

key proposals would have reversed the order of callup—by inducting 19-year-olds first, then working up to older men if necessary. Since we would seldom need all eligible 19-year-olds, the President also suggested a form of random choosing, or lottery, as the only fair way to decide who would serve.

Under such a plan there would be no need to continue deferments for graduate students since by the time they reached that point in their education, youths would already have served—or been assured that they would not be called except for a major emergency.

The Congress bought only a small part of the President's proposal. It agreed to the abolition of graduate deferments for all but medical trainees (who are liable after graduation to their own "doctors' draft"). But the congressmen specifically ordered the President not to institute any form of lottery, and thus set the stage for more trouble.

The new rules allow continued deferments only for men in their second year of graduate school or beyond. Those who will finish their first year this spring, and seniors graduating this year who had planned to go on to graduate school, are now draftable. And since President Johnson has unaccountably decided not to institute his own plan to call 19-year-olds first, the two-year group of graduate students will supply most of the manpower for the nation's draft boards.

Of the approximately 300,000 male students in the two classes, it is estimated that the draft will take about 60%. And others will likely enlist to exercise a choice of service. The graduate schools will be left, in the words of Harvard President Nathan Pusey, with "the lame, the halt, the blind and the female."

Dragooning most of the men from two full years of the education cycle in America is a matter of importance to more than just those students who lose deferments. Graduate assistants do much of the classroom teaching at universities—and some schools will lose half of these instructors. Under the new rules, no graduating college senior will know exactly when he will be called—and whether he should chance starting a year of graduate study. The some uncertainties are playing havoc with the universities which are already committed to overhead expenses for next year—with no idea of the size of their student bodies.

As long as the draft needs fewer than half the men who become available each year, then the country needs a selective service law that will take them with some even-handedness from among the wealthy and the poor, the intelligent and the average. The President should revive his own plan to draft the 19-year-olds first. That age falls early enough to prevent much disruption of career of school plans. And we still think some form of random lottery is the fairest way to choose the 19-year-olds who will serve.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
Bloomington, Ind., February 26, 1968.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Education, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Please permit me to convey my endorsement of American Council on Education suggestion that reexamination of selective service law include consideration of pooling age groups. In addition to a reduction in tremendous impact upon graduate education, the wisdom of this course is supported by considerations of equity between college and noncollege male vulnerability to draft, the crying need for personnel to teach undergraduates, and better distribution by age group in the Armed Forces themselves. Our concern in higher education is not to reduce any individual's obligation to his country nor to work any disadvantage upon the person whose resources do not permit the pursuit of higher education, but is rather in support of the national interest in avoiding a truly drastic interruption in the flow of educated manpower into the society and a major blow to our already hard-pressed institutions.

ELVIS STAHR,
President.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, N.J., February 29, 1968.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The recent reaffirmation of the President's Executive Order 11360, ending deferments of graduate students except those in the health sciences, has serious consequences for the nation generally, including the well-being of its