

MAINTAINING THE ALL VOLUNTEER ARMY TO MEET FUTURE LAND FORCE CHALLENGES

BY

COLONEL MICHAEL X. GARRETT
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2009

This SSCFP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements imposed on Senior Service College Fellows. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.



U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 25-03-2009		2. REPORT TYPE Civilian Research Paper		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Maintaining the All Volunteer Army to meet Future Land Force Challenges				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) COL Michael X. Garrett				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Center for New American Security 1301 Pennsylvania Ave Washington, DC 20004				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Center for New American Security 1301 Pennsylvania Ave Washington, DC 20004				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT DISTRIBUTION A: UNLIMITED					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT This paper will explore in broad terms personnel requirements for the All Volunteer Army in the next 20 to 30 years. This paper will not predict the future security environment, it will however, attempt to coalesce and make sense of collective assessments as well as describe numerous significant influences on the global security environment. Establishing a baseline for security is essential. It is essential that there be consensus on the types of challenges facing the United States to inform decisions on the composition and capabilities future military forces must possess to be effective in the next 20 to 30 years. This project will take into account constraints inherent in building future land forces, e.g. sufficient number of military age men and women with the intellect, aptitude, moral and physical ability to maintain a "campaign quality" all volunteer force and identifying out of that population qualified candidates to increase the ranks of our Special Operations Forces. Finally, this project will take into account budgetary constraints due to the economic challenges facing the United States in the near and distant future.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UNLIMITED	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 24	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)

USAWC CIVILIAN RESEARCH PAPER

**MAINTAINING THE ALL VOLUNTEER ARMY TO MEET FUTURE
LAND FORCE CHALLENGES**

by

Colonel Michael X. Garrett
United States Army

Professor Michael J. Pasquarett
Program Adviser

Disclaimer

The views expressed in the academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the US Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

US Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Colonel Michael X. Garrett

TITLE: Maintaining the All Volunteer Army to meet Future Land Force Challenges

FORMAT: Civilian Research Project

DATE: 25 March 2009 WORD COUNT: 6,180 PAGES: 24

KEY TERMS: All Volunteer Force, Land Force, Future Recruiting Challenges

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

This paper will explore in broad terms personnel requirements for the All Volunteer Army in the next 20 to 30 years. This paper will not predict the future security environment, it will however, attempt to coalesce and make sense of collective assessments as well as describe numerous significant influences on the global security environment. Establishing a baseline for security is essential. It is essential that there be consensus on the types of challenges facing the United States to inform decisions on the composition and capabilities future military forces must possess to be effective in the next 20 to 30 years.

This project will take into account constraints inherent in building future land forces, e.g. sufficient number of military age men and women with the intellect, aptitude, moral and physical ability to maintain a "campaign quality" all volunteer force and identifying out of that population qualified candidates to increase the ranks of our Special Operations Forces. Finally, this project will take into account budgetary constraints due to the economic challenges facing the United States in the near and distant future.

MAINTAINING THE ALL VOLUNTEER ARMY TO MEET FUTURE LAND FORCE CHALLENGES

... Asked what they were fighting for, General George Washington had said the object was “neither glory nor extent of territory, but a defense of all that is dear and valuable in life.”¹

Introduction:

The Army finds itself in a precarious position, at the confluence of 8 years at War and near the end of a comprehensive transformational effort. The last 8 years have exacted a toll on the Army and the young men and women of the United States of America who keep it viable. The Army has attempted to stay out front of developing threats and has even gone as far as to identify irregular warfare as the most prominent challenge of the near future.² The Army has challenged Congress and the American people by attempting the unthinkable, transforming the force in the middle of fighting two wars. An additional and significant constraint is the global financial crisis that will have Congress scrutinizing existing and planned programs to fill the fiscal void created by our current program requirements and lack of funds. As a result, great risk and uncertainty challenges one of the most successful experiments of democracy – the All Volunteer Force (AFV).

Thus begs the question, in light of the strain on the force and no foreseeable end in sight, how do we maintain the All Volunteer Army in both the quantity required by Global and Domestic security demands and the quality required by a force that is driven by a dynamic doctrine, more technologically advanced systems while facing an uncertain future? How do we account for the immense pressure on the Army and the apparent lack of American domestic support of the Force? How do we under the specter of a “near depression”, maintain ingenuity, alacrity, priority and funding for our recruiting and retention programs? These are the critical questions that must be addressed in order to maintain a strong, competent All Volunteer Army.

There are many approaches to solving this problem, although, like the times, the options are changing dramatically and frequently based on an increased uncertainty from all aspects of society. We can ill afford to waste resources, (the universal American government approach to problem solving “throw lots of money at it”), is no longer practical given the current fiscal crisis. Yet, the problem requires the American people to do more than send care packages to service men overseas, it is going to take America to go “all in” and support the war with our most precious resources, our Sons and Daughters. Congress will have to get past partisan politics and review the viability of programs that do not further our National Defense. It will take a strong willingness on the part of the President to call on all Americans to serve in specific ways as we work our way through the challenges of the day and posture our All Volunteer Army for the future.

Section I:

Persistent Conflict defined...

The Army determines much of how it looks at the future based on the notion that we are in an era of persistent conflict. Persistent conflict in the 2008 Army strategy is defined as “a period of protracted confrontation among state, non-state and individual actors who increasingly use violence to achieve their political and ideological ends”.³ Given the dynamics of this operational environment, our future recruiting efforts will be challenged continuously by conflict, and the number of recruits will reflect the additional requirements of persistent conflict versus relative peace. However, in order to determine our future force requirements with some certainty, we must have some insight into the future security environment.

The Future Security Environment...

A survey of the credible sources on the future security environment such as: the 2009 US Joint Forces Command, Joint Operational Environment (JOE) Report⁴, the National

Intelligence Center (NIC) Global Trends report⁵, or the source documents for the Army's most recently published strategy forecast the future security environment and how the force should be structured to confront that environment.

The reports generally agree that the United States will be challenged across the spectrum of conflict.⁶ The nation will be engaged in conventional and irregular warfare, perhaps simultaneously, in any number of places across the planet. Over the next several decades we can expect to see increasing pressure as globalization continues to distort and, in some cases, erase physical boundaries that separate nations. There will be increased connectivity developed between societies. Global population growth and vast migration from rural to urban areas will strain global resources while competition for water, food and energy will increase as supply dwindles. Climate change and the likely increase in natural disasters will make the coastal urban areas more vulnerable and susceptible to calamitous events. WMD proliferation and the specter of radical terrorist groups gaining access to nuclear or fissile material will challenge global response mechanisms. Ungovernable spaces, areas where there is little to no functioning government will provide safe haven for indoctrinating, training, arming and preparing the terrorist organizations of the future. Radicalism will take root in and take advantage of the growing population of have-nots and pit them against the haves, the nation states that are consuming more than their fair share of natural resources. Based off of these growing trends, one thing we can say with certainty is that the future is uncertain; the nation must be prepared to deal with that uncertainty.

Current and Future Economic Environment...

If climate change, radicalism, and proliferation of WMD are not enough consider the impact of the current global fiscal meltdown. The uncertainty of the future environment became much more so as we try to determine the impact of this fiscal emergency across society. The transfer of vast amounts of wealth from the West to the Middle East and oil producing countries like

Russia and Venezuela continues to tip the balance of power and change the global power structure. How does this alter future predictions? What does this do to the amount of money the nation spends on national defense and in an ever increasing competitive environment for recruiting the dwindling portion of the population that meets Army standards and requirements? Will we be able to afford the price to recruit and retain young men and women in sufficient quality and quantify to meet future security requirements?

Historical recruiting data...

It has always been difficult to recruit volunteers to serve in our Armed Forces. During the American Revolutionary War, in the winter of 1775 the number one concern of the Commander of our Armed Forces was sufficient volunteers available to man the Army and to win the fight against the British. Washington had his own qualitative and quantitative recruiting challenges and because we did not force men into service, the country was at the mercy of those loyal to the fledgling democracy, who could take time off from their farm or business to tend to the business of severing our ties from England and weathering the British onslaught during the fight for our freedom.⁷ Recruiting for the War of 1812 was also difficult; there was little structure and few rules governed how we recruited for our Army. The Army's first structured recruiting program was established in 1822. It established regional recruiting depots to enlist Soldiers to man outposts during the Westward expansion of the United States. This organization managed the recruiting effort for the Army through the end of World War II. It was not until 1945 the Army reorganized and the United States Army Recruiting Service fell under the purview of the Personnel Procurement Service of the Office of the Adjutant General of the Army. In 1962 the Army established the United States Army Recruiting Command with responsibility for all aspects of recruiting.⁸

Section II:

Quality...

Back in 2006, the Pentagon was on the defensive responding to the multiple attacks on the quality of recruits. "Military Waiver for Ex Convicts increase",⁹ "U.S. is recruiting misfits for army, Felons, Racists, Gang members fill in the ranks",¹⁰ "Army recruiting more drop outs", plastered on the front page of Time Magazine website,¹¹ "Redefining Quality among Army Recruits"¹² was the topic of an NPR story; Military Recruitment 2008: Significant gap in the Army's Quality and Quantity goals was the finding of a National Priorities Project study on Army Recruiting.

During a Department of Defense (DOD) news briefing, Dr. Chu, Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness commented "I don't think they are lesser quality recruits."¹³ However, the quality of Army recruits has been under scrutiny for the past several years. The media, Congress, American public and even Army Officers and NCO's questioned the diminishing quality of our most recent recruits. Eight years of war, multiple deployments, an ailing economy and as of 5 March 2009, 4865 personnel killed in Iraq and Afghanistan, have negatively impacted on the pool of eligible young men and women qualified to serve.¹⁴

The Army has a mission to accomplish; to win our nations wars. Yet in order to maintain our ability to fight, we need people, about 80,000 a year to maintain our current strength of 547,000 active duty Soldiers. The Army has made many exceptions to meet these requirements, and has reversed many long held standards; lowering expectations of new recruits; the goal of 90% high school graduates has not been met since 2004 and we have increased the age of new recruit's to 42.¹⁵

Despite these shifts in quality, the increase in the number of moral waivers, or waivers for criminal activity, is the exception most questioned. In an interview with the Army Times, LTG Benjamin Freakley talked about the challenging recruiting environment. He said that on average 7 out of 10, 17-24 year olds are disqualified from serving; lack of education and health

issues being the predominant disqualifiers.¹⁶ The bottom line is that the Army has had to recruit by these lowered standards to maintain a wartime force in one of the most difficult recruiting eras in our history. What we will see in the near future is not a lack of quantity but a potential lack of quality as we access into the Army today its leadership for 2040.

Demand and requirements based on Army's Vision...

The current Army Strategy, when considering the requirements for the future force cite a portion of the draft 2008 National Military Strategy states that, "The Force required is a truly synergistic force; one enabled by a robust mix of full spectrum and specialized capabilities, and modernized, tailorable, and postured to meet emerging challenges and win our Nation's war."¹⁷ Field Manual (FM) 7.0, the Army's Capstone training manual describes the future strategic landscape as one of "Persistent Conflict" further to say "The complexity of today's operational environment guarantees that future operations will occur across the spectrum of conflict".¹⁸

Full Spectrum operations are defined as, "a continuous, simultaneous combination of offensive, defensive, and stability tasks. These combinations are manifested in operations to seize, retain and exploit the initiative using mutually supporting lethal and nonlethal capabilities of Army Forces."¹⁹ As noted, the Army is working diligently to forecast future requirements. The Army Research Institute has contracted a number of studies as it considers future personnel requirements for the Army. "Identifying and measuring the aptitudes and skills that are projected to be required for effective human performance as the Army transforms to the Future Force is a major theme of this basic research effort."²⁰ With that said, what type of Soldier will the Army need in the future?

- We will need Soldiers who are fit, smart, adaptive and flexible.
- We will need Soldiers who are educated and can think on their feet. Privates and lieutenants are making critical, strategic decisions every day in places like Mosul, Iraq and Gardez, Afghanistan.

- Our Soldiers must be culturally aware and have the propensity to learn and retain a language.
- We will require Soldiers who are more technologically savvy.
- Owing to the proliferation of technology the expansion of the tactical network it will not be enough for future Soldiers to be able to navigate the web; they will need to be able to perform rudimentary troubleshooting of the network as well.
- Our doctrine for counter insurgency and stability operations will require Soldiers to function across the full spectrum of operations. This requires mental as well as physical agility, stamina and perseverance.
- Just like George Washington in the winter of 1775 we need Soldiers who can shoot a weapon, move under increasingly heavy loads, and solve difficult problems on the spot.

If we look at the qualification standards for enlistment appointment to the Army today we would find the following: Age generally between 17 and 42 years old. Must be an American citizen or lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Possession of a high school diploma was not mandatory but “desirable”.²¹ “A person who is not a high school graduate may not be accepted for enlistment in the armed forces unless the score of that person on the Armed Forces Qualification Test is at or above the thirty-first percentile; however, a person may not be denied enlistment in the Armed Forces solely because of his not having a high school diploma if his enlistment is needed to meet established strength requirements”.²² This is an interesting example of how the Army adjusts the standards for the quality of the force to ensure the quantity of the force. Current Army aptitude requirements are based on applicant scores on the Armed Forces Qualification Test. This test stratifies the population into fifths – the bottom fifth or Category V are by law ineligible to enlist.²³ The Army standards go on to further specify that Category IV soldiers are limited to 20 percent of the total number of persons

enlisted. Physical Fitness requirements are a bit more nebulous, a physical determines medical qualification more so than physical fitness to enlist. The Army limits the number of dependents that our married recruits can enlist with, but as with some of the other standards, this is waiverable for “particularly promising entrants”.²⁴ Moral character ineligibility criterion for new recruits seems fairly straight forward – Individuals under any form of judicial restraint – bond, probation, imprisonment or parole. No person who has been convicted of a felon may be enlisted in the Armed Forces – these aspiring recruits may request a waiver and based on the quantity requirements may or may not be enlisted.²⁵ Lastly, there are two pages on the particular website that dealt with “Provisions to Homosexual Conduct”.²⁶ In a nut shell it says we won’t ask and we don’t want you to tell or to display any activity that would lead one to believe that you were in an active homosexual relationship. This was interesting as homosexuals are a very important part of the population that we have intentionally dismissed as incompatible with Military Service. This is a very qualified, highly skilled population that possess many of the skills we believe will be required of our Soldiers in the decades to come.²⁷

So who is right, our Military Uniformed and Civilian leadership who claim that the quality of Army recruits have not suffered or the myriad organization and press outlets that claim we have compromised our standards and national security to ensure adequate numbers of Soldiers to fill our ranks and meet the requirements of an Army in its seventh year at war? Both, our standards have diminished, but it is hard to quantify and qualify traits of a person who joins the Army during a time of war, there are some traits that are not easily measured.

Quantity ...

The last eight years have provided a significant amount of data to make more than a guess at the future number of Soldiers required to meet the threat and challenges as outlined earlier in this paper. At the beginning of 1776, General George Washington had 20,000 Soldiers, two thirds in the Continental Army and the remainder as part of the States Militias²⁸.

At the end of the Revolution in 1783 there had been approximately 250,000 men that had served during the eight years of War. During the Civil War, conservative estimates suggest that over 3 million men served for both the Union and Confederate States. This, the most deadly of American wars, saw over 600,000 killed from 1861-1865.²⁹ During World War I, the American Expeditionary Force, Commanded by General 'Black Jack' Pershing numbered over 1 million. World War II, the largest war ever, saw the mobilization of over 100 million soldiers, 11 million from the United States. The Korean War required 480,000 Soldiers from 1950 to 1953³⁰. At the height of the Vietnam War in 1968 there were over 580,000 Soldiers serving in Vietnam and the resulting domestic dilemma forced the Nixon administration to consider the All Volunteer Force that we have today³¹.

There are currently 1.1 million Soldiers in the Active, Guard and Reserve Forces, with the Active Army at 547,000. The Army, as the famous maxim goes, has been rode hard and put up wet many times over the last eight years fighting in two distinct theaters of war. Tom Ricks, in a conversation with General Odierno during his last interview in November of 2008, asked what the U.S. presence in Iraq would look like in 2014 or 2015 – General Odierno said “I would like to see a ... force probably around 30,000 to 35,000 with many training Iraqi Security Forces and others conducting combat operations against Al Qaeda.”³² Tom Ricks later quotes Stephen Biddle, an occasional advisor to General Petraeus – he said “the mission will be long – perhaps 20 years”, and recommended that the United States maintain of force of 50,000 troops there for many years to come. There is a current effort at CENTCOM to better understand the regional requirements associated with the war in Afghanistan. My professional estimate would be somewhere close to 30,000 American troops in Afghanistan for about the same amount of time we are in Iraq. The Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan alone portend a deployed force between 50,000 and 80,000 troops over the next couple of decades. This requirement in Brigade Combat Team equivalents would be about 12 - 15 including enabling organizations. If we were to consider an adequate dwell between deployments, two years at home for each year deployed

we would require 45 Brigade Combat Teams. This would provide several additional brigades in the active forces and some number of brigades in the Guard for a surge capability to deal with other possible and unplanned threats.

Surprisingly, the future force requirements are fairly close to what we have today. In addition to similar force requirements we can expect similar tension on the force. “But the deeper and more abiding worry is about the military of ten or fifteen years from now. How long will it take to recover from Iraq?”³³ This was written by Tom Ricks in a section of his latest book *The Gamble* that paints the picture of a “Frayed Military”, where he went on to discuss the stress and the impact of now eight years of war on the Army. We are seeing the pressure and stress manifest itself in ways that should not surprise us, such as: increased suicide rates, higher instances of sexual assault, domestic violence, increased divorce rates, alcoholism, prescription drug abuse due to the multiple deployments in what may end up as the longest war in the history of our country.

If we consider that the Army end strength will remain fairly close to what we have today, and if we believe that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan will require continued presence for the next couple of decades, then I have sufficiently shaped the requirement, in terms of the quantity for the future. The most current assessments and predictions for the future, and the threats that we must consider, coupled with the continued evolution of technology and the very doctrine that drives our actions, provides a vector for the discussion of the qualities desirable in Soldiers of the future. The question we ask now is the same question that our leaders have asked since we formed the Continental Army –how do we meet our troop requirements?

How to Supply...

You can't come up with I don't Know or I'm stressed or I can't do this – you have to find a way.

Ssg Kinney, 2 March 2009

Like SSG Kinney who earned a Silver Star for actions that saved patients, soldiers and a MEDEVAC crew, the leadership of our Army has taken the same approach to manning our force over the last eight years and with their actions is shaping the very group of young men and women that will serve our Army in the future.³⁴ The Army has been repeatedly criticized over the last several years about the status of the force. The Army has been chided for lowering enlistment standards to ensure sufficient numbers to fight two Wars. There has been much written about the Army's responsibility to maintain a force capable of meeting our Constitutional mandate – to fight and win our nations wars. The challenges associated with American youth – under educated, physically unfit for the rigors of service, and morally questionable have been discussed. There were few solutions offered for many of America's woes that are impacting our ability to maintain an Army. Fewer recognized the issue as an "American issue" and not solely an "Army issue" and offering solutions to national problems. Our Army has accomplished a very difficult mission over the last several years – recruit and retain sufficient numbers to fight and win the War. It has not been easy for the Army to lower standards– but unlike many who analyze and provide their important points of view, the Army had a mission to accomplish, one that it could not fail. There is nothing new about adjusting organizational standards to ensure adequate numbers. For the last several years the Army has had to reduce its quality requirements to ensure sufficient numbers were available to fill our ranks. You have seen the stories on the number of waivers allowed by the Army that accepts recruits with criminal records that would have disqualified them in the past. With the economic crisis come increased recruiting opportunities as young men and women both high school and college graduates look for work in an uncertain environment. We can expect the quality of the force to increase significantly over the next couple of years, especially if we take advantage of the current job market and focus our recruiting efforts and policies on increasing the quality of our Army.³⁵

Section III:

Solution...

The Army can ensure that there are enough young men and women in the future to maintain the viability of the All Volunteer Army. In order to do so the Army must;

1. Continue to encourage innovation in our recruiting efforts.
2. The President and Congress must continue to prioritize and fund our recruiting efforts.
3. The President and Congress must develop sound policy that ensures we meet future diversity requirements and that we have the right cultural and linguistic capabilities we will need in the future.
4. The Army must continue to pursue solutions to societal challenges and short comings which are significant barriers to recruiting the force that we want and the force that we need to win our nation's future Wars. In short, the Army must continue to solve some of our nation's most difficult problems.

For example, the previous TRADOC Commander, General William Wallace stated; "I have serious thoughts about (the future), and it's got less to do with recruits than it does with the education and fitness of American youth, because all the trends are going in the wrong direction". [sic] Only three out of ten young men and women, ages 17 to 24, are fully qualified to be soldiers. One kid drops out of high school in the United States every 29 seconds - over a million kids dropping out of school. And we have fitness and obesity problems within our youth population, so in an organization like the Army, which values intellect, fitness and morals, and all the national trends are going in the wrong direction - that does, indeed, cause me some concern, unless we do something about it." ³⁶ General Wallace at the TRADOC Commander's conference last September, spoke passionately about doing something to change the trajectory of a problem he considered an issue of "national security". So what does General Wallace and

the United States Army Training and Doctrine Command do? They apply an Army solution to a national problem.

Last August the Army opened the doors of the first U.S. Army Prep School. The sole purpose of the school is to provide potential recruits with limited education the opportunity to earn a GED and meet the enlistment requirements for the Army. Early results of the Army Prep School (APS) program are promising and encouraging and a great example of the Army maintaining the quality of its recruits and helping to solve a societal problem as well.³⁷ There are a number of ways that the Army is preparing those who wish to serve; in my opinion, one of the most important is the Junior Reserve Officer Training Program (JROTC). These programs can assist in fulfilling some shortcomings in our national educational systems and address some of the most challenging problems, high dropout rates and obesity of our youth.

JROTC is a wonderful success story and an example of a program that requires all of our attention, efforts and continued funding. You only get one chance to make a first impression and this is the Army's chance to make an impression on the future Soldiers, Officers and NCO's that will lead our Army against the threats we will encounter over the next twenty years. Starting from very humble beginnings with six programs that were born out of a 1916 Defense Authorization Act to a program today that has expanded to over 1,600 schools and a Cadet enrollment of over 280, 000. JROTC continues to provide a marvelous opportunity to expose American youth to the Army and to service. JROTC completes the circle of military life as it utilizes the experience of 4,000 retired soldiers to teach, coach and mentor our young. The mission of JROTC "To motivate young people to become better citizens" is a mantra that transcends time and societal conditions. The program is so popular that there are over 250 schools waiting on additional funding.³⁸ There is much data on the value of JROTC, increased school attendance and decreased discipline issues, fewer drop outs, and higher GPA and SAT scores.³⁹ This is an area that the Army must continue to invest, not only does it provide an

opportunity to positively influence our youth, but it also provides a venue for the Army to gain foothold in an important sector of our society and to be proactive in solving national problems.

A current example and initiative to encourage is Army physical fitness training filling the gap of school systems that have dropped physical education from their curriculum. Improved physical fitness is one of the supporting goals of the JROTC program. We have the opportunity to shape positive behavior of our youth by teaching and showing the importance of physical fitness and well being. Many officers and NCOs of our Army twenty years from now are in a JROTC program now. We need to invest heavily into these programs to ensure that they remain relevant and attractive to our young men and women. We need to ensure that programs target the demographics that we will need for the future. We need to ensure that the programs reflect the traits and characteristics of the Soldier that we will need twenty to thirty years from now.

The Army must continue to maintain a diverse force and benefit from the advantages inherent in one of the most diverse population on the planet. This is absolutely critical to taking advantage of this significant national strength as we consider the nature of future warfare. The Army has always been ahead of the general population and American Society at large. It was the Army that forced integration in a way that set the stage for rest of American society. Although General Marshall supported measures to reduce discrimination in the wartime Army, he rejected the notion that the Army should dictate the societal norms – he said that it “would be tantamount to solving a social problem which has perplexed the American people throughout the history of this nation. The Army cannot accomplish such a solution and should not be charged with the undertaking. The settlement of vexing racial problems cannot be permitted to complicate the tremendous task of the War Department and thereby jeopardize discipline and morale.”⁴⁰ The Army very rarely has the luxury of waiting on problems to resolve themselves generally because lives and the security of the nation lie in the balance of decisions and actions. We find ourselves in a similar situation today as we wrestle with more complicated aspects of

diversity, such as sexual orientation, gender and religion; tough issues that we have avoided in the past. Take for example the population of homosexuals that have been excluded from openly serving in the military. In 1993 President Clinton unveiled his “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, Don’t Pursue” policy, in 1999 he considered the policy a failure and blamed the military for not properly enforcing the intent of the policy.⁴¹ The latest census data of 2000 provides a number of 4.3 million homosexual adults in the United States, although not accurate for a number of reasons it is the best number that we have.⁴² Our current policy denies us access to this very important part of our population.

I am certain that our leadership feels much like General Marshall had with integrating the military, with regard to the current policy on homosexuality today; however, I contend that we need to position the Army now to take advantage of this segment of the population as soon as the policy changes. In my opinion they will be an important part of the future force. We need to continue to pursue an Army that is representative of the population we serve not just today but we must take into account the changing demographics and adjust our focus to insure diversity two decades from now. We are in contact with our future today in our JROTC programs and other ventures. We need to use these programs to set conditions for the future force, the one we need twenty years from now.

In addition to exposing our youth to the Army, we need to consider other incentives to encourage service. One could argue that much of the growth in recruitment eligible population will come from immigrants.⁴³ A 2005 report that looked at non citizens in the military noted that in 2004 there were 35,000 non citizens serving in the Armed Forces and that 8,000 enlisted every year. The 2004 Defense Authorization Act offered a number of useful incentives and out of this effort the Army Translator program was born and provided an opportunity for service and citizenship that appealed to an important part of society. We need to consider future applications and adaptation to our current efforts to ensure that we take advantage of the

cultural and linguistic diversity offered by the Legal Permanent Residents (LPR) portion of our population.⁴⁴

A small fraction of our population has shouldered the weight of our effort to fight two wars for the last 8 years. The Armed Forces have borne the brunt almost alone. There is no National effort or sense of commitment towards the War effort for the average citizen. Even amongst the services there is an imbalance in terms of contribution to the current fight. The Army and the Marines have contributed most to the current fight and if you believe that the future holds more of what we are seeing today, the Army will continue to bear the largest part of this national burden. Every year we confirm the fact that there are Americans young and old with a sense of adventure and a sense of service ready to answer the nations' call to service. These men and women continue to fill our ranks to levels sufficient to meet the needs and mission of the Army. My sense is that the future will be no different. The last eight years have validated the resiliency of our population and the viability of the All Volunteer Force. We will be challenged in the future to meet requirements that are unknown to us today.

The mere fact that our intelligence estimates and most educated guesses at the future lead us to believe that the long war will continue portends the opposite – a major contingency operation in multiple theaters of war will happen. We need to maintain a balanced capability to meet future requirements and we must maintain a balanced approach to our recruiting. We need to take advantage of the first impression that we provide through our JROTC program, and use the program towards national level ends. We need to continue to recruit a diverse force, insure that our Army mirrors the population and recruit cultural and linguistic diversity that we will require in the future. We must continue to attract immigrants to our Army and reward their service with citizenship. Finally, we must have the full support of the President and Congress to maintain the priority and funding of the Government to make all of this happen. Although the future is uncertain and there are more questions than answers, I am confident that our Army will

solve the tough problems that are sure to come and will maintain the quality and quantity we require to meet our constitutional requirement – to fight and win our nation's wars!

ENDNOTES:

- ¹ David McCullough, *1776* (New York, Simon and Shuster, 2005),55
- ² U.S. Department of the Army, *Operations*, FM 3-0(Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, February 27, 2008, Figure 2-2, 2-5
- ³ Ibid.,1-1
- ⁴ U.S. Joint Forces Command, *The Joint Operating Environment (JOE) Challenges and Implications for the Future Joint Force*, (Washington DC: Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff, November 25, 2008)
- ⁵ National Intelligence Council, *global Trends 2025: A Transformed World*(Washington, DC: Office of the Director of National Security, November 3, 2008)
- ⁶ U.S. Department of the Army, *Operations*, FM 3-0(Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, February 27, 2008, Figure 2-1, 2-1
- ⁷ David McCullough, *1776* (New York, Simon and Shuster, 2005),79
- ⁸ Kansas City Recruiting Battalion Homepage
<http://www.usarec.army.mil/5thbde/4gbn/welcome.htm> (accessed March 5, 2009).
- ⁹ Ann Scott Tyson, *Military Waivers for Ex-Convicts Increase*,
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/04/21/AR2008042103295_pf.html (accessed March 5, 2009)
- ¹⁰ Nick Turse, *U.S. is recruiting misfits for army*, <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2006/10/01/ING42LCIGK1.DTL> (accessed March 5, 2009)
- ¹¹ Mark Thompson, *Army Recruiting More Dropouts*,
<http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1706118,00.html> (accessed March 5, 2009)
- ¹² Libby Lewis, *Redefining Quality Among Army Recruits*,
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=5559563> (accessed March 5, 2009)
- ¹³ Bryan Whitman, *Pentagon News Briefing with Dr. Chu, Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel*, <http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=3753> (accessed March 5, 2009)
- ¹⁴ Washington Post, *Faces of the Fallen*, <http://projects.washingtonpost.com/fallen/> (accessed March 5, 2009)
- ¹⁵ National Priorities Project, *Military Recruitment 2008: Significant Gap in the Army's Quality and Quantity Goals*, <http://www.nationalpriorities.org/militaryrecruiting2008> (accessed 5 March 5, 2009)
- ¹⁶ Army Times Magazine, *Interview with LTG Freakly, Commanding General Accessions Command*, 23 Feb 2009

¹⁷ LTG James D. Thurman, Deputy Chief of Staff, G-3/5/, *The Army Strategy 2008*, (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army) pg 6

¹⁸ U.S. Department of the Army, *Training for Full Spectrum Operations*, FM 7-0(Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, December 12, 2008), 1-1

¹⁹ U.S. Department of the Army, *Stability Operations*, FM 3-07(Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, October 6, 2008, Figure 2-1

²⁰ US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, http://www.hqda.army.mil/ari/research/basic_research.shtml (accessed March 5, 2009)

²¹ US Army Entry Requirements, <http://www.us-army-info.com/pages/enlist.html#req> (accessed March 5, 2009)

²² Ibid

²³ Ibid

²⁴ Ibid

²⁵ Ibid

²⁶ Ibid

²⁷ The Guardian, *Dream Ticket*, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2003/oct/16/onlinesupplement1> (accessed 24 March, 2009)

²⁸ David McCullough, *1776* (New York, Simon and Shuster, 2005),

²⁹ Casualties in the Civil War, <http://www.civilwarhome.com/casualties.htm> (accessed 5 March 2009)

³⁰ Wikipedia, Free Encyclopedia, Korean War, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Korean_War (accessed 5 March 2009)

³¹ Bernard Rostker, *I Want You, The Evolution of the All Volunteer Force*, (Santa Monica, RAND Corporation),4

³² Thomas E. Ricks, *The Gamble*, Penguin Press, New York, 308

³³ Ibid, pg 304

³⁴ Michelle Tan, *Warrior Medic*, Army Times, March 2, 2009

³⁵ Eric Schmidt, *Soft Economy Aids Recruiting Efforts*, <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html> (accessed 5 March 5, 2009)

³⁶ Our Voice the American Legion <http://ourvoice.legion.org/onlineupdate/996/> (accessed 5 March, 2009)

³⁷ The United States Army Home Page, <http://www.army.mil/-news/2009/02/11/16788-army-prep-school-marks-6-month-anniversary/> (accessed 5 March, 2009)

³⁸ Arlington Durden, Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) Program (23 Jan Information Paper)

³⁹ Ibid

⁴⁰ Civilian Aide to the Secretary of War, "Report of Judge William H. Hastie" memorandum for Chief of Staff for the Secretary of War, September 22, 1941.

⁴¹ *Lesbian and Gay Men in the Military*,
http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/rainbow/html/military_history.html (accessed 24 March, 2009)

⁴² Gary J. Gates, *"Gay and Lesbian Families in the United States: Same Sex Unmarried Partner Households"*, (Washington, DC, Human Rights Campaign)
http://www.urbaninstitute.org/UploadedPDF/1000491_gl_partner_households.pdf (accessed 24 March, 2009)

⁴³ Center for Naval Analysis "Non Citizens in Today's Military"
<http://www.cna.org/documents/D0011092.A2.pdf> (accessed 5 March, 2009)

⁴⁴ Ibid

