

The Inter-Agency Committee, asked to evaluate this problem by the National Security Council, is said to have made the same finding, after intense study of all the available data.

However, this advanced college training must be accompanied by an ongoing assessment of manpower needs and supplies at all times. I believe that 4,000 local boards should not be expected to maintain such continuing surveillance on a national scale, and that even a body such as the National Security Council cannot be expected to keep fully abreast of this picture in addition to its other extensive duties.

A special group devoting itself to manpower planning and resources—either a new one, or our present Office of Emergency Planning, or a similar body, should be constantly concerned with national manpower needs and supplies in all activities.

There will be men completing advanced degrees whose skills and training are, at that moment in time, needed more by the Nation in a civilian post than in a military one.

While the military should always have first call, as it does for doctors, on men with such special training, the national need will dictate the use of some men in nonmilitary service, just as men are now exempted because they are found unfit for duty.

However, college-trained men at all levels who are not essential elsewhere to the Nation at the time they finish their training, or later, will fall back into the available draft group.

The order of call of men when more are available than are needed could be solved in several ways, and many have been suggested.

Perhaps the one with the least inequity is the 2-year combination which would call by proportional age groups for 1 year only, and then revert to the prime age group pattern provided for in the Military Selective Service Act of 1967.

If you go to the prime age group immediately, you have skipped all the men in between, mostly the 20- and 21-year-olds. You have reduced your pool from 1.2 million men available to a pool that is 18,000 from which you will make the calls, and all the people who are 20 concerned with equity surely will be concerned with that.

The call, however, for the first year could run across the range, and it does not have to be done in several age groups. You could declare that one age group, 19 to 26 shall be considered to be the same age, just as in the prime group, and call them by birth dates, so you could take all the January birth dates, for example, in the first call.

This would provide for a ratio of calls, because the men certainly have birth dates in approximately the same ratio across the year.

This plan would spread the call among all age groups for the first year, and then concentrate for future years on the approximate 19-year-old group, plus the men who had been deferred for education.

A lottery of each prime age group might be an acceptable way of determining which available men were inducted.

An oldest first call in the prime age group would seem to offer one advantage—men with birthdays early in the year could be sure for several years in advance that they would enter service, and could make plans accordingly. If a new birth date lottery occurred each year, each individual would continue to be uncertain of his relative place in the line until a few months before his year of maximum vulnerability began.