

continue at Stanford as part of the academic program with specific provision for a closer integration into the academic structure. It also suggested the campus military programs be modified with respect to the organization and administration of ROTC.

**February 13**—The Senate voted 25–8, with no abstentions, in favor of the majority recommendation to end credit but called for an implementation study.

**February 24**—In a referendum, students voted 2,106 to 1,387 that “. . . ROTC has a legitimate place on campus and deserves support and credit from the University for all those parts of the program that are of genuine academic interest.”

**February 28**—A petition was filed by 53 professors which, in accord with Senate by-laws, calls for the Council review of the Senate action.

**March 11**—The Board of Trustees adopted its resolution, urging that “any action taken with respect to ROTC give full weight to the following:

- A. That this nation has a strong and valued tradition of civilian participation in military leadership;
- B. That deterioration of that tradition would move us very quickly toward the emergence of a military caste;
- C. That ROTC is vital to the continued supply of civilian leadership for the military services, and it is of crucial importance that first-ranking institutions, such as Stanford, lend their strength to that task; and
- D. Further that this board of trustees urges 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 series of events now reaches the final staging area where the Council may affirm, overrule, or modify the Senate’s action as it believes appropriate. Any action of the Council will be binding on the faculty, and the recommendation then will go to the President.

The minority report of the ad hoc committee suggested a program of military science, naval science, and aerospace

studies to be offered in the Stanford curriculum “under the aegis of a Military Studies Committee.” The committee would be appointed by the Senate and be composed of four professors from the University at large, the senior military officer from each ROTC unit, and four undergraduate students, two of whom would be enrolled in ROTC.

The committee also would determine credit for courses, the curriculum, and review the qualifications of military officers recommended for appointment to instructional positions.

Courses approved by the committee would be for degree credit, and other instruction specifically desirable for potential military officers would be conducted as extracurricular sessions. They would not exceed 18 quarter units or 12 semester units in a four year curriculum.

Individual contracts between students and the military would provide that any ROTC student could disenroll from the program within the first two years of the four year period without prejudice or obligation.

The proposed program would be undertaken for a five year trial period when a “searching review” of its success would be undertaken.

#### *‘Domino Theory’ Cited*

Brooks notes that faculty groups at Harvard, Princeton, and Yale—among others—have voted to deny ROTC credit, and the DOD is facing the reality of the “domino theory.” He states that although ROTC programs at Stanford and Ivy League schools are expensive, they represent prestige value. “Already there are stirrings of opposition to ROTC at state institutions,” Brooks explains, “and if the prestige schools drop the programs, other schools well could follow suit.”

Brooks, who has been in frequent consultation with national military and civilian DOD leaders recently, says that ironically the “officers that are turned out by these very prestige universities are of very fine quality.” Therefore, the services are anxious to retain ROTC on college and university campuses. The logic of this sentiment is evident when it is considered that approximately 20,000 new army second lieutenants are required each year.

The vice provost interprets the DOD attitude as one seeking to remove as many bases of academic criticisms as possible.

He further states:

“I think the DOD is willing to examine and review all the university contracts that exist, will take a broad view of them, and then give the colleges an opportunity to come up with something the armed services can live with.”

#### *Not Without Criticism*

Brooks is not without criticism of the military or the DOD. “They have waited too long,” he explains, “before fundamentally reexamining ROTC programs, and they have underestimated the strength of student and faculty opposition to ROTC.”

One of the basic problems is the fact military officers some-

### **CAMPUS REPORT**

Published weekly in Autumn, Winter, and Spring and bi-weekly in Summer quarters by the University Relations Office. Stanley I. Wilson, editor; Jan Studebaker, associate editor.

News items, letters to the editor, questions for the Q and A column, housing notices (Stanford faculty and staff only), and other editorial communications should be directed to the Publications Service, 332 Encina Hall. (See Calendar for special instructions.)

On-campus distribution queries should be directed to the Interdepartmental Mail, Ext. 2450; at the Medical Center, to the Mail Room, Ext. 5130. U.S. mail (first class) subscriptions at \$6.00 a year available at Publications Service, 332 Encina Hall, Stanford, Calif. 94305; make checks payable to Stanford University. Second-class postal permit pending at Palo Alto, Calif.