

“National Service, the Draft and Volunteers”

A debate featuring Milton Friedman

In *Registration and the Draft: Proceedings of the Hoover-Rochester Conference on the All-Volunteer Force*, edited by Martin Anderson, pp. 172-211. Hoover Institution, 1982.

© The Board of Overseers of the Leland Stanford Junior University

## INTRODUCTION

Albert Rees

ALBERT REES: Welcome to the last session of the Hoover-Rochester Conference on the All-Volunteer Force. I've attended almost all of this conference. In my view, it has been an extremely productive and useful discussion of the issues in which all positions have been well and eloquently put forward, and I commend the Hoover Institution and the University of Rochester for their planning of this conference. I can say this without blowing my own horn, because, although the Sloan Foundation is listed on the program as a sponsor of the conference, the role of the foundation is strictly that of providing a portion of the funding that has made the conference possible.

I might just say, for the benefit of Under Secretary Chayes, that economists are also sticklers for accuracy, and I should therefore point out that Mr. Alfred Sloan's middle initial was P, as in Peter, and not T, as in Thomas, as the program has it.

Our session this afternoon is a debate on national service, the draft, and volunteers. And it's my great privilege to chair this debate between two very distinguished Americans. I will not give them elaborate introductions. That would be presumptuous. You all know them.

Congressman Pete McCloskey has been for many years a leader in the House of Representatives, the body in which it sometimes seems to those of us on the outside to be increasingly difficult for anyone to offer any leadership. We're all indebted to him for the constructive role that he's played there.

Professor Milton Friedman won the Nobel Prize in Economic Science. Quite apart from his scientific contributions, which are enormous, he is very well known for his defense of the free-enterprise system, and his defense of freedom, even more broadly defined.

The format of our discussion this afternoon is that each speaker will make an initial 20-minute presentation. Following that, each will have 10 minutes for rebuttal. That should take approximately an hour. After that we will have discussion from the floor. Congressman, would you please be our first speaker?

## ARGUMENT FOR NATIONAL SERVICE

Pete McCloskey

PETE MCCLOSKEY: I can't think of a better arena or a more worthy antagonist to present this argument before.

Let me say at the outset that I know of no one in the United States who wants to return to the draft if the All-Volunteer Force is working. The problem has been that over the last year, discussions with noncommissioned officers and enlisted men have led to a growing perception in Congress that the All-Volunteer Army is not working—that the quantity and quality of recruits do not measure up to the tremendously demanding tasks that we place before our military forces.

At the outset, let me say that the purpose of a military force is not to make war. I'm afraid that we came out of World War II and the Korean War with the idea that Americans should fight, and would fight, anyplace for any oppressed nation or on behalf of any country where we perceive that freedom is in jeopardy. You may recall Jack Kennedy's words when he was inaugurated, that we would fight any foe, we would go to the assistance of any friend, to preserve liberty. The acclaim with which those words were received by the American public is not surprising when you realize that back in the early sixties we Americans had the view that we fought only just wars, that we fought only for good causes. Then we were led into the morass of Vietnam and, I think, through a tragic era. It's been my opinion that had Jack Kennedy not been assassinated in November of 1963, we would have been out of Vietnam within two years, and never have been involved there. But through a succession of circumstances we became involved.

I think public opinion may be as erroneous today with respect to our responsibility and our nation's need for an armed service around the world as it was in the early sixties in the belief that somehow, whenever we went to war on behalf of any nation opposing a communist adversary, this was correct. When public opinion strongly favors isolationism on the part of America and strongly opposes any use of military force, that is precisely the time we ought to have a considered and restrained debate on this subject.

Now, what is the purpose of an armed force in the 1980s and 1990s? It is not to make war. It is to preserve peace. But its readiness to fight a war is a deterrent to others who might try to terminate peaceful circumstances.

We've had five ambassadors assassinated in the last 15 years. We've seen a number of embassies under attack. We seek peace in the world through commercial and trade transactions in nearly every country of the world. There are American personnel, American property, and American investments around the world. I think all of us would concede that it is our desire that the commercial transportation and communications networks continue to grow, in hopes of a world peace in which the nations of the world are commercially interdependent.

But under those circumstances we can be prepared to see actions like that of the Ayatollah, actions like those in Afghanistan, in Africa, in Latin America, where American people and property assets are going to be threatened if we do not have a quality army able to respond. I think everyone would agree.

Now, if a volunteer army works, we would expect to have the quality and caliber of recruits capable of manning sophisticated weapons systems, capable of manning sophisticated

communications systems, capable of guarding nuclear warheads with all of the responsibilities that entails, capable of coolness under fire, of the ability to face hostile crowds in riot situations without losing their control-without losing their cool like the young Marines guarding those embassies under assault. Had any one of those Marines not been intelligent or not been cool, had he let loose a burst of machine-gun fire into the crowd, we could have had an incident which would have provoked a war.

I think all of us would agree that we need a quality army-in terms of fighting capacity and ability to deter aggression in this time of peace. Yet what is the record of the last year? We have had an insufficient number of young people volunteer for all branches of the service over the last four calendar quarters. In a test run in Germany last May, of 450 infantry soldiers, it was found that only 7 of those 450 young men could read at the ninth-grade level. We have had to drop our training manuals from the twelfth-grade level to the eighth-grade level, and now to the fifth-grade level. We're using comic books to train people to military proficiency because the level of the recruit has become so low. In fact, it appears that no reasonable young man will volunteer for the combat arms today, if he can get into school or get a job.

I've asked the following question here at Stanford; I've asked it at Foothill College; and I've asked it at 12 of the 24 high schools in this district How many of you will volunteer for two years of combat readiness training if I tell you what you're actually going to go through as a combat-ready soldier and if we double the current pay, from \$418 a month to \$836 a month? I have yet to have the hand of a young man on the Peninsula who is willing to volunteer if we double the pay.

The Army contends that if we increase pay, which is one of the alternatives, we can attract the proper number of the proper quality recruits. If that were so, I think we would be prepared to raise the pay by some reasonable amount. But the fact is that there is no indication that such a raise in pay will attract qualified people for this onerous duty of citizenship. And if that is the case if we cannot get the proper quantity and quality of people-what, then, are the alternative for the United States?

Well, there are two alternatives. At the present time, the right number of people are in the armed services, but we're approximately 600,000 people short in the reserves, the units that would have to flesh out the army in the event of an emergency. I might point out that the reserves are as crucial to our combat readiness and our deterrence policy as are the right number of weapons and the right number of radios and of ships and aircraft to transport troops into combat. This is because anyone who might want to test us would know that the reserves who would have to flesh out our troop units, 30 days or 60 days or 90 days after hostilities commenced, are just not there today.

We find young people all over America today who are willing to say, "Yes, if we are threatened, if the Ayatollah should lead us into war, we would be the first the volunteer." But the present problem stems from circumstances that differ from those of prior wars, including Vietnam and World Wars I and II, in that six months of careful, hard, arduous training must elapse before any young person has a reasonable chance of surviving in combat. To prepare a combat-ready army,

this training must be done in time of peace.

Now the argument has been made, particularly on the campuses, that constitutionally we do not have the power to force people into voluntary service in time of peace. That was destroyed by the Supreme Court in the sixties in the Holmes case, and in others, in which it pointed out that it wasn't merely a power but a duty of Congress to raise an army. When you go back to the Constitutional Convention debate, you find that it was clearly understood that the country couldn't wait until a war started to raise an army. It is in time of peace that the army must be trained and must be ready, particularly in this day and age where war could break out in 24 hours or, at the most, 30 days.

Now, who should serve in this army, if you concede that we have one and need one? At the present time, if we went into combat in Eastern Europe or in Germany, over half of the front-line infantry casualties would be black or Mexican-American. These two minorities during the Vietnam War made up about 17 percent of our population, yet in the rifle companies they furnished over 40 percent of those killed in action. Why? Because the draft had an exemption for college students: if you were able to get into college, you could avoid the draft. Those who couldn't get an education, who couldn't get jobs that justified being exempted from the draft, were drafted. When the services pick who is going to man what, of course it is the people who have the worst education and are the least able to handle the more sophisticated jobs who get the jobs in the rifle companies. If any of you saw the troops who had manned the North Korean DMZ jogging with President Carter a few months ago, when he jogged three miles with the troops of the Second Infantry Division, you couldn't have failed to notice that over half of those troops were black.

Now what kind of a country do we want to be? An affluent all-white or white-controlled nation whose most arduous duties of citizenship are borne primarily by the minorities and poor? The quality army that I think we need cries out for a cross section of America. People say, "Well, we're likely to get into war when we have a draftee army," but I think not. I think it's just the opposite. I think we're far more likely to get into war if the sons who are going to be killed in that war do not come from the best families of America, are not the sons of the university professors, the bankers, and the businessmen of America. Only if the rich as well as the poor are serving in the military will we see the whole country involved in the decision whether we go to war or not.

Now, the libertarians say, "Well, that's against our liberties." But the courts have spoken time and time again on that subject: if you're to preserve liberty, someone has to be ready to fight. It's never been conceived a denial of liberty to say to a young person, "One or two years of your youth will be spent in service to your country if the need is there." Take jury duty. We don't like jury duty. It's involuntary servitude. Anybody who's spent eight weeks sequestered in a jury on an antitrust case or a criminal case at \$5 a day, denied his livelihood, denied the ability to meet with his family, considers that an involuntary servitude. Yet we feel that the constitutional guarantee of a fair trial entitles a person to be tried by a jury of his peers, and, consequently, we impose that duty on ourselves in order to ensure justice. Similarly, it does not seem to me unwise or unfair to insist on a duty of young people, as a price of the privilege of being American, to serve their country.

Now, what does that mean with respect to the draft? At present, we need only about 400,000 young people out of the 4.3 million who turn 18 each year. If we take men and women, we need only about one out of ten. If we take just men, we need only about one out of five. None of us wants to go back to a straight lottery draft. How can we maintain morale in an armed force made up of one out of every five or every ten unlucky enough to have his or her number selected, while the other four, or the other nine, are back drinking beer on the Stanford campus? How would you feel if you were unlucky enough to be selected by a lottery draft?

A second alternative to the general draft is a draft for reserves only. In a draft of all young men, in which we'd probably lose 40 percent as mentally or physically unfit, we might be taking one out of there and could draft everyone into the reserve. If we drafted for four to six months of military training backed by three or four-and-a-half years of combat-ready reserve status, we would then have spread the burden fairly. We would have drafted all qualified young men, and at least would have fairness under draft conditions.

The third alternative is the program that I propose. This program would give an 18-year-old four options.

1. He could be drafted; or, to avoid the draft,
  2. He could enlist for two years, and, if he did, we would give him four years of college benefits;
- or
3. He could agree to enlist for six months, followed by five-and-a-half years of combat-ready reserve state, to get one year of college benefits; or
  4. He could volunteer for a year of civilian service in any of a number of agencies-federal, local, charitable--where service is performed (Peace Corps, fire-fighting, hospital work, and so forth) if he didn't want to volunteer to serve in the military. Many thousands of young people do this already. So the bureaucracy need not be excessively increased to administer the program. The selective service mechanism would make the assignments, and work would be at subsistence pay.

Frankly, today we have a lack of spots for young people who want to take a year off from their education, training, or work experience, so I think in general it would not be harmful to young people to serve in a volunteer capacity. If a young man were in the Mormon Church, for instance, which sends 20,000 young men overseas for two years, and wanted one of his two years to go for community service, such as the Peace Corps performs, rather than evangelical work for the church, that would qualify. If some-one wanted to work on the skyline in this county, protecting against fires or maintaining trails under the auspices of a local organization, that would qualify.

Only if a person did not choose one of the three alternatives to the draft would he then be subject to the draft, and under those circumstances, the burden would be spread fairly.

In an article in Newsweek magazine Mr. Friedman has said that whatever system we have must be perceived as fair. I can think of no fairer way than to flesh out our Army with a cross section of America, reluctant citizen soldiers. I find this national youth service program far preferable to a professional army in this day and age.

Let me conclude by saying what the state of Congress is on this subject at the present time. Last year the House Armed Services Committee voted 31 to 4 to move back the draft by instituting registration. And the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee voted 4 to 3 to install registration. When it reached the House floor, a number of us who felt we were going to have to look at the draft counted noses and found that the House broke down to about 30 percent who favored a return to the draft, 30 percent who opposed the draft under any circumstances, and about 40 percent who said, in effect, "Well, we may have to go back to some form of compulsion to have a competent army, but we need more facts before we do it." On that basis, the so-called Schroeder Amendment, as drafted by Leon Panetta of Monterey and myself, proposed that we have a six-month study and defer registration until that study was returned. When that proposal was taken up in conference, the Senate caused the period to be reduced from six months to three months.

So in February of next year we will have a report back from the administration on alternatives to the draft and on alternatives to returning to combat-ready status. That vote will come before us next spring. I hope that debates like this will continue up to that point, because it's going to take some courage on the part of politicians to address this issue, and courage comes more easily when you have an enlightened public.

Thank you.

## **ARGUMENT AGAINST NATIONAL SERVICE**

Milton Friedman

MILTON FRIEDMAN: I want to start by expressing full agreement with Congressman McCloskey about our objectives. Unfortunately, we need to have an army, and we need to have a good army and an efficient army. There's no dispute on that, at least between him and me. There may be some other people who will dispute that, but between the two of us there's no dispute about that.

The problem is not one of objectives. It is, on the one hand, a problem of methods and on the other hand, a problem of the effect of the methods applied on the rest of our society. We need an effective military for a democratic and free society. We do not need a military that would be effective for a totalitarian society, and that is a very, very important and basic difference. I know that Congressman McCloskey agrees with me on that, too. We disagree on what techniques will achieve the most effective military force for a free and open society. Unaccustomed as I am on this kind of issue to quoting the New York Times, I have in front of me an Op-Ed column that brings out some of these issues in a very effective way. The column is entitled, "Why Not Draft the Next Congress?" and I hope you will pardon me if I read a few

excerpts from it.

The All-Volunteer Congress has proved to be a failure. Its cost is extremely high, and there is not a proportional representation of minorities. There are also many doubts about the honesty and intelligence of the recent volunteers. Many of Congress's recent failures are owing to the low quality of its composition. A change is needed. This country can no longer afford the high cost of the volunteer system. Nor can it tolerate the low level of performance and reliability.

Conscription appears to be the only way to get a decent Congress at an affordable price.... Some people object to the idea of conscription in itself. But rather than being a moral evil, Congressional conscription should be seen as giving an opportunity for service to the middle-aged. The draftees would have the chance to serve their country and be a part of an important process, and would also learn a lot in the process. Can we allow our national interest to be determined by an overpaid, racially unbalanced, and psychologically unstable pack of volunteers? Our national interests can only be served by a balanced selection of people from all parts of society.

I've read only a small part of this piece, but I recommend the whole of it to you as an extremely effective document for bringing out the implications of departing from volunteer service. The plain fact is that maintaining an armed force of 2 million people in a democratic free society is a tough job. It's bound to be done imperfectly. It's bound to generate difficulties. As was brought out very effectively in Professor Bobbitt's paper, the farther grass always looks greener.

Every system that you adopt is going to have some evils. It's going to have some problems. The All-Volunteer Force, as it is now being implemented, has some real problems. There's no doubt about that. Congressman McCloskey pointed to some of them, though I think on the whole he exaggerates them. It has some real problems, but so, in my opinion, does a draft - far worse problems. Universal national service has some real problems that I'll come to, in my opinion far worse problems.

The danger is that we tend to run from the evils we know to those we don't know. We see the system we now have, where the problems have emerged and are visible, and are tempted to move to another system, for which the problems are in the future.

This is the normal political operating mechanism. Why do we have so many bad laws? Because legislators invariably tend to point to real evils, describe fine objectives, and then enact programs that are not well suited to -respond to those evils or achieve those objectives. There's a strong tendency on the political level to operate in terms of what ought to be done, and to brush aside the more fundamental question of how do you do it.

The national service rhetoric, which Congressman McCloskey adopts, has a great deal of appeal. It seems very reasonable to say that all young men owe their country service. But I hasten to add that its appeal is always in general terms and not in specific terms. On this I quote from Professor King's paper given earlier at this conference, expressing a favorable view toward national service: "I am not certain that any particular national service proposal would, in fact, be superior to the All-Volunteer Force or to the draft" I believe that what you will find, if you take all the

people who have expressed preferences for national service, is that each one has a different plan in mind. And none of them likes the other fellow's plan. There may be a good deal of support for national service in general, but there is very little support for any particular program.

Part of the appeal of the idea of national service is due to an intellectual confusion between two very different systems. One is universal military service, such as exists, for example, in Switzerland and in Israel. If you have a country which needs the service of all young men, and maybe young women, for its defense, essentially all able-bodied citizens, then a reasonably equitable and fair way to impose a tax on the people is simply to require everybody to serve, to see that everybody is trained, to see that all are available to come to the defense of their country. But that is not the situation in the United States. As Congressman McCloskey pointed out, we need at most to recruit something like one out of every five young men, or one of every ten men and women. I say "at most" because I believe that a superior policy of manning our armed forces would place less emphasis on obtaining people averaging 18.569 years of age. Together with retaining people over longer periods, such a reform would reduce substantially the number of people that would have to be recruited each year.

Be that as it may, for purposes of argument let us take the numbers that are now cited : at most we have to recruit one out of four or five males, or one out of ten young people. Under those circumstances, universal military service is simply not a feasible proposition. It would be necessary to train 2 million young men a year and 1.5 million of those would be irrelevant. Nobody really proposes that we require 2 million men a year to undergo military service in order to be able to get 300,000 or 400,000 men a year.

Universal national service is a wholly different thing. Universal national service is not universal military service. It is a system under which every young man or every young man and every young woman, depending on how it is done, is required to put in a year or two of so-called compulsory service in forms designated by somebody-or-other.

I'm going to come back to that in a moment, but I may say that Congressman McCloskey's own particular scheme is a rather backhanded way of reintroducing a lottery draft. It's not really universal national service. It's mislabeled and misrepresented, as he puts it forth. He talks about people volunteering. That's Orwellian language. Voluntary under his scheme is compulsory. In a speech he gave at the Commonwealth Club on August 12, 1979 and I was glad to see he did not repeat that part of his speech in his comments today he said, "We are now paying approximately 58 percent of our defense budget for manpower as against only 23 percent by the Soviets. We clearly cannot afford to spend more than the present 58 percent for manpower costs. If the volunteers are not of adequate quality and quantity, we do not have the option of paying more to get good-quality people and adequate numbers of them. Assume that the reason Congressman McCloskey did not repeat that is because he now realizes that those numbers are utterly irrelevant to the issue of the All-Volunteer Force. Of our current manpower costs, roughly 90 percent is going for people who would not be affected by the issue of whether you had an all-volunteer force or a draft. The All-Volunteer Force issue is concerned with first-term enlisted people. In 1978, the latest year for which I have figures, out of \$60 billion total military payroll costs, only \$5 billion was going to pay people in the first two years of service, and another \$5 billion to pay people in the second two years of service. So the total expenditure figure for



manpower costs he quoted has no relationship whatsoever to the issue of All-Volunteer Force. If Congress had not exempted itself from its truth-in-advertising legislation, we would have a case to bring before the Federal Trade Commission for misleading advertising.

In any event, the cost argument is also irrelevant for a different reason. The proposal he makes would cost a good deal more, not a good deal less, than the present volunteer system. What he proposes is to cut in half the pay of the lowest-paid people in the armed forces. Those are the people who are now being attracted into first-term enlistments. That would save only about \$2 billion. But he also has to handle all of those people who volunteer for national service. To administer them, he has to set up a mechanism and a bureaucracy to handle them, and he has to pay them. Estimates of these additional costs of his proposal vary from something like \$2 billion to \$40 billion, depending on what fraction of young people volunteer for national service options. So his program would cost more, not less, than our present program.

I must say that I was amused by the conclusion that Congressman McCloskey reached in his talk I mentioned, and I would be interested to know whether he still regards that as his proposal. He said, and I quote, "I urge reinstatement," note, reinstatement, "of the principle that all young men, people, at age 18 be asked to volunteer for the service of their country in a capacity of their choice, granting special benefits to those who choose to volunteer for the most arduous type of service." But that is a precise description of our present All-Volunteer Force.

What is our All-Volunteer Force? Perhaps they don't do a very good job of making it known, but the military does advertise that all young people, at age 18, are asked to volunteer for the service of their country in the capacity of their choice. Moreover, the military recruiting people give special bonuses for volunteering for the most needed branches of service. So what Congressman McCloskey was summarizing was a need for the program we now have.

If we go beyond his proposal and consider national service in general, I submit to you that it solves no problems that we now have with the All-Volunteer Force and creates vast new problems. If we're talking about a comprehensive universal national service if it's something more than a back-door approach to a lottery draft we'd have to handle 4 million people a year, men and women. If we suppose a two-year tour of duty, that means 8 million people to administer. Who allocates them to jobs? Who decides what they do? Who determines their training? What power to put in the hands of people who would seek it !

Note also that none of what those people would do would be useful work: it would all be make-work. If you tried to have them do useful work, the trade unions of this country would be down on you like a ton of bricks. It would be work which some people believe other people ought to be paying for, because the whole purpose would be to enable a group of administrators to direct young people into activities that young people did not want to engage in. If they wanted to engage in it now, we would already have a system of universal national service. Right now every young man in the country, and every young women in the country, has an opportunity to volunteer for a whole variety of tasks, paid and unpaid, and that is equivalent to a system of universal national service. But, unlike Congressman McCloskey's proposal, it is a truly voluntary system of universal national service, not a compulsory system.

I must say that we don't learn very much from history, and I really cannot do better than to quote Senator Robert Taft, who, in discussing the issue of the draft before World War II, said, The principle of a compulsory draft is basically wrong. If we must use compulsion to get an army, why not use compulsion to get men for other essential tasks? Why not draft labor for essential occupations at wages lower than the standard? In short, the logic requires a complete regimentation of most labor, and the assignment of jobs to every man. This is actually done in the communist and fascist state, which we are now apparently seeking to emulate.

In light of that comment it is interesting to consider who has favored and who has opposed the idea of using compulsion to man our military. With respect to the draft in the United States, the situation is quite clear: in the main, conservatives have been opposed to conscription, whereas liberals have supported it. The wartime draft was barely passed. In 1946, Robert Taft, all by himself, prevented President Truman from using the draft to return striking railroad workers to their jobs. Barry Goldwater in 1964 came out in opposition to the draft. President Richard Nixon and his Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, were the main movers in ending the draft in 1973. The one exception is that of Adlai Stevenson, who in 1956, under the urging of John Kenneth Galbraith with respect to the only issue on which he and I agree, came out in opposition to the draft.

In the congressional debates on the All-Volunteer Force, one of its main opponents was Teddy Kennedy. If you look at the overall record, you will see that those people who have opposed the voluntary force have generally consisted of two very different types : one group, the strong military types under the influence of some of the professional military, and the other what we now call, in our debased language, liberals.

If you look at the record in the United States, the first extensive treatment of universal national service was by Edward Bellamy in 1888, in his book Looking Backward, which is a socialist Utopian novel. Ever since, universal national service has been supported primarily by modern liberals, by people who believe in a collective society. It has tended to be opposed by people like myself who believe in a free society, who believe that individuals should separately be free to choose their activities in accordance with their values, and that if some of us want to hire others of them to do certain jobs for us, we have to pay them what it takes to get them to do it for us and not impose it on them by force directly or indirectly.

My general conclusion is that universal national service would be a monstrosity. If adopted, it would undermine the basic foundations of this free society, and it is something that we should avoid like a plague.

I do not believe that Congressman McCloskey, if he really looked seriously at the consequences of what he proposes and what would develop out of his proposals, would like what he found. This is an experience that has happened over and over again. The proponents of plans like this almost invariably turn out to be the people who later are the very ones who least like the Frankenstein they have created. I believe that Congressman McCloskey would find himself one of that group.

## **REBUTTAL**

Pete McCloskey

PETE MCCLOSKEY: When I was first training here at Stanford to be a lawyer, and later in my first years of law practice, some very great legal scholars and lawyers told me: If you've got a good case, argue the facts. If you've got a bad case, hold up the opposition to ridicule. The first point of my debate, you will note, Mr. Friedman has not addressed at all. He has devoted the whole 20 minutes of his opening statement to the Frankensteinian problems that a national youth service might present if in time of peace we required compulsory service in a free society. He points out, very properly, that we once passed a draft law in 1940 and then renewed it in 1941 by a single vote. But we did that only four months before Pearl Harbor, and as a result of the fact that we had had a peacetime draft, that we had had compulsory military training in time of peace, probably several hundred thousand young Americans weren't killed who might otherwise have been killed in World War II.

He quotes Mr. Taft's position, but that position was then, as it is now, in the minority. I think the other view which George Washington expressed after we had won the Revolutionary War but were in danger of being taken back by the British because under the Articles of Confederation our original 13 colonies didn't have the power to raise an army, and which called for acceptance of the principle that in order to hold off foreign aggression every young person of 18 sharing the privileges of this country should cheerfully serve in the military is more viable.

Mr. Friedman has an axe to grind here. He has properly pointed out the deficiencies of Congress, but let me recall for you that he was a member of the Gates Commission that recommended the All-Volunteer Army, and that the All-Volunteer Army was a mechanism proposed and supported strongly by President Nixon as a means of quieting public concern over Mr. Nixon's conduct of the Vietnam War. The campuses of this country, if you will recall, were in an uproar between 1967 and 1972, and it was very helpful to Mr. Nixon's policy to continue the bombing in Vietnam while also quieting down young peoples' concern over being drafted.

I also ask you to weigh the validity of the Defense Department's arguments today that the All-Volunteer Army is working against the recollection that it was this same Defense Department that argued then that we needed to be in Vietnam that "with one more division" we would win in Vietnam and was the author of a long line of pronouncements that no one could believe because the Executive branch of government, like Congress, tends to exaggerate its successes and not admit its failures.

The key question in whether we go back to a draft or not is not the question of national service versus a draft for the reserves. The key question is whether or not the All-Volunteer Army is working. And I submit to you that when, in his opening argument, a gentleman takes 20 minutes and doesn't even address whether the All-Volunteer Army is working, it is an attempt to divert attention from the weakness of the argument he would have to make to defend it.

Because clearly the All-Volunteer Army is not Working. If no reasonable young people on the San Francisco Peninsula will volunteer, can you say that it's working? Can we afford an army

made up of more than half by minorities in this country? Should we have an army made up only of those who can't get into school or get a job? These are the real issues that face debate in Congress. It's fine to hold the problems and the costs of the alternatives up to ridicule, but the responsibility of the country and its elected representatives is to provide for the common defense, and the questions are: Do we need a quality army? Should it be an army made up of reluctant citizen soldiers? Or should it be made up only of those who are so poor and so ignorant that they can be conned by a recruiting sergeant into enlisting?

Mr. Friedman also doesn't address the recent recruiting scandals. Perhaps you're aware that in Tennessee and Texas, Oklahoma and North Carolina the great bastions of volunteerism where young people have traditionally come forward to volunteer, we're practically indicting most of our recruiting sergeants for misleading the people that they ask to enlist or for faking the test scores, because you're not supposed to get into the Army unless you can read at a ninth-grade level, and the pool they have to draw from simply can't do that. What does that indicate about 443 of those 450 soldiers who were tested? It means that somebody lowered the recruiting standards or faked the results in order to draw people into the Army.

The real question is whether the All-Volunteer Army is working or not.

Because I was one of those who opposed Mr. Nixon on the Vietnam War, the Executive branch of government invites me every year to address the War College, which is made up of colonels and lieutenant colonels who have been selected as possible candidates for our Joint Chiefs of Staff. For the last five years in private sessions I have asked those gentlemen (and sometimes a woman is admitted) : Is the All-Volunteer Army working? The answer has invariably been nearly unanimous: one or two vote yes and 200 or so vote no. The consensus is that the All-Volunteer Army is not working and cannot work

Perhaps you saw the interview last fall on KQED television of four 19-year-old PFCs down at Fort Ord two white PFCs, one black, and one Puerto Rican. They were asked : Do you think we can make this army work? Do you think we can have a quality army that can fulfill its mission without going back to the draft? All four of those young men said they felt we would have to go back to the draft.

Based on the quality of recruits, the conclusion invariably reached by colonels, by captains back from Germany, by officers and enlisted men alike is that we need to go back to the draft, that we haven't got the quality soldier we must have to meet our needs. You may say, "Well, then, why isn't the Army saying so?" Because, presumably, it's the same situation we had in Vietnam: the professionals said we were winning and young people said we were not. Who do you believe when the Secretary of the Army says that the All-Volunteer Force is working and his own people in the lower ranks say that it is not? I submit to you that you will get the truth about the quality of an army far more reliably and quickly from the officers and enlisted men than from the generals and the civilians in the Pentagon Mr. Friedman is quoting.

Let me now read to you from a letter a lady wrote me after this debate began last year.

Dear Representative McCloskey: The Akron Beacon Journal published your feelings on the future of the draft, and I felt compelled to write to you because, although I am against the draft, I

know that it is probably the only solution for the armed services. My husband is a staff sergeant in the U.S. Army, with 14 years of service. I have seen the Army up close in the 11 years that we have been married. Everything that you have mentioned as being wrong with the All-Volunteer Army is in fact true. Today's Army is made up of minority groups, of people who don't want to work but want to draw a paycheck, of unemployables, of misfits, of social outcasts. Nobody who can get a job as a civilian goes into the low-paid Army.

I ask you in this room, isn't that our experience? If anybody can get a decent job, does he go into the Army today? I continue with the letter:

We returned from a tour of duty in Germany a year ago, and what I saw there scared me a lot. On any given day of any given week, we would not have put 50 percent of our troops into combat. My husband is an old Army and Vietnam veteran. He likes the Army the way it used to be. He doesn't understand today's Army. We have seen a lot of 10- and 12-year men get out because they wouldn't have their families around the situations that exist on bases today. I can confirm your belief that the military is greatly out of shape and would be slaughtered, just like the divisions sent against North Korea at the beginning of that war. It scares the life out of me that my husband would have to lead and depend on the men in his company. They would be worthless.

Now, whom do you believe about the quality of today's Army? Do you believe the academics on the college campuses? Do you believe the general in the Pentagon? Do you believe the servants of the White House, all of whom have something at stake in saying that the All-Volunteer Army is working? Do you believe the well-intentioned men who back in 1972, faced with the Vietnam War and the need to maintain a public opinion which would support that war, chose the All-Volunteer Army as a means to quiet public opinion so that they could continue the war?

I submit to you that the issue in doubt here is whether the All-Volunteer Army is working, and that no one should make the argument that we should continue the All-Volunteer Army without being able to defend the quality, and the quantity of those troops. Mr. Friedman's omission of this issue, his deliberate decision not to do that, in my judgment makes his argument worthless.

I probably won't have time to respond to Mr. Friedman's rebuttal, but I will point out to you that he has denied me the opportunity to rebut the one single argument that would justify the position he takes that the All-Volunteer Army is working. If it is not working, it's the duty of Congress to proceed in a fair way to meet the problems this country faces.

I stress again that it isn't that we want a larger army. It's that we want a quality army. It's not that we don't want minorities in the army. It's that we want all citizens, from every walk of life, to share the most onerous duty of citizenship. I think we all have a duty to serve our country, and it's not a duty that we should ask only our poor and our minority to bear. It's a duty that ought to be shared by Stanford students and MIT students. The Army ought to be a cross section of the best in America, not the worst. We're going to need that kind of military service in the next 20 years, not a huge force to fight aggressive wars, but a force that is small, tight, competent, and that we know is capable of going into combat on 24-hour notice. We don't have that today, and we must do whatever is required to get it.

## REBUTTAL

Milton Friedman

MILTON FRIEDMAN: If I can exercise unusual restraint, I'll be glad to give Congressman McCloskey two minutes of my time to answer his question. The question of whether the All-Volunteer Force is working is a meaningless question. We must ask, compared to what? The burden is on him to demonstrate that some alternatives he has to propose will do better and will correct the difficulties he sees with the All-Volunteer Force as well as or better than proposed changes in the method of recruiting the All-Volunteer Force.

Is the All-Volunteer Force working? If I compare it with the draft, most certainly it is. Personally, I do have an axe to grind. He is absolutely right. I have been opposed to the draft for at least 30 years, well predating the Vietnam War. If Congressman McCloskey would like some textual reference, I'd be glad to give him some from that fount of all wisdom, my book *Capitalism and Freedom*.

So, of course, I do have an axe to grind. But, as he himself pointed out, the effect of a draft was disastrous when we had the draft in practice. It was because of the draft that we had the uproar on the campuses. I believe that the Vietnam War would never have taken the form it did if we had not had a draft at the time, but I'm not going to go into that. I want to go back directly to his question: Is the All-Volunteer Force working? I ask, with respect to what? There is no doubt that the officer Corps has always been a voluntary corps; there are no shortages in its recruitment. It's fascinating to me that when people talk about whether the armed forces are working they tend to leave out 50 or 60 percent of the armed force namely, the career force and officer corps.

If we come down to enlisted men, what are the facts? The facts are that there are defects in quality and quantity, yet all four services of the military have been able to come within a few percent of achieving and maintaining their stated force objectives.

Congressman McCloskey unfortunately was not able to attend our sessions yesterday and this morning, or he would have known that everyone here is up to the neck with figures on both sides of the question of whether the All-Volunteer Force is working. But the principal facts are that we have been able to achieve our quantitative objectives; that on the qualitative side, the average scores for the four forces put together compare very favorably indeed with the average scores under the draft; and that, though there is a real problem in the case of the Army, a large part of that problem arises out of the unwillingness of Congress to implement the pay scales that were recommended by the Gates Commission. The pay now of the lowest-paid units in the force the first-termers is about 10 percent less than the minimum wage. And I use the minimum wage only as a benchmark. I'm not in favor of the minimum wage. In fact, one of the ways to get more people for the All-Volunteer Force would be to raise the minimum wage, because that would render more people unemployed and would drive them into the armed forces. The facts are that the Gates Commission did recommend a pay scale, and Congress has not been willing to make that pay scale effective. Initially the pay of first terms was raised substantially, and you did get recruitment. Now the pay has been allowed to erode relative to pay scales of

blue-collar workers in general.

I do not believe one ought to put on the military all of the sins of the whole society. Congressman McCloskey referred to the use of comic books to train the military. I was shocked a while back to get a comic book on economics that was being used in colleges in the United States. Unfortunately, our educational system has been failing in the civilian world as well, as and there's a good deal to be said for putting emphasis on that.

Regarding the problem of attracting college youth into the military, Congress, in its wisdom, has for some time been bringing college youth to stay out of the military-providing, as Charlie Moskos pointed out, something like \$4.5 billion a year in grants for higher education to induce people to go to college instead of into the military. Again, you ought to be consistent and put the two together. One of the best ways to improve the quality of people in the All-Volunteer Force would be to do as Charlie suggests: make any receipt of higher educational benefits contingent upon serving in the armed forces. So the point is that the armed forces have problems, of course. But all of those problems are soluble far short of the radical kind of proposal Congressman McCloskey proposes, by regular means. I wonder, if you went around and asked Stanford students whether they would volunteer to drive garbage trucks at \$400 a month, or even at \$800 a month, why it should be surprising if they didn't volunteer. Is it socially desirable that they should? Are you really saying that it's desirable that the police force of every city be a replica of the civilian population? If not, why should the armed forces be a replica?

We have officers, specialized people, in the armed forces. We ought to have more horizontal recruitment-also one of the recommendations of the Gates Commission. I'm going to close with one more comment, and let Congressman McCloskey reply, by telling you a little story of an experience I had when I was on the President's Commission for an All-Volunteer Armed Force. It concerns the attitudes of the top people in the military and why they favor the draft. They've always been in favor of a draft because it's the easiest life for them. They press a button and say to the Selective Service, send over another hundred-thousand people. It doesn't cost them anything. There they are.

During the Gates Commission we were interviewing the various Chiefs of Staffs, and, as it happened, General Westmoreland made the statement, "I do not want to command an army of mercenaries" (Congressman McCloskey referred earlier to mercenary soldiers). And I said to General Westmoreland, "Tell me, General, would you rather command an army of slaves?" He sat back in his chair and said, "Well, General, I don't like to hear our patriotic draftees referred to as slaves." I said, "Well, General, I don't like to hear our patriotic volunteers referred to as mercenaries." I then went on to say, ""You know, after all, General, I'm a mercenary professor and you've a mercenary general. And both of us are being treated by mercenary Physicians." There's nothing wrong with mercenaries: they're simply professionals. It's just one of those antics with semantics. But it would be very easy if I were a top military person to be attracted to a draft because it's a system under which we can use force to compel people to serve rather than having to make service something that young men want to engage in.

So in answer to your fundamental question, the All-Volunteer Force is on the whole working-imperfectly, not as well as it could or should perhaps, and certainly not as well as it can be made

to if we improve the operation of the All-Volunteer Force itself.

Now your obligation is to tell us how the particular difficulties of the All-Volunteer Force today would be cured by a specific alternatives that you have to propose, and, in particular, by a return to compulsion.

## **CROSS-REBUTAL**

Pete McCloskey

PETE McCLOSKEY: Let me point out that the very problem that you recognized in your Newsweek article, which I mentioned in my opening statement, you have chosen not to reply to. You say that, quantitatively, we have met our goal. But you concede that we are 600,000 men short in the reserves. When we set the 2.1-million-man goal for the armed force, it was based on a total force concept: that it would be backed up roughly by 1.3 million ready reserves ready to flesh out our combat divisions if we went into combat. You, and the Secretary of the Army, dismiss as almost irrelevant the fact that 600,000 of those reserves aren't there. And I think you'd concede that of the other 700,000, there aren't more than 100,000-some of the units of the Air National Guard-that are combat-ready.

As a matter of fact, those Army generals that you defend so strongly are saying that if we went to war in Iran tomorrow, we'd have to call up Vietnam veterans because of the lack of reservists. Can you image the kind of rebellion there would be in this country if, because we were unwilling to ask people who haven't served in combat to serve, we called up Vietnam combat veterans? I can think of no greater admission of the All-Volunteer Army's failure than the statement that in 1979, because our reserves don't exist, we would have to call up Vietnam veterans in order to fight another war. I don't think those people would fight. I think they would justifiably decline to be called up.

You have also not addressed, in either of your sessions, this serious question about the reserves. Most battles in history, and most wars, have been lost because of the lack of a proper reserve. It was generally the side which could throw a reserve into action that ultimately prevailed. Our lack of a sufficient, qualified reserve is no minor administrative failure. Every advocate of the All-Volunteer Army can see that the reserve is simply not there today.

You say that my plan is compulsory. It is true, under the plan, that if a person does not volunteer for two years of service for the reserve, or for a year of civilian service, he would go into a pool subject to being drafted. But at least he would have had the opportunity to avoid that.

The point of Professor Moskos's you made, that by paying \$4.5 billion in college benefits we are paying people not to go into the Army, I think is a good one. I think it would be perfectly appropriate to cut out all educational benefits and give them solely to those young people who volunteer for the two years in the combat infantry units I propose. In one poll of, I think, 100 high school students in this area, 98 were opposed to the draft. But when it was asked, "All right, what if you have these four choices: two years in the military, one year in the reserve, one year of civilian duty, or the uncertainty of six years susceptibility via the draft?," half of the young



men said that, under those circumstances they would enlist in order to get the four years of college benefits. I think it's very possible that under this national service program you would get 400,000 enlistees and volunteers and would never have to move to a draftlike compulsion, and that, if you did, it would be to draft a fairly small number out of a fairly large pool.

Under those circumstances you'd also have a high-morale army. My concern is that without the concept that everyone should be obligated to share this obligation or this choice, we have the problem of a low-morale army. I feel that without the reestablishment of a concept of duty this country is in trouble.

And that's what I'm talking about: the reinstatement of the attitude that we all have a duty to our country. That is basically the underlying disagreement between Professor Friedman and myself. He feels that we've got to economically reward people to get a quality army, no matter what it costs, because that's the only alternative, whereas I feel that the duty to serve and the need to spread this burden fairly is something we ought to preserve in the history and the ethic of this country. That's essentially what he calls a monstrosity. It isn't the administrative burden of it; it's the fact that it's compulsion during time of peace. But it seems to me that the history of this country shows that, whether it was the militia on the frontiers or the draft before World War II, only when we restored a common sense of duty did we make it a matter of pride to serve in the service.

I think the concept of duty to one's country is an honorable concept. I don't make any apology to someone who has taken one or two years out of his life to serve his country. Frankly, I spent 18 months in the Navy as an enlisted man, 21 months in the Marine Corps as an officer, and a number of years in the reserve. I think that, when you look at that kind of military education, 18 months or two years is as valuable to anybody's future, in terms of training and perception of the rest of the world and the rest of humanity, as any two years of the college any of us went through. Of course, it's one thing to serve in a war in which you fight the wrong people in the wrong place for an ignoble cause and another to serve your country to discourage our ever having to fight again in a major war.

## **DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

ALBERT REES: I'm now going to open up the floor for discussion.

DAVID HENDERSON: David Henderson, Cato Institute.

I have a question for Congressman McCloskey. Actually I have about nine of them, so I'm going to have to choose one.

How do you choose which information source to believe? You've told us that most of the people who are volunteers in the present military are dumb. You've told us that we can't trust the generals or the Department of Defense. And yet you're basing your case that the All-Volunteer Force is not working, in large part, though not completely, on numbers generated by that same Department of Defense or through interviewers with four of these dumb first-class privates.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: Is your question: Whom do I believe?

DAVID HENDERSON: How do you decide whom to believe? You seem to be very selective about whom you believe: you believe those who support your case and not those who go against it.

PETE McCLOSKEY: What I said was that, given the choice between elected officials, the Secretary of the Army, and his generals on the one hand, the PFCs, the second lieutenants, and the captains on the other, I would always believe the lower-ranking people. They have nothing to lose by stating the truth.

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: I have a question that probably is going to take about two minutes, and I want to put it out so that I'm not stopped in the middle of this great bout of democracy and debate. Because my question is not to the podium, it is to the audience, especially the young students in the audience. I want to pose a question for us to think about, and I encourage you then to bombard the chair.

First a statement. This "little" army that we're talking about is basically an army of 2 million people today. We've heard that there aren't enough people in the reserves, though we're talking about some 700,000 people in the reserves-almost another million people. That's almost 3 million people in the army. What kind of battle is an army like that going to fight? Why do we even need such an army? What kind of a war is it going to fight but a world war?

So my point is that, in this great democracy, we've got to question what this army's going to be used for. Do we have any interest in the wars that are going to be fought, because I don't think we're going to get it from the top. Congressman McCloskey, for instance, tells us that we've got to protect American economic interests in Iran. But do we? I'm proposing that we should ask this question. I would ask Congressman McCloskey whether it is really in our economic interested to protect the Shah? Why should we fight in Iran right now?

For that matter, Milton Friedman is another person we're not going to get an answer from. He talks about fighting for democracy - a person who went into Chile and advised Pinochet.

ALBERT REES: You may ask a question, but not make a speech which is not relevant to the subject of this debate. This is a debate on a very well-defined topic - whether or not we should have an All-Volunteer Force. If you want to ask a question that's relevant to that topic, please ask it. [Applause.]

AUDIENCE: The question for the people in America is: Do we have an interest in even going into the army? We don't want to talk about how we're going into the army, but why we should. Why should we fight in Iran? Do we own oil wells in Iran?

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: I have two questions. Question One: Is Professor Friedman aware of the fact that many democratic societies such as Switzerland, Holland, Israel, and Sweden have the draft without incurring any deficits in their democratic integrity?

My second question is in relation to his point that we need to ask whether the All-Volunteer Force is good. Good in relation to what? Is he aware of the fact that if war comes we'll have to

fight the Soviet Union, which has a mass-draft army, with all the advantages that go with that?

MILTON FRIEDMAN: Let me go to the first question.

Somehow or other I'm afraid you mustn't have been here when I was speaking, because I started out my comments by pointing out the difference between the situation in a country like Switzerland, Holland, or Israel and in a country like the United States. I said that I had no objection, in principle, to universal military service if that was what was required to defend our country. The situation in Israel, in which every citizen is asked to serve in the armed forces, is wholly different from the situation in the United States. For the United States, the question is: How do we get one out of five or one out of ten young people to serve in the armed forces? I do not believe that universal military service in a small nation like Israel is in any way antithetical to democracy or freedom. But I believe that using compulsory means to man the armed forces when only one out of every five or ten has to serve is very seriously antithetical to human freedom and democracy.

On your second point, of course, I'm aware that the Soviet Union is a major potential foe. But that does not mean to me that we can most effectively protect our system against the Soviet Union by adopting the method which the Soviet Union has adopted. Compulsion is universal in the Soviet Union, for civilians as well as military persons. In our society, voluntary cooperation is a fundamental, basic principle.

I might point out that, with respect to your first question, Congressman McCloskey cited George Washington. I agree with George Washington's initial statement. He was talking about universal military service at a time when the population of the United States was so small that we were in the position that Israel is in now. That's a very different circumstance from the situation we're in now.

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: This is for Congressman McCloskey.

Why do you include women in your national service bill? And do you foresee roles for women in combat?

PETE McCLOSKEY: On the first question. I would like to see the Equal Rights Amendment adopted. If women have equal rights, I feel that they ought to have equal obligation. As a matter of fact, in many of the jobs in the service today women are serving as well as or better than men. We are getting a better quality of education in, women volunteering than we are from the men.

To your second question: for reasons, I suppose, of my own background and chauvinistic attitude, I would prefer that women not serve in front-line combat units. This has also been the Israeli experience. They tried for a while, but felt that they didn't want to have women in the front-line combat units. If we fight a major war, certainly women, in any civilian capacity, are going to be injured as much as in the front-line units. In fact, the casualties in any European war involving nuclear exchange might very well involve casualties to rear echelon units that are as high as those in the infantry, into the front-line units. But I would prefer not to have women put

into the combat infantry, into the front-line forces. As I say, that's a preference.

If you take the constitutional argument that women have equal rights given that you get them- you can scarcely argue that they should not have equal obligation. I would prefer that that amendment pass, and, if it does, it will impose equal obligation.

SCOTT OLMSTED: Scott Olmsted, Stanford Libertarians.

As a libertarian, I believe that every individual owns his own person, his own body, and has the right to exercise sole dominion over it so long as he respects the equal rights of others to do the same.

I'd like to ask Professor Friedman if he agrees with this moral constraint (the moral principle of self-ownership). And I'd like to ask Congressman McCloskey what moral, not legal or constitutional, principle he holds that is different from this one that allows some persons to force an occupation on other persons and does not allow them control over their own bodies.

MILTON FRIEDMAN: I have a little difficulty replying to this, because obviously I regard myself as a libertarian. But I believe that "libertarian" covers a multitude of sins. I do believe that people own themselves. But I believe there are difficult problems of interrelations among people, and that to state the moral principle that people own themselves is not an immediate formula for giving practical answers to practical questions about how you resolve some difficulties.

For example, consider the case of a country like Israel. Does a libertarian who believes people own themselves also believe that it is inappropriate in a society like Israel for people to follow a policy of requiring everybody who lives in Israel to serve in the military? You and I would say, as libertarians, that if we had a large number of small countries like that, some of which did require military service and some of which did not, and if people were free to move among them or to choose among them, then there would be nothing wrong in any individual entering into an agreement with the community in which he lives that he will go along with adopting that rule. But, unfortunately, these are hard problems. There aren't a large number of small countries with these differences. And thus, while my moral principles, I think, are identical with those you express, they don't provide me with an immediate answer to many of these very difficult questions. Interrelations among people present strictly individualistic decisions.

As you know from what I've written, I believe that the argument of externalities is a cloak for covering up many government interventions that you cannot really justify on those grounds. But that doesn't mean there aren't some real cases of that kind.

ALBERT REES: We have a second question on the floor from Mr. Olmsted: What moral, as opposed to legal or constitutional, principle does Congressman McCloskey hold that is different from one which allows some persons to force occupation on other persons and does not allow them control of their own bodies?

PETE MCCLOSKEY: I believe in liberty so strongly that I would agree with Patrick Henry: Give me liberty or give me death. But I would consider that the real prospect of having to live

under the yoke of a system of government which denied me liberty of speech and liberty of religion and liberty of where I Lived and where I worked, which the communist system imposes, would move me to give up the liberty of my body for one or two years when I am young. It is a liberty well worth giving up in order to preserve those greater liberties.

MILTON FRIEDMAN: But you, and others, are free to do so without imposing a plan like you propose. The difficulty with this issue is that these are hard questions. I don't mean to say that they're easy. But you talk as if what you've just said is an argument for either a draft or universal military service. It is not. It is only an appeal to your fellow citizens that they should accept certain jobs at lower pay than they otherwise would accept.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: But since that appeal plainly isn't working, and no reasonable young people will volunteer, we then have to devise

MILTON FRIEDMAN: But (a) it is working, and (b), if you think it isn't, the alternative along your lines is for you to go on the stump as a recruiter for the military.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: Let me be very honest and put this question to you. As I say, I've spent much of my life in the military, but I know of no one at age 18 today who is going to volunteer, and certainly if I were 18, and if you were 18, we wouldn't volunteer to spend two years in the desert or in the jungles or climbing mountains-cold, wet, and miserable, or tired, hot, and hungry. What reasonable person is going to volunteer for that?

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: Why did you do it?

PETE MCCLOSKEY: Because at the time, 1945, when the choice existed for me there was a war on, and the concept was prevalent that every young person who was healthy had a duty to his country. Also, if he didn't volunteer, there was a draft behind him and he was going to get drafted. [Laughter.] No one would question that many of the alleged patriotic volunteers who left Stanford to go into the Air Force, the Navy, or Marine Corps didn't do so, in part, because the draft was in the background.

That is precisely the program I propose - a draft in the background - so that if there are insufficient volunteers, we will have the means to defend this nation.

MILTON FRIEDMAN: Let me just say one thing. The fact is that people are volunteering for the kind of jobs you're talking about at pay scales today that are lower than those recommended by the Gates Commission. The fact is that for a couple of years immediately after the institution of the pay scales recommended by the Gates Commission we did not have any shortages.

Economics is a serious subject, and one of the things we've learned in that subject is that if you want to know how people behave you don't ask them. You look. The doctrine of revealed preference in economics is a fundamental doctrine, and it is no good going around and asking. If you ask people foolish questions, there's only one kind of answer you're going to get.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: But, may I ask this, because I think it focuses on the point of debate, Mr. Friedman. Have you asked about the quality of these young men? In your debate you said we're getting the quantity, and we might be. But a third of these young men are leaving during their first enlistment. Have you made any personal inquiry to find out if the quality of the army is what you would like it to be?

MILTON FRIEDMAN: The quality of the Army is not what I would like it to be. I would like it to be a much higher quality army.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: Then it's not working, is it?

MILTON FRIEDMAN: That isn't the question. In politics, you don't beat a candidate without a candidate, and it's the same thing here. We have to ask, "not working relative to what?" I would say that if the quality is not as much as you and I would like, the way to improve it is to make the incentives better-to offer more-and those incentives don't have to be monetary. They can be nonmonetary. People could be offered greater opportunities within the service to choose their activities, to go where they want, and so on. Contrary to what you might think, I'm told by people in the military that it's precisely the dangerous and dirty jobs that are the easiest to fill.

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: My question is for Congressman McCloskey.

A great many of our ancestors fled Europe to avoid the draft. Do you think they had a duty to serve?

PETE MCCLOSKEY: Those ancestors who fled the wars of Europe were fleeing nations that made war through the whim of rulers that fought for glory, that fought for territory, that fought for a lot of different things that do not relate to our need for the military today. I quite agree. Our ancestors fled circumstances in their countries that were repressive, that were repugnant, that led the common man to be buried in wars fought by kings.

Once you concede that we need an army, it ought to be a quality army.

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: A great many of them fled specifically to avoid the draft.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: I accept that. But that isn't the case today, is it?

MILTON FRIEDMAN: No, but let me ask you a different question along the same lines, because I think the question of foreign policy is relevant. I don't think they're independent. I think we will have a better foreign policy, in which the public at large will play a better role, if we have a volunteer force than if we have a draft.

I don't think there's anything wrong with people not being willing to volunteer for conflicts they don't believe in and which they think are wrong. [Applause.]

PETE MCCLOSKEY: I completely agree with you.

MILTON FRIEDMAN: But having a draft means that they are forced to serve in conflicts regardless of their attitude.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: Right.

MILTON FRIEDMAN: Personally, I am not even in favor of a draft in time of major war. [Applause.] If you have a conflict like World War II, which had widespread public backing throughout the society, I do not believe there will be any shortage of young people willing to volunteer out of a sense of patriotism to defend this country. That's a major reason why I'm in favor of a volunteer force.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: Yes, but the problem is that the next war is going to burst upon us like Korea. It isn't going to be like World War II or Vietnam. I think that when you mentioned the Vietnamese experience, you really made that point. Congress didn't declare war for Vietnam. We never had the American people solidly behind a constitutional declaration of war. And we only went halfway with the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. We authorized a president to undertake acts of aggression, and then slid into conflict over a period of some three years.

I also think that the draft is a mechanism by which young people can express their opposition to an unjust and improper war, and that this carries over into this argument. It's one thing to say nobody wants to be drafted to fight an unjust war. It's another thing to say nobody wants to be drafted to make sure that we don't have to fight a war. As I see it, that is the purpose of the draft today. The danger is that we will be led into a war because we are weak, or perceived as weak—not because we're overly aggressive the way we were in the sixties.

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: My question, Congressman McCloskey, is whether you think our ancestors who fled Europe had the same kind of moral obligation to serve their country as you did in 1945? I wanted to see if you could carry that to the European situation.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: The European situation then compares with the recent situation in Vietnam. In the European case, however, wars were fought every year for centuries using the common man as fodder. Such wars were properly resisted.

I agree that a war in this country should be fought only if the American people, by majority vote of their representatives in Congress, declare war. My proposal is to cover our manpower requirements in the case we have a sudden case of that. This is an entirely different situation from the European situation you used as your precept.

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: I have a very short question on the same, or a similar, point.

Congressman McCloskey, do you not think that the best way to spread and protect the principles of freedom is actually to practice them at home and not just to preach them?

PETE MCCLOSKEY: I quite agree with that. But protecting freedom does require the maintenance of some kind of army. There is no lack of people around the world who would take our freedom from us if we didn't have an army.

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: If we reinstitute the draft and adopt the same totalitarian principles as the socialist and communist states, there's nothing to defend here anyway.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: If you look at the peace-loving European countries like Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and the Netherlands, you'll find that they all have compulsory service. It does not necessarily follow that a nation becomes warlike merely because it stands prepared to fight.

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: I'm one of the libertarians who do believe that involuntary servitude of any kind is bad.

Congressman McCloskey, you've brought up the race issue repeatedly and said, "No reasonable young man will volunteer for the Army today" and "The Army must be a cross section of the best in our society, not the worst." You made these statements in interesting proximity to other statements about statistics on the high proportion of black people in the military.

It's not at all certain that conscription will lead to a different racial mix than we have. I wish you had been here throughout the conference, because this is a point which a lot of interesting people addressed. If you a priori believe that a particular mixture is appropriate or desirable, you have to take certain measures in order to attain that mixture.

I'll now outline some appropriate measures that would actually bring about a different situation from what we have today, which I think is monstrous. One would be to exclude qualified black people who apply and say, "We don't want you. You're second-class citizens." Second would be to offer them a differential wage—a lower wage than white people. Then not as many black people would volunteer and more white people would volunteer. Third would be not to allow any volunteers whatsoever, but simply draft selectively on the basis of race.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: All three of those alternatives violate the Constitution.

AUDIENCE: They're also the only ways we could obtain the goal that you are proposing, and I think they're all evil and monstrous. If you don't like any of them, then you don't have any case whatsoever. I think that perhaps you should take a course in economics.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: I suppose this is a matter that economists are best suited to determine.

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: If you eliminate educational grants to get more people into the Army, then the rich boys will be in college and the poor boys will be in the Army. This is the old way, the way it was in Europe. I don't like it.[Applause.]

MILTON FRIEDMAN: The problem with what you are saying is twofold. In the first place, the facts are not what you say. Our present educational benefits are going to the wealthy. In my opinion, the governmental subsidization of higher education is a scandal because it taxes the



poor in order to provide benefits for the middle and upper classes. Those are the facts. The second problem with what you say is that, if you want to do what Congressman McCloskey wants to do, then that's what you have to do: you have to induce higher-educated, higher-status people to go into the armed forces, and the only way he has to do that is by paying them a higher wage. His proposal really amounts to giving higher military pay to people from upper-income classes than to people from lower-income classes.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: But, Mr. Friedman, don't you concede the validity of her statement? Under the All-Volunteer Army, as it is today, the rich boys are in college and the poor boys are on the front lines. That's also a fact.

MILTON FRIEDMAN: The rich boys are having to pay taxes to pay the wages of the poor, whereas under a draft, what you do is impose the cost on the poor, and the rich go scot-free and don't even have to pay to hire the poor as they do now.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: But you do concede her point, do you not?

MILTON FRIEDMAN: No. [Laughter.]

PETE MCCLOSKEY: Under your All-Volunteer Army, the rich boys are in college and the poor are in the rifle company. Isn't that true?

MILTON FRIEDMAN: Of course, that's true if we take only the enlisted forces and do not consider the officer corps. The rich boys in the military are in the officer corps.

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: Mr. Friedman, if the boys who are getting educational grants are in fact rich and do not need them, then you need more efficient people administering these things. That's right up your alley. You ought to be able to figure that out. [Laughter.]

MILTON FRIEDMAN: I have written extensively on that question and this is a wholly different question. Our present educational grant system is, in my opinion, a scandal. There is no way to correct it, in my opinion, except by much more fundamental measures than the kind of thing you're speaking of now. That's a different issue. It's not the present issue. The present issue is that, so far as the armed forces are concerned, it is the same as in every other occupation in this country: low-paid people are doing low-paid jobs; high-paid people are doing high-paid jobs. [Laughter.]

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: Mr. McCloskey, I haven't yet decided whether or not I'm for the draft, but I do have a serious problem with your proposal. You have spoken again and again about the need for having a cross section of the society in the military. At the same time though, I hear you use phrases like "the burden of the young people" and "the responsibility of the young men." Tell me, why must 18-year-old bear the burden of responsibility for the entire population of the United States? [Applause.]

PETE MCCLOSKEY: I can recall once in 1971 making an argument in Congress that we should not go to war without generals and Congress men sharing in the assault wave.

The reason that the burden falls on the young is essentially that combat, unfortunately, is best borne by the young, not old. That is an unfortunately fact of the youthful physical condition and relative lack of fear of youth and the fact that the circumstances of combat are far more easily faced by the young. I can recall walking down a road at the age of 24 as a second lieutenant, looking at a 31-year-old captain, and thinking, "Why should that old man be subjected to this?" He was too old to be undergoing the physical arduousness of what we were then facing in the Korean mountains. That's the reason for preferentially using the young. It's not a desire to put the burden on the young. It's the fact that the young have the best chance of survival. The best fighting people are young. If we went to war anywhere in the world tomorrow, I would just as soon see a few of the politicians that ordered people into combat accompany them in the assault wave.

COMMENT AND QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: My question is a little bit different. What bothers me is what the kind and size of army you're talking about will be, and has been used for. What bothers me are the Kent States, the Vietnam wars, the Korean wars, and Milton Friedman will know about this-what happened in Chile with the institution of fascism and the hands of the CIA. All these things, you know, make me question what this army is going to be used for. Our army is in a desperate shambles, that's true. But that doesn't bother me at all, because, in fact, I should be forming an army against your army.

My question is, which applications of this army are really for national defense and which for pure aggression? And who makes those determinations? Why are there U.S. troops in the Philippines? Why are there U.S. advisers in Chile? The question is: Why the hell should we join your imperialist army? And it is an imperialistic army.

MILTON FRIEDMAN: I want to answer this question. I believe you should have the freedom not to join the army. [Applause.] I don't agree at all with the implicit political judgment you have expressed, but I believe the great virtue of a free society is that it permits opportunity for people to have widely different views. I do not believe you ought to be forced under compulsion to join the armed forces. You ought to be free. But are you being consistent? Are you opposed to using force?

MARC STRASSMAN: My name is Marc Strassman, and I'm running against you for Congress, Congressman McCloskey.

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: What's your name?

PETE MCCLOSKEY:[He's] Marc Strassman, candidate for Congress.

MARC STRASSMAN: I'm running against you because I believe your position on this issue is intellectually and morally bankrupt. And that is because you're not addressing yourself to the premises of the entire constellation of the issue-which is why we even need an army and what we need it for, or, who needs the army and what they need it for. If we consider things in that

context, it won't be so easy to justify the need for a technically proficient military that can work with forward-based computer assisted weapons, which is what it has to do if its real function is to serve the economic interests of specific American-based multinational corporations in foreign countries and not to defend freedom as such. I think you should address yourself to that point.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: First of all, I welcome your running for Congress, because the most important part of our free process is full debate between people with different views.

We're working right now to get an initiative on the ballot so we can have a fair Republican presidential campaign in this state.\*

MARC STRASSMAN: I signed that.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: No matter what a view is, I think it contributes to the progress of this country, and, in part, I agree with you. I think that we should examine the purpose of the army and what the size of that army should be to accomplish those purposes. But as you point out, it is an army that is going to be asked to have great skills. And whatever the army is like, it should be made up of cool, competent people who can read. If the present army is not made up of such persons, as the evidence is beginning to indicate, we have to find a way of correcting this situation.

I'm not wedded to the idea of national youth service, but I am wedded to the principle that this country ought to have a competent army. I would much rather see an army of reluctant citizen soldiers made up of the rich as well as the poor than what we've got now. That's what we're seeking to achieve, and I'm perfectly willing to hear any suggestion for alternatives as to how we can reach that result. I think you'd concede from the evidence today that we can't reach it through the All-Volunteer Army. And we aren't going to reach it through a straight draft with college exemptions. We can't do it fairly if we're going to draft only one out of ten for this arduous duty. I think the best result is some sort of compromise that picks up Professor Moskos's suggestion that perhaps the only educational benefits tendered by the government should be to those volunteers who seek to serve the government in this arduous capacity.

But I agree with you in that I think in the next debate in this election year we ought to force the presidential candidates to address the larger contexts as well as these more specific questions.

MARC STRASSMAN: I share your view that the army needs skilled, competent operators to use the sophisticated equipment it relies on. I think that we have to address what they're going to be doing with those men and that equipment.

I'd like you to address the question of what our needs are going to be for the armed forces. Assuming that we have a force capable of rapid deployment, its purpose, as I see it, is going to be to take over oil fields. I think we have to examine why we need that oil, who's going to benefit from our having it, and whether that's what we want to do as a country. We should decide on that issue first, rather than deal with the secondary issue of the draft.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: You raise a very good point, and I think Mr. Friedman will want to address this also.

Let me just say that after 12 years of being in this funny business of politics, and particularly after following diplomatic negotiations and the posturing of national and international leaders and diplomats, I'm increasingly convinced that intergovernmental negotiations are not what's crucial to keeping peace in the world. There will always be leaders who want to go to war to satisfy themselves or some constituency, whether it be religious or economic. It looks to me that the most important building block of peace is the expansion of trade, commerce, and communications, and the export of values from one country to another. If you're going to keep up these commercial transactions, you're going to have to have airports, and ships, and you're going to have to have ownership of property. While it may be that we will be using our American Military force to protect airports or 747s full of passengers, or embassies with our people in them, that is an understandable and appropriate use of military force in order to keep the world moving towards an economic exchange of commerce and trade that builds the basis for world peace. We've got to have a police force.

MARC STRASSMAN: I might agree with you if the economic exchange were on the basis of mutual respect and not exploitation.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: I can't tell you that the rest of the nations of the world are, hopefully, resisting any tendency to exploitation. In fact, the oil crisis, the mineral crisis, and the coffee cartel are all essentially the result of nations which have been exploited starting to resist exploitation by using the principles of economics and the free market Professor Friedman so capably defends.

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: At the end of the last draft here in northern California, half of the people who were called for induction failed to show up. When resistance reached that level, it became impossible to enforce the draft. It was only possible at that point to cover up the fact that the resistance had reached that level.

I also want to point out, Congressman McCloskey, that your program is not fundamentally different in the choices it offers. We've never drafted people who volunteered for the Army.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: The resistance you speak of, though, occurred during the Vietnam War. The only way you could resist that war was to resist the draft. That's perfectly understandable to me.

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: That is true.

We had three large rallies last year here at Stanford against the draft and against your proposal. My question is: What are you going to do under your proposal with people like myself who are going to resist the draft on principle?

PETE MCCLOSKEY: Given the principles you espouse, you would have the option of civilian service. We have always given the option of alternative civilian service to those who opposed the

draft on religious grounds. Under my plan you would have that option. You could choose the year of civilian service and never come under any risk of being drafted. Also, if you were drafted, if you fell within that pool, and met conscientious objector criteria, you would be entitled to conscientious objector treatment.

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: I would refuse all of those.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: As a conscientious objector, you would oppose that also?

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: Yes.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: Then, under the rule of the Supreme Court in the Holmes case, you would be sent to jail.

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: Thank you.

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: You may have just answered one of my questions. I have a second one. Under your bill, Congressman McCloskey, would conscientious objections to the national service plan be allowed or recognized?

PETE MCCLOSKEY: Yes. You could be entitled to be a conscientious objector.

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: I'm sorry, I meant to ask whether conscientious objector status would be recognized for those who objected to the civilian plan options as well.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: The first three alternatives are all voluntary. [Laughter.] It's the fourth pool, where you don't choose any of the first three and therefore would be draftable, that the conscientious objector status would apply to.

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: I'm only talking about the civilian services, about the people who object to the compulsion involved in that because of the draft being in the background.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: The chances are that if you didn't choose one of the first three options, you probably still wouldn't be drafted under my plan. But if you were drafted and then raised the conscientious objection complaint, if you were successful you would be entitled to alternative civilian service. But the civilian service would then be compulsory for you, as it was in the sixties.

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: So there would be no conscientious objection for the civilian service options?

PETE MCCLOSKEY: No. Conscientious objection would be relevant only to the fourth default option.

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: I'm sure you've read the decision in the Holmes case, which says that in time of peace alternative service can be imposed, even on a conscientious objector, to preserve morale in the armed services. I take it that the law would be the same under your plan.

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: I have a second question: If your national service plan is passed, how would the two parts-the civilian system and the military system-utilize young couples with children where both parents are liable for service?

PETE MCCLOSKEY: We're trying to do everything we can to discourage 18-year-olds from being young couples with children.

COMMENT FROM THE AUDIENCE: There still exist a great number of people who are parents at 18, and they are parents at the time they would be liable to serve under your plan.

PETE MCCLOSKEY: I'll have to think about that one. I honestly don't know what I'd do with an 18-year-old who became a father and then claimed that he shouldn't have to serve.

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: How about an 18-year-old mother?

PETE MCCLOSKEY: I don't know that either. I'll have to think about that. I haven't thought that one out.

MILTON FRIEDMAN: No-under my plan, there wouldn't be that problem for 18-year-old women. It wouldn't be a problem because under present circumstances women would not be drafted, and there would therefore be no reason for a woman to volunteer for one of the first three options. She would be home free. So the plan is not universal in any way, shape, form, or manner.

QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE: My understanding is that under national service, women would be required to serve. I have heard from a reliable source that an attempt would be made to station young mothers near their homes. Could you comment on that?

PETE MCCLOSKEY: One of the problems we've had with women's rights is that women get pregnant. I've forgotten what percentage of the women in Germany are pregnant, but it's substantial. It's a problem we haven't begun to learn how to cope with yet.

ALBERT REES: I'm very sorry we're not going to have time to get to all the people who want to ask questions, but I don't think we should impose any more on our two distinguished speakers. They've done very well under what were sometimes extremely difficult circumstances, and I want to thank them both very, very much.

\* Editor's note: This refers to the California State initiative for proportional representation in the selection process for Republican delegates in the primaries.