

# Pitzer's ROTC Stand Still Leaves Questions

(First in a series.)

By BILL FREIVOGEL

The story of why the Academic Senate has granted ROTC limited credit after taking it away last year is largely told through the words and actions of President Kenneth Pitzer.

On February 13, 1969, the Academic Senate voted that "there should be no academic credit received for participation in programs of military training and education."

But just over a month ago, the Senate modified that stand in adopting the Army's proposal of "credit for (ROTC) courses taught on the same basis as other courses taught at the University."

On Monday, the Academic Council will review this position.

What happened between the somewhat contradictory Senate actions is entwined in Pitzer's establishment of the President's Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs and in the action of the committee itself.

It was the Advisory Committee that considered administration negotiations with the Defense Department. And it was this committee which recommended

to Pitzer in early January that he accept the Army proposal subject to modification by the Senate on the issue of academic credit.

## Key Questions

In analyzing Pitzer's actions and those of the committee, a number of key questions arise.

-Were questions of academic credit still open to review by the

## News Analysis

Advisory Committee, or was it supposed to be restricted to solving administrative problems such as allocating facilities?

-Was the committee representative of community opinions?

-Did the February 1969 Senate action eliminate credit for all military instruction or only for those courses taught by ROTC officers?

-Did the Advisory Committee recommend acceptance of the credit provisions of the Army proposal in January, or did it only ask the Senate whether the provisions were acceptable, without indicating a recommendation?

-Was it appropriate for Pitzer to recommend the Army's whole ROTC plan when serious doubts existed as to whether the Advisory Committee made a recommendation on the credit aspects of the plan?

-Did Defense Department, alumni, or Trustee pressures cause Pitzer to back away from last year's Senate vote, or did he disagree with that vote when it was taken?

## Credit Question Crucial

Whether or not the Advisory Committee had jurisdiction over credit problems is in many ways the crucial question.

Controversy over this point arises from a March, 1969, correspondence between Pitzer and two faculty Senate members, then chairman Leonard Schiff and G. Lee Bach, head of the Senate's Committee on Committees.

In describing possible tasks of a

committee, Pitzer seems to consider the credit question settled. He wrote: "In my view, there is a real difference between - on the one hand, decisions concerning academic course credit and faculty status - and on the other hand, arrangements for an extracurricular activity."

## Faculty Dominant?

"In the first area the formal faculty decision is a dominant factor, whereas in the second area student views are of comparable weight, and practical factors require special administrative input."

"Thus, if the Academic Council action leaves open the consideration of academic credit for courses taught by military officers, clearly an Academic Council committee should be established."

"However, if no questions of academic credit or faculty status remain to be considered, I believe a Presidential committee would be more appropriate."

## Presidential Committee

A Presidential Committee was established thereby implying that "no questions of academic credit ... remain to be considered."

This implication seemed confirmed by a May 5 memo from Schiff and Bach:

"The main issues remaining are administrative ones, though the problems of transition of a new ROTC status, will involve some academic matter."

By June, Pitzer seemed to have changed his stance slightly. In his charge to the newly formed Advisory Committee he asked them, "To insure, on behalf of my office and of the Senate, that such revisions as may be negotiated with the Department of Defense and the military services are consistent with the spirit of the Senate actions and of the faculty's views as expressed in the April referendum with due consideration also of the student and trustee view points as expressed by their respective resolutions."

(Continued on page 3)

# Pitzer's ROTC Stand

(Continued from page 1)

The new stress on student and trustee resolutions allowed the Advisory Committee to undertake a broader range of inquiry than at first seemed possible in the Pitzer-Schiff, Bach correspondence.

The importance of this phrasing in the charge is amplified in light of the minutes from the first meeting of the committee on October 14.

They read: "Mr. Brooks (Vice Provost Howard Brooks) read an exchange of memoranda between the President and Professors Bach and Schiff. . . The Bach-Schiff letter indicated that the 'main issues remaining are administrative ones, though the problems of transition to a new ROTC status will involve some academic matters.'

## Any Question

"The committee concluded, however, that nothing in the charge to the Committee prevents it from considering and rendering advice on any question it deems appropriate."

Committee member Lyman Van Slyke criticized the committee's broad interpretation during the proceedings. Reflecting

on the deliberations yesterday Van Slyke said, "I think the President just had a broader view of what the committee should do than I.

"I think the purpose should have been to implement the Senate's six resolutions (passed on February 13, 1969)," he continued. "But the letter of commission of the President was somewhat broader and the committee construed it broadly.

## Back To Senate

"The President hoped to moderate the action that the Senate took last spring, presumably by taking advice that would allow him to go back to the Senate," he said.

Most disagreed with Van Slyke, however. Their views and the other questions about the ROTC actions will be considered in an article on Monday.