



Selective Service Hearing: How to Meet Potential National Mobilization Needs

Transcript | April 24, 2019

This transcript was prepared by official military court reporters based on an audio recording of the hearing.

Commission:

- The Honorable Dr. Joseph Heck, Chairman
- The Honorable Mark Gearan, Vice Chair for National and Public Service
- The Honorable Debra Wada, Vice Chair for Military Service
- Mr. Edward Allard III, Commissioner
- Mr. Steve Barney, Commissioner
- The Honorable Dr. Janine Davidson, Commissioner
- The Honorable Avril Haines, Commissioner
- Ms. Jeanette James, Commissioner
- Mr. Alan Khazei, Commissioner
- Mr. Tom Kilgannon, Commissioner
- Ms. Shawn Skelly, Commissioner

Panelists:

- The Honorable Donald Benton, Director, U.S. Selective Service System
- Major General John Evans, Representative of the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command
- Major General Linda Singh, Adjutant General of Maryland, Maryland National Guard
- Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider, Assistant Professor, U.S. Naval War College
- Dr. Bernie Rostker, Former Senior Fellow, RAND Corporation



OPENING STATEMENTS

Dr. Joseph Heck

Welcome to the second public hearing on Selective Service by the National Commission on Military National and Public Service. The purpose of this hearing is to address an important question: What are the potential needs for a voluntary or compulsory national mobilization?

In 2016 the commission was created amid a debate over whether the requirement for selective service registration should be extended to women after military combat roles were open to women in 2015.

Congress charged us to answer two every important questions: first, does our country have a continuing need for a military selective service system and if so whether the current system requires modifications; second, how can we as a nation create an ethos of service and increase participation in military, national, and public service?

The first question is the reason we are here this afternoon. The four hearings we are holding today and tomorrow provide an opportunity to discuss the policy options the commission is considering with respect to the Selective Service System and a potential for a future draft.

This morning's hearing focused on the strategic security environment and potential requirements for elected service and the nation to meet those needs. This afternoon our distinguished panelist will discuss their specific suggestions for how to modify the Selective Service System as well other mechanisms that might be used to support a national mobilization beyond the current levels of the all-volunteer force.

The commission is exploring the use of the Selective Service System to induct personnel with critical skills, changes to the Selective Service System structure and criteria for a draft, and mechanisms to encourage volunteerism in a national mobilization, including the feasibility and



best structure of a national roster to source non-prior service volunteers for national security emergencies.

Tomorrow we will host two more hearings in which we will have the opportunity to discuss who should share common obligation to defend the nation in the event of a potential future draft.

So let me welcome our panelists: The Honorable Don Benton, Director of U.S. Selective Service System; Major General John Evans, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, Commanding of U.S. Army Cadet Command at Fort Knox, Kentucky; Major General Linda Singh, Adjutant General of the State of Maryland, the Maryland National Guard; Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider, assistant professor at the U.S. Naval War College; and Dr. Bernie Rostker, former senior fellow of the RAND Corporation. Thank you all for joining us this afternoon. And now I'd like to turn to our vice chair for military service, Ms. Wada for an opening statement.

Ms. Debra Wada

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the vice chair for military service I'm honored to lead the effort regarding Selective Service System and the military service for the commission. When it comes to selective service and military service, we find one commonality which is most Americans don't understand it. Although there is no draft the Selective Service still very much exists and is active and we should not be confused between the two.

So most young men today register for selective service as a secondary process, whether through financial aid or through driver's license. And in fact, 75 percent of them register as a by-product of another state or federal requirement. So registering is the law and therefore if a male fails to register there are ramifications whether through being denied federal financial aid or employment with the federal and state governments.

So, as you may know there was a district court case decided in Texas earlier this year, stating that an all-male military draft is unconstitutional. And earlier this month the federal



district court in New Jersey, handed a second opinion involving women and the Selective Service, issued an opinion denying the core parts of the government's motion to dismiss.

Previously the Supreme Court upheld the draft registration process, in 1981. In *Rostker versus Goldberg* the court ruled that a male only draft was fully justified because women were ineligible for combat roles.

And as we all know, that has now changed. So, I look forward to hearing from Mr. Rostker this afternoon on his thoughts on that decision.

But the decision will not speed up the commission's timeline for releasing our report, but it does, however, make the commission's work all the more important and relevant. The commission is considering whether there continues to be a need for the selective service in its current form, whether, changes should be made, and if should be disestablished. So when it comes to changes the commission is looking at whether registration should be expanded to include women, whether we identify individuals who possess critical skills that the nation might need, whether we call for volunteers in a time of emergency instead, or incorporating reasonable changes to identify, evaluate and protect those who will not serve in the military.

So, I look forward to hearing from our panelists today on these very important issues. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; I yield back.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, Debra. So, before we begin let me remind you to please silence any electronic devices you might have with you, and I'll explain how we will conduct today's hearing.

The commissioners have all received your written testimony and it will be entered into the official record. We ask that you summarize the highlights of your testimony in the allotted



five minutes. Before you, you will see our timing system. When the light turns yellow you will have approximately one-minute remaining. And when it turns red you time has expired.

After all testimony is completed, we will move into questions from the commissioners. Each commissioner will be given five minutes to ask a question and receive a response. And once again I remind commissioners that while I loath to gavel down on the panelists I'm not as reluctant to gavel down on a commissioner.

Depending on time we will proceed with one and possibly two rounds of questions. Upon completion of commissioner questions, we will provide an opportunity for members of the public who are in attendance to offer comments, either on the specific topic addressed today or more generally on the commission's overarching mandate. These comments will be limited to two minutes. The light will turn yellow when you have 30 seconds remaining and red when time has expired.

We are now ready to begin with our panelist's testimony. I'd like to begin with the Honorable Donald Benton. Director Benton, you're recognized for five minutes.

Honorable Donald Benton

Thank you very much, Chairman Heck, members of the commission and distinguished guests. My name is Don Benton and just two years ago I was appointed by the President of the United States to serve as the 13th director of the United States Selective Service System. During this time, we have made significant improvements in the agency which I will highlight today. I appreciate the work being done by the commission and we eagerly anticipate the commission's final report and recommendations to Congress in March of next year.

Those recommendations are critically important because the selective service is the third tier of defense to our nation, behind the all-volunteer active military and the military reserve component. Selective service is the keystone to our readiness capabilities, one that the



Department of Defense continually affirms, and we send a constant reminder to our allies and our detractors that we are united in our resolve to protect our freedoms.

The selective service is the keystone. When I arrived at the agency our annual budget was \$23 million, virtually the same annual budget from 1983. To offset this financial erosion caused by inflation we continue to leverage new technologies. Our fiscal year 2019 budget has been increased by Congress approximately \$3 million and we will use this to focus on updating our IT systems and enhancing our cyber security. At a \$26 million annual budget this is an incredible bargain to the American taxpayer as selective service is a hedge against unexpected emergencies.

And the keyword here, Commissioners, is “unexpected.” Rarely if ever do we expect a crisis or emergency to occur, but it is a responsibility of the United States Government to be prepared for the next unexpected emergency. The selective service is that preparation. We are ready now because of our active registration program.

In 2009 the late Senator John McCain said, “I certainly hope we’ll never face the requirement to reinstate the draft, but it’s essential that we retain the Selective Service System and the means to do so.” And every modern president has felt the same.

During my preparations for today and in this morning’s testimony I saw and heard certain statements about registration methods that have been categorized as either secondary, passive, indirect or even, some suggest, automatic. Nothing could be further from the truth. This is a misconception. These labels placed by others are false constructs. We do not use these terms at the selective service. To us registration is registration. And registration remains an enduring civic duty.

There is no meaningful distinction between any methods of registration. The consent language on every registration method used by every registration partner we engage is clear and easy to understand. Copies of those have been included in my written testimony.



A recent survey we've conducted shows that registrants know exactly what they're signing up for and where they did it. And in addition to providing manpower for the Department of Defense we have to remember that the other part of our mission is providing alternative service opportunities for conscientious objectors.

To fulfill this mission the selective service has nearly 11, 000 board members throughout the United States, locally, in their own communities to hear and decide requests from those seeking exemptions. And over the last two years we've made significant improvements at the agency.

Today I am very proud to say that the agency is fully capable of accomplishing our mission. For the first time in several years we have successfully completed a series of mobilization exercises to ensure that we can perform our mission effectively and efficiently. The structure that we use is one that is tried and true although we continue to modernize and update that structure with the additional funding previously mentioned. Based on our small budget and our huge responsibilities the selective service is one of if not the most efficient and cost effective agencies in the entire United States Government.

In the future, should we be asked to further enhance our capabilities or add responsibilities, whether it be readiness or reach we will do what the selective service has always done. We will rise and meet the challenge. Thank you for having me here today, and I look forward to answering your questions.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, Director Benton. Major General Evans, you're recognized for five minutes.

Major General John Evans

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, fellow distinguish commissioners, good afternoon and thank you for inviting me to speak to you today. As you know from your research thus far and from



recent media reports the Army has faced difficulties recruiting enough new Soldiers to meet the nation's needs.

As you discussed in your interim report the eligible pool of young people who could meet the Army's enlistment requirements is shrinking. The number of young people with a propensity to serve and with awareness of opportunities for service is an area of concern.

I'm grateful for the commission's efforts to raise awareness of opportunities to serve in our Army and the other services. As the commission's interim report states family members of current or former service members are more likely to serve in the military. We find that this propensity to serve increases among college enrolled youth as they learn more about what it means to be an officer.

United States Army Cadet Command is responsible for commissioning second lieutenant through the Army's Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps program and serves as one of the three principal Army commissioning sources. The other two being West Point, and the Officer Candidate School at Fort Benning, Georgia.

Today, Army Senior ROTC has over 32,000 cadets enrolled in 975 host, cross-town, and extension units at colleges and universities across the country. Over 16,000 of these cadets are earning a college education with a Senior ROTC scholarship. These two, three, and four-year scholarship total approximately \$348 million in 2019.

With a rate of over 5,800 second lieutenants per year Senior ROTC is the Army's primary source of commissioning officers. While ROTC's name implies that our officers go on to serve only in the U.S. Army Reserve and National Guard more than have go directly from college to the active Army. Last year that total eclipsed 3,000 officers.

Senior ROTC is the commissioning source for 63 percent of all Army active duty officers, including general officers. Women have been part of the Senior ROTC for almost half a century. A pilot program developed in 1972 led to the first women enrolled in ROTC. Today



over 27 percent of our 32,000 Senior ROTC cadets are female. Increasingly, these young women are choosing officer branches in the combat arms.

Additionally, females comprise an even greater proportion of Junior ROTC. Over 40 percent of our cadets in high school program. This strong female representation, both the junior and senior programs represents just one aspect of the diversity of our cadet corps. Among our Senior ROTC cadets over 13 percent identify as African American, over 12 percent as Hispanic, nearly 8 percent as Asian, and 1 percent as Native American, with 2 percent identifying as other races. This diversity of gender and ethnic background is a significant attribute of the Senior ROTC program.

Students representing a variety of perspectives and thought processes strengthen our Army and support our engagements with military and civilian partners around the world. Army Junior ROTC represents the nation's third largest youth development program behind 4-H and Scouts BSA and is comprised of over 304,000 high school students participating at over 1700 programs across the nation.

Junior ROTC's principle focus is citizenship and character development. And while Junior ROTC is not a recruiting program approximately 20 percent of cadets express an interest in pursuing a military career.

Were we to face a national mobilization Army Officer Candidate School or OCS would be the primary source for commissioning new officers to meet the increased demand. Within its 12-week program it is able to rapidly turn enlisted Soldiers or civilians into commissioned officer. Expansion of OCS's capability would require an increase in funding, cadre, and administrative staff involving both uniformed personnel and Department of the Army Civilians.

In conclusion, two broad elements factor into meeting the nation's needs in the event of a national emergency. The availability of candidates with the required skill sets who are able to serve among our eligible population and the ability of the armed services to rapidly transform abled candidates into service members.



Finally, a national mobilization effort requires a population of young adults who are able to serve. Holistic nationwide efforts should be made to address the two largest physical disqualifying factors for military service, a failure to meet fitness standards due to obesity, and illicit drug use.

Thank you again for the opportunity to speak to you today and for your work in supporting military, national and public service. I look forward to your questions.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, General Evans. Major General Singh, you're recognized for five minutes.

Major General Linda Singh

Thank you, Mr. Commissioner, and fellow commissioners as well. I want to thank you for having me here today. I would also like to thank the employers that support my personnel during times in which they are called to duty. Without their support we would not be able to do the things that we do. And I think they're often forgotten.

In my role as the adjutant general for Maryland I oversee the Maryland Military Department consisting of the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard, Maryland Emergency Management, and the Maryland Defense Force which is an all-volunteer support force within our state.

With almost 6500 Soldiers, Airmen, civilians and volunteers we are uniquely positioned to answer the call to serve in times of global conflict as well as responding when our Maryland citizens need us most. This uniqueness allows us to leverage a wide range of military and civilian skills across the landscape in which we serve.



In the Maryland Guard, talent management is something that we take seriously. As a result, we have built a diverse leadership team but realize that can be short lived without a diverse pipeline to draw from.

Finding, recruiting, training, and retaining our National Guard force is essential to meeting mobilization needs. Additionally, it is just as important to conduct challenging training to continue to prepare our members for the war fight as well for their homeland mission. It is also equally important to ensure that our Soldiers and Airmen are concurrently fielded modernize equipment to remain interoperable with our active duty counterparts.

Our members are all about service and the want to train and serve to the highest standard possible. We recognize that the Soldiers and Airmen that make up the Maryland National Guard are our most value resource. The Maryland Military Department will continue to field relevant and ready forces to fill the needs of our citizens.

I want to thank you for your support as we continue this chapter in our long and distinguished service. Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, General Singh. Dr. Schneider.

Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider

Chairman Heck and distinguished members of the commission, thank you for having me today. It's an honor to be included in this conversation. My name is Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider and I am an assistant professor at the Naval War College. I'm also an Air Force reservist at U.S. Cyber Command. So, I need to put the disclaimer that my comments today represents my own views and do not represent those of the U.S. Navy, the Naval War College, Cyber Command or the Department of Defense. I think it's all covered.



I was asked today to speak about the skills, the capabilities of the future armed force and discuss the gaps in the force as well as potential solutions as we move forward.

Too often our discussions of future warfare either draw on analogies of the past or presents some sort of SiFi leaving us with the false chose of humanoid robots or GI Joe's. The truth is that these things are not separate, and more than ever technology and human beings are entwined in war and competition. Fighter pilots now spend more time strategizing datalink integration than how to employ guns in a dog fight. Special Operation forces rely on satellite relays and real-time technical intelligence.

The arms race of today, both for winning competition and war is not about technology. It's about technologists. Whereas the mechanization revolution created a whole new class of military professional's today's warfare requires a new class of military professionals. Instead of machinery technician's future warfare calls for data scientists, network engineers, college security specialists, satellite communications, machine learning scientists, the list goes on and on. But these emerging technology missions will happen in conjunction with many of the bread and butter mission sets of today's military. Consequently, the force of future warfare will include data scientists and infantry officers, programmers and fighter pilots, graphic designers and logisticians, webmasters and special operations units. Technologists in this force located at research and lab centers in the United States imbedded in combat units, deployed and at home, and within reserve and Guard units focused on defending the nation against asymmetric threats. In addition, technological skills will become necessary capabilities for what would otherwise be core combat specialties.

So, if technologists are the key to winning great power competition and conflict then how does the U.S. fearing? The answer is that it is difficult to know. First, the U.S. has only begun to understand the technological skill sets it needs and is still largely unable to quantify what talent it currently has or how that talent stacks up against civilian much less adversary talent. Second, in the skill sets that we do closely monitor we have identified significant recruitment



problems. For example, the Air Force continues to forecast a large pilot deficit and all of the armed services are struggling to recruit, train, and retain cyber security professionals.

I am going to outline a few of what I see as the DoD's problems as it faces building that force in the future. The first is that the military is competing for this talent. In cyber security for example, a 2018 study conducted by ISC2 identified a cyber-security labor gap as almost 500,000 professionals. And the competition for talent goes beyond Silicon Valley. Pilots are also increasingly in demand with civilian and cargo airline seeking to replace aging workforce is a shrinking supply of new commercial pilots.

Additionally, the military draws from a smaller pool than these top civilian companies. Candidates must meet physiological requirements whether that means passing physical fitness tests or baseline health assessment. Top technologists with asthma have, some dental implants, IBS or problems with pronation may not be medically qualified to serve in the armed forces.

Recruiting and retaining a small pool of talent is an uphill battle for the DoD. And it's easy to blame this uphill battle on pay but studies suggest that top technologists are willing to sacrifice compensation for work satisfaction. And while the DoD offers a meaningful measure more work needs to be done to increase overall satisfaction. Too often individuals are asked to deal with unwieldy administration including an overly complicated defense travel system, human resources applications that are often inaccessible from standard Internet browsers, defense websites incompatible with non-PCs.

Additionally, the accessions and permissions systems struggle with nontraditional candidates. It provides little flexibility for career progression, a major incentive for recruiting candidates. Related, the military traditional family life, which call on military members and their families to move stations everyone three years poses significant challenges for career couples. But there are solutions and they can be both cultural, organizational, and IT.



Culturally the military needs to evaluate their standards for grooming physical fitness. If it is to work for creative progression opportunities, including fellowship in the civilian sector and it needs to think about how it obtains and maintains security clearances for its individuals.

Organizationally, The U.S. military visa continued to get creative ways to train and provide incentives for Reserve and Guard. The force of tomorrow is a force of technologists. And while it won't be easy to recruit, retain, or train the future forces there are innovative solutions. Above all the military must prioritize people and be willing to make cultural and organizational changes while investing in IT and processes that show the force that their services valued.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, Dr. Schneider. Dr. Rostker.

Dr. Bernie Rostker

Mr. Chairman, members of the commission I appreciate the opportunity provided today. My testimony really boils on to answering four questions: if the military Selective Service Act is to be retained, what should be the structure of selective service in terms of requirements for continued registration and the supporting infrastructure; two, should the act be modified to include registration and if necessary the induction of women? Three, how can the needs for critical skills be met; and four, is a need to maintain the current Selective Service System and the current law. So, let me answer these and then I'll be available for questions as we go forward.

As I've argued in my recent paper the current system of registration is ineffective and frankly less than useless. It does not provide a comprehensive nor an accurate database upon which to implement conscription. As I laid out it systematically lacks large segments of the eligible male population. And for those that are included the currency of information contained is questionable.



Numerically, let me suggest that the database of those eligible for conscription should be at least 93 percent comprehensive and 98 percent accurate. Levels that are far from achieving the current system. An alternative registration system that can achieve these levels and does so in a timely fashion consistent with the Department of Defense's timeline for inductions is much preferred to the current system.

I note that such a system was demonstrated as the registration in the summer of 1980 achieved these letters of comprehensiveness, accuracy and did so well within the DoD timeline. In terms of the options being considered by the commission, as presented in the staff memoranda, only one would meet these standards and still provide the supporting infrastructure to enable conscription to go forward. That option would be the one marked suspending registration. While a great deal of attention has been given to what form registration should take place the registration itself is not the long pole in the tank. The resumption of conscription is based upon the maintenance of the critical infrastructure that would allow the process to go forward.

I might also add as the general commented that a critical issue is the Army's ability to absorb conscripts. And that has been an area that has generally been overlooked as the focus has been on registration of the selective service.

The second question to be dealt with is, should the current art be modified to allow for the registration and induction of women? I must confess to have very different views on this question. I am clear my support for providing equal opportunity to men and women in the service. However, I am not so certain about equally compelling both men and women to serve especially on equal footings. Here my experience as direct of Selective Service during the Carter administration comes into play. While the administration clearly supported the registration of woman, I was impressed by the heartfelt feelings of so many against that position. We clearly didn't have the support of the Congress or the majority on Supreme Court. In fact, the Chief Justice went so far as invent facts in his majority decision in Rostker versus Goldberg, to reject the registration of women.



The most recent district court ruling finding the unconstitutionality of the male only draft also is not an endorsement for conscripting women. Rather, it is a blueprint for what the government needs to do to sustain the male only draft. I cannot think of a more divisive issue than the conscription of women, an issue that clearly does not have to be addressed given the likelihood we will never return to a draft. This is a fight we really do not need to have. It is a fight that can and should be put off till a time when it might really matter. Time in the future where attitudes might have changed, the threat facing the nation would be clear and not uncertain and speculative and a compelling case might be made. If this means that the Military Selective Service Act needs to be repealed so be it. And I'll have more to say on that later.

How can we meet critical skills? As noted in your staff memorandum the key to obtaining critical skills, either on standby, or as needed is volunteerism and incentives. In the past the so-called doctor draft backed by the ongoing draft. The incentive of avoiding being drafted does not exist today. Other incentives, both pecuniary and non-pecuniary will need to be bound and I endorse the commission's actions in this account.

So, finally, is there a need to maintain the current MSSA? The need to maintain the current system is predicated on the following statement in the staff memorandum, and I'll quote. "Although the DoD has no current plans to rely on conscription the nation has historically relied upon the SSS (Selective Service System) to provide personnel to fight and win the nation's wars and asserts that the United States must retain the ability to respond to unanticipated crises. This statement is misleading. It is an incorrect reading of our national history and the history of the military draft. In fact, pre-mobilization draft only existed after World War II and only for the conflicts in Korea and Vietnam. And proved so, if this had been Vietnam that it was replaced by an all-volunteer force.

We have engaged in active military conflict numerous times since 1973 when the all-volunteer force was established. And we did it without the help of the Selective Service System, including the longest conflict in our history. There are many reasons why we have been able to



do so which negates the need for conscription. Most significant is the change in military technology which makes the need for a mass of untrained manpower, the very thing the draft provides, unnecessary and an actual burden. The fact is the Army today does not need and cannot absorb the mass of untrained and unskilled men and, potentially, women the draft would provide.

If history tells us anything is that when we have needed to build a mass Army as we did for World War I and World War II there was sufficient time to develop a new selective system from scratch. In the former case, from a handbook written after the civil war, and in the latter case from the work of a planning cell at the Department of War. Such a cell could again meet any future needs for the reestablishment of the military draft.

So my bottom-line is that there is no need to continue registering people for the draft that will not become; no need to fight the battle over registering women and no need to continue the Military Selective Service Act. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, Dr. Rostker. Based on the competing views I give the staff kudos for their foresight in putting Director Benton and Dr. Rostker on opposite ends of the table. I appreciate it.

Thank you for your testimony. We will now move into commissioner questions and I will put myself on the clock for five minutes.

So Director Benton, based on what you just heard from Dr. Rostker, the question is, if the Selective Service System was to return to a kind of deep standby mode akin to that '76 to 1980 period where registration boards were suspended, the workforce substantially reduced, what functions would be most difficult to reconstitute rapidly and are there specific functions that are critical to maintain? Let's take that one first.



Honorable Donald Benton

Excellent. Thank you for the question, Mr. Chairman. To paraphrase Captain Sullenberger who saved hundreds of lives by landing on the Hudson, “When it is time to perform it is too late to prepare.” I think we should all remember that quote because to suggest that we could go into deep standby and register a mobilize at the same time, frankly, it is nearsighted and reliant on unsubstantiated assumptions to suggest that the selective service could be brought out of deep standby, able to simultaneously mobilize in a fair and equitable fashion in a short period of time. Based on our budget, 124 FTE selective service is essentially already in deep standby. We’re going to have size and the budget-buying power of the deep standby option laid out by the 1997 GAO report. Yet we still manage to register and exercise functionality of our mobilization structure. To further reduce the size of this agency would be catastrophic in the event that a draft is necessary.

In the event of a national emergency it would be difficult to reconstitute our mobilization structure that includes nearly 11,000 local board members in local communities who ensure fairness and equity in our system. The changing attitudes, in other words a drop in civic activity, which is one of the primary reasons for this commission, would make it very difficult for us to reach high registration rates in a short amount of time.

Absence of properly constituted local board and extremely low registration numbers would result because a loss of fairness and equity would occur, which would be obvious to the American public. We are a national insurance policy and we provide that insurance of one-third of a fully outfitted Apache helicopter.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you. So how do you answer the claim made by some that the data collected, especially in today’s increasingly mobile population that the data you collected, a. at the age of



18 for registration is accurate enough to be able to locate somebody between their ages of 20 and 25 which are the most likely ages to be called up if a draft was enacted?

Honorable Donald Benton

Great. That's a terrific question. It goes to the accuracy of our data which has been questioned by several who actually aren't in the know of what we currently do. So thank you. If you'd asked me a year ago, Dr. Heck, I would have said, I'm not sure I'm a hundred percent. Today, I'm a hundred percent and absolutely confident in the accuracy of our data. In fact, we have determined that the address data in our RCV system, for those that complete registrations, exceed 95 percent of accuracy at the time of registration. Now our registration system and our business practices allow us and will allow us to meet our mission requirements related mobilization.

After the initial verification we stopped verifying addresses. We do not have a need to use that data unless the President and Congress activate us. Through several systems we've put in place, VeriForm being one, and others, we have the ability to verify the accuracy and change the date and track every registrant within a couple of days.

So we don't see the need to spend our precious funding to update the system every day or every week because frankly it's out of date within a few hours of it being entered, as any database is. And so we reserve those funds approximately 25,000 and we can update the entire system within a day or two. So, we don't use the money to do that now. We will use the money to do it because we are capable of doing it, in very short order, at the time we are called upon to use that data.

The other think I want to point out is that we collect now, today, for the first time in the history of the agency emails and telephone numbers. So, we have a three-way triangulation to verify the data. So even if they moved out of their parents' house, because they registered when they were college, and they've then gotten married and they moved a couple of times, phone



numbers don't change today. Emails change but much less often that address do. So, we now have the capability of actually notifying and activating registrants within a few hours of the need to do so. And that's why I feel confident that we could absolutely mobilize under our current system.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, Director Benton. Vice Chair, Wada

Ms. Debra Wada

Thank you. Director Benton, I wanted to follow up, though, in our previous panel we talked about the potential for changes and the need for critical skills instead of sort of this draft of potentially unskilled labor pool that historically has been talked about. The selective service as it currently stands is not sort of set up that way to be able to identify those people with critical skills or skills that we would believe that are necessary in a future fight or a future requirement. If we are to retain the Selective Service System and we need to be able to help identify those sorts of people what would the selective service need to do to be able to do that?

Honorable Donald Benton

First, I agree with your premise we do need to be able to identify critical skills. And if current law authorizes us to have a system we would. We are not authorized under current law. We have a plan which we exercise and we're very familiar with how to implement. We would be able to implement it. But we're not allowed under current law to actually expend the funds on that. So, we have a plan. We keep the plan updated. I think there are 71 different medical professions, categories or classifications that we would use but our current system is such that we can adapt it very quickly with the proper funding -- and I understand we're on C-SPAN today, for those members of Congress that are watching us -- with the proper funding the selective



service can do anything you want us to do, including registering women if that's what Congress so decides.

But it requires money. And as you've heard from my previous testimony we've been on a deep standby, you know, life support budget for 40 years. And so, it's pretty remarkable what our small team has been able to do and maintain. But with some additional funding in very short order we would have a system up and running. We do have a current plan. But to implement it would take some additional funds.

Ms. Debra Wada

Can I ask though? Because we talked about the differences between professions that require licensing versus those that don't. So, for technologist most of them don't actually have a license. They have certifications. No one really tracks those certifications unless they're like the top one percent of one percent of that field. If we are in the future of a technology drain how would the selective service do that?

Honorable Donald Benton

Well, first of all, colleges give degrees in technology. So, we could follow college graduates that have been trained by our higher education facilities to do technological jobs. We can obtain that information from those universities and reach to those people that way. We can also do it through a national publicity campaign. Again, with proper funding. Because I believe that the patriotism level of America is high enough that we would obtain enough registrants in the particular categories that we are seeking with a proper outreach and education campaign on media. Again, in very short order.



Ms. Debra Wada

But is fair and equitable as the system is supposed to be setup to be if we're targeting, let's say, college graduates with IT degrees versus technologist who actually -- technology firms are saying they don't need college degrees anymore; so how do we maintain that fairness when we go after certain sort of skill sets that are not easily identified in our population and also that lends that fair and equitable set of, I guess the core of what selective service is supposed to provide?

Honorable Donald Benton

Great question. The fact of the matter is the fairness and equity system is designed for the all-inclusive conscription. When you reduce that down to a very specific skill set obviously that affects fairness and equity if you're talking about the large group. The fairness and equity could be maintained within that technological group, certainly. But because you're focused on a specific skill rather than no skills, clearly, it's a different kind of conscription, a different kind of draft than what we currently do for actual military service. And so, it would be up to the National Security Council, the Department of Labor. We do not maintain the authority, nor do we profess to have the authority to determine what skills are necessary, what skills should be drafted, what skills shouldn't. That's very clearly spelled out in Executive Order 13063A [sic], I believe, by President Obama, that the National Security Council and the Department of Labor will make those kinds of determinations, not the selective service.

Ms. Debra Wada

Okay. Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Dr. Gearan.



Mr. Mark Gearan

Thank you very much to the entire panelist for your helpful testimony. This is enormously important to us. We thank you for that as well as your own public service and commitment to the public good.

I'd like to turn to some questions to Dr. Benton. I was struck in your testimony that you talked about, for many men, registering for the selective service was a pivotal moment in their lives and many associate the registration to transition to the adulthood for doing the right thing. And I think in your oral testimony you said it's an enduring civic duty. Could you speak to that and how see this process as a part of this enduring civic duty?

Honorable Donald Benton

Absolutely. As a scout master and merit badge counselor for civics and citizenship of the community, citizenship of the nation, and citizenship of the world we stress in those trainings for young boys and young men the difference between duties, responsibilities and rights and privileges.

When you live in America you have rights and privileges that come with our constitution and the many laws that Congress has passed. But they're not free. They come with duties and responsibilities. The duty to pay your taxes. The duty to vote. The responsibility to serve in the military to defend this great nation if that necessity arises, and many others; follow the laws, and so on. And so when a young man or a young woman, as the commission or Congress may determine, reaches an age of adulthood and they're getting their own car, they're getting their own education, and they're getting their own homes, that's the time when you say, now that you're on your own are you willing to step up and protect this nation if it comes to that? And I can tell you from traveling this country, and the thousands of men that I've talked to it is a proud moment for them when they make that decision.



Mr. Mark Gearan

So if I could follow up, then, 'cause you said "The right to vote" as well, you have to kind of pair that as a privileged civic duty; could you imagine the Selective Service System being a vehicle to register young Americans to vote as another enduring civic duty?

Honorable Donald Benton

No.

Mr. Mark Gearan

And because?

Honorable Donald Benton

It would water down our focus. Our focus is to be prepared to protect this nation in an unexpected emergency. And that's what we should focus our very limited \$26 million budget on. Again, as I said at the end of my other testimony, Commissioner Gearan, if Congress decides that our structure is so great, which I believe it is, that we could accept other responsibilities and/or duties ----

Mr. Mark Gearan

I noted that you said -----

Honorable Donald Benton

I know that we can do that, but it would take money to do that.



Mr. Mark Gearan

I think in your testimony you said for the House to enhance our capabilities ----

Honorable Donald Benton

Correct.

Mr. Mark Gearan

---- we will rise to meet the challenge.

Honorable Donald Benton

That is correct.

Mr. Mark Gearan

So, if that was the challenge.

Honorable Donald Benton

We can do it.

Mr. Mark Gearan

You can do it. Thank you.



Honorable Donald Benton

We would do it. We work for Congress and the President of the United States and we will do what they tell us to do.

Mr. Mark Gearan

But you see nothing that could prevent that?

Honorable Donald Benton

Yes. Funding.

Mr. Mark Gearan

Anything else?

Honorable Donald Benton

No.

Mr. Mark Gearan

Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Allard.



Mr. Edward Allard

Dr. Schneider, in your testimony you listed several skill sets, at what age group would consider important or sufficient to capture the number of skill sets that you listed?

Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider

At what age?

Mr. Edward Allard

Yes; age group; range.

Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider

At what age? So as the vice chair mentioned a lot of these technology professions actually include individuals that do not have a college degree. And so, whereas in the past the, kind of, the ladder for IT was you got your computer science degree, and so you came out at 22 and then you started working, that has drastically changed. You still have a large amount of the very top talent that's coming out of kind of a standard education process where they're getting math, you know, their undergraduate, their master's, potentially, their doctorate. Now, if you're looking at people who already have their doctorate, you're looking at people who are in their, kind of, late twenties to late thirties as being kind of the primary there. But the reality is that these IT capabilities and especially the more nontraditional skill sets, like, the hacking community, in that community you might see people who are quite good at what they're doing at 18. And a lot of people who are winning the tech talent competitions around the world they are quite young.

That said, at the older end of the spectrum you have individuals that are much better at managing tech portfolios. This is where you see your program managers and your executive IT directors. So, there's probably a peak period of, kind of, technological capacity that would range



somewhere in the, like, early twenties and to kind of mid-thirties but the reality is that people who are working at the top of their game here are going to be doing that up until their fifties, sixties.

Mr. Edward Allard

Okay, thank you. Dr. Rostker, you had mentioned several things I found fascinating but up until recently, as Director Benton reported, the selective service had been restricted from doing any exercises, certainly joint exercises within DoD. What do you see are the benefits of doing those kinds of things, how frequently should that occur? And do you see a value in doing an integrated exercise with DoD and selective service?

Dr. Bernie Rostker

The only advantage would be to put a clear spotlight on the longest pole in the tent, and that is, DoD's ability or inability to absorb the kind of mass numbers that the requirement that has been laid upon selective service. My experience, and I don't think things have markedly changed, the Army was not capable of absorbing the numbers. The GAO was very much on the selective service's case about registration, and once we demonstrated that we could have an emergency registration that met the kind of numbers I talked about, initially 93 percent compliance and 98 percent accuracy then the GAO switched and said, well, that's nice but the real problem is the Army's inability to absorb those numbers.

So I don't think an exercise would be necessary but I do think that the capabilities suggested by the director is easily tested, and within the timelines he's suggesting or in an implementation of the system that he says exists the General Accounting Office could well do what they did with the 1980 registration and that is, randomly select individuals in the database and see who responds to the phone call. In our case we registered what we believe was 93 percent of the population. The GAO pulled several hundred records and made phone calls, and



was able to determine that -- I think out of 200 they got one "mickey mouse." And they were able to make contact. And if you look at the GAO report it certifies as to what the accuracy was.

Let me say that in one very important area I agree with the director. The critical issue in standby is not registration. It's the boards. It's the infrastructure. We would have an immediate court challenges if we went forward with an induction order based upon an 80 percent or a 70 percent population with questionable numbers.

So, getting those numbers right is important. It does take time. It will take resources. It is the boards. It's exercising the boards. That is the critical issue not the focus on registration. Having said all of that one might say is it all worth it, particularly given the situation with the constitutionality of women to have all of these fights given the fact that it is very unlikely. And if we had to reconstitute the registration there is no doubt in my mind, we could do so meeting the guidelines with a post-mobilization registration as we demonstrated in 1980. Not theoretical. Demonstrated.

Mr. Edward Allard

Okay, thank you very much. It seem my time has expired. Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Barney.

Mr. Steve Barney

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Major General Evans, thank you so much for being with us today. Thank you for your distinguished career in service to our nation leading men and women. We've been talking about this idea of identifying, perhaps for registration purposes, critical skills. One approach that the commission is taking a look at that is a little different than that



would be to create a national roster or a civilian strategic reserve that would involve people who, out of their sense of volunteerism, perhaps with some incentives that would encourage them to do this, to be willing to identify themselves, self-identify, prepare to employ their critical skills for the needs of the nation when it is used. I wonder if you can help us as we think about how that might translate into a rapidly mobilized capability, how such an organization could be organized and what types of training would be most effective in order to take those people who have skills that they've learned in industry or in academia and translate them into the skills and their capabilities needed by our military?

Major General John Evans

Thank you, Commissioner Barney. I'll give that a shot. I think as Honorable Benton said we don't have that type of structure right now so it's very difficult to reach into the civilian populous and pull out what those skill sets are. I can't speak for all of DoD but specifically I can tell you that we've taken a look at our talent management processes and we found ourselves a bit lacking. Our processes are a little industrial scale. We need to make them a little more agile and a little more adaptable. So we are implementing a new system called the Integrated and Personnel and Pay System-Army, IPPS-A which will give us an opportunity, as we field it over the next several years, to bring people into the Army and capture some of those more nuance skill sets that may not be part of a formal training program in the Army or what they're doing with regards to basic training.

With regards to how that translates from the civilian sector to what we would do in the Army, if we were to put together such a reserve on the civilian side and we can tie that reserve process into the Army process, in accordance with law and policy, that might give us an opportunity to very quickly identify the talent we need and then move it quick and to the front of the line for training.

Currently we do accelerate training in some instances. What we do with regards to expanding our training base in the Training and Doctrine Command requires time, requires



additional resources with regards to trainers' principle. And the way that we accelerate the training for some is we will directly commission those who have particular skill sets. You'll see that with our legal profession, our medical profession, our chaplaincy, and most recently, our Cyber Corps, those who have those types of skill sets. But I think that's one angle we could look at to get after it.

Mr. Steve Barney

Thank you. Dr. Schneider, in a lot of the work that you've done to study these technologists that are going to be such a key part of our national requirements in the future as well as some of the things that you've done to highlight the challenges of the personnel system, I wonder as you think about individuals you've interacted with who have a foot in both academia and technology, people who might be interested or willing to participate in such a national corps; do you have any insights as to the types of things that might motivate individuals to put their name forward to serve in that capacity and how the services might be able to best capture them and have them ready to act when the time is needed?

Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider

Sure. I think this is a really fabulous question. I see a lot of individuals who really want to give, and they want to serve, and they know that they have talents that can be used in unique ways. We're never going to compete on pay. They're always going to make more money in the civilian world. But work satisfaction and a belief in something bigger than yourself has been one of the dominant themes of Silicon Valley. Part of the problem we're having today is that the narrative of Silicon Valley about how to be bigger than yourself is in the anti-government narrative.

So, something has to be done to work with the private sector to make us understand that both the private sector and the government are kind of on the same page. I think that's something that has to be accounted for. But the other thing that has to be accounted for is that



right now, we don't have easy ways to bring these people into the military fold. We do have some direct commissioning programs, but it's hard to keep those people gainfully employed in the mission that we asked them to do.

So there are these kind of small civilian groups, like, the Defense Digital Service where you recruited people who are kind of high, top technologists and you're giving them these very specific and bounded projects, and then they are able to use their skill sets within these bounded projects which has been relatively successful with such a small group of people. But we're not seeing the same kind of success per people once you get into the people actually having to go into the services. Because once they're in the services and they're in the military then we have all of the administrative requirements of being a military member. You have your computer-based trainings and all the physical requirements of being part of that service. And so, if we're taking people whose time is really valuable and we spend most of their time on kind of making them Air Force or making them Army or making them Navy and not letting them do the mission then we lose satisfaction and it becomes difficult to retain those people.

Mr. Steve Barney

Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Ms. James.

Ms. Jeanette James

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to the panel for being her this morning [sic] and for your compelling testimony.

I'd like to start with Dr. Rostker. Dr. Rostker, in your testimony when you were describing the recent district court decision or ruling you described it as not an endorsement for



registering or conscripting women, rather it's a blueprint for what the government needs to do to sustain the male-only registration and draft. Would you please explain what you mean by that?

Dr. Bernie Rostker

Sure. I'm not a lawyer. So my lay reading of the opinion was that it was full of the argument that the government made an assertion and the courts found that there was no basis for that assertion; not dismissing the assertion but pointing out that the government had not made the case; had not collected the data; had not demonstrated that there was a, for example a high probability that most women might not meet the physical standards of combat training. That was one of the assertions. Where was the data to demonstrate that?

So, to me, in reading it the judge was saying, well, go do the analysis. If you make this assertion then collect the data, do the test that will sustain that. If it cannot be sustained, then obviously there's no basis for that statement. But if it can be sustained, he was leaving the door open, in my reading, to say well, maybe that would be a logical reason to exclude women from registration.

So, I think it was saying to the government, you're really sloppy. You're doing what was charged of the Rehnquist decision; the old canard about the role of women. If you look at the history of women in the combat exclusion, if you go back to the early 1970s it was impossible for women to serve forward of the division rear. And then it became the brigade rear, and then it kept marching forward. And today we've eliminated the combat exclusion.

So, I view that opinion not saying you have to register women, or the court made the decision that there's no validity to the government's case. Just that the government's case had not been demonstrated and needed to be demonstrated if we were to continue a male-only registration.



Ms. Jeanette James

Thank you. Continuing with you and then also Director Benton, if you would give us your thoughts. The commission has heard from many in the conscientious objector community who have advocated for the ability to self-identify as conscientious objectors during the registration process among other modifications; what's your evaluation of the Selective Service System's processes to protect conscientious objectors and what additional modifications would you consider?

Honorable Donald Benton

We believe in the system that we have. We think it's a pretty good system. We have a great relationship with peace churches throughout the United States, the conscientious objector community. We engage with them on a regular basis, as I'm sure Mr. Allard knows from his time at the commission. We believe it would be unnecessary, slow down the process and create a larger image of an unfair system if people were allowed to sign off as conscientious objectors first. It's totally unnecessary unless Congress and the President actually mobilize. So, we don't need to know ahead of time. And we do have a system in place if we do mobilize, with our local boards, where that decision is being made in the local community where that young man or young woman, potentially, would come from. And so we believe that's a much better system than having a military tribunal make those kinds of decisions or allowing people to self-opt out ahead of time so they wouldn't even be considered or reviewed by one of those local boards in terms of the necessity and/or the sincerity of their claim. And so, the current system seems to work well. It has worked well. The local boards work well. And we believe that there's no reason to allow people to opt out before there is a need for them to show that they are a conscientious objector.

Honorable Bernie Rostker

I would have no objection for a check box. It would have no meaning.



Honorable Donald Benton

Exactly.

Honorable Bernie Rostker

If it made people feel better if they checked it, fine. But they would still have to identify themselves when they have an induction notice that they were applying for status as a conscientious objector and present their case to the local board. But if it would make them feel better when they registered that they could check a box, you, know, why not?

Ms. Jeanette James

Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Dr. Davidson.

Dr. Janine Davidson

Yes, thank you all for coming today. I really appreciate your insights and your perspectives.

Dr. Schneider, welcome. Some of the comments that you made about the headaches that people have in serving in the military really resonated with me as former military pilot. Boy, and I'm looking at some junior officers in the crowd too, computer-based training, who doesn't love DTS, Defense Travel System, planning the squadron Christmas party, you know, all those things that just, you know, who wants to do that stuff, man? So, I turn to our two uniformed members here, Major General Singh, Major General Evans, these are perennials, right, we've heard them for a long time, but it does seem like in this particular community they've got better choices.



And so, do you envision a way where the culture and the structures and the processes of the uniformed military can adapt to this new world? We have, you know, people with family issues. The 20th century model of a single earner with, you know you don't have dual income families; high powered people marry high power people. And you want high power people serving in the military, how can we adapt to these people's zig zagging lives and their needs? Or do we need a different model?

Major General Linda Singh

So first, want to thank you for that question because I'm the mom of two very interesting millennials that are completely different. One's a police officer and one's going to medical school. And the thing that I hear, just from my perspective, my youngest, who is about 120 pounds can bench lift probably most of who's here. So, I feel pretty safe with whatever field she chooses to go in. But when I think about our millennials and I think about the new age we can really dance all around the issues of whether it should be women or not. It actually makes me feel a little less having worn the uniform for 38 years. I'm just saying, I guess, I don't matter then but got it. But let's just really look at what the issue is. We need to be able to continue to support a volunteer force. And if we're going to do that then how do we going to reach the young population that are the future leaders of tomorrow? And when I think about that what we are looking at is we go out in the school they need to know what options are available. And it's not just for them to serve in uniform. I worry about them serving in state and local government just as well. And so, we're trying to help them to see what options they have. If we could have a system where it is very easy for them to roll in and out of service into industry, maybe it's into federal government, maybe it's into local government, but we don't have a system that allows us to be able to do that today. The closest that you get to that is the National Guard and the reserve. And so, then when I look at, you know, just my force alone and we talk about how do we get volunteers? Well, I kind of disagree that I can't track individuals with skills, because my all volunteer Defense Force, while it's -- we're really trying to get at a younger generation because when I first became the adjutant general my all volunteer Defense Force -- I 'm not going to say what age they were because I don't want to get in trouble for age discrimination, but they



weren't at the level in which we needed them to. Great folks, amazing people but I needed a different category of individuals. And so, we really started recruiting volunteers. And so, I have about 250 volunteers right now today that have very high technical skills. Some are doctors. Some are cyber professionals. Some of them are engineers. Some of them are chaplains. Some of them are lawyers where they volunteer their time to support us within the state. So, if you looked at that model and you go back to where does that come from? The Constitutional model comes from the state militia, and that's really where they were at. And so, if we were to really look at, you know, maybe we need to look into what does it mean to get our young folks to start serving very differently. We ask them to do community service, so let's change that model. In 9th grade they have to do a semester some place. We have to decide where that place is. In 10th grade they have to do a semester some place. In 11th grade and then 12th grade, then they get the opportunity to say now I have a choice. Because it should be a choice. And when I think of it, you know, I made a choice to come in at 17 and I was a high school dropout. And I'm now sitting here as a two-star general. So you have to say where do you get folks, how are you going to inspire them to be able to not just set here but to -- you know maybe they're going to be -- you know, when I think of Secretary Wada, I mean, maybe they're going to be like it was someone like herself, right? But we're not getting to the heart of it. And so, we can dance all around the issue, we can clout the issue, but we need to get to the heart of what is it that's going to make our young people want to serve in public service whether it's uniformed or not.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Kilgannon.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Director Benton, I wanted to talk to you a little bit about your testimony and your defense of the registration system.



And when I think of selective service, I don't believe it to be a registration system. I believe it to be a draft system. And registration is one step of that. It's a means to an end. So in one of your answers to Mr. Gearan earlier you said as you go out and you talk to young men, you said, you talk to them about the education process and you say, "Are you willing to step up and protect this nation?" And I like that because I think it signifies to them the responsibility they're undertaking. But I noticed in material you provided with your testimony the driver's license applications for Texas, Montana, Virginia, and some other materials it doesn't say that. It doesn't tell young men who are eager to get their driver's licensing would do almost anything to get that at that time that they are potentially putting their life on the line. It says, "You're going to register with Selective Service." One of them says, "Military Selective Service" but it doesn't tell them the potential consequence of what they're undertaking; is that fair to our young people?

Honorable Donald Benton

Thanks for the question, Commission Kilgannon. I appreciate that. The fact of the matter is we should give our young folks a lot more credit than that. Unlike previous generations this generation carries around a palm size computer with them all the time. I don't think it's unreasonable at all to think that a young person, if they had a question about what the selective service was that they could whip out their little Apple or other device and look it up and read it. We have thousands and thousands of hits every day to our website.

I think it's unreasonable to think that young people today don't pay attention to what they sign, especially on their driver's license application or their FAFSA college form application. I think they do pay attention to what they sign.

I have four children; three boys. All three of them knew exactly what they were doing when they signed the FAFSA form, because if you look at question 9 and then go to the book that they provide for you, as we do on tax returns and every other government form where you



go to see what do they really want in that question, and you read what FAFSA is looking for makes it very clear what you're signing up for.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

So, it's common practice for them to read the fine print is what you're telling us?

Honorable Donald Benton

I think when you're filling out a government form if you don't look at the instructions on filling out the form you run high risk of filling out the form incorrectly and I think most Americans know that. So, I do think they do additional research as they're filling out these forms.

However, the form itself, even without the additional research, as I've indicated, makes it very clear that they are signing up for the selective service.

So, yes, I think it's open, clear and widely known, at least in a recent survey that we conducted, over 600 respondents, we asked them how did they ever hear of the selective service and they knew exactly where they'd heard of it; from a family member; from the driver's license -- if they didn't think they were signing up for the selective service for the military they wouldn't have been able to answer that question. And that's just most recent. We did that about two weeks ago. And so, we are very confident that most folks know exactly what they're doing. I am fully aware that this commission has heard from people who claimed that they don't. But I believe that is a minute minority in America.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

So, you have a lot of confidence in our young people and you expressed that in answer to a previous question about the level of patriotism being high; is that level of patriotism high enough to sustain a voluntary selective service registration process?



Honorable Donald Benton

That would be up to Congress and the Department of Defense, and, again, maybe the National Security Council could decide. I don't know the answer to that question. And I'm not afraid to tell you I don't know. I hope so. I hope so. Because like John McCain, I pray to God I will never have to activate or mobilize this agency.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

Me too.

Honorable Donald Benton

But I also pray to God that if I am required to, I will be ready to do it the way it is supposed to be done. That's my mission. That's my job. And that's what everybody at the selective service today is committed to. We don't have the luxury of thinking about other options. As Sullenberger said, "When it comes time to act, the time to prepare has past."

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

Thank you, Director. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Ms. Haines.

Ms. Avril Haines

Thank you. Thanks very much for taking time to this with us today. I want to dig into the skills set and skills-based issue and in a way drawing off of Steve's questions. Let me put them into two categories.



One category might be in the context of trying to attract the talent and the skills that we need in our civilian and in our military space. And I think technologists are a clear part of that but there are also other types of skills that are critical to our national defense. And that question of mobilization and trying to compete for the talent and bring them in and recruit them is a key one that you've talked a little bit about. One question that comes up for us is in the context of registration or in other places; can we use that to identify skills, right, and is that useful for recruiting purposes? And it's not really the intent of the registration system -- I mean, the registration system is really there to help us, essentially, in the event of a national emergency to mobilize folks but it is something that comes up on a frequent basis that this might be a space where we might identify people and that that could be useful to us, and it is riddled with all of the issues that have sort of been surfaced in different ways, which is that we're focused on a subset of the population between 19 and 25 that isn't necessarily going to have the skills that we're looking for at that period of time. And in many circumstances, it's not as easy to identify in the context of particular types of skills like the medical field or other things. So, I would love to hear from Dr. Schneider and General Singh just your perspective on whether or not that's a useful thing. And then I'll put out the other question that I've got.

In the context of a national emergency where we need a particular skill set and we need to draw on that skill set -- that's also been something that's been suggested to us, at least -- and it's unclear how likely that scenario is but it does seem to me, and I think General Singh you'd be particularly positioned to answer but I'd love to hear your thought too, Dr. Schneider, just how feasible for us to actually integrate skill sets like the one that you can imagine we would need in that circumstance into the force in the context of a national emergency; is that really a reasonable scenario and how would we prepare for that? Thank you.

Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider

So, the question first about can we identify the skills? The age group is a difficulty because so many of these skills, you know, are kind of added -- as that moment in time where they answer a question doesn't represent where the skill sets are. And to be fair, technology five



years from now, the programming languages have changed. The core specialties -- I mean, 10 years ago we weren't talking about cloud security and now that's one of the core competencies.

So that's a real challenge in some ways would have to be living and constantly updating, which is very difficult, logistically. But in the question about integrating skill sets I think the National Guard has actually started thinking about this in a very concrete way. The National Guard has taken real measures to create teams that are prepared to help with the defend the nation and their responses to cyber emergencies. Partly because where it sits legally in terms of its ability to act within the domestic populations. And there are states who have done a really good job of integrating core critical infrastructures with specific cyber protection teams, so you have, for example, an electrical power supply company, and the great thing about the guard is that you can members the guard who spend their day-to-day operations actually working on the SCADA systems or working on the ICS of those critical infrastructure and then if there were to be an attack it's easy then for that person to put on their Guard hat, now they have the authorities delegated to them from the Guard side that allows them to do things they can't do in their civilian capacity but they know the networks. Because one of the big problems, especially, when it comes to cyber incidents is that each of these companies and each of these infrastructures have very different types of networks and software. And so, having somebody that's already in the company and already understands how that works is like a huge asset. That's something that the Guard brings in a unique way even above and beyond the Reserve.

Major General Linda Singh

Just to add on to that, I think what makes it challenging is that once they're in the service it's easier for us to be able to track the skill but we're still not even there yet. And as Major General Evans even mentioned when we get to the Integrated Pay and Personnel System, which is different for the different services but when you think about that in general it give us the ability to be able to track some of that, but it's only as good as the data that you put in. So that's great for those that are already service members. But then we're talking about trying to recruit a



population that we don't even know where their skill sets are, what do they have, and what I want to be really careful about is that should we ever have to go forth where we are going to be calling not only God and country, but you're calling the Guard, you're calling the reserve, you're calling everybody and the we're asking for those to come in behind us, when you start looking at that I think that we are lying to ourselves if we think it's only going to be in technological skills. It is going to be everybody, ladi dadi. I hate to say that term. But we're going to need logisticians that have technical skills. We're going to need mechanics. We're going to need drivers. We're going to need everything because that's because that's the way the system works.

And when I think about just across the board it's about how do you get at that bigger group? And you know we will have some critical skills that maybe we need to focus in on, and I would say when we get that point, we need to do some public service announcements. Because I think that if I was to say in the state of Maryland I guarantee you that if I went and said I needed volunteers -- and if you think just back to the civil disturbance in Baltimore, my God, we didn't even have to ask for volunteers. We got volunteers we didn't need.

And so, you will get volunteers that are going to step forth. But if we don't have a process to be able to handle that, if we don't have a process to be able to integrate them, we will overburden the system. And so, we will find ourselves in a very challenging position. And so, I think there're two different issues that we have to look at. That's the ones that are not even in uniform yet, how do we get at that skill set, and then the one that are in uniform.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Ms. Skelly.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Director Benton, I'd like to try and stitch together some of the things that were mentioned here and get your opinion on a thought that we had in our



conversations as commissioners. Some of the words that you've mentioned and explained very thoughtfully are your consideration of fairness and equity with regards to registration and you've also talked about how you impart learning with regard to duty and responsibility. What I'd like to try to get at is your appreciation of the government's side those considerations of duty and responsibility when it comes to the individual, where does the government's role and responsibility come into play? And thank you for your testimony and your response with regards to how registration is considered primary versus passive and secondary.

Honorable Donald Benton

There is no such thing as passive.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

It's in regard to that. And it primarily had to do with driver's license applications and how they interact with registering for the selective service. We've got 50 states, DC and territories, how many of those bodies does the selective service even have agreements with for registration purposes?

Honorable Donald Benton

Let me make clear; these are not agreements. These are state laws.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Right.

Honorable Donald Benton

Passed by state legislators.



Ms. Shawn Skelly

Okay.

Honorable Donald Benton

Signed by governors of states, democrats and republicans. So, it's a state law.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Do those come about as part of your interactions with them or they just organically occur?

Honorable Donald Benton

Forty-one.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Forty-one.

Honorable Donald Benton

Forty-one; to answer your question. Forty-one plus the state of Alaska which uses the permanent fund rather than the driver's license.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Understand.



Honorable Donald Benton

Because every citizen there gets a check from the permanent fund.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

So, 41 out of 55.

Honorable Donald Benton

Well, there're only 50 states.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

And DC and the territories.

Honorable Donald Benton

And we have 41 agreements.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

So not every territory someone lives in is that facility to register available to them?

Honorable Donald Benton

Yes. DC is one.



Ms. Shawn Skelly

Got you. So, it's not universal across the United States; it's dependent upon the agreement?

Honorable Donald Benton

All but seven states I think do it, including our territories.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

So, there are penalties for failure to register, potential penalties, lack of access to federal jobs.

Honorable Donald Benton

Federal law lays out a number of penalties for failing to register.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Exactly. So is there a responsibility on the government side with regards to potential vulnerability or peril of penalties when I could be a male who -- as mentioned in the morning panel, fewer and fewer Americans seek driver's licenses now as a result of the economy and how things are going. If I don't have a need or my life's journey does not take me to college during the age of required registration therefore I don't hit the FAFSA process, perhaps, which means a couple opportunities, my word, to be "caught" by other systems to get me to register yet later in life I'm vulnerable to it where if I had decided to pursue a driver's license, if had been wanting to go to college and needed aid through the FAFSA process I'd be presented additional opportunities and requirements to register; does that impact the fairness and equity of how people would come in jeopardy of being penalized for something where depending upon where



you lived or you grew up in that you had more opportunities, my word again, to be “caught” by the system to say you should register, where I take your point to heart about duty and responsibility understanding as a citizen your obligations to the nation?

Honorable Donald Benton

Right. That’s a great question. And no, I don’t. I guess I would liken that to the fact that should we run public service announcements that tell you you’re going to go to prison if you steal or rob from people. I think most Americans probably know that. We work with every high school in America. This last year we mailed every high school principal a letter and posters. So, we are trying to be ubiquitous for that very reason, Commissioner, because -- it’s a horrible thing to have to tell someone I’m sorry we can’t verify you and it’s up to your agency. Now the agencies are the ones that determine the willful or not. We don’t make that determination. We simply, yes, they’re registered, no, they’re not. And so different government agencies can make different determinations based on what their perception in their interview and their background investigation. We simply provide the yes, registered, no, registered. But our job is, through outreach, now because of the budget this agency used to spend a lot of money on public service announcement and television advertisements. And we had 750 reserve force officers that went out into America and spread the word. Today we have less than 150 reserve force officers simply due to budget. But we do a fairly remarkable job still in terms of maintaining those relationships with high schools, still getting some public service announcements aired. In fact, this last year were able to get 10 major airports in America to have a major effort to educate the community.

And so, we continue to reach out in inter-seen and diverse ways. I think of a hockey rink in Burlington, Vermont where we bought an ad where they play all the state hockey games. I mean, that’s pretty important. We reach out to every superintendent of public instruction in each state when we do an outreach trip there. I’ve been on several outreach trips. We meet with the governor. We try to get the schools involved. We also meet with judges. I did an outreach trip to Hawaii and I met with the juvenile court judge. We talked to them about maybe it would be a



good idea to make sure that your juvenile probationary are not violating federal law by being registered for the selective service. It would be a good opportunity there.

And so, we are trying to be ubiquitous. That is our goal. It's hard to do with the funding we have but we are trying to make sure that everyone knows, because as I said earlier, it is heartbreaking to me to have to tell someone, sorry, we don't have any record of your registration. It's a small percentage of folk but even a small percentage is too many. So, we continually try to innovate and reach out, which is why we have evolved.

Paperwork Reduction Act, you know, we have to comply with that. So, our processes have moved over the years from paper to electronic. We don't think they're any less effective or any less transparent, but they are easier, and it makes it easier for people to register. And that's our goal. We want to inform, educate, and make it easy for the youth population to register. So we've moved from 98 percent paper registrations where you go to the post office; about 8 percent of registrations come in through those printed forms now, and what we call our registration partners, DMVs, recruiting stations, because they make sure that even though they sign up that they register. All of our partnerships, whether it's the Alaska Permanent Fund, the driver's license, Department of Education, we make sure that they make it clear to their folks what folks are signing up for. But we'd like to have more partners. We want more government forms. We want to reach out to more people. We don't want to leave anybody behind because we want people to know.

Now, if you know and you choose not to that's your choice and that's the beauty of it in America. Is, you can choose not to if you don't want to. There are consequences just like there are for any other choice that Americans may make. But what I don't want is for someone to not be able to receive the benefits and not having known about it. That's not right and we want to try to rectify that.



Ms. Shawn Skelly

Thank you for going down that path with me and such wholesome answer. I appreciate your indulgence.

Honorable Donald Benton

And I think we can rectify that if we had a little more funding for some more publicity, honestly.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Thank you, sir.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Khazei.

Mr. Alan Khazei

Thank you all, first of all for your service to our country and for sharing your thoughts with us today. My question is for Dr. Rostker. So, if I understand in your testimony you are recommending that we keep the Selective Service System in place, but we get rid of the registration process and we do a post-mobilization registration; how would that work? Why do you think it would be better? And what would you say to people, some of who testified as to say, well, having registration is a deterrent to potential adversaries to say that we have a resolve?
Honorable Bernie Rostker

Let me deal with the adversary question. That was the issue or the argument that convinced President Carter to call for the registration. That argument was sustained for about 10



days. Congress completely rejected it. It just made no sense to the people who were dealing with it. It goes back to the World War II and the single vote that sustained the registration.

The fact is that everything we just heard about all of the efforts and the dealings and driver's license totally useless; absolutely unnecessary. If the goal is to have a comprehensive list that's accurate, that can be drawn on which is consistent with the DoD timeline there is no reason to have an ongoing registration. We demonstrated in 1980 -- we registered the last week in July, the first week in August and by mid-September we had a list that was 93 percent comprehensive and expanded from there, that the GAO certified was 98 percent accurate. And that was well within the DoD timeline. There is no reason to have an ongoing registration.

The only argument that really has had any currency was it reminds the young man that he has an obligation, but we've undercut that by doing it through driver's licenses, by having it passive. As the director said, 90 percent of the people had to go and make the positive step of going to the post office, facing a government official, although it was simply a postal clerk and filling out a form. But we've eliminated that. He doesn't have to do anything. He gets this letter which says, by the way we've registered you. And that's the entire contact. Where is the commitment? You want to have a commitment then have a real commitment. But you can do that with a post-mobilization registration. The statement that we need to be prepared and it's too late, yes. We need to be prepared to have a post mobilization registration.

If you want to print the forms and have them in warehouses, fine. If you want the procedures, I can show you the handbooks that had those procedures; post-mobilization registration. When President Carter said in the state of the union, we're going to register we implemented the post-mobilization registration. The week before the postmaster general had signed a memo of agreement that in an emergency that the post offices would be the place of registration. I had the pleasure of calling him one week later and saying we were implementing the emergency registration. And we did the entire country for the price that it would have taken



to mobilize the election mechanisms which was the old way of registering, in California, and we did it with -- timely, accurate, comprehensive.

The question you asked about what states, I think California does not share driver's license -- so, hey, move to California you're basically exempted from being drafted because -- if you don't want to go to college, if you don't want get a government job and have aid the government's never going to find you. That's wrong. The publicity that we had that the money flowed once the decision was made that we were going to have registration all of that gave us a 93 percent registration comprehensiveness and 98 percent accuracy. We met the timelines. There is no need for a continuing registration.

Mr. Alan Khazei

I yield, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

So that concludes the first round. Hopefully everybody's doing okay, and we'll just dive right back into round two.

Honorable Donald Benton

Mr. Chair, I need to respond to that last question.

Dr. Joseph Heck

As we go back around through the second round of questions. So, we'll go into round two. We'll still make sure we have enough time towards the end for public comments.

General Evans, we've heard Dr. Rostker talk about the long pole in the tank with the military's ability to absorb, you mentioned it yourself, under the current timeline of first



inductees to MEPS 193 days and then the first 100,000 by day 205, with the assumption that if we are now mobilizing folks that the vast majority of the active duty force and reserve force is already engaged, and the Army being probably the biggest recipient of inductees; what's the plan? In the days of constricted force BRAC how are you going to absorb those inductees and get them out the door in a time to engage in fight?

Major General John Evans

Thank you, Chairman. Great question and I appreciate you asking it. It's a wicked problem for us. Make no mistake about it. I think some of it we get after with regards to identifying critical skill sets but that's only part of the problem. Really, most of the skill sets that will be required in time of crisis, particularly in a combat situation, are going to be skills that we're going to teach Soldiers. So, we're going to rely heavily on the training base to be able to fill that need.

Now, TRADOC right now is in the process of reviewing policies and getting back to the Army, speaking specifically for the Army, about what our capacity is and how we could accelerate the timeline. But in a time where we don't measure the speed of war by what it takes to cross on a Trans-Oceanic cruise liner but rather the milliseconds that it takes to be engaged in cyber or space warfare, we are looking for ways to be more agile on its face.

By design, the Training and Doctrine Command is built to expand. A couple of the really critical elements that we don't talk about a lot are the activation of the 80th and 108th Training Commands whose job it is to fill out our drill sergeants and augment the active duty force. And then we also have the ability to call up people who have prior military training, bring them back in as contractors or civilians and use them for the military occupational specialty MOS-type training that will be critical after the initial entry basic training occurs.

So, it's certainly something we spend a lot of time looking at as we take a look at all the OPLANs across the world and we will continue to apply a lot of brain power with that moving forward.



Dr. Joseph Heck

So, with what degree of confidence would you say that the Army would be able to make mission if all of a sudden you have 90,000 inductees showing up at your recruit depot?

Major General John Evans

Well, I think we have a high level of confidence. All of combatant commanders across the world take a look at their standing and operational plans and they take a look at what their force alignment is, and they communicate back to the service departments about what their requirements are, and the service departments plan against that. So, it's really getting out the door, which is the critical piece to build time in order to build combat power across the force. I think we have the capacity to do that but it is going to require resources and it will require probably changes in policy that will allow us to curtail some portions of the training plan now so that we are preparing young men and women for combat but not doing things that are not necessary for success in combat.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you. General Singh, I'm really intrigued by your state's civilian defense force made up of volunteers. Are they prior service or are they just civilians that decided to want to engage and help support the National Guard and the state of Maryland?

Major General Linda Singh

So, we do have some that are prior service. We try to make it so that it's about 50, 50. But we really will take someone that has never ever served before, they may not be able to serve and we look at them and say, you know, what is the specialty skill that you have? And if they don't have something then there are areas in which we actually train them. But we've started to be able to do with this particular group is there are places in which I have shortfalls that I can't



do all the things I'm being asked to do and continue to deploy and all of the other things, and we use this force to supplement some of our training and some of our support. And so, we've been able to actually turn that into what is their service dollars related to? So, if we take the hours, the community service hours that they give and translate that almost every single year we've turned that into almost a \$2 million, kind of, what I would say, cost-to-serve for them.

And so that's been helpful for us because they've done some pretty amazing things for us.

Dr. Joseph Heck

And is that something that's unique to the Maryland Guard or is that something that the Guard does across the states?

Major General Linda Singh

So not every single state has one. I think there's only about -- I want to say maybe half of the states that have them and maybe even a little less than that. And you know, they have been pretty problematic. I hate to say it but previously they were the boys' club. And it was problematic in the sense that it was very political. And so, when you really want to strip out that force and get to some critical skills you're then going to recruit in different places. And we do things in schools. We are partnered with University of Maryland, Townson University, Johns Hopkins, and so these individuals are absolutely critical to helping us to partner not just with the colleges and institutions and the schools but also in looking at our religious partners as well.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you very much. Ms. Wada.



Ms. Debra Wada

Thank you. I guess my question is for General Singh and Dr. Schneider. When we talk about technology cyber seems to be the big attention grabber here wherever you go. You know, in that particular case bringing people on even if they have the skills and we expand the age of what is eligible for selective service, actually utilizing them because they don't have a clearance, they don't have sort of the prep that we need them to be able to integrate into our military structure, like people who start digging into the details think it sounds good but it's never going to happen; so is it really necessary that we change the whole system for sort of these little specialized skills when in actuality in practical application we might never be able to get to use them? So, what should we be looking at if we're looking at what the selective service should look like in the future and if there should be changes? How to get over some of those sorts of barriers that we should be aware -- one, we should be aware of but two, like how would we approach those things? Because I'm thinking, is it time for us to bring back a strategic reserve since our reserve components have gone to a strategic reserve? Any way.

Major General Linda Singh

So, I think we can probably debate the whole operational strategic, that's another whole conversation, but I mean, we do need to look at a model that allows us to get at, and I still say going back into the high schools. Because we have to start there because not everybody's going to go to college, and nor should we be asking everybody to go to college because they could be going to trade schools. We leave the trade schools kind of out of it. We leave the community colleges out of it. So, we've got to get to that particular population. If we go back, what is the one thing that every single person has to have? If you are in the U.S. what's the one thing that every single person has to have?

Ms. Debra Wada

Social security number?



Major General Linda Singh

Social security card. Everybody has to have one. And it's time for us to relook at that anyway because we need to, from a cyber perspective, protect our social security numbers, right. So, we need to go a whole different kind of system even without it with that if we're going to protect identity. We just haven't gotten there yet. So, what if we were to look at, what is the one thing that every single person in the U.S. has to have? And if that's the one thing then how do you make so that if you know they have a social security card then what is it that we need from them? If it's tracking registration of skills, how do we get that? Because they're always going to use that social security number somewhere, some place somehow. And that also ties in back into taxes and everything else, right. So, we can find them. Somehow the government seems to find them. So, let's just think about the system and how can we use that in a much more efficient manner that allows us to be able to plan for the unmentionable, right, because we don't know what the future's going to look like. But I will tell you that the system we have today needs to be reinvigorated.

Ms. Debra Wada

Thank you. Dr. Schneider.

Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider

So, I want to take on this question about what these individuals with skill sets who maybe don't have clearances could possibly do. I first want to say it's a problem even within the active duty. We have these huge backlogs and so you have people who are sitting outside of the building waiting to get in for a huge amount of time doing almost nothing. But there are actually a lot of really innovative ways that we can use people that don't have security clearances. And one is to think about them as individuals who can build software or some sort of technology tool for a mission. Whether that's some sort of software tool for scheduling your flight operations or for handling manning. These particular projects are projects that DIUX has done under its



mandate, but those are projects that don't necessarily require clearances, especially for missions in the mission administration that's not a secret or top-secret job. And too often we think of cyber and technology as being something that looks like the NSA. But the reality is -- I mean, if we get a hundred great technologist and fix DTS they don't need a clearance for that. That would be fantastic, you know.

And the other thing, and this is something that Cyber Command has been doing, the team that I'm a part of at Cyber Command the Points of Partnership Team is a team that takes diverse skills that are not necessarily sitting at Cyber Command. So, I have a PhD in political science, I'm sitting at the Naval War College. We have other members of our team who have PhDs in data science, they're star companies. We have people from venture capital companies. We have individuals who have worked at Google. These are kind of top technologists. Most of them don't have a top-secret clearance. What they do for Cyber Command is they know what the emerging technologies are. So, they understand what's in the art of a possible and what's happening inside the private sector. And so, having individuals that can provide a linkage, not only a linkage about information or understanding of where technology is going but also a face that represents the government that's sitting next to Silicon Valley are technologist every day that show that we really are coming from the same background. So, I think there are large rolls that individuals without clearances can play.

Dr. Bernie Rostker

If I might. You're focusing on individual skills. You should be focusing on mobilization. And a good part of mobilization, certainly that occurred in post-9/11 was industrial mobilization. These capabilities reside in companies that are specialists. The issue isn't necessarily how you get the individual. The issue is how you get the company. We have whole companies that are cyber security specialists. You need to be able to tap them, and there's a whole literature on a whole set of issues on the procurement side about rapid procurement and the involvement of industrial capability into the DoD. That's as much mobilization as the individual -- touching the individual at the company to bring them into the military; bring the



whole company in. We did this in World War I. We actually, in the medical area, went to hospitals and created reserve units and brought the whole hospital in as a unit and gave reserve commissions to all of the doctor staff in the hospital to fully man a deployed military facility in Europe based upon a hospital in Cleveland, for example.

So, you need to expand your thinking from the individual to also the institutions.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Gearan.

Mr. Mark Gearan

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This has been such a great conversation here. Thank you. Dr. Rostker, I just want to make sure I understand your point to your second observation here in terms of amending or modifying the registration to include women. And you stated candidly that you're conflicted. Certainly providing equal opportunity are compelling; referencing your own service in the Carter administration and perspective well placed for that, but then saying that it's not really the time, it's not a fight that doesn't need to be fought at this point, which of course is our charge, right? It may not be the right time from your perspective but is the charge to this commission. So, I guess my question is, is that more of a political analysis that you're providing to us? I'm you're certainly not a lawyer for the court cases or what they were.

Dr. Bernie Rostker

Absolutely.

Mr. Mark Gearan

So, it's solely a political judgement you're rendering?



Dr. Bernie Rostker

When you get to that level it's all political.

Mr. Mark Gearan

Okay, so pretend you're a king and the politics are off the table.

Dr. Bernie Rostker

They can't be off the table.

Mr. Mark Gearan

Well, let's pretend.

Dr. Bernie Rostker

I can't pretend because we can meet our military obligation with men. We can meet them with me and women. The decision to include women is a cultural decision.

Mr. Mark Gearan

So, does it concern you, as a cultural decision that we're in a position of 2019, 2020 America where we would affirmatively say no to this possibility if it is a cultural question now? You said it's a political question. So, if it's a cultural question does it cut the other way in terms of your objective for equity and equal opportunity?



Dr. Bernie Rostker

Someone suggested that to me that the issue was given to the commission because the Congress didn't want to deal with it. And I would say as 11 members of the commission you can represent your personal views, but I don't think you can impose those views on the United States. I think it will eventually have to be Congressmen folks.

You can't change the law. So you can give them your views that you as 11 individuals have voted and decided that this is what you'd like to do; do you really think the Congress of the United States is going to say, well, the 11 told us that we're going to go do it? They're going to face their individual constituencies representing the views of their home and make a judgement. And they cannot, by putting it off two years or three years and giving it to you, avoid that responsibility.

I was just so convinced that registration was the right thing. There was no reason -- we would have run a separate draft to fill only women places. And boy did we get beat up on the hill because the country was not ready for it.

Mr. Mark Gearan

Right.

Dr. Bernie Rostker

And that's why we have a representative form of government and the Congress of the United States and they have to face their constituencies.

Mr. Mark Gearan

Right. Any other reflections on this question?



Major General Linda Singh

So, this is Linda Singh's personal view. We're coming up on the hundredth anniversary of the 19th Amendment and a hundred years ago we weren't ready for that either. Congress was split. The states were split, and we fought, right? Or at least the shoulders that I stand on they fought. And there were men and women who fought alike to move it forward so women have the right to vote. So, what I would ask you is, where are we today? And are we really debating something that should be asked to the future population? Because when I ask my young service members, I'm going to tell you, they look at me and they say, "Why are we even having this discussion? It should be just settled." And I know that we're culturally not ready for it, but we weren't ready for it a hundred years ago and we did it.

Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider

I think it's hard to make a compelling argument for women in combat if you're then going to saying that they're not part of this process. I also think that if the whole point of having this is to create a civic moment, then not letting women participate in it is also poor. And I also think that protecting women from the draft is -- I would say my personal reaction to that is that that feels a bit condescending.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Allard.

Mr. Edward Allard

I was struck, Dr. Rostker about, if I heard you correctly, you said that within three months you are able to get a 93 percent registration rate; July, August, September?



Dr. Bernie Rostker

Yes. What happened was we had a plan. Nothing was in place. The President on January 20th said we would register. It took until June for Congress to vote us the money. In that time frame, that six months we put all the infrastructure in place.

Mr. Edward Allard

So roughly nine months.

Dr. Bernie Rostker

But a lot of that first six months could be negated by planning.

Mr. Edward Allard

Understand.

Dr. Bernie Rostker

Once we had the go-ahead, we were able to implement the registration within a month. We registered enough one-year group and we registered it over a two-week period. It didn't tax the post offices to have people descend on the post office. We had all of the forms processed and in the computer by the second week in September. The lottery could have been held at that point, and at that point we had 93 percent compliance; 93 percent of the eligible population was in the computer and 98 percent accuracy.

Mr. Edward Allard

I understand that.



Dr. Bernie Rostker

We had a comparison. We had the previous on time registration of people within a month of the time they should have registered and that was 78 percent. So, because of the publicity and the like we were able to get that kind of penetration.

Mr. Edward Allard

That's what I wanted to get to, what was key, absolutely essential to have that? Did President Carter make an announcement?

Dr. Bernie Rostker

We had public service announcements. We had a lot of press coverage. Everyone knew that this was up and running and the question was would we have defiance? We effectively invited people to a party and had no idea how many people would show up. Well, the answer was 93 percent of those invited showed up.

Mr. Edward Allard

And the driver, was that the invasion of Russia?

Dr. Bernie Rostker

That was the President's concern. And this was in the face of a lot of opposition from the Republican side. Senator Hartfield particularly, led opposition. The press at the time would say no one's going to show up; we've been to the post office; we don't see anybody there. Well, a million people spread among 32,000 post offices over two weeks you're not going to see very many people at any given time.



Mr. Edward Allard

I find that remarkable to be honest with you. Director Benton, you say you have run some tests, what have been the findings of those tests? What are the strengths, weaknesses, areas for improvement? And what else would you like to do?

Honorable Donald Benton

Excellent. Thank you very much, Commissioner. If I may, I just want to touch a little bit on the 1980 numbers before I get into that. If you look at the GAO report, you'll find that 1982 the GAO revised those 93 percent number down to 87 percent. So, check into that. It's because they forgot to count all the population in all of territories, possessions and all of our American citizens that are overseas. And so, it's really around 87 percent. It was further reduced in 1997 to 87 [sic] and then in 1980 [sic] the GAO reduced that number again to 77 percent -- 1981. So, take a look at those numbers. And two months I think is a misconception. The president announced in January he's going to do it. It took Congress six months to fund it. How long do you think it would take today for Congress to fund an effort like that?

Six months later we start registering. So, America has been told for seven months they're going to be required to register. They had one common enemy, the Soviets. So, understand the circumstances were very different. And with all due respect to the doctor that was then, and this is now. And things are very different today. Electronic registration, a whole new deal. In fact, we wouldn't be compliant with the Paperwork Reduction Act if we didn't use electronic registration.

So, when I first arrived at the agency I said, "How do we know we can do our mission? My boss wants to know. Can we do our mission?" "Well." "When was the last time we did an exercise." "Uh." "You're taking too long to answer that question." So, we have conducted exercises; absolutely; in different phases. And we found a few glitches and they're fixed. And so that's why when you ask me a question and when the President asks me a question, are you



confident, my answer is absolutely 100 percent confident that our database is accurate and up-to-date and that our processes are up-to-date and in place that we can perform our function. So now what our focus is trimming off days from the 193 number. We believe we can do that. We're taking actions to make sure that we can do that. Especially with telephone numbers, texting and emails. We can not only reduce cost to the agency, printed letters, but also timeline for activation can be reduced dramatically with these new technologies.

And so those are the kinds of things we are doing. Just so you know.

Mr. Edward Allard

Thank you very much.

Honorable Donald Benton

I hope that answered your question.

Mr. Edward Allard

It did. Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

I want to let the commissioners know that in order to give everybody a chance to ask a second question and to make sure we leave time for public comments that I'm going to strictly enforce the five-minute rule. Mr. Barney.



Mr. Steve Barney

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. General Singh, we've had an opportunity as the commission to travel around the country this year and meet a lot of 17 and 18 year-old Linda Singhs who are excited about their service and ventures and I can't think of a better example of professionalism and success than what you've achieve in your career. And thank you very much for being here today and for that service.

Once upon a time in the Navy I was serving in command and I had an enlisted reserve sailor report in for the two weeks of duty, and as I had my initial welcome aboard meeting with this person I learned that this enlisted sailor was actually a state judge, which points out something that I think you brought out in your earlier testimony and that is, we have individuals with remarkable skills and professional achievement who serve and who volunteer to continue serving. I wonder if based on your experience in the reserve component and in leading are there things that you have learned that the nation can do to perhaps, like, through the MEPS process, whether we're talking about it in a mobilization context or otherwise to really help to get tools that can help up screen and identify the kind of valuable skills that the military needs so that we can best channel people into those critical needs that the service might have.

Major General Linda Singh (Maryland National Guard)

So first off, our process is already designed to do that. When we are recruiting, we already know where are the needs and how are we going to recruit into those fields. So that process is already set up and I'm looking at my counterpart her because they're part of the reason why we have those processes, at least on the Army side that allows us to be able to do that. But if I was to think about -- MEPS is kind of one of those things where, you know, what are some of the ways that we can improve that process because that's a medical process. And asking them to take on more than just focusing in on making sure our folks are medically cleared to kind of come into the service I think would be asking them just a little bit too much. But I think when we're looking at trying to ensure that people understand what is available to them, what do we



needs we have to do more education. And so, one of the things that just pops to my mind that's happening in Baltimore this year, the Army is actually focusing in on specific cities. And that's not just Army. It's Army Reserve and Army Guard. The Army is kind of leading it where we're recruiting in these big cities. And it's because that's an untapped market. It's a place where they really don't know what their options are, and we really need to be educating them before they get to the point of being disqualified. And so, when I think about that, part of it is making sure that we're out there and making sure that we're in the community and being engaged. And that's the biggest piece that I think most of my folks are starting to learn that the more we engage the more we open the doors. The more that we go into the schools -- and it's not like we're going in and saying hey, you've got to join the National Guard, or you need to join the Army. I mean, yeah, we're always wanting to recruit but we're talking to them about the different types of career paths they can. Or we're going in and teaching leadership or we're going in and teaching ethics. It's those types of things where the schools are now opening the doors for us and saying, please, we need more of you coming in and doing these types of things. And we're also doing a course in cyber. And what I will tell you is, you know, there are kids that have some amazing cyber skills and they haven't even graduated school yet. And so, you know, as I watch what's going on across the landscape, I really think that we have to start appealing to this younger group and if we don't engage them and appeal to them, I think we're missing a huge opportunity here. And so, part of what I would hope the commission would really push is to look at how do we engage them from a civic perspective and getting them to really think about how they serve.

There are things that I do and not everybody has to do that. There's a group of young me in Baltimore that I pass every single day. They wash my car windows and they want money. And I give them a dollar, and I'm always talking to them. I hand them my business card and I'm saying, hey, you know you could come into the Guard. I know you're not quite old enough, but you can come into the Guard. Now when they see me this next week, I have squeegees and new bottled stuff to give to give to them along with some Maryland National Guard recruiting materials. So, we should always kind of be trying to education them. And who knows? Maybe



one of them will join. But the point is that we have to engage them, and we have to engage them where they are.

Mr. Steve Barney

Thank you, General. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Ms. James.

Ms. Jeanette James

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Director Benton, in response to Commissioner Skelly's question you talked about the 41 states who currently have a law that links the system to obtain a driver's license with registering for the selective service and all of those laws were passed by the state legislators and then signed by the governors. And you also indicated that you have conversations with the governors on an ongoing basis; the assumption is that if the decision was made by Congress to change the law and include women in the registration that those state laws would have to be changed because my understanding is that some of those are very specific about the gender and the age group that it applies to; from your perspective in your discussions do you have any concerns about the viability of that part of the registration process if all of those 41 states would have to re-legislate and re-debate and re-adjudicate that linkage by law between the driver's license and registration for selective service?

Honorable Donald Benton

Terrific question. Really good. Because we've thought about that. And the more recent one, in fact, we've just recently added a state. As you know it's 41 now instead of 40. That language is generic. So, we've been kind of forward thinking for a couple years on the language but as with everything in America every state has a different view and so your comment about



that is correct. All those laws are a little bit different in some way. None of them are identical. Many are generic. Many tied it to a federal process. The federal changes that no change necessary there, but certainly some their language is specific, and it would require changes. In those states that have already passed those laws we believe that it would be relatively simple if Congress does make a change for us to go to those states and say, would you make this change?

Some states depending on where they're at may not like what Congress did and so that might be a problem for us. Do we believe that it will present a significant issue for our registration numbers? No, we don't. We believe that most of that can be, again, overcome with the proper publicity and the proper funding. But no. Most of the folks that are signing up through the driver's license are doing so because it's convenient. They would sign up through another source if that wasn't available. But it's convenient and it's powerful and we get them when they're thinking about it as they're going into their own lives, if you will. And so, it's a good timing mechanism to have it tied to the driver's license. Of the few states I'm not sure that they have a number on exactly how many would require changes, but we believe that we could overcome that in short order with the right funding and the right publicity. So, no, I don't it would be that significant. And, again, we don't differentiate, really, between a primary or a secondary. There's really no such thing as a secondary registration. They're all primary registrations for us. Some are electronic, some are paper. That's really the only difference. In fact, the ones that come from the DLL are the most accurate as I mentioned earlier because of the Patriot Act. No, we don't see that as a significant issue in terms of changing the DLLs. We think that that would be fairly simple to do especially if we knew Congress was moving when we're moving, and lock step with them probably in terms of our legislative efforts.

Ms. Jeanette James

Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.



Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, Dr. Davidson.

Dr. Janine Davidson

So, let's return to this question about how can we motivate or inspire more people to serve in various places. So, I'm looking at Dr. Schneider as well as Major General Evans in particular.

For General Evans, you know you mentioned in your opening comments that 70 percent of the young people don't even qualify to serve. So you're out there giving out squeegees with the National Guard emblems on it but they may not even be qualified; are there some standards or things that we do in the military that, whether you agree or disagree, that people have identified as maybe it's time to relook this? And I've heard things about tattoos and hair, and you know, maybe your parents put you on Ritalin when you were 13 and that disqualifies you, whatever; are there some categories like that where we could, just sort of low hanging fruit, not to lower the quality of our fighting force but to be more inclusive in a way in our high-tech environment where we could bring more people in?

Major General John Evans

Thanks, Honorable Davidson. I appreciate the comment and question. And you're right. So, we are currently, in the Army, and I'll speak from the Army here, we've got a talent management task force that's looking at lots of different elements of that. Do we have our medical standards where they need to be? Do we have some of the policies that tend to deal with how we present ourselves? Are they the right policies for this day and age? And there's been spirited discussion at senior leader levels about those types of things. I will tell you that our secretary is unequivocal about the fact that we must sustain a standard. He's absolutely unwilling to reduce that standard and I applaud him for that because ultimately it is leaders that get to deal



with that when we reduce the standard. And we're also looking at financial incentives. I think Dr. Schneider said, hey, it's hard to compete from a money standpoint with some of the industry that's out there right now, with unemployment being as low as it is, it's a challenge. And as we used to say in SOF, "I don't do it for the money, but the money never hurt." You know, we'd offer somebody a bonus or something like that. So, we are looking at levers that help. But I think principally, and I'm looking at your emblem up there on the two screens behind you, it comes back to that word "service." And it comes back to, really, your website there, "inspire." What are we doing to inspire young people to be willing to serve? We talk a lot about millennials but what's interesting is the millennials are kind of gone. They're too old. They've aged out. So, it's gen-Z or the I-gen or whatever you want to call them. They are motivated by different factors. As we dig into this, as we take a look at the data, we're finding that in some regards they tend to be a little more thoughtful about service than some of our millennials were. And I don't like putting stamps on any group or generation but my point is I think we can reach them at a level that has to do with a desire to serve and I think we are better served if we present them a good picture of what service means to the nation as opposed to saying, hey, here's an extra \$10,000.00 if you'll join the Army.

So, I don't know if that helps with your question.

Dr. Janine Davidson

Dr. Schneider.

Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider

So, I'm going to take a little of a contrarian position here. The first thing is I think even the language in which we discuss this belies bias that we have. So, reduce the standards; I don't think that's the right ----



Dr. Janine Davidson

“Adjust.”

Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider

Yeah, make the standards equivalent to what we expect out of them. So, do we expect that all of our force is going to be on the ground carrying large loads across difficult terrain? And we're looking at a conflict in Asia-Pacific, how much of that conflict is that, right? I've heard in the discussions, for example, about the Army's new rollout of their PT program, the discussion about hey, we want our Soldiers to be capable of conducting the Korea missions from 1950; which makes sense, right? Korea is one of the AORs that we look at all the time. But we're not investing in technologies that represent that same type of conflict. So, what we want right now is we want our Soldiers to be extraordinarily physically fit and be able to operate all these up-to-date technologies that are extraordinarily complex. And I think the reality is that there's got to be some give and take, especially if what we're talking about is a conflict or we're going to have to mobilize forces that can't all be high-tech, high physical fitness standards. We're going to have to think about what we're going to get and what we really value. And it really depends on the types of conflicts that we think we're going to opt into and the way in which we're going to fight them. And right now, we are investing in technologies; technologies and conflicts that are more long distance. And because of that I think that we can't apply all the same standards to all the same forces. I also think that what individuals really want is to feel valued. And I think that some of the things that we discount about how they feel valued and prioritizing their time, for example. I don't think that's a millennial issue. I don't think that's a new gen issue. I think it's just prioritizing people and showing people that even though they're serving, and we appreciate their service that service isn't how we value them.

Dr. Janine Davidson

Thank you.



Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Kilgannon.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

General Evans, in your testimony you talked about JROTC and the number of schools they're in, there are two numbers, 1709 Army JROTC units and then there is 3400 JROTC programs; what's the difference between those two?

Major General John Evans

I apologize if my numbers weren't clear. In the Army we have 1709 Junior ROTC programs that we sponsor. DoD-wide there are 3400. So that would be the Air Force, Marines, and Navy that have the others.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

Okay. So, I guess that means 3400 high schools; do you have an estimate of how many high schools you're not in and what are the obstacles to getting into more of the high schools?

Major General John Evans

So, in rough terms, there's about 33,000 high school in the United States. So, we're in roughly 11 percent from a DoD perspective. And the Army represents half of that number. For Junior ROTC we have over 300,000 kids. The biggest obstacle, frankly, is funding. The way the Junior ROTC program is administered is that the school systems hire the instructors, we certify them in the Army, and then we basically pay about half of their salary. We bring them back to the level they would be at if they were still on active duty. There's a formula for it. It's a little complex, but it's basically half. And then we provide the equipment for the program, the school



provides the space, things like that, but there is a bill to DoD, and we fund that at a certain level, and we decided collectively not to fund it beyond that level so that's why.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

We've heard from some that recruiters are not allowed onto high school campuses or discouraged from visiting; are you seeing that that there are schools that you'd like to be in but the administration is telling you, no, we'd rather that you not be here?

Major General John Evans

So, I've heard anecdotally that we're having trouble accessing some areas. And my good friend at Fort Knox, Major General Frank Muth is the commander of United States Army Recruiting Command, so he owns that recruiting force. And I will tell you that there are areas where we have a little bit of friction trying to get into the high schools. Some of that challenge, frankly, comes from how we reward student performance in high schools. For instance, we will - and will reward the school district by virtue of how many people they have that matriculate to college, but they don't get any credit for people who go on to serve in the military. I think that's problematic. I think that's something we should look at holistically.

What we are finding is that in the districts that have Junior ROTC programs they are absolutely the crown jewel. The superintendents, the principles, the administrators that I've talked love it; the kids graduate at higher rates; you have less teen pregnancy; you have less gang violence; you have higher GPAs; you have a better school to career or school to college path for those young people. So, it's a great program and one that I'm a huge fan of because we didn't have it in my high school.



Mr. Tom Kilgannon

And what's the number one attribute of JROTC, serving in it, that would increase a young person's propensity to want to serve in the military?

Major General John Evans

What I have found is that it is the fact that we provide structure where there may be structure lacking. It really is a citizenship and character program. It's not meant as a recruiting tool. We do get some benefits from recruiting, but what we find is, when I talk to the instructors and they point to me at child who may be a high risk youth, comes from a high risk environment, is that what they were lacking wasn't mental acuity or the ability to do things or even physical fitness, it was the fact that they didn't have structure in their home life and Junior ROTC provides them that structure.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

Thank you very much.

[The chairman discussed with Major General Evans the possibility of Major General Evans's need to depart in order to catch a flight.]

Dr. Joseph Heck

Ms. Haines.

Ms. Avril Haines

Thank you. Okay, I'm going to try to pack a lot into my five minutes. But let me try with this.



One thing that's been suggested to us is in the context of if we continue the selective service registration if that's our recommendation that there be an opportunity at that moment to give young people who sign up, essentially, an opportunity to learn about civilian public service, national service, opportunities to sort of indicate, look, there's a whole series of different ways in which you might serve, and that both that information would be useful to them, provide some access, potentially, but also to send a message that there are so many different ways to serve, and that that also might be an opportunity to allow/facilitate them to enlist in -- registration would actually then track their skills to some extent. I'd love any reactions to that.

Honorable Donald Benton

Let me just say, we do a little of that now. In fact, when we follow up in mail to a registrant regardless of the method of registration they also receive in that material on opportunities in the armed forces. So, it would be relatively easy to add to that public service opportunities as well. So, we already partner with the Army and DoD in terms of recruiting because if an individual signed up to register then why not let them know that there're some great career opportunities in the military. And so, we use that relationship and that partnership to help promote or at least educate what the opportunities are in the military.

As you know, from your work, about one percent of the population is touched today by someone that serves as opposed to a much higher 15, 20, 30 years ago. So, these kinds of partnerships where we're able to educate people on what the opportunities are very important, I think, for the nation. And so, we're happy to participate in that with the Department of Defense in that regard. And I think we could certainly do the same thing with public service.

Dr. Jacquelyn Schneider

Pragmatically, are you going to give people some information about how to apply to do these things? I mean, I've never successfully gotten through a USAJOBS, like, to an interview.



[Laughter.]

Ms. Avril Haines

Yes, no question there is an additional piece to the barriers to public service and national service across the board; without question. Yes, absolutely.

All right. Let me confirm something that I think was indicated in relation to the answer to my question and also to Debra's question just to make sure I've got it right. It sounds like there is a sense that it would be useful to basically have more information about what people's skills are but recognizing that what we want today in terms of skill sets is going to be different than what we're going to want in the future so it has to be flexible. And it has to be something that isn't just tracking the 19 to 25-year-olds. It's broader. That's fair?

[Affirmative response from all panelists.]

Okay. Thank you. A second, I think is just this question of -- in that context, if you go down this road -- General Singh pointed something I certainly have a lot of sympathy for which is that the social security number as our ID across the board has a lot of vulnerabilities that we should be mindful of. If there were a kind of broader registration or opportunity to basically provide this information, to have access to additional information, assuming we fix USAJOBS and a variety of other things; is that something that you see as valuable as a general matter?

Major General Linda Singh

I think that if you made the appeal, say that you go to an national ID, whether it's social security number with some kind of authentication to say that you not only are we going to be asking you to provide some skill sets but we could start keeping your data even more safely, I think that appeals to almost everyone. But we would have to have a guarantee that can do that which means we have to kind of take a step back and say, okay, how are we going to look at that? How are we going to first fix the problem that now everybody has, which is the personal



information? Because that I think is going to be the challenges. I can give you my skill sets, I could tell you what I'm doing but can you keep it safe? Are you going to be able to protect it? And so, let's look at social security number. Let's look at making it more secure. And then let's say, okay, since you have a social security number -- you need to get a job any way -- is there a way we could link that to skills?

Ms. Avril Haines

Thank you. General Evans, to the extent that you have a personal opinion about whether or not women should be included in the registration requirement I'd love to hear it.

Major General John Evans

So that's a policy issue that I would defer on because I'm not a policy guy. But what I will tell you is I have served with women my entire career and there's absolutely no differentiation with regards to their capability and attributes.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Ms. Skelly.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Over the last several years there's been a large and often pointed conversation, continual conversation about the Department of Defense being able to access critical skills and people mid-career that have developed skills through experience and time; putting your TRADOC hat on, how's the Army doing with the authorities that it has when given over time and have you had a chance to access people mid-career who might be looked into the high demand type folks?



Major General John Evans

Thank you, Commissioner for that question. You know, as I alluded to earlier, we're looking holistically at talent management right now to see how we can activate better leverage for some of that.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

It's a real paradigm shift to go after that.

Major General John Evans

It is. So, it's identifying those people which is hard in and of itself because it's not like we've got this big database to go off on. But it's also then trying to encourage and inspire them to want to serve which is a different problem. But I will offer, because we spend a lot of time talking about critical skills, and there is certainly an element of that with regards to rapid mobilization or a large mobilization, but since Dr. Schneider took the contrary view a few minutes ago I'll take it with her now, and that is, the largest consumer, historically, of the draft has been the Army. And they've been a consumer because basically what we needed is, you know, hard charging folks on the ground with rifles in their hands taking it to the enemy. We can teach people to do that. The bigger issue is their fitness and ability to be able to do that. So, while I can appreciate her point on, you know, should we kind of take a look of what the paradigm is right now and shift that? I think there's space to have that conversation but the number 1 resiliency factor in the crucible of ground combat is physical fitness, without a doubt. This is why we've made the turn the way we have with the Army Combat Fitness Test and this is why I am so concern, as is the Recruiting Command commander and the TRADOC commander and the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of the Army with the general level of fitness in our society. If we know that three out of 10 kids out there is physically, mentally, and legally eligible to serve that's 30 percent to start with. And that is not a really good place to be if you've got to mobilize hundreds of thousands of people in a time of combat. So, with absolute respect



for Dr. Schneider’s point on that we believe that’s pretty significant piece of the pie. We’re going to bring people in and we’re going to give them the skills that they don’t have in order to be effective in the jobs that we align them with but I think you’re hitting on something that’s very important and, that is, how do we figure out what the menu of options are with all the skills that are out there that we can employ?

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Thank you. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Khazei.

Mr. Alan Khazei

Thank you. Thank you all. This has been a great discussion. My question’s for Major General Evans. I also want to build off of what my colleague Commissioner Kilgannon was asking about JROTC and also referencing what Major General Singh said about “We’ve got to get kids in high school,” which I think is right. As we travel the country, we actually met some fabulous high school student who are in JROTC, so congratulation.

We’re the commission on military, national and public service and it’s the first time, actually, that all three have been brought under the same umbrella which we really see as an opportunity and the folks in Congress had the foresight to bring this together. And we’ve also learned, as you know better than I do, more people from the south tend to join the military than people from where I am in the northeast. I’m from Boston, Massachusetts.

Major General John Evans

True.



Mr. Alan Khazei

Would you be open to -- and I think some of the difficulty of getting to some high school in part of the country is because there's just concern about the military -- would you be open to, Major General Evans, developing a pilot program, potentially, in partnership with the Corporation for National and Community Service where you'd get exposed to what JROTC does but also have a program that exposes you to civilian national service opportunities, AmeriCorps, Peace Corps, YouthBuild, et cetera, et cetera as a way both to expand the program and also bring in -- it's not in my daughter's high school, Brookland High School. I'd like to see there. I think if it was presented that way folks in Brookland might say, oh, that's a great opportunity. Let's expose young people to both. Would you be open to trying to develop a program like that that would offer young people both exposure to the military and civilian service opportunities?

Major General John Evans

Thank you, Commissioner. I think the answer is as long as I don't have to pay for it.

[Laughter in the room.]

I will tell you I think it's a great question. So, all of our Junior ROTC cadet, like our ROTC cadets and like our Soldiers have a creed that they have to talk about; they have to memorize it. And it includes elements of service, just service. Because we built Junior ROTC on the military model to give it structure and give it form, but we are really trying to achieve with the program is teaching people about character. And so, I think we've already got the roots of that embedded in the Junior ROTC program. I'm certainly am not qualified to say what the department will or won't do in that regard, but I think it would not be a far cry for us to include elements of other types of service besides the military.

There are obviously other service organizations out there for young people in the high school. And I mentioned a couple of them, I think, in my comments with scouting and 4-H and



others. But I think talking about service is important. I think we've got to do that. We've got young people that are coming up now that, right, wrong, indifferent, we continue to tell them to think about themselves. We teach them to seek self-actualization. And that's fine. I think it's a great place for everybody to get to. But we also need to talk to them about selflessness and we need to talk to them about service. And we're probably not talking as loud about that as we need to.

Mr. Alan Khazei

Thank you very much. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Khazei, and Director Benton, General Evans, General Singh, Dr. Schneider, Dr. Rostker; we greatly appreciate your time today and thank you for providing valuable information to the commission.

We will now dismiss the panelists. If you'd like you could to take seats in that front row during public comments. Or, sir, if you need to catch a flight, we appreciate our participation today.

The commission is committed to transparency and openness with the public. In keeping with these principles, the commission intends to provide the public with an opportunity to deliver public comments during our hearings.

As a reminder in order to provide the greatest opportunity for as many participants to offer us comments as they like public comment is limited to a two-minute period a person as is noted on our website. Sign-up for public comment took place between the opening of registration and the start of this hearing.



When you signed up you received a numbered ticket. To ensure fairness tickets were randomly drawn. We will call out five ticket numbers at a time. And ask that when your number is called please come forward and make a like behind the mic located to my right, your left and provide your comment. On the easel to my left your right you will also see the ticket numbers in the order that you should line up. If time does not permit you to offer your oral comment we encourage you to submit your written comment at our website inspire2serve.gov. Additionally, if you have any written statements that you would like to submit for the record please provide them to staff at the registration desk.

I now invite ticketed 043, 035, 039, 037, and 032 to come forward and line up at the microphone here. Please if all five would come up and line up now so we could move through the comments expeditiously. Again, 043, 035, 039, 037, and 032. Number 43 please identify yourself and your affiliation and provide your comment.

[Not present.]

35?

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ticket #35

Commission members and staff, I am Dean Hess, colonel USA Air Force, retired, a senior advisor to SOS America. As a retired Air Force officer and business consultant concerned about the need for continuing to renew our country I commend [sic] the SOS America initiative to you as a part and hopefully a big part of the solution to respond to national emergencies.

If implemented our program would give citizens military training prior to mobilization and allow the military services to setup and support additional training resources that could be used for mobilization requirements, a key shortfall in our current plan.



As I said this morning, General Borling has testified here in Washington with you. I want to emphasize that only a small percent of our young men and women qualify physically and mentally for the all-volunteer force. We support the need to expand the opportunity for military non-combatant training in service for our young citizens.

We advocated affordable one-year, small unit military experience mixing geography, backgrounds and ages as a small unit of young people to take care of themselves as they would, based on their ability, for strenuous requirements that's not in the all-volunteer force requirements.

Absent exemptions, and given command, they would train and serve in platoons of 30 companies of a hundred and respond to noncombatant mission needs.

You've heard this morning about positive motivations for national service -- I would end with saying that if funded national service could will allow participants a vehicle to pay off loans, scholarships and a path to citizenship. Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, Colonel. Number 39; step forward, please identify yourself and your affiliation and provide your comments.

Ticket #39

Hi, my name is Brian Kim. I'm with the Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Lab; senior staff engineer. I was once a naturalized citizen in 1988 and currently I'm also a U.S. Air Force reservist. I support a Space Command operator; serving now in the military of our country.

When I swore in in 1988, I still vaguely remember, I have to bring it up on a website, some of the things I have to refresh my mind of why I came to the United States. And one of the things that I swore an oath to the United States of America is that "I will bear arms on behalf of



the United States when required by law. That I will perform noncombatant services in the armed forces of the United States when required by law; and I will perform work of national importance under civilian direction when required by law.” That’s my obligation.

I also swore to defend the Constitution of the United States when I swore in as a second lieutenant. So as a lieutenant colonel currently serving the United States service and it’s more important for us to really remember why joined, why we’re doing it and why we came here to the United States.

One other thing I would like to share with you is something I read at the Lincoln [sic] Memorial. It says, “I’m not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions, but laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truth discovered and manners and opinions change, with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors.”

We have an opportunity to change the law that has been in existence for several years. You, Commissioners, have an opportunity to make a change and make the suggestions. I think we’re in a place where we can make the changes. I think where many panelists have suggested the change that need to be made, I think we have an obligation to just so. I just wanted to make this statement. Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you. Number 037. Again, introduce yourself and provide your comment.



Ticket #37

Hello, my name is Bill Galvin, and I'm the counseling coordinator at the Center on Conscience and War. We were founded in 1940 to protect the rights of conscientious objectors. I think the best thing this panel could do that will help conscientious objectors is to recommend that draft registration ends for men and women.

But what I really want to talk about now is the issue of a check off box or some way to acknowledge that you're a conscientious objector at the time of registration.

I have talked to thousands of conscientious objectors probably tens of thousands. I've been doing this a long time. Most of them are registered as the law requires. Some of them have not. And it's for them a matter of conscience. They feel that to even register with selective service is a form of participation in war.

Earlier in this panel today the director of selective service called selective our third tier of defense. And this morning members of the commission were asking panelists about the deterrent effect of having the registration. So, the registration has been used in that way. And the people of conscience cannot just say, yeah, I'm going to put my name in there and allow myself to be used that way. So, for some of them having this check off box or some way to acknowledge they'll see it when you register would allow them to register. I'm not going to say that's going to make a huge difference in the registration rates. I think it probably won't make much of a difference, but it will make a huge difference for some people with conscience and allow them to register and not be penalized in all the ways that have been talked about this afternoon. So, I think that's a pretty important thing to do.

The other thing I want to mention is earlier today the director of selective service mentioned that when people get registered by driver's license or some way like that that they're aware of what they're doing, everybody reads the fine print when they fill out a government form; that's not true, okay. We get calls in our office from people who say, I just a registration



acknowledgement but I didn't register for the draft. And of course, when we talk with them some, we come to find out that they did something, like, get a driver's license or filled out the FAFSA that got them registered. So, we need to be aware that this is a real issue for a lot of people.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you so much. Number 032 come forward. And I'll also call up now 041, 034, 033, 036 and 038.

Ticket #032

I'm David Siegel. I'm a professor emeritus at the University of Maryland. I directed the Army Sociological Research Program during the early years of the all-volunteer force. I served on the Army Education Advisory Committee and I'm also a local Selective Service Board member. I've been studying military personnel issues for about half a century. There are a couple of surge issues I want to speak to, one is just to remind that whatever we do with regards to gender if we're going to treat men and women equally whether we register them or keep it in abeyance until we have an actual emergency you're doubling the size of the population that the system has to deal with. And in talking about what resources are necessary to do anything that needs to be kept in mind.

Dr. Rostker mentioned the issue of what happens after mobilization when people start coming into the military. We actually run that experiment every summer because voluntary enlistments increase at the end of the school year. And last year I visited all four of the Army's basic training centers. And all of them experience summer surges. And they deal with it amazingly, largely by drawing on the reserve components to provide additional drill sergeants. To my knowledge it had not taxed the National Guard very heavily. But I suspect that were we to go to larger national mobilization that is the way we would do it. We implement a call for s



service to National Guard drill sergeants and that simply means that they've got to be qualified to do what they're doing.

A number of years ago I participated in a study at the Center for Strategic International Studies of Junior ROTC and was amazed by the number of high schools that wanted Junior ROTC units that could not get them because the services were not providing the funding for all that. There have been two interesting studies of public Junior ROTC -- public military academy secondary schools; one in Chicago; one here in Prince Georges County. They've had phenomenal success. The reasons high schools want these programs is for most of them that have them it is the major extra-curricular activity available for the students. Without JROTC they wouldn't have anything. And they find that JROTC increases discipline, increases attendance, increases graduation, and all of those are good things and that's something that this commission should take very seriously. Thank you very much for your attention.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, sir. Number 041.

[Not present.]

34?

Ticket #34

Hi. My name is Arianna Standish. I'm a freshman at UC-Berkley. And looking around this room my brother Calem and I are the only the ones who would be affected by this decision on the draft. And I'm 19 and my brother is 15, and in a few years, if the selective service is extended to women, we would both have to register. And Director Benton made the point of registering for the selective service it is a marker of "adulthood" and something that young men



are excited about because they're going to serve their country. I do not believe it should be a marker of adulthood. It is something mandatory, not something you choose to do like voting, not something you work hard to do like graduating high school or getting into college, but it is something that you're forced to do by the law. And you're forced to give up your private information to military recruiters and should there be a draft, should we go to war you're forced to give up your freedom. And that should not be a marker of adulthood; that should not be our civic duty.

For me, my civic duty is going to school, getting an education, and getting a career where I choose to help society and it's not being a backup resource for the military.

And Benton also talked about the benefits to registering for the selective service. There is no benefit. The only benefit is that you don't go to jail or you don't get denied federal funding, you don't pay a hefty fine. So that's not a benefit. Those are negative reinforcements to force you to do something.

And I just think that needs to be made clear. It shouldn't be a marker of adulthood.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you very much. Number 33.

Ticket #33

God afternoon. My name is Kate. I am a parent of two draft-aged children. I was draft age myself when the selective service was reinstated 40 years ago. We flew out from California, and you may be wondering why, why did we make this trip? Why is it so important to us come and testify to you all that we do not think the selective service should continue.

I'm very troubled today listening to the comments by the panelist this morning and even some of the comments by you that talk about things like the selective service generates up to



80,000 leads for the military, that the selective service partners with the military to recruit people -- I have this experience because my son who registered under protest when he got a confirmation it had a little tag for recruitment into the Marines. I think what's the elephant in the room here is due to privacy and confidentiality that while this is selective service collecting this information? Its's because the government, whomever, the powers that be want to be able to track and monitor where people are. They want to show them that they can tell them what to do and I do not believe that that is the way to encourage public service, okay.

When you went down to Cal State, LA and they asked the panel, which included AmeriCorps and a couple of other service agencies, "Should your method of service, your voluntary service, should that be coercive, should that be mandatory?" And they all said, "No."

I talked to a Peace Corps person and I asked her, well, do you think if you get a in the mail that says if you don't register to go into the Peace Corps you'll get sent to jail and fined \$250,000; does that sound okay? But the main thing here is I don't like that people's information is being collected, that they have to give up their information and a list is kept but then could be used to contact them and get a hold of them and tell them, hey, let's go fight.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you. And thank you for making the trip. Number 036.

[Not present.]

38.



Ticket #38

Chairman and this Commission, thank you all very much for the work you're doing. I'm Tim Miller with Conservative Anabaptist Service Program. We work closely with selective service, the alternative service section, and while we acknowledge the right and responsibility of government, protect and care for its citizens in the way that it thinks best. As followers of Jesus Christ we also believe very deeply that we are called to service to our fellow man in ways that build up rather than destroy, even to the extent of a shooting in personal defense.

As was alluded to my Mr. Galvin's comments this morning about Hutterites in previous history we would see that when the military is responsible for conscription things turn out rather tragically for conscientious objectors as we saw in the Revolutionary War, the Civil War and World War I.

In World War II and since then things have been a lot better with the conscription run by a civilian agency. And our request would be that whatever changes are made that conscription

would continue to be overseen by or whatever registration or plans are made would be overseen by a civilian agency rather the military.

Also, in response to Dr. Rostker's comments checking off the box would make us feel a lot better.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, sir. Number 40.



Ticket #40

I am Major General Dennis Leach, United States Army, retired. I just have two quick data points to bring to the dialog. The first one is with regard to a mass mobilization. There was a question about can the Army absorb it? And it's a legitimate question but I would just bring up the point that we now have almost 10,000 recruiters in the U.S. Army most of whom are high speed NCOs who would make great instructors. And there's a pool of people waiting to be out of the recruiting business and into the business of what NCOs do best.

The other one is with this thing of cyber warriors and skill sets. I sense an assumption it would be easier to do it with an all-volunteer force as opposed to a conscripted force. But let me just go through three lines of what I refer to as the all-volunteer force arithmetic. The first is about 4,000,000 people turn 18 every year in the United States. The second one is that only 30 percent who qualify to meet the minimum qualifications for enlisting in the military. That leaves with a 1,200,000. Only 15 percent have a propensity to serve which gets you to 180,000. But in that 1,020,000 and between 1,200,000 and 180,000 who are able to serve but unwilling to serve I suspect there are quite a few national merit scholars and valedictorians who would make great cyber warriors, and also a number of all-state linebackers who would make great 11Bs. And when we look at the tradeoff between willing and able what we're dealing with now I think that we need to look at that arithmetic. Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, sir. Number 42.



Ticket #42

Hello. Thank you for giving me an opportunity to share my thoughts with you. I'm one of those 11,000 volunteers working for the agency, Selective Service System. I served in Portland, Oregon and now in the District of Columbia.

Selective service is definitely needed; necessary. We do not buy insurance to save money or invest. We spend the money to have insurance. And I see the agency's role as necessary insurance for our defense.

And also, one point to one of the panelists who mentioned the private sector volunteers in a national emergency. I can't really say that the private sector will be passionate about our nation's priority. I'm coming from the private sector and I can tell you. And therefore, we definitely need our own independence as the Selective Service System.

And another thing I would like to mention is we need to modernize the policy. We are Industry 4.0. We have utilized the intellectual diversity and I believe that women are as powerful as men when we are talking about the brain power. Especially in the science and technology-oriented world.

Guess what? We are in the war and the adversity has a great population today. So, I would like to ask you guys to consider the modernize policy.

And the last thing I would like to mention is we need resources and a strategy for innovation of the agency. We are not communicating with the citizens at the level of the postmillennial Z-generation. So, we definitely need a communication strategy. Also, in order augment the registration system as well as better preparedness we need innovation.



The Department of Defense is moving for faster, better and cheaper strategy, why not Selective Services System? Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

And could you please identify yourself?

Ticket #42

My name is Dr. Hoonjoo Lee. And I am very proud of being a volunteer for the Selective Service System. Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, ma'am. I believe that was the last ticket number that we had pulled, number 042. So, I again want to thank our panelists for providing their testimony today, and Gallaudet University for hosting us and all those in attendance who took the time to attend today's proceedings.

It's only with your help and input that the commission will achieve its vision, "Every American inspired and eager to serve." There being no further business before this commission the hearing is adjourned.

###