

#### Complex (NARMIC) publications

2. That all companies recruiting at the formal placement facilities of Stanford University be required to fill out a questionnaire which asks questions relating to student concerns about company practices. Companies should be required to complete this questionnaire as a condition for its recruiting. The questionnaire should be revised annually. (Approved unanimously)

3. That no policy review and recommending body in addition to the Committee on Services to Students be established for the Career Planning and Placement Center. (Approved unanimously)

4. That military recruiters be barred from using the formal placement facilities of Stanford University. (Approved 8-1; Bernstein, Clark, Lewis, Rehholz, Rhue, Sanchez, Van Petten and Winkle voted yes, Fischman voted no.)

5. That a referendum of the student body establish the policy of whether military recruiters and recruiters from companies falling within specific legislative guidelines relating to their production of weapons of war should be barred from the formal placement facilities of Stanford University.

The Committee recommends that this referendum be conducted differently from an ASSU referendum. We suggest some method by which all registered students receive a ballot, as well as a summary of the arguments which this Committee found most important on both sides of the issue. We suggest that either mailing ballots to all registered students or distributing ballots through the registration procedures would be appropriate. Because opinions change, we further recommend that the referendum be repeated in two years. (Approved 5-4; Bernstein, Clark, Rehholz, Sanchez and Van Petten voted yes; Fischman, Lewis, Rhue, and Winkle voted no.)

The following proposed recommendation was defeated 5-4:

That, on principle, some companies producing weapons of war should be barred from using the formal placement facilities of Stanford University. (Defeated 4-5; Bernstein, Rehholz, Sanchez, and Van Petten voted yes; Clark, Fischman, Lewis, Rhue, and Winkle voted no.)

#### II. LIMITATION OF SCOPE

The Committee has limited the scope of its recommendations to the formal placement facilities of Stanford and specifically excluded White Plaza and individual professors' offices for a number of reasons:

1. The arranging of interviews and providing of office space for those interviews amounts to a direct University subsidy of a private business transaction between recruiter and interviewee. Thus, the University may make a decision on whether it wishes to continue subsidizing certain of these business transactions.

2. To include White Plaza in any exclusionary policy would be to infringe on White Plaza's de facto status as a place where a wide range of activities takes place in an unregulated fashion.

3. To include an individual professor's office within any exclusionary policy would require the regulation of essentially private conversations between a professor and a representative from a recruiting organization. One can imagine that a professor might invite a former student who is working for a particular organization to talk with the professor while other students were present and participating in the conversation. A policy which included conversations in professors' offices would in-

clude a set of procedures or guidelines which will have to be developed by the Placement Center staff as to how such an open file system will be handled. Procedures should include a complete review of the files every two or three years. The Committee requests that whatever procedures are decided upon be submitted to COSS for approval before they are put into operation.

The Committee supports giving the Placement Center whatever additional funding or space is necessary to carry out this policy.

#### 2. Mandatory questionnaire

The questionnaire is a means to get information which may be valuable to students and which can be gotten most easily from the company itself. We believe the questionnaire should be mandatory; otherwise it is a meaningless or half-hearted gesture.

It is not our intent that questions be so numerous or detailed that the questionnaire would serve as a de facto exclusionary device.

If this recommendation is accepted, the Committee will send a letter to Dr. Keller suggesting questions which we feel should be included on such a questionnaire. Generally, we would include questions about Department of Defense contracts (dollar amounts, percent of total business, and general categories of materials or services supplied), classified contracts (number and dollar amount), affirmative action programs for minorities and women, overseas operations, degree of involvement in community programs, plans for preserving the environment, and whether the company is presently or has been recently involved in criminal court actions involving company actions.

The questionnaire should be returned to the Placement Center several weeks prior to the scheduled recruiting interviews so that interviewees can look at the answers before their interviews. Because student interests and concerns change over time, we recommend that the questionnaire be revised annually. Again, the Committee requests that the questionnaire be submitted to COSS for approval before it is used.

#### 3. No further advisory board

The Committee believes establishing a policy review board for the Career Planning and Placement Center is unnecessary. Most of the Center's activities are routine administrative tasks or individual counseling, and there is general agreement that these are performed in a competent and friendly fashion. Dr. Keller stated that while he would welcome such a board if the Committee felt it necessary, he believed that the Placement Center had adequate student input already. The Placement Center seems to be quite responsive to student needs, and we believe that this Committee is a sufficient body to review policies at the Placement Center. A further body would be an unnecessary pyramiding of the bureaucracy.

#### IV. MAJORITY STATEMENT ON MILITARY RECRUITMENT

The decision to favor the exclusion of all military recruiters from the formal placement facilities of Stanford University was reached by the Committee with a vote of 8 to 1. This was the only area of restrictive recruitment upon which a substantial majority of Committee members could agree, primarily because it was the single case where individual students would not be denied an essential service. A student's access to military positions or training programs in the armed forces would in no way be curtailed by a policy banning military recruiters from using the formal placement facilities at Stanford because the military services maintain recruitment facilities in close proximity to the campus.

certain organizations from utilizing the University Placement Services. However, the very act of judging, especially on a moral basis, who may and may not have access to the University and its facilities is potentially a very dangerous act which seems antithetical to the very nature of a University. Morality, in particular, changes from generation to generation; witness the current approaches to some of the very accepted and cherished values of generations of students who graduated but a few short years ago.

I fully realize that this University (and most other "great universities") fall somewhat short of this ideal, but I do not believe that past inadequacies and mistakes should justify the cessation of efforts directed toward the ideal. The forces of repression are ever around us, both within the University community and without. Indeed, if the University were to go along with the barring of military recruiters from the Stanford campus because of the precedent that it has set regarding exclusion of certain corporations (Goldman-Sachs) and barring our basketball team from playing Brigham Young University, we would, at once, continue to establish precedents that will in the long run be inimical to the concept of the University as a sanctuary of reason and discourse.

Yes, it is true that the military's role on the campus is out of proportion. This is true on many levels of the University and, in my opinion, has had a definite, deleterious effect. However, to deal with that issue will take a considerable amount of soul-searching, hard work, and reevaluation of the University within our society rather than an impulsive, finger-waving symbolic gesture directed at a very minor symptom. Indeed, it is my opinion that even if this act were effective, the cost to our personal integrity and freedom, in the long run, will be excessive.

Stanley E. Fischman, M.D.

#### VI. MAJORITY STATEMENT ON REFERENDUM

It is in some ways unfortunate that the question of whether a referendum is a valid method of decision-making is intertwined here with the specific issue of the recruitment policy at the Placement Center. However, the question of what a referendum means never comes up except in the context of a specific referendum on a subject of controversy. The arguments used against student referenda are generally similar no matter what the issue, and reduce themselves to three propositions:

1. The referenda which have been conducted are flawed in a variety of ways.
2. Students are only one constituency of the University; student referenda should therefore be only one input into a decision.
3. A referendum is always an unsatisfactory way to make a decision, and this is especially true in a University.

#### A. Flaws in past referenda

We recognize the problems which there have been with past ASSU referenda, and for this reason our recommendation specifies some differences between this referendum and an ASSU referendum. The objections to past referenda generally refer to vague wording of propositions, insufficient publicity, little public discussion of the issues, the fact that only in retrospect is a referendum regarded as anything but advisory, and actual irregularities in voting. We believe that the referendum we have recommended meets these objections.

Appendix C contains the wording which we propose for the referendum. It would be appropriate for the elected representatives of the student body, the Student

referendum to examine University policies on matters pertaining strictly to student services. When there are policies which affect the Constitutional rights of an individual or other rights which have been specifically guaranteed, these should not be subject to referenda. However, there is no question of rights involved in recruitment policy, at least in the ordinary definition of that word.

It may be that the real reason there is so much resistance to allowing students to make decisions about policy for the Placement Center is that it simply is politically unfeasible. It may be that certain elements of the Stanford community which have some power object to having students making such decisions. If such is the case, if faculty, Trustees, perhaps some administrators, are using their power to prevent the establishment of a mechanism by which students set policy for a student service, then this obstacle to change should be publicly discussed as the real reason why a referendum is opposed.

#### C. Referendum an unsatisfactory mechanism

We regard the referendum as an improved if imperfect tool for making the decision on recruitment policy at the Placement Center. We are forced back to our basic assertion on control of the Placement Center: students should establish policy for this student service. Of the available ways for students to democratically decide policy, at this time the referendum seems the most desirable. The other alternative which comes to mind is some sort of representative system, like the Student Senate. However, the issues concerning Placement Center policy are basically questions of values, and the most direct way to ascertain the values of the student community is by referendum.

Those opposed to referendum as a decision-making device generally believe that there are other adequate channels for student input into the decision-making process. The fact that students comprise a majority of this Committee is sometimes cited as evidence of student input into decision-making. This argument ignores the very fundamental difference between giving advice and making decisions. Persons without power are rarely satisfied with merely giving advice, and persons with power usually regard the giving of advice as sufficient input for those without power. Yet if we imagine a situation where students had the power to make this decision, it seems highly predictable that other constituencies would object that they were only giving advice. There would be fear that the decision would go the "wrong way" and that interests of the Administration, for instance, were not adequately considered in the final decision. The question is not one of adequate channels for student input, but of the ultimate decision-making power.

A companion argument of referendum opponents is that those who will be held accountable for a decision should have the power to make the decision. However, if the power to make a decision is transferred to a different constituency, the students in this instance, then the former possessor of that power (the Administration) should no longer be held accountable for the decision. Certainly the effects of whatever decision students might make on Placement Center recruitment policy would change the situation which administrators must work with, but these effects would be similar to other factors which change the environment in which administrators must operate at present.

It is true that the President would probably be held accountable for the decision to give the power to student representatives on next page