

# RD FACULTY CONCERNED ABOUT RAMIFICATIONS OF THE SENATE DECISION AFFECTING R.O.T.C.

the argument that abuses or degradation of standards exist in the ROTC program as it now operates, but that theoretically, such abuses might develop at some unforeseen time. The Senate originally charged the Committee to define a basis on which "proper relations between the ROTC Department and the University may be established by review and reform of the present relations." The Majority of the Committee, in spite of these instructions asserts that "there can be no proper relations between the University Departments and ROTC as an organized on campus program" and it ignores the specific, substantial, and sweeping proposals of the Minority Report to work out a positive and progressive relationship which will be responsive to legitimate criticisms and will assure curricular control of ROTC by Stanford University.

A number of faculty members were unaware at the time of the Senate vote on ROTC that allegations of inferior teaching and poor quality of ROTC courses had not been substantiated nor vindicated by the Senate ad hoc Committee on ROTC. Moreover, a preceding charge that "ROTC compromises the integrity of Stanford's degrees" and "the academic integrity of faculty rank" seems more and more questionable in the light of the recent Allan Carter report of the American Council on Education.<sup>2</sup> That is, wouldn't it be absurd to argue that academic integrity at Stanford University is compromised because of studies in the Humanities which relegated Stanford to second place relative to the University of California in excellence of graduate education? The University of California has the same ROTC programs as Stanford and has recently acted to retain those programs within the curriculum.

The one area where initial and subsequent charges against ROTC invoked some doubt on the part of concerned faculty is that ROTC is "incompatible with free intellectual development of students." But while the Majority Report expresses alarm that ROTC may subvert intellectual freedom, it ignores the impairment of ROTC courses which many have chosen to take and many wish to take. No compulsion requires any student to take ROTC courses unless he so chooses, and only a minority do so. Now the Academic Senate has adopted a compulsory act which deprives the student minority of the present freedom to include ROTC courses in its curriculum. The Senate has done so under the extraordinary theory that it will protect the freedom of students by compulsorily depriving them of an option which they now possess.

It is noteworthy that the Majority Report on ROTC specifically mentions that "the Majority also consciously sought to exclude personal feeling about the war in Vietnam from its deliberations." The very fact that this point is stressed in the final report is sufficient to lead one to conjecture on the degree to which the signatories of that report and members of the Senate have been capable of separating the analysis of ROTC from their feelings about the war in Vietnam. Five of the ten faculty members who signed the September resolution opposing ROTC are members of the Senate of the Academic Council. One Senate member who spoke eloquently for and voted for the Majority Report has promulgated a position paper which directly ties the US-Vietnam and other foreign involvements, and the ready supply of young men, with his opposition to ROTC.<sup>3</sup> We faculty members who are concerned about the future of ROTC at Stanford cannot accept the arguments of those who claim that the Vietnam involvement had no influence on their decisions regarding ROTC. We urge that long range decisions which would tend to remove the training of officers from the civilian influences

of the University life ought not to be taken hastily and perhaps irresponsibly in an atmosphere of frustration and anguish over a controversial involvement in Vietnam.

The plea of the concerned faculty is that members of the Academic Council become concerned and consider objectively the arguments to be presented on April 4th. The question today primarily is ROTC, but it also involves the welfare of any department at Stanford which in the future may meet the disapproval of a majority of members of the Senate involving slightly more than a quorum.

When you evaluate the arguments to be presented on April 4th, please note the recent student referendum on ROTC which, in an unusually large turnout, favored support and some academic credit for ROTC. The Board of Trustees, on March 12th, directed President Pitzer to continue negotiations with the Department of Defense officially "leading to appropriate actions which will improve and vitalize this important program." The Trustees also urged that full weight be given to the following two considerations:

1. This nation has a strong and valued tradition of civilian participation in military leadership.
2. Deterioration of that tradition would move us very quickly towards the emergency of a military caste.

We believe with the minority of the ad hoc Committee on ROTC that Stanford University has an obligation to serve the nation and society, for the University benefits from its privileged place in that society. Stanford University may choose or not choose to continue to participate in ROTC. If the University chooses to continue, it is obligated to support ROTC in conditions that offer reasonable assurances of vitality and worth to its students, as well as to the military service.

Among the arguments which we commend to your consideration are the following:

This nation has traditionally relied upon its civilian academic institutions for the preponderance of its military officers — particularly in times of national emergency, but also in times of comparative peace.

This tradition has served this nation well in the past, maintaining civilian influence and control over the military through civilian participation. There has been a continued infusion into our armed forces of leaders with dominantly civilian concerns and outlooks, and a return from service to prominent positions in civilian life of men who can knowledgeably criticize and shape the role of our armed forces.

The pitfalls of moving away from a strong tradition of civilian participation in military leadership are evident in the history of countries in Europe and Latin America whose armed forces have been dominated by an isolated military caste, and whose public life has been blighted by the arbitrary use of military forces in civil affairs. A narrowness of viewpoint which tends to evolve in any military establishment becomes greatly compounded through isolation of that establishment from other elements in society.

The concept of ROTC is entirely consistent with the military traditions of this nation. There are those who hold the arbitrary removal of ROTC courses from the academic structure of our major universities will force the military services to develop quickly suitable alternatives. The fact is that at present no suitable long range alternative to the ROTC program is available to provide the quality and the numbers of officers to provide leadership for our armed forces. Additional actions at this time which will erode that status of ROTC and degrade the worth of the programs to students may seri-

ously impair the vitality of ROTC at our major universities. Such action would be a grave disservice to this nation.

Dissatisfaction with the draft and the Vietnam conflict has created an environment on our campuses which, for several years, has deterred participation in ROTC. But we urge that the question of American involvement in Vietnam should not be confused with the question whether American college men should have an opportunity, while at college, to qualify as officers or whether this training for civilian pursuits should be segregated from training for military pursuits.

Concern over the present forms of ROTC has frequently obscured recognition of the beneficial aspects of the programs in the students of Stanford. The courses are relevant, of interest to over 350 students, and of worthy academic quality. The ROTC programs provide approximately \$250,000 each year in student financial aid, bringing to Stanford very able students, including some who otherwise would not be able to come to Stanford. There are also some 40 graduate students presently enrolled in ROTC programs at Stanford. The operative question is whether any unrestrained group in the University shall, by compulsion, deprive these students of this freedom which they have possessed and exercised for many years and which the Majority Report does not even claim has had any serious adverse consequences.

In the past three years the military services have instituted reforms in the ROTC programs in concert with universities and colleges. The services have indicated a willingness to continue to modify programs to adjust to individual institutional requirements. The Secretary of Defense recently stated: "The Department of Defense stands ready at any time to coordinate with those institutions having ROTC programs in resolving any problems, current or potential and would welcome their ideas and assistance." There is no reason that suitable programs responsive to legitimate criticism cannot be evolved providing premature action removing ROTC from the academic structure of the University does not foreclose suitable options before negotiations can be undertaken.

All Stanford faculty members have reason to be concerned with the ramifications of the recent Academic Senate vote to end academic credit for ROTC courses. They should not resign their right to pass final judgment on the recommendations of the Senate. They should not overlook the fact that the Senate policy is at variance with the wishes of a substantial majority of students in a recent referendum, and is also at variance with the exploratory approach of the Board of Trustees. The whole nation may be affected by what happens at Stanford on April 4th. Stanford need not follow the lead of other universities, but should take the lead in the development of an acceptable on-campus ROTC Program. The ROTC issue can be resolved with time. We should give President Pitzer and the Department of Defense that time.

## References:

1. "ROTC at Stanford: A Faculty Proposal," Kristelanetz, Sneed, et al., September 1, 1968.
2. "An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education," Academic Council on Education, editor Allen M. Carter, 1968.
3. "A Statement Regarding the Report 'Stanford University and the ROTC Departments,'" Ashley, Holt, February, 1969.

Drafted by the following members of the Academic Council:

Harold M. BACON; Roy B. COHN; Gordon A. CRAIG; Gayton E. GERMANE; Nicholas J. HOFF; Eric HUTCHINSON; John LOFTIS; David M. MASON; Jean MAYERS; John E. McDONOUGH; David M. POTTER; William E. RAMBO; William SHOCKLEY and James T. WATKINS, IV.



Daily  
4 Apr 69

# A REPORT FROM STANFORD FACULTY CONCERNED ABOUT RAMIFICATIONS OF THE SENATE

On April 4, 1969, the Academic Council will meet to consider, among other matters, a review of the recent Senate decision to end academic credit for military training and education at Stanford. This review is the result of a faculty petition of more than 50 signatures to the Academic Secretary to the University calling for a reconsideration by the Academic Council of the Senate's decision to eliminate academic credit for all ROTC courses and requesting adequate consideration of the Minority Report of the ad hoc Committee on ROTC.

Although the focus of the forthcoming review is ROTC, the signatories of this report believe that the issues involved have ramifications which extend well beyond the immediate status of ROTC at Stanford.

Fundamentally, our concern is directed toward the precipitant action of the Senate. Not only was the Minority Report of the ad hoc Committee on ROTC given little consideration in the Senate debate, but the Majority Report of the Committee was approved, in the main, within an unduly short time after the report was issued. Also, there is an assumption of the uniqueness of purpose of Stanford University underlying the Majority Report, and therefore the Senate action, which is not shared by many faculty members. This assumption, if allowed to stand, has major implications for other areas of the University.

It is recognized that Senate members expect to vote according to their own judgment, and not under instruction from their constituents. But, when decisions of major impact are to be taken, a broad basis of University wide discussion and sharing of opinion should precede the decision. We submit that no adequate discussion or testing of opinion preceded the vote by which, on the latter part of a single afternoon, the Academic Senate took up the Committee Reports on ROTC and made sweeping decisions concerning them after less than three hours of debate. Those decisions were of far reaching academic consequences and were, in fact, of national importance. On matters of major significance the importance of obtaining a consensus of the Academic Council itself overrides considerations both of the prestige of the Senate and of the inconvenience of convening the Academic Council in plenary session to speak its collective mind.

To address the issue of ROTC directly, it is well to point out the inconsistencies between the original arguments in the proposal of September 1968 by 10 faculty members, which initiated study of ROTC at Stanford, and the arguments contained in the Majority Report adopted by the Senate on February 13, 1969. In the September proposal, the authors stated that "certain features of the Military Science programs at Stanford are undesirable first, because they compromise the integrity of Stanford's degrees; second, because they compromise the academic integrity of faculty rank at Stanford; and third, because they are incompatible with the University's commitment to encourage the free intellectual development of all its students". In addition, they stated that "the quality of the teaching staff in the military science programs is not comparable with that in other departments at Stanford," and that "there is some indication that this (course) material does not present a significant challenge to Stanford students."

The majority of the ad hoc Committee on ROTC, ironically — after lengthy deliberations — moved away from these issues and based their objections to ROTC upon the philosophical precept that ROTC is institutionally incompatible with the academic objectives of the University. The case against ROTC presented by the Majority appears to be founded principally not on

the argument that abuses or degradation of standards exist in the ROTC program as it now operates, but that theoretically, such abuses might develop at some unforeseen time. The Senate originally charged the Committee to define a basis on which "proper relations between the ROTC Department and the University may be established by review and reform of the present relations." The Majority of the Committee, in spite of these instructions asserts that "there can be no proper relations between the University Departments and ROTC as an organized on campus program" and it ignores the specific, substantial, and sweeping proposals of the Minority Report to work out a positive and progressive relationship which will be responsive to legitimate criticisms and will assure curricular control of ROTC by Stanford University.

A number of faculty members were unaware at the time of the Senate vote on ROTC that allegations of inferior teaching and poor quality of ROTC courses had not been substantiated nor vindicated by the Senate ad hoc Committee on ROTC. Moreover, a preceding charge that "ROTC compromises the integrity of Stanford's degrees" and "the academic integrity of faculty rank" seems more and more questionable in the light of the recent Allan Carter report of the American Council on Education. That is, wouldn't it be absurd to argue that academic integrity at Stanford University is compromised because of studies in the Humanities which relegated Stanford to second place relative to the University of California in excellence of graduate education? The University of California has the same ROTC programs as Stanford and has recently acted to retain those programs within the curriculum.

The one area where initial and subsequent charges against ROTC invoked some doubt on the part of concerned faculty is that ROTC is "incompatible with free intellectual development of students." But while the Majority Report expresses alarm that ROTC may subvert intellectual freedom, it ignores the impairment of ROTC courses which many have chosen to take and many wish to take. No compulsion requires any student to take ROTC courses unless he so chooses, and only a minority do so. Now the Academic Senate has adopted a compulsory act which deprives the student minority of the present freedom to include ROTC courses in its curriculum. The Senate has done so under the extraordinary theory that it will protect the freedom of students by compulsorily depriving them of an option which they now possess.

It is noteworthy that the Majority Report on ROTC specifically mentions that "the Majority also consciously sought to exclude personal feeling about the war in Vietnam from its deliberations." The very fact that this point is stressed in the final report is sufficient to lead one to conjecture on the degree to which the signatories of that report and members of the Senate have been capable of separating the analysis of ROTC from their feelings about the war in Vietnam. Five of the ten faculty members who signed the September resolution opposing ROTC are members of the Senate of the Academic Council. One Senate member who spoke eloquently for and voted for the Majority Report has promulgated a position paper which directly ties the US-Vietnam and other foreign involvements, and the ready supply of young men, with his opposition to ROTC. We faculty members who are concerned about the future of ROTC at Stanford cannot accept the arguments of those who claim that the Vietnam involvement had no influence on their decisions regarding ROTC. We urge that long range decisions which would tend to remove the training of officers from the civilian influences

of the University life ought not to be taken hastily perhaps irresponsibly in an atmosphere of frustration and anguish over a controversial involvement in Vietnam.

The plea of the concerned faculty is that members of the Academic Council become concerned and objectively the arguments to be presented on April 4th. The question today primarily is ROTC, but it involves the welfare of any department at Stanford in the future may meet the disapproval of a majority of members of the Senate involving slightly more than a quorum.

When you evaluate the arguments to be presented April 4th, please note the recent student referendum on ROTC which, in an unusually large turnout, supported and some academic credit for ROTC. The Board of Trustees, on March 12th, directed Dr. Pitzer to continue negotiations with the Department of Defense officially "leading to appropriate action which will improve and vitalize this important program." Trustees also urged that full weight be given to following two considerations:

1. This nation has a strong and valued tradition of civilian participation in military leadership.
2. Deterioration of that tradition would move quickly towards the emergency of a military dictatorship.

We believe with the minority of the ad hoc Committee on ROTC that Stanford University has a duty to serve the nation and society, for the University benefits from its privileged place in that society. Stanford University may choose or not choose to participate in ROTC. If the University chooses to continue, it is obligated to support ROTC in a way that offer reasonable assurances of vitality to its students, as well as to the military service.

Among the arguments which we commend for consideration are the following:

This nation has traditionally relied upon civilian participation in military leadership for the preponderance of military officers — particularly in times of national emergency, but also in times of comparative peace.

This tradition has served this nation well in maintaining civilian influence and control over the military through civilian participation. There has been continued infusion into our armed forces of leaders from civilian concerns and outlooks, and from service to prominent positions in civilian life. Men who can knowledgeably criticize and improve the role of our armed forces.

The pitfalls of moving away from a strong tradition of civilian participation in military leadership are evident in the history of countries in Europe. America whose armed forces have been dominated by an isolated military caste, and whose public life has been blighted by the arbitrary use of military power in civil affairs. A narrowness of viewpoint which to evolve in any military establishment becomes compounded through isolation of that establishment from other elements in society.

The concept of ROTC is entirely consistent with military traditions of this nation. There are no grounds for the arbitrary removal of ROTC courses from the academic structure of our major universities. The military services to develop quickly substitutes. The fact is that at present no other alternative to the ROTC program is available to provide the quality and the numbers of officers and leaders for our armed forces. Addition at this time which will erode that status of ROTC and degrade the worth of the programs to students.