

Casebook:
The Draft and National Service

CHARLES B. RANGEL
Bring Back the Draft

● Charles B. Rangel (b. 1930) has been a Democratic member of the U.S. House of Representatives from New York since 1970, representing the Upper West Side and Harlem neighborhoods of New York City. His political career has focused on revitalizing poor neighborhoods and giving opportunities to the underprivileged. Since 2007, he has been chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

A combat veteran of the Korean War, Rangel was a vocal critic of President George W. Bush's decision to go to war with Iraq, and in early 2003, shortly before the war began, he introduced a bill in Congress to resume the military draft. The following essay, explaining his reasons for doing so, was published in the *New York Times* on December 31, 2002. He has advanced the idea several times since.

Preview What are your feelings about reinstating the draft?

President Bush and his administration have declared a war against terrorism 1 that may soon involve sending thousands of American troops into combat in Iraq. I voted against the Congressional resolution giving the president authority to carry out this war—an engagement that would dwarf our military efforts to find Osama bin Laden and bring him to justice.

But as a combat veteran of the Korean conflict, I believe that if we 2 are going to send our children to war, the governing principle must be that of shared sacrifice. Throughout much of our history, Americans have been asked to shoulder the burden of war equally.

That's why I will ask Congress next week to consider and support 3 legislation I will introduce to resume the military draft.

Carrying out the administration's policy toward Iraq will require 4 long-term sacrifices by the American people, particularly those who have sons and daughters in the military. Yet the Congress that voted overwhelmingly to allow the use of force in Iraq includes only one member who has a child in the enlisted ranks of the military—just a few more have children who are officers.

I believe that if those calling for war knew that their children were 5 likely to be required to serve—and to be placed in harm's way—there would be more caution and a greater willingness to work with the international community in dealing with Iraq. A renewed draft will help

bring a greater appreciation of the consequences of decisions to go to war.

Service in our nation's armed forces is no longer a common experience. A disproportionate number of the poor and members of minority groups make up the enlisted ranks of the military, while the most privileged Americans are underrepresented or absent.

We need to return to the tradition of the citizen soldier—with alternative national service required for those who cannot serve because of physical limitations or reasons of conscience.

There is no doubt that going to war against Iraq will severely strain military resources already burdened by a growing number of obligations. There are daunting challenges facing the 1.4 million men and women in active military service and those in our National Guard and Reserve. The Pentagon has said that up to 250,000 troops may be mobilized for the invasion of Iraq. An additional 265,000 members of the National Guard and Reserve, roughly as many as were called up during the Persian Gulf War in 1991, may also be activated.

Already, we have long-term troop commitments in Europe and the Pacific, with an estimated 116,000 troops in Europe, 90,000 in the Pacific (nearly 40,000 in Japan and 38,000 in Korea) and additional troop commitments to operations in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Kosovo and elsewhere. There are also military trainers in countries across the world, including the Philippines, Colombia and Yemen.

We can expect the evolving global war on terrorism to drain our military resources even more, stretching them to the limit.

The administration has yet to address the question of whether our military is of sufficient strength and size to meet present and future commitments. Those who would lead us into war have the obligation to support an all-out mobilization of Americans for the war effort, including mandatory national service that asks something of us all.

Reading Closely

1. What is your response to Rangel's argument? On what do you base your response?
2. How does Rangel establish his ethos in this essay? How does he use logos? pathos? Mark the passages that best establish those three appeals.

Considering Larger Issues

1. **Together with a classmate**, define Rangel's intended audience for this essay. What information in the essay helps you define the audience?
2. What is Rangel's purpose in writing this essay? What does he want his audience to do with his argument?

5. **COMBINING METHODS.** To develop his argument, Rangel uses *cause-and-effect analysis*. Concentrate on his analysis, and account for its effect in terms of supporting the argument, fulfilling the rhetorical appeals, and reaching the intended audience.
4. What questions did you have after reading this essay? In other words, what specifics about national service does the author leave unspoken? **Working with a classmate**, list all the places that Rangel talks about national service but doesn't mention who exactly should serve, where, and how. How might you and your classmate fill in the blanks? Be prepared to share your answers with the rest of the class.

Thinking about Language

1. **With a classmate**, use the context of the essay and a dictionary to define the following words and phrases. You'll see that some familiar words are being used in unfamiliar ways. Be prepared to share your definitions with the rest of the class.

terrorism (1)	shared sacrifice (2)	daunting (8)
engagement (1)	force (4)	mobilized (8)
dwarf (1)	disproportionate (6)	commitments (9)
governing principle (2)	citizen soldier (7)	mandatory (11)

2. What is the author's attitude toward war? What words and phrases express his attitude?

Writing Your Own Arguments

1. In a three- to four-page essay, respond to Rangel. You might argue that it's impossible, unnecessary, or unwise to reinstate the draft and develop a list of good reasons for your assertion. Or you might flesh out his argument, such as by arguing that the concept of national service needs to be broadened to include men and women of all social classes, physical abilities, religious convictions, and age. You'll need to conduct library and online research in order to supply convincing logical appeals. Be sure to refer to the guidelines for checking over an argument on page 655 as you draft and revise.
2. In an essay of three to four pages, argue for various ways that Americans should be allowed to accomplish their national service if it becomes a requirement. Such a paper will entail research on your part because you'll want to incorporate statistics, facts, experiences, and observations that support your argument. You'll also want to be sure to establish goodwill and common ground with readers, to enhance your credibility as a writer. You should assume an audience of traditional college-age young people for this essay. Refer to the guidelines for checking over an argument on page 655.

CHARLES MOSKOS AND PAUL GLASTRIS

Now Do You Believe We Need a Draft?

Charles Moskos (1934–2008) was a professor of sociology at Northwestern University. The *Wall Street Journal* once called him the country's "most influential military sociologist," a scholar who studies the military as a social structure and its relationship to the larger society. A peacetime draftee who served in the U.S. Army Combat Engineers in Vietnam, Moskos was the author of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy for gay and lesbian military personnel that was adopted in 1993. Paul Glastris is editor in chief of *Washington Monthly*, a liberal political magazine, and a senior fellow at the Western Policy Center in Washington, D.C. He was previously a correspondent and editor at *U.S. News & World Report* and a special assistant and senior speechwriter to President Bill Clinton. The following essay was originally published in the November 2001 issue of *Washington Monthly*.

Preview What specific knowledge do you have of the draft?

President Bush has said that the new war against terrorism will be "a 1
different kind of conflict." He is more right than he knows. Not only are
we facing a uniquely shadowy enemy, one committed to inflicting mass
civilian casualties on U.S. soil. But for the first time in our history we are
entering a war of significant size and probable duration (administration
officials have said it may last for "years") without drafting young men to
fight the threat.

Not only are we not drafting our young men. We are not even planning 2
to draft them. Elected leaders are not even talking about the possibility of
drafting them. That terrorists might poison municipal water supplies, spray
anthrax from crop dusters, or suicidally infect themselves with smallpox
and stroll through busy city streets is no longer considered farfetched. That
we might need to draft some of our people to counter these threats — now
that's considered farfetched, to the extent that it's considered at all.

America needs to wake up. We're at war. We need a draft. But be- 3
cause this is a new kind of conflict, we need a new kind of draft. A 21st
century draft would be less focused on preparing men for conventional
combat — which probably won't be that extensive in this war — than on
the arguably more daunting task of guarding against and responding to
terrorism at home and abroad. If structured right, this new draft might
not be as tough to sell as you would think.

Churchill famously said that America could be counted on to do the 4
right thing, after exhausting all other possibilities. On the subject of the
draft, we are rapidly reaching that point of exhaustion. A draft might
be avoidable if enough Americans were volunteering to serve. But we're
not. Soon after the events of September 11, newspapers reported that
the phones in military recruitment offices were ringing off the hook.

Follow-up stories showed that all that clamor had brought virtually no new recruits. So far, our patriotism, though sincerely felt, has largely amounted to flag-waving and coat holding.

Perhaps we could get by without a draft if our all-volunteer military had more than enough troops on hand. But it doesn't. The actions so far taken in Afghanistan, and the buildup to support those actions, have been relatively modest. Yet with personnel cut by a third since the end of the Cold War, the services were hard-pressed to meet ongoing missions even before September 11. There is already talk of pulling U.S. forces out of the Balkans, something the Bush administration wanted to do anyway. But it will not please our NATO allies, whose long-term support we will need in the fight against terrorism, and who will have to fill the gap with more troops of their own.

We are calling up large numbers of reservists, but because so many of them work as police officers, firefighters, and emergency medical technicians, our municipalities are being drained of precisely the people we will need if (when) the terrorists return.

Indeed, it seems clear that we are going to need thousands more men and women in uniform to deal with terrorist threats here at home. The president has appointed former Pennsylvania Governor Tom Ridge as his new homeland security "czar." The federal government will be taking over airport security, either providing the services directly or supervising



Young men burning their draft cards during a protest against the Vietnam War.

private firms providing it. However the restructuring shakes out, we are clearly going to need more federal armed personnel to guard dams, nuclear power plants, sports complexes, and U.S. embassies abroad; more border patrol and customs agents to keep terrorists and their weapons from entering the country; more INS agents to track down immigrants who have overstayed their visas; more coast guard personnel to inspect ships; more air marshals to ride on passenger jets; and more FBI agents to uncover terrorist cells still operating within and outside our borders.

Where are all these brave men and women going to come from? Certainly, America is rich enough, and the need vital enough, that we could afford to offer significant salaries to lure candidates. But even in a weak economy, there is a finite number of competent people willing to choose a career that requires wearing a uniform, performing often dull work, such as guard duty, with alertness, and being ready at any moment to risk one's life for others. A whole range of government agencies and private firms, from the U.S. Army to Brinks to local police departments, must compete for this limited labor pool. And the pool is probably not expanding.

Consider this: Between 1980 and 2000, surveys showed that the number of young people saying they would definitely not serve in the military rose from 40 to 64 percent. The only reason this change of attitude did not destroy military recruiting efforts is that the need for new recruits plummeted with the end of the Cold War. But the military is feeling the pinch nonetheless. The armed services have had to double starting pay to recruit half as many enlistees, and the quality of new recruits is not what it should be. The number of enlistees scoring in the top half of the armed forces qualification tests has dropped by a third since the mid-1990s. In fiscal year 2000, the Army took in some 380 recruits with felony arrest records, double the number in 1998. Desertions are also on the rise. Most telling, over one-third of those entering the military fail to complete their enlistments. Contrast this with the one in ten of draftees who did not complete his two-year obligation during the Cold War. Much better to have a soldier serve a short term honorably than to be discharged for cause.

NO PEELING POTATOES

Reinstating the draft is the obvious way to meet the suddenly increased manpower needs for military and homeland security. This fact would have seemed obvious to previous generations of Americans. That today we aren't even talking about a draft is a measure of the deep psychological resistance Americans have developed to anything that smacks of the state compelling anyone to do anything. Ideology plays a role here. In general, the left doesn't like the military, and the right doesn't like anything that interferes with the marketplace. When it comes to national needs, the left believes in something for nothing, the right in every man for himself.

The psychological resistance also gains comfort from arguments 11
made by the opponents of the draft and by the military hierarchy, which
also resists a return to conscription. (The military resists the draft largely
because it resists all change; it opposed ending the draft in 1973).

One argument is that today's military requires professional soldiers, 12
especially for overseas missions. Let's leave aside the fact that in World
War II, Korea, and Vietnam, most combat soldiers had only six months
of training before being sent to war. Let's also grant that because of to-
day's high-tech weapons and complex war-fighting strategies, the actual
combat must be left to professional soldiers (though there is some reason
for skepticism here). Still, there are hundreds of thousands of vital mili-
tary jobs — not peeling potatoes — that could be filled with short-term
draftees.

One example is peacekeeping. From experience with U.S. deploy- 13
ments in Bosnia and Kosovo, we know that combat troops tend to chafe
at peacekeeping duty when they are stuck on bases with nothing to do
and little opportunity to train with their weapons. But it's also clear that
military police thrive on such assignments, because they get to perform
the jobs they are trained for — patrolling neighborhoods, arresting trouble-
makers, intervening in disputes with a minimum of force. Military police
work doesn't require that many special skills. After two months of basic
and four months of special police training, new recruits are shipped off
to places like Tuzla, and they do just fine. The average tour of duty in
Bosnia or Kosovo: about six months. Short-term draftees, in other words,
could easily do these M.P. jobs, and many others besides. This would free
up more professional soldiers to fight the war on terrorism without re-
quiring that the U.S. abandon other commitments.

Draftees would not have to be offered the relatively high wages and 14
benefits that it takes to lure voluntary recruits (an increasing number of
whom are married with families). This would leave more funds avail-
able to raise pay for the kinds of personnel that the military is having a
terribly hard time holding on to, such as computer specialists, mid-level
officers, and master sergeants. To put it baldly, we now have overpaid
recruits and underpaid sergeants. In the draft era, the pay ratio between
a master sergeant and a private was seven to one; today it is less than
three to one. Restoring something like the old balance is the best way to
upgrade retention in hard-to-fill skills and leadership positions.

All these arguments apply equally to the homeland security front. 15
There is no reason why conscripts, with professional supervision, can't
work as border guards, customs agents, anthrax inoculators, or disaster-
relief specialists. Federal law enforcement agencies and unions will deny
this with all their bureaucratic might, but it's true. It takes less than five
months to train someone to be a border guard. The FBI turns applicants
with law or accounting degrees into fully fledged agents after only four
months of training.

Other developed nations that have retained the draft typically use 16
conscripts for homeland security. In Israel, draftees serve in both the
regular military and as lightly armed "guard police" along the Gaza
Strip. They also man the "home command," which provides security and
other services in the country's cities during emergencies, such as the Scud
missile attacks during the Gulf War. In France, which finally abandoned
its draft last year (believing that threats to its security had diminished),
conscripts worked alongside professional police in the Gendarmerie and
provided emergency airport security when terrorists set off bombs in the
Paris Metro in 1995. In Germany, most draft-age men choose to serve ei-
ther in the military or in some form of civilian service, such as working
with the elderly. But about one in ten chooses to work in a state or fed-
eral police force, providing such things as border security, or they train
as volunteer firefighters and serve part-time for seven years.

One can imagine a similar three-tiered system of youth service in 17
America, with 18-month terms of duty for all citizens age 18 to 25. In this
new-style draft, conscripts would have what all Americans now demand:
choice. They could choose to serve in the military, in homeland security,
or in a civilian national service program like AmeriCorps (there's no rea-
son women couldn't be drafted for the latter two categories). In return,
draftees would get GI Bill-style college scholarships, with higher awards
for those who accept more dangerous duty.



AmeriCorps volunteers working at a construction site in New Orleans in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.

Back in Vietnam days, opting to fulfill your draft requirement stateside in, say, the National Guard, was considered a way to save your skin. That won't be so true in the new war on terrorism. As we saw with the deaths of firefighters in New York, homeland security duty can be dangerous. 18

THE SUCKER FACTOR

That brings up the second argument against the draft: that the sons of the elite will find ways to avoid service. Of course, that's even truer in an age of all-volunteer forces. But it's fair to ask: How can a draft be made equitable? 19

The best way would be to require all young people to serve. One reason more young people don't serve now is the fear that while they're wearing the uniform, their peers will be out having fun and getting a leg up in their careers. If everyone were required to serve, no one would feel like a sucker. They might even enjoy the experience; surveys show that most former draftees look back on their time in the service with fondness and pride. 20

It's possible, however, that the country won't have the need for every eligible young person to serve. What then? One answer is a lottery with no student deferments. (Under Selective Service rules established after Vietnam, college deferments are no longer allowed.) 21

Part of what makes Americans dubious of conscription is our memory of how the class-biased draft of the Vietnam War era helped drive America apart. We tend to forget that the more equitable draft that existed during World War II and for 20 years afterwards helped bring the country together. During the peaceful years of the 1950s — a time not unlike our own, when the threat of mass destruction hung in the air — most Ivy League men had to spend two years in uniform, before or after college, working and bunking with others of very different backgrounds and races (the military, remember, was about the only racially integrated institution at the time). 22

This shared experience helped instill in those who served, as in the national culture generally, a sense of unity and moral seriousness that we would not see again — until after September 11, 2001. It's a shame that it has taken terrorist attacks to awaken us to the reality of our shared national fate. We should use this moment to rebuild institutions like the draft that will keep us awake to this reality even as the memory of the attacks fades. 23

A 21st century draft might be more welcome than most of us realize, especially among young people whose lives will be affected by it. While national leaders and pundits have avoided the subject, a potential return of the draft has been a hot topic of conversation among young people since September 11. "If it's something they want us to do for our country to keep us safe, then go for it," Ryan Aaron, a senior at U.S. Grant High School in Oklahoma City, told *National Journal*. Another young man, 24

Julian Medina, a day laborer cleaning up office buildings near the still-smoldering World Trade Center, told the *Washington Post*: "If I have to, I'd fight to catch the man who did this." Not all young people are so gung ho; many, in fact, hate the idea. But at least they're talking about it. If their views can move from news pages to the editorial pages, and ultimately to the floors of Congress, then we could be on our way to a more secure and more unified America.

Reading Closely

1. What did you learn about the armed forces that you didn't know before reading this essay? Write out three things you've learned and one thing you'd like to know more about.
2. Map out the overall organization of the argument in terms of the introduction, the thesis statement, the supporting arguments, recognition of the opposition, and the conclusion. Which passages make up each of these organizational parts? Prepare to share your response with the rest of the class.

Considering Larger Issues

1. What is the thesis for this essay? Is it explicitly stated or only implied? What reasons do the authors give to support their thesis? What specific evidence do they provide to support each of their reasons? (You may find yourself drawing on your responses to question 2 under Reading Closely.)
2. Who is the audience for this essay? What words, passages, or examples help you establish the audience? How does knowing that this essay first appeared in *Washington Monthly* affect your answer?
3. Which passages and examples fulfill the rhetorical appeals of ethos, pathos, and logos?
4. **COMBINING METHODS.** The authors rely on *cause-and-effect analysis* to build their assertion that we need to reinstate the draft. Mark the passages that analyze causes and those that analyze effects, and explain why the authors chose to use them.
5. What specific information did you learn from the photographs and captions on pages 682 and 685 that enhanced or complicated the information in the essay?

Thinking about Language

1. **With a classmate**, use the context of the essay or your dictionary to define the following terms. Be prepared to share your definitions with the rest of the class.

uniquely (1)	cells (7)	chafe (13)
casualties (1)	lure (8)	intervening (15)
municipal (2)	finite (8)	baldly (14)
crop dusters (2)	pinch (9)	conscripts (15)
daunting (5)	enlistees (9)	inoculators (15)
clamor (4)	reinstating (10)	GI Bill (17)
recruits (4)	ideology (10)	leg up (20)
hard-pressed (5)	conscription (11)	class-biased (22)
reservists (6)	skepticism (12)	bunking (22)

2. **With a classmate or two**, write a short paragraph that summarizes all the ways the authors support the opening sentence: "The new war against terrorism will be 'a different kind of conflict.'" What words, phrases, and passages in the essay illustrate this assertion? Share your paragraph with the rest of the class. Now condense your paragraph into a single sentence. Be prepared to share your group's sentence with the rest of the class. Also be prepared to discuss the language you marked that illustrates the assertion.

Writing Your Own Arguments

1. How can a U.S. college student connect with the idea of "a different kind of conflict"? How might this essay be an inspiration to you—or just the opposite? **With one or two classmates**, discuss possible responses to these questions. Then draft a three- to four-page essay in which you argue either for or against the importance of reinstating the draft for reasons of national security. Pay careful attention to the organization of your argument as well as to your use of the rhetorical appeals. Work with the guidelines for checking over an argument on page 655 as you and your classmates plan, draft, revise, and respond to each other's drafts.
2. The authors suggest a three-tiered system of national service, one limited to citizens 18 to 25 years old. Evaluate this suggestion by considering the following issues: whether short-term training could be enough to teach any job well (or make any job interesting), whether the choice among the three tiers would be fair to those in each tier, and whether you or anyone you know aged 18 to 25 would be interested in any of these tiers and why. In order to make a fair comparison, you'll want to conduct research into the current programs of voluntary U.S. national service, such as AmeriCorps and Teach for America. In addition, you'll want to research the experiences and actions (both positive and negative) of military personnel stationed in the Middle East, the Balkans, and elsewhere, as well as in the United States. (Consider, for example, whether a draft would have had any effect on the treatment of prisoners in the Iraq War.) You may also want to research compulsory national service programs in other countries, including those mentioned by the authors. Write a three- to four-page essay in which you evaluate Moskos and Glastris's recommendations. Refer to the guidelines for checking over an argument on page 655 as you draft and revise.

WALL STREET JOURNAL

Uncle Charlie Wants You!

Begun in 1889, the *Wall Street Journal* now has a circulation of two million print copies daily. Although it focuses primarily on news and opinion about business and financial issues, it does address other fields. The *Journal* published the following piece in its online Opinion Journal section in November 2006. The anonymous writer takes on the renewed argument offered by Congressman Charles Rangel to reinstitute the draft and argues instead that enlistment in the military should remain voluntary.

Preview Who, in your mind, enlists in the military? What leads you to make this assessment?

Harlem Congressman Charles Rangel created a stir once again this week with his call for renewing the military draft. His own party leaders quickly disavowed any such plan, suggesting just how unpopular the idea is among most Americans. Yet the proposal deserves some further inspection before it vanishes, if only to expose its false assumptions about the current U.S. military.

A vocal Iraq war critic, Mr. Rangel told CBS News recently, "There's no question in my mind that this President and this Administration would never have invaded Iraq, especially on the flimsy evidence that was presented to the Congress, if indeed we had a draft and members of Congress and the Administration thought that their kids from their communities would be placed in harm's way."

In other words, Mr. Rangel's real argument is about class in America, not over the best way to fight Islamic terrorism overseas. He's suggesting that somehow only the poor serve in Uncle Sam's Army. But his views are both out of date and condescending to those who do serve. Alas, they are shared by many on the political left, who think that the military places an unfair burden on the working class.

In this mythology, the military is overly reliant on uneducated dupes from poor communities because those from more affluent backgrounds don't want to serve. But the truth is closer to the opposite, according to a recent Heritage Foundation report on the demographic characteristics of the military. It's titled "Who Are the Recruits?" and Mr. Rangel, a Korean War veteran, might want to read it before implying that the military doesn't look like America.

According to the report, which analyzed the most recent Pentagon enlistee data, "the only group that is lowering its participation in the military is the poor. The percentage of recruits from the poorest American neighborhoods (with one-fifth of the U.S. population) declined from 18 percent in 1999 to 14.6 percent in 2003, 14.1 percent in 2004, and

13.7 percent in 2005." Put another way, if military burdens aren't spread more evenly among socioeconomic groups in the U.S., it's because *the poor* are underrepresented.

Or consider education levels. In the general U.S. population, the high school graduation rate is a little under 80%. But among military recruits from 2003–2005, nearly 97% had high school diplomas. The academic quality of recruits has also been rising this decade. According to Heritage, the military defines a "high quality" recruit as someone who scores above the 50th percentile on the Armed Forces Qualifying Test and has a high school degree. The percentage of high quality recruits had climbed to 67% in 2004 and 64% in 2005, up from 57% in 2001.

And what about race? In 2004, about 76% of the U.S. population was white, which was only slightly above the 73% of military recruits (and 72% of Army recruits) who were white. Blacks made up 12.17% of the population in 2004, and made up 14.54% of recruits in 2004 and 13% in 2005. Hispanic Americans are also slightly overrepresented in the military compared to their share of the population, but also not to a degree that suggests some worrisome cultural chasm among the races.

The overall truth is that today's recruits come primarily from the middle class, and, more importantly, they come willingly. This makes them more amenable to training and more likely to adapt to the rigors of military culture. An Army of draftees would so expand the number of recruits that training resources would inevitably be stretched and standards watered down. Meanwhile, scarce resources would be devoted to tens of thousands of temporary soldiers who planned to leave as soon as their year or two of forced service was up.

It's true that such training would help to shape up more young Americans who could use a few weeks of Marine discipline at Parris Island, and if this is what Mr. Rangel has in mind he should say so. But the price would be a less effective fighting force, and precisely at a time when experience and technological mastery are more important than ever in a fighting force.

"The military doesn't want a draft," says Tim Kane, an Air Force veteran and author of the Heritage study. "What the military wants is the most effective fighting force they can field. They want to win wars and minimize casualties. And you don't do that when you're forced to take less-educated, unmotivated people."

What about Mr. Rangel's point that conscription would have made intervention in Iraq less likely? It's impossible to know, but this is a dangerous argument for the future in any case. The main reason for having an effective Army is to deter enemies by making them believe we have the will to fight if we must. Mr. Rangel is saying the U.S. needs a conscript Army precisely to show an adversary we'll never use it. This is a good way to tempt Iran, say, into provocations that could lead to larger conflicts in which we would have no choice but to fight.

Reading Closely

1. What argument is the writer making about the draft in this essay? How do you know? Identify places in the essay that support your answer.
2. What is Congressman Rangel's argument about the draft? Why would he make this argument?
3. What research does the writer conduct to compose this essay? Does this research help support the argument? Explain your answer.
4. Analyze the arrangement of the essay. What is the writer's organizational strategy? How does this arrangement support or detract from the overall argument of the essay?

Considering Larger Issues

1. What is your response to the writer's argument?
2. **Working with a classmate**, identify the appeals (ethical, logical, or pathetic) the writer relies on to make the argument. Cite evidence from the essay that supports your claim.
3. **COMBINING METHODS**. How does the writer use *exemplification* and *cause-and-effect analysis* in this essay? How do these rhetorical methods support or detract from the writer's argument?

Thinking about Language

1. Use the context of the essay or a dictionary to define the following terms. Be prepared to share your definitions with the rest of the class.

disavowed (1)	affluent (4)	amenable (8)
mythology (4)	demographic (4)	conscription (11)
dupes (4)	chasm (7)	provocations (11)
2. Review the transitions the writer uses to move readers from paragraph to paragraph. What kinds of transitions are they? Do you find them effective? Why or why not?

Writing Your Own Arguments

1. This essay does not elaborate on the benefits of a voluntary military force because the writer dedicates most of the essay to opposing Rangel's argument for a draft. For a three- to four-page essay, do research to identify and then evaluate the arguments for keeping enlistment in the military voluntary. Then create your own argument about whether or not you think these claims in favor of a voluntary military are valid. As you compose your essay, be sure to refer to the guidelines for checking over an argument on page 655.
2. Now that you've read three essays on the draft—Rangel's, Moskos and Glastris's, and the *Wall Street Journal's*, reflect on which arguments about

this topic you find most persuasive. Consider, too, arguments missing from all three essays. Compose a three- to four-page essay in which you add your voice to this debate, making your argument about the draft and national service. Remember, you don't necessarily have to side with one of the essays you've read; you can offer a different perspective on the debate or a new argument that none of the writers addressed. So that you are well informed on the issue, conduct additional research, especially as you explore your position. Be sure to refer to the guidelines for checking over an argument on page 655 as you draft and revise.

MAGGIE KOERTH

Women in the Draft: A Necessary Part of the Quest to End Discrimination

Maggie Koerth (b. 1981) wrote the following essay when she was a senior at the University of Kansas, majoring in journalism and anthropology. It was originally published in the *University Daily Kansan*, the student newspaper of the University of Kansas, in February 2003.

Preview What's your opinion on women in the draft? Do you think it's necessary for ending gender discrimination?

Women, what are you willing to do to gain gender equality? Stage a protest? Lobby your congressman? How about go to war? 1

Chances are, most women on this campus would tell you they are in favor of gender equality. We want all the beneficial effects that true equality will bring. Unfortunately, while we have been busy fighting for equal education and job opportunities, we have forgotten that true equality does not always equal fun. 2

On Jan. 7, U.S. Representative Charles Rangel proposed that the draft be reinstated if our country goes to war with Iraq. When he did not propose that women be included in the draft, the most common reaction I heard from my peers was a sigh of relief. 3

In a way, this is understandable. Few people desperately want to risk death on a battlefield, and the draft itself is not a popular institution. However, the draft is also one of the most glaring examples of state-sanctioned sexual discrimination in our country. 4

Every argument made by the Selective Service (www.sss.gov/wmbkgr.htm) and by the Supreme Court (*Rostker v. Goldberg*, 453 U.S. 57) against the inclusion of women in the draft is based on the assumptions that women do not belong on the battlefield and that the military has no use for anyone who is not on the front lines. Both are untrue. 5

The Israeli armed forces have drafted both men and women since 1948 without any detriment to their ability to fight and win. For decades, those women aided their country by serving in technology, intelligence and other behind-the-scenes positions crucial to the military effort. Their work allowed more men to be moved to frontline positions. 6

According to the Israeli Defense Forces Web site, www.idf.il/english/organization/chen/chen.stm, drafted women have been serving as paramilitary border police in combat positions since 1995. This is the equivalent of serving on the front lines. 7

Are Israeli women really that much more useful and capable than American women? I doubt it. 8



Jessica Lynch and Shoshana Johnson became symbols of the role of women soldiers in the Iraq War. Both were wounded and captured in the early weeks of combat before being rescued by U.S. troops; in the photo above, Lynch is carried off a military plane on a stretcher. Seven months later (in the photo below), she and Johnson were honored at *Glamour* magazine's Women of the Year awards ceremony.



So why have so many women ignored this issue? Why are there 9
not daily protests on Wescoe Beach demanding the military respect the
equality of the sexes?

It can't be because it's a hard point to argue. 10

Even those people who will never be convinced that women can 11
fight in a war must see how useful women can be to the support services
of the military, especially now that the military is so understaffed.

I am not asking women to believe the draft is a good thing. I am not 12
asking them to want to fight and die.

What I am telling women is that we cannot pick and choose what 13
equalities we want.

This is not a new problem. Gloria Steinem addressed the same issues 14
in 1970 in a *Washington Post* article called "Women's Liberation Aims to
Free Men Too."

To her, accepting all parts of equality would ultimately help both 15
sexes by equally distributing the pressure of traditionally sex-related
roles like military service.

"We want to liberate men from those inhuman roles as well," she 16
wrote. "We want to share the work and responsibility, and to have men
share equal responsibility for the children."

If we accept the discrimination of the draft, we accept the chauvinis- 17
tic images of an unreliable, delicate womanhood and a macho, war-
loving manhood. No amount of protesting for more "fun" rights will
erase that acceptance.

So ladies, stand up and fight for all your rights, even the unpopular 18
ones. Like the Selective Service ad says, "You can handle this."

Reading Closely

1. How does Koerth define "gender equality"?
2. How does she link gender equality with the draft?
3. What are three things you understand in her argument? What's one thing you want to know more about? Be prepared to share your question with the rest of the class.

Considering Larger Issues

1. Who is Koerth's audience for this essay? What does she want the audience to do?
2. **Working with a classmate**, identify the passages in which Koerth uses ethos, pathos, and logos. Be prepared to discuss the effectiveness of each of these passages with the rest of the class.

5. In making her logical appeals, Koerth refers to other sources of information. What are some of these sources? Explore them in order to evaluate their validity and relevance to her argument. Be prepared to share your answers with the rest of the class.
4. **COMBINING METHODS.** How does Koerth use *cause-and-effect analysis* to help shape her argument?
5. Which rhetorical methods other than argument do the photographs on page 694 feature? to what effect?

Thinking about Language

1. Use your dictionary or the context of the essay to define the following terms. Be prepared to share your definitions with the rest of the class.

gender equality (1)	discrimination (4)	support services
lobby (1)	detriment (6)	(11)
reinstated (3)	paramilitary (7)	chauvinistic (17)
state-sanctioned (4)		
2. Mark all the words and phrases that Koerth uses to emphasize the concept of "equality." What is the overall effect of her word choices? Could they have been more subtle? more explicit?

Writing Your Own Arguments

1. In a two- to three-page response to Koerth, engage each of her assertions. You'll need to consult the citations she mentions (the Web sites, court cases, and articles) in order to understand the supporting materials to which she refers. Your response could be the basis for a longer argument paper. Refer to the guidelines for checking over an argument on page 655.
2. If the United States required military or civilian national service of all 18- to 25-year-olds, what would you choose to do? Write a three- to four-page essay in which you argue for your personal plan and the reasons for it. You may find that you'll have to conduct Web-based or library research in order to come up with a plan, although the essays in this section may help you get started. If you are older than 25, write your essay in the form of advice to a specific younger person you know. Refer to the guidelines for checking over an argument on page 655.