

September 1, 1968

ROTC AT STANFORD: A FACULTY PROPOSAL

There is a growing dissatisfaction with the military science programs at Stanford, both among faculty members and in other parts of the university community. We share this dissatisfaction. We differ somewhat about which features of the ROTC programs we find undesirable, and somewhat more about the grounds on which we find them undesirable. But there are some grounds on which we are all willing to criticize certain features of these programs. Moreover, we believe that ultimate responsibility for evaluating all university programs on these particular grounds properly lies exclusively with the faculty. These grounds are the following. Certain features of the military science programs at Stanford are undesirable first because they compromise the academic 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.

One can get a rough idea of the features we find objectionable on these grounds by reading the accompanying proposal outlining the conditions under which we would find the operation of military science programs at Stanford acceptable. This proposal will be submitted, in the form of a motion, to the Academic Senate at its regular meeting on September 26, 1968. This paper will present our arguments in support of this proposal. Both the nature of our objections to the present military science programs and the ways our proposal would remove them will be stated more explicitly.

We emphasize that our objections to the military science programs at Stanford will be confined to those that can be defended on the grounds just listed. Similarly, our proposal for changes in the programs is aimed only at removing features which can be attacked on these grounds. Although some of us believe that military training in any form is undesirable; that military training is inappropriate on a university campus; or that assisting current military manpower procurement policies in any way is immoral; we shall not base our criticism on any claims of this sort. Some may think that, in eschewing such arguments, we avoid the crucial moral issues. This may be true. But we do so with the desire to focus on issues which are undeniably the legitimate concern of Stanford faculty members, as faculty members. There can be no doubt that our proposal is a proper matter for consideration by the Academic Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

gone ~~Ed~~ - Joseph Sneed, Assistant Professor, Philosophy
Anne Kostelanetz, Assistant Professor, English
Italy - John Goheen, Professor, Philosophy
Stat - Bradley Efron, Associate Professor, Statistics
Merrill Carlsmith, Assistant Professor, Psychology
Frank Von-Hippel, Assistant Professor, Physics
George Leppert, Professor, Mechanical Engineering
Ronald Bellor, Assistant Professor, Classics
Charles Dreksaier, Professor, Political Science
Robert Polhemus, Associate Professor, English

GUIDELINES FOR MILITARY SCIENCE AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY

- I. Academic credit shall not be given for any activities offered by military science departments.
- II. Courses pertinent to military science may be offered by regular departments of the university for academic credit, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The decision as to whether such a course shall be offered by a given department is to be made by the faculty of that department in the usual way.
 2. Teaching staff for such courses must be members of the department offering the course. Their appointments must be approved by the department faculty and the university administration in the usual way.
 3. Qualifications of this staff and its privileges, including tenure, are to be the same as those for other academic appointments of the same rank.
 4. These courses shall be open to all students, subject only to prerequisite and registration restrictions the department concerned may elect to require. In particular, participation in any part of these courses shall not be confined to those students cleared to receive "classified information," nor to those students participating in other aspects of the military science program.
 5. Grades in these courses shall be given in accordance with general university policy. In particular, neither a student's participation in other aspects of the military science program nor his potential for "military leadership" shall be considered relevant.
- III. No member of the staff of a military science department shall be a member of the Academic Council unless he is also a faculty member of a regular department of the university at a rank which entitles him to membership in the Academic Council.
- IV. All activities of military science departments on the Stanford campus shall be regulated by the university's general policies governing voluntary activities. In particular, they shall be "both open and limited to members of the Stanford community, i.e. Stanford students, faculty members, and staff and their immediate families."
- V. No Stanford faculty member or administrator, acting as a spokesman for the university, shall encourage students to participate in activities of military science departments, except in the manner in which participation in all voluntary activities is actually encouraged.
- VI. These guidelines shall become effective at the beginning of Fall Quarter, 1969. However, the provision denying academic credit to military science courses (I.) shall not apply to students enrolled in military science programs prior to this time. That is, students already enrolled in ROTC programs may continue to receive academic credit for courses taken to complete the present requirements of these programs.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF GUIDELINES

(In the following discussion, the Roman numerals refer to sections in the preceding proposal, "Guidelines for Military Science at Stanford.")

I. At present, a student who completes a four-year military science program accumulates 24 to 33 of the 180 units required for graduation from military science courses. These units are counted as part of the 90 units required outside the student's major field. Last year 98 students - 88 from the School of Humanities and Sciences and 10 from Engineering - fulfilled their graduation requirements in this way. The total undergraduate enrollment in these programs last year was approximately 1,000. This situation jeopardizes the integrity of Stanford's academic degrees for the following reasons.

A. The quality of the teaching staff in the military science programs is not comparable with that in other departments at Stanford. See Appendix I for a resume of the academic qualifications of military science personnel. Few of these men hold advanced degrees from highly regarded institutions. The advanced degrees held by these officers are usually not in fields related to the subjects they teach. These men are not engaged in creative research or scholarship pertinent to the subjects they teach.

B. The text materials for military science courses are standardized. Essentially the same material is used in all institutions where these programs exist. There is some indication that this material does not present a significant intellectual challenge to Stanford students. Administrators concerned with these programs admit that students seldom receive less than a 'B' in military science courses. Unfortunately, we could obtain no hard data on this point. The Registrar's Office informed us that it is contrary to their policy to compute comparative grade point averages.

C. Some of the material covered in military science courses - weapons, marksmanship, tactics, and so forth - appears to be of such a narrowly pragmatic, non-academic nature as to raise doubts about its legitimacy within a university curriculum. (Military science courses are listed in Courses and Degrees. No academic credit is given for military drill.)

D. There is some evidence that the objective of military science courses at Stanford extends beyond those that are appropriate to academic activities of the university, and that the methods used to gain these objectives are similarly inappropriate. For example, in the current issue (1968-69) of Courses and Degrees (p. 305) we find that one of the aims of the Army ROTC is "to develop individual character and attributes essential to an officer." Some proponents of military science programs have even gone so far as to describe this objective and the method used to attain it as "indoctrination" in military values.

The method used by the services to develop traits of character that are consistent with their moral code is indoctrination. The process of indoctrination is usually indirect. In courses like military or naval history, it consists of

studying a problem from specialized point of view with little or no acknowledgment or weight given to other perspectives. In exercises like drill or repetitive learning, it seeks to develop habits of instantaneous response without questioning or reasoning.*

We admit that this raises difficult issues. It is hard to determine the extent to which students' adoption of "military values" is an objective of the military science programs as they now operate at Stanford. Even if this is an acknowledged aim of the program as a whole, it is still difficult to determine to what extent, if any, it is pursued by means of "indoctrination" in courses for which academic credit is given. Spokesmen for these programs maintain that this aspect has been de-emphasized in recent years. Because of the complex factual issues involved, we prefer to rest our case for I. on the preceding three points. However, should these arguments not prove sufficiently convincing, we believe that a thorough investigation of the "indoctrination" issue is warranted.

II. We recognize that some of the material treated in military science courses is appropriate subject matter for courses in the university: for example, military history and naval engineering. If there is a demand for courses in such areas, we see no reason why this demand cannot be met through regular departments of the university. In this way course content, grading standards and faculty qualifications would be subject to the same controls as other university offerings. We see no objection to the military services providing funds, and even staff, for these courses, provided the course content and staff meet the usual standards of the department which offers the course. The decision as to whether this is the case clearly must rest with the faculty of the department concerned.

III. At present there are 14 members of the staff of the military science programs who are members of the Academic Council. The procedure for appointing officers is roughly the following. The military services present nominations to the university administration. The administration may veto any nomination. It has done so at least three times. The nominee's military record and college transcripts are examined and, whenever possible, a personal interview is held. Though they are members of the Academic Council, these men are not subject to the usual university policy on tenure, for the military services agree to recall them immediately at the request of the administration. The administration has exercised this privilege once in recent years.

The position of these officers constitutes a serious threat to the privileges associated with faculty rank at Stanford. First, military science staff are appointed in an irregular manner. This violates the principle that the primary responsibility in making faculty appointments shall rest with the faculty itself. Second, it creates a class of nominal faculty members without the full privileges and benefits that should accompany faculty rank. The principle that there should be no discrimination with respect to privileges among holders of the same academic rank is one which should be maintained. Failure to do

*Lyons, C. M. and Masland, J. W., Education and Military Leadership (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959), p. 169.

so weakens the claim of every faculty member to these privileges. Third, no serious effort is made by Stanford to secure the best available men in their field to fill these positions. The results of this have been mentioned in connection with I.A.

- IV. There is some evidence that participation in military science programs at Stanford is restricted in ways that are incompatible with the university's commitment to make its offerings, both academic and non-academic, as accessible as possible to all its students. For example, the most recent issue (1968-69) of Courses and Degrees (p. 306) restricts all Army ROTC activities to male U.S. citizens of an age that will not preclude their appointment in the Army by their 28th birthday; and that the "primary criterion" for admission to these activities is "the potential of becoming an effective Army officer" as determined principally by the judgment of the Professor of Military Science and his assistants. Likewise, we find (p. 315) that instruction in "Naval subjects" is restricted to "selected male students." The Air Force ROTC lists no comparable restrictions.

We believe that the most efficient means of assuring that the military science programs are open to all who desire to participate in them is to require that they conform to the university's policy regulating all voluntary, non-academic organizations on the Stanford campus. A copy of this policy is attached (see Appendix II).

We are aware that it is currently the policy of the Recorder's office not to assign classrooms on a regular basis to voluntary organizations. This would clearly hinder some military science activities. We suggest that this policy on classroom allocation be reviewed with the aim of arriving at a policy on classroom allocation which can be applied without discrimination to all voluntary activities at Stanford, including the military science programs.

- V. There is evidence that, in the past, it has been the university's "official policy" more actively to encourage students to participate in military science programs than in other university programs. For example, see the enclosed pamphlet ROTC at Stanford (Appendix III). This pamphlet is sent by the Dean of Students' Office to all male Freshmen at the university's expense. Note, in particular, the conclusion of President Sterling's message on the frontispiece: "This leaflet...invites you to send for further detailed information if you are interested, as I hope you will be."

We feel that it is improper for an official spokesman of the university to use his prestige and influence to direct a student's interest to a particular university program, unless all programs receive similar support. Such a practice is a subtle form of coercion and an infringement on the student's right to choose for himself the direction of his intellectual and professional interests. As such, it is inconsistent with the university's commitment to maintain a climate of complete intellectual freedom.