

Letter of Report on ROTC

Following is the letter of report from the ad hoc President's Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs of January 12, 1970:

DEAR PRESIDENT PETER:

On June 6, 1969, you appointed a President's Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs. On October 30, 1969, you transmitted a proposal from the Army for revision of the Army ROTC program at Stanford University, with a request for this Committee's advice on the proposal.

The Committee's views on the proposal have been grouped under three headings:

- I. General background.
- II. Alternative steps.
- III. Consideration of paragraphs 2a and 4a in the proposed contract.

Appended are a copy of the contract, background material and individual statements by members of this Committee.

I. General background

In our judgment, the memorandum from Colonel Ramey to Mr. Brooks (attached) outlines the most extensive contract modifications likely to come from the Department of the Army in response to the faculty Senate action of February 13, 1969 and the subsequent Academic Council referendum.

We see the central point of possible dispute to be paragraph 2d of the proposed contract—which provides that ROTC courses be reviewed for credit "in accordance with normal University procedures." Presumably this means the Committee on Undergraduate Studies.

The majority of this Committee takes the view that the Committee on Undergraduate Studies has the resources and administrative procedures to deal with such proposals. (Mann and Van Slyke dissent on this point.)

The majority noted that the possibilities of such course-by-course review was pointed out in the *Stanford Daily* advertisement of April 15, 1969, by a number of senators who urged Academic Council support for the faculty Senate action of February 13, 1969. (Mann, Mann, and Van Slyke believe this advertisement to be non-germane.)

II. Alternative steps

The Committee voted on the acceptability of three alternative recommended next steps. In order of acceptability they are:

- (1) That you approve and accept the Army proposal, subject to obtaining the advice and consent of the faculty Senate on the proposal for the granting of academic credit on a course-by-course basis in accordance with the procedures and standards of the Committee on Undergraduate Studies. Six of the Committee members (Blanchard, Caldwell, Mann, Mayers, Roesch, and Webb) found alternative (1) acceptable, and two (Mann and Van Slyke) found it unacceptable.)
- (2) That in view of the controversial nature of paragraph 2d, it would be prudent for you to submit the Army proposal to the faculty Senate for its advice. Four of the Committee members (Blanchard, Mann, Mann, and Van Slyke) found alternative (2) acceptable, and four (Caldwell, Mayers, Roesch and Webb) found it unacceptable.
- (3) That you reject the Army proposal on the grounds that it

is academically in conflict with the faculty Senate action, and is administratively unworkable.

One member of the Committee (Van Slyke) found this proposal acceptable, and the seven other members found it unacceptable.

III. Consideration of paragraphs 2a and 4a in the proposed contract

As proposed by the Army, paragraph 2a would read:

"To establish a Center for Military Studies as an integral element in the academic and administrative structure of this institution . . ."

The majority recommends (with Caldwell, Mayers and Van Slyke dissenting) the deletion of the words "academic and administrative" from this section of the contract. It would read:

"To establish a Center for Military Studies as an integral element in the structure of this institution . . ."

The Committee suggests (with Van Slyke abstaining) that the words "tenure and" should be inserted into paragraph 4a of the proposed contract as follows:

"The senior commissioned Army officer assigned to the institution will be designated The Director, Center for Military Studies, with these full rights and privileges normally accorded Professors of the University, except *tenure and* membership on the Academic Council."

University Stands Ready To Aid TAs Who Are Caused Hardship

Dr. Lincoln Moses, dean of the graduate division, points out that as early as last December 24 he notified deans and department chairmen that the University "stands ready to aid" teaching assistants who are caused hardship by a recent internal revenue service ruling on taxation.

The University began withholding for income tax this month, on advice of counsel, after several IRS rulings. In protest, about 45 members and supporters of the American Federation of Teachers staged a peaceful information picket in front of the President's office last Thursday afternoon. They are seeking restoration of \$30 per month now withheld for income taxes by the University.

Teaching assistants now receive about \$2,700 annually, plus tuition fellowships on nine units' work toward an advanced degree.

In emphasizing that the University is prepared to aid those in financial distress, Dean Moses said he wrote in the December letter:

"Students should first consult their departments. Cases which cannot be adequately helped out at the departmental level may be referred by the department to The Graduate Division where loan funds will be available — or if justified, grant-in-aid funds." According to Dean Moses, no hardship requests have come to his attention so far.

He added these comments:

"No policy of reimbursing TAs for their taxes is contemplated. The maximally taxed (one exemption) lowest paid TA (Course Assistant) still receives more for his academic year stipend than do hundreds of graduate students now at Stanford on University Fellowships, NSF, NIH, NDEA, Fellow-

From Campus Reports, Jan 28 '70

DRAFT FOR REVIEW BY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

(Spacing and indentation to be improved in final typing at office of Vice Provost Brooks).

DATE: 7th January, 1970

TO : President Kenneth S. Pitzer

FROM : President's Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs

SUBJECT: Comments on proposal for revision of the Army ROTC program

Dear President Pitzer:

On June 6th, 1969 you appointed a President's Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs. On October 30th, 1969 you transmitted a proposal from the Army for revision of the Army ROTC program at Stanford University, with a request for this Committee's advice on the proposal.

The Committee's views on the proposal have been grouped under three headings:

- I. General background
- II. Alternative steps
- III. Consideration of paragraphs 2a and 4a in the proposed contract

Appended are a copy of the contract, background material, and individual statements by members of this Committee.

I. General background

In our judgement, the memorandum from Colonel Ramey to Mr. Brooks (attached) outlines the most extensive contract modifications likely to come from the Department of the Army in response to the Faculty Senate action of February 13th, 1969 and the subsequent Academic Council referendum.

We see the central point of possible dispute to be paragraph 2d of the proposed contract -- which provides that ROTC courses be reviewed for credit "in accordance with normal University procedures". Presumably this means the Committee on Undergraduate Studies.

President Kenneth S. Pitzer
7th January, 1970
Page 2

The majority of this Committee takes the view that the Committee on Undergraduate Studies has the resources and administrative procedures to deal with such proposals. (Manne and Van Slyke dissent on this point.)

The majority noted that the possibilities of such course-by-course review was pointed out in the Stanford Daily advertisement of April 15th, 1969 by a number of senators who urged Academic Council support for the Faculty Senate action of February 13th, 1969. (Mann, Manne and Van Slyke believe this advertisement to be non-germane.)

II. Alternative steps

The Committee voted on the acceptability of three alternative recommended next steps. In order of acceptability they are:

Academic [1]. That you approve and accept the Army proposal, subject to obtaining the advice and consent of ~~this~~ *the* Faculty Senate on the proposal for the granting of academic credit on a course-by-course basis in accordance with the procedures and standards of the Committee on Undergraduate Studies.

(Six of the Committee members [Blanchard, Caldwell, Mann, Mayers, Roesch, and Webb] found alternative [1] acceptable, and two [Manne and Van Slyke] found it unacceptable.)

[2]. That in view of the controversial nature of paragraph 2d, it would be prudent for you to submit the Army proposal to the Faculty Senate for its advice.

(Four of the Committee members [Blanchard, Mann, Manne, and Van Slyke] found alternative [2] acceptable, and four [Caldwell, Mayers, Roesch, and Webb] found it unacceptable.)

President Kenneth S. Pitzer
7th January, 1970
Page 3

- [3]. That you reject the Army proposal on the grounds that it is academically in conflict with the Faculty Senate action, and is administratively unworkable.

(One member of the Committee [Van Slyke] found this proposal acceptable, and the seven other members found it unacceptable.)

III. Consideration of paragraphs 2a and 4a in the proposed contract

As proposed by the Army, paragraph 2a would read:

"To establish a Center for Military Studies as an integral element in the academic and administrative structure of this institution..."

The majority recommends (with Caldwell, Mayers and Van Slyke dissenting) the deletion of the words "academic and administrative" from this section of the contract. It would read:

"To establish a Center for Military Studies as an integral element in the structure of this institution..."

The Committee suggests (with Van Slyke abstaining) that the words "tenure and" should be inserted into paragraph 4a of the proposed contract as follows:

"The senior commissioned Army officer assigned to the institution will be designated The Director, Center for Military Studies, with those full rights and privileges normally accorded Professors of the University, except tenure and membership on the Academic Council".

Alan S. Manne, *Chairman*
Professor of Economics and
Operations Research

William N. Blanchard
Graduate Student - Department
of Aeronautics and Astronautics

Dan E. Caldwell
Senior
Department of History

J. Keith Mann
Associate Dean and
Professor of Law

Jean Mayer
Professor and Vice Chairman,
Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics

Carol Ann Roesch
Sophomore

Lyman P. Van Slyke
Associate Professor & Associate
Chairman, Department of History

Eugene J. Webb
Professor of Organizational Behavior,
Graduate School of Business