

# ROTC - A RETURN TO STANFORD?

The University of California at Berkeley and at Davis has it, the University of Santa Clara has it, San Jose State has it, the University of San Francisco has it, Princeton has it. Yale, Harvard, Dartmouth, Columbia, and Boston University are in various stages of reinstating it.

Stanford University however, does not have an ROTC program and the forecast for the future is, at best, a degree better than gloomy.

In 1970 almost all the so-called "prestige-name" schools, including Stanford, voted ROTC off their respective campuses. However, with the passage of time and a trend toward more moderate thinking, many of these schools have asked, or are considering asking, the military back.

Marxist  
economist  
Claude Steiner  
Stanford this quarter

Davis gave her first free  
Memorial Auditorium on call  
"What is a Marxist Approach  
Women?"

Davis is a former UCLA instructor who  
from the administration of Gov. Ronald Reagan  
avowed Communist philosophy. Miss Davis had  
leader of the National Alliance Against Racial  
Political Repression.

Davis was accused and acquitted of kidnapping



**JOINT SERVICES COMMISSIONING** in Dinkelspiel Auditorium several years ago. Many of these men received full tuition scholarships to attend Stanford and participate

in the ROTC program. Many would have been unable to attend the university had it not been for the program and available scholarships.

## BERKELEY

When the Academic Senate, composed of the faculty, at Berkeley voted to banish ROTC, the Regents overrode their decision and insisted the program remain on campus. At the same time, however, moves were made to upgrade the quality of the courses and to make them more suitable to an academic community. (This had

been one of the main beefs of the Academic Senate—that courses in marksmanship and map-reading did not belong in a University.)

Students continued to participate in the program although not as many as in previous years, and they were allowed to graduate minus the number of units received

(Con't on page 6)

STANFORD'S DIRECTION  
6/76



## ROTC. . . (Con't from page 1)

for ROTC courses. The Academic Senate did refuse to allow credit for the courses in any of the University schools. This "dual policy" was a difficult one to work with for students and administrators but it did mean that ROTC stayed on the campus.

Over the past five years a commission appointed by the Chancellor has investigated the ROTC program and its instructors and, in turn, upgraded the requirements for professors and courses alike. A look in the college catalogue in 1968 showed courses entitled "Weapons and Marksmanship", "Map Reading and Basic Tactics", "Leadership, Branches of the Army, Counterinsurgency".

The 1974 catalogue listed courses such as "The Role of the Military in Society," "Theory of Organizational Behavior", "Theory and Evolution of American Warfare to 1899" and "National Security Policy" (to be taken in conjunction with Poli. Sci. 520).

Today students are still not receiving credit for courses taken in Military Sciences but the Regents have ordered the Chancellor to intercede on behalf of these students to allow them to graduate short those units normally granted for the ROTC courses.

### MODERATE TREND

Temper have cooled on the campus and the faculty is apparently not as anti-ROTC as it was five years ago. These days the number of faculty for reinstating ROTC almost numbers those against. One UC professor of history who voted ROTC down in 1971 made written comments recently in support of reconsidering ROTC. He suggested that maintaining ROTC at Berkeley gave the university and the university community a chance to influence with its own perspectives and values the officers and young cadets taking part in the ROTC program.

He wrote in part:

"When we stop encouraging people from our own community to serve as leaders in the various services, we are essentially saying it is all right with us if such leaders—powerful as they are likely to be—do not share in the information, perspectives and values to which the University has dedicated itself.

"We are saying, 'Let the professional academies—West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy and the Officers Candidacy School—produce the military leaders. Or—at best, we are saying to the ROTC unit here, pack your things and go off to Mississippi or South Carolina where the prevailing ideologies of the local community are more likely to accentuate just those characteristics of traditional military institutions that we most distrust and dislike."

At present it is not known when the vote to fully reinstate ROTC will take place.

### STANFORD—A DIFFERENT POLICY

The situation at Stanford is different. A professor who preferred to remain anonymous, but one who has been involved in efforts to reinstate the program at Stanford, reflected on the differences between the two schools and the possibility of reinstatement at Stanford.

"Even though the events at Berkeley and here seem to parallel, there is an entirely different legal problem with reinstatement here at Stanford. The administration and trustees simply do not have the legal power that they do at Berkeley," he explained.

At Stanford the faculty has complete control over courses which will or will not be offered. It was the Academic Senate's decision to eliminate any credit for ROTC in 1970 and the military packed up and left.

The Stanford professor compared the situation at Stanford to the situation in 18th century England where the Crown found itself powerless to rule Parliament. The Crown could only influence members of parliament, it could not dictate action.

"The same is true of the Stanford administration. It is powerless to dictate policy on the ROTC program, it can only encourage or discourage the Senate," he explained.

"It is my opinion that the administration is entirely in favor of the return of ROTC, but it will not risk political scandal over the issue. If a faculty group can push it

through the Senate the administration would be delighted, but I feel that if Lyman were to come out in favor of ROTC publicly he'd set the cause back several years. The power lies in little groups of the faculty."

Those in favor of restoring ROTC to Stanford feel that last year's cross-enrollment program with Santa Clara was an important first step. It enabled students from Stanford to take ROTC classes at Stanford, although no credit was given. About twelve students signed up for the program.

He conceded in the end however, that "the situation looks brighter—both sides have become more realistic in the five years that have passed."

### ADVANTAGES OF ROTC

The most obvious advantage of offering an ROTC program on campus is that it offers students who could not otherwise afford it a chance for a four year scholarship. The scholarship, if awarded, pays full tuition for four years plus expenses for lab work and books. In addition the student receives \$100 a month as a living stipend. Students who take advantage of these scholarships are then required to serve in active duty for

four years. Those who go through the program without a scholarship are asked to serve for two years. The decision to take part in such a program is entirely up to the individual.

Hand in hand with the advantage to the student is the advantage to the college or university—which benefits by the added tuition money. Four years at Stanford in tuition alone would amount to more than \$20,000.

Even more importantly there is a strong belief that it is to the country's advantage not to segregate the military and the academic community from one another. Supporters of ROTC say it is highly desirable that some of the country's military officers experience a civilian institution.

Major Pope pointed out that only one fourth of the U.S. generals are ROTC graduates. "The people who are influencing the military are still three to one West Point graduates."

It is feared that such a situation is likely to lead to a military establishment with extremely narrow perspectives. The ROTC program offers the civilian population—and the academic community—an opportunity to be represented.

## Tenure. . . (Con't from page 5)

governing bodies. This restriction upon members of the staff of scholars of the Hoover Institution is all the more inconsistent, since the belief is widespread in the faculty that advancement at Stanford depends primarily on research and relatively little on teaching ability. It seems likely that the absence of tenure bothers the research specialists of the Hoover Institution much less than being excluded from the Academic Council and Senate.

There can be no understanding of tenure without finding out how the privilege came into existence, and there can be no serious consideration of the problems besetting tenure today without comparing tenure then with tenure now. The specialists in other professions are quite right in asking why academicians should be granted special treatment in this way, and there is a good answer to the question. The roots of tenure are to be found in the concept of academic freedom that originated in the European universities long ago, first in those in Germany. Universities had always been under pressures of various kinds, but in the early modern period it gradually became possible to do something about the situation. The academic research specialists, i.e., the professors, of that time, felt very strongly that they could not effectively seek and discover and teach the truth about God, man, and nature—or to put it another way, about origins, society, and science—unless they were entirely free of outside pressures to color their findings and conclusions in accordance with the dictates of authority. In the 18th and 19th centuries the most serious threats to this freedom came from religious and governmental powers. When the tradition of "academic freedom" was brought from Germany to the United States in the middle of the 19th century, along with the German emphasis on the right to unrestrained research, the opposition to academic freedom remained much the same in nature as in Europe. Because many American universities had been established with strong religious support and because expansion of the frontiers of knowledge rather than teaching was widely regarded as the most important function of universities, and also because this often meant a strong emphasis on scientific research, the first attempts to restrict academic freedom appeared in areas touching upon controversial subjects, such as the theory of evolution. The Johns Hopkins University and the University of Chicago were among the earlier American universities to adopt the German tradition of stressing research and investigation as their main purpose and both became havens for those who suffered for departing from the dominant religious or political line. To illustrate, if a personal note will be excused, I well remember that when I joined the faculty of the Department of History at the University of Chicago

a little more than thirty years ago, one of my most distinguished colleagues and friends was a man who had run afoul of certain restrictions in the teaching of history, religious as I recall the affair, and that when the situation came to light and the merits of the case were examined, he was invited to Chicago.

Colleges and universities were also founded by individuals, by states, by cities, and by non-sectarian groups, as well as by churches, and these too sometimes restricted the right of professors to carry on their research and to make known their findings. Whatever the origin of the institutions, however, until about a quarter of a century ago academic tenure was needed and served a useful purpose in the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge. The principal reason for this is that administrative officers in those not so very distant days held and used great power, often quite arbitrarily. Though it is almost forgotten now in the days of self-effacing trustees, modest and retiring presidents and deans, and apologetic department heads, these persons were once, even in the land of the free, very powerful. The fact that they were often petty autocrats rather than kings, popes, and emperors hardly made their mean little tyranny less objectionable. These little despots could not always discharge faculty members they did not like or of whom they did not approve, but they had a power almost as effective, for they could sit back and do nothing. For the professor, especially the young professor, this was almost as bad as outright expulsion. It was of course for the dean or chairman simply a matter of holding up promotion or increases in salary, always, it goes without saying, for reasons that sounded plausible.

To recur for a moment to the slightly envious professionals in the outside world, the lawyers, doctors, and builders, it should be remembered that they were never subject to such petty tyranny by means of financial deprivation and the blighting of a career. The market for their services was always larger and enormously more rewarding in terms of income. Moreover, because of the conditions in these other professions, it was rare for the head of a firm to take out his personal dislike on brilliant young architects, engineers, or lawyers. Essentially this was for solid economic reasons; a brilliant young man on whom brought money and business to the firm and to punish him or her punished all the partners. They had sound reasons therefore for seeing to it that those who merited advancement got it without delay and financial rewards with it. The case was quite different with the academic administrator; he lost nothing and his colleagues were not likely to interfere with his little games. Tenure was only a slight remuneration for the bullying to which young academicians were exposed, and few lawyers or engineers would have considered it worth much if they had had to take the small pay and unfavorable working conditions along with the tenure.