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It is essential that the United States implement national service to reflect the balance between the people, the government and the military or more commonly referred to as the "remarkable trinity" that Carl Von Clausewitz described in On War. The elimination of the draft in 1973 and the professional military that ensued has led to a significant decline in the ability of the average citizen's involvement in our governmental processes, to include the commitment of military forces. There are numerous benefits to be derived from mandatory national service, especially after events of 11 September 2001. Now is time to cement the enhanced patriotism that has long been nearly non-existent in Americans in order that our future generations will not have to experience a disaster in order to come together as a nation.
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IMPLEMENTING UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH CLAUSEWITZ'S REMARKABLE TRINITY

Universal national service or conscription is essential to reflect the balance between the people, the military and the government that Carl Von Clausewitz described in On War. Additionally, we must take action now in order for conscription to become ingrained in Americans and a part of our culture by the year 2010. This paper proposes that the United States eliminate the all-volunteer forces policy and implement universal national service. The result will encourage the American public to become more intimately involved with the government and the policy making processes, especially those that affect the use of the military.

I define conscript as "one who is compulsorily enrolled for some service or job." My definition of conscription is a process to ensure that every ablebodied citizen performs mandatory service to our country. I do not want to confuse this with solely military service or the draft, as some definitions of conscription have become known as a synonym.

THE REMARKABLE TRINITY

Clausewitz wrote, "[w]ar is more than a true chameleon that slightly adapts its characteristics to the given case. As a total phenomenon its dominant tendencies always make war a paradoxical trinity – composed of primordial violence, hatred and enmity ... The first of these three aspects mainly concerns the people; the second the commander and his army; the third the government. ... Our task therefore is to develop a theory that maintains a balance between these three tendencies, like an object suspended between three magnets." There have been many interpretations of this passage, but generally this has become defined as "what Clausewitz referred to as the 'remarkable trinity': the military, the government, and the people."

This trinity has become engrained in U.S. Army doctrine. As an Army Officer, I have been taught this concept throughout my military career at every school from the Basic Course through the U. S. Army War College. Additionally the concept was documented in the June 1993 Army Field Manual 100-5, Operations, where it states, "The criteria for deciding to employ military forces exemplify the dynamic link among the people, the government, and the military. The people of the United States do not take the commitment of their armed forces lightly." I believe that senior Army leadership has come to know and accept the remarkable trinity as a truism in our American democratic system. Similarly, other services also reflect this philosophy.

I feel that there are several interrelated issues, which are driving Americans away from the realities of the remarkable trinity. These issues are primarily based on the all-volunteer force, which was implemented in 1973 with the end of the draft. I will address four: the civil-military
gap, public complacency, renewed patriotism and recruiting. I will address some arguments for universal national service and conclude with some aspects of the cost of implementing this new policy.

THE CIVIL-MILITARY GAP

My concern as a soldier is that the largest element of the remarkable trinity, the people, appears to be lost in their understanding of not only the military aspects of the United States, but also their involvement with their own government and the government process. "Personal connections to the military are declining, and because the gap in opinion does diminish with contact with the military (particularly service in uniform), support for national defense is likely to decrease in the future. ... the downsizing of the force is reducing social connections to the military, and these will inevitably reduce its institutional presence and thus its prominence in American public consciousness."^5

This disconnection is being addressed as the "civil-military gap." Don Snider, an eminent military writer, states, "since the end of the Cold War, the tensions between the civilian and military leaders (particularly during the first Clinton administration), and between American society and its military subsociety have increased."^6 He further explains the "gap" exists because "military and civilian leaders view each other's culture negatively and hold strong negative stereotypes of each other."^7 Further examples to describe the "gap" are found in an article by Richard Kohn where he states; "[t]he US military is now more alienated from its civilian leadership than at any time in American history."^8

"In 1973 conscription was abolished in favor of an all-volunteer army"^9 which, as a side affect, has drastically reduced the percentage of Americas involved with its military. There are many statistics available to describe the low percentages of the American population with military service. However, this situation is best illustrated where "[t]here is now one person on active duty for every 202 citizens in this country. That compares to one soldier, sailor, marine or airman for every 84 citizens back in 1973, when the draft was ended and to one service man or woman for every 11 citizens at the height of World War II."^10 Another source states that "[f]ewer than 6% of Americans under the age of 65 have served in the military."^11 Whatever the source, it is very easy to see the disconnect between the general population and the military.

To further exacerbate the problem, a second leg of the remarkable trinity, the government, is affected. Our elected officials and many non-elected bureaucrats are becoming less familiar with the military based on their lack of any significant military experience or interest. "Beginning in the mid-1990s, the percentage of veterans in Congress dropped below that in the comparable
cohort of the population. ... the change in veterans' representation may eventually affect agenda-setting in the Congress, the level of understanding of military affairs in that body, and ultimately, the quality of legislative policymaking for, and oversight of, the armed forces.\textsuperscript{12}

To further illustrate this decline, the following data is provided concerning the makeup of the 107\textsuperscript{th} Congress presently in session:

In the Senate, 38 of the 100 members have prior military service. Previously, there were 43 veterans in the 106\textsuperscript{th} Congress and 73 veterans in the 93\textsuperscript{rd} Congress in 1973, the year in which the draft was eliminated. The US House of Representatives shows the same trends. There are 130 veterans of the 435 members in the 107\textsuperscript{th} Congress, a decline from the 136 veterans in the 106\textsuperscript{th} Congress and well below the 320 in the 93\textsuperscript{rd} Congress.\textsuperscript{13}

To add to the widening of the gap or the differences between the civilian leadership and the military society, many soldiers believe that "extraordinary efforts to avoid military service during the Vietnam War by top political and military opinion leaders in Washington (President Bill Clinton, House Speaker Newt Gingrich, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, columnists George Will and Patrick Buchanan)\textsuperscript{14}\textsuperscript{,} a common issue today among political elites from both parties. This is not leadership by example, an ingrained value in soldiers and military leaders and it is also a far cry from the famous words of John F. Kennedy, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."\textsuperscript{15}

Another frustration is that the elected officials are well aware of the problem. Republican Senator John McCain recently wrote an article where he stated, "[I]n the past, it has been a rite of passage for our nation's leaders to serve in the armed forces. Today, fewer and fewer of my congressional colleagues know from experience the realities of military life. The decline of the citizen-soldier is not healthy for a democracy."\textsuperscript{16} Democratic Senator Joseph Biden, a non-veteran, introduced a National Veterans Awareness Week Resolution on July 31, 2001. In the resolution he stated, "[a] citizenry that is oblivious to the capabilities and limitations of the armed forces, and to its critical role throughout our history, can make decisions that have unexpected and unwanted consequences. Even more important, general recognition of the importance of those individual character traits that are essential for military success, such as patriotism, selflessness, sacrifice, and heroism, is vital to maintaining these key aspects of citizenship in the armed forces and even throughout the population at large.\textsuperscript{17}

These are indicators that the "people" portion of the remarkable trinity is greatly affected and clearly demonstrates that the "government" leg has become just as distorted. To illustrate this with the makeup of the 107\textsuperscript{th} Congress, "the average age of a Member in the House is 54 years and of a Senator, 59."\textsuperscript{18} With 31% having served in the military, I believe that the majority
of our policy maker's only knowledge of the military has been acquired the same way that columnist Suzanne Cassidy wrote of how she acquired her feelings where she was, "[I]nfluenced by M*A*S*H reruns and the Iran-Contra affair, my feelings about the military used to waver mostly between cynicism and indifference." The Congressional inexperience is significant in that with a professional military force in the United States, the employment of our forces becomes skewed from the reality of the situation at hand.

Madeleine Albright's infamous words, as the United States ambassador to the United Nations in 1993, seem to exemplify this point very clearly when determining to send U.S. troops into Bosnia where she stated, "[w]hat's the point of having this superb military that you're always talking about if we can't use it?" She made this comment to then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell, a co-author of the Weinberger-Powell Doctrine which spoke about the necessity of a clear political end state and the use of overwhelming force to accomplish those objectives before employing the United States military forces. Today, our military training, at all echelons reinforces that diplomacy is the first and "the most effective tool for resolving conflicts around the world. 'The current approach to addressing national security engages the Department of Defense and services too often and too quickly' in conflicts that might otherwise be worked out peacefully."

It appears now that the military is a tool of first resort in the minds of many of our elected and political appointees; so too, it also appears that the general public agrees or does not necessarily disagree. The "indifference is well illustrated in our most recent war in Kosovo, which sparked no significant public response." In fact, this air only war, "was the longest U.S. combat operation to have taken place since the war in Vietnam, which ended in 1975. At a price tag of more than $3 billion all told, it was also a notably expensive one. ... In all, out of some 28,000 high-explosive munitions expended altogether over the air war's 78-day course, no more than 500 non-combatants in Serbia and Kosovo died as a direct result of errant air attacks, a new low in American wartime experience when compared to both Vietnam and Desert Storm.

PUBLIC COMPLACENCY

There has been much written and talked about regarding complacency in America, especially concerning today's young people. Deborah Mathis, a Tribune Media Services writer states that, "[s]everal surveys and studies over the past couple of years have revealed that American youth are very active in the volunteer world, the new generation's style of social action." From my personal experience in assisting with my son's college entrance applications, I would argue that a major reason for this surge is the requirement leveraged by colleges and
universities that have made volunteering a major factor for acceptance into their institution. The number of validated volunteer hours is definitely a deciding factor. But this is not necessarily what I consider as an example of complacency.

I am more inclined to agree with Senator Biden who acknowledges the indifferent attitudes among the American youth where he states, “today's young people, a generation that has grown up largely during times of peace and extraordinary prosperity and has embraced a ‘me first’ attitude, it is perhaps even more important to make sure that there is solid understanding of what it has taken to attain this level of comfort and freedom. The failure of our children to understand why a military is important, why our society continues to depend on it for ultimate survival, and why a successful military requires integrity and sacrifice, will have predictable consequences as these youngsters become of voting age”.  

Additionally, this attitude is ingrained much deeper than America's youth. A major indicator of this complacency is demonstrated by voter apathy, especially the young voters. Since the 1960 Presidential election, where 62.77% of the total voting age population (VAP) turned out to vote, the percentages of VAP has consistently decreased, reaching a low of 49.08% in 1996. In the 2000 Presidential election, 51.3% of the VAP turned out to vote. Between 1972 and 1996, the voter turnout for the 1820 year old and 21-24 year old category of voters has been consistently the two lowest categories on record, averaging 37.34% and 42.89% respectively. Additionally, these two age categories are the lowest two age groupings in the number of registered voters at 47.9% and 50.06% respectively. Again, these figures reflect Presidential election numbers. The local election turnout results for non-President elections are even worse. For the November 6, 2001 “off-year” general election, of the registered voters, only “34 percent cast ballots” in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania. These are very reflective of the results around the country, even after the events of September 11, 2001 when patriotism has “supposedly” hit an all-time high.

RENEWED PATRIOTISM

The September 11, 2001 attack on America has been closely compared to the attack on Pearl Harbor. There are many similarities, but the most striking is the renewed patriotism that has been found by all Americans throughout the world, along with the hope that this will inspire our citizens to become more involved in our national interests and governmental processes.

“Since the Sept. 11 terrorist attack, newspapers everywhere have reported daily on the ‘surge of national pride,’ declaring, ‘public displays of patriotism reach a level last seen in the Cold War.’” Others are proclaiming “The sucker punch left America's heart heavy. Briefly, we
were on the ropes. But we've sprung back. The whole country is on its feet—defiant, feisty and strong.29

No doubt about it, American patriotism is back. We are now openly proud to display and wave the American flag everywhere while singing the National Anthem and “God Bless America” at every public event of any nature. Sports teams from high school through the professional leagues have the American flag displayed on their helmets and jerseys. Flags are hanging from the overpasses, buildings and attached to back windows and sides of cars, while homeowners are proud, to once again, display the American flag on the houses daily rather than for only on a National Holiday. As a matter of fact, “The surge of patriotism in the wake of Sept. 11 has resulted in a shortage of American flags.”30

What is more important is the fact that we, as a nation, are again talking about the advantages of being an American citizen. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld best summed it up with, “[t]he United States of America represents something so important to the world—our free way of life. If you care about human beings, you have to care that the U.S. model, which benefits not just the people in our country but across the globe, succeeds. If we value that, we have to be willing to defend that way of life.”31

Support for the military is high as well. On 24 October 2001 “[p]olls show 90 percent of Americans support military actions in Afghanistan” and “65 percent said they would still support the war if 1,000 American troops were killed.”32 On November 11, 2001, a Times-CNN, Newsweek poll also found that, “[s]upport for military action against Afghanistan also remains at very high levels, about nine of 10, with approval rates for how it’s being conducted almost as high.”33

Many cynics are already asking, “How long will the renewed patriotism last?” As early as October 14, 2001 the headlines ran an article titled, “Will this spirit last?”34 Most interviewees agreed that the strong public support would last for a very long time. “By attacking civilians on American soil, the terrorists appear to have forged a resolve not seen in decades, including a willingness to endure a lengthy campaign and to make sacrifices to punish the perpetrators of the Sept. 11 attacks.”35 However, I tend to agree with the findings of Charles Moskos and Paul Glastris who state, “[s]o far, our patriotism, though sincerely felt, has largely amounted to flag-waving and coat holding.”36 A more firm commitment by American youth would reflect increased rates of volunteering for military duty which has not yet been the case at the recruiting stations across America.
ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCES RECRUITING

Recent trends in recruiting volunteer service members show that all the services are not meeting enlistment objectives. The economy has been one key to the recruiting efforts in the military during the post-draft era. Recruiting research by John T. Warner and Beth J. Asch found that, "since its inception, the all volunteer force has had its ups and downs. The downs have typically occurred in the periods of tight civilian labor markets." Further, they found, "With civilian unemployment at its lowest since the start of the AVF (All Volunteer Force), the U.S. armed forces missed their total recruiting enlisted objective by 6000 in Fiscal Year (FY) 1998 and 8500 in FY 1999. The Air Force, which had never missed its recruiting objective, fell 1800 recruits short of its FY 1999 target of 34,400. The Army missed its target of 74,500 recruits by 6300."38

The economic growth throughout the United States has had a major impact on decisions of military eligible citizens. "The real earnings of 18 – 24 year-old male high school graduates have risen since 1993, leading to a decline in relative military pay of about 10 percent ... [t]he unemployment rate has fallen by almost half since July 1992."39

To overcome this shortfall, "the services have expanded their recruiter forces, advertising budgets, and enlistment incentives. ... These policy actions have apparently begun to take effect. Although the armed forces experienced recruiting shortfalls in 1998 and 1999, all four services met their 2000 recruiting objectives."40 In fact, at a September 4, 2001 news conference, Secretary of the Army Thomas E. White announced that the Army had, for the second consecutive year, achieved its FY 2001 recruiting mission, nearly one month ahead of schedule.41 The major reasons cited were the newad campaign, initiated in January 2001; the slower than expected economy, the Army Internet chat room and Hollywood's positive portrayal of soldiers.42

At the conclusion of the news conference, a question was asked concerning the amount of money spent on recruiting for FY 2001. MG Dennis D. Cavin, Commanding General of the U.S. Army Recruiting Command stated, "The advertising budget was slightly over $146 million. When you roll in pay and all of those things, it's roughly around $470 million."43 In FY 2001 the Army recruited 75,800 new soldiers, which equates to $6,200 for each new recruit. Another source puts the cost to recruit one new soldier in the Army at $11,187, the highest of all the services per soldier.44 Whatever figure you use, it is very substantial and could certainly be put to better use in this time of constrained budgets. Additionally, I feel that is an unacceptable cost, considering that is the cost to get them in the door. These figures do not include to costs
associated with basic pay and benefits, basic training, job training and equipping the soldier before they are assigned to a unit.

The impact of September 11, 2001 has not shown any drastic increase in the numbers of enlistments, even though there have been many inquiries. Despite the resurgence of national patriotism, a Defense Department spokesman, on September 24, 2001 stated, "our anecdotal reports say there's been a jump in the number of phone call and emails inquiring about enlisting'. The down side, he said, is, 'a lot of the inquiries we're getting don't meet the criteria. They're too young, or they're too old.' The recruiting numbers from late September 2001 showed a slight increase, compared to September 2000, however, the October 2001 data reveals a decrease from the peacetime October 2000 recruiting numbers.\textsuperscript{46}

This is not a new phenomenon; rather it is one of the myths that are continually dispelled. "Recruitment patterns remained little changed after the Lebanon bombing and nearly simultaneous Grenada invasion of 1983. ... Ditto for the 1989 invasion of Panama and this year's terror attack which killed about 3,000 people in New York City, Pennsylvania and Washington, D.C."\textsuperscript{47} Additionally, a propensity to serve survey of young males between the ages of 16 and 21 has shown that those who would "probably" or "definitely" serve has fallen from 34 percent in 1991 to 26 percent in 1998 and further dropped to 21 percent in August 2001.\textsuperscript{48}

**PRESENT POLICY SHORTFALL**

The simultaneous existence of the growing civil-military gap, public complacency and the growing propensity for our youth to elect other than military service will not correct itself. If left unattended, the situation will exacerbate, as there are no policies in place to correct these issues. The existing civil-military gap will continue to grow, as fewer citizens are involved in the government. Recent trends in voter turnout appear to be deteriorating, despite our patriotism, so there is no indication that voter apathy will disappear. Our renewed patriotism will eventually fade as we get back to our "normal" routines, just as it did 10 years ago after the Persian Gulf War. And, as the economy improves, our military recruiting process will continue to suffer, just as it does today, despite an economic recession during the past year.

What may be as more important is the change in attitude of the leadership, if we are to compare September 11, 2001 to December 7, 1941. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, "President Franklin D. Roosevelt's 'Call to Sacrifice' ... 'summoned Americans on the 'home front' to accept denial of creature comforts.'\textsuperscript{49} What followed was a period where, "[y]oung men
enlisted; young women went to work; children collected aluminum foil and bought war stamps. In contrast, "[t]oday, we are told to get back to work; go out and spend money; get aboard planes that just a few months ago were weapons of terror." Other advice that came from President Bush is, "One way to defeat terrorism is to show the world the true values of America through the gathering momentum of millions of acts of responsibility and decency and service.' He suggested volunteering time in hospitals, schools, homeless shelters and other community organizations—all of which is possible right in your own home town. This call to volunteer, locally, is not going to train people to fight terrorism at home, nor will it create incentives for citizens to become soldiers who will fight terrorism at home and abroad. The bottom line is that, "our political leaders appear reluctant to ask the American people to sacrifice or to call them to serve. Instead, they are urging a return to normalcy. To jump-start the economy, the public is told that their obligation is to shop."

I am not exactly sure that those actions are policies that will fight the new war on terrorism and at the same time bring the American society back in line with the remarkable trinity. The question then becomes, "what can we do about increasing public indifference and detachment from military affairs, an intolerable state of affairs in the world's sole superpower?" There are many who have called for the re-instatement of the draft, a policy which, if implemented would realign the balance between the people, the government and the military as was advocated by Clausewitz. Moskos and Glastris have proposed the draft for many years on the basis that, "Since the end of the Vietnam War, it seems that many Americans across the political spectrum have come to accept the idea that government has no business requiring its citizens to do anything other than pay taxes."

REINSTATEMENT OF THE DRAFT

As previously stated, volunteering is one recommendation to demonstrate our renewed patriotism and get the people involved in the new war on terrorism. Moskos and Glastris believe, "It is tempting to think that this new ethos of volunteerism, plus a bit more military spending, might be all we need to meet the new terrorist threat. But it's unlikely to be. There's a reason America has instituted a draft in past wars: because volunteerism doesn't fill uniforms." American society needs more.

Even before the 2000 Presidential Election there were many people, to include members of Congress, who recommended a draft. In July, 1999 many, "key members of Congress' military committees, for the first time in a generation, are discussing revival of the draft.'
Asserting that not enough young people are enlisting and with the nation’s commitments abroad growing constantly, the chairman of the House Armed Services subcommittee on readiness was quoted as suggesting that, sooner or later, there may be ‘some form of selective conscription.’ Benjamin Joyce reported in May 2000 that because of recruiting shortfalls, “[a] contentious word is being whispered in the halls of the Department of Defense. ... They just might reinstate THE DRAFT!”

Soon after the September 11 attack, others came out more openly for a new kind of draft or even national service. Philip Meyer of USA Today reported that universal national service makes a lot of sense, especially if terrorism remains a permanent U.S. threat. Additionally, he feels that universal national service would assist in closing the increased social and political “gap” between service members and civilians, initiated because of the draft rules from Vietnam draft and the resultant all-volunteer military. And Moskos and Glastris contend that, “for the first time in our history we’re entering a war of significant size and probable duration without drafting young men to fight the threat. This will have to change. America needs a draft.”

Those who propose a draft are quick to point out that “a new kind of draft” is needed, not a replication of the Vietnam draft system. Not only is a draft needed that does not provide easy access to, “generous deferments for those wealthy and wise enough to be in college, while unfairly burdening the minorities and the less-affluent,” but also, “[o]ne that would focus less on preparing men for conventional combat.” Robert D. Ford, a former state director of the Selective Service System during the Vietnam War points out that, “[a]s long as someone has to go, everyone should have an equal share in that burden.” In re-establishing the draft more equitably, all proponents allude to the fact that, “during World War II and Korea, the children of the elite served along with those of the working class, and had a lesson in democratic citizenship along the way.”

An additional benefit from the World War II draft was the establishment of the G.I.Bill. This allowed veterans an opportunity to acquire college degrees which in turn greatly contributed to improvements in America’s economy and society. This is something that we need today to stay competitive in world economic markets.

**HOMELAND DEFENSE**

America’s professional Army is well prepared to perform its mission and is doing so abroad. The new war on terrorism requires much more manpower than presently exists in the military forces today. “Homeland defense—the new top priority for President Bush and the military establishment—is labor-intensive work. The armed forces will have their hands full.
hunting down the terrorist cells overseas.\textsuperscript{66} This also validates a longstanding argument by
many, in and out of the military, of, "how thin the armed forces may be stretched as the
Pentagon settles into what Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld called a 'long, unrelenting,
global war on terrorism.'\textsuperscript{67}

National Guardsmen are providing airport security. There is an increased need to protect
our borders with Mexico and Canada to prevent terrorists from entering our country through
them. Members of Congress are proposing that the federal government take over control of
security of the nation's nuclear power plants that are vulnerable to terrorist attacks.\textsuperscript{68} Columnist
David Broder wrote, "there are myriad tasks here at home which can be done by well-trained
volunteers – safeguarding the transportation and communications systems, assisting in
monitoring the flow of goods across U.S. borders and providing security at large public
gatherings of all kinds. And there is the vital work of helping shattered families rebuild their lives
and achieve at least some of the dreams they held before the terrorist attacks.\textsuperscript{69}

"The reality is that homeland defense in the war on terrorism is bound to be labor
intensive, as demanding of manpower as the big wars of the past. But we do not have the vital
tool we used in those wars: the draft.\textsuperscript{70} To add to the problem, many of the reservists and
National Guard members are the same who are counted on to defend the local communities.
"Because so many reservists work as police officers, firefighters and emergency medical
technicians, however, our municipalities are being drained of precisely the people we will need if
(when) the terrorists return.\textsuperscript{71}

Our government leaders continue to suggest new ways and programs for citizens to
become involved in Homeland defense. Each new suggestion requires more government
bureaucracy, more manpower and no increase in funding that leads to satisfying the
requirements through volunteer efforts. In a November 8, 2001 speech, President Bush,
"announced plans to mobilize more than 20,000 volunteers to help with homeland security by
working with police departments and other agencies. The volunteers would come from the
existing Senior Corps and AmeriCorps programs.\textsuperscript{72} President Bush then, "asked states to help
develop a modern civil-defense service that would be modeled after the volunteer firefighter
programs, which provide trained, equipped firefighters.\textsuperscript{73}

All of these are great ideas and need closer scrutiny and much debate before
implementation. Additionally, it is depending predominantly on volunteering, requiring vast
numbers of people. I am not convinced that the patriotic fervor is that long lasting and that
volunteering will be productive after any prolonged period of time. Americans are immediate
results oriented and get bored easily, especially when there is no action. This is illustrated by a
mid-December poll where, ‘[t]he number of people who believe a terrorist attack is ‘very likely’ in the near future has dropped by half—from 48 percent to 23 percent—since October.’

THE NEED FOR UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE

It is now time to implement universal national service in America. This is not a new proposal as it has been talked about throughout the history of the United States. Seth Gitell, a national political writer at the Boston Phoenix, writing about Theodore Roosevelt’s book, Fear God and Take Your Own Part, where Roosevelt argues for a system of universal service, and states, “[I]n a free republic rights should only be allowed as corollaries to duties. … The full citizen must do a citizen’s full duty; and he can only do his full duty if he fits himself to fight for the common good of all citizens.” Gitell further writes that Roosevelt’s, “creed, that citizenship carries with it obligations to one’s country was shared by George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and the Kennedy’s.”

Others, more recently, have suggested some form of national service. As Senator Sam Nunn noted in the early 1980s “a compulsory national service program (including not only military but civilian service) ‘for all youth … would ultimately be of great benefit to the nation.’” Bi-partisan support has recently come from Senators John McCain and Evan Bayh who have recently introduced, “legislation to revamp national service programs and dramatically expand opportunities for public service.”

The advantages of universal national service (UNS) in the United States are numerous. Although there are no definite “proofs”, these arguments for UNS are key to connecting the people to the government and the military.

I firmly believe and agree with Christoph Nesshover’s belief that “mandatory service assures closer relations—and thus better democratic control—between the armed forces and the society.” What UNS does for any democracy is exactly what Germany experienced and why they are adhering to their policy of conscription. “Overshadowed by its Second World War legacy, Germany places emphasis on having a citizens’ army as a safety measure against an army which threatens the nation. Conscription was meant to guarantee that the army is deeply rooted in society.” Our elected officials will also have a better foundation to make national security decisions that involve the employment of the military, international agreements, budgetary decisions, policies and the representation of their constituents. Their first-hand experience of the inner-workings of their government, from their common service and experience, will enable them to make better decisions in all aspects of our lives.
Secondly, and just as important, is the responsibility every citizen has to being an American. “Being a citizen or becoming a citizen of the world’s sole superpower should not be a mere joy-ride. There should be obligations associated with American citizenship, especially at a time when Americans have numerous reasons to be glad that they are American citizens profit from the country’s increasing prosperity, its falling crime rate, the world’s sole super power backing in travel abroad, and safety at home from international aggression. In short, Americans are selfish because they take for granted the superior quality of everything that their government offers, but balk when the government demands anything in return. It’s time we all learned to express some gratitude for our privileged position in the world.”

The events since September 11, 2001, have shown a tremendous increase in the patriotism and coming together as a nation of America. America needs to keep that spirit high, forever, and to weave a commonality among the citizens so that we can appreciate our neighbors, our government and our military. Senator McCain recently wrote, “[w]hat is lacking today is not a need for patriotic service, nor a willingness to serve, but the opportunity.” In order to leverage the energetic youth of today, we can provide them the opportunity to serve that is apparently missing. The large number of proposed jobs created with homeland defense should provide ample opportunity to serve. I think we are truly fooling ourselves if we believe that volunteerism will fill the ranks.

Many homeland security related jobs are already available. However, there is a crisis brewing throughout the rest of the government civilian job sector. “After 11 consecutive years of downsizing, we face serious imbalances in the skills and experience of our highly talented and specialized civilian workforce. Further, 50 percent will be eligible to retire by 2005. In some occupations, half of the current employees will be gone by 2006.” A present concern, related to homeland security is that, “[t]he government is concerned that an aging work force may deplete the number of workers in the Federal Response Plan.” In an effort to fill those positions, “the government is using patriotism to appeal to Americans to fill depleting ranks of federal doctors, firefighters and structural engineers, among others.”

Recruitment problems would become largely a thing of the past with UNS. Each government agency could reduce expansive and costly, both monetary and manpower, recruiting programs. Expensive advertising would be diminished, people could be diverted to more productive jobs within their organizations and there is great potential to remove inter-service and inter-agency competition and rivalries within the government, producing a more cohesive and efficient work force.
The common experience provided by UNS will provide the citizens with a much better understanding of how their government operates and should motivate them to get involved in the entire process, starting with the election of their representatives. "Engaging hundreds of thousands of young Americans in a national service program would reinvigorate a participatory political culture. Young people will learn how they fit within the national structure, the nature of their gifts and of their nation’s needs, and to see anew the special value of our democracy. Even if they disagreed with the policies they would understand the government process and express their displeasure by voting.

Another benefit of the common experience is the socialization aspect. Arnold Park argues for a mandatory draft stating that it, "could act as a monstrous social mixer, forcing people from all backgrounds and all lifestyles to mingle in an environment where competence is the only measure of success." The same is true for UNS. And according to David Broder, "For many of us who were white, the draft brought the first experience of taking orders from African Americans and Latinos. It taught survival skills, and made you understand — in a fundamental way — your obligations to a group much larger and more diverse than your own circle of friends."

Once that close relationship is developed between all Americans, based on personal, relevant experience, the public will make conscious decisions, especially in the voting booths of America. Citizens will have an on-hand experience, sense of responsibility and a semblance of knowledge on the day-to-day operations of their government, at all levels.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

As in most government programs, the costs drive the ability to sell the issues and implementation of the policies. And, as in most government programs, startup costs are usually high with the follow-on bureaucracy building costs escalating from there. UNS does not have a specific dollar cost associated with it and until the system is debated and designed, there can be no valid dollar amount assigned. In fact proponents for and against the reinstatement of the draft cannot put a dollar figure to the costs, let alone attempt to solve the cost of UNS.

Several attempts have been made to put a cost to UNS. In 1982, Richard V. L. Cooper estimated, "that a men-only national service program of this sort would add $15 to $25 billion to the federal budget. Including both men and women would about double this figure." He does not provide the basis for that kind of estimate. More recently, Amitai Etzioni estimated that, "if every 18-year-old participated, total cost would be $33 billion a year ($11,000 per person times three million people)."
Those are the direct costs, however, there are other cost offsets that would be realized from the implementation of UNS. "Not only would a national service draft reduce youth unemployment rates directly—approaching 30 percent or more for certain minority groups—but a possible side benefit would be decreased future unemployment rates for national service participants, a result of the skills and maturity presumably gained during their period of service." Reducing unemployment, providing a trained skill and potentially reducing welfare payments in the future sounds like a very positive benefit to society and the government's budget.

There are many jobs available at the local, state and national level with the Peace Corps, Department of Interior, Immigration and Naturalization Services and as civilians in the Department of Defense, in addition to those mentioned with homeland defense. The entry-level pay for their duty performance could in fact actually help to decrease the overall budgets at these levels of government. Granted, the turnover for these jobs might be higher because of the transitory nature of UNS, it would be much cheaper than privatizing the job to contractors, as is the present trend.

Another benefit is that once an untrained person was trained and worked that area, they may actually enjoy the sense of accomplishment derived from performing their civic duty and stay on to serve as a career after their commitment was completed. From my military experience, there are many assignment locations that are to be avoided, at all costs. Just ask the experts, most of who have never been there. "Careers in the military or government are seen as second-rate choices. ... Jury duty and other forms of civic obligation are looked down upon and shirked whenever possible." Like many assignments, people will change their minds once they have been there.

A final cost that needs to be considered is the cost of not being prepared, "in addition to the loss of life, economic losses because of Sept. 11 are 'in the hundreds of billions, if not trillions of dollars.' So Americans should have a 'new perspective on the issue of what is affordable.'"

CONCLUSION
The events of September 11, 2001 show that we are extremely unprepared, at home, to defend against the asymmetrical attacks of the "enemy", despite having arguably, the world's strongest military force. America's professional military is akin to being a hired gun of the Old West; hired to keep the bad guys out of town. It is now time to act on our wake up call and come together to defend our freedoms, as a nation, united.
Universal national service is the right tool to accomplish that task. We can no longer afford the cost of being unprepared. Let us leverage the renewed patriotism, relinquish our apathy and develop a national identity. UNS is an essential part to re-creating pride in America while maintaining that balance of Clausewitz’s remarkable trinity. We should not have to wait until a disaster strikes to be proud of our nation.
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