

## Mahout's Forecast for 1967

Let others predict the ups and downs of the stock market, the weather, the space program and the New York Yankees. Our crystal ball is tuned to American politics, and it enables us to foresee with virtual infallibility a few of the major events that will mark the year 1967:

**JANUARY:** President Johnson delivers his State of the Union Message in which he urges a national lottery for the selection of future Democratic presidential nominees. His proposal is widely interpreted as a slap at Bobby Kennedy's aspirations. Not to be outdone, Gerald Ford, in his Minority State of the Union Message, proposes that the Democratic nominee be chosen by successive rounds of Russian roulette among the leading hopefuls. The Ripon Society, a group of "young members of the business, professional and academic communities" issues its own Message insisting that regardless of what the Democrats do, Republicans should limit their next two nominations to "dynamic, progressive, vigorous" men under the constitutionally prescribed age of thirty-five. "We are willing to sacrifice one or two elections as the price of making ours the Party of Youth," says the Republican research group, the median age of whose members is twenty-eight.

**FEBRUARY:** Ronald Reagan inaugurates a weekly television series called "Reagan Plays Himself" in which he calls up viewers to ask them how they think California should be run. All those whose suggestions are actually used in Government are given Prize Professorships in subjects of their choice at the University of Berkeley. Runners up get voting seats on the University Board of Regents.

On the day before Washington's birthday, the Supreme Court hands down an historic decision (*Cosa Nostra v. Spellman*) banning the use of confessions in Catholic Churches. Enraged, Senator Dirksen introduces a Constitutional amendment requiring Bible reading for an hour of every Supreme Court session.

**MARCH:** Richard M. Nixon, that indefatigable campaigner, announces at a covered dish supper in the Wichita school board race that he favors a negative income tax for helping the poor. Hubert H. Humphrey replies the next day in a three hour address to the Kiwanis Club of Boise: "Republican Negativism."

**APRIL:** Thirteen Republican governors call on former President Eisenhower at Gettysburg and urge him to seek a "Republican alternative to Vietnam." Ike promises to leave shortly for Asia, but LBJ steals the headlines away by announcing a three-week tour of Europe (which he pronounces

"Yurp"). This is taken as a response to mounting criticism of the Administration's European policy.

**MAY:** Ike's trip began with a stop-over in South Korea, where he is asked to greet the 50,000 American troops stationed there. "But I thought I brought all the boys home," he says. "Why wasn't I informed?"

Meanwhile, President Johnson's European itinerary is shortened from three weeks to one and one-half days because of the refusal of every government but Luxembourg to grant him a visa. "This should not be interpreted as a setback for American foreign policy," A State Department spokesman says, "but rather as a reaffirmation of the traditional ties of good will and friendship that have always existed between the United States and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg."

**JUNE:** Mr. Nixon, addressing the Boys Club of Harlem, (which he painstakingly pronounces "thee boys") suggests that air-conditioned libraries in big city slums would siphon off teen-age violence during the hot summer months. H.H.H. delivers the Democratic rejoinder in a marathon address to the 4-H Clubs convention in the Chicago Stockyards: "This is simply more Republican me-too-ism. Nixon is copying a program that the Administration has already used with great success in U.S.I.A. libraries in Indonesia, Ghana and the United Arab Republic"

**JULY:** Two presidential hopefuls take trips: George Wallace, an announced third party candidate, visits Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, where he is given a hero's welcome dwarfing that of Bobby Kennedy the year before. His speech in Johannesburg ("Ek is 'n Afrikaner) gets wild applause. Governor Romney visits Hollywood, where he enters into high level negotiations with movie producers. After several days of "deep meditation" he announces that he will resign the governorship of Michigan to accept the starring role of George F. Babbitt in a new film based on the novels of Sinclair Lewis. Republican National Chairman Ray Bliss predicts that this move will greatly enhance Romney's chances for the Presidential nomination.

**AUGUST:** In a surprise maneuver, widely interpreted as a counter to Romney, Bobby Kennedy announces that he and his family plus Caroline and John-john Kennedy, will soon begin filming a re-make of "Cheaper by the Dozen."

Stokely Carmichael announces that by using various aliases on Ronald Reagan's T.V. show, he has been able to accumulate majority voting control of the University

Board of Regents. His first move is to demand the resignation of Prize Professor of Urban Pacification Sam Yorty. Summer School students take the occasion to riot for miscellaneous causes; Barry Goldwater calls for defoliation of the Berkeley campus, and Ronald Reagan is faced with his first major crisis since becoming governor.

**SEPTEMBER:** Reagan resolves the crisis by going into round-the-clock broadcasting of his T.V. show. In three days he has awarded enough voting seats on the Board of Regents to offset the Carmichael majority. Rioting subsides, except for a small group of young die-hards, led by President Eisenhower (recently returned from Asia), who keep chanting the slogan "Bring the Boys Home From Korea". Ike's followers burgeon into a full-fledged student movement as students return to Berkeley from summer vacation.

**OCTOBER:** To steal some of the national acclaim for Reagan's handling of the Berkeley crisis, Romney tries to persuade Eisenhower to abandon his protest movement. "Oh fiddle-de-dee," says Eisenhower in rejecting the suggestion. "I haven't felt this young since Normandy."

The Supreme Court meets for the first time under the new 25th Amendment. Legal passages from the Bible are read ("An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth" and so forth) before the Court gives what many later criticize as a "political" decision in *Ginsburg v. Song of Songs*. They hold unanimously (with Justice Douglas laughing hysterically to himself) that several books of the Bible contain obscene passages with "no redeeming social value or interest."

**NOVEMBER:** President Johnson makes his long-postponed trip to Yurp where he is in high spirits at a diplomatic reception at the Royal Court of Luxembourg. He gives the Grand Duchess a playful wallop and remarks, "You know, ma'am, you may be royalty but I could fit you and your whole country into my king-sized bed." The resulting cancellation of the President's visa is called by a State Department spokesman "a temporary strain rather than an irreparable breach in the firm fabric of the Atlantic alliance."

The off-year elections for the school board of Wichita bring an overwhelming victory to the slate backed by Mr. Nixon, who also is given credit for similar victories in Texarkana, Amarillo, East Orange and Sheboygan.

**DECEMBER:** But the real test of presidential strength is recognized to be the premier showing of the Kennedy and Romney films in the week before Christmas. Critics dub Kennedy's performance "boyish but convincing", while Romney as Babbitt is called "impressively sincere". The Ripon Society comments: "The new star John-john Kennedy looks like the kind of presidential timber the Republican Party should be seeking out."

Thus, all America looks forward to the Oscar nominations in the spring as the first reliable indication of who will become their next president.

—MAHOUT

*Readers have asked us who 'Mahout' is. He is, according to Webster's Dictionary, "a keeper and driver of an elephant."*

## 1968 Target Seats

In choosing its presidential nominee for 1968, the Republican Party must, as Senator Dirksen says, "go hunting where the ducks are." Yet the "ducks" for 1968 include not only the electoral votes needed to capture the Presidency but also the Congressional seats essential to Republican control of the House.

Thus, "target seat" strategy will be an important factor in choosing the presidential nominee. A target seat is a district that the party lost in the previous election by less than ten per cent of the vote. These districts are usually singled out by each party for special attention and for concentrated campaigning.

The location of the target seats for 1968 should have considerable bearing on the Republican choice for President — the nominee should be strongest where the target seats are most numerous. The following table shows the regional distribution of these seats.

TABLE OF TARGET SEATS

	Republican	Democratic	Regional Totals
Northeast	13	9	22
Midwest	5	19	24
Far West	6	5	11
Border	5	3	8
South	5	4	9
Party totals	34	40	

Of the thirty-four seats lost by Republicans in 1966 by less than ten per cent of the vote, thirteen are in the Northeast, five in the Midwest, six in the Far West, five in the border states, and five in the South. Of the forty seats lost by Democrats in 1966 by less than ten per cent of the vote, nine were in the Northeast, nineteen in the Midwest, five in the Far West, three in the border states, and four in the South.

The tone of the Congressional races in these five areas may vary widely, and a candidate who does well in one area may do more poorly than his rival in another. But it seems likely from the figures that if Republicans are to control the House, they must have a presidential candidate with great appeal in both the Midwest and the Northeast.

Indeed, combining the above totals, forty-six of the seventy-four target seats (over sixty-two per cent) are located in either the Northeast or Midwest; seventeen of the seventy-four (twenty-three per cent) are found in either the Border or Southern States, and eleven of the seventy-four (under fifteen per cent) are in the Far West.

These totals suggest that the ideal Presidential candidate for Republican control of the House would be one with a solid base in either the Midwest or Northeast, proven appeal in both, and no great alienation from the voters of the other three areas.

—L.W.H., T.A.B.

# POLITICS AND CONSCRIPTION

## A Ripon Proposal to Replace the Draft

Americans in the past decade have become increasingly aware of the injustices of life in the nation's poverty pockets: an awareness made possible by the virtual disappearance of poverty as a threatening norm. The intelligent public, has become far more sensitive to the seriousness of secondary forms of racial discrimination which previously went largely unnoticed because of the prevalence of more obvious inequities.

Today, injustices in areas once considered secondary and qualified, have assumed first prominence in the national conscience — and quite properly so. But the fundamental injustice of military conscription, which previous generations of Americans recognized instantly, has now become a moral issue which is compromised, side-tracked, and interpreted — devastatingly — as subtle.

After fifteen years the draft is again a public question, but the focus upon it is woefully fractured. Many supposed reformers of the draft seek merely to build an even greater civilian conscription on top of the one that served the military. Too many critics accept at face value the Pentagon statistics and bureaucratic judgments used to support a continuation of the draft — something they would never do when investigating the contribution of public housing to the elimination of poverty, or when listening to the apologetics of authorities on the state of the urban Negro.

### NAPOLEONIC IDEAL

It is remarkable that the present conscription program has been so little scrutinized. A draft, by definition, is antithetic to a free society. The "nation in arms" has traditionally been a Napoleonic ideal, a Prussian virtue; while in Britain and the United States impressment has always been seen as unjustifiable except when the security of the state requires it. That principle lay behind the drafts of the Civil War, World War I and World War II. It was understood in each instance that when national security could be maintained without conscription, the draft would be terminated.

Today we are arguing in America whether this deferment or that is more "fair;" whether the Selective Service System is consistent from board to board; whether this or that prominent individual deserves his deferment; whether draft-card burners and other protesters should be tried and punished by the courts or tried and drafted by the Selective Service, and so on. Indeed, what should be apparent by now in the debate on the draft is that the only truly fair system of manpower recruitment — in a nation that has reached the point of not needing a draft — is no draft at all. Today, as the result of a burgeoning manpower supply, increased federal revenues, and the rising sophistication of military skill requirements, we have reached that point.

The Ripon Society urges the Federal Government to eliminate the draft, to improve the salary, incentives, fringe benefits, and prestige of the military, and to establish a 2.7 million man volunteer army.

## I. The Draft and Politics

The confused focus of the draft issue is as much a product of official indifference and political manipulation in recent years as of misguided criticism from some reformers in recent months. Such diverse leaders as Adlai Stevenson and Barry Goldwater advocated abolition of the draft in their Presidential campaigns, but Congress, with responsibility every four years for extending or ending the draft, has given the matter only the most perfunctory attention, holding only ten minutes of debate on it in the Senate in 1963.

General Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, has asserted that the reason for so little debate is that the Armed Services Committees have always done their homework on the issue and found no reasons for changes. However there is little evidence that such homework ever really probed deeply into the draft

since the present Universal Military Service and Training Act was written in 1951. The tightly controlled hearings held briefly last summer by the House Armed Services Committee, after some six months of public prodding by other Congressmen and the press, further demonstrated how really out of touch with the problem Congress has been. At no time during those hearings did the Committee seriously ask itself whether the draft is necessary at all. Indeed, Representative L. Mendel Rivers (D-S.C.), Committee Chairman, opened the hearings by declaring that a draft of some kind is necessary.

### CLOSED STUDIES

Where the Congressional leadership has tended towards indifference, the Administration has tended to pigeonhole the issue into closed studies. In a series of speeches presented on the House floor in early 1964, a group of Republicans were the first to call forcefully and publicly for a draft reform. However, three days before their scheduled presentation, the White House announced a committee on draft reform to be set up within the Pentagon to report within a year, by spring of 1965. This move thwarted the draft reform movement for nearly a year and a half, for it took that long for observers to realize that the Pentagon had no intention of releasing its study.

It is possible that the Defense Department study as of May, 1965 had come to the tentative conclusion that the draft could be abolished and an all-volunteer modern military instituted. One can only speculate on the reasons for the suppression of that report at that time: certainly one factor was the escalated Viet-Nam War, not so much because this move necessitated the draft as because it required the U.S. to appear before the world as "determined" and "willing to sacrifice."

In early 1966 criticism of the draft again became widespread, with various povertarians charging that Negroes were bearing an unfair share of draft quotas (a charge later effectively rebutted). Meanwhile House Republicans produced evidence of inconsistent applications of policy from board to board and state to state and demanded that the Pentagon report be released and a full Congressional study undertaken.

### PENTAGON 'REPORT'

The Administration responded not by releasing the Pentagon report, but by issuing what Congressman Thomas B. Curtis (R-Mo.) appropriately called "a report on a report." The 22½ page, double-spaced, wide-margined release barely got into the draft problem; it raised far more questions than it answered. Rejecting a volunteer military, the Pentagon estimated its cost at from \$6 billion to \$17 billion with no breakdown of these figures. (Secretary McNamara in 1965 estimated the cost of a volunteer military at \$4 billion on one occasion and at \$20 billion on another.) Just how such conclusions are reached is a mystery.

For example, to justify its apparent decision that higher pay would not have much effect on enlistments the Pentagon paper described part (and just a part) of a survey of boys 6-19 which asked whether "pay alone" would induce them to join the military if there were no draft. The "surprising" findings were that "equal pay with civilian life was considered the most important inducement by less than 4 percent" But, of course, "pay alone" is not the "most important inducement" to persons planning almost any career, and especially teenagers, who not only are idealistic but have no concept of how really low military wages are now. Good wages unquestionably are an important inducement to any career, and previous surveys of public opinion made by the military cited low pay as a major reason for the relative unattractiveness of the military life in the eyes of civilians.

Later attempts by Congressmen and other critics to pry loose the Pentagon calculations were unsuccessful, though the Pentagon did send the Armed Services Committee some additional tables and charts that were stuck in the back of the official testimony when it later appeared

in printed form. Remarkably, these tables, while not nearly all of the Pentagon's study product, give a much different picture than did the oral testimony presented before the Committee itself and the press.

At least one figure in the oral testimony (the influence of pay on enlistments, mentioned before) was inaccurate and its out-of-context usage was a misrepresentation of the meaning of the Pentagon's own survey. Indeed, under one table<sup>2</sup> is the remarkable statement that "the resulting total additional fiscal costs associated with an all-volunteer active force of about 2.65 million would probably aggregate about \$5.4 billion per year by 1976;" that is, \$600 million dollars less than the minimum estimate given in oral testimony.

**L.B.J.'S COMMISSION** Even without such later-supplied information, however, the oral report in late June, 1966 gave draft critics ample ammunition. But before they could launch a full attack, the White House once again stymied reformers by announcing a blue-ribbon Presidential "National Advisory Commission on Selective Service."

The Presidential Commission is less vulnerable to attack than was the Pentagon study, but considering its origins and the fact that several of the same people who staffed the Pentagon study are working for the Commission, there is reason to believe that at least part of its motivation is similarly political. Undoubtedly the distinguished members of the Commission are sincere in their desire to find ways to improve the draft system. However, a Commission source indicated in mid-October — just two and a half months before the Commission's report is scheduled to be on the President's desk — that only two "official" meetings had been held.

Perhaps the very skilled staff men have gleaned information and opinions from knowledgeable people on all sides of the draft question. However, there has been no opportunity for knowledgeable draft critics — particularly proponents of a volunteer military — to examine the facts, challenge the premises, or debate the theories with which the Commission is working. It is hard to imagine the suppression of this latest study (due in January), but its value certainly will be lessened by the fact its operations were clothed in mystery.

Meanwhile, in the course of these developments, the misrepresenting conclusions of the Pentagon's "report on its report" have detoured many commentators from the important question: should America dispense with the draft? Fifteen years ago — indeed at any previous time in American history — the necessity of any draft would have been the first point of contention.

Now, however, the draft critics have scattered their attacks and proposals in so many directions that it will be difficult for any reform to overcome the resistance of the still very strong lobby for the present system. Indeed, most of the proposed reforms would not really provide a system more effective militarily or more equitable than the one we have today.

## II. Two Deficient Alternatives

Few people truly favor the present practice of conscription. Particularly in the undergraduate community — where the draft is subject to fraternity bull-sessions, student government polls, and "New Left" petitions — resentment is high. Careers must be planned, wives courted, and courses selected, all under the shadow of uncertainty of the draft.

The most commonly mentioned alternatives to the status quo are the lottery and a universal national service.

### 1. THE LOTTERY

As General Hershey has observed, the lottery would merely substitute impersonal injustices for human injustices. Some people find such a system neater, more abstractly pure, more principled. But to the young married father taken instead of a school dropout, or the future, but-as-yet-untrained, doctor taken instead of the unemployed worker, the system's orderliness would seem small solace. Nor would the country's interest in obtaining skilled technicians and other specialists for the military while insuring the civilian sector a supply of its critical personnel be served by a lottery.

Some lottery proponents protest that certain deferments would be allowed under a lottery. But since the nation has millions more young men of draft age than it needs in the service, those deferments would have to be broad indeed to maintain a semblance of universality. The only difference between that kind of system and selective service would be in the "Russian roulette" arbitrariness of the lottery.

Moreover, the lottery still would not solve the problem of resentment caused by some young men being drafted and others missing service. By what might be called its method of planned capriciousness, the lottery would merely build one more anxiety into lives already troubled by the absurdities and dehumanizing impersonality of modern society.

### 2. NATIONAL SERVICE

A system by which every young man (and woman?) would perform some kind of service to the country is even more problematical than a lottery. Again it would not even purport to deal with the backward manpower policies that underpin the draft. Indeed, institution of national service would make replacement of those policies even more difficult by building upon them. The illustration, always cited by national service proponents, is the young college graduate who would like to go into the Peace Corps but cannot do so without also (possibly) serving two years in the draft. However, they have yet to consider the men of many skills and patriotic perspectives — including ones with the ability and desire to join, say the Peace Corps, — who still would be drafted under national service to fill up the Armed Forces. While options for service would increase for some, their good fortune would simply mock those unwillingly channeled through an unreformed military draft.

National service springs less from a desire to reform the draft than to reform society. Those men and women who have experienced the fulfillment of volunteer service to mankind would understandably like everyone to enjoy such an experience even though the voluntary element might have to be removed to accomplish it. Moreover, national service proponents are concerned that many young men who might otherwise enjoy such an experience on their own are discouraged by the draft and should be given another option.

It has been charged against national service that to achieve its objectives would require wholly unparalleled state control of human endeavor, far beyond the constitutional provision for conscription to provide for the common defense. Originally, proponents argued in reply that "assignments" to various social projects bearing the government stamp of approval would take into account individual interests and abilities. But the same might be said of the Communist system, the only difference being that national service proposes to conscript persons for only two or three years (though longer periods have also been suggested).

Lately, however, some key advocates apparently have decided that the non-military alternative service would be "voluntary." In terms of human freedom, this is scant improvement. While the practical choice no longer would be merely the indication of a desire for work in a social project of one kind or another, it would still be to join national service or be drafted by the military. So instead of a system of total compulsion the United States would substitute one that is compulsion for some and mere coercion for others. But is this not an infringement on human liberty if, in fact, no draft is really necessary?

### WOMEN'S SERVICE?

The administrative problems of national service are no less staggering than the philosophical problems. Since many of the projects proposed would be of a social service nature, there would be little fairness in coercing young men into them while letting young women go free. By the mid 70's, two million men will be turning 18 each year — 1.2 million of them unneeded by the military. With another two million women a year (and assuming a three-year term for men and two years for women) a pool of 7.6 million would be potentially available for national service, all drained from an already tight labor market. Obviously, there are not nearly enough jobs to be done through VISTA, the Peace Corps, etc. to occupy any appreciable percentage of such a

number — nor money enough to pay them. (Present training costs for one Peace Corps volunteer are \$7,800.)

National service advocates calculate manpower supply differently, of course, and usually, when pressed, some decide (though not Dr. Margaret Mead) to exempt women after all. They also point out that perhaps 15 percent of young people are not fit for any service. But then the advocates use present manpower figures (1,800,000 men a year) while admitting national service could not be instituted until the early '70's.

### A COERCED

**PEACE CORPS?** Also, the figures of men to be allocated to various approved national service projects are computed on a yearly basis, as if one year's supply of manpower were all national service was asking, instead of two, three or more. The favorite Peace Corps program is always increased in national service projections to four of five times its present size. Failing even then to note that less than a third of the Peace Corpsmen now serving are draft-age, proponents of national service are completely oblivious of the fact that Peace Corps selectivity is far too tight, even now, to permit wholesale expansion, especially under a system of coercion.

Many new thousands of men also are seen "serving" in the Job Corps, although how the Job Corps can be considered the moral equivalent of either the Peace Corps or the military itself remains a mystery.

Finally, national service offers no fair outlet for the man whose service to his country simply does not fit some bureaucratic scheme. It is said that the future doctor would be helped in his career if before medical school he worked as a hospital menial through national service. That is certainly questionable, both from the standpoint of the individual and the country's need for practicing physicians. But in any case, what similarly valuable training does the national service offer the future but-as-yet-untrained painter (highway beautification?) or poet (editing the Job Corps yearbook?) or musician? People in our diverse society would be just as misused by national service as by the draft, and maybe more so.

National service would not end the draft's injustices but compound them. There would still be deferments, not only for the physically or mentally unfit, but for young fathers, men with occupations critical to the national security, and probably farmers. Some men would serve and some would not.

### DISPLACED CONCERN

One would not want to deprecate the social goals or the contributions, present and potential, of the Peace Corps, VISTA, the Job Corps, the proposed Teachers Corps or Health Corps. But meeting social needs and opportunities by grafting a national service onto the draft would be like taking cough medicine to cure an earache. It would be an inappropriate way of dealing with social problems as well as a counterproductive way of treating draft inequities. Its very proposal is a case of displaced social concern.

Voluntarism is a much more powerful instrument for social advance. It is as hard to imagine Peace Corpsmen who joined only to avoid the draft as it is to imagine "assigning" men to the clergy. If certain social objectives are worthwhile, they are worth pursuing by means of a joint government-private effort. What is needed is a semi-public foundation that would finance on a subsistence basis volunteer work of social worth. Such opportunity for service would be available not only on a yearly basis, but for college and high school students during the summertime.

However, a gargantuan Brook Farm built on compulsion and conscription would, as Harvard President Nathan Pusey has said, be at best "a colossal waste of time."

Unhappily, the waste of time occurs in even considering national service, or a lottery, as alternatives to today's draft. Congress for good reason is unlikely to adopt either, beyond perhaps a marginal change or two in the present system. But such changes, whether giving an outright exemption to Peace Corpsmen or drafting from the lower age groups first, would not constitute truly relevant reform.

What the national service and lottery schemes do accomplish is to confuse the issue.

## III. Why Voluntarism

The practical case for a volunteer military rests, in largest part on the new manpower and financial possibilities for the complete replacement of conscription. Not since the early part of the 19th Century has America had such a high percentage of its population in the draft-age category. As the post-World War II baby-boom comes of age the number of young men is rapidly rising. The American generational revolution reordering political life is relevant to the military institution as well. Where some 1,100,000 men turned draft-age each year in the early '50's, some 1,800,000 are turning draft-age this year, and in 1975 the figure will be up to 2,100,000.<sup>4</sup> That means an immensely expanded pool of potential volunteers. Whereas 59% of an age group turning 26 in the early 1960's had seen military duty, only 38% of age groups turning 26 in the mid-1970's will have seen military duty.<sup>5</sup>

Secondly, the increasing sophistication of military technology has restructured the nature of manpower needs. A radar technician is several times more expensive to train and several times more expensive to lose. The draft does not attract such people and draftees do not ordinarily become highly skilled technicians. (The benefits of the military's famed training schools usually are not lavished on men who will serve only a year and a half after completion of instruction.)

### HIGH TURNOVER

It is said that the draft does tend, through its threat, to get men suitable for technical training to enlist on their own. But these men too are largely a manpower waste for the military. While the turnover rate of draftees fluctuates from 90 to 97 percent, the turnover rates for first term enlistees (and officers) is also very high, ordinarily over 75 percent.

Indeed, in a normal year, over 500,000 men — out of a total force of between 2,700,000 to 3,200,000 men leave the military. That is one out of every six men; it is hard to imagine a business operating with such a high annual loss. According to Brigadier General Lynn D. Smith (Army), even before the Viet-Nam buildup, at any given time some 43 percent of Army men had less than a year's experience.<sup>6</sup>

According to General Smith, "the basic problem of the Army [is] too much personnel turnover." Commanders complain, says Smith, that "As soon as we are able to operate as a unit, the trained men leave and we have to start all over again."

The equivalent of ten divisions are in training at any given time. They tie up the energies not only of themselves, but also of thousands of career men who must do the training. A 1957 military efficiency report by Ralph J. Cordiner, former Chairman of General Electric to President Eisenhower, described the situation at many training camps: "I found antagonism and bitterness over the draft. They were checking off the days until they get out. We must devote 25 percent of our military effort to training men who don't stay. The trainers are discouraged. They resemble the poor teachers whose every class flunks."

Interviews with servicemen, trainers and draftees alike, indicate that the situation has not much improved in the last few years. Cordiner's conclusions seem even more valid now with our increased pool of potential volunteers: "Reduced to its simplest terms, the personnel problem appears to be a matter of quality as opposed to quantity. It is not a matter of the total number of people on hand, but it is a matter of the level of retention of those possessing a high degree of leadership quality and those with technical training and experience the services so urgently need. It is a matter of not being able . . . to keep and challenge and develop the kinds of people for the periods of time necessary for them to make an effective contribution to the operation of the force. . . . It is foolish for the armed forces to obtain highly advanced weapons systems and not have men of sufficient competence to understand, operate and maintain such equipment."

The cost of the draft in money and manpower is enormous, and in the last analysis, perhaps incalculable. But it is worth noting that the turnover rate for career men is only 15 percent per year. If that sort of rate, com-

mon in Canada's voluntary system, could be maintained throughout our military, we could effect an annual savings of personnel numbering in the hundreds of thousands along with the time and money required to train them.

**LOW WAGES** Low wages lie behind much of the turnover problem. Yet because the draft is costly and provides a certain supply of manpower, pressure to raise the wages of the military (particularly first-termers) has been minimal. Today an entering private in our military makes slightly more than a Rumanian peasant on a collective farm: \$90.60 per month.<sup>8</sup> That amount is only 20 percent more than he would have earned per month just after World War II, twenty years ago, despite the fact of 60 percent inflation of the dollar in that period.

The American private also makes substantially less than his counterparts in Canada or Britain — where volunteer systems operate — or his counterpart in Germany, with its selective service system. Indeed, the difference in pay is magnified in each of these cases by the gap in standards and costs of living between other nations and ours. Nor, it must be added, has any of them the great productive margin of the United States to support its military financially.

**MORALE** If a man does make a career of the service he and his wife frequently find themselves living in unattractive military communities. Whether from ignorance of modern planning techniques or from some misguided worship of the spartan mystique, the military has constructed some of the most sterile and unesthetic communal agglomerations in the country. Psychologically, such an environment cannot help but have an influence on a potential careerist's attitude toward the services.

Another negative psychological influence is the draft's own aura of compulsion which carries over to the military as a whole, making it seem less desirable a career to many people than it need be. It is not affirming to an army mechanic, for example, to know that the job he enjoys and to which he has committed himself by choice is done by his fellow worker, a disgruntled draftee, under compulsion. A volunteer system would improve military morale and the popular attitude towards the military career enormously. More enlistments would result, and the entire tone of military life would improve.

**MANIPULATED STANDARDS** Yet another manpower policy change that would abet a volunteer system would be a substantial lowering of unrealistic and irrelevant induction standards, particularly physical requirements.

Rejection rates among our NATO allies are much lower (18 percent in Italy, 18 percent in France, 25 percent in Norway, for examples) than the 47-52 percent which is the fluctuating average in the United States. A year or two ago many well-meaning observers saw in the then rising draft rejection rates a sign of increasingly poor physical condition of our nation's young people.

But the truth was that faced with an over-abundance of available manpower and already having loosened requirements for other deferments, the Pentagon and the Selective Service simply were waxing more "selective" by stiffening objective criteria and statistical interpretation. Some months rejections ran as high as 57 percent. However, with the advent of the Viet-Nam buildup in the middle of 1965, the rejection rate began to drop, until by the summer of 1966 it was down to 39 percent, the Korean War level.

Such manipulation of standards is one of the indefensible inequities of the present draft. Not only do deferment and induction physical test standards vary from board to board, but they vary from time to time. Under a volunteer system the standards would be much lower than the norm of the past few years. Positions and work would be found for men now being judged unfit because they are unusually tall or short, thin or fat, or have some chronic physical problem that would make them unsuitable for combat. Since only one in five military jobs is combatant, there is no good reason to apply standards of combat fitness to every man who volunteers for service. Indeed there obviously are many career men presently in the military who could not meet current standards. But fat or thin they still make

adequate supply officers, clerks and — presumably — Pentagon generals.

**USING CIVILIANS** Similarly, the sophistication of new skills required by the military also makes possible and desirable the greater use of civilians in technical, non-combatant positions. There is nothing radical or untried about such a proposal; the Seabees of World War II are merely one classic example of trained men recruited from civilian life. The principle of hiring people who already are trained is well-established, but it could be much more widely applied — to custodial service, for example.

## IV. The Cost

All these proposals would cost money: funds for better recruitment programs, better college scholarship programs for potential officers, more attention to side-benefits and, particularly, higher salaries.

However, the upper estimate of \$17 billion dollars given by the Pentagon as the cost of a volunteer military appears inordinately high; it would mean an average increase of \$6,000 dollars a year for everyone in the services. A much more reasonable estimate is suggested by Dr. Walter Oi, Professor of Economics at the University of Washington and a participant in the original Defense Department study of 1964-5. Oi suggests that the turnover rate for the Army, for example, should be reduced from 25% per year to 16.9%. This would mean some 144.6 thousand new men per year would be required to maintain an enlisted strength of 857 thousand. Even with no pay boost at all, some 90.3 thousand could be expected to volunteer after the draft's abolition. To obtain the balance of some 55,000 men, according to Oi's detailed analysis, would require a 68% pay boost for all enlisted men in their first tour of duty and smaller pay boost for later tours of enlisted men and for officers. The cost would be an additional 4.05 billion dollars a year for all the services.

Moreover, Oi makes the very important point, neglected by the Pentagon entirely, that society itself bears a considerable cost in order to maintain the draft, a cost that largely would be eliminated under a volunteer system. Included in this cost is the loss to the economy of productive manpower and its foregone goods and services. The draftees and the volunteers who are draft-coerced themselves bear, in effect, a tax which conservatively amounts to 1 billion dollars a year in lost civilian income. If the income lost to all servicemen (and to the economy) is measured, the total is 5 billion dollars a year.

Actually, Oi's draft replacement figure of four billion dollars is upward biased. It does not take into account certain savings that could be obtained through the use of more civilians in servicemen's jobs or for the benefits of improved recruiting methods, such as an enlistment bonus incentive for already skilled individuals. And Oi does not note the possibility of manpower savings through reduced physical standards for acceptable service;<sup>9</sup> nor does he attempt to assess the effect of savings wrought by improved morale and longer manpower experience under the volunteer system. What Oi's figures do indicate is an overall saving to the society as a whole once we achieve a voluntary military.

**PROBE NEEDED** A full-scale Congressional probe by members of the Labor and Education, Joint Economic and Appropriations Committees as well as the Armed Services Committees is required to explore more fully the economics of a volunteer system. It should be undertaken in January by the new Congress. Such a probe should be aimed at setting boundaries of cost rather than establishing a hard figure, because too many intangibles of attitude obtain and cannot be programmed in anyone's computer.

However, at this point it does seem appropriate to note that America's national government treasury is growing by more than six billion dollars per year. The United States can well afford an improved military system and the abolition of the draft.

had been notified of their induction; at that time they would be allowed to sign a commitment to serve in a branch of their choice after completion of their college careers and given a deferment on that basis. Of course, they also could opt to serve at once.

## BETTER ADVICE

Under a transitional draft the Selective Service office would publish and distribute to all registrants a booklet fully explaining the options and broadly describing career opportunities in the various services. (Today, except for a skimpy fold-over flyer whose information is couched in a kind of scolding bureaucratese and merely made available to registrants who request it, the Selective Service System makes virtually no attempt to educate young men in their obligations and choices. For example, one is told he has the "right" to appeal his classification, but he is given no clue as to how to make that appeal.)

Even when the volunteer system was completely implemented the Selective Service would continue to register young men and to classify them, against the day when massive conscription might be essential. The physical examinations given all young men would be designed — as they are only theoretically designed today — to provide all young men, including those from disadvantaged backgrounds, with advice on their state of health, to direct the sick ones to help, to provide the military with an account of their fitness for potential induction.

During the transitional draft registration and classification of men would remain the responsibility of local boards, though under tighter national guidelines. To end the inequities that result when categories of registrants are inducted in some areas but not in others, actual selection would be made from a national pool.

Even the transitional draft described here would be an improvement over the permanent draft that we have today, or, for that matter, over national service or a lottery. But some men would still serve under compulsion while others served by personal choice and others not at all. Such inequity, inevitable under any system of compulsion, and the new reality of manpower surfeit, make the real virtue of the transitional draft just that — it is transitional, planned to smooth the way to an all-volunteer, all-professional military.

## VII. The Political Challenge

The case for abolishing the draft and replacing it with a volunteer system is not necessarily a partisan issue. But then neither are most of the larger national issues, and the draft does unmistakably have partisan implications.

Several outstanding Democrats, particularly from the state of Wisconsin, have contributed much to the cause of draft reform. Libertarians of the left and right alike have sought to restore the priority principle of voluntarism as regards the employment of man's labor — a principle that attracted so many immigrants to our shores in the first place. They have seen clearly that the exercise of control over a man's very physical being, when not required by national security, is a giant step towards the totalitarian condition, whether or not that condition is ushered in by well-meaning would-be reformers. Indeed, as a great liberal, Justice Louis Brandeis, once wrote, "Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government purposes are beneficent. . . . The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in the insidious encroachment by men of zealous well-meaning, but without understanding."<sup>1</sup>

## DEMOCRATS CRITICIZED

But despite the essentially libertarian and non-partisan character of the case for a volunteer military, it unquestionably has been a Democratic Congress that has stymied reform in recent years and a Democratic President who has manipulated the issue in ways apparently calculated to prevent thorough debate. Conversely, Republicans in the Congress have taken up the cause of draft reform, some working individually and

with little public notice for years. The Republican Party has a good foundation for reform; it need only build upon it.

The ideological conflict implicit in the draft, while certainly not of the liberal versus conservative sort (as those words are commonly understood), does fit into an almost inevitable partisan dichotomy. It would seem more than possible to us that the Democratic Administration finally will come out in favor of a watered-down national service scheme, thereby committing itself to the further extension of government compulsion and manipulation.

## REPUBLICAN OPPORTUNITY

Republicans as a party have the opportunity to raise not only a standard of opposition but one offering a far more enlightened course. Through the Republican program herein advocated the contradictions and confusion, the byzantine complexities, discriminations and inefficiencies of one of the nation's most consequential institutions can be terminated. The evasion mentality among the young can be curbed. Lives already anxious in a precarious world can be freed of the draft's additional uncertainty. The insidious, subtle power of a vast bureaucracy to interfere in a citizen's personal plans — to "channel," threaten or punish — can be eliminated.

Should the Republican Party adopt this cause, which would have been a natural one for Robert Taft, Sr. or Arthur Vandenburg, it can both improve the quality and effectiveness of our military and enhance freedom. Coupling the replacement of the draft with advocacy of municipal and state government support for a wholly volunteer service in the social fields, the Republican Party can demonstrate a rounded program of reform superior to any other, reform that will rank among the proudest and most significant of our era.<sup>2</sup>

---

Off-prints of this article from the December, 1966, issue of the Ripon FORUM can be ordered from the Ripon Society, P.O. Box 138, Cambridge, Mass. 02138. Price: fifty cents a copy; ten copies or more, thirty cents each. Price of a year's subscription to the FORUM is \$5 (\$3 for students).

---

## FOOTNOTES:

<sup>1</sup>"In answer to a question at a Congressional hearing on the defense budget on February 26, 1965, Secretary McNamara estimated \$4 billion. . . . In an interview with *This Week*, December 5, 1965, he said at least \$20 billion." George F. Gilder and Bruce K. Chapman, *The Party that Lost its Head*, Knopf, N.Y., 1966, p. 314.

<sup>2</sup>Statement of Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), June 30, 1966.

<sup>3</sup>Table 8, P. 10043, *Review of the Administration and Operation of the Selective Service System*, Hearings before the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, June 22-24, 28-30, 1966.

<sup>4</sup>U.S. Census, interview, June 8, 1966.

<sup>5</sup>From an unpublished paper of Dr. Walter Oi, Department of Economics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>6</sup>Brigadier General Lynn D. Smith, "The Unsolved Problem," *Military Review*, June, 1964.

<sup>7</sup>Report of the Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation, "A Modern Concept of Compensation for Personnel of the Uniformed Services," March, 1957.

<sup>8</sup>Pentagon figures, August, 1966. This includes a pay raise of 3½ percent earlier in the summer, which will be eaten up by one year's inflation.

<sup>9</sup>Oi makes a brief comparison, as well, of the operations of the proposed lottery system and the all-volunteer system, and finds that the lottery would be less efficient, more expensive for the military and society and would require substantially more accessions of manpower.

<sup>10</sup>A five-percent Army-wide sample as of November 2, 1962.

<sup>11</sup>Quoted by Thomas E. Dewey, *On the Two Party System*, lectures edited by John A. Wells, Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1966.

<sup>12</sup>The foregoing article was released to the press on November 30, 1966.

# Overhauling the State Legislatures

Republican leaders from two states have proposed changes in legislative machinery to make state governments more responsive to the pressing needs of their people.

In Massachusetts, led by Governor John Volpe and Attorney General-elect Elliot Richardson, Republicans have proposed that the state legislature be reduced in size and reorganized. A pre-election version of the reform program was put forth in an article by state representative Francis W. Hatch, Jr., in the *Boston Globe* in which he characterizes the present legislature as old-fashioned, inefficient, irresponsible, and irresponsible.

Chief among the changes Hatch would initiate is the reduction of the present House from 240 members (the second largest state body in the country) to 160 members. Hatch favors eliminating multiple-member districts and in so doing reducing the constituencies of more than half of the members of the present House.

He believes, however, that a cut in the size of the House will not be, by itself, a legislative cure-all. "The House cut is like a merchant changing his store front and then inviting shoppers to come to a completely remodeled facility," Hatch states. "Unless the interior is modernized at the same time, the store acquires a disgruntled clientele."

## INTERIOR CHANGES

Among the "interior changes" Hatch advocates for the House are: new legislative rules which will make continual suspensions of the rules unnecessary, a reduction and integration of the present thirty-one joint legislative committees, more professional staffing of committees, a reduction in the number of bills which legislators must consider, and a shortening of legislative sessions.

## POLITICAL NOTES

● George Romney is reportedly looking hard for a presidential campaign manager to rally some conservatives and coalesce the support of other Republican governors (twenty of the twenty-five Republican governors are thought to be leaning toward Romney now).

Reportedly eliminated from consideration already are F. Clifton White (identified too closely with the right wing) and Robert Price (personality conflicts with Nelson Rockefeller and Jacob Javits). Leonard Hall has also apparently been discussed, but not too favorably.

Prime candidates now appear to be Governor John Love of Colorado, Governor Dan Evans of Washington, and Donald M. Ross, a national committeeman from Nebraska who is one of Bliss' four national vice-chairmen and was Bliss's disciplinarian of the National Young Republicans last spring.

● The twenty-five Republican governors will control enough votes at the 1968 convention to decide the Republican ticket, according to Nelson Rockefeller. But the New York governor warned that there is much to be done before individual races for the nomination begin heating up. He identified the governors as the best hope for a Presidential victory in 1968.

● Senator Robert F. Kennedy of New York now has a New England press office with a full-time paid staff.

As Hatch argues, "Unless many antiquated procedures are changed, the state legislature will not be responsive to the complex needs of the twentieth century."

Striking a similar theme, Pennsylvania Governor William W. Scranton told the 72nd National Conference on Government that almost all state constitutions must be revised if the federal government is not to be forced to enter further into the normal state-controlled areas of housing, education, transit, poverty, and conservation.

## SCRANTON'S PROPOSALS

"For only some states to meet this challenge with modernized constitutions would not relieve the federal government of its burdens in such matters," Scranton stated. "The challenge can only be met by a nation-wide movement for modernizing the constitutions of all the states."

Scranton recalled that he found the situation of Pennsylvania so confused and frustrating when he assumed office that he had no choice but to push for constitutional reform. He warned, however, that changes in most constitutions require the support not only of the legislature but also of the average voter who must be convinced that a better future requires a better constitution.

The important thing, he concluded, was that the constitution and governmental machinery be reformed, and reformed quickly. "If we pool our skills, suppress our rivalries and unite our interests, the remaining years of this century may go down in history as the period in which our forefathers' dream of a union of independent states was given new and final affirmation."

—T.A.B.

● Interference from the Federal government may be increasing the problems of Republican governors, who received a resounding vote of confidence in the elections for the manner in which they have held their place in America's federalism. Governor John Chafee of Rhode Island cited the example of his state's long-range Child Welfare Program: "First, the Federal Government says 'wonderful, we'll help you by paying ten per cent of your budget.' Then, in they rush to our cities with the War on Poverty with ninety per cent federal funds, bypass the state completely, hire away our state social workers from all our other programs, and say 'we are really helping you out, be more grateful.'"

● Congressman Dick Bolling, the ambitious power among liberal House Democrats, reportedly will fight to hold the current Democratic-Republican ratios on House Committees established by the last Congress. The ratios were adjusted to reflect the lopsided Democratic win in 1964. Prospects are for a stormy opening of the Ninetieth Congress.

● The Presidents Commission on White House Fellows urges interested men between 23 and 35 years of age to write for information to its Director, care of the White House, Washington, D.C. Applications for next year's programs will be accepted until January 6, 1967. Ripon members have won a disproportionate share of the awards in the past two years.

## P. O. BOX 138: A Coffee Pot Bubbles

Cambridge chapter alumni returning to Ripon's two-room suite above the Harvard Square Theatre cannot believe what has happened. Stunned by the neatness of it all, they gape at: wall-size bulletin boards arranged to show press, officeholder and citizen response to Ripon writings; a wrap-around work-shelf with a new postage meter, collating rack and ditto machine; built-in continuous desks along one wall with new shelving and filing space; metal mailboxes instead of the old egg-crate ones; and a restructured area for the administrative secretary. There are new filing systems for correspondence and research material; routing chits to guide documents to the proper hands; and a "FORUM comment book" in which subscribers' criticisms and witticisms are scrawled or pasted. A coffee pot bubbles in the corner.

People are beginning to live in this office, and those who don't are missing the excitement of waking up to what Ripon has become in four short years. It is at least more than a post office box.

**PRESS** Press coverage of Ripon publications and position papers is good. Our Washington service forwards over one-hundred clippings each week which review, report or editorialize about the books *From Disaster to Distinction* and *Southern Republicanism and the New South*.

Extensive press coverage across the ideological spectrum may explain our publisher's report that several key East and West Coast bookstores are sold out of *From Disaster to Distinction*; a second printing is contemplated.

## BOOKSHELF: We Propose

"The need for Congressional reform is urgent if our society is to maintain Congress as a study and deliberative body charged with making crucial social judgment and maintaining the traditional separation and balance of governmental power essential to the preservation and further development of human freedom."

These are the words of Congressman Thomas B. Curtis in opening the Foreword to a recent book *We Propose: A Modern Congress* (Mary McInnis, editor) by the House Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing.

The 330-page book, published by McGraw-Hill, contains proposals by twenty-three leading Republicans on everything from the old problems of the seniority system, standing committees, lobbying procedures, minority staffing, and floor procedures to the new challenges presented by rapid scientific and technological change and the pressures for television and radio coverage of Congressional debates.

The Republican task force that produced *We Propose* was created, according to Minority Leader Gerald Ford, because Republicans feared the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, controlled by the Democrats, would propose few of the badly needed reforms.

The task force was chaired by Congressman James C. Cleveland of New Hampshire, and carried on the work of the committee of former Congressman and Congressman-elect Fred Schwengel of Iowa. A motto

The Ripon Society of New Haven recently announced the opening of a new office at 211 Park Street in New Haven. Members returning from research and management positions in November campaigns are preparing an analysis of the backlash phenomenon for distribution in mid-December.

New Haven has also inaugurated a series of "think sessions" to benefit from the expertise and scholarship of the Yale University Community. Professor Henry Wallich served as consultant for a session on "Inflation and the New Economics — the Republican Viewpoint". In a later meeting, Bradford C. Snell discussed his forthcoming book, *Omnipartisan Politics and the Metropolis*, which presents a theory of practical politics based on the 1965 Specter and Lindsay campaigns and Snell's travels through Western Europe last summer.

**FORD VISITS** In Cambridge, Ripon Society members were selected by the Kennedy Institute of Politics to chair four discussions with Congressman Gerald Ford during his two-day visit in November. Ford answered questions on such topics as Vietnam, Congressional organization, Republican strategy, presidential nominees in 1968, House research, and legislative proposals for the coming session. His remarks were all off-the-record, but it can be reported that he had kind words for the Ripon Society and that he unequivocally renounced any Congressional coalition with Southern Democrats.

—W.S.P.

for this valuable study has been penned by Congressman Cleveland:

"But over the hill and horizon  
A light is beginning to burn;  
Dissent is getting respectful again,  
Thinking is taking a turn . . .  
So courage my lonely colleagues,  
Be of good heart and cheer;  
Minority views are sometimes read  
And the public's beginning to hear."

THE RIPON SOCIETY is a national organization of young members of the business, academic and professional communities who develop research and policy for the Republican Party. It offers the following options to those who wish to subscribe to its publications and support its programs:

- Forum only: \$5 (\$3 for students)
- Subscriber: \$10 annual contribution.
- Contributor: \$25 or more annually.
- Sustainer: \$100 or more annually.
- Founder: \$1000 or more annually.

All \$10 contributors will receive the FORUM, Ripon books and frequent research papers. Won't you forward your subscription today?

### THE RIPON SOCIETY

P.O. Box 138, Cambridge, Mass. 02138

(Editorial correspondence should be addressed to Josiah Lee Auspitz, editor, Ripon FORUM.)