

SEP 3 1971

Ever since a spirited debate of the ROTC-credits issue at the general faculty meeting of late spring, followed at the same meeting by a show-of-hands vote on whether to allow the granting of 16 credit hours of Military Science toward the 192 hours required for graduation from Moorhead State College, a number of us have not felt that this faculty yet has full and satisfactory answers to some of the following points.

1. Does the majority of this faculty really accept the argument made by some of its members who drew a parallel between Moorhead State College's Internship program and Student-teaching versus ROTC to the effect that these programs all are similar if not equal--that the departments of the college relinquish control over the outside agency and evaluation of the interns/student-teachers as does the college over ROTC course content and qualification of instructors?
2. Do we accept the implications of a colleague's remark made at last spring's faculty meeting to the effect that a general faculty gathering is better informed and more properly democratic to decide the ROTC question than are especially appointed ad hoc committees of CC&I and the Faculty Senate whose parent bodies each twice voted to discontinue accepting ROTC credits toward graduation from this college??
3. And how can we be satisfied with the Administration's going along with a close vote of 74 to 66 (total 140 vs. total faculty of 330) as a mandate for continuing the granting of 16 hours of credit in Military Science courses toward 192 hours required for graduation from MSC???
4. What reasons are behind the desire to continue ROTC on this campus? Is there a central control which brings pressure to bear upon this college to offer a Military Science program? Is there Federal funding involved? Has the State of Minnesota or the State College Board reason(s) to wish this college to offer credit for military instruction? Are we, as a college, merely accommodating our sister institution in the Tri-College University? Or, are we drifting along with a trend--having no positive stand on the issue either way???
5. Why can we not hold the position that curricula at this college shall be only for the professing of peaceful philosophies and pursuits? Can we not attempt to set aside emotional bias; purposefully separate the ROTC issue from the Vietnam War; and insist simply, quietly, and calmly that for any intents and purposes Moorhead State College shall be for PEACE?
6. Why can we not, with objectivity, with serene steadfastness, let this college state plainly that it will no longer offer, accept, nor condone any course appealing to Man's instinct to deny, exploit, dominate or destroy another human; that this college will, instead, strive to gain strengths which make it possible to offer to all who come here the best kinds of reasons to preserve the values that matter and to promote additional values obtained from JOY in the creating of good things for the body, mind and the spirit???

We would, therefore, propose that we conscientiously pursue activity of discussion and information-sharing of facts and opinions regarding the ROTC-credits question as well as foreseeable effects of implementation of the change. And after suitable time a referendum call be made through circulation of a petition to bring this issue to a vote; that ALL voting members of the whole faculty VOTE by secret Faculty-Mail ballot.