

What we do strongly oppose is the maintenance of the present sequence of filling calls, starting with the oldest eligible age group (twenty-five to twenty-six) and working down. This will have the practical effect in the coming months of concentrating the draft very heavily on this year's college graduates and present first year graduate students.

The ideal, in our opinion, would be some form of national lottery at age eighteen or nineteen as recommended by the President last March, with the young men being enabled to complete their then phase of education (high school, college, or first graduate degree) before actually serving. This would require legislation. Short of this, and entirely in the range of executive discretion under the present law, would be a policy of taking a proportionate fraction from each of the seven eligible age groups (nineteen through twenty-five). This would better meet the needs of the armed forces, would avoid inequitable discrimination in favor of or against any particular group, and would reduce to tolerable dimensions the impact on graduate studies and on the universities.

The President's message of March 6, 1967 stated clearly the reasons for altering the policy of selecting the oldest eligible age group first, as did the Burke Marshall Commission and the Clark Panel. The House Armed Services Committee endorsed such a change of policy, and the Conference Report on the Bill as enacted in June stated that it "will in no way proscribe or inhibit the President in changing the priorities of various age groups for induction, nor will it preclude him from adopting the so-called modified young age system which would involve identifying the nineteen to twenty year age group as the 'prime age group' for induction."

To indicate the seriously detrimental effects of the recently announced decisions, I can summarize for you our analysis of the consequences for the Johns Hopkins faculties of arts and sciences and advanced international studies. Under normal conditions, we would have 800 first and second year graduate students in arts and sciences in the next academic year. Of our present first year students, about 30 percent are women and foreign nationals, small number are veterans, and 8 percent are physically unfit for military service. Upwards of 50 percent would therefore be eligible for the draft and the vast majority of these would presumably be drafted under the present policies.

This would entail a gross financial loss of \$800,000, partly offset by savings in financial aid to students from general university funds; we estimate the residual net impact at about \$550,000. This is 12 percent of our core expenditures for instruction and unsponsored research in arts and sciences, and is more than we have been able to allocate in normal years from either endowment income or from current gifts.

There are no obvious alternative sources to replace such lost income. Moreover, the loss of so large a fraction of the normal complement of first and second year graduate students would have severely unfavorable effects on undergraduate teaching arrangements and teaching quality. Presently some 200 graduate students in arts and sciences hold part-time teaching appointments. They handle the laboratory sections in natural sciences, the bulk of the elementary language instruction, much of the undergraduate mathematics teaching, and some part of the teaching load in other fields.

Few of the foreign and female graduate students are in this teaching group, so we estimate that the draft policy might reduce junior instructors by 75 percent or more. Since the undergraduate needs for teaching will be unchanged, this loss of graduate student instructors would require a vast increase in the size of class sections or the total abandonment of personal instructional contact, with highly detrimental effects on the quality of undergraduate education. At the same time, many on-going research projects of great significance would be curtailed or postponed, especially in the natural sciences and certain areas of social science which depend on organized team efforts to carry through the research projects.

Any effort to compensate for these effects by massive "over admission" would mean a general lowering of standards for several years to come, with adverse effects all around.

At our School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, the proportion of potentially affected students is even higher, amounting to about 63 percent. That student body consists of future foreign service officers and future teachers of international affairs, groups whose importance to the national welfare has been emphasized by the Congress in passing the Act for International Education.

A further defect of the policies so far announced is the absence of any provision to permit a graduate student to complete a full year of studies once he