

remained in graduate school to the age of 26 were in a position often to avoid service.

Now, we have given a lot of thought to the basic question as to whether the graduate schools were being used for the purpose of dodging the draft. I think there are examples of this, although, in this respect I agree with President Harrington as I understood his statement that we felt that this was a minimal effect and that though many were able to avoid the draft, they were in graduate school for legitimate reasons and would have been there, draft or no draft.

Nevertheless, I think all of us felt that the change in the laws which reduced any incentive, however small, to use the graduate schools as an alternative to being drafted would be desirable to eliminate.

Consequently, we have recommended to the association of graduate schools back in October and the council of graduate schools, a larger group, both recommended to people in the administration and in the Congress that as a long-run objective they would like to see a random selection at an early age.

If this were made before a person entered into college or at least before he completed college, he would be in a position, if selected, to plan his own career in a way which suited his own objectives.

He might serve before going on to college, he might interrupt his college career at the end of the first 2 years or, if the provisions of the program made it possible, he might postpone this until the end of his college career, at which time he would be called upon to serve.

Having been called upon to serve and, in accordance with the administrative rules, picked the time to serve, there would be no question of his motives for being in graduate school.

I think I can say as a graduate dean that the faculty and the administrators alike would feel a good deal easier under those circumstances.

We do not like to be used, to be perfectly blunt about it. We appreciate certain factors, I think, all of us, in the rules as they were promulgated a few weeks ago; namely, they did not provide for categories of graduate students to be eligible for deferments in addition to those already provided by the legislation.

It is again something that the deans debated at great length last summer and fall and they were all agreed that it would be divisive and corruptive of the educational system if we were to get into the definition of certain categories of students who are eligible for deferments while others were not.

We recognize that if the conditions were such that we had drastic limitations of certain very critical skills that could not be adapted to by other diversion of resources, that in time we might come to a different level of mobilization, a different supply of critical skills in this country, we might come to this.

This was true during the last war. We were not convinced this was the case at the present time, and in the absence of a showing that this would be desirable we would think this would be quite corruptive and divisive in our universities to start picking out particular skills.

After all, the skills that we want, the leadership in the future, depend on not having just scientists and scientific technicians, but people who have the broad training not only in the sciences and mathematics, but