

2/20/70



As Vote Nears

Faculty ROTC Views Range Widely

By LARRY DIAMOND

The Academic Senate is slated to reconsider the status of ROTC on campus within two weeks. Arguments for and against ROTC are varied, diverse, and exceedingly complex; and both practical and philosophical differences threaten to split the faculty in much the same manner as last spring's voting.

On January 22, the Senate voted to allow Army ROTC unit credit for courses approved by the Committee on Undergraduate Studies (CUS). That action will be reconsidered at a special meeting of the Academic Council on March 2.

Many view the Faculty Senate vote as a reversal. But, Philosophy Prof. Philip Rhinelander sees the new proposal as an option that did not exist last year. "The possibility of a mechanism which would give selective credit to ROTC courses under University auspices was not open a year ago," he argues.

Objections Dispute

"Since the middle option was worked out this year, we thought that nothing could be lost by trying it."

Prof. Stephen Kline, Mechanical Engineering, also feels that the Senate's vote does not reverse last year's decision, but rather, follows fairly closely what was asked for. Kline points out that the University now has the decision the course content,

not the Department of Defense; that the ROTC instructors will no longer be members of the faculty; and that military studies will no longer be a distinct department. "The major objections," says Kline, "have been met."

But 13 members of the Faculty Senate-14, if one includes Chemistry Professor Lawrence Altman, who walked out of the meeting before the vote was taken, think that the major objections have not been met. Those who voted against the ROTC proposal view the intention of last year's vote as allowing ROTC on campus only as a non-credit, extra-curricular activity. They see the recent vote as a clear reversal.

Logic Questioned

Economics Prof. Alan Manne, former Chairman of Pres. Pitzer's Advisory Committee on ROTC, notes that last year's Academic Council referendum offered the option of allowing the administration to negotiate flexibly with the Department of Defense on academic credit, but the faculty voted instead to deny academic credit. The decision of last year, he claims, was definite and inflexible, and did not allow for the negotiations which the Administration subsequently conducted.

Manne said, "You would have to go through some kind of Alice-in-Wonderland logic to see this as anything but a reversal of last year's decision."

Reversal or not, what many see as the major question is the power of an externum agency, ROTC, to prescribe the curriculum of University courses. Arthur Hastings, Asst. Professor of Speech, believes that the University should not have outside entities involved in its educational structure. "ROTC is a branch of the armed services; it does not offer the kind of academic program that is appropriate for the university," he says.

Yes Or No Approval

Prof. Altman agrees with this objection, as do most of the others who voted against the proposal. He feels that, "If ROTC courses were taught—really taught, not just sponsored—by normal members of the faculty, and if the initiative and control of these courses came from within Stanford, then I could not object to credit for ROTC. But the mere year-or-no approval of course content doesn't give us sufficient control over courses which are still drawn up by an outside agency."

A majority of Faculty Senate

members clearly feel that the mechanism for evaluation of courses in the proposal does give the University sufficient control. Prof. Paul Berg of Mathematics claims that a major element in last year's vote to ban all credit for ROTC courses was the inability to evaluate the courses and determine which deserve credit.

News Analysis

Professor of Surgery Roy Cohn attacks as "absurd" the argument that the University should have control over the content of ROTC courses. He notes that the state prescribes the course content for all licensed professional—i.e. doctors and lawyers—and therefore he sees nothing objectionable about it prescribing the content of military training courses.

Civilian Instructors?

Some members of the minority find fault with the specific mechanism for evaluation of the ROTC courses. "To ask the Committee on Undergraduate

Studies to administer courses of this type is to ask for continual headaches, and to politicize the tasks of that committee," Manne argues.

Another argument that has been raised is whether the ROTC classes should be taught by military personnel. Economics Professor Moses Abramovitz bases his major objection to the present ROTC proposal on the belief that they should not. "ROTC instructors," he says, "would still be nominated by the Army and be under the supervision of the Department of Defense. This is not consistent with the normal University standards for selection of faculty, nor is it consistent with faculty independence and excellence."

Cohn vehemently disagrees. His argument: "Our faculty isn't so great that some military men might not be the equal, if not the superior, of some of our faculty members. We can profit a lot by teaching methods developed in the military; they, in fact, have paid a lot more attention to teaching methods than the

University has."

Humanizing Effect

An argument of some who voted for the ROTC proposal is that by keeping the ROTC program, the University can have a humanizing affect on the military. Prof. David Potter, History, believes that ROTC has been "a factor in maintaining the tradition of civilians in the armed forces. This is a tradition worth preserving."

Rhinelander posits that "the views of the University must be brought to bear on the military. There is no hope of modifying the military mind if one cuts off all relations with it. Severing ties with ROTC may result in a stiffening of military blindness."

Prof. Ronald Rebbholz, English, criticizes this view. Rebbholz said, "It is ludicrous to expect that a civilian component produced by ROTC will have an impact on Army policy."

Punitive Clause

Perhaps the most volatile issue related to ROTC is the punitive clause in the individual contracts. (Please turn to page 8)

(Continued from page 1)

These punitive provisions threaten an ROTC student with active duty as an enlisted man if he drops out of the four year scholarship program during the last two years.

History professor Philip Dawson sees the continuation of the punitive clause as his major objection to the ROTC proposal. He said that there is "no obligation for the University to give credit to ROTC as long as the punitive clause remains in the contracts."

It will take an act of Congress to eliminate the punitive clauses from the contracts, but what Dawson finds particularly troublesome is "the unwillingness of the Army to even approach Congress and request a change."

Lyman said, "Substantial and demonstrable progress towards resolving this problem is essential to the continuation of ROTC at Stanford past next year."

Prof. Thomas Ehrlich of the Law School, who drafted the Pitzer proposal, emphasized that the punitive clause is one of his very great reservations. "The military's purpose could be achieved without this kind of sledge-hammer arrangement."