

## THE VOLUNTEER MILITARY: SHADES OF CHANGE

Recently we were told that Negroes are enlisting in such numbers that the U.S. Army might soon fail to reflect a "balanced" representation of the nation's populace. Shades of Mr. McGovern's quotaization schemes. Wouldn't it be horrible, simply insufferable, were the Negroes serving in Uncle Sam's forces to exceed that 13.5 per cent of the total American male population that they represent? Imagine.

One of the arguments against the volunteer army was that it would become a "mercenary" force, comprised, at the lower levels, heavily of young men anxious to make a better living than was otherwise available to them; that is, those least employable—such as young Negroes in our society—would be most prone to join the military. I was never quite able to figure out just what the main objection to this was, when the volunteer army was in the talking stages.

Were the opponents of the all-volunteer army afraid that the Negroes would seize guns and overpower white America? Were they worried that if, horror of horrors, the army didn't exactly equate, in racial percentages, the population at large, a great thunderbolt would descent from Him, Upstairs, and strike us all dead? Or, perhaps, were they more realistically concerned about increased racial strife within the military itself?

Lt. Gen. Robert C. Taber makes the good point that the "Redskins have a pretty fair team and I never hear anyone discussing what the percentage of blacks are on the Redskins' football team." But that just isn't going to impress the Cassandras.

Let us not, please, be called alarmist if we observe, ever so gently, that there will be calls for a quota system for the military 'ere long. General Whatsname will say: "Owing to the likelihood of exacerbated tensions within the enlisted ranks; given, also, of course, the continuation of the present trend toward heavier black enlistment than is deemed, at the general staff level, in the best interest of the enlisted ranks: we would recommend that incentives be arranged to heighten the interest in enlistment among Caucasians, and, failing that, that a Percentages Authority be established to bring about the desired levels of enlistment of the various racial groups." Or something like that.

At bottom, most likely, there is a rather strong dose of racialism in the arguments of those protesting the increased Negro enrollment. Seems to me as if they are expressing a genuine (if misguided) fear about Negro loyalty, or at least about Negro willingness to play the game according to military rules. One would think that the proper way to handle difficulties within the ranks is to dismiss the trouble-makers, of whatever race, from the service. But not to fret, in advance, lest Negroes somehow become a problem.

In addition, I wonder if there isn't a latent anti-free market bias implicit in the attitudes of those worrying about this trend toward higher Negro enlistment than heretofore. Assume, as we may, that most people act at least somewhat rationally, and that if the volunteer army, with its better pay than previously, is a more attractive alternative for a young Negro male than some other job or no job at all, then a rational action for such a person might well be enlistment in the military. There he could learn a useful trade, get some bearings, be paid for his education,



and, as they say, see the world—or at least Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio.

What, in short, is wrong with that? Why shouldn't Negro males enlist in the military as good sense might dictate? Sure there will be problems; the American melting pot has yet to melt. Sure, those problems, and the very fact of higher Negro enlistment than white enlistment, point up the economic inequities within our society. But the answer, if answer there be, is not quotas on Negroes in the military, but rather a whole complex of economic reforms, in a libertarian free-market direction, that would make more likely the chances of Negro advancement economically. For the moment, if the choice is no job or a job in uniform, the wise young male, Negro or whatever, may well decide to sign up.

*David Brudnoy teaches at Harvard's Institute of Politics, Boston College and the University of Rhode Island. Dr. Brudnoy's viewpoint appears in this column every third month, alternating with the viewpoints of Murray Rothbard and Tibor Machan.*

## THE LADY OF KASA

*It well may be that I  
Deserve your scorn and hate . . .  
But the flowering tree at my gate,  
How can you pass it by?*

Hitomaro

# frontlines

## □ THE FREE WOMAN'S SEMINAR

Libertarians have frequently ignored issues and movements dealing with civil liberties and human freedom. The result so far has been that the left has, by default, become largely identified with such inherently libertarian issues as women's liberation, marijuana legalization, gay liberation, civil rights, the free-school movement, Indian rights, etc. Hopefully, libertarians' attitudes are changing: the **Libertarian Party of Kentucky** recently became the first libertarian organization to devote an entire conference to the issue of women's liberation. Conference organizer **Sue Brown** reports for *Frontlines*:

The Free Woman's Seminar, sponsored by the **Libertarian Party of Kentucky** on November 24, 1973 in Louisville, managed to be a success despite a Thanksgiving parade which cut off access to Stouffer's, rainy weather, the holiday weekend, and a smaller attendance than expected (approximately 50 persons—men and women—fought the difficulties to attend; 100 tickets were sold altogether). Although the majority of the people attending were nonlibertarians, LP people from Ohio and Illinois were present.

The program consisted of a morning session—theme, "The Free Woman and the Free Society"—with **Susan Brown** (LPK chairman), **Bobbi Jahn** (biologist and company manager), **Kay McAlpine** (economics analyst at Ford Motor Co.), **Sharon Presley** (psychologist), **Lyda Lewis** (Miss Kentucky 1973), and **Tonie Nathan** (LP vice-presidential candidate) each giving talks in her specific areas of interest. A lot of good ideas about how women could achieve their goals without resorting to the use of force came out of this session.

Kay McAlpine mentioned, among other things, that large companies might consider establishing day care facilities on a

payroll deduction plan and emphasized that often men have the same problems as women in this area if they are widowed or have custody of their children after a divorce. She also mentioned some of the "good" things about working for a large company such as Ford, and attacked some of the myths of the Social Security System, pointing out not only its discriminatory treatment of women, but its ineptitude as a whole. Sharon Presley made some excellent points, paralleling the nonauthoritarian personal relationships which women are seeking with a nonauthoritarian political system. She emphasized the danger of allowing government to dominate our lives and specifically mentioned the danger in supporting government-financed daycare centers (the government system of compulsory education is a breeding ground for such horrors as a forced drug program for hyperactive children). Tonie Nathan dealt with the difference between "liberation", "freedom", and "independence", relating the history of her very liberated mother and her own discovery of independence.

Highlighting the afternoon session was a panel discussion by local women journalists; a lecture and demonstration of Korean Karate by Martin and Bobbi Jahn; a panel discussion on romantic relationships; and workshops on money and investment, romantic relationships, and how government works.

The Romantic Relationships panel and workshop were the most largely attended events of the day with discussion centered around establishing individual autonomy in relationships between people on an intimate level.

The nonlibertarians that attended the seminar seemed pleasantly surprised that so many relevant issues of the women's liberation movement had solutions that they had not previously considered—the compliments were unanimously positive.



TONIE NATHAN, the first woman in history to receive an electoral college vote, as LP 1972 vice-presidential candidate, makes the distinction between "liberation", "freedom" and "independence".

As usual, the libertarians just enjoyed having an excuse to get together and discuss ideas.

The news media gave the event excellent coverage both before and after the seminar was held. The *LOUISVILLE TIMES* (daily) did a feature article on the LPK and the seminar, *THE COURIER-JOURNAL* ran a detailed announcement too. Nathan and Presley appeared on two television shows the Friday before the seminar, and Ms. Nathan did three radio interviews. Two television stations (WAVE, an NBC affiliate, and WKLY, an ABC affiliate) covered the actual seminar. WAVE ended its coverage of the event with the very statement: "The Free Woman's Seminar: a concept way ahead of its time, or too late." Anyone for next year?

□ **SIL EAST COAST CONFERENCE**  
*Frontlines* correspondent, SIL director **Dave Walter**, reports:

On Saturday, November 17th, 160 libertarians gathered at Drexel University in Philadelphia for **Society for Individual Liberty's** annual Fall East Coast Conference, with the theme "Toward a New Liberty." A variety of talks and seminars were held, giving something of interest to virtually every libertarian who attended.

**Dr. Murray N. Rothbard**, honorary chairman of SIL's Academic Advisory Board, led off the conference with an in-depth analysis of the shortage-prone U.S. economy and the governmental interference that led to it. Rothbard observed that many people attribute inflation to greedy businessmen, but he wondered why there was a "quantum leap" in greed in just the last few years if this were true! He rejected rationing of short supply



SPEAKERS AT THE MORNING SESSION of The Free Woman's Seminar prepare to present their ideas. Left to right are Sharon Presley, Bobbi Jahn, Tonie Nathan, Kay McAlpine and Lyda Lewis.