1970 WASN'T ALL BAD

The year 1970 seems to have left a bad taste in the mouths of millions of good people. To alleviate this condition without resorting to the use of mouthwashes, News Notes readers are reminded of some of the slightly encouraging happenings during the preceding year.

In Portugal, the Minister of Defense acknowledged that young officers, some of them college graduate conscripts, are "subverting" Portugal's effort to keep its African colonies subjugated. Fewer young USA males were required to kill Vietnamese men, women, and children than in any year since 1964. There were over six thousand fewer conscripts in 1970 than in 1969. And Defense Secretary Laird predicted even fewer unnecessary conscripts in 1971.

Ernest D. Fears, Jr. became the State Selective Service Director of Virginia. Fears is the first black man ever to head a state system. His salary of $22,885 per year is more than he received as head basketball coach of Norfolk State College. Shortly before, gentle Bob Eaton at Allenwood Federal Prison Camp was denied parole because, according to his Hearing Officer, he is "a threat to society." It is not often that a pacifist receives such an unintended compliment. A co-prisoner CO was told he was "unfit for society," which hopefully is also true. No doubt the Hearing Officer fits right in.

Spanish pacifist CO Pepe Beunza was asked what he would do if his country were invaded. He replied, "We are already invaded by the Americans, politically, culturally, and economically. Not only does our army not defend us, but they open our gates to the invaders." Pepe will go to prison in 1971, maybe for seven years. But in West Germany, the 18 months of alternative service for COs—not available at all in Spain—was liberalized. About 80% of the 1400 monthly applications for CO status are granted.

The re-enlistment rate in the armed forces dropped below one-third, the lowest in fifteen years. Dr. Curtis Tarr ordered destruction of the files of 26 million overage draft registrants, even though draft regulations require them to continue sending information on their marital, educational, and health status to their local draft boards. Not a word was heard from "law and order" enthusiasts about Dr. Tarr's blatant encouragement of law-breaking.

The World Council of Churches appealed for help to provide food, clothing, and counseling for USA deserters and draft resisters in Canada. The New York Civil Liberties Union announced that it was winning over 90% of the draft cases it handles in federal court. The Jewish Peace Fellowship revealed a near 50% increase in the number of Jewish COs performing alternative service, compared with 1969.

In France, the period of compulsory military service was reduced from 18 months to one year. Defense Minister Debre noted that "no threat is visible" to France's security.

Draft resistance in Puerto Rico continued to grow. At Ft. Dix, Maj. Gen. Howard Cooley named Specialist 5 Richard Weidman as Soldier of the Month last August. Army Intelligence was unable to dissuade Weidman's commanding officer, Lieutenant Clay, from making the nomination, despite Weidman's open criticism of the Vietnam war in which he has served as an unarmed medic. The Pentagon broke down and admitted that for six years it has turned over to the Department of Justice the names of men rejected for military service because of the use of drugs.

In the interest of good taste (and cowardice) News Notes joined the regular press in not reporting an interesting ACLU case from Southern California, now before the Supreme Court. Central to the case was a slogan on a young man's jacket urging people to have sexual intercourse with the Selective Service System. He is charged with being obscene, but defense attorneys claim the slogan did not appeal to anyone's "prurient interests." The Minneapolis Library says it was all a misunderstanding, and anyone can read News Notes. The year 1970 wasn't all bad.

ROTC in trouble

Enrollment in the Reserve Officers Training Corps in 1970 dropped to its lowest level since 1947. The Pentagon reported last December. In 1968 there were 213,470 enlistees, in 1969 a total of 155,946, and last year 109,598. During that period the number of colleges where participation in ROTC was compulsory dropped from 132 to 48, but it was started on additional campuses in voluntary form.

In percentage terms, enrollment dropped 33% for the Army, 24% for the Air Force and 14% for the Navy.

To counteract the trend the Army has reverted to a policy, dropped in 1963, of requiring a large number of ROTC graduates to serve only from 3 to 6 months active duty instead of two years. This applies to men graduating this spring, who will be called to active duty in July, 1971.

Later this year Congress will be asked to double the number of ROTC scholarships to 30,000 and to double the subsistence allowance to $100 for participating college juniors and seniors. President Truman used the low enrollment rate in 1947 as one of his arguments for reestablishing the draft in 1948.
The Goals of draft counseling:

AN EDITORIAL

—Joe Twinksky

Some people suggest that draft counseling merely encourages men to oppose the draft or guides them in evasion techniques. And “Movement” people often suggest that draft counseling just encourages men to work obediently within the system of deferments and alternative service, rather than to confront the system.

I think both suggestions represent gross distortions of the goals of draft counseling. What would be achieved by encouraging men to evade or stall or take deferments or claim conscientious objection? The draft board that loses one man simply drafts another to meet its quota—and quotas are met, if not in one month then in another. And the man who is drafted is more likely to be poor, uneducated, and dark skinned than the one who escaped.

Facilitating draft evasion through use of legal or quasi-legal methods is sometimes justified by anti-draft people as a way to clog the channels of Selective Service so it eventually must slow to a halt, but recent experience suggests that the real effect is to keep Dr. Tarr’s staff busy plugging loopholes, streamlining procedures, and reducing deferment alternatives. And my impression is that the deferment-bound, loophole-hunting, I-can-get-anything-out-of-the-draft, evasion mentality often corrupts the ideals and corrodes the spirit of the man who practices it and the man who encourages it. I think draft counseling should have quite different goals and effects.

Draft counseling is one of the important thresholds to social change, an entering point for large numbers of people. Many a man first begins thinking about the nature of his society and its demands on him when he is confronted by decisions about the draft. The draft counselor may be the first person sought out by the young man in this frame of mind. Whether he merely seeks technical information, or begins to think about the effect of his actions on other men and on the society, may depend on the vision of the counselor he sees.

Draft counseling may also be a step toward commitment for the counselor. Many of us took up draft counseling as volunteers without having thought much beyond a desire to see that others had access to help. In stimulating other men to clarify their thinking about draft alternatives, many of us have found our perspectives. Some have become better draft counselors as a result, while others have gone on to personal involvements in politics more directly productive of social change.

Helping others to free their spirits may in the long run be the only way to meaningful change, but it is a slow way and its societal effects are not often seen directly. The very thing that makes draft counseling productive of a new sense of freedom and worth, its ability to stimulate the value system of the counselee without imposing on him the opinions of the counselor, will be frustrating to those who feel a sense of urgency and want to see results. Few resistance groups and few radical political organizations are still doing draft counseling today, though many are doing so. They have gone on to forms of direct action, organizing, and political action whose effects are more direct and visible.

I believe draft counseling has more radical purposes and effects than skeptics at either political pole realize. I think the goal of the good draft counselor is to encourage the man he counsels to make his own decisions, to seize control of his own destiny, to resist the pressures to conform to other people’s ideas of what is right or expedient. A good counselor realizes that to encourage an easy solution which does not require the counselee to undergo the painful process of examining his own convictions, loyalties, and values is just to substitute his “channeling” for that of the draft board. Manipulative counseling and technical gimmicks do not produce free men; they substitute one dependency for another.

New Challenge

Today draft counseling is under strong challenge. Selective Service is changing rapidly. The Hershey conception of “channeling” the civilian population through the use of deferments is ending; fewer and fewer deferments are available. Many legal loopholes and stalling techniques are being closed off. The Selective Service System is more open with information than it was under Hershey; with the prospect that better (though still inadequate) draft-information booklets will soon be available from draft boards. Thus the justification for draft counseling as a source of information not provided by the government, and the conception that with enough ingenuity anyone can find a loophole that will keep him out of the draft, are not as viable as before.

Is the need for draft counseling ending? I think the opposite is the case. More and more men—among those with highly eligible lottery numbers—are being forced to choose between stark alternatives which can only be examined in terms of basic values and convictions: military service, conscientious objection, draft refusal with the risk of prison, or permanent emigration. The draft counselor is needed not only as a source of technical information about these options, but even more as a sympathetic, non-manipulative friend with whom to examine the moral, political, social, religious, and personal implications of each. While fewer men may have to face the draft in 1971, these men will have harder decisions to make and a greater need for good counseling.

Another view of draft counseling is epitomized by an editorial in the October 24 issue of the Peacemaker. It suggested that draft counselors should manipulate in an anti-draft direction rather than toward cooperation with the system. Those who tell counselees, as the Peacemaker suggested, that “there are only two alternatives—either one cooperates or one does not,” are channeling.
The *Peacemaker* article had this validity: it reminded us that a great many draft counselors channel in the opposite way—talking only about legal and “acceptable” alternatives, implying that resistance does not exist or that the informed conscience cannot choose it. This is no more valid than suggesting that it is the only acceptable course. In many families, especially those without economic advantages, going into the army is still part of growing up, a rite of manhood, and a necessary demonstration of patriotism; the son of such a family who merely pursues a deferment has broken with an imposed pattern and declared his independence.

Many college-educated sons of middle-class families find easy support for avoiding the draft through deferment procedures, and conscientious objection; for them these courses of action are actually easier and more conformist than going into the army. For them, and for men from the peace churches, the *Peacemaker* challenge may be valid. But these men are not the majority: they are an economic and cultural elite.

I have never regarded draft counseling as primarily informational. For me, its purpose is trying to help another person examine the reality by which he is confronted in terms of the goals that matter in his life. Information may be needed along the way, and I am glad when some of it is imparted by the government instead of me. But my goal is a free society, and I don’t see any way to arrive at one without the personal freedom to manage their own lives. It is that, and not inoculating anti-draft attitudes, that I consider the essence of draft counseling. In the long run, I think, it is far more likely to produce a livable, peaceful, and free society.

### Volunteer fund-raisers

Burt Knopp, a retail merchant in Connecticut, has been working as a volunteer CCCO fund-raiser in southern New England since April, 1970. His efforts have resulted in more contributors and larger contributions to CCCO. Many people, when approached, were glad either to learn of CCCO’s work, or to be brought personally up to date on CCCO’s program, and to support its continuing services.

Burt says, “It takes only a few hours an evening to make phone calls to people, and they seem genuinely grateful for the information; most end by saying how happy they are that I called.” An evening or so each week can be a real boost to CCCO.

Burt reports that his work is most rewarding and wonders if other people interested in helping CCCO continue its work would be willing to serve in a similar capacity in other areas of the country. Those people who might be willing to act as volunteer fund-raisers should contact Doug Farnsworth in Philadelphia, Joe Tuchinsky in Chicago, or Mike Wittels in San Francisco.

### Alternative service opportunities

Much discussion has taken place within interested agencies and between them and members of a National Selective Service “task force” on alternative service for COs. The discussion arises because several thousand COs are job-hunting for assignments satisfactory to Selective Service, and can’t find them. There appear for the first time, to be more recognized COs than there are acceptable jobs.

This situation has arisen for three reasons. First, the number of COs has grown by leaps and bounds during the last few years. There are about 50,000 COs in the last current classification picture, compared with 34,000 a year ago, 29,000 in 1968, and 23,000 in 1967. The figures cited are for September 30th of each year. There were, incidentally, about 16,000 on that date in 1960.

The second factor, also new, is the highest unemployment rate in well over a decade. During periods of high unemployment the routine, underpaid jobs which most COs do for hospitals across the country are subject to “job-freeze” policies, which prevent hospital administrators from filling all the vacancies which occur.

The third reason for the shortage of jobs is far from new, and could be rectified. This is the unrealistic and rather punitive attitudes of most local boards backed up by State Directors and, thus far, National Selective Service. The policy of “disruption” is suggested by, but not required by the Law or Regulations. And there is no legal basis whatever for draft boards refusing to approve an assignment because it pays well. These policies were always unfair. It is not particularly unfortunate that they have become unworkable.

The reasonable solution would be two-fold. First, educated COs should be permitted to utilize their skills. College educated men are not very good, ordinarily, at emptying bedpans, making beds, and sweeping halls. They tend to become less conscientious and to feel sorry for themselves instead of the patients.

The second change needed is to permit COs to take jobs with non-profit agencies wherever they can find them, including across the street from their local draft board. This would be especially helpful to COs within minority groups, and COs without financial resources. Boards which require that a job be 30, 50, or 100 miles from the COs home—and most of them do—are completely ignoring the fact that black youths have much more trouble finding work under the best of circumstances. And concerned conscientious ghetto dwellers are desperately needed by this society to work right where they are.

Of course, there are less intelligent, unacceptable ways to solve the problem of COs unable to find work, and National Selective Service has given some of them—such as the establishment of work camps—serious consideration. It remains to be seen what changes in policy take place.
Year of decision

This month, February, both the Senate and House Armed Services Committees are expected to begin hearings on the draft, which will expire on June 30 if no action is taken by Congress. Newspapers across the country are beginning to take editorial positions and, hopefully, organizations will do the same.

There are a variety of positions held by Congressmen and Senators, military men, and civilians within the Nixon administration. Some want the usual four year extension, others a one or two year extension, and still others feel the draft can and should be either ended or put on some form of stand-by basis.

Those who want the draft law extended do not agree as to whether student deferments should be continued, or whether the state quota system should be replaced by a national monthly call for men with specific lottery numbers, without reference to where they live or how many other men their local board has available. Under the present system men with lottery numbers 180-195 were called in some states and not others.

In keeping with custom, draft calls for January and February were inflated, so that monthly quotas could be low at the time Congress makes its decisions. With 34,000 men called up the first two months, monthly quotas for the remainder of the year should average not more than 9,000, and perhaps as low as 5,000.

As the year winds down, enlistment rates are going up, even without the increases in military pay and other incentives planned by the Administration. An end to the draft this year remains a political possibility despite President Nixon’s backing away from his campaign promises. That possibility should be diligently pursued.

Currently imprisoned

In the interest of greater accuracy we list only the following from current prison visitor reports:

Allenwood, Pa.—Bud Alcock, John Back, Paul Beach, Rick Boardman, Willie Boss, Frank Callahan, Julius Cox, Bob Eaton, Rick Fallow, Al Futterman, Tom Marsden, George Mische, Tom Moore Leo Ransome, Andy Reinbach, Chuck Simington, Mike Simmons, Francis Spicer, Ken Stapel, Mike Williams, Robert Znuda

Ashland, Ky.—Jon Bayless, Will Bradbury, Dan Brustein, Ed Durkin, Ed Gargan, Nick Reidy, Bill Sweeney, Chip Tallon

Lewisburg, Pa.—Dave Eberhardt, Robert Jackson, Tom Lewis, Bob Malecki, Bob Meli, Tom Melville, Joel Meyers, Bob Monosson, Bob Siegal, Larry Smith

Safford, Ariz.—Barry Blakely, Kevin Boyle, Dokie Campbell, Samuel Costeles, Dennis Dade, William Gutierrez, Alan Hobbs, John Jarvie, David McRae, Nick Marshall, Louis Motisher, George Rogers, Rick Wilson, Art Zack

Sandstone, Minn.—Jon Bach, James Bale, Fred Chase, Mike Cullen, Mike DeBartolo, Steven Evans, Chuck Fullenkamp, Ron Lucas, Jerry Malmanger, Joe Mulligan, Seth Peterson, Jr., Marvin Sagedahl, Bill Seeverts, LeRoy Stark, Ernest Theel, Roger Yule

Springfield, Mo.—Thomas Allen, Loren T. Lentz, Steve Moriarty, Danny Ray Owens

Terminal Island, Calif.—Vince O’Connor