approval of a committee consisting this year of Professors Massad and Stedman and a student, Bruce Goldman.

Some defense funds support meetings, but the research supported is primarily in materials engineering, theoretical physics, and chemistry. No change in directions of research, due to defense funding, has occurred yet; but it is difficult to predict the future.

Of \$21.3 billion for research in the defense budget, \$723 million are for basic research, a real increase of 9% over last year. Of these dollars, \$300 million go to universities and \$180 million to industry; the rest are for research done by the Defense Department itself. An increase in ROTC scholarships and predoctoral defense support in science and engineering is expected soon; by contrast, the budget of non-defense agencies like the National Science Foundation is decreasing. The shift toward defense support of research and away from other sources is a national policy over which the University has no control.

Elizabeth Bouts asked whether the hiring of G. Gamota (as director of the Institute for Science and Technology) implied anything about future trends in the University's attitude toward defense research. Professor Kahn replied that the difficulty in predicting the future, that he had referred to, meant primarily faculty attitudes, not University policy. He sees the pressure toward defense research as coming, not from University policy, but from the fact that the defense budget has increased while the budgets of other research sponsors (National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities) have decreased. In particular, he sees Gamota as more interested in promoting University interaction with industry than in promoting defense research.

Brad Hydan asked about the work of the classified research committee and about enforcement of the "human life" policy in the case of unclassified research. Professor Kahn replied that, of eight proposals received in the last two years, one was rejected by the classified research review committee, and five of the other seven were eventually funded. All research proposals, classified or not, require the approval of Vice Presi-

dent Overberger; if there is any question about their propriety under the regents' guidelines, they are sent to the classified research committee.

Professor D. Rucknagel raised the following four points. (1) The alacrity with which Gamota seemed to embrace defense funding has led to fears that the regental guidelines will be winked at. Concerns of this sort arose once before, and the classified research committee at that time was found not to be as neutral as the guidelines intended. He hopes that the University will reaffirm its intent to abide by the spirit of the guidelines. He also expressed concern that, since one member of the review committee is not a U.S. citizen, difficulties with security clearance may deny the committee access to information that it needs in order to do its work. (2) He is concerned with the pace of the arms race and fears that military research, much of it on college campuses, may decrease national security. (3) The Defense Department is eager for liaison with academicians. He fears that, despite civilian control of the military, a wholesale switch to defense funding would result in military co-optation of academic research. He stressed the importance of keeping the University really free. (4) In view of the strong temptation to seek Defense Department money, he hopes that students and faculty will look closely at its implications.

In response to point(1), Professor Kahn said that he sees no evidence of this "alacrity." If anything, the University's defense research has flattened out. He also said that the classified research committee can do its job without security clearance. In connection with point (3), he said that "wholesale switch" is an overstatement. He contrasted the Defense Department's budget for research at universities with the \$3 billion budget of the National Institutes of Health. Defense-sponsored research is not a large proportion of the total, though it is growing. Finally, he said that many of the issues raised were matters of national policy that should be addressed to the government, not the University.

Professor Bailey asked whether the policies on classified research and on human life are separate. Professor Kahn replied that they are part of a single policy, but that the human life rule applies to all research, not just classified research.

M. Brown thanked Professor Kahn for his report and Professor Rucknagel for his comments.

ADJOURN-
MENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas Blass
Senate Secretary