

Decision-Making at Stanford: A Chronology of ROTC

September 1, 1968-"ROTC at Stanford: A Faculty Proposal" issued by Kostelanetz and 9 other faculty members; many of its proposals appear in later majority report of 2/69, including no credit and VSO status; recommends effective date of 9/69.

September 26, 1968-Above report presented to Academic Senate; Ad Hoc Senate Comm. on ROTC established.

February 7, 1969-Ad Hoc Senate Committee on ROTC reports, with 5 members supporting a Majority Report (including Kostelanetz and Van Slyke), and 3 members supporting a Minority Report (including Brooks and Col. Thomas).

February 13, 1969-Academic Senate passed 6 of 8 recommendations of Ad Hoc Senate Comm. on ROTC, including, "Beginning with the fall term 1970, no entering freshman shall be granted academic credit for ROTC activities; vote was 25-0; items 2 and 3 (dealing with ROTC's future status on campus) were referred to the new ROTC Comm., "For early consideration and report back to the Senate."

Comments on Majority Report (from Daily, 2/12/69):

"...as a formal, on-campus program, sponsored, sanctioned, and partially supported by Stanford University, the ROTC program is not compatible with the University. The incompatibility is inherent ... and cannot be removed by various changes which are from time to time proposed." (from Presole)

Prof. Kostelanetz: "We began with a definition of the University and found an essential conflict of interest between this and the concept of ROTC."

Prof. Van Slyke: The majority were "not objecting to the objectives of ROTC, the recruitment of junior officers. We do object to the vehicle. We don't object to students under contract attending Stanford but we do object to on-campus training ....All objections to ROTC were institutional. The same recommendations would have applied to any other institution in similar circumstances."

Col. Thomas: "It would be ROTC in name only by its very nature. It would take a change in legislation to allow for the program as envisioned by the majority to take place."

February 17, 1969-Reporting in the Daily on a 2/14/69 exclusive interview with David Eckhard (Deputy Secretary of Defense and former Stanford trustee) Stanford should "keep ROTC on campus and upgrade it to meet academic standards .... We need some educated people as military officers ... We have to have some who have had the benefit of a wide education .... (The) faculty has an understandable position in denying academic status to ROTC professors, but something could be worked out to raise the standards of its curriculum to keep it on campus."

February 24, 1969-Student referendum: "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." Passed by 3-2 majority (2106-1357, of 11,400 students).

March 11, 1969-Board of Trustees statement called ROTC "vital to the continued supply of civilian leadership for the military service," and "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." No mention made in statement about academic credit.

May 2, 1969-Results announced of faculty mail poll, which asked approval or disapproval of 2/13/69 Academic Senate decision on ROTC. As defined by an Academic Council meeting of 4/4/69, "Disapproval carries the understanding that the President of the University will enter into negotiations with the Department of Defense and return to the Senate for its consideration not later than one year from this date a proposal for continuation of ROTC at Stanford which will assure programs consistent with the academic objectives and standards of the University, and responsive to the views which have been expressed by reports, referenda and petitions of the University community."  
Out of nearly 1,000 votes mailed out, the Senate action of 2/13/69 was approved by a vote of 403-356.

Comments on the impact and interpretation of this vote:

Open letter to Academic Council members, preceding above vote, signed by Germane, Mason, Mayers, Nix, Shockley, Spicer, Watkins (published in Campus Reports, 4/22/69): "...approval of the Senate action means that the faculty accepts irrevocably and without benefit of alternatives, a decision to remove ROTC from any academic status at the University -- a decision which may impair the worth of ROTC programs to the extent that they may not continue and which at the very least would place the content of ROTC instruction outside the curriculum and the control of the faculty. President Pitzer stated in response to questioning at the Academic Council meeting of April 6th that the Senate action on ROTC limits the exploration of alternatives for continuing ROTC at Stanford.... The ROTC issue can be resolved with time. Give President Pitzer and the Department of Defense that time. You are urged to vote for disapproval, the second alternative on the referendum ballot."

Col. Stanley Ramey (Daily, 5/2/69): "...the purpose of the mail referendum was that of asking that President Pitzer be allowed to negotiate with the Department of Defense without restrictions being placed on anyone .... The results of the referendum will make negotiations very difficult."

Prof. Alan Manne, later Chairman of President's Advisory Committee on ROTC, said (after his January 1970 protest resignation) that the 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." (see February 20, 1970)

June 6, 1969-President's Advisory Committee on ROTC appointed. The understood purpose of this committee is quite significant because 1) That would partly determine the nature of its membership -- i.e., a committee to examine major policy issues might have different applicants and final membership than a committee whose primary purpose was that of working out transitional details; and 2) That would determine the latitude which the committee had in examining diverse issues -- i.e., a group intended to consider transitional details might be exceeding its approved role in examining alternative policies counter to those which it was established to implement. One view which has been put forth is as follows: An implementation group should either have membership sympathetic to the policy which it must put into effect, or be limited in its deliberations to the policy which it is assigned to implement; if neither of these restrictions holds, the implementation group becomes a new policy-making group-- and policy is never effected.

Stated Purpose of new ROTC Committee

The sixth recommendation of the Majority Report of the first ROTC Committee, adopted by the 2/13/69 Academic Senate meeting (as amended 3/20/69) reads: "Appropriate University authorities should promptly initiate action leading to revision or termination of the contracts between Stanford and the armed forces (a) in order to enable the transition to begin in 1970, and (b) in order to reflect the non-credit status of military training at Stanford. We further

3

recommend that a committee be appointed, composed of faculty, administration, military science department, and students, to assist in effecting the transition. The Senate "referred to the committee contemplated under Recommendation 6 the matter of Recommendations 2 and 3 for early consideration and report back to the Senate."

The lead article of the 2/19/69 edition of Campus Reports is entitled, "Committee Will Be Selected for Implementation of ROTC Ruling." The article states, "A committee of administrators, faculty, students, and the Reserve Officers Training Corps departments will be named to work out details of a Senate decision to end academic credit for military training and education at Stanford. The Senate of the Academic Council last week voted 25-8, with no abstentions, to terminate credit starting with the 1970 freshman class. The implementation group will be named by the Committee on Committees.... Six of the eight recommendations contained in the committee's report were adopted by the Senate, and Items 2 and 3 were referred to the new implementation committee for further consideration.... Senate Chairman Leonard I. Schiff stated that the faculty members believe that the two items need more consideration, although the sentiment of the majority of the Senators was quite clear that no academic credit should be offered."

3/4/69-Pitzer wrote a letter to the Chairman of the Academic Senate, Leonard Schiff, and to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, Lee Bach. The President states: "While action appointing a new committee on the ROTC should undoubtedly await the next meeting of the Academic Council, I believe it may be desirable to consider certain matters in the interim. It seems clear that we will be negotiating with the Defense Department concerning future arrangements for ROTC and that a committee to advise the Stanford negotiator will be needed. In my view, there is a real difference between--on the one hand, decisions concerning academic course credit and faculty status--and on the other hand, arrangements for space, facilities, and conditions for an extracurricular activity. In the first area the formal faculty decision is a dominant factor, whereas in the second area student views are of comparable weight, and practical factors require special administrative input. Thus, if the Academic Council action leaves open the consideration of academic credit for courses taught by military officers, clearly an Academic Council committee should be established. However, if no questions of academic credit or faculty status remain to be considered, I believe a Presidential committee would be more appropriate."

5/5\_Bach and Schiff respond to Pitzer's letter, after awaiting the 5/2/69 announcement of the faculty vote reaffirming the Academic Senate position of 2/13/69. "On the basis of the faculty poll, which effectively eliminates academic credit for ROTC courses and regular faculty status for ROTC personnel, we believe that the main academic issues at stake have been settled. Under these circumstances, it seems to us appropriate that a presidential advisory committee, rather than an Academic Council committee, be appointed. The main issues remaining are administrative ones, though the problems of transition to a new ROTC status, will involve some academic matters. We doubt the need for two new ROTC committees under these circumstances, and believe that the presence of faculty members on your advisory committee may be sufficient to provide faculty representation on any such academic matters."

Pitzer wrote a letter to each member of the new ROTC Committee. According to his charge to the Committee, their functions have grown from that previously stipulated, both by the faculty, and by official administration statements (see above). Pitzer now lists five functions for the new committee: "1. To advise me on any problems concerning ROTC

4

which may be brought to the attention of the committee or of the President's Office. 2. To advise and consult with my representative (Vice Provost Brooks) assigned to the administration of the ROTC Programs on the campus and to the task of negotiating revisions of the ROTC contracts or agreements with the Department of Defense and the military services. 3. To insure, on behalf of my office and of the Senate, that such revisions as may be negotiated with the Department of Defense and the military services are consistent with the spirit of the Senate actions and of the faculty's views as expressed in the April referendum with due consideration also of the student and trustee viewpoints as expressed by their respective resolutions. 4. To consider such problems as may be brought to the Committee's attention by individual participants in the ROTC programs and by those responsible for the conduct of these programs. 5. To consider and advise me on any new proposals for military education programs which may be offered for the University's consideration."

June 12, 1969-Brooks writes a letter to Prof. Manne, Chairman of the second ROTC Committee: "This is to report that I have gotten our local military people started on the matter of contract revision, in accordance with the instructions of the President, which in turn were based upon the actions of the Senate, subsequently confirmed by the Academic Council. Enclosed are copies of memoranda to each of the local service heads. (NOTE: As of 5/1/70, Brooks, Glover, and Pitzer have refused to release the contents of this memoranda) .... The Army is about to come forth with a proposed program which, so far as I can tell, is designed to meet most if not all of the revisions desired by the Senate .... My job...is to represent the President in these negotiations, and to keep you informed in such a way that you can effectively exercise the assigned responsibility."

June, 1969-The June, 1969 edition of the Stanford Observer contained the following article, quoted here in its entirety: "ROTC'S FUTURE BEING STUDIED. A faculty-student committee has been appointed by President Pitzer to advise him on the future of Reserve Officer Training Corps at Stanford. In May, the faculty voted to end academic credit for military training and education, starting with freshmen entering in 1970, and Pitzer said he would consult with the Department of Defense toward an appropriate non-credit ROTC program. In appointing the committee, whose chairman is Prof. Alan S. Manne, Pitzer said he expected negotiations with the military services to continue through the summer and fall."

September 22, 1969-Publication of report by DoD Special Committee on ROTC. The report stated that ROTC was a "highly desirable method of officer procurement for the United States of America," and recommended "that the Department of Defense support ROTC by continuing to develop a viable partnership between the services and the universities." (p.1) The November, 1969 edition of the Stanford Observer noted that this report called for "appropriate credit be given for ROTC courses." It neglected to note, however, that Vice Provost Howard Brooks was one of the nine members of this special DoD ROTC committee.

October 14, 1969-First meeting of President's Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs (appointed 6/6/69) scheduled, in a letter to Committee members from Provost

Provost Brooks. The letter of notification about this meeting was dated 9/17/69, and was "At the request of the Chairman, Professor Alan Manne." Brooks' letter stated that, "The general purpose of this first meeting will be to consider how the committee wishes to proceed with its assignment, and to be brought up to date on the progress and state of my negotiations with the military services."

October 22, 1969-Proposal for revised Army ROTC contract submitted by Col. Ramo to Vice Provost Brooks, at his request (See Campus Reports, 1/23/70)

October 30, 1969-Proposal transmitted to ROTC Committee, "with a request for this Committee's advice on the proposal."

November 6, 1969-President Pitzer unexpectedly appeared at the second meeting of the ROTC Committee. Pitzer requested endorsement of the Army proposal, and according to the minutes of the meeting, "President Pitzer then discussed the importance of the ROTC question to many members of the Stanford community, including Trustees and alumni (sic) .... He also reported conversations with various Defense officials, including Mr. (David) Packard, and commented on difficult congressional attitudes, noting that the chances are decidedly dim for legislative correction of such problems as the 'punitive clauses' in individual contracts."

November 20, 1969-President's Advisory Committee on ROTC begins examination of Army proposal. At that meeting, Vice Provost Brooks noted Pitzer's concern over possible federal funding cuts. According to the minutes, "Mr. Brooks indicated the reasons for the President's concern about ROTC and the University's external relations, pointing to the narrow margin by which the so-called Rivers amendment to the DOD appropriations bill was defeated in the Senate-House Conference Committee after having been passed by the House. He emphasized that there are very real problems, and that the President needs the Committee's counsel in these matters."

January 12, 1970-ROTC Committee sends letter to Pitzer approving, by a 6-2 vote, of the bulk of the proposed revised Army contract, as being "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."

January 15, 1970-Pitzer sends letter to Steering Committee of Academic Senate, requesting that it be placed on the January 22 Senate agenda. In the letter, Pitzer states that, "...I, personally, find the Army proposal reasonable and acceptable, and very close indeed to the recommendations adopted by the Senate on February 13, 1969. The Army has offered substantial concessions to the University and seems to me to have met virtually every requirement except on the matter of individual student contracts .... I strongly urge favorable Senate consideration."

January 22, 1970-Academic Senate accepts revised Army plan for a 1-year trial basis, by a vote of 23-13.

January 23, 1970-Prof. Alan S. Manne, Chairman of President's Advisory Committee on ROTC, resigns. In a letter to Pitzer, Manne said, "In view of yesterday's regrettable Senate action, it is inappropriate for me to remain on this committee. Another member of the Committee, Prof. Lyman Van Slyke, later resigned as well, on the same basis. In a joint letter of January 9, 1970 to Pitzer, the two wrote: "Last spring, the Academic Council voted to uphold the Faculty Senate action of February 13th. The Senate action was, in our opinion, a sound one and long overdue .... The Department of Defense has

shown no willingness to negotiate a non-credit program here - despite the fact that at Carnegie-Mellon University, none of the ROTC courses may be used as elective credit or as substitution for required courses. Stanford is being asked to adopt the DOD's position, and thereby to reverse last spring's faculty decision. This makes the issue no longer one of ROTC alone, but also one of university governance."

- January 28, 1970-Stanford Daily publishes remarks of Pitzer at press conference held day before. "The president was intent on emphasizing the importance of the university maintaining close ties with the outside community. Pitzer noted that negotiations with the Defense department over new ROTC status based on last year's Academic Senate guidelines (sic) proved fruitless because the government thought officer's training would fail under the new rules. 'Considering this,' the President added, 'I decided that we should not break off these relations.'" Pitzer also said at this time (see Campus Reports, 2/4/70) that the position adopted by the Senate "is as good a compromise as possible under present circumstances."
- February 4, 1970-A request for an open community forum on ROTC was presented to Pitzer in a letter signed by the New Narratorium, Student Mobilization Committee, SDS, and the New University Conference
- February 12, 1970-Pitzer refuses above request, in lengthy letter discussing recent history on the ROTC issue: "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 20, 1970-Daily reports interview with Prof. Alan Manne, former Chairman of President's Advisory Committee on ROTC. Manne "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...was definite and inflexible, and did not allow for the negotiations which the Administration subsequently conducted."
- February 23, 1970-ASSU Senate Chairman writes to Pitzer requesting open forum on ROTC, as indicated in a resolution passed by the ASSU Senate on February 19.
- February 27, 1970-Background series begins in Daily, written by Bill Freivogel. In the series, which has four parts and continues through March 6, a number of issues are discussed: what legitimate function the President's Advisory Committee had, the composition of the Committee, Brooks' and Pitzer's role, and other matters. A former member of both old and new ROTC Comprof, Lyman Van Slyke, is quoted as saying, "The President hoped to moderate the action that the Senate took last Spring, presumably by taking advice that would allow him to go back to the Senate." In a later part, Van Slyke stated, "You know there were two ROTC cadets and the third student is engaged to a cadet. I just think that kind of representation is completely unfair." Regarding this student membership, "Council of Presidents member John Grube recalls that he made the appointments in his role as chairman of the Committee on Nominations of the Legislature of the ASSU. But knowledgeable members of that committee, Faye Armstrong and John Wooten, claim they were never involved in the deliberations, Grube never attended any of their meetings, and he was never on the committee." All three students were opposed to the 2/13/69 Academic Senate decision that they were supposed to implement. In addition, two of the faculty members were strong supporters of some academic credit for ROTC. That is, before they were even appointed to the implementation committee, at least five of the eight committee members favored some academic credit; their committee was established to implement a no-credit plan. Former Chairman Alan Manne later commented

about DoD influence: "For you to ask me what effect I think Defense Department pressure had in affecting Pitzer's decision is to assume that he at one time agreed with the original Senate decision. I don't know that he did. I choose to judge his attitudes by his actions.." Preivogel attempted to get some answers from Pitzer himself. The conversation went as follows: "Q: 'President Pitzer, did you support last year's faculty Senate decision on ROTC?' A: 'I did not make any categorical recommendations a year ago. I was new on campus then so I listened to the Senate's debate and commented on a few subjects.' Q: 'After you became acquainted with the University did you then support their decision?' A: 'I think what is being proposed now is an improvement over what was proposed then.' Q: 'Did you support the Majority Report...last year?' A: 'I think that this is enough detail. I had a press conference with your editor and some of the people on your staff a few weeks ago, and you could have asked that then. I just haven't been thinking about this whole thing this week. I am not familiar with the documents now, and I am not prepared to comment on it now.'"

March 12, 1970-Pitzer answers 2/23/70 letter from ASSU Senate Chairman, John Shoeh. He states: "I do not believe that a single public meeting of limited duration would serve a constructive purpose at this time. Those interested in the subject have expressed their view at considerable length .... There has been extensive opportunity for those having opinions on the ROTC issue to express them through campus decision-making mechanisms involving committee members nominated by the ASSU as well as the faculty and by communications through a large number of written media."

April 3, 1970-In addressing an Academic Council meeting (which was interrupted by some 140 demonstrators), Pitzer told the professors he particularly regretted the application of such coercive tactics in an effort to overturn the mail vote decision of the faculty in which it was decided by a margin of 390-373 to approve academic credit for ROTC on a limited basis, beginning next Fall." (From Campus Reports, 4/3/70). The above mail vote was announced at this meeting.

April 10, 1970-In a Daily article about Pitzer's response to anti-ROTC demonstrations, "Pitzer re-emphasized the democratic nature of the decision making process by which the faculty voted to allow Army ROTC to qualify for limited credit. 'To allow a small pressure group to overturn that sort of decision-making would be most unfortunate to the University.'...When there is new evidence with regard to ROTC, the Academic Senate should re-evaluate its decision. But, 'we ought to regard this (the ROTC decision) as decided for this year.'"

April 21, 1970-A Daily article reported an off-ROTC meeting yesterday in which Provost Richard Lyman stated that he "prefers 'rational dialogue' ... for changing national or University policy."

April 23, 1970-Student referendum results announced. The vote on "Should the ROTC program be continued at Stanford?" was 2919-2781. The vote on "If ROTC does continue at Stanford, should it be given credit?" was 1898-3616.

April 29, 1970-Cambodia

April 30, 1970-Academic Council meeting called by Pitzer. Regarding Provost Brooks, Pitzer said that, "During the past 15 months Dr. Howard Brooks has been considered for several positions in the federal government in several different departments."

May 7, 1970-The Academic Senate voted 36-6, that, "1. Having received the request of the Academic Council at its meeting of May 1st, 1970, for consideration of termination of credit for ROTC courses at the end of the current academic year, hereby determines that academic credit for ROTC courses shall be terminated effective August 31st, 1970; and 2. Requests the President's Advisory Committee on ROTC

Affairs to study and make recommendations for the fair and equitable implementation of this decision, including any transitional arrangements needed for credit by those students presently enrolled in ROTC programs."

May 19, 1970-New ROTC Poll distributed by mail. Poll attacked as being "incredibly biased."

May 27, 1970-Daily article indicates Brooks declines position as Undersecretary of AF.

June 1, 1970-ROTC Comm. poll and report delivered to President. His office refuses to release the contents until he presents them to Academic Senate at 6/4/70 meeting.

---Prepared by ROTC 44  
June 2, 1970

## SENATE ACTION ON ROTC

February 13, 1969 as amended March 20, 1969

Of the following eight recommendations from the Majority Report of the ad hoc Senate Committee on ROTC, of February 7, 1969, the Senate endorsed Recommendations 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, and referred to the committee contemplated under Recommendation 6 the matter of Recommendations 2 and 3 for early consideration and report back to the Senate.

1. After a transitional period (see Recommendation 5 below), there should be no academic credit received for participation in programs of military training and education.

2. By the end of this period, non-credit, required military training and education should no longer be offered on the Stanford campus. Consistent with these recommendations, a scholarship or contract "program" may remain, comprising normal academic education, supplemented by on-campus voluntary activities and off-campus training.

3. By the end of this period, all remaining military programs or activities should be regulated by the University's general policies on Stanford Voluntary Organizations. No Stanford faculty member or administrator, acting as a spokesman for the University, shall encourage students to participate in military training and education, except in the manner in which participation in all voluntary activities is encouraged.

4. Individual contracts between Stanford students and the armed forces should be revised to reflect actual practice. We recommend further that punitive clauses involving enlisted service be removed.

5. These provisions should be in force by the fall term 1973. Beginning with the fall term 1970, no entering freshmen shall be granted academic credit for ROTC activities. The three ROTC departments should be replaced by a single Armed Forces Officers Program no later than fall term 1973. This program shall be for the purposes of administration, counseling, and recruiting for reserve officer training and education. (N.B. Because present institutional contracts specify one year's notice prior to termination, the transition cannot begin before 1970.)

6. Appropriate University authorities should promptly initiate action leading to revision or termination of the contracts between Stanford and the armed forces (a) in order to enable the transition to begin in 1970, and (b) in order to reflect the non-credit status of military training at Stanford. We further recommend that a committee be appointed, composed of representatives of faculty, administration, military science department, and students, to assist in effecting the transition.

7. During the transitional period, we recommend that the status of officers presently attached to ROTC units remain unchanged. Until the fall term 1973, newly assigned officers shall carry the rank of "Lecturer," except for the newly assigned senior officers of each branch of the armed forces, who shall carry the rank of "Lecturer with rank of Professor." After the beginning of the 1973-74 academic year, representatives of the armed forces at Stanford shall carry no academic rank. Similarly until this time, the departmental and administrative structure of the ROTC program shall remain as at present.

8. Students already enrolled in ROTC programs, and those enrolling prior to the fall term 1970, shall continue as at present, except that present contracts should be revised in accord with Recommendation 4.

PROPOSALS AND ACTION ON FUTURE ROTC STAFFS

	Majority Report of ROTC Comm. I (2/69)	Minority Report of ROTC Comm. I (2/69)	Faculty Action (2/69 & 4/69)	DOD "Benson Comm." ROTC Report (9/69)	Army Proposal, Endorsed by ROTC Comm. II (1/70)	Faculty Action (1/70 & 3/70)
Academic Credit	None	Max: 18 units	None	Credit supported, amount unstated	Max: 9 units	Army Proposal Approved
Structural Organiza. & Status	Vol. Student Org., under Dean of Students; "on-campus voluntary activities and off-campus training"	A Dept. of Military Stud. under A Military Studies Comm. under Comm. for Undergr. Studies	Referred to ROTC Comm. II for "early consideration"	A Dept. or other "organizational device," such as "center -- under high level committee -- reporting to "senior officer close to institution's chief exec."	A Center for Military Studies, under Provost's Office, with academic credit approved by Comm. for Undergr. Studies	Army Proposal Approved
Instructor Selection & Status	"Lecturer," except senior of each service who would be "lecturer with rank of professor"	"Lecturer," except senior of each service who would be "professor"	Majority Proposal Approved	"Appropriate academic rank," except senior of each service who would be "professor" or equiv.	University Staff (equiv. to "Lecturer"), except senior who would have rights & privileges of prof., except tenure & Ac. Council members.	Army Proposal Approved
Punitive Clause	Eliminate	Eliminate for first two years; maintain for Letter two years	Eliminate	No change now	No change now	Army Proposal Approved

**NOTES:** Vice Provost Brooks wrote the 2/69 Minority Report, and was one of its three signatories (along with Col. Robt. Thomas); he voted against the Majority Report in the 2/69 Senate meeting, yet he was selected to negotiate its implementation, largely during the summer of 1969. During that summer, Brooks was a member of the 9-man Benson Committee, a special group convened by Department of Defense to find ways of justifying and reinvigorating the ROTC program. Brooks later strongly supported the new Army Proposal which he was presumably instrumental in obtaining. In late April '70, Pitzer announced that, "During the past 15 months Dr. Howard Brooks has been considered for several positions in the federal government in several different departments." (At the end of May, it was announced that Brooks had declined the post of Undersecretary of the Air Force for Education and Manpower.)

ROTC Comm. I was an Ad Hoc Academic Senate committee which was established 9/26/68; it disbanded after issuing Majority and Minority Reports on 2/1/69. ROTC Comm. II is a Presidential Advisory Committee established 6/6/69; it was called for in the 2/69 Academic Senate decision, for the purpose of implementing the rest of that decision. Membership on ROTC II was presumably based on that understanding -- although much of the group did not support what they were selected to implement. ROTC Comm. II never met until 10/69, after negotiations with DOD were largely completed. Those negotiations and the subsequent Army Proposal effectively subverted the decisions that this ROTC Committee was nominally established to implement.

President Pitzer stated, in a 1/16/70 letter to the Academic Senate, that "I, personally, find the Army proposal reasonable and acceptable, and very close indeed to the recommendations adopted by the Senate on February 13, 1969. The Army has offered substantial concessions to the University and seems to me to have met virtually every requirement except on the matter of individual student contracts (i.e., "punitive clause")."

The 4/10/70 Stanford Daily reported that, "Pitzer re-emphasized the democratic nature of the decision making process by which the faculty voted to allow Army ROTC to qualify for limited credit. To allow a small pressure group to overturn that sort of decision-making would be most unfortunate to the University."