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Abstract

This paper will explore the basic history of the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) and their relationship with institutions of higher education. ROTC was well received on campuses during WWI, but its position of prestige was soon questioned and this was no more evident than in the Vietnam War era. This paper will examine the debate over ROTC on the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire campus and how this small Midwestern campus compared with other universities across the nation with the issue of ROTC. UW-Eau Claire to this day does not house an ROTC program so this paper aims to try to speculate why Eau Claire was successful in keeping ROTC off of the campus.

Historiography

There have been a handful of works done on the history of ROTC and the relationship with the military and higher education. The most famous and widely cited is *Education and Military Leadership: a Study of the R.O.T.C.*, by Gene M. Lyons and John W. Masland. Lyons and Masland are heavily cited in both pro and anti-ROTC literature. A second book I consulted for numerous sections of this paper is *Making Citizen Soldiers: ROTC and the Ideology of American Military Service* by Michael S. Nieberg. Nieberg has taught Navy and Marine ROTC students at Carnegie Mellon and at the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs.¹ The Howard Lutz papers serve as my main primary source. As far as I know, these papers have not been utilized, making this paper and the sources unique as I am one of the first to really explore them.

**Introduction**

By the end of March (1968), ROTC officers were beginning to talk about their unit in words similar to the army’s professor of military science at Michigan State, who likened his assignment to being at “an embassy on foreign soil.”

The United States Armed Forces have relied on the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) since 1862 with the establishment of land grant colleges, to train officers for the Army, Air Force, Marines, and the Navy. While attending one of the military academies such as West Point or participating in Officer Candidate School (OCS) will produce officers for the military, ROTC provides the most military officers.

There was considerable opposition to the Vietnam War on campuses across the U.S. and at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, which is made evident in the Howard Lutz papers, a prominent professor at UW-Eau Claire during this time. Part of that opposition is due to the fact that ROTC is still not on UW-Eau Claire’s campus. Opposition to the Vietnam War encouraged many people to reconsider the place of the military in society. This was particularly true on college campuses. Lutz’s papers show that this was not just true on top tier campuses, but also at regional campuses like UW-Eau Claire. Opposition to ROTC and the military in general on campuses nationwide was not always as great as during the Vietnam War. Organizations like the Committee on Militarism in Education provided materials to educate people like Howard Lutz. Howard Lutz then utilized this knowledge to inform members of the University of Wisconsin Eau Claire community about the issues of ROTC and the military in higher education. Lutz sent a call out to the UW-Eau Claire faculty to take this issue seriously as can be speculated from his

---


3 Land Grant Colleges were established by state Legislatures or Congress to benefit from the 1862 Morrill Act. These colleges were to teach agriculture, military tactics and technical education and receive some type of support from the federal government.
papers. UW-Eau Claire currently remains one of only two University of Wisconsin system schools without an ROTC unit.

**Background Information**

The issue of ROTC on college campuses across the United States has sparked much debate since its beginnings. There are many reasons as to why ROTC has not developed on the UW-Eau Claire campus, but in order to get there, one must examine the controversy and debates of the 1960s and 1970s in the United States. A concept that will be used throughout this paper is that of militarism in education. Militarism in education is the relationship between the United States Department of Defense and institutions of higher education. The Department of Defense uses colleges nationwide to train young civilians to become officers in all of the branches of the military.

It is important to understand the history of the military in higher education. There were four historical developments in our Nation’s history which led to the military’s relationship with college campuses. Three of these events were associated with major wars. The first event coincided with the Civil War. Congress passed the Morrill Act in 1862, setting aside tracts of public land to states that agreed to the terms of the act. The terms were that the money that came from the sale of the land was to be used by the state for the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts, in such a 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.

---


5 Ibid., Box 1, folder “Militarism”, Militarism in Education,” 1950.
The Morrill Act was the development of Land-Grant Colleges which were used in part as a means to train men for military service.

The second event contributing to the relationship between the military and institutions of higher education was the National Defense Act. In 1916, Congress passed this act enabling the War Department to establish ROTC units in schools and colleges. From the time of the Morrill Act (1862) until 1916, there was no clear cut policy for the land-grant colleges detailing the training in “military tactics” as introduced by the Morrill Act. Sometimes military training was voluntary and other times it was compulsory. The compulsory training length of time varied with no standard. After the 1916 National Defense Act was passed, the War Department set a standard in regards to the ROTC and military training was made compulsory for all first and second year male students.  

The third event linking the military to college campuses came in 1923 with the Wisconsin Challenge. For some years leading up to the Wisconsin Challenge, there had been an impression that the Morrill Act required land-grant colleges to make military training compulsory. In 1923 Wisconsin’s legislature passed a statute prohibiting compulsory military training at the University of Wisconsin in Madison. UW-Madison was a land-grant college. One year later, the University of Minnesota board of Regents took a similar stance. Wisconsin’s action was upheld by the Department of the Interior on June 20, 1930. Attorney General William D. Mitchell said that “the statutes nowhere specifically require that the offered course in military tactics must be compulsory.”

Thanks to the Wisconsin Challenge, a University of California ROTC case came

---

7 Ibid., Box 1, folder “Militarism”, Militarism in Education,” 1950.
before the Supreme Court and the court made notice of the two land grant colleges (Wisconsin and Minnesota) who had successfully eliminated compulsory military training.  

The final event linking the military to college campuses began during WWII in the form of specialist training. The military turned to colleges for specialist training and research. Almost as soon as WWII began, “colleges and universities…were put on notice that ‘every classroom must be a citadel’ and that every able-bodied male should be definitely preparing himself for military service.”  

This program began with collaboration between college educators and Armed Forces representatives “in an effort to devise a plan for the use of the colleges and universities in the training programs of the Army and the Navy.” For the most part, the colleges were ready to collaborate with the military and in some instances the college authorities did their best to persuade the Armed Forces to use their schools. Not all of the colleges desiring a military training unit could get one mainly due to inadequacies in dorm space and facilities. Carthage College in Illinois is an example of a college who wanted a military unit but did not have the space and was thus denied by the Armed Forces. The Eau Claire State Teacher’s College (ECSTC) had a specialist training program in 1943.

**From Open Arms to Dissent**

ROTC was not always a source of disagreement on college campuses across the nation. In fact, most universities benefited in some respect by having a working relationship with the military; some universities also saw their ties to the military as being patriotic and a way to protect them from suspicion [of being “un-American”]. World War I was a time of great

---

9 Ibid., Box 1, folder “Militarism”, Militarism in Education,” 1950.
10 Ibid., Box 1, folder “Militarism”, Militarism in Education,” 1950.
11 Ibid., Box 1, folder “Militarism”, Militarism in Education,” 1950.
reception for military training programs across the U.S. as collegiate administrators believed it was their university’s responsibility to help society and “they volunteered to help in whatever ways they could during WWI.”12

World War II contributed to a different take on ROTC. In 1917, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Committee on Academic Freedom in Wartime said that faculty and staff could be fired because of their “attitude or conduct” related to war. 13 This meant that certain behaviors or opinions expressed may have been interpreted as being “un-American” or “un-patriotic”, so some may have kept their mouths shut out of fear of being terminated. ROTC units were taken apart during WWII as they were thought to be too slow in producing trained men, so ROTC units had to be re-created on colleges after the war. In 1950, this re-creation of ROTC was completed. However, during this time America was facing a new war situation, “Cold War in Europe, hot war in Asia, and atomic war in the American psyche.”14 America now needed more reserve and active-duty military officers and this renewed the relationship between institutions of higher education and the military. This relationship was not all open arms and acceptance.

ROTC and higher education each had their own reasons in regards to function and toleration of military training programs. The military wanted an officer training program that focused on training and acquisition of knowledge that would allow young men to become officers immediately following graduation whereas university administrators thought education was the building block for officer training. They wanted civilian instructors to teach psychology, history, and engineering to the cadets whereas the military wanted a uniformed officer to instruct

13 Ibid., 25.
14 Ibid., 35.
the ROTC program. Despite their differences in opinion on how military instruction should be delivered, the military and institutions of higher education both agreed on the importance of ROTC to the university and to the nation.\footnote{Nieberg, Michael S. \textit{Making Citizen Soldiers: ROTC and the Ideology of American Military Service} (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2000), 39.}

The military had their beliefs and reasons for having ROTC units on college campuses across the nation. They are stated below:

1. A belief that the military needed a place on campus if it was to compete successfully with industry for talented men.
2. A more subtle desire to maintain good relations with higher education—the locus of critical military research.
3. A belief (especially prevalent in the army) that ROTC instilled civic awareness and patriotism.
4. The great cost-effectiveness of ROTC, especially in comparison to the service academies.\footnote{On average in 1969, an ROTC officer cost $4,320 to produce. Officers coming out of Officer Candidate School cost $8,406 to produce, and graduates from the service academies such as at West Point, cost $47,136 (Making Citizen Soldiers, p. 132). ROTC was clearly the most cost effective approach to producing officers for the military.}
5. A desire to please members of Congress, most of who were firm supporters of an on-campus military instruction program.\footnote{Nieberg, \textit{Making Citizen Soldiers}, 40.}

The university on the other hand, had their reasons for the support and toleration of ROTC on campuses. Their reasons were:

1. A firm belief, especially among the highest officers of universities (themselves often ardent supporters of the Cold War), that American higher education had an obligation to assist in the prosecution of the Cold War as a service to society.
2. A desire to keep the military happy in an era in which, at several large research universities, government contracts were worth many millions of dollars. Total Department of Defense (DOD) outlays to universities for basic research alone equaled $105.7 million in 1958, and they continued to climb into the late 1960s.
3. A fear that any negative statement about the military could be construed as “un-American” and lead to marginalization or dismissal.
4. A belief that ROTC contributed to good order on the campus and good citizenship in the undergraduate population.
5. A belief that training officers via ROTC would “civilianize” the military by infusing it with ideas from the universities. Concurrently, ROTC would prevent the creation of a military caste composed of officers trained at the service academies.
6. A desire to please groups with influence over the university, such as alumni, trustees, and state legislators, most of whom were staunch supporters of ROTC.  

Areas of disagreement were set aside and a more patriotic approach to preparing an officer was taken in the public eye. The public perception of military-university unity was seen as more important than any of the above issues causing disagreement. Patriotism, like we are currently experiencing with the wars today, was important to overshadow any dissent with the military and ROTC programs on campuses.

The Tet Offensive was considered a turning point for ROTC and its reception on college campuses nationwide. A famous quote by news anchor Walter Cronkite summed up the majority mindset of the nation: “What the hell is going on? I thought we were winning the war!” The Tet Offensive was considered the event that “breathed life into languishing American liberalism” and prompted another look at the place of war and the military in American society. Tet scarred American’s confidence and shattered some hopes that the war in Vietnam could be won. Some Americans felt lied to by the government and soon after Tet, the war in Vietnam and the place of the military on campuses nationwide, dramatically shifted.

The military relations before the Tet Offensive were more neutral. The universities did not necessarily embrace ROTC, but they accepted the program and decided their relationship

---


19 The Tet Offensive consisted of a series of attacks by the Viet Cong on major urban areas of South Vietnam. During Tet, the lunar new year and also a festive Vietnamese holiday, both sides observed a cease-fire. During this time American soldiers and the South Vietnamese were preparing for the holiday while the Vietcong were preparing for a deadly battle. The Vietcong disguised themselves as ARVN(Army of the Republic of Vietnam) soldiers or civilians and infiltrated into the cities. On January 30, 1968, the Vietcong set forth on a massive attack, striking 36 of the 44 provincial capitals, 5 of 6 major cities, and 64 district capitals, and 50 hamlets. The Vietcong also raided the U.S. Embassy at Saigon. The offensive shocked the U.S. and South Vietnam; Americans had seriously underestimated their enemy. According to George Herring, if Tet was a “defeat” for the Vietcong, it was still a costly “victory” for the U.S. and South Vietnam. Source: Herring, George C., *America’s Longest War: the United States and Vietnam, 1950-1975* (New York: Newberry Award Records, Inc., 1979), 184,186,188.


with the military would have a humanizing approach on military training. Also, most universities and their faculty did not want to draw attention to them as being “un-American” or “un-patriotic”. Tet provided grounds for citizens to seriously reconsider the place of the military in higher education.

The Conflicting University Mission

Although disagreements were often set aside, they still existed. One issue questioning the role of ROTC on campuses is that of goals of each university. Most universities promote and embrace free thought and individuality.

Universities have placed certain values on education. They require that a course teach intellectual search, and aspires to individual creative thinking. ROTC, as a branch of the U.S. military is based upon blind obedience, other imposed discipline, the exercise of arbitrary authority, and the rejection of reason.²²

This flyer was posted in the W.R. Davies Center at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire in 1971, the year when the university was considering establishing an ROTC unit on campus:

Would you welcome on this campus, courses for college credit where a major aim of instruction is admittedly indoctrination, where the free exchange of ideas has most often been discouraged, and where course content is determined by military authorities virtually independent of the normal processes of academic control? ²³

A trend in anti-ROTC literature is the issue of control. The ROTC unit was not under the control of the university. Instead, it was controlled by the U.S. military. Universities were supposed to provide offices, drill arenas, locker room space, and rifle ranges for ROTC.²⁴

President Harold Dodds of Princeton was quoted in a pro-ROTC article stating that “the overwhelming consensus is that the quality of ROTC academic programs is sub-standard and unbecoming to both the services and the colleges, that ROTC courses are ‘thin’, ‘dull’,

²² Ibid., Box 1, folder “ROTC (2) [1971-1976], “UW-Eau Claire’s Involvement by Stewart Dix, 1977.”
²⁴ Ibid., Box 1, folder “ROTC Materials Lutz,” 1970.
memorizing of facts, concerned with ‘trade school’ rather than ‘academic’ mental techniques.”  

Despite the fact that education did not serve the purpose to promote nationalism or militarism, there were a large number of colleges across the U.S. that were ready to make war their purpose for whatever length of time the government wanted. Some universities held onto opinions such as this in order not to draw suspicion from the government and to appear “patriotic.” It was not in their best interest to defy the government.

With all the disagreement and conflict between faculty, students, and the military, ROTC needed a change to keep their enrollment numbers. The 1964 Vitalization Act provided ways for more young men to get involved with ROTC.

**Move to Improve: the ROTC Vitalization Act 1964-1968**

During the late 1950s to the early 1960s, dissent for against the military and its ties to civilian institutions was growing. President Dwight Eisenhower and sociologist C. Wright Mills made arguments that the military had too much control on society. Mills said that “military ascendancy” and the new role that the services had taken in many fields traditionally dominated by civilians, including education.” President Eisenhower also cautioned against the increased presence of the military in education. “The prospect of domination of the nation’s scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present-and is gravely to be regarded.” These views did not have an immediate negative impact on ROTC. ROTC officials were more concerned about the quality of their program. They were concerned that

---

26 Ibid., Box 1, folder “Militarism”, Militarism in Education,” 1950.
28 Ibid., 85.
ROTC would not be able to meet the officer numbers needed by the Armed Forces. Enrollments in ROTC programs were declining each year. ROTC needed some changes. In 1964 Congress passed the ROTC Vitalization Act as a way to improve and equip ROTC with its mission as the U.S.’s main source for active-duty military officers. This bill proves that Congress and the Armed Forces truly wanted to gain from ROTC. This program was taken seriously and was in need of an update if it were to succeed.  

ROTC would soon come under fire from student organizations and faculty most notably during the Vietnam War. “While real, sustained opposition on the campuses did not arise until 1968, student and faculty hostility to the Vietnam War affected ROTC….as early as the 1965 teach-ins at the University of Michigan.” As mentioned before, there was much debate about the role the military played in mission statements of universities. Most universities found the military and its ideology of indoctrination and strict discipline not congruent with a liberal arts education. This was not always the case. During the 1950s, many faculty and students did not have these concerns over government influence on the institutions of higher education and their mission statements. It was in the 1960s when the negative notion of military influence in higher education started to surface. Increasing number of people during the 1960s felt that “the university would have to curb government influence if it was to remain objective and able to pursue truth.” The reformation of ROTC was not to improve content but rather to boost numbers. Compulsory ROTC had already been let go in the early 1960s but ROTC enrollment and commissions were decreasing and this concerned military officials. They developed four interesting theories to try to explain this decrease.

30 Ibid., 86.
31 Ibid., 86.
The first theory was that Cold War hysteria had been dying especially after Stalin died. The military hypothesized that men felt less obligated to join the military as Cold War tensions died off. The second theory was the issue of the draft. Men had enrolled in ROTC as a means of evading the draft, meaning they avoided becoming noncommissioned officers by enrolling in ROTC. In 1961, men who were married were placed at the end of the draft list. Also, college men who were passing their classes received draft deferments almost guaranteed. Military officials decided that the draft was less of a threat during the 1960s than during the 1950s. The third theory was the issue of time. ROTC demands stretched thin valuable time in student’s lives so more students were unwilling to join up. College classes were too demanding and ROTC just made their schedule all the more hectic. The final theory was that college students in the 1960s did not feel the same calling to serve their country than in previous decades.  

To combat this dilemma, the military started to decrease requirements for getting into ROTC. They reduced qualifications much like the regular U.S. Army is doing today. Students who would not normally qualify for ROTC such as transfer students or students who did not attend a college that housed an ROTC unit could now enroll in the program. ROTC also petitioned for more scholarships and higher monthly stipends for cadets. The monthly stipend was proposed to be raised from $27 a month since 1947 to $50 a month in 1962. ROTC officials also proposed a decrease in the time spent on drill and tactics on campus. Summer camps were created to hone military ceremony and drill skills. A major change to the ROTC program was the addition of a two year program. ROTC had always been a four year

33 Ibid., 89.  
34 Ibid., 90.
commitment. These two-year programs allowed transfer students and students attending technical colleges to participate in ROTC thus with the goal of boosting enrollment.\(^{35}\)

When the bill passed, it included the following features:

1. The addition of two-year ROTC programs
2. The authorization of 5,500 full scholarships each year for each service limited to cadets in the four year program
3. Monthly stipends increased to $50
4. The ability for students who attended nearby institutions without ROTC programs to be enrolled in ROTC at a college with an ROTC program
5. Reducing student-instructor contact hours from 480 to 360.\(^{36}\)

This bill also made it mandatory that the highest ranking ROTC instructor be given the title of professor and also that the college give credit for ROTC classes. This was regardless of the officer’s educational background. Despite these changes to the ROTC program, one still needs to ask why? What is the need for military training programs on college campuses?

**Why have military training programs on campus?**

What drew college campuses around the U.S. to want military training programs on their campuses? A big reason was prestige. The California Institute of Technology had a large war research program and received a lot of publicity for it. They appeared in the news and in books such as *Scientists Against Time* and *Rockets, Guns, and Targets*.\(^{37}\) The military gave medals and citations to the colleges and their faculty members for military training and weapons research and the college’s took seriously their part in developing weapons of mass destruction. For example, the President of Emory University boasted about “four members of the University faculty and seventeen of its graduates who participated in the research leading to the

---


\(^{36}\) Ibid., 94.

\(^{37}\) Ibid., Box 1, folder “Militarism”, Militarism in Education,” 1950.
development of the atomic bomb.” Another example of this pride was stated by Denver University’s Chancellor who referred to “Twenty former professors, instructors, and assistants from our science department who were employed by the Manhattan Project in developing the atomic bomb.” 38

Colleges nationwide also served as research institutions for the military. The California Institute of Technology has an enrollment of more than 24,000 students in engineering, science and management war training courses. They also taught advanced meteorology to Army Air Force cadets and had a unit of Navy V-12 Engineering Specialists. The California Institute of Technology had over $80,000,000 in government research contracts employing more than 4,000 people for these research endeavors. This is a striking example of the relationship between the military and institutions of higher education. A little closer to home is the example of the University of Illinois where the U.S. government spent $900,000 on a munitions development laboratory which employed Illinois University chemists who turned out smoke shells and other battlefield products. 39 While it may make sense for the military to partner up with technology schools with the goal of developing battlefield technology, Emory University was an example of a relationship one would not expect between the military and the college institution. The school of Theology at Emory University was affected by military influence when the U.S. Navy made a contract allowing six pre-chaplain students to be trained in Emory’s School of Theology. The contract covered instruction, medical services, and subsistence. In addition to these amenities, the six Navy pre-chaplains received pay as enlisted men. 40


39 Ibid., Box 1, folder “Militarism”, Militarism in Education,” 1950.

40 Ibid., Box 1, folder “Militarism”, Militarism in Education,” 1950.
ROTC was not always widely accepted on college campuses, but it had been tolerated as mentioned earlier. After the Tet Offensive, ROTC officers such as the army’s professor of military science at Michigan State spoke about his position as being, “an embassy on foreign soil.” Violence and dissent about ROTC differed from campus to campus. Political views moved more to the left and ROTC was now a target in protests. Forty-five Air Force ROTC (AFROTC) units experienced “verbal abuse, sit-ins, placards, pamphlets, and anti-ROTC articles in both official and unofficial campus newspapers” from February to June 1968. Most anti-ROTC movements were peaceful and ROTC helped this by not getting involved in the confrontations as was written in their handbook. 41 One popular and widely publicized anti-ROTC protest took place at the University of Pittsburgh in October of 1968. An ROTC officer confronted a protestor who was wearing a jacket with army medals he had bought at a surplus store. The officer insisted that the student take off the medals but the student refused. Instead, he told the

officer to remove the medals if he was offended. The officer cut the medals off of the jacket. Later that day, the officer apologized to the student. This was not a violent act, but the ROTC was already facing dissent from the campus and the officer’s behavior made ROTC look bad. This gave members of the campus community more leverage in their quest to get ROTC off of campuses. The student newspaper at the University of Pittsburgh wrote,

ROTC versus Democracy: This blatant act of assault, without any legal authority to act, was shocking to everyone who witnessed it. But in effect, the action taken by [the] Sergeant…is a microcosmic example of the problem that ROTC presents to this university in particular and to the entire higher educational system in general.

Tet was the turning point for opposition to military presence of campuses, so now here is a look at student and faculty concerns about why ROTC did not belong on campus.

**Faculty Issues with ROTC**

The most common response by the anti-ROTC groups is that ROTC instructors do not fit the academic qualifications of University Professors.

The inviolate right and responsibility of a college and its faculty to freely search and select the most qualified colleagues available is obviated. ROTC instructors need demonstrate no capacity for either research or teaching. The normal standards for faculty are waived and the salaries come from the government, not the college bursar.

The instructors of ROTC classes were not civilian instructors, most did not have PhD’s, tenure, or serve on university committees, but ROTC programs were considered full academic departments. ROTC instructors did not answer to the university but rather to an outside force, the Department of Defense, who paid their salaries and who the officers had signed up to serve.

---

43 Ibid., 115.
44 Ibid., Box 1. Folder “Militarism-in Education [1977-1979],” Allen Hoppe, ROTC and Higher Education”
Also, ROTC officers did not tend to stay at a given university for more than three years.\footnote{Nieberg, Michael S. Making Citizen Soldiers: ROTC and the Ideology of American Military Service (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2000), 49.} To go along with the argument that ROTC instructors do not meet university standards in education, is a study of 131 officers teaching military history. Of these 131 military officers, seventeen had no college courses in history, seventy-one had only one to three courses in history, and only thirty-seven of these officers had four or more college courses in history.\footnote{Ibid., Box 1, folder “ROTC Lutz [1967-1971], “Northern Illinois University, Eugene Maier, 1971.”} The status of military science instructors is ambiguous at best. They are subject to the hierarchy and control of their commanding officer and the Pentagon. These instructors are supposed to be members of the faculty with faculty status.\footnote{Lyons, Gene M. and Masland, John W. Education and Military Leadership; a Study of the R.O.T.C.: Princeton, New Jersey, 1959, 175.} This is a major issue with some faculty who work hard for tenure and advancement. These military officers, young and old, and regardless of their educational background were granted the title of professor. Some faculty argued that granting faculty titles to the military officers was irresponsible and against academic protocol. In 1962, 12.6 percent of Air Force officers had advanced degrees (beyond the bachelors) and approximately one in five did not possess a bachelor’s degree.\footnote{Nieberg, Making Citizen Soldiers, 76.} This was a grave concern for civilian faculty members.

In order for a University to approve a new class or department, there are certain channels that have to be gone through. Northern Illinois University made a very important point on this:

In our opinion, it would be advisable to seek an extension of at least a year from the Army to explore all the problems posed by ROTC. To our knowledge no single academic course, let alone an entire department of military science and tactics has been approved in so short a period of time. And in this case the proposed department is under the control of an outside agency.\footnote{Howard Lutz papers, circa 1951-1985. USGZE UHC278 A10/2g. Special Collections and Archives. McIntyre Library. University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. Eau Claire, Wisconsin.} 

Despite faculty concerns on the officer’s academic qualifications to teach at the university level, ROTC became an academic department, ROTC courses became accredited
regardless of faculty finding their content substandard, and ROTC instructors were granted the title of “professor” without having the appropriate academic background that their civilian counterparts possessed.  

**Student Concerns**

The ROTC program took about \(\frac{1}{8}\) to \(\frac{1}{5}\) of the credit hours in a four year college which could almost equate to a minor. It is said that an officer trained under ROTC will be more liberal, however the military science program took away time that could have been used for electives that would make the cadet more liberal. Lyons and Masland state that ROTC students forget a lot of their military science material over their four year college careers, with the majority of it being the memorization of facts. By time the cadets graduate and enter one of the services, they have to be “trained on the job.” Lyons and Masland suggested an alternative to campus based ROTC programs. The cadet could receive their training at summer camps after they graduate from college. This way they could learn military drill in boot camp like all of the other G.I.’s do and then take their military science courses in a three to four month span upon graduation. This suggestion is more consistent with the Marine Corps who do a lot of their officer training upon graduation from college.

Despite much opposition, the military and its supporters had statistics on their side. The most recently available statistics (1966) on ROTC graduates state that according to reports by the Army Personnel Research Office, “the largest single source of junior officers in the Army is the Senior Division ROTC program on 232 college campuses across the United States.” In the fiscal years


\[\text{Ibid., Box 1, folder “ROTC Lutz [1967-1971], “Northern Illinois University, Eugene Maier, 1971.”}\]

\[\text{The term liberal is used in this sense to describe “well-rounded”. For example, at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, students are expected to take classes not pertaining to their major in order to get the full experience of a ‘liberal’ education.}\]

\[\text{Ibid., Box 1, folder “ROTC Lutz [1967-1971], “Northern Illinois University, Eugene Maier, 1971.”}\]
year 1965, 11,400 ROTC graduates were commissioned as Second Lieutenants in the U.S. military compared with only 2,300 commissions coming out of Officer Candidate School (OCS) and only 522 graduates of the Military Academy at West Point. 53

ROTC was the primary program for recruiting and training officers for the regular Army, Navy, and Air Force. As mentioned above, ROTC commissioned more officers than the combined Academies at West Point, Annapolis, and Colorado Springs. Between 1968 and 1974, the three Academies provided only three to nine percent of newly commissioned officers whereas ROTC provided between 23.6 and 38.2 percent of the newly commissioned officers. ROTC was understood as a program for training reserve officers. ROTC promoted the concept of an armed force too small to be a threat to civilian patrol. “ROTC and the colleges which sponsor them thus bolster the military industrial establishment which profits from providing the weapons, uniforms etc for the Armed Forces.”54 This was quoted in the March 1977 Militarism Memo newsletter put out by the Committee on Militarism in Education. 55

The U.S. military was highly dependent on these ROTC students as the above numbers demonstrate. Activists such as Howard Lutz may have been so involved in anti-ROTC and militarism in education movements because of these numbers. They may have wanted a smaller military. The statistics are somewhat striking. The military academies such as the one at West Point have high entrance requirements and an intense application process therefore weeding out many officer candidates. There is a certain prestige associated with men and women who graduate from the military academies. Gene Lyons and John W. Masland found ROTC
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instruction of limited academic utility. The details are spread over four years and are forgotten.

The courses fail to challenge the imagination of the superior, and in many cases, the average student. Below is a sample ROTC curriculum for the Army in the 1950s.

**Standard Army curriculum, 1950s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Contact Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Science I (Freshmen)</td>
<td>Introduction, Weapons and Marksmanship, Leadership Lab (drill), Military History</td>
<td>5, 25, 30, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Science II (Sophomores)</td>
<td>Role of the Army, Map/Aerial Photo Reading, Crew-Served Weapons, Leadership Lab</td>
<td>10, 20, 30, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Science III (Juniors)</td>
<td>Leadership Lab, Branches of the Army, Tactics and Communications, Leadership, Military Principles, Pre-Camp</td>
<td>30, 30, 55, 10, 20, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Science IV (Seniors)</td>
<td>Operations, Logistics, Leadership Lab, Administration and Military Justice, Service Orientation</td>
<td>50, 20, 30, 30, 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The University of Missouri (Columbia) had a Peace Studies program. They also had Army, Air Force, and Navy ROTC programs. The three ROTC programs were well funded while the Peace Studies program was left to fend for itself. The University provided buildings, grounds, maintenance, and utilities for the three ROTC programs and expenditures for salaries and wages. The Pentagon provided the salaries for the ROTC instructors and $150,000 in scholarships. The Peace Studies program was denied any funding. The Curriculum Committee
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for the College of Arts and Sciences considered increasing the amount of credit hours for the Army and Navy ROTC from twelve to eighteen. The Peace Studies program was opposed to this so they made a proposal to the committee: “that ROTC credit be counted towards an Arts and Sciences degree only if accompanied by an equivalent or greater number of course hours in Peace Studies.” Their counter proposal also added:

“If the rationale for allowing any ROTC credit towards an Arts and Sciences degree is that it exerts a humanizing influence on the military, then the College of Arts and Sciences should take seriously its responsibility to provide this humanizing influence and require that course taken in the military programs be counterbalanced by courses in Peace Studies.”

On April 13, 1977, the college of Arts and Sciences approved the shift from twelve to eighteen credit hours for the Army and Navy ROTC towards a degree in Arts and Sciences but did not accept the counter proposal by the Peace Studies program. This outcome brings to light the militarization of the faculty, making it seem as if they place more priority on preparing for war than for peace.

ROTC received much negative publicity as has been mentioned thus far. At the Worchester Polytechnical Institute in Middleboro, Massachusetts, the Army ROTC program launched a mock invasion of the town. That morning in May of 1966 uniformed men who were completely armed, went on patrol through the town. The only problem with this mock invasion was that the ROTC unit did not inform the officials of Middleboro and terrified residents flooded the emergency lines with calls about the suspicious looking men.
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Another concern with ROTC that received negative publicity was the issue of “subversive” student groups. At the University of Washington, ROTC cadets were warned of “subversive” groups on campus. These groups included Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). The ROTC cadets were instructed to gather posters and other information on these groups and their respective members (students and faculty). The cadets were basically instructed to spy on their peers. One cadet at the University of Washington refused to do this and is credited with leaking the story to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). The information collected on these missions were used “in an attempt to add realism to our Brigade Staff training” as stated by the officers who gave the orders. I interpret this as a mock intelligence gathering mission. This spy mission was broadcasted nationwide and the University of Washington President Charles Odegaard demanded the operation to be terminated.

The military denied any involvement in a spy mission but later admitted to it when a military intelligence file on left-wing activists surfaced. This particular file stated that those who were in opposition to the Vietnam War “were in fact our enemies”. The military then refused to show the file to President Odegaard with the justification that the materials were secret. At this time the University of Washington was removing credit for courses that used classified information.  

The University of Washington scandal and the Middleboro incident tried to keep out of the news but to no avail. Once these incidents hit national news, more negative feedback was received for ROTC. The University of Washington incident was known as the “duck scandal”. The duck scandal brought much negative attention to the University of Washington as it was the first time military training on the campus had been seriously questioned. Both faculty and
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students stated that the ROTC was in violation of academic freedom, most notably the open exchange of ideas. This incident created a negative blanket over ROTC at the university but also was a contributing factor to military training nationwide.  

Now this paper will examine the relationship of the military and higher education at a regional level. ROTC was not limited to large campuses, so it is important to examine the debate on smaller campuses such as the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. Eau Claire is a unique case study as the university currently is one of only two University of Wisconsin system schools without an ROTC program.

The Army Air Force Cadet Training Program at Eau Claire State Teacher’s College

The University of Wisconsin Eau Claire had a specialist training program on its campus from March 1943 to June 1944 through the Army Air Force.  

President William R. Davies of the Eau Claire State Teacher’s College made a request to U.S. Senator Alexander Wiley in December of 1942. Davies suggested a strong interest in having an Army training unit assigned to the Eau Claire State Teacher’s College (ECSTC). Davies wanted to use the college’s facilities to their maximum potential in the war effort and “to keep relatively intact a representative faculty.”  

On February 6, 1943 the ECSTC received word from Congressman Merlin Hull that a college training detachment of 300 men would be stationed at Eau Claire. President Davies, Regent Peter J. Smith and Mabel Chipman, the business manager signed the contract on March 31, 1943. This contract would provide for monthly compensation for instruction, medical
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service, supplies, housing, use of classrooms, and janitor services. Willis Zorn was appointed to oversee the use of ECSTC facilities between the military detachment and the regular college program. The ECSTC cafeteria staff provided meals for the men.  

As mentioned above, the Army Air Force training program lasted at Eau Claire from March 1943 to June 1944. The number of military trainees going through the program varied from 300 to 178, and all the way down to only 31 cadets at the program’s end. The Dean of Instruction, Mr. A.J. Fox was coordinator for the academic program. Under his coordination were the departmental coordinators. Bjarne Ullsvik was departmental coordinator for the mathematics department and was required to work six hours a week with the training program. Dr. Roy C. Judd of the physics department contributed nine hours a week including laboratory training to the program while Henry Kolka of geography contributed three hours a week. Ruth Johnson represented the English department and contributed three hours a week. Mr. W.E. Slagg of biology was assisted by Lyla Flagler and Alice Matz (the college nurse) in training the cadets in medical aid. The airport located approximately one mile south of ECSTC provided ten hours of instruction through the War Training Service of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. This instruction included take-offs and landings for the cadets.

By April 1944 all cadets not originally in the Air Force were dropped from the training program on ECSTC’s campus. The academic program was discontinued and instructors brought to the university were dismissed. This sudden end to the training program upset many young men cadets. However, the men did enjoy their stint at Eau Claire. There was a USO (United
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Service Organization) operating at the YMCA in Eau Claire. On August 10, 1944 President Davies accepted a Certificate of Service Award on behalf of the Eau Claire State Teacher’s College for their help with the Army Air Force cadet training program. The cadets who went through the Eau Claire program placed in the top ten percent of the colleges in the Western Flying Command. The cadets who went through this short lived program did extremely well and had a great deal of respect for the Eau Claire State Teacher’s College campus.

Making the Case for ROTC at UW-Eau Claire: 1971

In 1949 the faculty at the Eau Claire State Teachers College had a vote on having a Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) unit on its campus. They voted surprisingly in favor and persuaded the administration “to do anything possible to procure a unit.” Nothing came of this until twenty years later which sparked a debate among a new faculty and student body. Some of those students were strongly against the idea of ROTC on Eau Claire’s campus. The issue of ROTC was brought up in a general faculty meeting. One opinion was that by accepting an ROTC unit was extending opportunity to students, and that was not a question of whether there would be officers in the armed forces, but of where they would be trained; if they could be brought under the umbrella of a liberal arts institution, it was the hope and expectation that it would turn out Army officers who would be humane.

The negative view was the strongest with those expressing their concerns that an ROTC unit contradicted the University’s mission. The Administrators though reluctant, decided not to
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welcome an ROTC unit on the campus of Eau Claire. They did not want to go against the overwhelming consensus of the faculty even though the administration had the power to override their disapproval for ROTC.\footnote{Carter, Hilda R. and Jenswold, John R., \textit{The University of Wisconsin Eau Claire: A History 1916-1976} (Stevens Point: Worzalla Publishing Company, 1976), 123.}

On Thursday September 5, 1974 there was a proposal for an Air Force ROTC unit published in \textit{The Spectator}. Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs John W. Morris said that “ROTC has many advantages for the student such as scholarship benefits, additional educational and career benefits, and upon graduation the students receive a commission in the Reserves.”\footnote{Howard Lutz papers, circa 1951-1985. USGZE UHC278 A10/2g. Special Collections and Archives. McIntyre Library. University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. Eau Claire, Wisconsin.} Many others like Dr. Howard Lutz disagreed with Morris’ comment and took action. The University Student Senate passed 19-6, a bill calling for the withdrawal of UW-Eau Claire’s application for an ROTC unit. They said it was irresponsible for UW-Eau Claire to provide at its own expense, classrooms, offices, and storage space to an organization which they could exercise no control over. They said that ROTC would undermine the fundamental integrity of UW-Eau Claire and the Senate asked President Haas to withdraw the application for ROTC.\footnote{Ibid., Box 1, folder “ROTC (2) [1971-1976]. “UW-Eau Claire’s Involvement by Stewart Dix, 1977.” The Howard Lutz Papers provide numerous accounts of anti-ROTC literature and written correspondences between Howard Lutz and a professor at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh. Lutz did not write the anti-ROTC literature but because they were among his collection and often times duplicated, I believe Lutz to be strongly against the establishment of ROTC. Lutz’s records also include numerous hand-written notes and comments on anti-ROTC literature which show his obvious concern for the issue. Lutz also received in the mail, an envelope requesting a donation to the Committee on Militarism in Education (CME) so I am speculating that he was a member of this important anti-militarism organization.}

Another bill proposed by Student Senate President Tom Jolin added some support to the ROTC issue. He claimed that ROTC could be beneficial, would expand the curriculum, provide opportunities for students and provide an alternative to the draft. This was not well-received. Jolin was defeated in his re-election campaign that year (1977) for Student Senate.\footnote{Ibid., Box 1, folder “ROTC (2) [1971-1976]. “UW-Eau Claire’s Involvement by Stewart Dix, 1977.”} One can
only speculate that his support for ROTC had something to do with him losing his re-election campaign.

The faculty had their reactions too. Professor of Sociology at UW-Eau Claire, Walter P. Thoresen said ROTC divided the faculty and made it difficult for some to work together. He said ROTC was an emotional clash. On December 14, 1971, the University held a meeting to discuss action regarding the establishment of an ROTC unit. Before the vote was taken, President Richard E. Hibbard announced that the voters should know that a “yes” vote meant “disapprove” and a “no” vote meant support for an ROTC on UW-Eau Claire’s campus. The vote panned out as follows: 150 yes votes, 109 no votes, and 2 abstentions.

Resisting the ROTC and the Vietnam War on the Wisconsin State University - Eau Claire Campus

The Vietnam War sparked much protest and debate nationwide. Vietnam is probably one of the most controversial wars in our nation’s history and provoked a wave of student activism even on the campus of Wisconsin State University Eau Claire. “Once students at Eau Claire discovered the Vietnam War, they began to imitate their peers on other campuses, who engaged in marches, teach-ins, and rhetoric, but in a basically peaceful manner.” On April 15, 1967 Eau Claire participated in the national “Day of Mobilization.” Approximately fifty-six people walked from Owen Park through downtown Eau Claire to the Barstow Street Federal Building. The marchers were received with mixed reactions including a few who accused them of being
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communist. Dr. Howard Lutz addressed the crowd at the federal building “to use methods more humanitarian than it is currently using in an effort to gain peace.”

In 1968 near Thanksgiving vacation, there was a teach-in at the Davies Center. Approximately 2,500 students and 100 faculty members attended. Topics of the teach-in included racism, student rebellion, religion, university structure, drugs, justice, and the war. The teach-in was based off a leadership conference at the University of Minnesota in which the keynote speaker was Vice President of Student Affairs, Paul Cashman (University of Minnesota). The teach-in served as a place for students to voice their concerns and for the faculty to understand how the students truly felt. The next year the teach-in was repeated. These teach-ins served as an excellent way to connect the students and faculty in controversial issues such as the Vietnam War.

One of Eau Claire’s largest movements occurred in 1969. The Eau Claire Vietnam Moratorium committee announced that they would be partaking in the national observance. Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, had a son who attended Eau Claire. Laird said, “We want to show the concern all over the country, and the hope that the war will be over soon, and that a peaceful demonstration like this can help bring an end to the war.” John Laird was probably one of the main reasons why Eau Claire’s participation in the Moratorium received so much coverage in the media. The week of the Moratorium beginning on October 10, 1969 had students on Eau Claire’s campus distributing literature and black armbands at a table in the Davies Center. The main event of this campaign was the march on October 15, 1969 at night. Nationally, the Vietnam Moratorium was supposed to cease “business as usual” to bring
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awareness to the Vietnam War dead, however President Leonard Haas said “business as usual” would be maintained on Eau Claire’s campus because “it would be inappropriate for the university as a public agency to take a formal position,” according to Haas. Eau Claire State University had to remain neutral.  

On October 13, 1969 marked the beginning of a forty-two hour vigil at the federal building on Barstow Street. Students from Eau Claire State University (UWEC) took turns reading the names of 40,000 American troops who had lost their lives in Vietnam. The count stood at approximately 2,000 people who observed the Moratorium in Eau Claire. Wisconsin State University Eau Claire was considered “very quiet” as related to other campuses across the nation who participated in the Moratorium.  

Around 6:30pm on October 15, 1969 people met on the WSU-Eau Claire campus to prepare for a march downtown. In Owen Park, the marchers paused at the bandshell to pray and listen to speakers. It was raining and the marchers carried a banner that read “Save Faces—Not Face”.
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There were approximately 1,700 marchers who crossed the bridge into downtown Eau Claire led by marshals. The media crews were there mainly to try to catch photographs of John Laird, the son of Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. It was a non-violent march. The marchers ended at Wilson Park where the banners came down and the candles were blown out. 82 The Vietnam War struck all different campuses nationwide and even on the small campus of WSU-Eau Claire, marches were held.

**Dr. Howard Lutz and his Impact at UW-Eau Claire**

Howard Lutz was an important player to the ROTC debate at the UW-Eau Claire campus. He left many records, correspondences, and articles in his collection chronicling the ROTC debate on campuses all over the nation. Lutz provided other students with information on ROTC
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as is evident by two student research papers in his collection. Howard T. Lutz became a history professor at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire in 1957 and retired in 1989. Lutz received a bachelor’s degree in 1945 from Havorford College and a master’s in Scandinavian Studies from the University of Minnesota in 1949. Lutz was a member of the Society of Friends. He was also a conscientious objector during World War II. Lutz was involved in several peace groups such as the Fellowship of Reconciliation. At the time of the Vietnam War, Lutz strongly opposed the addition of an ROTC program at UW-Eau Claire and served as a counselor to students who wanted to obtain conscientious objector status. Howard Lutz died on December 26, 1990. A large part of the information in Lutz’s records come from the Committee on Militarism in Education, a subgroup of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

There have been numerous debates, both pro and con in relation to ROTC. The military relies heavily on ROTC for young officers, yet ROTC has caused much dissent on campuses nationwide. What alternatives are there to a seemingly necessary military training program?
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Alternative to ROTC

An article in the October 1977 issue of the Militarism Memo provided a different alternative to ROTC than has been mentioned thus far. “ROTC and the military infiltration of our civilian colleges would be unnecessary if the armed forces were withdrawn from garrison duty around the world and were expected instead to meet the defense needs of the U.S.”

Brigadier General Hugh B. Hester, U.S. Army (Ret.) writing in the Harvard Crimson, October 11, 1973 said “A highly trained professional military force of 500,000-600,000 capable of handling sophisticated weapons for national defense, and an annual military budget of between $25-30 billion will provide this nation with all the security possible through military means.”85 This is an interesting suggestion. General Hester suggested using our military men to protect our own country. ROTC could be used to train a security force for the United States, not for wars on foreign soil. This point has some relevance today as the issue of sending U.S. troops overseas is creating a lot of controversy. The military has money and money provides means to advertise. Military advertising was an effective mode of appealing to young men undecided about their futures.

Military Advertising

The military had means to promote themselves. Advertising on the television, radio, and in popular magazines gave the military the means to appeal to young, impressionable minds. The Committee on Militarism in Education published monthly and bi-monthly newsletters highlighting various issues surrounding the military and education. Their newsletter was entitled Militarism Memo. The November/December 1977 newsletter focused on the military and
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advertising. Arthur J. Willett, a subscriber to Militarism Memo, surveyed fifteen issues of Science World, a Scholastic magazine that was geared to the likings of junior and senior high school students in mind. His survey of these weekly publications during the 1976-1977 school years yielded the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Full Page Color Advertisements</th>
<th>Number of Mail-Back Inserts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Reserve</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air National Guard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marines</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC (Army and Navy)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Guard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis is to show that the schools utilizing these magazines are being infiltrated with extensive military advertising that becomes part of the curriculum even though it had not been questioned by the teachers or the parents. The Militarism Memo also stated that the general accounting office said that each branch of the Armed Forces currently buys its own separate lists of names and addresses of high school students. “Over 8.5 million pieces of direct mail were sent to male high school seniors last year (1976) indicating that each student may have received up to six or more letters from the military.” Advertising played a huge role in the past for recruitment and still does today. We are barraged with advertising on the radio, television, and the internet. Most people reading this paper can probably vocalize at least one of the U.S. military’s advertising campaigns for any of the branches such as “Army Strong” or “the few, the proud, the Marines.”

Conclusion

ROTC and the military have enjoyed high praise and suffered much criticism when it comes to their relationship with institutions of higher education. UW-Eau Claire embraced the Army Air Force specialist training program in 1943-1944 but now remains adamantly opposed to having an ROTC unit on the campus. The trend from positive reception to increasing negative connotation leaves many with mixed feelings on the military. It is very interesting to note that when UW-Eau Claire voted against an ROTC program in 1971, the administration was for an ROTC unit, however they thought it important to consult the general faculty before making a decision. The UW-Eau Claire administrators could have easily overridden the vote but they did not. This says something about the political hierarchy on UW-Eau Claire’s campus. They represent democracy more or less. While campuses such as UW-Eau Claire did not make national headlines during the Vietnam War and anti-ROTC protest movements, we can say with much certainty that this small campus did have a strong opinion. The Committee on Militarism in Education and similar organizations provided educational materials and on a more regional level, people like Howard Lutz read them and informed others as is evident from his collection. While not all universities were successful in their opposition to ROTC, the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire has managed to remain democratic in voting procedures and have successfully kept the establishment of ROTC from happening.
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