of defense bases primarily employing military personnel, its loss in government manufacturing jobs in shipyards, arsenals, and armories has been severe since 1961. As shown in table 1, these job losses were proportionally about three times greater than in any other region.

Table 1.—Personnel affected by actions to close or reduce major military installations,  $1961-65^{-1}$ 

## [Census region and type of activity]

Region	Manufacturing installations				Bases and other installations			
	Number of actions	Number of per- sonnel	Number affected per 1,000 employ- ment	Rank	Number of actions	Number of per- sonnel	Number affected per 1,000 employ- ment	Rank
New England Middle Atlantic Pacific South Atlantic East North Central West South Central Mountain East South Central West North Central West North Central	3 3 1 1 0 0 0	12, 200 13, 350 4, 950 1, 000 900	3. 17 1. 08 . 68 . 12 . 07	1 2 3 4 5	3 12 16 4 7 13 9 2	6,600 26,850 26,235 14,400 10,950 31,450 13,340 17,100 15,550	1. 35 2. 18 3. 60 1. 78 . 90 6. 69 6. 35 5. 57 3. 51	8 6 4 7 9 1 2 3 5

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Information on actions is from U.S. Department of Defense news releases and a memorandum dated July 20, 1965. A major closing is one which affects 350 or more personnel. Employment figures used in the calculations are total nonagricultural employment, 1964, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

## VARYING IMPACTS

The closings affect three States of the region in varying degrees ranging from 2.6 jobs for each 1,000 nonagricultural employees in Massachusetts to 32 jobs for each 1,000 in Maine.

The severity of the impact depends in part on the type of installation to be closed. The shutting of a military base probably has the least impact. Military bases are typically quite self-sufficient with on-base housing and post-exchange facilities limiting the amount of money spent in the local community. In contrast, a government-owned manufacturing facility such as an arsenal or a Navy yard employs many civilians who live in the local area and trade at local stores. Thus, it contributes substantially more to a community's economic base than a typical military installation.

The impact of a defense base closing is also influenced by the reuse potential of the land and buildings vacated by the Department of Defense. An Air Force base requires an extensive amount of land relative to the employment it provides. In contrast, a Navy yard uses only a small land area to generate substantial employment. Consequently, the task of providing an equal amount of employment through alternative uses of Air Force facilities is not nearly as formidable as that of replacing employment in a shipyard's land and buildings.

Perhaps a major factor determining the severity of the impact of a defense installation shutdown is the size of the affected work force in relation to total manufacturing employment in the area. If the installation is located in a large metropolitan area, then the closing of even a sizable manufacturing facility will have a relatively negli-