

## Cadets On Committee

3/3/70

# More ROTC Questions

By BILL FREIVOGLER

Ten persons - President Kenneth Fitzer, Vice-Provost Howard Brooks, and the eight members of the President's Advisory Committee - controlled the implementation of last February's Faculty Senate decision to remove credit for "participation in programs of military training and education."

Of the ten, four opposed the Senate's action and three thought it went too far.

Fitzer's and Brook's doubts about last year's decision are probably the most interesting and were undoubtedly the most influential in altering it - this will be covered in future articles.

Here, attention will be focused on the attitudes of the members of the advisory committee, especially the student members, as they worked to implement the Senate's action.

Two of the three students on the Advisory Committee are ROTC cadets. Chairman Alan Munn and Professor Lyman Van Slyke, the two dissenters from the committee's recommendations, criticized this makeup.

### Representation Unfair

Van Slyke said, "Have you investigated the student representation on committee yet? 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."

Just what those appointment procedures were still remains in doubt, however. 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.

### Appointments Unclear

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.

Grube acknowledges that he knew that William Blanchard and Dan Caldwell were in ROTC, but said, "They knew the organization well. The appointments given the applicant pool were the best possible."

### Wanted Change

"You can make all sorts of innuendos," he continued, "but they all had some very good ideas. They all wanted change and had some ideas on what could be done."

Both Blanchard and Caldwell confirmed Grube's claim that they wanted changes, but their statements indicate that they both opposed the Senate's decision on

the crucial academic credit issue.

Caldwell, who occupies the normal Senior position in ROTC of a battalion officer and squad leader, thinks any criticism of his place on the committee is judging guilt as association." He denies any conflict of interest in his role.

### Some Changes

Caldwell began his committee work with the conception that "there needed to be some changes," but he disagreed with the Senate decision on credit. "I basically thought some form of ROTC had a place as a credit activity," he said.

Graduate student Blanchard, a commissioned first Lieutenant, emphasizes the same points. "My particular viewpoint is that some of the courses were valid enough to have credit," he said.

Both Caldwell and Blanchard

## News Analysis

admitted to "some surprise that two ROTC members were on the committee. But Blanchard denied that the committee was stacked, while Caldwell reluctantly acknowledged: "It obviously was not indicative of the entire student body."

### Third Student

The third student member of the committee is junior Carol Roesch. Though engaged to a ROTC member, Roesch vehemently denies this involvement had any effect on her actions.

While she maintains that she was in general agreement with last February's decision she emphasized that she thought it went too far on the credit issue.

"Why screw all of those students?" she asked. "Frankly a lot of students would be screwed up the wall, and in the process the only liberalizing force in the army would be lost."

Throughout the deliberations of the Advisory Committee, the academic credit issue was consistently described as the "crunch issue." Nevertheless, all three students disagreed to some extent with this part of the decision they were implementing—and two of the members had what could be generally described as conflicts of interest.