

tion by the University on academic credit. Decisions on academic credit are appropriately delegated to the faculty because the faculty has particular competence to judge the intellectual content of courses and the pedagogical capability of instructors. It would be a fundamental abuse of this delegated power for the faculty to decide academic issues on the basis of non-academic criteria as to which the faculty has no special competence.

Each faculty member (and every other member of the University community) is entitled to have—and arguably is obligated as a citizen to have—an opinion on the issues raised by United States foreign policy in general and the Vietnam War in particular. But the status of membership in the Academic Council does not evidence any special competence on those issues. If, contrary to our view, the question of academic credit were to be decided with reference to political questions of general interest, then a different and more encompassing constituency should be allowed to make the decision. But we think that institutional decisions by the University must be made on the basis of the educational purposes of the University, not the political judgments of a University constituency, however defined. The distinction between individual views on political issues and institutional decisions on University matters must be recognized and respected.

WILLIAM F. BAXTER  
THOMAS EHRLICH  
KENNETH SCOTT  
Law

The Army ROTC proposal, recently considered and approved by the faculty Senate on a one-year trial basis, is now under review by the total membership of the Academic Council. The proposal makes significant changes in the structure of the Army ROTC program at Stanford. Those changes may be seen most readily in a tabular form.

*Academic Credit*

**Present Army ROTC Program**

27 quarter units for classroom instruction by military officers.

**Proposed Army ROTC Program (Effective September 1, 1970)**

No automatic or blanket credit would be given for any instruction by military officers. Army ROTC could submit proposals of courses for academic credit to the Committee on Undergraduate Studies, empowered by the Academic Council to approve credit for Undergraduate Specials. The Army would submit course proposals for between 6 and 9 units of credit. Each proposal would be considered by CUS on its academic merits, with no presumption that any such proposal would be accepted.\*

\* Students currently enrolled will be given special consideration by the Committee on Undergraduate Studies.

*Status of Military Officers*

**Present**

The senior officer has the title of Professor of Military Science with full faculty prerogatives and privileges except tenure. Other officers are Associate and Assistant Professors with corresponding status.

**Proposed**

Faculty rank and status would be *abolished*. Military officers thereafter would have the status of University Staff—the classification used for administrative personnel and other persons, currently numbering over 1,800. University staff members are invited to attend the *regular* meetings of the Academic Council without the privileges of the floor or of the vote.

*Organization*

**Present**

Army ROTC is currently a Department of Military Science with full status of an academic department. It reports to the Dean of Humanities & Sciences.

**Proposed**

Academic departmental status would be *abolished*. The new designation would be an administrative unit, the Center for Militaries Studies, and would report administratively to the Provost.

On the important matter of individual student contracts, particularly the so-called punitive clauses involving enlisted service, the University is making a major effort to secure significant changes in present practices.

By way of comparison, the Senate ROTC actions of February 1969 called for the following changes:

1. Academic Credit: Beginning with the Fall term 1970 and thereafter, no entering freshman would be granted academic credit for participation in programs of military training and education. Beginning with the Fall term 1973, no credit would be given for any participation in programs of military training and education.
2. Status of Military Officers: Until Fall term 1973, there would be no change in the present status of military officers presumably on duty here. Thereafter, representatives of the armed forces at Stanford would have no academic rank.
3. Organization: By the Fall term 1973, the three ROTC academic departments would be replaced by a single Armed Forces Officers Program, for the purposes of administration, counseling, and recruiting for reserve officer training and education.

In comparing the current Army proposal with the Senate recommendations of February 1969, it will be seen that recommendations 2 and 3 have been fully met. The academic credit aspects of the proposal differ from the Senate action of February 1969; therefore, the President returned to the Senate on this matter in January 1970.

I urge the membership of the Academic Council to sustain the Senate action of January 22, 1970.

E. Howard Brooks  
Vice Provost

I support the Senate Action of 22 January 1970.

A wide variety of "Undergraduate Specials" of dubious academic merit and taught by people without scholarly credentials, are taken for credit at Stanford. For example, against my wishes one of my Freshman advisees has signed up for something called "Introduction to Theater Games," offered by a senior in his dormitory. I find it inconceivable that ROTC courses taken for credit can be of lower academic quality than these "Undergraduate Specials." On the contrary, some of them compare favorably with regular offerings in the departments. In any case, ROTC courses will go before the same Committee on Undergraduate Education as the "Specials" and will receive at least equal scrutiny from our faculty watchdogs. Under these conditions, to refuse ROTC the same privilege we accord seniors and graduate students is an act of blatant political prejudice.

At the Academic Council meeting of 2 March 1970 Professors Franklin and Kaplan proclaimed that their opposition to the Academic Senate Action of 22 January 1970 was indeed political, not academic. They are opposed to American participation in the Vietnamese Civil War and wish to hurt the United States Army and the United States government. I admire their courage and honesty. But I maintain that the University must not allow itself to be "politicized." We must not permit any faction, whether of the Right or Left, to impose its views on the campus and to deny academic freedom to those students who wish to take serious, intellectually valid ROTC courses (screened by the appropriate faculty committee) for credit.

The students have spoken. In a vote taken last year they supported ROTC by a margin of 3 to 2.

The University finds itself in critical financial straits. Quixotic moves of no intrinsic importance but which will encourage still further drying up our financial resources can only be deemed irresponsible.

WILLIAM CALIN  
French & Italian

Many substantive reasons have been given for reasserting the position of the Academic Council in April of 1969 and refusing to endorse the action of the Academic Senate of February 1970 with respect to the programs of the ROTC. These include the clear inaccuracy of the contention that the military will not accept programs which exclude academic credit, the possibility that Stanford did not vigor-

tradition that our army should be a citizen army, not a militaristic caste, is too valuable to be sacrificed to those whose deep feelings about Viet Nam prompt them to treat other questions as mere symbols of Viet Nam.

My second observation is that we seem to forget that the ROTC question does not involve a requirement, but an option. No one has to be in the ROTC program, and those now in it are there by reason of a personal decision. A student vote has shown a majority favoring this right to decide. If the vote had gone the other way it would have been hailed as a solemn negative sanction. Having gone as it did, it is dismissed as negligible. But the question to be determined now is whether students who wish to devote an extremely limited part of their curriculum to military studies leading to a commission, shall be deprived of their option to do so. At a time when the curriculum is more permissive than ever before, it seems arbitrary to repress this form of individual choice.

DAVID M. POTTER  
History

In response to your invitation in *Campus Report* of 4 March, I would like to submit the following statement about ROTC for publication in *Campus Report*:

Last year both the Senate and the Academic Council voted, in effect, to make ROTC an extracurricular activity at Stanford University. Now the Council is being asked to approve Army proposals that, according to President Fitzer, come "very close" to realizing the will of the faculty last year. In truth the Army's proposals accomplish almost nothing of the sort. Apart from the military instructors' ceasing to be members of the Academic Council, the proposals involve changes that are nominal, not substantive.

We must not be fooled by talk of courses in military science being like all other Undergraduate Special courses that are submitted to the Committee on Undergraduate Studies for approval or disapproval. At the moment Undergraduate Specials are proposed by members of the University community in response to their own interests or to the initiative of a group of students, often in a residence. There is a vast difference between such a procedure and a program of courses proposed to CUS on the initiative of the Department of the Army, with the basic content of the courses and the order in which they are given determined by the Department of the Army, with the courses taught by virtual appointees of the Department of the Army, and with the students participating in the program, should they decide to drop the sequence of so-called Undergraduate Specials in their junior or senior year, liable to induction by the Department of the Army for two to four years.

In truth the Army's proposals mean that an agency external to the University

will control course offerings, teachers, and the student's freedom of academic inquiry—the same violation of the University's academic autonomy that the Senate and the Academic Council rejected last year. If we have any doubts, we need only read the proposals themselves (Senate Doc. 334, p. 2) where we are told that the purpose of the contract is to establish a Center for Military Studies as "an integral element in the structure of this institution" with the right to determine a curriculum; or again, "a major organizational element in the University structure under a senior academic official."

I suggest that the Army wants ROTC as an integral, curricular rather than extracurricular part of the University because it wants to confer on its program and itself, in the eyes of students and the nation, the dignity that attaches to this and other major universities. Why should we allow the University to be used in this way by the Army when we would, I am sure, be extremely reluctant to have the University comparably used by, let us say, the Roman Catholic hierarchy seeking to establish a seminary at Stanford? Is it really because we want to satisfy the desires of students or civilianize and civilize the military mind? Those objectives could be achieved with an extracurricular ROTC. Or is it because the Army has money, and influence with other bodies—especially the Department of Defense and the Congress—that have even more money? I suggest that we announce with the mail vote that the Academic Council's decision of last year is not for sale. I suggest that we vote to *disapprove* the Senate's decision of January 22, 1970.

RONALD A. REBHOLZ  
Dept. of English

I voted in the Senate meeting of January 22nd to support the new ROTC proposal, and also signed the petition for a mail ballot to allow all members of the Academic Council to express their opinions. My reasons for supporting the new ROTC proposal are briefly as follows:

1. The plan is experimental, being limited to one year. I think it would be short sighted not to give it at least a trial. If the Committee on Undergraduate Studies finds that the plan is unworkable, or that its administration puts the Committee in a false position, it can so report to the Senate. As to the claim that the new plan involves a "reversal" of the 1969 decision of the Academic Council, I would point out that the new plan was not among the alternatives seriously and systematically considered in 1969.

2. Arguments about the exertion of "pressure" on the ROTC issue seem at best to cancel out. Assuming that there have been "pressures" from Washington or from Alumni to keep ROTC (and I have no direct knowledge of these) there have

been more immediate local "pressures" exerted on the other side.

3. If ROTC were excluded systematically from all college campuses, the result would be a *symbolic* defeat for the military. But the *practical* result might well be the creation of new service academies for training of military officers, in a wholly militaristic atmosphere without any of the counter influence provided by the University context. This would be a loss, not a gain.

4. I reject the view that approval of the current ROTC proposal constitutes endorsement for the war in Vietnam. First, it was the *civilian* policy makers who got us into and are continuing this war. Second, those who claim that the only issue now relevant to ROTC is the Vietnam war seem to be saying that whether ROTC should be on campus depends at any given time on the state of popular approval or disapproval of the military at that moment. I do not think a shifting policy of this sort would be either sound or practicable.

P. H. RHINELANDER  
Philosophy &  
Humanities

The real issue before the Academic Council has never been discussed and was only obliquely indicated in Professor Wayne Barnett's motion to adjourn the meeting of March 2, 1970.

The basic question is *not* whether academic credit shall be given for courses proposed by the Army or how much or by whom, or even whether having taken a course in humanities influences the behavior of an officer in time of war.

The fundamental question is whether the Academic Council of the Stanford University shall become a political forum in which every critic of government, society, or environment and every advocate of political action would be allowed to seek the approval of 51 percent of the Council members so that he could proclaim "support of the Stanford Faculty" for his position.

Regardless of the closeness of the vote on this referendum, the result will be construed, and headlined, as "STANFORD FACULTY SUPPORTS PENTAGON" or "STANFORD FACULTY PROTESTS WAR IN VIETNAM."

The Senate acted properly in considering and resolving an academic issue. In my opinion, however, the *stated* question is inappropriate for the Academic Council and the *fundamental* question should be answered with a resounding "NO." Since the motion to adjourn failed and since there is no opportunity to vote "not to disapprove," I shall vote to "approve," but my intent is to discourage the use of Academic Council meetings by political advocates.

RALPH J. SMITH  
Electrical Engineering