

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1970

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

# Faculty Will Review ROTC; Pitzer Rejects Open Forum

By FRANK MILLER  
President Kenneth Pitzer has rejected a request for an open community forum on ROTC, but the entire faculty will review last month's Academic Senate decision.

In a seven-page letter released yesterday to the Stanford Community (printed in full below), Pitzer denied that he had acted with "haste and secrecy" in dealing with the ROTC question. After outlining the history of decision affecting ROTC on the Stanford campus he said, "In view of the extensive discussion which preceded the Senate vote and the opportunity for further debate and deliberation in the event of its review by the entire Academic Council, I believe no constructive purpose would be served by calling a separate meeting on this issue at this time."

Also yesterday, a petition was submitted by Professor Harold Kahn, history, signed by many more than the required 50 members of the Academic Council asking for a special meeting of that group to review the Academic Senate decision on ROTC. Prof. Kahn claimed that 146 faculty members had signed the petition although Donald Winbiger, academic secretary to the University, has not yet verified that number.

Another petition was also submitted by 28 members of the Academic Senate proposing that a mail ballot be submitted to the faculty asking for approval or rejection of the Senate's decision. The group of faculty members, composed of some in favor of the Senate's action and others opposed, wants the special Council meeting to concentrate on discussing ROTC rather than haggling over procedures.

Restoring Decision  
The petition circulated by Kahn asks for a special Council meeting to consider the decision of the Academic Senate and "at the very minimum restore the prior decisions of the Academic Council and Senate, announced in 1969, with respect to ROTC at Stanford."

Three weeks ago the Academic Senate voted to allow Army ROTC to grant limited credit to

ROTC courses, subject to approval of the Committee on Undergraduate Studies, on a one-year trial basis. A year ago the Senate voted to deny credit to ROTC courses after a general phase-out to be completed in 1973.

A Council meeting of all faculty members of the rank of assistant professor and higher must be held within four weeks since there is not a regularly scheduled meeting before April. Kahn asked Winbiger to call a meeting "before or no later than March 5 so as to avoid the prospect of the Council convening itself during Dead Week."

Not During Dead Week  
Kahn feels the event is of such importance that any action should be conveyed to the Stanford community by the news media which is not possible during Dead Week (the Daily does not publish during Dead Week).

Winbiger did not know yesterday when the meeting would be held.

The two petitions assure that the whole matter of ROTC and the possibility of having a mail referendum of the faculty on it will be discussed at the Council meeting. According to Winbiger, "anything regarding ROTC will be up for discussion at the meeting."

Any Action Possible

The Council could take any action on the matter it deems proper although it is unlikely that it will do more than reject or reaffirm the Senate's decision.

The Pitzer letter was in response to requests of February 5, by the New Moratorium, the Student Mobilization Committee, the SDS, and the New University Conference to have an open forum on ROTC. In a letter to Pitzer, the groups said "many members of the community are confused about ROTC and its place on the campus." They cited "widespread public concern with the presence of ROTC at Stanford" in asking for the forum.

Pitzer said, "I believe that a review of the recent history of decisions affecting ROTC on this campus will show that I have not acted arbitrarily, with undue haste, or without advice from the faculty and students."

February 12, 1970  
To the Stanford Community:

I have received a letter bearing the names of the New Moratorium, the Student Mobilization Committee, Students for a Democratic Society, and the New University Conference as signatories. It deals with ROTC at Stanford, charges me with "haste and secrecy" in referring recommendations of the Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs to the Faculty Senate, and requests a "community forum" on the subject. Because the letter carried no personal signatures and first appeared in the Daily, I am addressing this reply to the community in general so that the same audience may have my full response.

I believe that a review of the recent history of decisions affecting ROTC on this campus will show that I have not acted arbitrarily, with undue haste, or without advice from the faculty and students.

There have been numerous events and discussions over the past year and a half, nearly all of which have been reported in full or in summary form. Informal talks and organized panel presentations on ROTC took place early in the fall of 1968. These culminated in a report by ten members of the Academic Council entitled "ROTC at Stanford: A Faculty Proposal."

This was followed by the creation of an ad hoc Committee on ROTC by the Faculty Senate on Sept. 26, 1968. In creating the Committee, the Senate resolved that "the ROTC program should be altered, but that proper relations between the ROTC departments and Stanford may be established by review and reform of the present relations."

On Jan. 16, 1969, the Senate Committee held an open hearing, "ROTC and the University." The meeting consisted almost entirely of statements offered from the floor by those interested in the subject.

On Feb. 7, the Senate received the report of the Committee on ROTC. The full reports of the majority and minority recommendations were

published as a Campus Report Supplement on Feb. 11. The majority report recommended an end to academic credit for regular ROTC courses. It also recommended the adoption of voluntary status for military training programs in the University; it did not recommend the abolition of ROTC at Stanford.

On Feb. 13, the Faculty Senate endorsed six of the eight minority recommendations of its Committee on ROTC by a vote of 75 to 9, including the proposal that no academic credit be given for participation in programs of military training and education. It called for further committee study of recommendations that ROTC be changed to an extracurricular activity, an action which later led to the formation of the Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs.

In an ASSU referendum on Feb. 24, students voted 2,106 to 1,367 that "... ROTC has a legitimate place on the campus and deserves support and credit from the University for all those parts of the program that are of genuine academic interest."

On March 11, the University Board of Trustees adopted a resolution concerning ROTC in which it urged "The President of the University to continue his consultation with the Department of Defense, leading to appropriate actions which will improve and vitalize this important program." The full text of the Trustee's resolution was published in the Campus Report March 19.

On April 4, the Academic Council debated the Faculty Senate's Feb. 13 ROTC decision. At the conclusion of its discussions, the Council voted 249 to 139 for a mail ballot of the full Academic Council.

To encourage any member of the faculty who wished to do so to place his arguments, oral or on, on the ROTC matter before his colleagues, a special Campus Report Supplement for this purpose was announced and the presentations received were published on April 22.

On April 30, the mail balloting of the members of the Academic Council (Continued on Page 5)

## Text Of Pitzer's ROTC Letter

(Continued from Page 1)  
approved the Senate's ROTC decision by a vote of 403 to 366.

On June 6, I appointed the President's Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs, with the responsibility, among others, for advising on revisions of ROTC agreements with the Department of Defense. The three student and five faculty members were nominated, respectively, by the ASSU and the faculty nomination committee.

On Oct. 22, a proposal for the revision of the Army ROTC program was submitted by Colonel Barney to the University. I forwarded the proposal to the Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs on Oct. 30, 1969.

The recommendations of the Advisory Committee on ROTC were outlined at the Academic Council meeting of Jan. 8, 1970, by its Chairman of the Faculty Senate, Professor Cletch, and reported on the front page of the Daily on Jan. 12. Professor Cletch noted that the Senate was expected to consider the report at its Jan. 22 meeting, and urged members of the Council to make their opinions known to their Senate representatives. His address to the Council was reported in full in the Campus Report Supplement of Jan. 15.

The official report of the Committee was sent to me on Jan. 12, and I transmitted it with a covering letter summarizing my response to it to the Steering Committee of the Senate on Jan. 16. Copies of this correspondence, newspaper advertisements and other background material were sent on Monday, Jan. 19 to members of the Senate, to students (including representatives of ASSU and the student Senate), and to the campus news media (The Daily, KZSU and Campus Report) whose representatives attend the Senate meetings. The Daily featured extensive news coverage of the major recommendations on Jan. 20 and a criticism of them the next day.

On Jan. 22, the Faculty Senate, after extensive debate, voted 22 to 13 to approve on a one-year basis the plan endorsed by the Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs under which Army ROTC courses could qualify for limited academic credit through the Committee on Undergraduate Studies; to eliminate faculty rank for instructors; and to create a Center for Military Studies in place of the Department of Military Science. Faculty and students from the ROTC Committee participated in the debate, which was transmitted live to Bishop Auditorium to an audience of students and faculty. The report of the Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs and my memorandum transmitting it

to the Faculty Senate were also published in full in the Jan. 23 Campus Report.

At a press conference in my office on Jan. 22, the ROTC matter was one of the subjects considered and freely discussed. My comments were reported in the local press and in the Campus Report of Feb. 4.

As the chronology indicates, the question of ROTC at Stanford has been discussed on numerous occasions and in numerous forms, ranging from meetings of the Faculty Senate and the Academic Council—where jurisdiction in such matters as academic credit properly resides—to a student body referendum. These discussions and actions provide a background for the current recommendations now being considered by the faculty.

As already noted, the Senate on Feb. 13 adopted six of eight recommendations from the majority report of its ad hoc Committee on ROTC and referred two other recommendations to a committee to be established subsequently. Recommendation Six stated that "University authorities should promptly initiate action leading to revision or termination of the contracts between Stanford and the armed forces...." On my instructions, Vice Provost Brooks began negotiations with the three services for revision of the contracts to bring ROTC at Stanford as closely as possible into conformance with the recommendations of the Senate. In keeping with this resolution I also appointed the Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs, as already noted.

This Committee spent two months considering the Army proposal submitted by Colonel Barney. After this extended discussion the Committee recommended, by a six to two vote, that I accept the Army proposal with minor changes (which were made) and subject to obtaining the "advice and consent of the Senate on the proposal for granting of academic credit on a course-by-course basis in accordance with the procedures and standards of the Committee on Undergraduate Studies."

In accordance with the Committee's recommendation, I therefore requested the Steering Committee of the Senate to place this question prominently on the Agenda for the Jan. 22 meeting. This was necessary so that the three services would know whether or not they could enroll scholarship students in the coming Autumn Quarter, and so that the students could apply for these programs if they wished. It was also intended to provide ample time for full consideration of the issue. As I have publicly stated, no contracts will be signed with the Army while a potential

review of the Senate's decision on academic credit remains pending.

My own position on ROTC has been made plain on numerous occasions; I share the deep concern expressed by many faculty and students about the need for revision of individual student contracts with the military services, and intend to work for such change through Congressional action. In other respects, I feel the Army proposal reasonable and acceptable, and very close indeed to the recommendations endorsed by the Faculty Senate a year ago.

The position of ROTC on campus will be substantially altered under the Army proposal. In abolishing faculty rank and Academic Council membership for ROTC instructors, the Army proposal meets one of the primary objections voiced to this program a year ago. In contrast to the 27 units of credit now possible for military-sought courses, the Army has agreed to credit course proposals up to a combined total not to exceed nine units to the Committee on Undergraduate Studies. This group already has the responsibility for determining whether special, non-disciplinary courses may receive credit; ROTC courses would receive the same scrutiny. The Army has agreed to be judged by the same standards and to abide by the committee's decision. There is, in short, no guarantee that any course will receive any credit.

The only remaining central issue is the question of whether or not Army ROTC shall have an opportunity to submit course proposals which may qualify for limited academic credit on the same basis as other special, non-disciplinary programs. This question properly remains within the faculty's jurisdiction. The Faculty Senate and the Academic Council are the appropriate decision-making bodies.

In view of the extensive discussion which preceded the Senate vote and the opportunity for further debate and deliberation in the event of its review by the entire Academic Council, I believe no constructive purpose would be served by calling a separate meeting on this issue at this time.



## 34 Plea 'Nolo Contendere'

By RALPH KOSTANT  
Thirty-four SRI-Harover demonstrators entered plea of "nolo contendere" to charges resulting from last spring's protests. Many are Stanford students.

perhaps as much as two years of parole.

The out-of-court deals which resulted in the pleas filed Tuesday and Wednesday included dropping charges of obstructing free passage, disturbing the peace,

## Carswell Opposed