

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1968.

Subject: Impact of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 on Graduate Education.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: In conjunction with the hearings of your subcommittee, we would like to bring to your attention the statement we recently forwarded to the National Security Council. We understand that our contribution as well as that of many other groups making similar observations does not appear to be reflected in the recent statements from the National Security Council or the Director of Selective Service.

We hope that the views expressed in our letter be of some value in the hearings you are now conducting. If we can be of more direct assistance to you, please call us.

Sincerely yours,

CHAUNCEY STARR, *Chairman.*

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1968.

Subject: The Military Selective Service Act of 1967.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The Committee on Public Engineering Policy of the National Academy of Engineering has become concerned about the possibility of serious impact of the new Selective Service Act on our nation's resources of personnel trained at the highest academic levels.

During the past two decades, the federal government has sponsored graduate education with emphasis on such fields as science and engineering, in order to increase the availability of specialists who would be able to deal with the social, technical, political, and economic problems of our nation. The national assets created by this public investment are worthy of enlightened stewardship and further development.

Present laws and regulations regarding the eligibility of graduate students for military service are likely to produce a catastrophic reduction in the number of graduate students at our colleges and universities after the middle of 1968 and may also reduce the flow of eligible candidates to our educational institutions in future years. The consequences of these impending temporary as well as long-term effects are of deep concern to us.

From the point of view of national interest, it would seem desirable to seek out alternatives that would continue to encourage the most intellectually able individuals to be trained through graduate education to fulfill an essential function in our society. Furthermore, an inventory of trained faculty and research capability has been built by our educational system to provide advanced educational experience of the highest quality for the considerably increased numbers of qualified graduates. This educational system and that inventory should not, if at all possible, be subjected to highly fluctuating demands since this results in inefficient use of limited resources.

We recognize the need to have an equitable system for selecting those who are to serve the nation's military needs but trust that this can be done in the context of an overall appraisal of the nation's best interests. As a first step, in order to reduce the current uncertainties in the plans of graduate students and graduate educational institutions, it would seem desirable to delay for one more year the induction of graduate students so as to permit more extensive research and analysis on the impact of the new law on the graduate schools and the nation's intellectual resources.

If, after additional analysis, it is found desirable to maintain graduate students fully eligible for the draft, it is hoped that a way may be found to make the necessary draft calls in equal proportion across the age group suited to military service rather than demanding heaviest contributions from the age group that has already received the heaviest investment in intellectual skills.