

CAMPUS REPORT SUPPLEMENT

NUMBER 6

APRIL 22, 1969

Published for Stanford University Faculty and Staff by the University Relations Office as an adjunct to the weekly *Campus Report*.

Letters To The Editor

Written arguments on the Stanford ROTC issue have been submitted for publication in the *Campus Report*.

Mailed ballots were sent to the 999 Council members on the campus and the foreign campuses, and they are to be returned to the Academic Secretary on or before April 30.

The results of the balloting will determine the fate of ROTC on the Stanford campus. (See *Campus Report*, April 15.)

At the request of Council members who wished to express their views on the matter, the following letters are published:

Dear Sir:

These are among the grounds which I find for voting to disapprove the Senate action on ROTC.

- (1) I am not convinced that ROTC is, or need be, incompatible with the University's primary commitment. The majority committee's report rests heavily upon the assumption of inherent conflict of interest, without demonstrating manifest conflict and without convincing me that, insofar as on-campus training of officers is concerned, there exists an inherent conflict.
- (2) In the absence of manifest conflict, issues pertaining to course content and contractual agreement should at least be studied and negotiated prior to enacting a program which has aided thousands of students for many years without evident contamination of the university.
- (3) The faculty in no sense "abdicates" its responsibilities, as some senators allege, in asking the President to negotiate and return a proposal to the Senate. Without relinquishing any control which we now possess, we are simply asking the President to find out what can be done. I am willing to assume that the President understands the university's primary commitment and will negotiate from that position.
- (4) Having been unavoidably absent from the Senate meeting on February 13, I cannot know how persuasive the arguments were. But having read the entire committee report prior to that time, I do not conceive that my information could have been sufficiently augmented during that session to enable me to vote with

the majority. There were twenty absences (or abstentions), suggestive that some did not anticipate Senate action at that date. The announcement of the February 13 Senate meeting stated that the committee report on ROTC would be distributed to the Academic Council on February 11 in a *Campus Report* Supplement, thus virtually precluding any opportunity for Senators to obtain reactions from constituents who had read the report.

- (5) In short, I question the process by which the Senate decision was reached, as well as questioning whether that decision represents either the faculty viewpoint or that of the university community. I believe that the university community should be the last to act out of panic or in accordance with any dominant theory; yet I sense that this decision was taken with too much urgency and in part because a few other schools had acted similarly.

Yours, sincerely,

ROGER W. GHAY
Professor,
Food Research Institute

Dear Colleague:

We urge you to uphold the Senate action of February 13. The principal effect of an affirmative vote will be to remove academic credit for ROTC beginning with the freshman class that enters in the fall of 1970. Despite misinterpretations to the contrary, the Senate action would permit ROTC to remain on campus as an extra-curricular activity.

Should the Senate action be rejected, the only substantive change in the status quo will be to provide the University Administration with flexibility to negotiate with the Department of Defense on the subject of academic credits. We believe that this is an area in which the faculty ought not abdicate its responsibilities.

Senators:

G. Almond; L. Altan; H. Ashley; J. Ballam; C. P. Berg; M. Bertrand; H. Breitrose; J. Carlsmith; W. Clebsch; P. Dawson; H. Efron; E. Good; A. Kosterlantz; R. Lind; A. Mame; K. Scott; F. von Hippel; L. Zatz.

Dear Sir:

I am discouraged and frightened by the most vocal (not necessarily the most pop-

ular) attitudes on education and the pursuit of knowledge currently surfacing at Stanford. As a member of the Academic Senate Ad Hoc Committee on ROTC, and a participant in all but one faculty debate of the ROTC issue, I have listened to and considered virtually all of the arguments expressed by both sides.

The original thrust of the attack on ROTC was directed at specific anomalies in the structure of the Stanford programs. The main areas of contention were the content of academic courses, the appointment and rank of military teachers, the structure of the Military Science Departments, and the outside control of the curriculum of the University departments. These are all eccentricities of the ROTC programs which are dealt with and rectified by the Minority Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on ROTC.

It is clear to me, however, that these academic and institutional faults in the Stanford-ROTC relationships were only a pretext for a much broader and far more dangerous attack on the academic freedom of this University. ROTC has become the scapegoat for moral outrage at the continuing war in Vietnam. A vocal minority of the Stanford community has decided to impose its own moral system upon the rest of us. In logic characterized by non-sequiturs, these people have determined that in order to have peace in the world every action connected with the defense and security of our nation must come to an end, whether it be war-related research (an ill-defined euphemism) or the preparation of University students for service as officers in the Armed Service. It is of no concern to those who have appointed themselves our moral judges that they will deprive students of the opportunity to study war and national security. And this will only be the first of many fields of study to fall by the wayside in the path to utopia. The field of Applied Electronics is already under attack.

The position of the Majority of the Committee on ROTC is an example of the denial of academic freedom on moral grounds. As the work of the Committee progressed and the Minority met all of the academic and institutional arguments against ROTC, the Majority was forced to end its masquerade and stated that the "goals of ROTC were antithetical to the goals of Stanford University." The Majority's "newly achieved" abstract philosophical frame of reference is severely flawed. All of the Majority's substantiating argumentation is based on the premise that ROTC is incompatible with Stanford.

This is a premise that is never proved, and many can not readily accept. The move to a philosophical position by the Majority was also a very convenient move. For in philosophical discussion one can develop one's own definitions, and one can ignore the concrete to deal with the nebulous. Finally, I personally found it objectionable that six members of the Stanford community should presume to define the goals of this diverse and multiphistic University in the name of the entire community. Any group within the University can define the goals of this institution in that group's satisfaction and the exclusion of others.

The Committee Majority claims that the presence of ROTC programs and Military Science Departments on campus violates the "commitment to the creation and dissemination of knowledge in an environment of free intellectual activity." On what basis do they make such a claim? At this point we come to the vague and piecemeal superstructure of their abstract argumentation. They attack such enigmas as "conflict of interest" among those men who are both teachers and military officers. This argument is certainly narrow-minded, and at best attributes little intelligence or integrity to these men. Their position on this issue really reduces to an action that President Pitzer refused to take: the hiring and firing of instructors on the basis of political beliefs and positions. Another of their arguments attacks student-service contracts. The issue of contract stipulations is correctable, is currently being worked on, and is really not within the realm of the Stanford Faculty's consideration. In lieu of dealing with course content, the Majority attacks the more abstract subject of course goals. Here, there is a confusion of the Military Science Departments and the ROTC programs. The goals denunciated by the Majority are those essentially of the ROTC programs "to prepare and train University students for commissioning into the Armed Services." A distinction should be made, however, between the goals of the ROTC programs and the goals of the Military Science Departments of the University: to educate University students in Military art and science. To be sure, the education received in the Military Sciences is essential to and inherent in the concept of an ROTC program. However, the Military Science Departments are part of the Stanford educational community, and the Minority position would strengthen these ties.

The positions and arguments presented by the Majority lead to one ineluctable conclusion: "If . . . ROTC denotes an organized on-campus program of education and training, then the Majority is *compelled* to state there can be no 'proper relations between the ROTC departments and Stanford.'"

The Academic Senate debate over the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on ROTC

was disappointing to those who had served on the Committee. It appeared to be a foregone conclusion that the Senate decision would be to deny credit to Military Science Courses; and debate revolved around whether the ROTC programs could survive if such a move were made. There was never discussion of the academic merits of the courses involved, which the Majority did not contest, even in their report. One Senator stated that he agreed with the conclusions of the Majority Report, but not with the rationale. This indicates to me either a great fault in the Majority's argumentation, or misguided logic on the part of that Senator. The Minority Report was mentioned once, and once only, by a Senator who said, in effect, he didn't like it. As people filtered out of the meeting, the Senate voted 25 to 8 to slap the wrist of the military by denying credit to Military Science Courses. In essence, the Senate ignored the entire text of the Majority report, the entire Minority report, and played games with an essentially rigid set of recommendations by the Majority, excluding the *key* recommendations.

I was heartened by the vote of the Academic Council to bring this most important issue, and the hasty decision of the Senate before the entire faculty. I urge the faculty to consider the flexible and positive response to the question of "ROTC" offered by the Minority report of the Academic Senate Ad Hoc Committee on ROTC.

The Minority, too, affirmed the "primary commitment of the University to free intellectual activity." But we believed that truly free intellectual inquiry must not be limited in scope, because of political persuasion or moral witch hunts. It seems a paradox to "protest" freedom by denying freedom of choice of academic endeavor to interested students.

There are those who say Stanford must cut itself off from the Department of Defense and SRI in order to more easily criticize these aspects of our society. But I question the validity of this position. Men of experience realize that uninformed criticism only polarizes and serves no useful role in the improvement of current institutions and the creation of new ones.

The Minority believed that a secondary commitment of Stanford is to the society which created it, and in which it holds a privileged position. The commitment can be met in part by providing highly educated officers for the forces which defend the freedoms so liberally enjoyed at Stanford. One mode for fulfilling this commitment is the ROTC programs.

I hope that the faculty will register its concern for objective consideration of, and improvement of ROTC at Stanford. A vote disapproving the Senate action will give President Pitzer and the Department of Defense an opportunity to work out a new, institution-oriented, vitalized ROTC

program with the background of the Committee work and faculty debate which has taken place here at Stanford. Any new proposals would come back to the faculty for review and further action. I urge the faculty not to associate with the precipitous negative action taken by the Senate; its abdication of authority over and responsibility for ROTC at Stanford. Be positive and help Stanford lead the way in reform of our social institutions.

THOMAS CARRATO

Signator, Academic Senate Ad Hoc Committee on ROTC Minority Report

Open Letter to Academic Council Members:

The purpose of this letter is two-fold: first, to provide information on the ROTC issue to those faculty members who may not yet have voted in the mail referendum on ROTC and second, to urge those faculty members to exercise their hard won right of ballot on this issue and vote *disapproval* of the Senate action on ROTC.

On April 4 the action of the Senate was brought before the Academic Council for review. At that meeting the following resolution drafted by a group of faculty concerned about ramifications of the Senate action on ROTC was placed before the council:

Resolved: The Academic Council directs the Academic Secretary to conduct a referendum of the Council by mail on the following alternatives: "Approval or disapproval of the Senate's action of February 13, 1969 on ROTC." Disapproval carries the understanding that the President of the University will enter into negotiations with the Department of Defense and return to the Senate for its consideration not later than one year from this date a proposal for continuation of ROTC at Stanford which will assure programs consistent with the academic objectives and standards of the University, and responsive to the views which have been expressed by reports, referenda and petitions of the University community.

Despite efforts to block a mail out vote as well as *discredit, table* and *amend* the resolution, the question in its above form was carried by an overwhelming majority of the well-over 400 members present at the meeting. As a consequence, the final decision on the resolution has been placed in the hands of the entire membership of the Academic Council.

The ballot which has been sent to faculty members carries, in addition to the resolution passed by the Academic Council, an explanation of the Senate action on ROTC of February 13. What this explanation fails to point out is that a central thrust of the Majority Report was that "If the language of the Senate's charge is taken to mean that 'ROTC' denotes an organized on-campus program of education and training, then the Majority is *compelled*

to state there can be no "proper relations between the ROTC departments and Stanford" (underscoring added).

The statement has been made and undoubtedly will be made again that voting to disapprove the Senate would be a serious "default on the part of the faculty" delegating responsibility for ROTC to President Pitzer and the Defense Department. Nothing could be farther from fact. The resolution that was passed by the Academic Council clearly stipulated that "Disapproval carries the understanding that the President of the University will enter into negotiations with the Department of Defense and return to the Senate for its consideration . . . a proposal for continuation of ROTC at Stanford" (underscoring added). This means that the faculty will retain fully its prerogative to control the form that ROTC will eventually take at Stanford should it be continued. It further means that the faculty will have definite commitments on the part of the Department of Defense when the faculty finally decides how ROTC might be continued at Stanford.

On the contrary, approval of the Senate action means that the faculty accepts irrevocably and without benefit of alternatives, a decision to remove ROTC from any academic status at the University—a decision which may impair the worth of ROTC programs to the extent that they may not continue and which at the very least would place the content of ROTC instruction outside the curriculum and the control of the faculty. President Pitzer stated in response to questioning at the Academic Council meeting of April 4th that the Senate action on ROTC links the exploration of alternatives for continuing ROTC at Stanford.

A vote for disapproval is not a vote for or against ROTC. It is, however, a vote for more deliberate and representative behavior by Senate members. It is a vote in support of the majority vote in the Academic Council meeting of April 4. It is a vote which recognizes the wishes of a substantial majority of students voting in the referendum of February 24, 1969 and which is consistent with the exploratory approach of the Board of Trustees endorsed in its meeting of March 12, 1969. It is a vote to repudiate the tactics employed by a 10-member faculty group through its September 1968 "Faculty Proposed ROTC at Stanford" wherein allegations were cast at the competence of the teaching staff and the quality of the curricula of the military science departments which were never substantiated in fact nor were the individuals concerned vindicated.

The ROTC issue can be resolved with time. Give President Pitzer and the Department of Defense that time. You are urged to vote for disapproval, the second alternative on the referendum ballot.

/s/ Gayton E. Germaine; David M. Mason; Jean Mayers; William D. Nix;

William Shackley, William E. Spicer;
James T. Watkins, IV

Dear Sir:

After reading the statement by faculty members supporting the retention of the ROTC program, which appeared in the *Stanford Daily* on April 4, I feel obliged to challenge a number of the assertions which that report made. I was particularly struck by what appeared to be the repetition of traditional popular presumptions concerning the relationship of the military to civilian society which have never been substantiated by a shred of empirical evidence. During three years spent as a military psychiatrist at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, I devoted several months to studying the effects of military service and particularly Basic Training upon recruits at Fort Dix, New Jersey. Those studies showed that the social and psychological techniques to which the inductees are subjected had rather effectively to significant and probably damaging effects on the personality. These included dissolution and rejection of their previous identity, acceptance of the omnipotence and omniscience of the military system with recognition of the crushing recrimination it can inflict if they should seek to challenge its authority, and belief in the legitimacy and righteousness of the system. Overall the processes of Basic Training bear striking similarities to the methods of thought reform or brainwashing that have been described by Lifton and others in China, but which we have been hesitant to label as such when used in our own society. In addition to social acceptance as a reward for acquiescence to a new system, the military relies heavily on its self proclaimed right to confer manhood, an offer that has wide appeal to the late adolescent struggling to establish his identity in this area.

One may well ask what the long term effects may be on an individual of two or more years of indoctrination and total immersion in a subculture that espouses a value system which is the antithesis of that to which the larger society is committed. In a comprehensive review entitled "The Military in a Democracy," Cohen stated that there are "deeply corruptive consequences of military organization on the individual" with lasting implications for society. However, the danger of military service lies not so much in its potential to irrevocably damage the mind of the young inductee, but more to proselytize for its own ends during the two years that he is within its grasp. One result is that society has adopted a posture of special concession toward the military, making its power and expenditures largely immune from the criticism that plagues other governmental operations. At the same time it allows the military to assume an insidious and slowly increasing control over the entire society. While the military exists merely to protect society, it has frequently become a law unto itself, acting with scorn for the values

and cherished prerogatives of the system it was developed to serve.

The presence of ROTC programs on college campuses appears to be a reflection of the special privileged status that the military has acquired for itself in society, with support coming predominantly from those whose attitudes have been shaped by their own military service. Whereas it may be true that maintaining contact with civilian institutions has an ameliorating effect on the military, it seems comparable to suggesting that the only answer to pollution is to dilute it. And clearly the diluting influence works both ways.

Sincerely,
PETER G. BOURNE, M.D.
Medical Center

Dear Sir:

I wish to urge my colleagues to vote for the second alternative in the forthcoming referendum on ROTC—the alternative which requests the President to negotiate with the Defense Department and within a year to bring back a plan for Academic Senate consideration which might allow the continuation of ROTC on an acceptable basis. I say "might" because, in spite of evidence of a new and unusual willingness on the part of the Department of Defense to re-evaluate requirements on ROTC programs it still may prove impossible to negotiate terms which are mutually acceptable. I doubt that such will be the case, but if it is then so be it. At least we will not have been purely doctrinaire in our decision.

I find in the majority report of the Senate's committee on ROTC and in the Senate's subsequent approval of a portion of it some of that same rigidity and religious-like intolerance which many of us find so disturbing in the most militant of our students. Certainly there are objections to the present arrangements. They include issues of course quality, academic appointments, individual student contract provisions, and others. It is inconceivable to me, however, that one would adopt an action which is alleged, rightly or wrongly, to be equivalent to disbanding ROTC without first determining whether those objections could be removed. Yet this is what the Senate did.

I hope that its action will be disapproved. I hope that the President thus armed, and with a year's deadline, will work toward a plan whereby ROTC fellowships differ as little as possible from other university fellowships. I believe such a plan is desirable not only because it would insure a continuing source of student financial aid, but also because if we must have armed forces, then I want their officers to be broadly educated and in the tradition of free inquiry.

In any event, if the second alternative—negotiation—is approved, no irrevocable action will have been taken. The Senate will have the issue back for decision in a

year's time. It will, though, have a better view of what the alternatives are.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT HEFFNER
Physics

Editor, Campus Report:

To someone exposed for seven years, four in ROTC and three on active duty, some recent arguments in favor of allowing academic credit and professional status have sounded like rumors from Never-Never Land. I was a "regular" (i.e. scholarship) student in the Navy program at Harvard, then officer aboard a carrier in the Mediterranean. I know I speak for hundreds of my acquaintance and similar experience in saying that:

1. The quality of courses was and must remain *necessarily* quite low. They were taught by rote, mainly from manuals used at every university in the country. The only challenge they presented was how to get an A with little work: this was done by merely "creating" the multiple-choice exam along with the instructor—that is, arithmetically culling past exams.

2. Nevertheless, ROTC courses and weekly drill were a painful burden to anyone really interested in his major, and in college. They were also a waste of time, in no way preparing one realistically for military service: everything useful is learned after ROTC. Turning a few courses over to the university is no solution: ROTC must still teach guns and leadership.

3. As for the "leavening" effect of college-trained officers, I felt and now believe this is in great part a pretence of the military: what they want is manpower, "warm bodies."

4. Finally, given the definite withdrawal of credit from ROTC by several other major universities, the Department of Defense appears ready to do almost anything to keep ROTC associated with the university in any form. If Stanford decides to keep ROTC within the academic curriculum, we may find ourselves to be a bulwark of military legitimacy in the country.

JOHN FELSTINER
English Department