*Source A: DAVID M. KENNEDY. “The Best Army We can Buy.” The New York Times. July 25, 2005.*

THE United States now has a mercenary army. To be sure, our soldiers are hired from within the citizenry, unlike the hated Hessians whom George III recruited to fight against the American Revolutionaries. But like those Hessians, today's volunteers sign up for some mighty dangerous work largely for wages and benefits - a compensation package that may not always be commensurate with the dangers in store, as current recruiting problems testify.

Neither the idealism nor the patriotism of those who serve is in question here. The profession of arms is a noble calling, and there is no shame in wage labor. But the fact remains that the United States today has a military force that is extraordinarily lean and lethal, even while it is increasingly separated from the civil society on whose behalf it fights. This is worrisome - for reasons that go well beyond unmet recruiting targets.

One troubling aspect is obvious. By some reckonings, the Pentagon's budget is greater than the military expenditures of all other nations combined. It buys an arsenal of precision weapons for highly trained troops who can lay down a coercive footprint in the world larger and more intimidating than anything history has known. Our leaders tell us that our armed forces seek only just goals, and at the end of the day will be understood as exerting a benign influence. Yet that perspective may not come so easily to those on the receiving end of that supposedly beneficent violence.

But the modern military's disjunction from American society is even more disturbing. Since the time of the ancient Greeks through the American Revolutionary War and well into the 20th century, the obligation to bear arms and the privileges of citizenship have been intimately linked. It was for the sake of that link between service and a full place in society that the founders were so invested in militias and so worried about standing armies, which Samuel Adams warned were "always dangerous to the liberties of the people."

Many African-Americans understood that link in the Civil War, and again in World Wars I and II, when they clamored for combat roles, which they saw as stepping stones to equal rights. From Aristotle's Athens to Machiavelli's Florence to Thomas Jefferson's Virginia and Robert Gould Shaw's Boston and beyond, the tradition of the citizen-soldier has served the indispensable purposes of sustaining civic engagement, protecting individual liberty - and guaranteeing political accountability.

That tradition has now been all but abandoned. A comparison with a prior generation's war illuminates the point. In World War II, the United States put some 16 million men and women into uniform. What's more, it mobilized the economic, social and psychological resources of the society down to the last factory, rail car, classroom and victory garden. World War II was a "total war." Waging it compelled the participation of all citizens and an enormous commitment of society's energies.

But thanks to something that policymakers and academic experts grandly call the "revolution in military affairs," which has wedded the newest electronic and information technologies to the destructive purposes of the second-oldest profession, we now have an active-duty military establishment that is, proportionate to population, about 4 percent of the size of the force that won World War II. And today's military budget is about 4 percent of gross domestic product, as opposed to nearly 40 percent during World War II.

The implications are deeply unsettling: history's most potent military force can now be put into the field by a society that scarcely breaks a sweat when it does so. We can now wage war while putting at risk very few of our sons and daughters, none of whom is obliged to serve. Modern warfare lays no significant burdens on the larger body of citizens in whose name war is being waged.

This is not a healthy situation. It is, among other things, a standing invitation to the kind of military adventurism that the founders correctly feared was the greatest danger of standing armies - a danger made manifest in their day by the career of Napoleon Bonaparte, whom Jefferson described as having "transferred the destinies of the republic from the civil to the military arm."

Some will find it offensive to call today's armed forces a "mercenary army," but our troops are emphatically not the kind of citizen-soldiers that we fielded two generations ago - drawn from all ranks of society without respect to background or privilege or education, and mobilized on such a scale that civilian society's deep and durable consent to the resort to arms was absolutely necessary.

Leaving questions of equity aside, it cannot be wise for a democracy to let such an important function grow so far removed from popular participation and accountability. It makes some supremely important things too easy - like dealing out death and destruction to others, and seeking military solutions on the assumption they will be swifter and more cheaply bought than what could be accomplished by the more vexatious business of diplomacy.

The life of a robust democratic society should be strenuous; it should make demands on its citizens when they are asked to engage with issues of life and death. The "revolution in military affairs" has made obsolete the kind of huge army that fought World War II, but a universal duty to service - perhaps in the form of a lottery, or of compulsory national service with military duty as one option among several - would at least ensure that the civilian and military sectors do not become dangerously separate spheres. War is too important to be left either to the generals or the politicians. It must be the people's business.

*David M. Kennedy, a professor of history at Stanford and the author of the Pulitzer-Prize winning "Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1929-1945," is working on a book about the American national character.*

*Source B: John Whiteclay Chambers, II. To Raise an Army: The Draft Comes to Modern America. New York: Free Press, 1987 pp. 274-276.*

Although the nation’s traditional isolationism ended in World War II, Americans have not fully adjusted t the costs of their new world role, nor have they altered either that role or the international order to the extent that an army has become unnecessary. Divided as it is over the proper kinds of foreign and strategic policies, and even less united over military formats, the country has stumbled along on makeshift formats. In compensation, it has sometimes tried, with varying success, to substitute other armies for its own. It has augmented American forces with those of its European or Asian allies and, overtly, or covertly, it has supported indigenous Third World forces as proxies for American military power. Either way, when divergent interests became apparent, so did the limits of the form of military power.

Once again the contrast with Europe highlights the difference in America. Unlike the United States, the continental powers have not abandoned conscription, even though they too have reduced reliance upon the mass army. They have kept the draft partly to maintain their forces, but also to sustain the connection between military obligation and the nation-State. This politico-military type of national integration, so important to continental Europe, has remained alien to the United States. Without universal military training, only a minority of Americans served routinely in uniform; the army was never the nationalizing force that it was in Europe.

The evolution of American nationalism has been a social and economic as much as a political experience. It required the continued recognition of individual, local, and pluralistic interests and loyalties. Uniquely, America has evolved from a society to a nation and only lastly to a state. In Europe, centralized States predated the emergence of nationally conscious “nations.” Unlike the political-military nationalism of France and Germany, American nationalism was based upon a socio-economic ideal—the individual’s right to liberty and opportunity, and the “pursuit of happiness,” in Jefferson’s felicitous phrase—rather than on polity and *raison d’etat*. In America, therefore, it has not been self-contradictory for an ardent nationalist, like President Reagan, also to be an opponent of peace-time conscription. The military obligation of American citizenship remains ill defined. The draft remains an episodic and largely unintegrated part of the nation’s history.

The American experience with military formats over the past four hundred years demonstrates that they are determined by social conditions and political attitudes as well as military criteria. Whatever the future of the current All-Volunteer Armed Force, its successor will surely be a socio-political and military mechanism rooted in the circumstances of its own time, as well as part of the inherited evolution of the nature of peacetime and wartime armies—an evolution shaped as much by trends in society as by the nature of war itself.

*Source C: George Q. Flynn. The Draft: 1940-1973. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1993. pp. 281-282*

 The basic problem of drafting scientifically in a democracy was unresolved. The tensions conscription generated between the myth of efficient, centralized manpower utilization and the myth of equality of sacrifice in a democratic polity remained unrelieved. Such tensions had evaporated in a popular World War II with its massive mobilization and in peacetime when few were drafted. But in limited war conflicts, with marginal public support, the draft could not sustain itself for long. But neither had the all-professional volunteer force proved itself in anything beyond the quick and clean action against minor opposition. What would happen if the United States again required a mass army for a lengthy tour is anyone’s guess in the 1990s.

*Source C:*

July 9, 2012

**Let’s Draft Our Kids**

**By THOMAS E. RICKS**

IN late June, Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal, the former commander of international forces in Afghanistan, called for [reinstating the draft](http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/07/03/mcchrystal_time_to_bring_back_the_draft). “I think if a nation goes to war, every town, every city needs to be at risk,” he said at the Aspen Ideas Festival. “You make that decision and everybody has skin in the game.”

This was the first time in recent years that a high-profile officer has broken ranks to argue that the all-volunteer force is not necessarily good for the country or the military. Unlike Europeans, Americans still seem determined to maintain a serious military force, so we need to think about how to pay for it and staff it by creating a draft that is better and more equitable than the Vietnam-era conscription system.

A revived draft, including both males and females, should include three options for new conscripts coming out of high school. Some could choose 18 months of military service with low pay but excellent post-service benefits, including free college tuition. These conscripts would not be deployed but could perform tasks currently outsourced at great cost to the Pentagon: paperwork, painting barracks, mowing lawns, driving generals around, and generally doing lower-skills tasks so professional soldiers don’t have to. If they want to stay, they could move into the professional force and receive weapons training, higher pay and better benefits.

Those who don’t want to serve in the army could perform civilian national service for a slightly longer period and equally low pay — teaching in low-income areas, cleaning parks, rebuilding crumbling infrastructure, or aiding the elderly. After two years, they would receive similar benefits like tuition aid.

And libertarians who object to a draft could opt out. Those who declined to help Uncle Sam would in return pledge to ask nothing from him — no Medicare, no subsidized college loans and no mortgage guarantees. Those who want minimal government can have it.

Critics will argue that this is a political non-starter. It may be now. But America has already witnessed far less benign forms of conscription. A new draft that maintains the size and the quality of the current all-volunteer force, saves the government money through civilian national service and frees professional soldiers from performing menial tasks would appeal to many constituencies.

Others argue that the numbers don’t add up. With an average cohort of about four million 18-year-olds annually, they say, there is simply no place to put all these people. But the government could use this cheap labor in new ways, doing jobs that governments do in other countries but which have been deemed too expensive in this one, like providing universal free day care or delivering meals to elderly shut-ins. And if too many people applied for the 18-month military program, then a lottery system could be devised — the opposite of the 1970s-era system where being selected was hardly desirable. The rest could perform nonmilitary national service.

A final objection is the price tag; this program would cost billions of dollars. But it also would save billions, especially if implemented broadly and imaginatively. One reason our relatively small military is hugely expensive is that all of today’s volunteer soldiers are paid well; they often have spouses and children who require housing and medical care.

Unmarried conscripts don’t need such a safety net. And much of the labor currently contracted out to the private sector could be performed by 18-year-olds for much less. And we could raise the retirement age for the professional force from 20 to 30 years of service. There is no reason to kick healthy 40-year-olds out of the military and then give them full retirement pay for 40 years. These reforms would greatly reduce both recruiting and pension costs.

Similarly, some of the civilian service programs would help save the government money: Taking food to an elderly shut-in might keep that person from having to move into a nursing home. It would be fairly cheap to house conscript soldiers on closed military bases. Housing civilian service members would be more expensive, but imaginative use of existing assets could save money. For example, V.A. hospitals might have space.

The pool of cheap labor available to the federal government would broadly lower its current personnel costs and its pension obligations — especially if the law told federal managers to use the civilian service as much as possible, and wherever plausible. The government could also make this cheap labor available to states and cities. Imagine how many local parks could be cleaned and how much could be saved if a few hundred New York City school custodians were 19, energetic and making $15,000 plus room and board, instead of 50, tired and making $106,329, [the top base salary](http://blogs.edweek.org/teachers/teaching_now/2010/11/salary_discrepancy.html) for the city’s public school custodians, before overtime.

The savings actually might be a way of bringing around the unions representing federal, state and municipal workers, because they understand that there is a huge budget crunch that is going to hit the federal government in a few years. Setting up a new non-career tier of cheap, young labor might be a way of preserving existing jobs for older, more skilled, less mobile union workers.

But most of all, having a draft might, as General McChrystal said, make Americans think more carefully before going to war. Imagine the savings — in blood, tears and national treasure — if we had thought twice about whether we really wanted to invade Iraq.

[*Thomas E. Ricks*](http://ricks.foreignpolicy.com/)*, a fellow at the Center for a New American Security, is the author of the forthcoming book “The Generals: American Military Command From World War II to Today.”*
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**December 15, 2006**

**Top Commanders Appear Set to Urge Larger U.S. Military**

**By** [**THOM SHANKER**](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/thom_shanker/index.html?inline=nyt-per) **and** [**MICHAEL R. GORDON**](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/g/michael_r_gordon/index.html?inline=nyt-per)

WASHINGTON, Dec. 14 — The review of [Iraq](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/iraq/index.html?inline=nyt-geo) policy by senior commanders appears to be headed toward a recommendation to increase the size of the American military, both to sustain a long-term commitment in Iraq and to leave the United States better positioned to deal with potential adversaries, in particular Iran and North Korea, Pentagon and military officials said Thursday.

The latest indication came when the Army chief of staff, Gen. Peter J. Schoomaker, called for expanding the force by adding more active-duty troops and by making more use of the National Guard and Reserve.

His statement, on Thursday, came a day after President Bush met with the [Joint Chiefs of Staff](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/j/joint_chiefs_of_staff/index.html?inline=nyt-org) in the Pentagon’s secure conference room to discuss reshaping strategy in Iraq. That session, officials said, included a detailed discussion of whether the armed services are large enough to sustain the mission in Iraq and meet other global security threats.

Officials who took part in the session or who were briefed on it would not give specific figures that were being discussed for growth goals. But their descriptions revealed a broad conclusion that has received increasing support in Washington: that regardless of the exact shape of President Bush’s new strategy on Iraq, the Army and Marine Corps are stretched thin by their commitments around the globe, in particular in Iraq.

That conclusion is being punctuated by the departure of Defense Secretary [Donald H. Rumsfeld](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/r/donald_h_rumsfeld/index.html?inline=nyt-per), who officially leaves his post on Friday and who was long the champion of the idea that high technology and better intelligence could substitute for a bigger military.

Although expanding the Army’s size would be too slow a process to provide immediate relief for the force in Iraq, several ideas are being considered to fill the short-term demand for troops there, especially in Baghdad.

One proposal being studied, according to Pentagon officials, is accelerating the arrival in Iraq of a handful of combat brigades already scheduled to deploy there in 2007. Sending troops in early or keeping soldiers in Iraq past their scheduled departure has been a way to temporarily increase American troop presence in Iraq without ordering in forces that had not been on the deployment roster.

A new study by the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative research group in Washington, that was released on Thursday also called for a surge of forces to Baghdad over the near term on the grounds that the nascent Iraqi security force is not up to the task.

The report was written by the military historian Frederick W. Kagan and by Jack Keane, the retired general who served as vice chief of staff of the Army. It calls for adding four to five additional combat brigades to Baghdad and deploying them in neighborhoods that have mixed Sunni and Shiite populations and have been the scene of sectarian violence.

The report argues that this can be done without stretching the Army and Marines to the breaking point, but it also advocates increasing both forces by a total of at least 30,000 per year for the next two years.

At the Pentagon, even those not supporting the surge option argue that the Army needs to grow to sustain the force levels required in Afghanistan and Iraq and to meet other national security threats.

Officials who were briefed on the president’s discussion with the Joint Chiefs said there was a consensus that the review of administration strategy in Iraq must be broadened to include decisions on how to prepare the American military for the global counterterrorism mission beyond Iraq.

In particular, they said there was a need to show enough force strength to deter potential adversaries from aggressive moves based on an assumption that American power was bogged down in Iraq.

“A lot of it was discussed yesterday with President Bush,” said a senior Pentagon official who was briefed on the discussions by one of those in attendance.

The nation faces three choices or “we will break the active component,” General Schoomaker said in an appearance before the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves. He said the choices included reducing demand on the military, which seems unlikely; gaining the guaranteed ability to mobilize the National Guard and Reserve; and increasing the size of the active forces.

On the last point, said that “current demand on the force makes this a wise and prudent action.” He gave no figure on his goal for the Army, but noted that even in an optimistic best case, the Army probably could grow by only 6,000 to 7,000 soldiers per year.

Congress authorized a 30,000-soldier increase in the active-duty Army after the Sept. 11 attacks in what was described as a temporary measure. Army officials say they hope to reach that authorized total troop strength of 512,000 by next year.

Gen. Gordon R. Sullivan, the former Army chief of staff who now heads the Association of the U.S. Army, a private support group, said in an interview that senior Army officers have told him in recent months that the service needs an active duty strength of some 535,000 to 540,000. General Sullivan said that figure assumed assured access to mobilize the National Guard and Reserves.

General Sullivan said his personal view was that the Army needed to have an active duty strength of more than 600,000 if such ability to mobilize the Guard and Reserves could not be guaranteed.

He noted that there has been a debate over the past few years as to whether the Army deployments were a “spike” or a “plateau.”

“Surely, we know by now that it is a plateau,” he said. “We are sending people back with 12 months dwell time. One reason we are doing it is that we don’t have enough to spread this commitment out.”

http://www.nytimes.com/2006/12/15/world/middleeast/15military.html

*Source E: “Rangel Introduces Bill to Reinstate Draft: Rumsfeld says he sees no need for military draft.” CNN. <ttp://www.cnn.com/2007/ALLPOLITICS/01/07/rangel.draft>*

**WASHINGTON (CNN) --Rep. Charles Rangel introduced a bill in Congress Tuesday to reinstate the military draft, saying fighting forces should more closely reflect the economic makeup of the nation.**

The New York Democrat told reporters his goal is two-fold: to jolt Americans into realizing the import of a possible unilateral strike against Iraq, which he opposes, and "to make it clear that if there were a war, there would be more equitable representation of people making sacrifices."

"I truly believe that those who make the decision and those who support the United States going into war would feel more readily the pain that's involved, the sacrifice that's involved, if they thought that the fighting force would include the affluent and those who historically have avoided this great responsibility," Rangel said.

"Those who love this country have a patriotic obligation to defend this country," Rangel said. "For those who say the poor fight better, I say give the rich a chance."

According to Rangel's office, minorities comprise more than 30 percent of the nation's military.

Under his bill, the draft would apply to men and women ages 18 to 26; exemptions would be granted to allow people to graduate from high school, but college students would have to serve.

Anyone who didn't qualify for military service because of impairments would be asked to perform community service.

The lawmaker has said his measure could make members of Congress more reluctant to authorize military action. The Korean War veteran has accused President Bush and some fellow lawmakers of being too eager to go to war.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld told reporters Tuesday he sees no need for a draft. He said the military is managing to attract enough skilled recruits without one.

"We're not going to re-implement a draft. There is no need for it at all," Rumsfeld said. "The disadvantages of using compulsion to bring into the armed forces the men and women needed are notable."

*Source F: Editorial Cartoons*









*Source G: Stephen M. Kohn. Jailed for Peace The History of American Draft Violators, 1658-1985. New York: Praeger, 1987. pp. 142-143.*

 The type of questions draft resisters raised stands in sharp contrast to the official debates on the draft, which center almost entirely on military manpower options. Lacking in these debates are the moral questions concerning war, peace, foreign policy, and the viability of nonviolence in world affairs. No one questions whether killing is right or wrong—rather, the question is how to kill, with nuclear bombs or with conventional troops. No one asks whether war is a legitimate tool for the implementation of foreign policy. The questions revolve around when to go to war, for what reasons, and against which enemy. The anti-draft movement, however, raises fundamental questions in an uncompromising manner. It questions the morality of an assumed reality.

 Warfare has fundamentally changed. The advent of nuclear war has given added power and appeal to the nonviolent philosophy of draft resistance. The inhuman barbarism of nuclear holocaust has forced new generations to reevaluate their willingness to support warfare in any capacity. The courage and heroism associated with the glories of former wars have faded. Where is the young boy who dreams of growing up to lead the battle of Hiroshima? These radical changes in the nature of warfare have forever altered the role of the military in modern society. Parades, medals, and reminders of battlefield exploits are becoming aspects of antiquity. The Nuclear Veteran, the Agent Orange Veteran, and the Vietnam Veteran are slowly replacing the Veteran of Iwo Jima and D-Day.

 Draft resisters have pioneered a new form of courage—the courage of peace.

*Source H: Walter E. Williams. Reinstating the Military Draft. The Examiner. December 28, 2006.*

*Editorial Commentary Page.*

**BALTIMORE** - Congressman Charles Rangel plans to introduce legislation calling for reinstatement of the military draft. He says, “There’s no question in my mind that this president and this administration would never have invaded Iraq, especially on the flimsy evidence that was presented to the Congress, if indeed we had a draft and members of Congress and the administration thought that their kids from their communities would be placed in harm’s way.”

Rep. Rangel, D-N.Y., has it completely backward in terms of incentives created by the draft. Let’s apply a bit of economic logic to it, but first get a pet peeve of mine out of the way: The term “draft” is a euphemism for what is actually “confiscation of labor services.” The Defense Department can get all the military personnel it wants on an all-volunteer basis; it could simply raise wages. Indeed, there exists a wage whereby even I would volunteer my services.

The draft is needed when the military wants to pay soldiers wages lower than those earned in the non-military sector of our economy. When we did have a draft, as in 1950s, look at who was and was not drafted. The commander in chief at that time, President Dwight Eisenhower, wasn’t drafted. Neither were members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Generals and other high-ranking officers weren’t drafted.

Who was drafted? Recruits, and it’s not hard to understand why. A newly inducted recruit’s pay was $68 a month. The pay of the commander in chief, Joint Chiefs of Staff, generals and other officers were many multiples higher than a recruit’s pay. It’s not difficult to understand why drafting recruits was necessary.

Some argue that depending on an all-volunteer military is too expensive. That’s wrong. The true cost of having a man in the military is what society has to forgo, what economists call opportunity costs. Say a man worked producing televisions, for which he was paid $1,000 a month. If he’s drafted, he’s not producing $1,000 worth of televisions. The sacrificed $1,000 worth of televisions is part of the cost of his being in the military whether he’s paid $68 a month or nothing a month.

One effect of the draft is to understate the full cost of military operations. In 1959, prior to my being drafted, I drove a taxi for Yellow Cab Company in Philadelphia, earning about $400 a month. In August that year, I started earning $68 a month. The military budget saw a cost of $68 as opposed to the $400 worth of taxi services society had to forgo. Simple economics suggests that if the cost of a resource is understated, there will be bias toward greater and more wasteful use of that resource.

Contrary to Rep. Rangel’s assertion, a draft would tend to give rise to greater, not less, use of the military. Today’s all-volunteer military consists of high-quality soldiers and fewer misfits than yesteryear. I speak from experience; I was one of those misfits. Being drafted meant lower wages and a waste of my time.

To make matters worse, my basic training was at Fort Jackson, S.C., and afterward, I was stationed at Fort Stewart, Ga. This was 1959, and I didn’t have a very good orientation on Southern customs and standards for blacks. There were many self-created adjustment problems associated with my activities, such as: organizing black soldiers to go to the post dance on the “wrong” night; sloppy soldiering; being court-martialed and winning; investigations of me, at least being tailed, by the military authorities; and at-home FBI inquiries of neighbors about Mrs. Williams.

The military draft is an offense to the values of liberty, causes misallocation of resources, and there’s a higher risk of getting a bunch of misfits. The all-volunteer military does none of this.

*Walter E. Williams is a professor of economics at George Mason University.*

*Examiner*

*Source I: Ben Duffy, “Rangeling in the Draft.” The Daily Collegian, Posted: 11/27/06.*

<http://media.www.dailycollegian.com/media/storage/paper874/news/2006/11/27/EditorialOpinion/Rangeling.In.The.Draft-2507481-page2.shtml?sourcedomain=www.dailycollegian.com&MIIHost=media.collegepublisher.com>

Rep. Charles Rangel (D-NY) wants to bring back military conscription. Just after this month's Democratic victories in the House and Senate, Rep. Rangel resurrected an old idea that he had previously proposed in January of 2003. According to CNN.com, "Under his [2003] bill, the draft would apply to men and women ages 18 to 26; exemptions would be granted to allow people to graduate from high school, but college students would have to serve."

The bill failed miserably, with two in favor and 402 against. Just this month, Rangel dragged his draft proposal out again, although he is getting almost no support from the incoming Democratic leadership. Rangel's newest proposal would offer civil service alternatives for those who do not want to take up arms.

"Young people (would) commit themselves to a couple of years in service to this great republic, whether it's our seaports, our airports, in schools, in hospitals," said Rangel to the Associated Press.

Rangel is not a hawk, and has been against the Iraq War since day one. His proposed draft is intended to make the American public think long and hard about who is bearing the brunt of military service in this country.

According to the Associated Press, "Rangel, a veteran of the Korean War who has unsuccessfully sponsored legislation on conscription in the past, has said the all-volunteer military disproportionately puts the burden of war on minorities and lower-income families."

Actually, I agree with Rangel on this point, even if I think that he's being partially disingenuous. One problem is that the Left said pretty much the same thing about the draft during the Vietnam War. Young men who went to college could defer their military service, and many used academia as a "draft shelter" in which they waited out the entire war.

Minorities and poor whites with fewer educational opportunities ended up doing the grunt work in Vietnam, while middle-class and wealthy men hung around campus. So, it's impossible to please the Left on this issue. When there was a draft, they were against it because it was "racist" and "classist," and now that we have an all-volunteer force, they're against it...because it's "racist" and "classist." It seems that the only system they would approve would be a draft without college deferments and without alternative service. Under such a system, no one would be exempt from military service, not even the Bush twins.

Does anyone really want that? I certainly don't. It would work worse than the Vietnam-era draft, which is why I don't understand the Rangel bill. He says that he wants all Americans to share the duties of military service, but then he creates a huge loophole in the form of alternative civil service. I surmise that all of those young people who are not enlisting now would not enlist under Rangel's plan either. They would simply take the civil service alternative, and Rangel's plan would fail to better distribute the duties of military service.

Rangel's plan would fail to reach its intended goal, but that does not mean the goal is without merit. Actually, what concerns me is the thought that some people in this country think they are too good for military service and would never even consider it.

When I was a young 18-year-old trainee at Fort Leonard Wood, I remember feeling an intense culture shock. I was thrown into a world that bore no resemblance to the white, middle-class New England environment that I left behind for a world in which half the population seemed to speak with a Southern drawl.

As a 23-year-old veteran just out of the Army, I had to experience some reverse culture shock as I readjusted myself to the UMass student body, a largely white, middle-class, New England conglomeration. I still think that those who subscribe to Rangel's philosophy often exaggerate and misunderstand the economic and racial disparities within the military, but Rep. Rangel does have a point.

So, why not adopt the Rangel plan? I suspect that if we did, most young Americans would select the civil service alternative rather than join the service. I have difficulty calling it a draft at all, since no one would be actually forced to serve.

Instead, let's say that all young Americans would be required to perform a period of national service. How you choose to fulfill that service is up to you. If you want to spend your two years as airborne infantry, then that's your decision. If you'd rather work in a civilian capacity, you could be placed in a hospital or school. The point is that everyone does his part, from the farmer's son to the senator's daughter.

Rep. Rangel is not usually someone I agree with, and I am suspicious of his motives in this situation. Nonetheless, I don't believe that the Rangel plan is entirely bad. For maximum shock value, he seems intent on calling it a "draft," which it really isn't. It's a call to national service, and that's something that I completely support.

© Copyright 2007 The Daily Collegian

*Source J: “Rich Enlist in Army: 800,000 Privileged Youth Enlist to Join the Fight in Iraq.”The Onion. January 10, 2007. <http://www.onion.com>*

WASHINGTON, DC—Citing a desire to finally make a difference in Iraq, in the past two weeks, more than 800,000 young people from upper-middle- and upper-class families have put aside their education, careers, and physical well-being to enlist in the military, new data from the Department Of Defense shows.

Young Manhattanites line up outside the Times Square recruitment office.

"I don't know if it was the safety and comfort of the holidays or what, but I realized that my affluence and ease of living comes at a cost," said Private Jonathan Grace, 18, who was to commence studies at Dartmouth College next fall, but will instead attend 12 weeks of basic training before being deployed to Fallujah with the 1st Army Battalion. "I just looked at my parents in their cashmere sweaters and thought, 'Who am I to go to an elite liberal arts college and spend all my time reading while, in the real world, thousands of kids my age are sacrificing their lives for our country?' It's not right."

Added Grace: "Whether I agree with the war or not, our president needs us, and I'll be damned if I'm going to let our least advantaged citizens bear the brunt of this awesome burden."

At the on-campus temporary recruitment table at Reed College in Portland, OR, the line of students eager to sign up for active duty stretched around the block Monday. Recruiters across the country reported a similar trend, with scores of young people asking how soon they could be ready to go to battle in Iraq.

"They don't have these recruitment centers where I live," said Daniel Feldman, 26, who resides in the affluent neighborhood of Brookline, MA and recently passed his bar exam. "I didn't realize you could just sign up, but now that I do, all of my friends from law school, yoga class, and temple are going to join, too. And not the Reserves either. We're talking down and dirty, right on the front lines."

Drill sergeants at boot camps in South Carolina and San Diego, though at first skeptical of the recent crop of potential Marines, said they have been impressed by their work ethic, claiming the wealthy youngsters' desire to "do their part" is undeniable.

"They haven't complained once since getting here," Sergeant Greg Forenczek said of the new upper-crust recruits. "Usually, after the first two hours, you know who's going to get dismissed early, but not with these kids. There's a fire in their eyes—a fearless passion to become U.S. soldiers"

"They inspire me," Forenczek added.

New Marine Sierra Pettingill, a 22-year-old sociology major who left Duke University before her final semester, said she felt compelled to serve after realizing she did not have a single acquaintance who had died, or even served, in Iraq.

"I was sending out invitations to my champagne-brunch birthday get-together when I heard that U.S. military casualties in Iraq had reached 2,900," Pettingill said. "I decided then and there that I would not allow this inherently unequal system to perpetuate any longer, no matter how much I want to go have martini night at the Oak Room."

Though most of the privileged enlistee youths said they were motivated by a newfound concern that America's reputation could be permanently damaged with a loss in Iraq, others have cited the examples set by their relatives as instrumental in their decision to join.

"My great-great-great-great grandfather would not have been able to make a fortune in the fur trade and real-estate business had it not been for the brave people who fought in the Revolutionary War," said 24-year-old John Jacob Astor VIII, who has put all of his business ventures on hold indefinitely. "My children are going to know the importance of stepping up to the plate when their nation needs them."

"From this day forth, the Astor name will be synonymous with sacrifice," he added.

U.S. Gen. John Abizaid, who has in the past argued against a timetable for withdrawal from Iraq, now says that with the influx of nearly a million troops expected to be on the ground Feb. 1, the region should be stabilized within six weeks.

Document K:

**New York Times**

**October 20, 2007**

**Op-Ed Contributor**

**Party Here, Sacrifice Over There**

**By WILL BARDENWERPER**

IN January 2006 I stepped off a C-130 in Tal Afar, [Iraq](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/iraq/index.html?inline=nyt-geo). As I began my 13-month deployment, I imagined an American public following our progress with the same concern as my family and friends. But since returning home, I have seen that America has changed the channel.

Young investment bankers spend their impressive bonuses on clubs in Manhattan and many seem uninterested in the soldiers fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. As a Princeton graduate and a former financial analyst, I was once a part of this world, and I like returning to it, putting the Spartan life of Tal Afar and Anbar Province behind me. But even as I enjoy time with the friends who have welcomed me home, my thoughts wander back to other friends who continue to fight as the city parties on.

Serious problems with the war in Iraq are well chronicled, but I am struck by one that does not seem to trouble the country’s leadership, even though it is profoundly corrosive to our common good: the disparity between the lives of the few who are fighting and being killed, and the many who have been asked for nothing more than to continue shopping.

Those who rationalize this disconnect have argued that our soldiers are volunteers, happy doing what they signed up to do. While it is true that most soldiers are devoted to country and comrades, and are focused on their mission, the assertion that soldiers are cheerfully returning for multiple combat tours is grounded in statistics and arguments that are misleading.

Supposedly impressive re-enlistment rates are cited as evidence that soldiers enthusiastically support the war effort. In reality, these retention numbers are more the result of the “stop-loss” policy, where soldiers are required to remain in the Army after their contracts have expired if their units are deployed or ordered to deploy soon. My platoon’s infantrymen expected to be “stop-lossed” and some felt they might as well cash in on the re-enlistment bonuses if they were going to be forced to stay in the Army anyway.

Few of today’s soldiers expected 15-month deployments separated by home stays of less than 12 months. The stress on Army families is enormous, especially since at least four of those months at “home” are generally spent training in the field. Sacrifices like these were the norm in World War II, and families left behind could draw strength from the knowledge that everyone was in the same situation. Today’s military families shoulder this burden pretty much alone.

The Army is badly damaged. The relentless deployment schedule drives many highly trained junior officers and noncommissioned officers out of the Army, while the Pentagon resorts to stop-loss and call-ups from the Individual Ready Reserve to stop the bleeding. These measures are abusing the very Americans who have already made the greatest sacrifices in the war effort.

Never in my life have I seen such commitment, with soldiers and officers working in hazardous conditions upward of 16 hours a day, seven days a week, for over a year, barely able to pause long enough to commemorate their fallen friends. Meanwhile, in the banking houses of New York, the shaky credit markets and the Dow are the things that matter; the problems facing our soldiers 8,000 miles away seem to capture little attention.

Can we continue an interventionist foreign policy with a country divided in this way? The president says that America is engaged in a struggle between good and evil, but is he addressing all citizens when his policies touch so few of us? To ask this question is inevitably to raise the issue of whether we should reinstate the draft. As a recent infantry officer who has younger siblings, I recognize what a profound question this is.

A draft would have one of two consequences. The first is that it might actually relieve the strain on today’s soldiers and end the “backdoor draft” of volunteers who have already served while their civilian peers remain comfortably undisturbed. I am aware that Army leaders fear that a draft would hurt the professionalism of today’s force. However, the lowering of recruiting requirements, as well as the offering of big signing bonuses to impressionable high school students, is already diminishing standards.

The other possible consequence is that serious consideration of a draft could set off such a violent reaction from the American public that the pressure on politicians to abandon their cliché-ridden rhetoric and begin a well-considered withdrawal would be overpowering.

Either situation would accelerate movement toward a decisive point — a commitment to victory, or the realization that Americans simply do not believe the threats cited are really worthy of the sacrifices required to vanquish them. Many years and many lives later, the very least we can do for my friends fighting a world away is to try to decide.

*Will Bardenwerper, an Army infantry officer from 2003 to 2007, was stationed for 13 months in Nineveh and Anbar Provinces in Iraq.*

**Document L:**

**Bush Calls for More Community Service**
President Praises 'Americans Who Serve a Cause Larger Than Themselves'

By Tim Craig
Washington Post Staff Writer
Tuesday, November 20, 2007; A02

CHARLES CITY, Va., Nov. 19 -- In a speech at the historic Berkeley Plantation, where 38 English settlers held what many consider to be the nation's first Thanksgiving in 1619, [President Bush](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/George%2BW.%2BBush?tid=informline) on Monday saluted the military and the nation's "good Samaritans" and called on Americans to perform more community service.

"This Thanksgiving, we pay tribute to all Americans who serve a cause larger than themselves," Bush told about 500 supporters gathered at the plantation on the banks of the [James River](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/James%2BRiver?tid=informline), about 30 miles southeast of [Richmond](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Richmond?tid=informline). While Bush vowed that U.S. troops fighting in [Iraq](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Iraq?tid=informline) and [Afghanistan](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Afghanistan?tid=informline) will continue to make a stand against "extremists and radicals," most of his remarks were focused on a message of honoring those who serve others.

Bush held up three Americans as examples of what the country should be proud, including a [Virginia Tech](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Virginia%2BPolytechnic%2BInstitute%2Band%2BState%2BUniversity?tid=informline) professor killed in April trying to protect his students from a gunman.

In falling back on the theme of compassion, which was a staple of his presidential campaign in 2000, Bush asked Americans to honor those who make the country better, including teachers, firefighters, farmers, police officers and clergy.

Before the speech, Bush stopped by a Richmond food bank, where he looked over rows of canned goods. At one point, the president lifted up a can of Bush Beans and quipped, "Why, cousin."

At the Berkeley Plantation, originally named Berkeley Hundred, Bush noted the location's role in the creation of the Thanksgiving holiday.

When Capt. John Woodlief and 37 colonists washed ashore aboard the Good Ship Margaret in 1619, they read a statement saying, "The day of our ship's arrival . . . shall be yearly and perpetually kept as a day of thanksgiving."

The Pilgrims, who are widely credited with holding the first Thanksgiving, arrived in [Plymouth](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Plymouth?tid=informline) a year later.

In his speech, Bush did not take sides in the "first Thanksgiving" debate, but he praised the [Virginia](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Virginia?tid=informline) settlers for helping to establish democracy. The president also expressed remorse at the "terrible cost" Native Americans paid at the hands of the settlers, and he went on to condemn the slave trade as a "shameful chapter in our nation's history," acknowledging that racial divisions persist in America.

"Today, we are grateful to live in a more perfect union," said Bush, noting that slaves were once held at the Berkeley Plantation. "Yet our society still faces divisions that hold us back. These divisions have roots in the bitter experiences of our past and have no place in America's future."

Bush called on the country to spend time this week remembering the "many examples of the good heart of the American people."

He signaled out [Liviu Librescu](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Liviu%2BLibrescu?tid=informline), an Israeli-born Virginia Tech engineering professor who tried to keep [Seung Hui Cho](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Cho%2BSeung-Hui?tid=informline) out of his classroom so his students could try to escape through the windows. Librescu was killed during the shooting rampage that left 33 people dead, including Cho.

Bush also recognized Jeremy Hernandez, a [Minneapolis](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Minneapolis?tid=informline) man who helped rescue children off a school bus that was about to plunge into he [Mississippi River](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/Mississippi%2BRiver?tid=informline) after a bridge collapsed. He also praised Doris Hicks, a [New Orleans](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/related/topic/New%2BOrleans?tid=informline) principal, for reopening this summer the first public school in New Orleans's Lower Ninth Ward since Hurricane Katrina hit in August 2005.

"These stories remind us that our nation's greatest strength is the decision and compassion of our people," Bush said.

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/11/19/AR2007111901414.html