



PUBLIC COMMENTS

[The National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service](#) has solicited input from the public about the topics under its mandate since January 2018. Individuals have shared their views by posting comments on the Commission [website](#), emailing info@inspire2serve.gov or national.commission.on.service.info@mail.mil, submitting comment cards at public events, or mailing letters. These public comments supplement research efforts and are one of many factors under consideration as the Commission deliberates its recommendations to the Congress, the President, and the American people.

The Commission is committed to transparency and openness with the public. With that in mind, the Commission will be posting comments received from the public on its website at regular intervals. This document covers all public comments received during the month of July. Future comments will be released on roughly a monthly basis.

There are a few facts about these comments that are important to understand.

- Public comments are posted in the order received with the most recent comment being listed last.
- The comments may address questions or topics posed by the Commission. The views expressed in comments reflect those of the individual or organization who commented and do not represent the official views of the Commission or the federal government.
- Comments are not nationally representative. Additionally, there is no limit to the number of comments a single individual or organization may submit.
- Although the Commission's initial request for comments published in the Federal Register expired (September 30, 2018), the Commission extended the submission of comments until December 31, 2019.

The National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service posts comments received in their entirety. The Commission applies redactions in limited circumstances to personally identifiable information, such as personal email address and phone numbers. The Commission reserves the right to redact language that poses a threat to individuals. Posting of public comments does not constitute an endorsement of any views expressed therein or of the content of any external links that members of the public have included in their comments.

The Commission welcomes comments from the public on any aspect of the Commission's mission and feedback on the staff memorandum released prior to the Commission's public hearings. Please submit your comments at <https://inspire2serve.gov/content/share-your-thoughts> by 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on December 31, 2019.

Date	Text of Response
7/1/2019	<p data-bbox="214 84 1499 115">Just read an article saying you were wanting ways to encourage military service among young people today.</p> <p data-bbox="214 155 1934 220">I joined the Air Force in Miami Florida in 1972, at the age of 18. I had two reasons. I wanted to travel and see the world. I wanted to develop the confidence to go to college and use the G.I. Bill to pay for it.</p> <p data-bbox="214 261 2049 326">It worked! I developed a great deal of confidence and discovered what I wanted to study. I graduated with a bachelor degree DEBT FREE. I also met a wide variety of people from many parts of the country and beyond which widened my perspective in life and matured me.</p> <p data-bbox="214 367 1940 431">Focusing on debt free college/trade school might help. Can't testify to the travel part as I never left the U.S. But I never would have known Altus Oklahoma existed without the A.F.</p>
7/1/2019	<p data-bbox="214 441 1159 542">Statement to the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service Regarding Commission Staff Recommendations on Civic Education From the Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools</p> <p data-bbox="214 583 1986 647">It was a privilege and an honor to testify before the Commission last October, alongside Dr. Emma Humphries of Justice O'Connor's iCivics Program. I thank the Commission for that opportunity and for the Commission's concern and interest in civic education.</p> <p data-bbox="214 688 1992 753">As I suspect you have heard from many in the national civic learning community, we are very supportive of the recommendations in the "Commission Staff Memorandum: Civic Education."</p> <p data-bbox="214 794 2049 859">The proposed recommendations for State and Local Education Agencies are meaningful, thoughtful and would help improve the teaching of civics in every school, for all school populations in the nation.</p> <p data-bbox="214 899 2028 1075">We are delighted by and strongly support the proposed recommendations at the Federal level. There is a demonstrated need for dramatically increased Federal funding to ensure innovation and equity in civic learning (the traditional role of the Federal sector in education). Ensuring disaggregated data is provided from the National Assessments of Educational Progress (NAEPs) in Civics would ensure state and local policymakers have the data they need to assess the adequacy of their approach to civic education. Both the national award and recognition program and the institutional home within the US Department of Education would be very useful and helpful developments for civics.</p> <p data-bbox="214 1115 2045 1291">Our only suggested change to the Staff Recommendations would be to ensure the eligibility of not-for-profits (alongside State and Local Education Agencies) in any Federal level competitive grant program. For the past two decades, innovation in civic education has come from the non-profit civic education programming community. Entities such as iCivics, the Constitutional Rights Foundation, the Constitutional Sources Project, the Mikva Challenge and many others have led the way in new teaching strategies, the use of digital media and all manner of innovation, which makes the subject come live and much more interesting to the student. Funding is needed to support this on-going innovation and improvement in the teaching of civics.</p> <p data-bbox="214 1331 2003 1396">On behalf of the national civic learning community, I thank the Commission and its very talented staff for not forgetting civic education and for considering such important and useful policy recommendations. Thank you for this opportunity to provide feedback on the "Staff Memorandum: Civic</p>

Education.”
Respectfully submitted,
Ted McConnell
Executive Director, Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools



7/1/2019

Statement to the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service
Regarding Commission Staff Recommendations on Civic Education
From the Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools

It was a privilege and an honor to testify before the Commission last October, alongside Dr. Emma Humphries of Justice O'Connor's iCivics Program. I thank the Commission for that opportunity and for the Commission's concern and interest in civic education.

As I suspect you have heard from many in the national civic learning community, we are very supportive of the recommendations in the "Commission Staff Memorandum: Civic Education."

The proposed recommendations for State and Local Education Agencies are meaningful, thoughtful and would help improve the teaching of civics in every school, for all school populations in the nation.

We are delighted by and strongly support the proposed recommendations at the Federal level. There is a demonstrated need for dramatically increased Federal funding to ensure innovation and equity in civic learning (the traditional role of the Federal sector in education). Ensuring disaggregated data is provided from the National Assessments of Educational Progress (NAEPs) in Civics would ensure state and local policymakers have the data they need to assess the adequacy of their approach to civic education. Both the national award and recognition program and the institutional home within the US Department of Education would be very useful and helpful developments for civics.

Our only suggested change to the Staff Recommendations would be to ensure the eligibility of not-for-profits (alongside State and Local Education Agencies) in any Federal level competitive grant program. For the past two decades, innovation in civic education has come from the non-profit civic education programming community. Entities such as iCivics, the Constitutional Rights Foundation, the Constitutional Sources Project, the Mikva Challenge and many others have led the way in new teaching strategies, the use of digital media and all manner of innovation, which makes the subject come live and much more interesting to the student. Funding is needed to support this on-going innovation and improvement in the teaching of civics.

On behalf of the national civic learning community, I thank the Commission and its very talented staff for not forgetting civic education and for considering such important and useful policy recommendations. Thank you for this opportunity to provide feedback on the "Staff Memorandum: Civic Education."

Respectfully submitted,

Ted McConnell

Executive Director, Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools

7/1/2019	<p>I am a 26 yr Army vet and retiree. After watching one of your public hearings recently I was sickened and had to turn it off. Leave it to a bunch of President Obama era Pentagon folks to be appointed to now a 3 year committee to "redefine" a problem that they advanced. For most of my adult life, women in general wanted all military roles to be open to female participation and advancement. Over the years, political appointees made sure that happened. The country celebrated the first female fighter pilot, first female General Officer etc. Now all MOSs are open the only honest position to have is to make women's participation in Selective Service System mandatory - just as it is for males. Look up the word equal. Read the definition and memorize it. If, God forbid we ever need a draft, women had better be drafted proportion to their percentage of the overall population. If the Selective Service for the military is not equal - it will be overturned in the courts. But until that happens, nobody will have any confidence in the system,</p> <p>Your committee should have nothing to do with 'national service' - you are intentionally confusing the issue; diluting the issue of mandatory female military service.</p> <p>Picking up litter in parks, scrubbing graffiti from subway trains; emptying bed pans in a VA hospital or assisting teachers in Appalachia is not the same as military service. Trying to equate the two is disingenuous</p>
7/2/2019	<p>This systematic dismantling of the Military Bands, has contributed to the widening civ-mil divide. Over the past 15 years, Military Bands have been targeted as being too expensive, however they are the only portion of the military able to reach large and small communities in a positive way through music. The emotional power of music allows key messages to be delivered to the American public, without partisan politics getting in the way. A government mandate to stop further reductions in military bands to allow for long-term outcome based analysis will demonstrate quantitative and qualitative effects. These effects will assist in rebuilding the American public's connection to the military that serves them.</p>
7/2/2019	<p>I am writing this as a male who has served in the US Army Infantry for over 15 years and has multiple combat deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan. The SSS must be maintained as emergency response to a large scale attack or national emergency . With that being said, since the barriers excluding women from ALL front-line combat positions on the grounds of "fulfilling our nation's founding ideals of fairness and equality" (POTUS Obama, 2013); their exclusion from the SSS should be as well. Since 1917, the US government ;in some form or fashion; has forced, coerced, threatened, and intimidated male citizens into the SSS. Punishments have varied over the years. Failure to register or maintain can lead to fines and prison, and prevents one from several government benefits such as federally-backed student loans or employment in the federal sector. In the 1981 Supreme Court case Rostker v. Goldberg the Supreme Court ruled that the practice of requiring only men to register for the draft was constitutional on the basis that women were restricted from serving in combat roles. That restriction is no longer applicable in total. On February 22, 2019 Judge Gray H. Miller issued a declaratory judgement that the male-only registration requirement of the MSSA violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, since the restrictions on women serving in combat roles in the military, which were present at the time of the decision in Rostker, no longer applied and men and women are, therefore, similarly situated for purposes of a draft or registration for a draft. Women have fought for and won the right to die in battle on the front line. Because of that the government has limited itself to two options, completely eliminate the SSS or force women to register under threat of punishment as it has men for over 100 years. In this area women have secured their equal right. Give them the equal responsibilities that come with it. FORCE WOMEN TO SIGN UP FOR THE DRAFT and add "another step toward fulfilling our nation's founding ideals of fairness and equality".</p>
7/4/2019	<p>Hello. Why do men right now need to still register even though the all male draft has been declared unconstitutional? Would it not be just for each man right now who needs to register to bring a lawsuit against registration until this is worked out? If something is unconstitutional why does this evil continue??? Thanks.</p>
7/10/2019	<p>I wanted to serve after 9/11 but was told I was too old. I live near Luke Air Force base and would love to work there but again, I'm really too old now. I'm 59 and have a BA and an MA in Geographic Information Systems. I currently run my own business but my one desire is to serve our great country. I wish I wasn't too "old."</p>

7/12/2019	<p>In response to ?? 1,2,7 above: Service can teach one to live for the good of all, and this attitude will strengthen community. I see that as important. As a Mennonite/Amish pastor I don't see it as the government's calling as much as it is the job of the church to inspire faith and selflessness, which result in voluntary service. Mandatory service is not feasible, and neither will it be very valuable, when compared with voluntary service. I gave 8 years of service overseas with NGO's of the Amish Mennonite church. My daughter is currently serving at a home for handicapped children in Virginia. Our local church operates a fully licensed, 5-star, 40 bed Nursing Home, staffed primarily by youth serving voluntarily...from various States. The program/service there is changing lives, as it has done for the past 50+ years...lives of youth, as well as the lives of the elderly residents and their families. Thanks for your work and considetation of these issues! Lamar Hochstetler Madison, VA</p>
7/14/2019	<p>Mandatory conscription is a violation of the 13th Amendment. The US hasn't even had a draft since 1973, that's over 40 years ago. The military had said that they have no plans to reinstate the draft anyway. It's a waste of money.</p>
7/15/2019	<p>Raise the age limit for otherwise qualified individuals. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>
7/15/2019	<p>On behalf of American Bar Association President Bob Carlson, we are pleased to submit a letter to the Commission on the importance of civic education and in response to the Commission's "Staff Memo: Civic Education." We have sent the full letter to 'info@inspire2serve.gov.</p>
7/17/2019	<p>As a concerned U.S citizen and a strong believer in equality I would strongly appreciate one of the following two scenarios regarding the selective service system to take place:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) That it be abolished & replaced with a completely voluntary system for all citizens. This means that all selective service requirements to be granted government services like driver's licenses, Financial Aid for school & government jobs would be abolished. 2.) That it be extended to include those who were assigned female at birth, instead of only forcing those who were assigned male at birth to do so. In other words, In other words, it would create a fairer and more equal playing field for all genders and simplify the process for those who do not fit within the gender binary or with their assigned birth sex
7/17/2019	<p>I would love to serve, but the window is skewed. At 18 we make the best choice for ourselves and our future, which for me was college/professional career/self employment. I tried to join the Guard/Reserves at 37 because I was inspired to serve after my duties as a fully functioning and contributing citizen were entrenched. Despite my youthful athleticism and adult mind, I was denied based on age. I'm not looking to retire, I'm looking to serve. Until you remove these barriers like every other English speaking Five Eye nation, you're not going to achieve what you're looking to do. Please eliminate the age discrimination for otherwise qualified individuals. I hope this changes in 2020.</p> <p>████████████████████</p>

7/18/2019	<p>I am a veteran and I served the Army in the late sixties. When the they ended draft,no was against it. Currently the Army has a 135,000 manpower shortage. They're currently paying \$40,000 bonus to make up the shortage by the end of September.</p> <p>I support a Military draft for males, but not for females. I also would support a mandatory service which would include other forms of national service other than the military. Under a draft every man called would not qualify, but would have the choice to serve in other ways under a mandatory service. Females still should have the right to volunteer for the military.</p> <p>I hope our representatives understand manpower for our military is important.</p> <p>Bill Harper</p>
7/18/2019	<p>I am a veteran and I served the Army in the late sixties. When the they ended draft,no was against it. Currently the Army has a 135,000 manpower shortage. They're currently paying \$40,000 bonus to make up the shortage by the end of September.</p> <p>I support a Military draft for males, but not for females. I also would support a mandatory service which would include other forms of national service other than the military. Under a draft every man called would not qualify, but would have the choice to serve in other ways under a mandatory service. Females still should have the right to volunteer for the military.</p> <p>I hope our representatives understand manpower for our military is important.</p> <p>Bill Harper</p>
7/19/2019	<p>I believe if the draft is reinstated BILLIONAIRES AND MILLIONAIRES SONS AND DAUGHTERS SHOULD BE DRAFTED FIRST AND DON'T LET THEM DODGE IT LIKE donny BONE SPURS BOK BOK THE CHICKEN RACIST trump ERIC IS 35 donny SAYS HE LOVES ARE MILITARY ERIC JOIN UNLIKE KILLING BEAUTIFUL ANIMALS THAT CAN'T PROTECT THEM SELF'S</p>
7/20/2019	<p>We're too divided of a country for anything but elective service (conscription, etc.). This will only worsen as we multi-generational Americans are forced to contend with unfettered pots-1965 Third World immigration we never asked for, illegal immigration from Latin countries, and the notion that if we oppose any of it we are "racist."</p> <p>The generations that have signed-up in the past (including my lineage and knowledge of those who have served but no longer will or would) no longer feel the country represents them or their values. I think that's why you're seeing the numbers plummet.</p> <p>The only solution I can see to this is to appeal more to recent immigrants who now see themselves as American. Much like South Africa, more whites are going to shun the military in favor of financial gain, and in retreat of a society that is growing to resent them.</p>
7/20/2019	<p>We're too divided of a country for anything but elective service (conscription, etc. would likely fail). This will only worsen as we multi-generational Americans are forced to contend with unfettered post-1965 Third World immigration we never asked for, illegal immigration from Latin countries, and the notion that if we oppose any of it we are "racist."</p> <p>The generations that have signed-up in the past (including my lineage and knowledge of those who have served but no longer will or would) no longer feel the country represents them or their values. I think that's why you're seeing the numbers plummet.</p>

	The only solution I can see to this is to appeal more to recent immigrants who now see themselves as American. Much like South Africa, more whites are going to shun the military in favor of financial gain, and in retreat of a society that is growing to resent them.
7/20/2019	<p>If you want to convince more people to serve in the military, one or more of the following things will have to happen...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It might need to be a universal requirement out of high school, but before college (e.g. Israel, Sweden, Finland, Switzerland, etc.), so that no one is slighted by serving. College is a much smarter option if given the choice, and the quicker one gets started and completes schooling, the better. 2) Increase the pay. I think a young enlisted person makes on the order of \$25K annually. I made more in my part-time college job, and make that in a month now as a mid-career educated professional. And I retain all of my freedoms and don't have to worry about dying in some foreign land for questionable causes. Make it worth the risk. 3) Shorten the term of service. An eight year contract (regardless of actual full-time requirements) with the possibility for IRR call-up and stop-loss is ridiculous, and has discouraged many people I know. 4) Increase or abolish the age limits to appeal to all walks of life. I know currently-serving people who would love to have civilian-minded (read mature and big pond) personnel in their ranks. For lack of better words, the military can be a bubble filled with douches, and not representative of the country as a whole.
7/22/2019	Do not put women in combat roles, especially if they are drafted. They will be casualties one way or another. Their thought process and decision making abilities differ from men's, and could cause hesitations in combat, this resulting in more damage than good. Their body requires things that may not be readily available in combat, thus amplifying the problem. For those women that choose to enlist/commission, that is one thing. To draft women who do not want to be some where is an unnecessary evil. If you truly need to increase the fighting force with people who are forced, maybe it's time to re-evaluate what ridiculous wars we are in.
7/25/2019	As a woman I would support the draft for my son because as a man it is his duty to serve his country. I do not feel that way about my daughter. She should never have to register for the draft. Most women are not physically or emotionally equipped to handle combat or combat environments.
7/27/2019	Service should not be mandatory, we already have the largest volunteer-to-join military in the world. Although I do support expanding national service options beyond military service.
7/27/2019	I have spent my entire adult life in public service! It should not be mandatory, however! We are not a Communist Nation!
7/27/2019	Service has value in that it can help humanity through volunteering via public health projects, helping the impoverished, etc. Incentivizing Americans with educational benefits or internship/apprenticeship opportunities are probably the best ways. Distrust is probably the biggest barrier. We do not trust the military act fairly and not to be abused in unnecessary wars abroad. The draft is not necessary because we should be aiming to reduce our presence overseas and to be more pacifist. The selective service system should include women. No, a mandatory service requirement is not necessary because there are plenty of men and women willing to serve if the incentives are there. Mandatory service would reduce morale and would decrease the trust in the government. To repeat, incentive service through educational benefits and employment, internship, or apprenticeship opportunities.

7/27/2019	I feel that females should be required to register at age 18. Since they are now placed in the same fields (combat) they should have to take the same steps all males are required to at age 18. Plus, it give the country a much better personel pool to work from. It should be an equal opportunity situation. No double standard.
7/28/2019	I think every US citizen who is able-bodied or -minded should serve at least one year either directly out of high school or college (or immediately after dropping out of either). Service is a fundamental aspect of a democracy and healthy society. It gives us all a vested interest in the decisions made by our government, thereby increasing public interest in participating in governance. It allows us to make a contribution to they system we all benefit from. It helps bring us together.
7/28/2019	I think every US citizen who is able-bodied or -minded should serve at least one year either directly out of high school or college (or immediately after dropping out of either). Service is a fundamental aspect of a democracy and healthy society. It gives us all a vested interest in the decisions made by our government, thereby increasing public interest in participating in governance. It allows us to make a contribution to they system we all benefit from. It helps bring us together.
7/29/2019	Forced service under this President, would force people to commit human rights violations. I would campaign against any elected official that would vote for it. So not sure you could get anyone besides a republicans to vote for forced service to the TREASON Party
7/29/2019	Forced service under this President, would force people to commit human rights violations. I would campaign against any elected official that would vote for it. So not sure you could get anyone besides a republicans to vote for forced service to the TREASON Party
7/30/2019	To Whom It May Concern, I ask that: (1) The Selective Service System be discontinued. (2) If the system continues, that citizens be given a place to request Conscientious O

7/30/2019	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I ask that:</p> <p>(1) The Selective Service System be discontinued.</p> <p>(2) If the system continues, that citizens be able to officially request Conscientious Objector status.</p> <p>(3) That mandatory service not be required, as nonprofits will loose their youth volunteer base.</p> <p>Selective Service should be abolished in the United States. It is involuntary servitude and prohibited under the 13th Amendment. Additionally, every time a new draft is initiated, it is met with uproar and debate, and even protest as was the case in Vietnam. Requiring young men to register or be federally punished is akin to cohering pro-War speech, especially for those who identify as Conscientious Objectors and do not believe in War. I must either register and go against my conscience, or risk receiving no federal aid for the rest of my life.</p> <p>Concerning me personally, I am an eighteen year old who recently completed my Selective Service registration online for fear of loosing student aid. I am concerned that I was unable to officially declare Conscientious Objector status for my religious, moral and ethical beliefs anywhere on the document. Citizens should have a right to designate themselves as opposed to War in peacetime. Our republic was founded upon the freedom of conscience underlying the First Amendment, which can and should be expressed before civil liberties are strained during times of war and, "to be more safe, [citizens]...become willing to run the risk of being less free" (Alexander Hamilton).</p> <p>Mandatory service should not be required in the United States. Considering the activism of today's young people when it comes to Gun Violence and Climate Change, these people are already serving their country in the hopes of making it, and the world, a better place. I also believe that the PeaceCorps and AmeriCorps should be strengthened, so that if youth want to serve, they have the ability to do so and generate positive change in our world. If service is required, then all of us young people who volunteer at local nonprofits will be taken away from serving locally, which will be detrimental to our own communities.</p> <p>As a We the People (Center for Civic Education) Student who commented in late April, I hope that you consider my thoughts.</p> <p>Respectfully, Logan J. Hoopes Lake Tahoe, Nevada</p>
7/30/2019	<p>I'm a 12 year old Boy Scout and I'm writing to you about Selective Service. I am of the opinion that the draft is useless and wrong, It is useless because we haven't used it since Vietnam and when we did, it divided the country unnecessarily. It is wrong because you are making people sign up for a war that they don't want to fight. I know in six years I will be forced to sign up to be drafted and I would like the see it abolished or made optional by then. If it becomes optional, girls can be included too.</p>
7/30/2019	<p>I'm a 12 year old Boy Scout and I'm writing to you about Selective Service. I am of the opinion that the draft is useless and wrong, It is useless because we haven't used it since Vietnam and when we did, it divided the country unnecessarily. It is wrong because you are making people sign up for a war that they don't want to fight. I know in six years I will be forced to sign up to be drafted and I would like the see it abolished or made optional by then. If it becomes optional, girls can be included too.</p>
7/30/2019	<p>I'm a 12 year old Boy Scout and I'm writing to you about Selective Service. I am of the opinion that the draft is useless and wrong, It is useless because we haven't used it since Vietnam and when we did, it divided the country unnecessarily. It is wrong because you are making people sign up for a war that they don't want to fight. I know in six years I will be forced to sign up to be drafted and I would like the see it abolished or made optional by then. If it becomes optional, girls can be included too.</p>

7/31/19

Comment for Inspire2Serve, Following the June 20, 2019, hearing, "Creating an Expectation of Service"

Dear Commissioners, I came to the June 20th expecting to learn, and I did indeed hear a good range of perspectives and thoughtful reasoning about the questions you have raised while helping to bring about a transformative national service initiative.

I would like to offer these comments for your consideration:

1- Several panelists made strong arguments in favor of relying on local groups and communities as the primary organizational links to opportunities for youth to serve. However, the program opportunities should also be very much geared to the possibility of youth serving in other parts of the country. Geographical diversity should be emphasized in order to overcome gaps in knowledge about counterparts in other regions, to match resources flexibly with priority needs, to align with training potential and to broaden perspectives. When I spoke about the Commission's work with my friend, a retired naval officer, he said he would strongly recommend every participant be posted at least 500 miles from their home environment.

2- One commissioner noted the importance of an integrated national/military service platform as a potential benefit to the nation in the event of major emergencies and in order to deepen resiliency to respond and rebuild. Such events could come not only as an external attack or critical infrastructure failure, but also as the result of an infectious disease pandemic with little notice. The notion of a "one concept", well-integrated information platform for inspiring and linking those ready to serve offers many potential advantages including, a) bringing a much wider range of candidates into awareness of military service, and b) through resulting actual service together, deepening the network of people, with common experience, training and disciplines, across the country who are aware of one another's circumstances and capabilities. Just think about and perhaps model the on-going value of national service to the abiding linkages we see across the country among firefighters and emergency responders who recurrently train together, socialize and share wisdom about the challenges they encounter.

As a Returned Peace Corps Volunteer, I have not met another person with Peace Corps experience who does not have a continuing identity with the mission of the organization and a confidence and commitment to being active in their community.

3- Several of the commissioners and panelists expressed concerns that national service candidate participants would react badly to the presumption by the government that youth should be encouraged to serve and would find the notion an imposition on their autonomy or individual liberties. One panelist suggested that individual preferences would inescapably be pitted against community interests. While I personally remain open-minded as to whether service should be obligatory for all young people or instead universally, strongly and effectively encouraged, I think this argument is overly timid because a) we as individuals find and express our individuality most creatively in community with others and b) many participants will look to national service as a welcome challenge to learn, to grow and to experience life beyond their existing parameters.

4- In both June 20th sessions, I heard many commissioners and panelists voice the view that civics education and experience by youth in serving others beyond their immediate circle need to be made a greater part of schooling, perhaps beginning in kindergarten. In addition, two of the afternoon panelists and the chair of the commissioners cited the dismaying statistics showing how few of the potential cohort of young men for military service actually meet the necessary criteria. One panelist made the case very well for insuring that the service opportunities provide for young people working on their GED (General Education Diploma). In view of these three concerns, I recommend the Commission give serious consideration to advocating for very strong governmental leadership to improve the quality of primary and secondary education across the nation. The proportion of students completing secondary education on time and qualified for further education, training or work must be increased- perhaps the most important factor shaping the future of national, military and public service.

5- In conclusion, I very much appreciate the initiative of the Congress to establish the Commission, the careful and open way in which the Commission has gone about its work and the reasoned ideas contributed by so many citizens. I hope the Commission arrives at clear recommendations to have an effective, integrated platform for linking youth and other volunteers to service for the nation, to fund the program for participation at the significant scale needed and to inspire not only our citizens but our elected leaders to advocate strongly for national, military and public service.

With thanks, Edward W. Russell, Pleasantville, NY

7/31/19	As an advisory board member of SOS America I fully support Dean Hess' recent communication with your department. Mandatory service to our country by every young man or woman would be beneficial not only to the company but as importantly to the individual. It is my hope, in the not-too-distant future, to have a program like this become mandatory. Howard Ecker
7/31/19	<p>Dear Commissioners:</p> <p>As National President of the National Treasury Employees Union, which represents approximately 150,000 federal employees in 33 agencies, I want to thank you for your service on the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service and for taking the time to work through the challenges impacting individuals seeking a career serving their country. I am writing to share my comments on the proposals laid out and discussed in the Staff Memorandum on Public Service that was the topic of two recent hearings held at the Partnership for Public Service.</p> <p>Improving Basic Hiring Processes</p> <p>NTEU believes in and strongly supports the Merit System Principles, which ensure that individuals are hired to work for the federal government based on merit, not on their race, age, gender, political views, or relationship with the hiring official. NTEU also fully supports the application of veteran's preference in hiring decisions as part of our obligation to help those who have worked so hard to defend our nation and our freedom. At the same time, NTEU recognizes that the process used to hire new employees can be onerous. However, we have seen that some of the things that make the process onerous are due to complicated extra steps that agencies include in their hiring process out of long-standing practice or fear of future litigation—rather than requirements directly tied to the statute or court decisions. Furthermore, despite ongoing congressional efforts to provide additional flexibilities to agencies to improve the hiring process and the time it takes to hire a new employee, agencies rarely use any of the multiple tools available to them. A sustained effort to provide comprehensive training to all agency Human Resources (HR) professionals and opportunities for HR professionals in various agencies, not just the Chief Human Capital Officers, to meet with each other and experts at the Office of Personnel Management and share best practices and challenges they are facing are critical to success.</p> <p>Your proposals to modernize the recruiting, application, and candidate assessment processes have merit, especially proposals to ensure that hiring managers and subject-matter experts are part of the hiring process from the beginning and that 35 percent of a supervisor's performance evaluation be based on personnel management, recruiting, and human capital responsibilities. However, sometimes the sheer volume of applications received by a vacancy announcement can leave HR offices overwhelmed, necessitating the use of some sort of assessment tool to help manage the selection process.</p> <p>I also appreciate your proposals to establish and revitalize existing programs to build a pipeline for recent graduates to enter public service. While there is a serious lack of young people entering the federal government, revitalizing programs like the Presidential Management Fellows program requires actual jobs to be available after the fellows complete the program. Moreover, while a Public Service Corps that would provide money, clearances and employment in return for a service commitment is noble, as is the idea of a Public Service Academy, the reality is that federal employees have endured hiring freezes and pay freezes and cuts to agency budgets for years. As a result, some of our members must buy their own pens and paper because of their agency's limited budget for supplies. The question then turns to how such programs will be funded in this current fiscal climate.</p> <p>Regarding proposals for expanding noncompetitive eligibility for groups of individuals, history has shown agencies to have abused such flexibility and using those programs as the only method of hiring, which undermined veterans' preference and civil service protections. Without additional details, NTEU does not have a full position on these proposals but urges caution and encourages consideration of the issues we have raised as you work to finalize your recommendations on improving the hiring process.</p> <p>Critical Skills and Benefits</p> <p>NTEU fully supports efforts to make the federal government an employer of choice—one that is competitive with the private sector for top talent. However, we remain opposed to efforts by some to cut benefits in a "race to the bottom." Recent administration proposals on employee pay, retirement, and health care, among other benefits, would result in reduced pay and coverage. We have similar concerns about proposals put forward in your memorandum. For example, while NTEU has been on the forefront in championing paid parental and family leave, it should not be gained at the expense</p>

of one's retirement. A federal pension – a guaranteed income not dependent on the stock market—may not be as popular a benefit for employers in the private sector, but its fall from use is one of the leading contributors to the retirement insecurity in this country. And while we are intrigued by the proposal to offer a cafeteria plan of certain benefits, such as flexible spending accounts, health savings accounts, and life, dental, vision and disability-income insurance, we are concerned about the costs associated with the proposal and the trade-offs that may be required for employees for this benefit, especially since current dental and vision insurance costs are fully paid by the employee.

The staff memorandum also proposes the establishment of a new civil service personnel system to accommodate the modern workforce. While we appreciate that it is tempting to throw out the old system and start over, in general, we believe that the General Schedule still works well. It provides a merit system and transparent policies and protections. It provides greater parity in pay between men and women than the private sector and takes into account the numerous locations where federal employees work and the unique jobs that they perform. We agree that paid leave and flexible time off are good goals to attract a younger workforce, but Title 5 does not need to be overhauled to reach those goals.

We agree that some of the problems with the current personnel system that are discussed in the staff memorandum do exist. However, NTEU simply does not believe that throwing out the current system is a solution to this problem. Instead of attacking federal workers as bureaucrats and attempting to cut their pay and benefits while limiting agency funding, Congress and the administration could highlight the important services provided by federal employees and work to make the federal government a more attractive place to work. We look forward to working with you in support of proposals to make that happen.

7/31/19	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I would like to comment on your consideration of the Selective Service System:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If you are going to continue to require registrants to sign up to prepare for some terrible war, then they should be able to register as Conscientious Objectors. 2. If we are putting our young people in harms' way, then women should be included. 3. Young people today do not seem to be oriented toward making their communities and this nation a better place; I notice lack of altruism. How about a required national service of one to two years before college for all with choice between Armed Services and something like Americorps. Financial and educational rewards should be equal so young people can choose based on their interests from child development to forestry and water supply to rehabilitation of homes for those in need to development of new trades in areas of high unemployment to penal alternatives to military. <p>Thank you for your attention, Nancy Dolphin [REDACTED]</p>
7/31/19	<p>Statement to the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service Regarding Commission Staff Recommendations on Civic Education From the Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools</p> <p>It was a privilege and an honor to testify before the Commission last October, alongside Dr. Emma Humphries of Justice O'Connor's iCivics Program. I thank the Commission for that opportunity and for the Commission's concern and interest in civic education.</p> <p>As I suspect you have heard from many in the national civic learning community, we are very supportive of the recommendations in the "Commission Staff Memorandum: Civic Education."</p> <p>The proposed recommendations for State and Local Education Agencies are meaningful, thoughtful and would help improve the teaching of civics in every school, for all school populations in the nation.</p> <p>We are delighted by and strongly support the proposed recommendations at the Federal level. There is a demonstrated need for dramatically increased Federal funding to ensure innovation and equity in civic learning (the traditional role of the Federal sector in education). Ensuring disaggregated data is provided from the National Assessments of Educational Progress (NAEPs) in Civics would ensure state and local policymakers have the data they need to assess the adequacy of their approach to civic education. Both the national award and recognition program and the institutional home within the US Department of Education would be very useful and helpful developments for civics.</p> <p>Our only suggested change to the Staff Recommendations would be to ensure the eligibility of not-for-profits (alongside State and Local Education Agencies) in any Federal level competitive grant program. For the past two decades, innovation in civic education has come from the non-profit civic education programming community. Entities such as iCivics, the Constitutional Rights Foundation, the Constitutional Sources Project, the Mikva Challenge and many others have led the way in new teaching strategies, the use of digital media and all manner of innovation, which makes the subject come live and much more interesting to the student. Funding is needed to support this on-going innovation and improvement in the teaching of civics.</p> <p>On behalf of the national civic learning community, I thank the Commission and its very talented staff for not forgetting civic education and for considering such important and useful policy recommendations. Thank you for this opportunity to provide feedback on the "Staff Memorandum: Civic Education."</p>

Respectfully submitted,
Ted McConnell
Executive Director, Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools
[REDACTED]

7/31/19	<p>From a Freedom of Religion standpoint, conscientious objectors should be allowed to declare their status on Selective Service forms. If hospital workers can legally object to performing abortions, people whose conscience doesn't permit them to kill should be accorded the same status on the same ground of taking of life. Many religious people who are conscripted aren't aware this option exists until too late, and they need to see it on the form.</p> <p>Gertrude Reagan Palo Alto Friends Meeting (Quaker)</p>
7/31/19	<p>National Youth leadership council is an initiative that is traceable to nation building for synergy and strength, the future of a nation is in the capacity and productivity of the youth. Hence, values like integrity, patriotism and national consciousness must be integrated into our educational system from the cradle to the pinnacle. For me, national youth service corp in Nigeria is to promote unity, peace and prosperity among several ethnic groups and tribes. I believe joining the initiative would be a privilege of extending my competence and skills towards empowering lives. Thanks for contacting as soon as possible.</p>

7/31/19	<p>Universal service; Universal service isn't politically possible in any form in the United States outside of times where a super majority of the population believes there is an existential threat. The Individual Freedom ingrained in The American character isn't compatible with mandatory service. Taxes are a far lower threshold of obligation and are a challenge in it's of itself.</p> <p>Selective Service System; It seems minor to add women to the pool. In my observations, the draft is the last resort. Setting up a national system to force people into service for anything but an extensional threat is again seemingly at odds with the American Character.</p> <p>Military Service; Military Recruiting standards are fairly high, people who may be personal benefit the best, and society are often barred from service due to t minor criminal issues and medical conditions that while not affecting them now, have the ability to become a major liability later. You highlight this, changing it to those willing, rather than those abled. This would be a tremendous cost to the service, but I believe worthwhile for American society. As your report points out, only 1.6% of people are of high educational quality and a propensity to join. Removing that 'high academic quality' should at least double the rate.</p> <p>The BRAC process is counter to recruiting efforts and continues to centralize military service. While it is possible there are savings thought centralization there is a societal impact on this. Your report and my research seem to point to familiarity as a leading path to service. If bases are centralized people who come into contact with the military continues to decline and become more centralized. This is especially notable for large population centers like NYC.</p> <p>The JROTC program seems to be an outsized recruiting method, this program should likely be expanded if the BRAC can't be reversed and spread. Ideally both. This would be in line with the later recommendations of a semester of service in High School.</p>
7/31/19	<p>My name is James Palmer and I live in Brewer, ME. I'm writing to request that you make provisions for conscientious objectors in your regulations concerning for a military draft. Thank you.</p>
7/31/19	<p>I write in support of allowing citizens registering with the Selective Service System to self-identify as conscientious objectors. Anyone so identifying would have to document their objections to military service. Additionally, I believe the Selective Service should also allow registrants to indicate their interest in national service in place of military service. I served two years in the US Army willingly as an officer and know the realities of military service. However, I also respect the rights of others who may object to military service. I have known many conscientious objectors who performed other voluntary services of benefit to our country. William Gillen ████████████████████ ████████████████████</p>
7/31/19	<p>As one who spoke vehemently against the odious institution called The Draft in the sixties, I encourage its final burial, after its implementation so long ago caused the burial of thousands of young men who deserved so much better. Their one chance to live life was exterminated, as if they were vermin, by a criminally insane desire for regime change in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. I remember the time well. That same mentality continues today in Washington DC, by most in Congress and the executive branch. As the song goes, "When will they ever learn?"</p> <p>The opportunity is at hand to prevent further moral atrocities by termination of this hideous institution. Further, it is time to eliminate any state sponsored penalties against those who may have refused to register, understanding the need to avoid future Walls of Remembrance. On this Memorial Weekend, the best honor we can give those who served is to end this monstrosity and also to exert moral pressure away from policies of national belligerence and conquest, and to a spirit of honor and reconciliation.</p>

Jon Olsen Jefferson Maine

7/31/19

September 30, 2018

Comment on Military Draft and Public Service

We are writing to urge that any changes to the selective service laws incorporate an option for those who are conscientiously opposed to participation in war. We are Mennonites and part of the Anabaptist Christian tradition. Our religious tradition holds that military service is contrary to the teaching of Jesus, who taught us to love our enemies: “You have heard that it was said, ‘Love your neighbor and hate your enemy.’ But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, that you may be children of your Father in heaven.”(Matthew 5, 43-44)

Below we describe some of the history of Mennonites that indicates refusal of military service and a commitment to peaceful alternative service such as that offered in military drafts since World War II.

Schleitheim Articles of 1527. This was the first statement of Anabaptist beliefs. Article VI states that Anabaptists will not serve as soldiers: “The use of the sword is outside the perfection of Christ...”

Early Writings of Menno Simons. The Mennonite Church is named for Menno Simons and he was a pacifist: “The prince of peace is Jesus Christ... True Christians do not know vengeance.... They are children of peace... they walk in the way of peace.”

Martyr’s Mirror. This book, published in the 1600s, contains stories of martyrs of Christianity with an emphasis on Anabaptists. The story of Dirk Willems (d. 1569) illustrates the love of enemies that Jesus taught. Dirk was imprisoned in the Netherlands for his faith. He managed to escape by fleeing across a frozen river. However, a man following and attempting to capture him fell through the ice and was drowning. Dirk returned to pull his pursuer from the river. As a result, Dirk was captured and burned at the stake.

Peace Witness in North America. In 1778, ten Mennonite families who refused military service were ordered by a court to leave Pennsylvania and all their belongings were confiscated and sold. In World War I, many Mennonite young men went to prison as a result of their refusal of the draft. Joseph and Michael Hofer died at Fort Leavenworth as result of mistreatment. In World War II, more than 3000 Mennonite conscientious objectors served in mental hospitals as alternate service. Mennonite young women volunteered to work in mental hospitals even though they were not subject to the draft. The experiences of these volunteers led to an improvement in mental health care through the US after the war. There have been Mennonite conscientious objectors to every draft since World War II.

Amish Forgiveness. In 2006, 10 Amish school children were murdered in Nickel Mines, PA. Rather than seeking vengeance, the Amish responded by

forgiving the murderer. The Amish are also Anabaptists and these events illustrate how to love one's enemies.

Mennonite Service Activity. Many Mennonites feel called to engage in service work (even in the absence of a military draft) to illustrate that difficult circumstances in our world can be addressed through nonviolent action. Mennonite Central Committee and Mennonite Disaster Service are two organizations that do important service work.

Sincerely yours,

The Youth Christian Education Class, Madison Mennonite Church

Mark Ediger

Hannah Gingrich

Elinor Kosek

Lydia Oakleaf

Daniel Quintanilla

7/31/19

September 30, 2018

To members of the National Commission on Military, National and Public Service,
As members of diverse faith communities who value service to God's world, we have particular interest in the Commission's mandate to find ways to engage communities in public service. We also are concerned about Selective Service registration and its implications for freedom of religion, belief and conscience, and equal protection under the law.

Despite often strident national conversations defending "religious liberty," the United States has a long history of discrimination against people of faith and conscience who object to cooperation with war and the preparation for war, including Selective Service registration. It has been affirmed by all branches of the US government - the Supreme Court, Presidents, and Congress - that the primary purpose of registration with Selective Service is to be prepared for war. This means that even the act of registration can be a violation of conscience for many people of different faith traditions and beliefs. As you know, when individuals fail to register – for reasons of faith or otherwise, they can be punished, through a variety of life-altering sanctions, without due process. There is no provision under the law to accommodate religious beliefs within the current Selective Service System registration process. This must change, and the simplest way to accomplish this is to abolish the registration requirement for all.

If, following its deliberations, the Commission recommends retaining Selective Service registration, a provision to allow people to register as conscientious objectors should be initiated. This is essential to ensure that religious beliefs are accommodated. In addition, those who can no longer register because of their age should have their sanctions lifted and their full rights restored.

Also under the Commission's consideration is the issue of national service. Many of our faith communities sponsor voluntary service programs. We applaud government programs to encourage service, such as the Peace Corps and Americorps. We oppose mandatory civilian or military service. We believe, and have learned through our experiences, that genuine service comes from the heart—not coercion. We would hope that proposals for engaging people in service will recognize and support the many voluntary service programs that currently exist throughout our communities, rather than try to compete with them. These and other civiliandirected programs have not been funded or promoted on the same scale as military service. We believe that civilian service should be incentivized equally, with benefits similar to those offered by the Armed Forces available to all, even those whose religious beliefs prevent them from participating with war.

We look forward to seeing your proposals.

Thank you.

Signed:

National Council of Churches

[Redacted signature]

[REDACTED]
nationalcouncilofchurches.us
Church of the Brethren Office of Peacebuilding and Policy

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Mennonite Central Committee U.S.
Rachelle Lyndaker Schlabach, Director
Mennonite Central Committee U.S. Washington Office

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
National Campaign for a Peace Tax Fund
Malachy Kilbride, Executive Director

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
<http://info@peacetaxfund.org>
Center on Conscience & War

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
centeronconscience.org

7/31/19

Dear People,

Peace activists and other thoughtful people say a DRAFT would quickly put a stop to these endless wars. They point out that if there was a DRAFT the people would resist being DRAFTED and the country would have to face the issue of our young people fighting wars in countries far from our borders that have nothing to do with our national security.

So bring on the DRAFT they say - let's level this field of war - where only the poor and underprivileged because of a lack of resources and opportunity are forced to join the military because our country prioritizes corporate wealth over care of it's citizens.

And they have a very good point. Don't you agree?

I oppose a DRAFT. I oppose a DRAFT of men and women. I oppose a DRAFT of any age, of any skill. I oppose a country built on endless war for profit that goes to corporations that do not care for me, my children, my grandchildren or anyone else.

We shall overcome.

In hope of a peace loving nation someday.

Robie Tenorio

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

7/31/19

W. Andrew Harrell, Ph.D., J.D.
Attorney at Law

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

COMMENT ON THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NATIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE

September 27, 2018

Submitted Via E-Mail Attachment to: info@inspire2serve.gov/ Docket No. 05-2018-01

I am going to provide some comments on this commission, based in part on my attendance at your recent public presentation in Los Angeles. I am not interested in receiving any response from the commission nor any future correspondence. Instead, I am sending a copy of this comment to my Congresswoman, urging her to act on it.

By way of background, I have had a number of family members involved in U.S. Army Intelligence and in the CIA. They were involved, dating from the Eisenhower administration, in the “secret” war in Laos. They were appalled by the barbarity of their involvement in SE Asia, and urged me and others to oppose the inevitability of this ill-conceived misadventure. This was 1960, and I had just turned 15. My public opposition to this war dismayed my local Congressman and the local draft board. My Congressman informed me that “he didn’t represent people of my ilk” and that he was actively encouraging the draft board to “get me” into the Army and teach me a lesson.” He hoped that many of us “traitors” would die. After graduating from Pomona College in 1967, in the midst of graduate school, my quarrel with the draft board intensified, to the point that I began attending law school to defend myself and other “traitors.” In 1971 I completed my Ph.D. and was well on my way to completing law school. I began working with lawyers in the Pacific Northwest to fight the Selective Service System. My entire legal career has been spent on human rights issues. I currently defend soldiers as part of the MAP group in AILA who have immigration issues with the USCIS, DOJ and the DOD. In other words, I have been fighting the U.S. government for most of my adult life and will continue to do so if necessary. Many of the problems that we faced in the 1960s are unresolved, and your commission is symptomatic of this unfinished business.

First, you propose that the SSS implement some sort of universal registration, regardless of age or gender. This is unnecessary and appears to be a sop to an outdated agency. The government already has more than enough data bases. There are commercial data bases that have this information. As part of my research I routinely use a variety of data bases and search software to locate seemingly isolated, hard-to-find individuals and groups. If you want a

universal registration, provide all citizens with universal health care. This is how it's done in modern countries. The SSS practice of registering only males is unconstitutional, placing an undue disadvantage and burden on them. I don't know how you keep this on the books. It is a blatant violation of equal protection. My understanding is that compliance is dubious, and prosecutions are rare. Unlike the 1960s, there are tens of thousands of lawyers who would be eager to fight you on an expansion of registration. Go ahead and try, but it will be a PR nightmare. We're ready for you. My experience with the SSS was that it was that it's day-to-day operation was the most egregious violation of due process I have ever encountered. Its conduct was and likely remains a textbook violation of the APA. I recommend that the SSS use this commission as an opportunity to explore its abuses and poor reputation and, if possible, rehabilitate itself. It's a relic from the past and should be killed. In a true national emergency, Americans are eager to volunteer to protect their country. The mere existence of the SSS is a blight.

Second, you are exploring universal conscription. Very few countries have conscription and, with a few exceptions, most are small, developing countries engaged in local conflicts where conscription might be justified. Your aim, on the other hand, is to provide a reservoir of poorly paid potential cannon fodder. Any draft which targets young males is patently unconstitutional. You don't even have a rational basis for doing this anymore. Every published, data-driven study repeatedly documents that a draft imposes an unfair tax on those who are drafted and confers an unfair benefit on those who are not drafted. In the Vietnam War the draft deprived the civilian workforce of badly needed workers. It reduced consumption and consumer demand and was the direct cause of a prolonged recession. National debt was increased. I hope I don't need to articulate the life-long trauma and ill health that this war resulted in. Since WW II this country has engaged in 38 military adventures. I cannot point to a single benefit from this constant state of war. If you re-instate conscription, you will further divide this nation. Your timing is awful since I doubt that very many Americans would be motivated to give their lives in service to the current "president." If you want a military, keep it professional and pay it well.

Third, the ability of this nation to wage war is declining. It is an aging population and the current administration has made a concerted effort to reduce migration, disregarding the fact that first and second generation immigrants have been the mainstay of combat forces in previous conflicts. The demographics are against the U.S. continuing to expand or maintain its empire.

Fourth, American youth have many things already on their minds: staggering college debt, joblessness, stagnant wealth, racism, lack of health care, environmental disasters, etc. Solve these problems first and give our youth a country worth fighting for.

Fifth, one of your missions is to increase volunteerism. There is a crying need to provide youth with meaningful work that pays a living wage. (This was the strong message at your dog and pony shows.) What it seems that you really want is youth to volunteer for free. This isn't going to happen. America certainly has many challenges, and our youth has the energy and talent to do address these challenges, but don't make them slaves. Raise taxes and use this volunteerism to backdoor a guarantee income. Failing to do this, this country is headed to massive unemployment, unrest, and a country definitely not worth fighting for.

Sixth, you propose making certain occupational fields permanently vulnerable to the draft. This is a remarkably stupid idea. It imposes a burden on people in these fields and creates a natural deterrent to going into them. It places the military in direct and unhealthy competition with the private sector. This proposal presumes that the military should dominate scarce human and financial resources even more. Have you forgotten Eisenhower's warning? Haven't you militarized the consciousness of the country enough? Finally, this proposal presumes that the military knows enough to anticipate what it needs. You are going in the wrong direction with this proposal. You need to drastically reduce the scope and cost of the military. Maybe train the commander in chief to be diplomatic rather than a man-child bully. We constitute less than 5% of the population. We are not in a position to continue to threaten, kill or coerce the rest of the world.

Seventh, someone submitted a comment that we need cyber warriors to defend us. I know something about this, since I am one of the pioneers in data science and AI/machine learning. A goal of machine learning is to eliminate human operators, i.e., to have autonomous, unsupervised machine learning. When this is achieved (soon?), your cyber warriors will be a liability since the “machine” will be more creative and relentless. Your current military, especially the expensive high tech weaponry, will be vulnerable to an AI attack. The enemy will use your own stuff to kill you. You people need to rethink this before you fall back on old military paradigms. And, get people who are really doing AI research and application rather than these political science consultants who seem to be writing all of the popular articles but really are dangerously clueless.

Eight, your proposal to draft STEM scientists is dangerous and ill-advised. When I was an undergraduate, many of my professors had been part of the Manhattan Project. They constantly warned about the absorption of the sciences into the military and the restrictions on research. The military already controls too much of research funding. This is not healthy and disadvantages us internationally. You should use this commission to explore and debate this. It may be instructive to review the discussion of Heisenberg’s involvement in the German A bomb to appreciate the pitfalls of coercing scientists into war-related activities.

Sincerely,

W. Andrew Harrell, Ph.D., J.D.

7/31/19	<p>Greetings,</p> <p>Thank you so much for your time and reflection. I wanted to submit the following suggestions for consideration.</p> <p>Please consider adding to national service registration these additional registration options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) registering as a conscientious objector; (2) registering as an employee of a non-governmental unarmed civilian protection group; (3) registering as a nonviolent public servant. <p>Thank you once again!</p>
7/31/19	<p>To the National Commission on Military, National and Public Service.</p> <p>I've only recently become aware of your Commission, and offer my comments below for your thoughtful consideration.</p> <p>On your "Share Your Thoughts" page http://inspire2serve.gov/content/share-your-thoughts you ask 7 questions. I find question #3 the most significant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How can the United States increase participation in military, national, and public service by individuals with skills critical to address the national security and other public service needs of the nation? 2. In order to inspire and engage people in public service, they must understand what the "public" is they are serving. Over the last 60+ years, Civics education has practically disappeared from school curricula across the country. During this time, the teaching of American history also has been diluted, even, some might argue, altered to fit a new political narrative that is hostile to the founding of the Republic. Students have been taught to be suspicious of their historical legacy, even to despise it. 3. Given the deliberate "shaming" of America in textbooks and lesson plans, how are students to be inspired to serve their country? [Howard Zinn's A People's History of the United States is in public and private schools, and serves as a prime example of the early "Progressive" effort to rip apart the diverse yet cohesive tapestry that is the United States of America.] 4. And so I suggest that your Commission collaborate with the Department of Education to honestly assess the state of Civics and American History curricula in the United States. I believe you will find evidence of a concerted effort to tear at the fabric of our Republic's history with the intent of turning generations against their country. And perhaps then you will be able to explain why it is increasingly challenging to inspire younger citizens to serve their Republic out of patriotic pride and a sense of duty. 5. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration, 6. Catharine Trauernicht 7. McLean, VA

7/31/19	<p>The military draft is not necessary since there are no threats to the nation any longer. Any threats to the United States are those which are invented by the pentagon and other vested interests whose careers and paychecks depend on continual strife throughout the world. The hawks of government will always find a nation to demonize somewhere in the world because it is in their best interests to do so. The only reason why we don't have half a million troops in the Middle East is due to the fact that the military doesn't have a bottomless supply of cannon fodder like it did during the Vietnam War.</p> <p>Due to the smaller armed forces that we have since the end of the Cold War, a draft would be somewhat selective due to computers and technology and wouldn't look anything like the draft prior to 1973. No longer would just anyone be drafted but only the best, brightest, and smartest would have their lives and careers interrupted. Does anyone think the deadbeats of yesteryear would be drafted? The drug users, high school dropouts, misfits, felons, and others would be omitted due to the fact that they are more difficult to train and present problems that the armed forces would be forced to deal with. Note the problems that the military faced during the Vietnam War as well as the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq when it lowered standards and let felons, drug users, and others into the ranks and later had to discharge them because of the problems they presented.</p> <p>If the United States would cease expanding its empire around the world and concentrate more on the problems here at home, it could even decrease the size of its armed forces which has become nothing more than a federal make-work program as well as a burden on the taxpayer. Only a fool or someone suffering from delusions actually believe that the US military is overseas in order to "defend our freedom".</p>
7/31/19	<p>Hi, I'm a recent selective Service local board member and I volunteered to do so, because even though I was never in an age group to be drafted, I would have gladly served my great country and the causes of freedom then, now and until my last earthly breath, as I have learned that without freedom, life is less than rewarding and the progression we came to this telestial sphere for, is thwarted! Unfortunately many in this most free country on the Earth, now don't understand that freedom, is often not free and thus must be Compelled to understand they need to do thier part to sustain freedom or be required to do so and if capable!</p>
7/31/19	<p>I want to join army</p>