

Towards an on-campus ROTC program at Stanford University

A Report and Recommendation

by

The Ad Hoc Committee

(Appointed by the Faculty Senate “to investigate Stanford’s role in preparing students for leadership in the military, including potential relations with ROTC”)

Ewart Thomas, Professor of Psychology (Chair)

Greg Boardman, Vice Provost for Student Affairs

Eamonn Callan, Pigott Family School of Education Professor and Associate
Dean for Student Affairs in the School of Education

Ingrid Deiwiks, Administrative Services Administrator, Freeman Spogli
Institute for International Studies (staff)

Imani Franklin, International Relations, '13

Hester Gelber, Professor of Religious Studies

Akhil R. Iyer, International Relations, '11

Sharon Long, William C. Steere, Jr. - Pfizer Inc. Professor in Biological
Sciences and Professor, by courtesy, of Biochemistry

Orrin “Rob” Robinson, Professor of German Studies and, by courtesy, of
Linguistics

Scott Sagan, Caroline S. G. Munro Memorial Professor in Political Science
and Senior Fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies

April 2011

Towards an on-campus ROTC program at Stanford University

Table of Contents

Recommendation	3
Introduction	5
Section 1: A brief history of military studies on U.S. college campuses	6
Section 2: A brief history of ROTC at Stanford University	8
Section 3: Rationale for a restructured ROTC program	10
Section 4: Key characteristics of a restructured ROTC program	11
Section 5: Objections to the Committee's recommendation	12
5.1. The antidiscrimination argument	13
5.2. The civilian-military divide	14
5.3. Concluding comment	16
References	17
Appendix 1: A <i>sample</i> of arguments that were <i>not</i> extensively discussed in the Ad Hoc Committee's Report	20
Appendix 2: ROTC programs at other universities	24

Recommendation

The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on ROTC has considered carefully a variety of evidence, arguments, and likely consequences pertaining to a possible renewal at Stanford University of the Reserve Officer Training Corps program within the U.S. military. The Committee concludes that an on-campus ROTC program can be designed that conforms closely to standard academic practice at Stanford. Further, the Committee concludes that such a purposefully designed restructuring of ROTC would, on balance, further the educational interests of Stanford students, keep faith with the broadly civic values in Stanford's founding grant, and contribute in a small but significant way to reducing the perceived gap between the military and civil society in the USA. The Committee did not try to specify the exact terms of an appropriate ROTC program at Stanford, because we expect that such details will arise out of future discussions with the military. Instead, we have tried to describe a well-designed process that, we believe, would lead to an appropriate on-campus ROTC program.

Accordingly, the Committee unanimously recommends the following:

- 1. The President of Stanford University should invite the U.S. military to re-establish an on-campus ROTC program consistent with the recommendations of this Committee.*
- 2. The Faculty Senate should appoint immediately a Stanford ROTC Committee as a standing subcommittee of the Committee on Undergraduate Standards and Policy. This committee would be available to advise the President during any exchanges between the university and the military that might ensue from the invitation. The committee also would work with ROTC representatives on the design and scope of the Stanford-ROTC program.*
- 3. The Stanford ROTC Committee and designated ROTC representatives will review the instructors and instruction of ROTC courses on campus. This committee, through C-USP, will recommend, on a case-by-case basis, whether an instructor be given a lecturer or visiting professor status, and will be responsible for maintaining coordination between the university and the national ROTC programs. After the first ROTC instructors have been appointed, the Stanford ROTC Committee may be expanded to include some of these instructors.*
- 4. ROTC courses should be open to all Stanford students whether or not the students are in ROTC. Exceptions need to be approved by the Stanford ROTC Committee.*
- 5. The courses in the Stanford-ROTC program may be eligible for either academic or activity course credit, following existing Stanford curriculum review and approval processes.*
- 6. The Stanford ROTC committee should encourage opportunities for Stanford faculty and ROTC instructors to design jointly taught courses that could meet both academic credit standards and ROTC training requirements.*

The Committee looks forward to discussing its recommendation for an on-campus ROTC program with the Faculty Senate on April 28, 2011.

Introduction

The Ad Hoc Committee on ROTC has examined over the past year whether, and in what form, Stanford University should renew its relationship with the Reserve Officer Training Corps programs within the U.S. military. The university's Faculty Senate, in a motion on March 4, 2010, had proposed that the Committee be appointed to "explore the logistical, financial and pedagogical implications of any such relationship for Stanford and its wider mission, and report back to the senate detailing a range of options the university might pursue and the consequences they can be expected to have." The Senate discussion was premised on the expectation that the military policy of 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' (DADT) would be repealed "within the next year or two," thus clearing the way for a "reasonable discussion." At its first meeting in July 2010, the Committee decided to proceed with its examination so that the university would have studied options if and when DADT were to be settled. The Committee decided also to limit consideration to two options, namely, maintaining the current, essentially off-campus ROTC program and renewing it as an essentially on-campus program.

The Committee's report is divided into the following sections. **Section 1** contains a brief history of how and why federal educational policy in nineteenth century America fostered the mixing of pure knowledge with applied knowledge and technology in higher education. The fact that this new mission at many institutions was broad enough to include military training was due, in part, to a widespread desire to imbue the officer corps with a healthy respect for the newly won liberties in the republic. Stanford University was conceived as a multi-purpose, multi-faceted institution that lay within this emerging model of the American university. In **Section 2**, we sketch the history of ROTC at Stanford and assess the current context for the Committee's analysis.

Section 3 presents the Committee's reasoning in support of its recommendation for an on-campus ROTC program. Our reasoning hinges on the civic aspects of Stanford's mission, the importance of the military as a public institution, and the benefits to all students of an education in which future military officers and other citizens learn from each other through direct contact. **Section 4** describes the overall character that a restructured ROTC program might have that conformed to Stanford's academic norms. We draw heavily in this Section on our review of established ROTC programs at other campuses in order to ensure that the kind of program we have in mind would be feasible. **Section 5** addresses the most serious objections to our recommendation to the Faculty Senate. The letters submitted to the Committee, the statements made at public hearings on the issue, and the many posts on Stanford community blogs suggest that a significant number of individuals within our community have deeply held objections to

ROTC-at-Stanford. In this Section, we try to identify the main objections and explain why we believe they are less compelling than the arguments in favor of an on-campus program.

Section 1: A brief history of military studies on U.S. college campuses

The idea of placing military studies on college campuses in the USA has an interesting history dating back at least to the Revolutionary War. A major theme in the complex disputes between ‘republicans’ and ‘federalists’ was the republican belief that public support for an expanded system of higher education was needed to preserve the newly won individual rights and freedoms, and to produce generations of leaders, including military leaders, who would be imbued with republican principles and would serve as a counter to extant monarchist and aristocratic tendencies in the new nation. For example, at the Constitutional Convention of 1787, Charles Pinckney and James Madison recommended the establishment of a national university, and this idea was later supported by the first six U.S. presidents. In some visions, the national university would have included a military academy, both because linking military studies to the classical education and modern scientific training available on a university campus would enhance the prestige and quality of military studies, and because such a link would impede the formation of a quasi-aristocratic military caste that tended to reproduce itself outside of civilian control. These views echo Samuel Adams’ belief (in a 1776 letter to James Warren) that all citizens, particularly military men, should be “taught the Principles of a free Government, and deeply impressed with a Sense of the indispensable Obligation which every member is under to the whole Society.” And when Thomas Jefferson, as president in 1802, signed the bill establishing the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, the main goal was the creation of a professionally trained military leadership, but there was also the hope that a truly republican military academy would recruit widely in the larger society and would inculcate in future officers republican principles, the most critical of which was the subordination of the military to civilian direction.

Half a century later, Congressional debates about expanding federal support for higher education led to the Morrill Act of 1862, which provided federal lands to states for the establishment of the so-called land grant colleges and universities. The justification for the provision of federal resources was often couched in terms of increasing the nation’s wealth through combining practical and scientific training with the classically liberal curriculum, improving the minds of the citizenry, and extending education to the “laboring classes.” But here, too, there was concern that the ongoing Civil War might lead to the establishment of a large, centrally controlled standing army that would be a threat to basic individual liberties. This danger would be mitigated, it was felt, by distributing

the responsibility for officer training to at least one college in each state and to the jurisdiction of that state. Accordingly, the purpose of the land grant colleges was stated in the 1862 Act as:

without excluding other scientific and classical studies *and including military tactics* [italics added], to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.

Many of the land grant institutions struggled to stay afloat in the years following the Civil War, but a second Morrill Act of 1890 brought financial stability by allocating to these institutions annual federal appropriations which, in turn, led to annual appropriations from state governments. This second Act also gave states the right to designate “separate-but-equal” land-grant colleges for African Americans. The land grant movement, therefore, is regarded as pivotal in the development of the American university system, because it facilitated the democratization of education, established a healthy diversity in the overall structure of the system, and demonstrated the necessity of federal support for the setting and implementation of educational policy.

By the time Governor and Mrs. Stanford decided, in 1884, to establish a university memorializing their son, who had died earlier that year, their desire for an institution in which “every useful calling [was] taught and as near practical as may be” was not unique. The founding principles of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (founded in 1861) and Cornell University (founded in 1865) were expressed in very similar terms, for the simple reason that these were both land grant institutions, albeit privately owned and operated, that owed their existence to the 1862 Act. The Stanfords visited both universities, as well as Harvard, Yale, and other places, in 1884. They were so impressed by General Francis Walker, the third president of MIT, that they invited him to be Stanford’s first president. General Walker declined the offer, but became one of the main advisers to the Stanfords during the next three years. Their visit to Cornell also yielded an important adviser, Andrew D. White, the first president of Cornell. It was President White who recommended David Starr Jordan, a member of the pioneering class at Cornell and president of Indiana University, as the first president of Stanford. Not surprisingly, when Stanford University opened its doors in 1891, its structure reflected a debt both to the tradition established by the European universities, namely, that of the discovery and dissemination of knowledge in a community that is dedicated to free and open inquiry, and to the tradition that was emerging at Cornell University, MIT, and the other land grant colleges, namely, an emphasis on the practical aspects of life. Indeed, the “nature” of Stanford University was set out in the Founding Grant of November 11, 1885, as:

that of a university with such seminaries of learning as shall make it of the highest grade, including mechanical institutes, museums, galleries of art, laboratories, and conservatories, together with all things necessary for the study of agriculture in all its branches, and for mechanical training, and the studies and exercises directed to the cultivation and enlargement of the mind.

Consistent with the latter tradition, voluntary military training was introduced to the pioneer class at Stanford, but student interest in military drill was minimal that year. In 1892, there was a reasonable enrollment in band practice, owing to a trustee's gift of a full set of band instruments, and there were lectures on military tactics to a few students, but there was still not much drill. The following year saw a tremendous surge of interest in drill practice, with enrollment reaching 125 in the first semester. However, when the Registrar was forced to admit that there had been an error in stating the amount of credit to be given for drill practice, enrollment dropped to near zero in the second semester, although band practice continued until the end of the semester. There was then a lapse in the program until the beginning of the Spanish War in 1898, when a voluntary military organization was formed on campus and many students enlisted in the State Militia. Two decades later, America's participation in World War I led to a program of compulsory military training at Stanford in 1917, and this was merged the next year into the Student Army Training Corps. Following the end of World War I, military training was retained at the university on a voluntary basis as a unit of ROTC for the next fifty or so years.

Section 2: A brief history of ROTC at Stanford University

The structure and funding of ROTC as we know it today are generally attributed to, among other sources, the National Defense Acts of 1916 and 1920, and the ROTC Revitalization Act of 1964. Stanford's association with ROTC dates back to the 1916-19 period, with enrollment in ROTC peaking during World War II at about 50% of undergraduate men. Enrollment was about 1100 in 1956, 732 in 1959, 586 in 1964, and 383 in 1968. In October 1968, when sentiment against the country's conduct of the Vietnam War was high, the Stanford Faculty Senate appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on ROTC to examine whether "proper relations between the ROTC departments and Stanford may be established by review and reform of the present relations." In February 1969, the Ad Hoc Committee reported to the Faculty Senate its belief that ROTC could not be established at Stanford "as a compatible and worthwhile academic endeavor," and it recommended that, by 1973, the university phase out all academic credit for ROTC programs and academic rank for military staff. The Senate accepted this recommendation by a 25 to 8 vote. This was followed by a series of referenda, Senate actions, reviews of Senate actions by the Academic Council, negotiations between President Pitzer and the three services, and, finally, a 390 to

373 vote in the Academic Council in March 1970, accepting a proposal from the Army that academic credit be given on a course-by-course basis under the aegis of the Committee on Undergraduate Studies.

However, by May 1970, the political climate had changed considerably. Against the backdrop of the U.S. invasion of Cambodia, proposals by President Nixon to eliminate student deferments from military service, and threats of violence on the campus, the Senate voted 36 to 8 with 4 recorded abstentions to terminate academic credit for ROTC courses and, on a divided voice vote, requested the Advisory Committee on ROTC Affairs to report "its recommendations as to the termination or retention of ROTC at Stanford in any form." The following week, the ASSU Senate passed a similarly negative vote and, in October 1970, President Lyman reported to the Faculty Senate that all military training on campus would be phased out by June 1973, and that the Air Force program would probably be withdrawn by June 1971. The Air Force ROTC program was terminated in June 1971 by the Air Force for dwindling enrollment. The Army and Navy ROTC programs concluded in June 1973. Stanford students could continue to participate in ROTC, but their training henceforth occurred away from campus.

Today, about 15 Stanford students obtain their ROTC training at UC Berkeley, Santa Clara University, or San Jose State University, depending on their service branch. These students bear a burden in combining a Stanford education with off-campus military training that sometimes requires long commutes, so that one obvious advantage of an on-campus program would be that ROTC students could pursue their military ambitions with less stress and inconvenience. This advantage was one of the factors that likely persuaded the Faculty Senate in March last year to appoint the present Ad Hoc Committee.

The Current Deliberation. As important today as it was 40 years ago is the principle that any proposed Stanford-ROTC program would have to pass muster "as a compatible and worthwhile academic endeavor." The evaluation of compatibility has to include current assessments of curricula and the potential for pedagogical conflicts between the two 'cultures', military and academic. In addition, the Committee has had to address a new dimension of compatibility, namely, that between the university's nondiscrimination policy and differential treatment in the U.S. military on the basis of, e.g., sexual orientation, gender identity, and physical disability. These evaluations turn on many issues, but one to which the Committee often recurred is its acceptance of the traditional view that universities, even private ones, have an important civic role to play in strengthening national institutions, such as the U.S. military.

In order to gauge community sentiment, we invited faculty, students and staff to write us with their views on a possible expansion of ROTC at Stanford, and we received about 90 responses. Also, we met privately with small groups of faculty

and students, and had two town hall-style meetings, one with students that drew about 100 participants, and one with faculty and staff that drew about 20 participants. We periodically scanned blogs sponsored by Stanford entities, e.g., Stanford Says No to War and the Stanford Daily. We reviewed Stanford documents from the late 1960s and early 1970s about the faculty debate over ROTC, and the subsequent departure of the Army, Air Force and Navy ROTC programs. In addition, we met with senior ROTC officers from the Army ROTC program at Santa Clara University and the Air Force ROTC program at San Jose State University. (Officers at the Navy and Marine Corps ROTC programs at the University of California-Berkeley politely declined our invitation.) The Committee's viewing and reading list also included a documentary about the experiences of a platoon in Afghanistan, a couple of books on military life, a literature review we commissioned on the state of civil-military relations in the U.S., a study of transgender people in the military, a book on racial integration in the army, and various documents about the growth of federal support for higher education in the nineteenth century. For the sake of readability, we have not included footnotes, but we have listed the more important of our sources in the **References** section at the end of our report. Also, as just noted, of the various relevant arguments, some occupied more of the Committee's attention than others. For convenience, **Appendix 1** lists a sample of arguments from the Stanford community that were considered but not fully addressed in the present Report.

Section 3: Rationale for a restructured ROTC program

If we ask about the proper relation between ROTC and Stanford, any good answer must keep faith with the university's fundamental values. According to the Stanford founding grant, our purpose is to "promote the public welfare by exercising an influence on behalf of humanity and civilization, teaching the blessings of liberty regulated by law, and inculcating love and reverence for the great principles of government derived from the unalienable rights of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The unmistakable echoes of the Declaration of Independence in the text remind us that Stanford University from its inception has had a broadly civic and not merely an academic mission. We assume that these values should continue to guide us in the future. Our commitment to freedom and democracy is not confined to the fate of any single nation. Still, the United States is the country in which our university has flourished. It is home to the vast majority of our students, alumni, faculty, and staff. We bear some special responsibility to contribute to the success of its public institutions. The American military is one such institution, the structure and policies of which have been shaped profoundly by American society via its representatives. The intellectual and moral quality of its officer corps is crucial to the future of the nation, and we believe that a better integration of ROTC on

campus would be a small but important contribution to the nation in which we have prospered for over a century.

We believe that the excellent liberal education we provide our undergraduates can contribute profoundly to the skills and virtues rightly expected of military leaders. Such men and women must be exemplary communicators and collaborators; they must be adept at decision-making that is based on complex evidence, a high sense of moral principle and secure commitment to the rule of law; they must also interpret the tasks they are assigned in light of a rich understanding of the common good. An on-campus ROTC program would certainly make Stanford a better choice of college than it currently is for students who wish to serve their nation as military officers. But, perhaps as importantly, an on-campus ROTC would augment the civic education of other Stanford undergraduates as well. The opportunity to talk about patriotism, just and unjust war, human rights, imperialism, and anti-colonialism, etc., in a classroom or dormitory that includes prospective officers in America's military is something from which all our students can benefit. To whatever extent a restructured ROTC would make that opportunity more widely available to our students, we believe it will improve the quality of undergraduate education at Stanford for ROTC and non-ROTC students. In this regard, our conclusion is similar to that of the minority in the Ad Hoc Committee of 1968-69, namely, that a suitably amended ROTC program would provide "military studies of worthy academic quality and proven interest to substantial numbers of Stanford students as academic programs."

Section 4: Key characteristics of a restructured ROTC program

Stanford faculty members have a duty to ensure that all courses taught at Stanford meet high pedagogical and academic standards. ROTC instructors have a duty to teach the specific curriculum their service has deemed necessary for the professional training of young officers. Are these duties necessarily divergent in their execution?

The committee has reviewed how other universities around the country – including comparable top-ranked research universities – have managed the potential tensions between these two different requirements. (Please see **Appendix 2** for information about ROTC programs at Duke, MIT, and Princeton.) We are convinced that adequate mechanisms can be put in place to ensure that under a restructured ROTC program all Stanford students would continue to receive an education that meets suitably high pedagogical and academic standards. Indeed, we believe that a deeper level of interaction between Stanford faculty and ROTC instructors in the future has the potential to improve educational opportunities for all Stanford students.

Our research into ROTC programs around the country revealed that different universities have very different ways of assigning credit and ensuring quality control for ROTC courses and instructors. Some universities give academic credit to virtually all ROTC courses with minimal oversight; others have faculty committees to review instructors assigned by the services and use the existing university-wide or departmental course approval processes to review specific course syllabi for credit purposes. We believe that the latter model best serves our interest and propose the following principles and procedures be adopted should Stanford decide to invite one or more branches of the U.S. military to conduct ROTC training on campus.

1. A faculty committee should be formed to review with designated ROTC personnel the instructors and instruction of ROTC courses on campus. This Stanford ROTC Committee will recommend, on a case-by-case basis, whether an instructor be given a lecturer or visiting professor status and will be responsible for maintaining coordination between the university and the national ROTC programs.
2. ROTC courses should be open to any Stanford student whether or not the student is in ROTC. Some exceptions might be made for courses that involve specialized military training, and such exceptions would require approval by the Stanford ROTC Committee.
3. ROTC courses, like other courses taught on campus, may be eligible for either academic or activity course credit, following existing Stanford curriculum review and approval processes. (Stanford students are permitted to count eight units of activity courses toward graduation credit requirements.)
4. The Stanford ROTC Committee should encourage opportunities for Stanford faculty and ROTC instructors to design jointly taught courses that could meet both academic credit standards and ROTC training requirements.

Section 5: Objections to the Committee's recommendation

Throughout our discussions with different groups and individuals on campus, we heard many impassioned arguments against reinstating ROTC. However, after serious consideration of these points of view, we are recommending in favor of reinstating ROTC. Below we have summarized our reasoning with respect to some of these arguments.

5.1. The antidiscrimination argument. The repeal of DADT has been a catalyst to both sides of the Stanford-ROTC debate. Indeed, the repeal was the occasion for an unexpected objection to a Stanford-ROTC program. This objection focuses on the alleged persistence of discrimination within the military despite the repeal of DADT and says that any restructured, on-campus ROTC program would make Stanford complicit in such discrimination. The Committee has much sympathy for the goal of inclusion, a goal that it shares with those making this objection. What we deny, however, is that creating a more productive relationship with ROTC must wait until Stanford University can declare the American military to be entirely discrimination free.

According to some who made representations to the committee, the American military continues to violate the civil rights of vulnerable minorities despite the repeal of the DADT. The exclusion from military service of transgender and medically disabled individuals, and policies that harass individuals who are atheists, are cited examples of post-DADT oppression. Until all these wrongs have been put right, any further collaboration between Stanford and ROTC would supposedly make the university complicit in the violation of rights to equal treatment, and thereby breach our own antidiscrimination policy. We are in agreement with some of what was said by those who proffered this objection. For example, we fail to see any good reason for the current exclusion of persons from the American military merely because of their transgender status. But our committee did not set out to determine whether all the policies of the American military are fully in keeping with the nation's civic ideals. That seems to us far too high a standard to set in order to open the door to a more educationally productive relationship between Stanford University and ROTC.

No doubt all major American institutions—including its institutions of higher education—can and should do a better job of living up to the nation's exalted civic ideals. The repeal of DADT was a momentous event in the national pursuit of equality, but it was certainly not the final step in that pursuit within our military. In parallel, it should be admitted that our institutions of higher learning also are at some measurable distance from that final step. Indeed, we can hardly say of ourselves what has been said about the military in an influential study by Charles Moskos and John Butler: “[The military today] is an organization unmatched in its level of racial integration. It is an institution unmatched in its broad record of Afro-American achievement. It is a world in which the Afro-American heritage is part and parcel of the institutional culture. It is the only place in American life where whites are routinely bossed around by Afro-Americans.” The American military was not always at the vanguard of racial integration, but it certainly has been in recent decades.

We believe that institutions can learn from each other. Institutional disengagement is an unpromising way of generating the mutual criticism, respect, and understanding that would enable us to do precisely that. For example, the Committee noted that some of the most trenchant arguments that were presented to us against ROTC were marred by naïve and derogatory stereotypes of the American military. Unfortunately, such stereotypes are only to be expected given little contact between the military and our students, faculty, and staff. The increased contact that would likely characterize an on-campus ROTC program will contribute, the Committee believes, in a small but significant way to reducing the perceived gap between the military and civil society in the USA.

An on-campus ROTC program would not be an endorsement of any current policy of the American military. Our nondiscrimination policy is a cornerstone of our academic culture, and Stanford will continue to admit students, whether they belong to ROTC or not, through an impartial admission process and then protect them from discrimination in university-administered policies and programs. In Section 4, we stipulated that, with the possible exception of a small number of specialized courses, any ROTC courses offered at Stanford should be open to all students whether the student is in ROTC or not. It is primarily this expectation that leads us to reject as unfounded the concern about the university's violating its own nondiscrimination policy.

5.2. The civilian-military divide. Some students, faculty, and staff who share our sense that broadly civic values are part of what defines us as a community strongly reject the idea that ROTC has any proper place on campus. Some who are pacifists, or those who believe that America is dominated by a militarism represented by our armed forces, will likely reject our recommendation. On the other hand, our proposal in no way depends upon complacency about the wars that America is currently fighting or has fought in the recent past. These wars, like all American wars, depend upon the decisions of elected civilian governments. Whatever folly or wisdom those decisions reveal shows nothing about the competence or integrity of our military. More important perhaps, one can coherently take a critical view of the uses that have been made of the American military in recent history and still acknowledge the cardinal importance of educating future officers to the very best of our ability as a nation.

Other objections hinge on what is perceived to be an irreconcilable conflict between the values of a liberal education and the ends of military training. According to some of those who made submissions to our committee, whereas liberal education fosters independent thinking regardless of authority, military roles require unquestioning obedience. Therefore, the education that befits Stanford undergraduates is antithetical to the kind of training that military personnel receive, or so it was argued. This objection was determinative in the

majority report of the Ad Hoc Committee of 1968-69, which concluded that a formal, on-campus ROTC program was inconsistent with the definition of Stanford University as “a community whose members ... have a primary commitment to the creation and dissemination of knowledge, in an environment of free intellectual activity.” However, the objection depends on a view of role expectations within the American military’s officer corps that is at best incomplete. Obedience to lawful authority is certainly a part of military roles. But members of the officer corps must be able to do much more than obey orders. They must be capable of nuanced moral decision-making, independent problem-solving, and responsible leadership. Such qualities are intrinsic to the ideal of liberal education. To be sure, we do not say that conflict cannot arise between military and academic values; we only deny that this conflict is so severe as to preclude a closer connection with ROTC at Stanford than currently exists.

Another argument in this vein suggests that the vocational commitment that ROTC presupposes is at odds with the properly prevocational character of undergraduate study at Stanford. We believe the objection to be overstated. Many Stanford students arrive on campus as freshmen with well-formed vocational plans and a single-minded determination to carry them through; it does not follow that their conduct is unbecoming a Stanford student. It is true that our academic values are in conflict with narrow specialization at the undergraduate level, but the hazards of narrow specialization are already addressed through general education requirements. Another related concern is that, if a student on a ROTC scholarship were to leave the program, the student would have a financial obligation to the government and would need financial aid to continue at Stanford. We believe that undergraduates at Stanford should certainly have the freedom to change vocational commitments without the worry of incurring prohibitive financial sacrifice. Therefore, ROTC students who change their mind about a military career must have access to strong financial aid support to mitigate the costs of their decision.

The recent WikiLeaks controversy has prompted concern that ROTC students could in some circumstances be denied the academic freedom that is rightfully theirs. ROTC students are “discouraged” by the military from reading materials on the WikiLeaks site because in so doing they may undermine their eligibility for future security clearance. But the discouragement is far from unique to ROTC students. *Any* student considering a career after graduation that would require security clearance would have good reason to avoid academic assignments that focus on classified documents. Yet no one could sensibly say that Stanford should be unwelcoming to all students who are contemplating careers in public service that would require security clearance. And if that is true, it seems hard to argue that Stanford should be unwelcoming to the ROTC students in our midst because such students may be worried about future security clearance. This controversy does remind us that important ethical

questions surround the academic use by students and others of classified materials that have become publicly available. However, the Committee thinks that keeping ROTC at a distance from the Stanford community is not a part of any satisfactory answer to these questions.

Some concern about the academic freedom of instructors, as opposed to students, has been expressed in the aftermath of the WikiLeaks scandal. If an instructor gives an ROTC student an alternative assignment in order to avoid reading classified documents, is the instructor not allowing the military to control curriculum? The question is comparable to asking whether accommodating a student who does not want to undertake vivisection in a class where it is required is ceding control of the curriculum to the animal rights movement. In both cases “no” seems the right answer to us. If a Stanford instructor assigns classified documents that have become public in their classes, students may ask for accommodation and the instructor may then make or deny such accommodation. All this would not appear to be relevant to the future of ROTC on campus.

5.3. Concluding comment. The Committee welcomes the prospect of an on-campus ROTC program at Stanford University. We envision that courses, such as “Ethics and Leadership,” would engage ROTC and non-ROTC students in frank and probing discussions about what it means to be a moral leader, and that Stanford professors would teach some of the required ROTC courses, such as, “Military History.” These curricular changes would expand the opportunities for educating Stanford students, including those who serve in the military, in citizenship, and this expansion cannot but contribute to mutual understanding between the military and civil society. If the Faculty Senate were to accept our recommendation, it is reasonable to predict, based on the variety of arguments at the town hall meetings and in the community letters, that many in our community would regard that as the correct decision, whereas others would regard it as a mistake. However, our hope is that the spirit of collegiality that has characterized the debate for the past year will prevail into the future, so that the new, on-campus program would benefit from the full range of ideas and energies to be found on our campus.

References

Books

Elliott, Orrin Leslie. *Stanford University. The First Twenty-Five Years*. Stanford University Press (1937).

Lipsky, David. *Absolutely American*. Vintage Books (2004).

McDonald, Robert M. S. (Ed.). *Thomas Jefferson's Military Academy: Founding West Point*. Introduction, by Peter S. Onuf. University of Virginia Press (2004). Also available at Google Books:
<http://tinyurl.com/3wfgt2h>
last visited 4/18/11

Moskos, Charles C., and Butler, John Sibley. *All That We Can Be: Black Leadership and Black Integration the Army Way*. Basic Books (1996), p. 2.

Roth-Douquet, Kathy, and Schaeffer, Frank. *AWOL*. Collins (2006).

Sherman, Nancy. *The Untold War*. W. W. Norton & Company (2010).

Papers

Bryant, Karl, and Schilt, Kristen. "Transgender People in the U.S. Military: Summary and Analysis of the 2008 Transgender American Veterans Association Survey." Whitepaper prepared for The Palm Center and the Transgender American Veterans Association (2008).
http://www.palmcenter.org/publications/dadt/transgender_people_us_military
last visited 4/19/11

Golby, James. "Diversity and the Effect of Commissioning Programs on the U.S. Military Officer Corps." Personal communication, Stanford University (2010).

Wade, Kathryn Lindsay Anderson. "The Intent and Fulfillment of the Morrill Act of 1862: A Review of the History of Auburn University and the University of Georgia." M.A. thesis, Auburn University (2005).
<http://etd.auburn.edu/etd/handle/10415/677>
last visited 4/19/11

Film

Junger, Sebastian, and Hetherington, Tim (Co-Filmmakers). *Restrepo*. Outpost Films/National Geographic Channel (2010).

<http://restrepothemovie.com/>

last visited 4/18/11

Weblinks

Advocates for ROTC

<http://www.advocatesforrotc.org/>

last visited 11/20/11

Constitutional Council rules in favor of ROTC advisory bill, *The Stanford Daily*, March 12, 2011

<http://www.stanforddaily.com/2011/03/12/constitutional-council-rules-in-favor-of-rotc-advisory-bill/#comments>

last visited 4/19/11

“Corps Curriculum” by Joshua Davis, *Stanford Magazine*, Jan/Feb 2002

<http://facultysenate.stanford.edu/Ad%20Hoc%20Committee%20on%20ROTC/index.htm>

last visited 4/19/11

Excerpt from March 4, 2010 Faculty Senate Minutes

<http://facultysenate.stanford.edu/Ad%20Hoc%20Committee%20on%20ROTC/index.htm>

last visited 4/19/11

Land-grant colleges and universities

<http://www.answers.com/topic/land-grant-colleges-and-universities>

last visited 4/19/11

Letter from Ad Hoc Committee on ROTC to Stanford University community:
Your thoughts on possible relations between Stanford University and ROTC,
November 2010

<http://facultysenate.stanford.edu/Ad%20Hoc%20Committee%20on%20ROTC/index.htm>

last visited 4/19/11

Log on ROTC at Stanford 1968-1973, by Donald Winbigler, September 12, 1973

<http://facultysenate.stanford.edu/Ad%20Hoc%20Committee%20on%20ROTC/index.htm>

last visited 4/19/11

ROTC committee members

<http://facultysenate.stanford.edu/Ad%20Hoc%20Committee%20on%20ROTC/index.htm>

last visited 4/19/11

Stanford University ROTC Departments: A Report and Recommendations,
February 7, 1969

<http://facultysenate.stanford.edu/Ad%20Hoc%20Committee%20on%20ROTC/index.htm>

last visited 4/19/11

The Facts about the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) and the Case
Against Bringing it Back to Stanford

<http://www.stanford.edu/group/antiwar/rotc.html>

last visited 4/19/11

Appendix 1: A sample of arguments that were *not* extensively discussed in the Ad Hoc Committee's Report

I. Anti-ROTC

1. Students aged 17-18 are too young to make as consequential a decision as signing up for ROTC. They need to be protected from adverse consequences of such a decision, e.g., financial and mental health consequences.
2. This is a slippery slope—once ROTC returns to campus, the university will feel pressure from the military to compromise yet other aspects of our academic integrity.
3. Until the US military achieves minimal standards of “humanity and civilization” [defined in the letter], it does not belong in any other civilized institution, such as a university.
4. To bring ROTC back would provide campus resources, legitimacy and prestige to a prescribed non-Stanford military curriculum in a way that we do not do for any other societal institutions. This undermines undergraduate education values in numerous ways.
5. The term “situationism” refers to the recognition that situational (environmental) factors are much more determinative of individuals’ behavior than dispositional (internal) factors. According to this theory, intelligent, liberally-educated, academically rigorous, and free-thinking people do not necessarily have a positive effect on the military as a whole, because the behavior of the military is largely determined by situational or contextual factors, not by attributes of the individual. Accordingly, any argument that assumes Stanford-educated students would have a positive impact in the military has no logical basis and should be discarded.
6. There should be no doubt that students who come to Stanford have at least some (possibly subconscious) trust in the university as an educational and academic institution. Situationism tells us that, to the extent such trust exists, students’ opinions of other institutions will be influenced by the level of trust and respect that Stanford exhibits with respect to those other institutions. In other words, if students were unsure as to how much they should trust or respect another institution (e.g. ROTC or the military), and Stanford was to demonstrate trust in or respect for that institution, then *either* the other institution (e.g. ROTC) would gain the student’s trust/respect, *or* the student would abandon their trust in Stanford. In the former case, if the other institution was one that Stanford did not intend for its students to *necessarily* trust or respect (for example, if it was an institution that Stanford wanted its students to think critically about), then Stanford’s demonstration of trust or respect in that other institution would have undermined the university’s own objectives. It goes without saying that the latter case, in which Stanford loses the student’s trust, would be undesirable. Strengthening Stanford’s relationship with ROTC would give rise to both of these adverse situational effects on students.
7. Both undergraduates and graduate students at Stanford can apply to attend one of the five Officer Candidate Schools (OCSs), which can generally only happen after graduation from Stanford. We might therefore see a decision by Stanford not to provide ROTC training on campus as an expression of institutional preference that the military wait until students have finished a degree before asking them to commit to a military career. The military itself might prefer that students commit earlier than that, but Stanford is under no obligation to facilitate such commitments.

8. If the different branches of the military wanted to make ROTC convenient for students at Stanford, there is nothing preventing them from renting space in Palo Alto, within easy biking distance of the campus, where training exercises could be held. Again, it appears the military would rather be given space on campus rather than do this, but Stanford is entitled to express the opposite preference, just as it would probably do if a large corporation wanted space on campus to train its future employees.

9. The military caste argument, if anything, may be a reason to *oppose* ROTC training on campus, because such training may make it more likely that students who are able to gain admission to Stanford and who come from military families will be persuaded to join ROTC rather than coming here without that commitment. My own experience with ROTC undergraduates suggests that many students who do ROTC feel pressure to do so from their families. Having it available on campus, with Stanford's imprimatur, could persuade more of these students to join ROTC.

10. Furthermore, the best way to formulate the University's position is by considering community members' rights. For instance, I could say as a student I have a right to an education and therefore the University's position should be so and so, or a staff member could say that he has a right to have the University fulfill the obligations of an employer, and so on. But there is no right to convenience. So the desire for convenience clearly does not hold the same kind of importance as other appeals to actual rights. For example, the right of students and faculty to have an environment conducive to learning and research, which bringing the military on campus would degrade.

II. Pro-ROTC

1. National defense is a public good from which all Americans benefit, philosophical objection to the military or not. ROTC programs at universities, particularly those that are expensive, private ones, enable more of those students who choose to help bear the cost of this public good to obtain an education.

2. There is not an intellectual conflict stemming from the inclusion of ROTC on campus. Philosophically, officer candidates are required to make two decisions relevant to intellectual freedom. First, to accept a career that will require them to disassociate expression of personal political opinion from their professional status—this is in fact a requirement in many professions, to include journalism, higher echelons of business, and any other career that requires individuals to participate in the projection of institutional values. Second, officer candidates agree to directly participate in the enactment of government policy and comply with military orders. While there are many means of serving society that permit outright opposition to government policy, government service, whether as a bureaucrat, police officer, or soldier, generally does not. The health of the nation requires sincere individuals to serve both through democratic opposition and in direct government employ, and is better served when both cadres are well educated.

3. The primary advantage of instituting a ROTC program will be an increase in diversity, in two respects. First, the availability of the ROTC program and its accompanying scholarship will attract students of a particular bent—service-oriented, practical, and looking for a physical, mental, and moral challenge in their future career. Second, and ultimately more important, will be the resultant increase in diversity within the military's officer corps.

4. At no time as a cadet did I feel discouraged from pursuing the full range of intellectual opportunities at Stanford. ROTC actually persuaded me to take classes and participate in activities that I would ordinarily not have, by encouraging me to be more culturally aware.
5. The phrase "out of sight, out of mind" definitely applies to the current ROTC students at Stanford. It was my experience as an undergraduate that there were woefully few discussions about the role of the military in society. By bringing ROTC back onto campus, I think these issues will be made much more salient for our students and that is a very good thing, regardless of one's personal politics.
6. Stanford is remarkably disconnected from an institution that plays an incredibly central role in American society. The choice to ostracize the military from this campus has been detrimental indeed and will be potentially disastrous for this country in the long run. Stanford would do well to actually display the commitment to diversity of which it so often boasts and not allow the politics of a select few to limit the freedom of participation and expression of many.
7. We should not conflate roles and responsibilities of certain official positions with the roles and responsibilities individuals have as active citizens of a thriving nation and intellectually-engaged Stanford student body. That is to say, just because I, as a military officer, may be obligated to follow the instructions given me by the elected leadership of our country, that does not mean I cannot have my own viewpoints and exercise those viewpoints in conversation with friends, in intellectual exploration in class, and most important, in the voting booth.
8. During my three years on active duty in the Navy, I found that officers educated at universities such as Stanford often had markedly different attitudes than their peers from the military academies or state universities with large ROTC programs. I believe that the presence of such officers in the military is highly desirable; they are representative of a significant element of American society and are more likely to question unreasonable or illegal orders or policies than those educated in a more militarily, hierarchically oriented environment.
9. I have repeatedly stressed in my communications with those who oppose bringing ROTC on campus that one of the most important reasons I disagree with them is precisely so that ROTC training may be enriched and perhaps changed by their voices--the voices of those who reject militarism and war. It is thus essential that if ROTC is invited back on campus, it be done in a way which does not glorify military service, and which invites those who oppose military service to participate.
Our tax dollars train and equip our warriors, and our elected representatives send them into battle. Like it or not, the actions of our armed men and women are, and will remain, *our* actions, and a boycott would neither sever our ties with nor end our support for the American military. Further, it's hard to believe that a boycott is the most effective path to equality in the military. By keeping ROTC off-campus, we turn down opportunities to meet and debate military officers, to introduce the military to the transgendered (and vice versa), and to earn the credibility that comes from having served ourselves.
10. We are confronted with incompatible moral goals, necessitating a difficult choice. How great is the injustice done by the policy against transgendered recruits, and how great an injustice would we commit if, in service to country, to civic discourse and, possibly, to equality, we allowed them on campus anyway? Reasonable people disagree on the right answer.
11. The faculty should vote to reinstate ROTC. Doing so will enrich Stanford in ways many of your colleagues may not imagine, and doing so will send a message to the vast majority of undergraduates that Stanford does not maintain a "detachment" from the US military forces, but is proud to contribute to their support.

12. I agree that it would be a great idea to provide access to the ROTC program at Stanford and encourage the students to join. At the same time you must understand that even parents like me and my wife who is also a veteran would never encourage our children to join the military. You may ask why and the answer is clear with two wars being fought for no reason or purpose and no clear end in sight I would not subject my children to the horrors of war no matter how patriotic I am. These current conflicts serve no purpose do not protect our freedoms, and above all make no sense. You still have my support but not the encouragement for my children to attend.

Appendix 2: ROTC programs at other universities

I. Three schools where Stanford students currently can enroll in ROTC programs

The Air Force ROTC Detachment 045 Warriors at San Jose State University
<http://www.sjsu.edu/depts/AFROTC/general.html>

The Military Science Program (Army ROTC) at Santa Clara University
<http://www.scu.edu/academics/bulletins/undergraduate/Military-Science-Program.cfm>

The Navy ROTC at the University of California, Berkeley
<http://navyrotc.berkeley.edu/>

II. Notes from visits to, or discussions with, Duke, MIT, and Princeton

1. ROTC Oversight Committees:

- a. Duke. The Arts & Sciences Committee on Officer Education oversees the Duke-ROTC programs. The powers of this committee were denoted by the university's faculty assembly, the Arts and Sciences Council, the only body authorized to grant credit for any courses at Duke University. The Officer Education Committee evaluates all ROTC instructors who are involved in assigning course grades. It reviews each candidate's dossier, interviews each one in person, and then formulates its judgment as to whether to nominate this candidate to the Dean of Faculty for an appointment as a Visiting Faculty member (their usual term is three years). The committee consists of five faculty members (typically from different disciplines--science, social science, humanities, engineering, etc), one Administration representative, and the four commanders of the ROTC units, who would be Lt. Colonels or Navy captains.
- b. MIT. There is a committee of faculty, admissions office administration, undergraduates, and graduate students that provides oversight. This committee does not pick the ROTC instructors; the military services do. But the committee has on occasion asked that the services reconsider the choice of a potential instructor if committee members feel that he or she is not fully qualified to teach the course. ROTC instructors are usually brought for 2-4 years and are not generally renewed as they go onto other jobs in the military.
- c. Princeton. ROTC courses would receive credit at Princeton only if they are approved by the faculty according to their regular procedures. There does not appear to be a separate ROTC oversight committee.

2. Courses and Credit:

- a. Duke. Introductory ROTC courses generally do not get credit. Half credit goes to several subsequent courses, and full credit to advanced courses in military history and similar subjects. The Arts and Sciences Council, through its

committee system (notably its Curriculum and Academic Standards Committees), evaluates and decides upon the credit-worthiness of all undergraduate courses, including those of the ROTC programs.

- b. MIT. ROTC courses do not generally receive credit. The two exceptions are: (i) A Sloan school faculty member volunteered to co-teach with a ROTC instructor a course on “leadership” that was approved through the Sloan School curriculum committee. (ii) Four ROTC physical fitness courses count toward the eight required MIT physical fitness courses for undergrads. Any MIT student can take any ROTC course, but in practice, relatively few do (with the exception of the Sloan School leadership course noted above), since the courses do not give credit. “ROTC” appears after the course listing for any of these courses on the MIT transcript.
 - c. Princeton. ROTC courses theoretically could apply to be credit-bearing but that has not happened. Currently, no ROTC course receives academic credit.
3. The structure of ROTC :
- a. Duke. The Army-ROTC shares a detachment with Duke’s Historically Black College neighbor, North Carolina Central University, and Duke views this as one of the best collaborations with its sister university 4 miles away. It provides one of the few opportunities for students from Duke and Central to participate in activities on the other campus.
 - b. MIT. MIT’s program is only half MIT students, with the rest coming from Harvard, Wellesley, and other New England schools. The instructors say that the ROTC commitment adds up to 20 hours a week of work to students, mostly early morning physical training and academic course work.
 - c. Princeton. The program includes Princeton students, as well as cadets from The College of New Jersey, Rider University, and Rowan University.