

realize how costly young men are, to avoid letting drafted soldiers be cheap substitutes for civilian labor, to avoid letting drafted soldiers look like cheap substitutes for what machines can do, and to avoid letting a draft make all soldiers look equally cheap, so that in their allocation among tasks within the services, the better educated and better trained fail to get allocated to the jobs that they are best suited for.

In terms of cost accounting and business management and in providing incentives to get things done in the most economical way, it is worth while to have soldiers look as expensive as they really are.

Second, I very much appreciate Mr. Oi's emphasis on the question of fairness and equity in compensation. I have heard a lot of discussion among faculty and students about the unfairness of the draft, yet hardly anyone appears concerned about the unfairness of the way these young men are compensated once they have been drafted. On top of what is sometimes called the burden of service and the risks that go with it, we add a financial burden that is borne solely by the young men who get drafted, not by those who are not drafted.

Here I think we must avoid being too appalled by some of the cost estimates. If an argument for paying soldiers more is that they are being unfairly taxed as well as obliged to serve, we should not get in the position of saying we can't afford to eliminate the unfairness if it is expensive. If the tax is unfair, those of us who avoid taxing ourselves in order to get soldiers cheap, through the draft, shouldn't continue enjoying that unfairness merely on account of how much we benefit.

Turning to the draft itself, I am very much attracted to a nearly universal lottery. The two most difficult manpower problems, in converting to a nonselective form of draft, are how to make sure of an adequate supply of officers, how to make sure of an adequate supply of doctors. I am not going to try to solve those problems for you, but aside from getting officers and getting doctors, I am doubtful whether at age 19 or 20, or even 21 as Mr. Oi preferred, we have any good national or economic grounds for exempting or deferring anybody, in terms of what his educational plans and his career plans are.

At that age young men differ in terms of their talents, their interests, and so forth. But if we are talking about armed forces on the order of 3 million rather than 6 or 12 million, I doubt whether we have to worry about spoiling the economy, unbalancing the civilian manpower reserve, hurting the educational basis of our society, by having a draft that does not discriminate with respect to skills, professions, talents, or career intentions.

On the question of the age at which to put young men through the lottery, I think it possible to make this a little flexible, leaving it to the personal choice of the young man, but making it equally available to all young men. We could have a scheme that says everybody who has not been in the lottery yet goes into it at age 22, but if the 22-year-olds and those who volunteer for the lottery at earlier ages don't fill the year's quota, then the 21-year-olds go into the draft. If they don't fill it, the 20-year-olds. So there could be a sliding scale, giving every young man, within a narrow range of years, some choice about when to run the lottery risk, but making sure that if not enough