

# FINAL REPORT OF THE MINORITY AD HOC SENATE COMMITTEE ON ROTC

## FOREWORD

The undersigned members of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on ROTC submit the following Minority Report with recommendations for the improvement of ROTC at Stanford University. This Minority Report is based upon the following fundamental position.

For the foreseeable future, this nation will require armed forces of considerable size, and will require substantial numbers of well-educated and well-trained officers to lead them. The ROTC programs have been for many years the principal means for providing such officers for the permanent forces or for reserve components. Participation by such installations as Stanford University in the ROTC programs, voluntary on the part of the University and voluntary on the part of its students, is therefore of considerable importance to the nation. Moreover, maintenance of ROTC programs on the campus provides a desirable opportunity for those students who wish to earn a military commission and thus meet their military service obligations as commissioned officers.

In the proceedings of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on ROTC there has been no evidence presented to show that ROTC programs are inimical to the fundamental interests of Stanford University or its students. On balance, it has been shown that the availability of ROTC programs is beneficial to the University, particularly in its financial aid programs for students. If for these reasons, the University concludes that it should participate in ROTC, the University is obligated to support ROTC in conditions that offer reasonable assurances of vitality and worth to its students, as well as to the military services.

It is the judgment of the minority members of the Committee that ROTC cannot survive as an extra-curricular activity separated from the academic structure of the University. Indeed, we consider that such separation is inconsistent with a decision to continue ROTC at Stanford and would be tantamount to abolition.

On the other hand, the minority members are firmly convinced that a number of important improvements should and can be made in ROTC to meet the legitimate criticisms of its present form and to place ROTC in an appropriate relationship to the academic structure of the University.

The improvements we propose retain military studies of worthy academic quality and proven interest to substantial numbers of Stanford students as academic programs. Removal of these studies from the curriculum would deprive Stanford students of existing opportunities for relevant academic inquiry without accompanying benefit to any other constituency of the University.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The minority members of the Senate *ad hoc* Committee on ROTC recommend:

1. That ROTC continue at Stanford University;
2. That ROTC continue to be part of the academic program of the University with specific provision for a closer integration of ROTC into its academic structure;
3. That ROTC programs be modified with respect to the organization and administration of ROTC, the status of and appointment procedures for its instructional staff, the

curriculum, and the contractual relationships between the military services and the University and between the services and Stanford students.

4. That, to accomplish the above recommendations, the following program for ROTC be instituted at Stanford,

## AN IMPROVED ROTC PROGRAM FOR STANFORD

The minority members reject the premise that a substantive case for or against ROTC at Stanford has been established upon purely institutional considerations. Many subjective judgments about the proper educational role of the University are involved in such a premise. Many different opinions exist within the University about what constitutes valid service to external concerns and interests. While it is possible to conceive that under certain circumstances the presence of ROTC could be inimical to Stanford, we do not find that presence, in actuality, to be a threat to the integrity of the University. We do find that over the years institutional relationships for ROTC established by contract and law have become archaic and in need of reform. Therefore we have mainly responded to the charge of the Senate of the Academic Council by proposing reforms that will establish suitable relationships for ROTC. We believe the program which we recommend for ROTC at Stanford will, upon critical evaluation, be found to emend those features which the majority members considered most objectionable in the present program.

Our position rests upon the belief that a point by point comparison of the following program and the objections raised to ROTC by the majority report will affirm that ROTC can be continued at Stanford as a compatible and worthwhile academic endeavor.

## Departmental Structure

The Departments of Military Science, Naval Science, and Aerospace Studies shall be combined into a Department of Military Studies. The Chairmanship of this single department shall be rotated among the heads of ROTC Units. A distinction shall be made between the Department of Military Studies and the ROTC Units. The Department of Military Studies shall be a part of the academic structure of the University. The ROTC Units shall be administrative agencies with the function of serving students preparing for a commission in the Armed Forces. The Units shall administer scholarships and contracts, conduct extra-curricular sessions, and advise students on preparation for commissioning. The three units of the Department of Military Studies shall receive University administrative support as the Provost may designate. *Rationale:*

The present arrangement of three separate military science departments results in an excessive administrative overhead and overrepresentation at councils of departmental chairmen not warranted by the size of these departments' instructional staff or the variety of their course offerings. Different budgeting, personnel administration, and reporting in the three military services, however, do require that each ROTC Unit be administratively separate. The ROTC Units will

appropriately operate at Stanford as administrative agencies of the military services, and not as direct sponsors for academic programs.

#### *Organization of Military Studies Programs*

A program of Military Science, of Naval Science, and of Aerospace Studies shall be offered in the Stanford curriculum under the aegis of a Military Studies Committee. The Committee shall be appointed by the Senate and be composed of four Professors from the University at large, the senior military officer from each ROTC unit of the Department of Military Studies, and four undergraduate students (two of whom will be enrolled in ROTC and two from the university-at-large).

The Military Studies Committee shall determine credit for courses offered by the Department of Military Studies, shall determine the curriculum for the Military Studies Programs, and shall review the qualifications of military officers recommended for appointment to instructional positions. The Military Studies Committee shall be responsible to the Committee on Undergraduate Education. Proposed military science courses which appropriately fall into the category of Undergraduate Specials shall be submitted to the Committee on Undergraduate Education for approval. The Military Studies Programs shall include those courses which are necessary to qualify students for a commission through the ROTC programs, and are available for students who wish to attain a background knowledge of military art and science. The Programs shall include accredited courses offered by the Department of Military Studies, courses offered in other departments of the University, and any approved military science Undergraduate Specials.

*Rationale:* The determination of programs of military study, review and of appointments of military teachers and adjudication of course credit by a Military Studies Committee will fix responsibility for military studies at the University in a manner more consistent with institutional practices. The military services, under this arrangement, will assume more a role of an accrediting body with respect to curriculum.

Other features of this proposal which seem beneficial are: (1) the provision for continual review and upgrading of military studies programs, (2) the attractiveness to able military officers, providing for appointment of those officers who can make the most substantial academic contributions to the University, (3) the involvement of students and non-military faculty along with military officers in determining the military studies to be undertaken, and (4) a reduction of the sense of isolation of military teachers within the academic community.

The extent of the nation's gross national product that is allocated for defense and the fact that warfare unhappily continues adds relevancy to this field of academic study. A fear that a militaristic view will prevail is unfounded from the evidence this committee has received, and in any event, the military point of view can be leavened by a standing committee which is pluralistic in perspective and reflects the values of the University.

#### *Academic Rank*

The senior military officer of each unit of the Department of Military Studies shall have the rank and title of *Professor* of Military Science, Naval Science, and Aerospace Studies, respectively, with the same perquisites which now pertain to those positions.

All other military officers of the instructional staff shall have the rank and title of *Lecturer*, with the privileges and perquisites which now pertain to that position.

In the event that officers who ordinarily would be appointed Lecturer have unusual qualifications, the Military Studies Committee may recommend appointment as Assistant or Associate Professor for the term of their anticipated presence at Stanford.

*Rationale:* The rank of Professor for the senior military officer appointed to each ROTC unit is considered appropriate to his experience, knowledge and responsibilities, and is stipulated in present law.

This academic rank also attracts to ROTC assignments better senior officers with about twenty-four years of broad military experience and education. Membership in the Academic Council provides a means for desirable involvement by the senior military officer in university affairs.

Since no direct correlation between military education and experience and regular academic credentials exists it seems appropriate to make "Lecturer" the normal appointment for more junior military officers. This rank is consistent with that accorded well-qualified individuals from the professions and the community who teach courses at Stanford. However, when special competence is available or found, a provision for professorial appointment of these officers is warranted.

#### *Appointment Procedures*

Those to be considered for appointment to the rank of Professor shall go through the normal review and appointment procedure, or as close to that procedure as is possible. The following procedure is proposed.

- a. The Service concerned will submit a panel of nominations, together with their credentials, to the President of the University. The credentials will include: (1) Personal resume. (2) Educational record, including transcripts of academic work, service school attendance, etc. (3) Evidence of instructional and other faculty-type experience.
- b. The President will submit the nominations to the Military Studies Committee for review and recommendation. It is intended that the Committee for this purpose, would function as a school or department faculty "search committee." Regular Advisory Board recommendation forms will be prepared as completely as possible.
- c. The service concerned shall be prepared to present at least the Committee's preferred candidate for interview by the Committee and the President (or his designated representative).
- d. The Committee will then submit its recommended and preferred candidate to the Provost for review at that level.
- e. The Provost will submit the recommendation to the Advisory Board for consideration. It is assumed that the



Advisory Board will review the cases in the light of the special considerations in the same way that it takes into account other appointments in other professional fields.

- f. Following Advisory Board action, the recommendation will follow the usual course to the Board of Trustees for final action.

For those to be considered for appointment as Lecturers, the procedure shall be the same as for professors, except that the recommendation need not be submitted to the Advisory Board.

In the event that a junior officer is proposed for an assistant or associate professor, the candidate would be processed through the same channel as are professors of military programs.

*Rationale:* The foregoing proposals provide a procedure closely akin to the normal procedure for faculty appointments. The major difference is of course the initial search mechanism which is conducted through the heads of ROTC units and their respective military services. The minority members considered the title of Visiting Professor but rejected it on the basis that deviations from the norm would be greater with this title than under the procedures outlined. Visiting professors are typically appointed for one year, and have no administrative responsibility. Senior military officer appointments are usually for a period of three years. Senior military officers are responsible for direction of their programs as well as representation to other elements of the University.

#### *Academic Credit*

The courses of the Department of Military Studies which are approved by the Military Studies Committee shall be offered for degree credit. Instruction desirable for potential military officers but considered by the Military Studies Committee to be of a narrow training scope shall be conducted as extra-curricular sessions. Assuming that studies in military history and national security affairs will, in the future, be available in other departments, degree credit for courses offered by the Department of Military Studies shall not exceed 18 quarter units or 12 semester units or their equivalent in a four-year curriculum.

*Rationale:* The military science and studies courses which meet University standards should not be excluded arbitrarily from the curriculum or credit. The evidence before this committee has indicated that most of the courses offered in the military sciences are equivalent in quality to those of other departments. A few, such as Naval Orientation, have been generally acknowledged to be of a narrow training nature and credit will not be sought for these and similar courses. The proposed limitation on total degree credit is not the result of a bargaining process resulting in a compromise limit. Eighteen quarter units or 12 semester units over a four-year period represents our judgment on courses existing and planned for the military studies curricula which are likely to be deemed worthy of academic credit and at the same time meet the needs of the services. Additionally it is believed that this proposed limitation on academic credit for military studies will insure ROTC students the flexibility to undertake their other academic responsibilities without incurring an undue overload. Wherever possible, courses offered by other departments of the University should be substituted for military-taught

courses, thus further reducing the amount of degree credit and student overload.

#### *Student Contracts*

Individual contracts between students and the military departments shall be changed to clearly reflect actual practices. Specifically any ROTC student—either those on financial assistance or associated on another contractual basis—must be assured in writing that he may disenroll from ROTC within the first two years of a four-year program without prejudice or obligation.

*Rationale:* The practice has always been to disenroll any ROTC student without prejudice for future military service and without obligation during his first two years. In no case has a student not receiving financial assistance been denied disenrollment without obligation at any time over four years. The real nature of the agreement between students in ROTC and the services is a compact which the student may break without obligation assuming he is acting in good faith.

Changes in individual contracts will require negotiations with the military services. Such negotiations should be undertaken immediately.

It should be noted that students may enroll or audit military science courses without joining ROTC. Those who are not certain of their interest or choice may use this means of securing increased information on which to base their decision about ROTC.

#### *University Contracts*

Contractual agreements between Stanford University and the military services should be altered to reflect the provisions of this proposed program.

*Rationale:* Contracts are subject to renegotiation on a yearly basis and either party may terminate on a year's notice. If altered relationships are agreed upon, the changes in contracts and agreements must follow immediately.

#### *Retroactive Application*

Loss of academic credit by students enrolled in ROTC or change in faculty status of military officers already appointed to the Stanford faculty shall not be incurred as a result of the provisions of this recommendation. All other changes shall be implemented as expeditiously as possible.

#### *Trial Period*

The proposed program shall be undertaken for a five-year trial period upon mutual agreement between the military services and Stanford University. At the end of the five-year trial period there shall be a searching review of the success of the proposed program.

*Rationale:* A five-year trial period was selected to permit evaluation of two complete cycles of the four-year program with particular regard to the evaluation of students completing the program.

## CONCLUSION

The foregoing recommendations are based upon a particular view of the University and of the appropriate relations between the military services and this University. We believe Stanford to be, among other things, a pluralistic community serving a number of important and worthwhile functions, including liberal arts and preprofessional undergraduate education as well as graduate training in the arts and sciences and in the professional fields. No one college or university can or should attempt to serve every possible interest in all of these areas, but we hold that ROTC has a long and honorable history as part of the Stanford scene and that it fits within the framework of what Stanford does well.

In our consideration of the place of ROTC at Stanford, we accepted the premise that, given the evident state of the world and this nation's responsibilities in it, there will be for some time to come a substantial need for military forces of considerable size. Such a force will require the very best leadership at all levels that the country can provide. ROTC is a major source of that leadership and will continue to be so for the foreseeable future. The service academies and other means of officer training, as presently constituted, cannot possibly supply the need of over 30,000 new officers each year. The colleges and universities are reasonable sources of young officers, and ROTC has been for many years the means of the cooperative effort between the military services and universities to provide these officers.

We accept the view that the University has a responsibility to serve the nation and society, for the University benefits directly from its privileged place in that society. No single institution can render every service, and each must, of its own free choice, select those areas in which it can serve effectively. The University cannot be isolated from the pressing problems of our society, nor should it be. One important set of problems facing the country is that of foreign and military policy. This has been so since the establishment of the United States and it can be assumed that it will continue to be so for some time to come. Stanford and many other colleges and universities have, over the years, cooperated with the Federal Government and the military services in the training of young officers; this is one of the relevant major problem areas in which this University has served.

We believe that much of the current anxiety about and opposition to ROTC is rooted in the profound disagreements with the conduct of our policy in Southeast Asia and our involvement in the Vietnam War. We urge, however, that ROTC be judged in the context of the nation's history and in the context of a reasonable estimate of the future. The termination of the present war will not end the need for adequate national security forces and for the need to provide the leadership for them. We believe that the nation's colleges and universities, including Stanford University, should participate in training the leadership for these security forces.

There is no doubt that accommodation of ROTC on a university campus requires arrangements at variance with accepted and standard academic policy and practice. As we have shown, we do not argue for the *status quo* with respect to the way in which ROTC is organized and administered and in the way in which it relates to the academic structure of the

University.

The presence of ROTC as an academic program offends some members of the faculty and of the student body who hold that there should be no pre-professional educational programs, at least at the undergraduate level. Some faculty members and students are concerned with the presence of a program that has certain marked external controls in contrast to the more typical internally-regulated activities. Some conclude that instruction by the military is inevitably antithetical to free intellectual inquiry. But in our investigations and inquiries, we have found that there are several other pre-professional academic programs with an accepted place in the Stanford scene. We have found that there are other activities subject to various forms and degrees of external constraint. We have found no evidence that military instruction inhibits the development of the freely inquiring minds of those enrolled in ROTC; indeed there is no evidence that the present system, with its admitted variations from standard academic practice, is the least harmful to the academic community or to anyone in it.

We do not hold that ROTC is essential to Stanford University nor do we hold that Stanford University is essential to the military services. We do not claim that in the long run ROTC is necessarily the ultimate means of preparing college-educated officers for military service. But for the present, it is the best means available to the country and is likely to be so for the foreseeable future. In the meantime, ROTC provides important advantages to the University and to its students. The presence of ROTC provides our students with the means of earning a commission so that they may meet their military service obligations as officers. The ROTC programs provide approximately \$250,000 per year in student financial aid, bringing to the University a very able student element including a number who otherwise might not be able to come to Stanford. ROTC provides an opportunity to study in a field that is certainly relevant to modern day concerns and which would not otherwise be available to the Stanford students.

Moreover, we have found the military services to be not unmindful of trends in educational thought and have undertaken serious steps to improve the quality and acceptability of ROTC programs on college and university campuses. While each service has varied in its approach to the situation, they all have important elements in common. Each has given its department chairmen considerable flexibility to substitute courses in other departments for military courses, to arrange schedules to suit individual students, and to negotiate with their institutions other aspects of the ROTC programs. The Professor of Naval Science is told, for example, that he "will function as an academic department head in fact as well as name . . . (and) is expected to structure a program of studies for each Naval Science student that will satisfy the University's overall degree requirements."

In considering the manner in which ROTC should be related to the academic structure of the University, we took cognizance of these present and continuing efforts of the military services to make ROTC more compatible with the desires and procedures of the academic community. What the minority members of the Committee have recommended is fully compatible with the trends in the services.

Since we hold that ROTC should continue at Stanford University, we consider it essential that it be integrated as



Closely as possible into the regular academic structure. We believe that it should be an academic program subject to normal University controls and supervision. We consider this to be essential to the survival of ROTC at Stanford.

We do not believe that ROTC could survive with vitality and challenge, be useful to the services and worthy of the University's support, as a non-credit "voluntary activity" program outside the academic structure. We doubt that it would be attractive to any significant number of high-quality students and we doubt that it would be subject to adequate control by the University. As we have said earlier in this paper, we reject this proposal for we consider it tantamount to abolition.

We have proposed a different solution, one designed to bring an improved ROTC program more into line with accepted standards of the University. Separation from the academic structure would, in your judgment, render ROTC ineffective and unmanageable and eventually unacceptable to the military services. We take the position that ROTC can and must be improved in the interests of the nation, of Stanford University and of Stanford students.

/s/ E. H. Brooks

/s/ J. T. Carrato

/s/ R. L. Thomas

## APPENDIX

### Trends in ROTC--Institutional Relations at Selected Colleges and Universities

#### I. The East

##### *Columbia (Navy)*

A 1966-67 review resulted in a reduction in the amount of academic credit for Naval Science courses from 21 "points" to 9, out of a total of 126 required for the degree. Naval Science work in the sophomore year has been eliminated; "rote work" has been shifted to three summer cruises, where only one cruise was previously required. The Department of the Navy has given the Columbia Professor of Naval Science considerable flexibility to adapt to the changing requirements of Columbia College.

##### *Cornell University (Army, Air Force, Navy)*

A faculty-student commission has recently completed a review of the status of ROTC recommending retention subject to important changes in the next three years. Specifically recommended: courses with substantial political or policy content required of ROTC students should be taught in regular academic departments by regular faculty; the services should make greater use of the University's resources with respect to scientific and technical training; no credit be given for courses offered solely by the military departments; all drill, indoctrination and training in military skills should be either

extra-curricular or confined to summer camps or cruises; there should be improvements in appointment procedures of military officers and the title professor should be confined to the senior officer for each service; provision for University supervision of ROTC should be strengthened. In addition to other minor recommendations, the Commission recommended that Cornell join with other Universities and develop a set of new proposals for ROTC and officer procurement to the Department of Defense. The Commission also recommended that if substantial changes in ROTC "are not forthcoming within three years, the University seek other means of meeting the provision of the Morrill Act and its Charter."

The faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences voted in favor of this report.

##### *Dartmouth (Army, Air Force, Navy)*

Dartmouth considerations have been very similar to those at Cornell. A Dartmouth committee has recommended reduction of degree credit to two courses, cooperation with other institutions to work out new methods of recruitment of college graduates, limitation of faculty status to the senior officer of each service, improved supervision by the college. All of these are good for only three years; if no action by the services to change or improve, everything should be moved to summer camps or cruises. These recommendations were approved by the Dartmouth Faculty January 30, 1969.

##### *Harvard (Army, Air Force, Navy)*

No response has been made to inquiries, but a newspaper report of December 13, 1968 indicated that the SDS broke up a faculty meeting assembled to debate the status of ROTC. More recent newspaper accounts indicate that the Harvard faculty has abolished academic status for ROTC.

##### *Pennsylvania (Army, Navy)*

The faculty of the College has recommended that no credit be given for courses taught by military personnel. Other changes are pending.

##### *Princeton (Army, Air Force, Navy)*

A faculty committee is at work on the status of ROTC. The following are indications of the trend of thought as reported by the committee's secretary.

Recognizing the need for college trained officers, the committee is searching for a "more appropriate relationship." ROTC courses will not count for credit in the future. Faculty status will be limited to the senior officer or "Lecturer with the rank of Professor." ROTC programs will probably lose departmental status.



### *Yale (Army, Navy)*

On January 30, the faculty of Yale Colleges voted that ROTC should be given "extra-curricular status without academic credit." Commanding officers should be "designated by a title indicating that they do not have the academic authority usually associated with a professorship."

The Dean of Yale College has indicated that President Brewster and the Fellows are likely to accept this recommendation.

## *II. The Mid-West*

### *Michigan (Army, Air Force, Navy)*

There is at present "no great or urgent push" for complete abolition of credit, although if it came to a vote, there probably would be reduction.

Faculty rank is considered "honorary." A committee has been appointed to look into the status of ROTC, and is considering the same questions as are other institutions.

### *Northwestern (Navy)*

A committee has just been appointed to "consider the role of the NROTC in the College."

## *III. The West*

### *California-Berkeley (Army, Air Force, Navy)*

According to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, it is not likely that "in the present climate" the Regents will approve any change in the academic credit and faculty status provisions. There are, underway, reviews of courses and efforts to improve faculty selection to make ROTC "more respectable and acceptable." A substantial interest among faculty and students on the ROTC question seems to have died away, although the Yale action may stir it up again.

### *Pomona (Army)*

The College Policy Review Council has recommended that ROTC be continued, but that no credit be given for military science courses (although a student's transcript should "list" such courses). With respect to faculty status, the Council recommended that the senior military officer be given the status of "any other temporary appointment," but that no professorial rank be given to junior officers.

### *Southern California (Army, Air Force, Navy)*

"We are to date pleased with our association with the ROTC programs and have no plans at present for altering this association." (1/29/69)

### *Washington (Army, Air Force, Navy)*

Under review.