

No danger in Hatfield army bill

Editor's note: The following article is the second of a two part series on the Volunteer Army bill by Bruce Chasan. The first portion of the analysis appeared in Thursday's Emerald, and outlined answers to two objections to the bill. Today's conclusion offers answers to two more potential objections.

OBJECTION No. 3: "A volunteer army might be dangerous in that it would tie the President's hands. Realistically, how could we expect to meet emergencies?"

My answer: it's dangerous not to tie the President's hands. The need for greater Congressional influence in foreign policy decisions has already been stressed, so it is unnecessary to report those arguments. But rather, we see that this objection really wants to know if the military security of the United States would be endangered. I rather doubt it.

In the post-Vietnam period of 1970-1975, the Department of Defense estimates that we need 2.6 or 2.7 million men in uniform. Professor Oi says, "The one time when a volunteer system was tried, in 1948-1949, the number of volunteers was sufficient to sustain a force of 1.5 million men—an outcome which is cited as failure of the system. However, the population base from which these men were recruited was only half the size of that which will be available in 1970-1975." ("Op. Cit.") In any given year now, the number of men turning 18 is two million compared to 1.2 million in 1948. So it appears feasible just from the numbers alone.

Nevertheless, Senator Hatfield's bill provides for

substantial pay increases in line with the \$4 billion annual raise advocated by Professor Oi. This represents a 68 per cent raise for army enlistments, from \$2500 to \$4200 per year. It is meant to insure that the armed services are attractive enough to join (as well as to provide fairer compensation for labor).

Question: "But wouldn't troop strengths tend to fluctuate at least initially and wouldn't this put us in a vulnerable military position?"

My answer: Undoubtedly troop strengths would fluctuate initially. A steady state volunteer army would take a few years to achieve, but this would not endanger us. There are 1.3 million men in Reserve and National Guard units. The President could reactivate them at will to meet short-term demands for personnel. But he would have to consult the Congress on questions of the draft and protracted states of war. (Lest anyone still thinks this restricts the President too much, you would do well to recall that he still retains the power to destroy every man, woman and child on Earth in 30 minutes.)

Rely on reserves

Incidentally, the status of reserves has been controversial in many quarters. By and large they have been spared from duty in Vietnam. Washington State Congressman Floyd Hicks sought to amend the draft bill in 1967 so as to limit the number of draftees and rely more heavily on the reserves: "Mr. Chairman, this amendment means just exactly what it says, that we would use some of our reserve forces so that the country will know the condition we are actually in,

instead of pulling young kids in and putting in four months and sending them to Vietnam where a goodly number of them are being killed within a very few months, and then we have to respond to letters, 'Why is it that my boy was drafted in May and killed in October and the Reserve people are still walking around town?' We spend a lot of time in our Committee on Armed Services on the reserves. This Congress appropriates a lot of money for them. We do not use them. We should use them." (Congressional Record, 25 May 1967.)

The amendment was defeated.

We can afford it

OBJECTION No. 4: "Well, a volunteer army would be too expensive. We can't afford it."

My answer: The \$3.7 billion pay raise provided by the Hatfield bill could be increased substantially and we still could afford it. The Pentagon wastes at least that much every year. The estimated Federal budget for the coming year is \$198 billion. I find it difficult to believe we cannot afford it.

More over, a volunteer army will yield numerous savings. A volunteer serves longer and has a higher probability of re-enlisting. There is less turnover. Training costs go down. There are fewer Veterans, and hence, fewer Veterans benefits to be paid, etc., etc., ad infinitum.

In conclusion, I would urge the speedy enactment of Senator Hatfield's bill or one like it. It is folly to defend freedom abroad and deny it at home. In the interest of passing the best possible legislation, I invite comments on this article.

Emerald Editor

(Continued from page 10)

would be "unfathomable" for her to understand — if she hasn't looked into herself and America. Any ethnocentric person slave to the nation's White psychology can easily say they are "creating problems."

Perhaps the knifing incident she mentioned was, (contrary to what I heard some people think), an incident fought on racial lines. I refer to Calvin C. Hernton's book "Sex & Racism in America." Hernton describes the Whites' paranoia about Negro sexuality and of the effect this has on the Negro. He mentioned how this and many other inner workings of the subconscious White mind has caused many an interracial dance floor to become an arena of clashing egos and counter-egos between the races.

Joseph Carson
Senior, Geography

Guerilla warfare

Emerald Editor:

This letter is a reply to Mr. David S. Cohen's letter of Feb. 11.

Dear Mister Cohen: If the "Glorious Communist Socialist Chinese People's" Republic did not export guerilla warfare plans and weapons to South Vietnam, the B52's and its crews would have rapped every inch of her country side by now. And the whole of South Vietnam would have become another R. and R. resort for GIs besides Bangkok, Tokyo, the Philippines and Hawaii. Furthermore, if Mao did not write his "little Red recipe booklet," your country's famous "China Open Door Policy" would have worked out beautifully. And not only the Dow, but the Pentagon would have "incorporated" China long time ago. Just too bad isn't it? Eating your heart out?

By the way, your retired "Secretary of State" Mister Dean Rusk did not call the Little Red Book the modern "Mein Kampf." It is the article written by China's Defense Minister Lin Piao titled "Long Live The Victory of The People's War!" that bit him. But it so happens that all of Lin Piao's references to justifiable violence dealt with autonomous and self-reliant revolutionary movements within nations. (It would have included the bloody revolution by Gen. G. Washington too.) Not a single sentence can be construed as threatening Chinese military action aimed at the "liberation" of the people of another country. I guess in this country one can call any book "Mein Kampf" if one wants to serve his purpose.

Peter Tak-Cheung Hon
A former foreign student
Class of '68, Math.

Free scholars

Emerald Editor:

Raymond Peat's comments on the experimental "free scholar" program recently approved for the Honors College are wrong as to almost all their facts. The Oxford system requires examinations at the end of each year of residence; the Oregon program relieves students of potentially all examinations. Oxford uses outside examiners to provide a check on the substance of the approved programs; the Oregon program does not require any such checks. Oxford students are required to consult at least weekly with at least one "tutor"; the Oregon requirement is far laxer.

The American examination system is unrelated to German practice. In Germany, as in most continental countries, examinations are given at the end of a course when the student declares himself ready (with rather broad discretion in the student but not unlimited discretion).

Alfred P. Rubin
Former "Supervisor"
at Cambridge

Love

Emerald Editor:

Re: Mr. "Fully Equipped" Milner (EmEd 2/17).

Thank you Mr. Milner, for reminding us once more (we keep forgetting) that Love is indeed the first and foremost of the four-letter words.

Michael Northup
Jr., Psychology

Shut it down

Emerald Editor:

Being of timid and moderate disposition, it is with great reluctance that I must rally the University to a condition of General Strike. Though to some this clarion call may sound extreme, I can assure them this has come about only as the result of the most serious circumstances — circumstances which affect the lives of every student here at the University.

The issue, of gravest magnitude and severity, has to do with the room temperature of my office. Usually kept at a moderate 68 degrees, the past two days it has shown the most contemptible variation — once being frightfully warm and another being distastefully chilly. Having been refused assistance by the physical plant personnel, I went directly to President Johnson. His secretary tried to cover up for his closed-minded policy toward student grievances by saying he was in a meeting.

Showing admirable initiative I burst through the door, dis-

rupting a financial aid meeting, designed to generate additional funds for student loans. Demanding an audience with Johnson produced immediate results. Intimidate and fearful, he suggested I come back in an hour when he was free. Accepting this for what it was, a brutal de-humanization of my basic integrity, I declined the offer while depositing the contents of a bottle of ink on his beige floor-carpet.

That evening I attended a specially convened meeting of MDS (Moderately Deranged Students), where my grievances finally received what they deserved—a call to action. At first we thought an open letter of apology from President Johnson would be sufficient, but upon serious deliberation it was concluded that the only moderate reaction was General Strike!

Some of you may say that such a minor problem does not warrant the shutting down of the University. Some may naively assume that the rights of a few can be violated without retaliation. Or some may reason that a discomfort to a few does not justify the discomfort of many. But indeed, these shallow reactions only demonstrate the nature of your bourgeois, conditioned mentality. If you recall, the historic seige of Leningrad was the consequence of the grievance and disrest of but a few men! Likewise if you recall the sacking of Rome was the consequence of an ultimatum from but one dissatisfied soul. So, to say that great things cannot come from small numbers is but a mental trick foisted upon the slumbering masses.

Look into your hearts! Search your souls! Throw inhibiting rationale and logic to the wind! The cause is here! Shut it down! Shut it all down! And keep it shut down until someone properly adjusts the room temperature in my office.

John Mitchell,
Human Development,
Grad.

On music review

Emerald Editor:

It is entirely gratifying to us in Eugene and university music community that the Emerald is giving more attention to the local musical scene. Honest criticism can only be of benefit to all concerned. One hopes, though that future reviews may avoid the pontifical generalizations that marred Mr. Mike Romanov's review of the Eugene orchestral situation, which appeared on Feb. 3.

I would submit that as a "newcomer" Mr. Romanov is

poorly advised to criticize the policy and operations of the Eugene Symphony on the strength of one concert which he did not attend. His wild statements about "trivial programs" and "unenthusiastic response" are hardly borne out by the orchestra's performances over the past few years, and such sweeping, uninformed pronouncements do not lead a reader to trust Mr. Romanov's judgments.

The same may be said for his implication that there is a need to "bring back life into the local musical scene." This is, of course, his own opinion, and one wonders whether a "newcomer" has observed the local scene enough to know whether such a resurrection is in fact necessary.

Such an evaluation must certainly rest on more than the two concerts, one attended, one not, on which the opinion seems to be based. Eugene offers a wide variety of musical events other than orchestral performances.

The assertion that the University Orchestra's brass section can match that of the San Francisco Symphony is just plain silly. I agree that our brasses are very fine, but they are not professionals and if Mr. Romanov can not hear the difference between students and professionals (even when the latter have a bad day), one questions his ability to listen carefully and critically to anything.

Since I did not hear the University Orchestra's concert, I would prefer not to comment on Mr. Romanov's evaluation of

the performance. It is worth noting, however, that the orchestra is a regular class in the school of music and that it is directed primarily towards the education of the players. This influences the choice of repertory; for instance, a difficult composition may be very much worth studying and performing even if the performance is not perfect in every respect.

Again, best wishes to the Emerald in future music coverage. If Mr. Romanov engages in more of it, let us hope that he establishes some credentials as a perceptive listener, which his specious generalizations conspicuously fail to do.

Peter Bergquist
Associate Professor,
Music and 1st Bassoon,
Eugene Symphony

Opposes 18 vote

Emerald Editor:

Should 12 and 14-year-olds, just because they are old enough to procreate, be allowed to start raising families? Do 18-year-olds have the knowledge, judgment, productivity of goods and services and tax paying ability to justify giving them the franchise to vote? I think not.

Geo. Trumbo
Kellogg Rt., Box 22
Oakland, Or. 97462

Is he real?

Emerald Editor:

Re: Don Wilt's Weird Side-show. Excuse me, but do you exist?

Rex E. H. Armstrong
Freshman, Pol. Sci.



"Now I know how Jackie Robinson must have felt. . . ."