

Committee on Services to Students Report on Recruitment Policies

Following is the text of the Committee on Services to Students report to Stanford President Richard W. Lyman concerning recruitment policies at the Career Planning and Placement Center.

Headed by Timothy C. Clark, a senior history major, the committee includes Neil S. Bernstein, sophomore undeclared major; Stanley E. Fischman, assistant professor of psychiatry and pediatrics; Robert E. Freelen, acting dean of students, ex officio without vote; Suzanne E. Lewis, assistant professor of art history; Ronald A. Reholz, associate professor of English; Thomas A. Rhue, assistant dean of graduate studies; Fernando Sanchez, sophomore economics major; Peter R. Van Petten, sophomore undeclared major; and Christian F. Winkle IV, senior political science major.

I. RECOMMENDATIONS

In these recommendations, the phrase "formal placement facilities" includes the Career Planning and Placement Center, the Law School Placement Office, the Placement Center at the Graduate School of Business, and any similar facilities which may be established in the future. It does not include White Plaza or the offices of individual professors.

1. That more information be made available on companies recruiting at the formal placement facilities of Stanford University through the maintenance of an open file on each recruiting company. This file should contain all information submitted by individuals or organizations, including, of course, the company itself. Information submitted should be signed and have an address of the person or organization submitting the information. Copies of materials in this file should be submitted to the companies which recruit so there will be a chance for rebuttal and so recruiters may be prepared to answer questions which interviewees may ask. The opportunity for rebuttal of statements or allegations should be extended to everyone, and all such rebuttals should also be included in the file.

There are also a number of general studies or publications on what companies are doing work in specific areas which have come to the attention of the Committee. These concern such topics as production of weaponry, number, value, and nature of contracts with the Department of Defense, performance in areas of ecological concern, and others. The Committee recommends that these and other such publications which may appear in the future be included in the materials available at the Placement Center. The following is a partial list which the Committee recommends:

Council on Economic Priorities Newsletter
Defense Marketing Service (DMS) Intelligence Report
American Friends Service Committee publications
National Action Research on Military-Industrial Complex (NARMIC) publications

(Approved unanimously)

involve difficulties both in enforcement and in definition of precisely what constituted a recruiting interview.

4. In general, the problems of enforcement are greatly reduced by limiting any exclusionary policy to those facilities which are established specifically for recruitment.

5. Nothing in these recommendations should be construed as limiting access to campus by anyone for purposes other than recruitment. Members of excluded organizations should be allowed and encouraged to come to Stanford to discuss the activities and policies of their organization, even though barred from recruiting in the formal placement facilities.

III. DISCUSSIONS OF UNANIMOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

1. More information and open file.
This recommendation is aimed at correcting the present situation where generally the only information available to a student who is interested in a particular company is the public relations brochures put out by the company itself. Dr. Keller emphasized to the Committee the inadequacy of the information available to students, and urged that a Career Information Service be funded and established.

A number of suggestions were made to the Committee on how to make this information available, and we recommend that an open file on each company be maintained for a number of reasons:

A. **Financial:** It was suggested that the University sponsor an extensive examination of companies recruiting at Stanford, a task which would require much effort and expense. Maintaining an open file on each company would require only someone to establish the files and then file whatever information is submitted, as well as making the contents of the file available to the company periodically. It seems that initially this could be accomplished by one work-study student who would have responsibility for doing these relatively simple tasks. The Committee urges that the funding for one additional work-study position at the Placement Center for this purpose be made available.

B. **Legal:** It has been suggested that having the University publish a report on a company's activities would make it liable for erroneous information contained in the report. Our hope is that a policy of accepting whatever signed information is submitted will avoid any sanction of these materials by the University and hence avoid the legal difficulties.

C. **Censorship:** Accepting all information submitted would remove the danger that some information would be censored for being inappropriate, insignificant, inaccurate, or whatever. Allowing the opportunity for rebuttal should reduce the possibility of misinformation being perpetuated.

Some set of procedures or guidelines will have to be

Furthermore, competition for jobs in the armed services does not operate at levels comparable or equal to that for jobs in the civilian labor market. Thus, the policy we recommend would neither limit services available to students in any significant way nor would any students be denied important opportunities in seeking jobs.

For those on the Committee who favored maintaining a policy of open recruitment for companies with DOD contracts, the decision to ban the military was based on a fundamental belief that the University should divorce itself from military functions, whether it be DOD contracts, ROTC training or military recruiting. The military has no proper place within the fabric of the University as an independent private and domestic institution. The degree of coercive involvement with the DOD insofar as military recruiting is concerned may be observed in the fact that military recruiting on campus is demanded by the DOD as a condition for the awarding of its research contracts to the University. Again, private companies do not and indeed should not create similar erosions of the University's right to function as a free and independent institution.

Neil S. Bernstein
Timothy C. Clark
Suzanne E. Lewis
Ronald A. Reholz

Thomas A. Rhue
Fernando Sanchez
Peter Van Petten
Christian F. Winkle IV

Bernstein, Reholz, Sanchez, and Van Petten add to the reasons above the following argument for barring military recruiters from formal placement facilities:

Recruitment of talented and trained people by the armed forces is the first act in a clearly definable process that results in the unwarranted and hence immoral killing of people in Indochina. Stanford University, by lending its placement facilities and the prestige of its name to military recruiters, aids that process. It should stop doing so, primarily because aiding the agents of an immoral act is itself immoral and therefore incompatible with the nature of the university. Furthermore, barring military recruiters from formal placement facilities will be a political gesture that announces the opposition of Stanford students to the war and invites imitation by students at other universities.

The arguments that should be weighed against this line of reasoning are analogous to those raised against barring certain companies from formal placement facilities. Those arguments are discussed in the minority report on barring companies and should be considered there.

V. MINORITY STATEMENT ON MILITARY RECRUITMENT

As I have mentioned frequently in our meetings, I feel I understand and sympathize with the thoughts and feelings that lie behind the advocacy of abolition of certain organizations from utilizing the University Place-

Space paid for by University Relations

Senate, to approve the final wording of the propositions.

(If some restrictions are adopted, potential recruiters would be required to submit a statement that they qualify under the regulations before being allowed to recruit at Stanford. Any person could submit evidence that a potential recruiter does not qualify, with disputes to be resolved by the Committee on Services to Students after an investigation.)

There has certainly been ample publicity and discussions of recruitment policies at the Placement Center. However, in an attempt to provide each voter with the arguments made on both sides of the issue, we urge that a statement from each side accompany the ballot which each student receives. Members of this Committee are willing to submit these arguments to be included with the ballots. Of course, there would undoubtedly be further discussion of the issue in the Daily and probably from organized groups on both sides of the issue.

Clearly there will be no ambiguity about the role of the referendum in decision making if our recommendation that it be binding is accepted. Voting irregularities should be reduced by mailing each individual student a ballot and a stamped envelope for its return. Using numbered ballots should guarantee ballots would not be duplicated.

The recommendation includes a provision that the referendum be repeated in two years. We subscribe to the belief that recruitment policy should reflect community sentiment, and clearly that sentiment is subject to change over time. Others assert that recruitment policy should be based on some kind of principle which is immune to variation over time. A principle exists only as long as it is supported by some kind of consensus; obviously the consensus which existed at one time in regard to recruitment policy no longer exists. Until it becomes clear that a consensus on principle once again exists, we see no alternative but to review the policy periodically. Such review necessarily makes the issue both recurring and political. However, falling back on a principle which is no longer supported by a consensus is unlikely either to put the issue to rest nor to reduce the political controversy surrounding it.

B. Students only one constituency

The Career Planning and Placement Center exists because it provides a service which benefits students. Other persons or groups benefit as well, but these benefits are secondary and do not in themselves justify the existence of a Placement Center. In simplest terms, our argument is that students should set policy for a student service. Certainly there are other affected constituencies, but their interests are not primary and their rational concerns can as well be considered by the student body as a whole as by an official University committee or a University administrator.

Certainly it is not always appropriate for a student referendum to establish University policy, even on matters pertaining strictly to student services. When