

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

le Grade

Pentagon-Run Schools

Excel in Academics, Defying Demographics

Of Course, It Doesn't Hurt That Parents Can Be Ordered to Get Involved

Sneaking Kids Back on Base

By DANIEL GOLDEN

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
FORT KNOX, Ky. — If the schools on this U.S. Army base were lagging in standardized-test scores, they would have plenty of excuses. Their students are poorer and more racially diverse than the national average, and only 60% finish the school year where they started it.

Instead of struggling, however, the schools the Pentagon runs at Fort Knox and other U.S. military bases are defying demographics by acing the National Assessment of Educational Progress, a federal exam regarded as the best gauge of precollege academic performance.

In the 1998 NAEP eighth-grade writing exam, for example, military bases in the U.S. ranked No. 2, second only to Connecticut, among 39 states and jurisdictions. In reading, their eighth-graders tied for fourth out of 43. Of the 13 NAEP tests the schools have taken at home and abroad in various grade levels and subjects since 1994, only once have they failed to top the national mean.

Bound for College

But tests aren't the only measure of the system's success. The Defense Department says that its schools are sending more than 80% of their graduates to college, well ahead of the overall national rate of 67%. And parent satisfaction is so high that the department has had to crack down on those trying to sneak their children back into the system after leaving the military or moving off base.

Most astonishing to those who have studied the NAEP results is the Pentagon's record with low-income and minority children. At least half the 34,000 students at its 71 domestic base schools qualify for free or reduced-price lunches under the federal school-lunch program because their parents are on the low end of the military pay scale. Forty percent of the system's students are black or Hispanic—10 percentage points above the public-school average.

But 35% of the students in the base schools' lunch program demonstrated writing proficiency last year, almost as high a rate as the 40% among their other students. Nationally, only 10% of such low-income students achieved proficiency. And 26% of black students and 32% of Hispanic students scored at or above proficiency, far exceeding national averages of 7% for blacks and 10% for Hispanics.

"This debunks the notion that demography is destiny," says Roy Truby, executive director of the National Assessment Governing Board, which oversees NAEP. "It's one of the most encouraging things I've ever seen."

Ray Tolleson, interim director of the Pentagon schools, says they are so effective because they spend extra time and effort training teachers and trying to involve parents in school life. Military authorities grant service members release time—typically, an hour a week or a half-day a month—to volunteer in the schools. At Fort Knox, every school also is adopted by an Army unit, which may do anything from mentoring to proctoring.

"We've found a blueprint for success," says Gen. Patrick K. G. Ambler, commander of the U.S. Air Force in the Pacific and an adviser to the schools, which require 24 credits for graduation, two or three more than most states demand.

Of course, some aspects of the military formula would be hard to replicate in civilian life. The domestic base schools, which are funded from the Pentagon budget, spend \$7,279 per pupil. That's about 23% more than the national average and 26% more than Fort Knox's neighboring Hardin County school district, which depends on local taxes and state and federal aid. The Pentagon says it uses the extra funds for such things as staff training, art and music classes and technology. While class sizes are about the same as the national average, a higher proportion of teachers at the Pentagon schools hold master's degrees. And the schools have about twice as many computers per student as the national norm.

But "you can replicate the drive for parent involvement and the intensive staff training," says Mr. Tolleson, a former Northern California school superintendent. "Our teachers are really apprised of the latest techniques for working with kids," he adds.

The higher levels of minority achievement at the base schools echo their roots. After World War II, the military established schools overseas for children of occupying forces in Europe and the Pacific. At the same time, it formalized a school system in the U.S., primarily in the then-segregated South, to provide integrated schools for children of the newly desegregated armed services. In most other parts of the U.S., local school districts run base schools or dependents go to school off base.

Fort Knox's schools, which have 3,200 students, don't look much like military academies. They are relaxed places where students wear jeans and can participate in a full slate of extracurricular activities. Through close cooperation with the military authorities, the schools strive to maintain a creative learning environment, effective discipline and sensitivity to the upheavals in children's lives.

At the Fort Knox schools, many of the parent volunteers also serve as role models, including Sgt. Ricky Price, who helps fifth-grade teacher Amelia Blossom Pegram at MacDonald Intermediate School. Sgt. Price tutors students who struggle with spelling or math, hands out rewards for good test scores and "has made a difference to some of the boys who have less parent support or come from single-parent families," Ms. Pegram says.

Detail Makes the Difference

When Ms. Pegram tries to elicit some holiday essays from her students, she first describes a menu—corn, coleslaw, and meat—in tones as flat as those she might use in giving her weekly spelling test. Then her voice ripens to savor a feast: "End-of-season corn, fresh coleslaw, smoked-meat barbecue."

The difference? "The detail?" ventures Danielle Stephenson, a braided 11-year-old. "What it looked like and tasted like?"

"All right," says Ms. Pegram, who has taught at Fort Knox for 26 years. "We're using the language, taking it up a bit." The students begin writing. Sgt. Price hunches over one of them, dispensing advice.

'I'll Go In'

Serita Samuel, a nurse, frequently volunteers at the Pierce Elementary School, which her son and daughter attend. But her husband, Bernard, an Army sergeant, plans to retire in March to study nursing at the University of Louisville. In that case, they would have to leave the base and forfeit eligibility for the Fort Knox schools. The prospect so distresses Ms. Samuel that she is thinking of joining the Army herself rather than sending her children to local public schools.

"They care about learning here," she says one morning as she grades a spelling test. "I told my husband, if he goes out, I'll go in."

Her daughter, Jasmine, a third-grader, is composing a cherry-pie recipe on a computer. "I don't want to go to another school," she says. "I want to stay here."

Fort Knox schools are trying experimental techniques, from peer mediation for student disputes to a form of exile from regular classes, called in-school suspension, for misbehavers. These gentle approaches work particularly well here because they are backed up by a threat. If a soldier can't keep his children in line, or ignores repeated requests for a conference, the school can call his commanding officer. At the least, the soldier will get a dressing-down; at most, he or his family may be expelled from base housing.

In one recent instance, an elementary school sought help from Fort Knox authorities after a mother—a soldier's wife—insulted a cafeteria worker. The garrison command reminded the soldier that, under Army rules, he was responsible for his family's conduct. Similarly, after being contacted by Fort Knox High School, military authorities chewed out a soldier whose son had joined a gang. And when the 16-year-old's behavior didn't improve, they evicted the boy from base.

"At Fort Knox, the command is going to support you, so parents know they better show up for conferences," says Lois Gray, a former Fort Knox principal who is now superintendent of the Hardin County schools. "If I have a parent who works at Dow Corning, I don't usually call the Dow Corning chief executive."

Systemwide, about 35% of the base schools' students come or go each year, a turnover rate higher than that of many troubled urban schools. Such high mobility disrupts learning and often creates social turmoil. At many regular schools, the problem gets no special treatment; kids are just expected to assimilate.

By contrast, the base schools—where many of the teachers are military wives or were "Army brats" themselves—confront the problem directly or even try to turn it into an advantage. Since 1994, the domestic base schools and the Pentagon's 153 overseas schools have shared the same curriculum. That helps students adjust when their families are transferred from one base to another.

Travels of 'Flat Stanley'

Eight of Betty Yundt's 25 fifth-graders at Fort Knox's Walker Intermediate School have joined the class since the start of the year; four others have left. But the students stay in touch with ex-classmates by sending them a "Flat Stanley," a cardboard cutout named for the two-dimensional hero of a 1964 book who was mailed to faraway places. The pen pals carry Flat Stanley with them and send back postcards to describe the places he has visited. Students learn geography by pinning the postcards to classroom maps, and gain a little math by measuring Flat Stanley's journeys.

Fort Knox High teacher Laurie Walker, who is married to a sergeant, assigns personal narratives on topics such as "My Worst Move." Ninth-grader Jessica Wood, who came to Fort Knox from Georgia in July, just before her stepfather was sent to Korea, took the opportunity to reflect on her family's upheavals.

"I slowly got out of bed wondering what the day was to hold even though, deep down in my heart, I already knew," she wrote. "I walked downstairs to find my mother helping my dad pack his bags. I can remember wanting to go back upstairs and locking myself in my room. I guess I thought that if I did that then it would be like the day was not happening, like he would not really have to leave."

As with other Pentagon schools, much of Fort Knox's approach is based on the idea of doing it over again to get it right. Writing is taught in three phases: brainstorming, first draft and revision. Each year, the Pentagon administers its own systemwide writing test over three days—one for each step in the process.

1/2

KK/
ANDY EL-
Should we
visit one
of these?
BR

Civil-
military
GAP

Fort Knox school superintendent Frank Calvano credits staff training for inculcating effective techniques. The schools have rearranged class schedules so that teachers can attend a mandatory session each Wednesday to bone up. One of the ideas taught in these sessions is "mastery learning," which is based on the concept that all students can learn—just at different speeds. Those scoring less than 80% on a subject are taught the material again and retested, while the rest of the class deepens its study of the subject.

A Legal Maneuver

Periodically, Congress hears proposals to transfer the Defense Department schools to local districts. But many Fort Knox parents are so loyal to the Pentagon-run system that, when they lose family eligibility by moving off base or retiring, they keep their children in the schools through a legal maneuver. They go to court to have friends or former neighbors on base appointed guardians.

Children with guardians are supposed to spend at least half of their nights on base, but enforcement has been spotty. In 1995, before a recent crackdown on abuses, 132 of the children in Fort Knox schools were ostensibly living with guardians. Today, about 40 have guardians, says garrison manager Malcolm Fogleman.

When Sgt. Nancy Hewlett had to move off post this year for medical reasons, she didn't want to uproot her daughter Tasha, who was entering her senior year at Fort Knox High. So, Ms. Hewlett and her civilian husband had friends on base named as guardians, giving them legal and financial responsibility for Tasha.

"It's a big decision," says Ms. Hewlett. "She's my flesh and blood. But Fort Knox has a lot more to offer Tasha than the Hardin County schools."

2/2



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Captain James Stavridis
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT AND NAVAL AIDE
TO THE SECRETARY

ROOM 4E686, THE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20350-1000

(703) 695-4603
stavridis.james@hq.navy.mil

Stavridis, James

From: Laingen, Charles
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 1999 4:42 PM
To: Becraft, Carolyn; Boros, Scott; Buchanan, Lee; Butler, John D; Calland, Albert; Carr, Maurice; Cosgriff, Kevin J; Cullin, Brian P; Edwards, Gene H; Grossenbacher, John J; Guter, Donald J; Houck, James W; Hudgens, Robert K; Hultin, Jerry M (Under Secretary of the Navy); Hutson, John D; Jurkowsky, Thomas J.; Nemfakos, Charles P; Pirie, Robert B; Plehal, John; Preston, Stephen W; Quinn, John P; Sapp, Donald W.; Slack, Christopher; Stavridis, James; Steele, Bert; Treanor, Julie; Van Dyke, Mark A; Walter, Chip; Wilcox, Robert G; Work, Robert; Zeppieri, Carla N; Laingen, Charles; 'BlasiolLA@hqmc.usmc.mil'; Oliveria, David K; Natter, Robert J; Calland, Albert; Cowen, James; Ryan, Norbert R; Dawson, Cutler; Rouin, Christopher J.; Boros, Scott; O'Callaghan, Edmund W; 'bpllaingen@aol.com'
Subject: SECNAV Speech

Sir or Ma'am:

Attached is the Secretary's 27 October 99 speech at the 41st Lecture Series of the **Reed College Women's Committee**, Portland, Oregon.

Summary:

Reed College is the Secretary's alma mater. He discusses the growing gap between military and civilian society in this country, and presents his concern that more must be done to counter this trend that is a troubling one in any democracy. The gap, he argues, is a natural one, given the military's tendency to adhere to a set of values different from civilian society - that are indicative of a basic mode of thinking about moral issues representing a "guardian tradition." These values include the tendency to risk all in combat - and to be risk averse in other areas - and, the strong sense of the "collective" - the team, which provides for much deeper relationships, and a greater sense of honor, than in civilian society.

This very different world is becoming more detached from the society it protects, because of the fewer number of the population serving in the military (a majority of men in World War Two, compared to about 5 percent of eligible men and women today). The Secretary highlights the boundaries between the military and society, and describes it as a "membrane" across which there needs to be much greater interaction and understanding. He leaves the audience with the "charge" to become more engaged in learning about the military, encourage others to serve, and to combat stereotypes of service members, as they would for any other minority group.

There is a good question and answer period which follows the speech, beginning on page 9.

All of the Secretary of the Navy's speeches can be accessed at
<http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/people/secnav/secnavpg.html>

Very respectfully,

CDR Chip Laingen
 SECNAV Speechwriter
 (703) 614-4926
 DSN 224-4926



Reed College - 27 Oct
 99.doc

Edited remarks as delivered by
The Honorable Richard Danzig
Secretary of the Navy
Reed College Women's Committee Lecture Series
Portland, Oregon
27 October 1999

REED COLLEGE WOMEN'S COMMITTEE LECTURE

Thank you, very much, Jan (Moore, Reed College Women's Committee Co-Chair), for such a nice introduction. I had to think, when you mentioned my reputation for liking brevity it derives, I think, entirely from the fact that when I spoke here at commencement, I remarked that I had asked for some advice beforehand, and I was told, "*Just keep it to fifteen minutes!*" (laughter). I was then introduced with a recollection of a story about how my basketball coach here looked at me one day in sheer disgust and said, "*You're not big, but you sure are slow.*" (laughter) It struck me as a somewhat inauspicious introduction; it makes yours, Jan, look much nicer. (laughter). I have to tell you that however much one likes brevity, no one really likes it when they are being praised.

The issue of brevity did come home to me, more seriously, since the time of my Reed commencement. As Secretary of the Navy I had occasion to give a speech, which I must admit, did go on a little long. It was apparent to me that it was going on at greater length than it should have when a naval officer got up at the back and started to walk out. Using the authority invested in me as Secretary of the Navy, I ordered him to stop, and asked him where he was going.

He said, without batting an eye, "*To get a haircut.*" Well, I've had substantial legal training, and I thought I was very capable of dealing with this, and so I asked him why he didn't get his haircut before I started speaking. He said, "*I didn't need one.*" (laughter) So now I believe in brevity..

I would actually like to take that little exchange for the basis of what I plan to talk to you about. I would like to start with a subject that is well known and treasured as an issue of considerable controversy for generations of Reedians - and it is an obvious juxtaposition to the military culture - and it is haircuts! (laughter)

It is striking; perhaps some of you may have observed that the Reed tradition, shall I say, and the naval traditions, with regard to haircuts, are somewhat different. (laughter) The Navy and Marine Corps, by and large, recognize the existence of this activity, and Reed does not. (laughter)

I think it is worth asking that appearance in this respect is important to the military; and, what it means, for instance, that Marines get such short haircuts. It ties in very well with the second characteristic that is obvious for anyone that looks at the military, that the military wears uniforms. In case this phenomenon should be a complete surprise to people here, we brought some models for you (gestures to uniformed staff members in audience - laughter).

Why is it that military members wear uniforms and take pride in them? Why is it that certain standards of appearance, like haircuts, matter? I think at first blush it may relate to some sense of the importance of appearance, and of discipline. If we're going to give people weapons of immense potency; if they're going to fly complex aircraft, or drive ships that are tens of thousands of tons; we want them to project an impression of meticulousness, of discipline.

The important thing is that beyond the outward aspects of appearance, and a sense of discipline, a uniform also suggests the uniformity within the organization, and a commonality. It helps to establish the boundary between people who are within the organization and people who stand outside of it. You can immediately tell at a glance, who is, and who is not, in the normal course, occupying the professional position of being a Sailor, or a Marine; or for that matter of course - though I will talk mostly about Sailors and Marines - someone who is in the Army or in the Air Force... a less respected, perhaps, profession, but nonetheless... (laughter) You want me to stop using the microphone now? (laughter)

The experience of establishment of boundaries is suggestive of a very important topic, which is the attention to creating a barrier. A very nice book was written by Jane Jacobs, the same author who has written the book on the death of American cities, called Systems of Survival.

She suggests that there are two basic modes of thinking about moral issues, and in which there are two worlds that are very different; that occupy positions side-by-side, and are in many other societies. She argues that one of those positions derives from one of the most basic attributes of all animals - and that is that we defend territory. It creates kind of a guardian tradition.

A second tradition is of an aspect that is deeply human; that we engage in trade, and intercourse, and exchange between ourselves. Her suggestion is that these two modes generate two

sets of values which are frequently in contrast with one another. One of those contrasts is with respect to boundaries.

Jane Jacobs argues that the military - the guardian culture - needs boundaries, because it needs to sharply distinguish between the people who are insiders who can be trusted, and people who are outsiders who should be distrusted. The commercial set, engaged in trading, has quite an opposite attitude with respect to these things. It is essential to the operation of a merchant that he charge a fair price to anyone, and that, by and large, he not distinguish between strangers and intimates - and, in fact, will welcome strangers into his shop, or into his trade. Therefore, two very contrasting notions about the world exist side-by-side, depending on which of these professional roles one is playing and emphasizing.

The question of boundaries interests me considerably, because I find that for myself, as Secretary of the Navy, responsible in many respects for standing astride these boundaries, I have as a central function of my job representing the civilian world and its values to the military system; saying about some things, this is not consistent with what the civilian world wants. Examples that are of historical significance are when Secretaries of the Navy are responsible for punishing people. For example, the Tailhook Convention, where there was misbehavior with respect to women that was intolerable by the values of the larger society, the organization, internally, had to come to recognize that.

Conversely, as Secretary of the Navy, I am charged with representing the military institution to the larger society; to suggest to it, things within the military society that need to be respected and honored, and needs that the institution has - including such mundane things as funding and support for its operations - that it needs the support of the larger society for.

It is fundamental to my concerns, in these contexts, to ask what is the boundary between the civilian world and the military world like? Is it an arena, which, as when matter and anti-matter meet one another, we have useful fermentation? Is it a kind of porous membrane through which there is movement back and forth, and enrichment across both sides? Or is it a world in which there is a gap, a ditch between these institutions, and very little fruitful interaction?

What occasions my speaking to you this evening is that I am worried to some substantial degree that there is too much of a gap, and too little of that movement back and forth through that membrane, in ways that would be mutually beneficial. I would like to talk with you about some of the characteristics of the

military world, and to suggest to you some of the things about which you as civilians, it seems to me, ought to be interested in; and, express to you my concerns, particularly about the Reed community, vis-à-vis the military world, and the distance that exists there.

There are two characteristics about the military that are particularly explanatory that I would like to spend a couple of minutes on. The first is risk, and the second is the collective nature of the military enterprise.

Risk is something that is, on the one hand, fundamental to the military experience. We ask military officers to put their lives on the line in all kinds of contexts. I know that there is an impression now, in the wake of a war in Kosovo in which we didn't lose lives, and in the wake of the period of some eight years in which we have been doing overflights of Iraq - in which Iraq has been targeting our airplanes, and we have not lost a plane - that there must be some kind of immaculateness about this; that we don't lose lives in the military. But the practical reality is that we do - not only in combat missions like during Desert Storm, where in fact there were a significant number lost, but also in the context of training, in an everyday kind of way.

Two Navy pilots died today in their plane that crashed while undergoing routine training. We regularly lose pilots in the course of training exercises. People die all the time in the Navy and the Marine Corps, and in the Army, and the Air Force, because the equipment they are engaged with, and the things we ask them to do are dangerous - very dangerous.

The military environment responds to that risk by becoming stunningly - in other areas - risk averse. I think of it sometimes as if there is a law of conservation of risk... (laughter)... that if in some aspects of your life, you are forced to be very vulnerable, then in other aspects of your life you seek a maximum of control and comfort.

Many of the attributes of the military that people tend to devalue and criticize are reflective of this characteristic. We have built a world in which we have attempted to give military members a high degree of assurance about their income, their regular career moves, their promotions, their housing, etcetera.

This is all subject to criticism in some ways, and this criticism is legitimate in some dimensions. We have created something that is, ironically, closer to the Marxian ideal than in any other aspect of American culture. The military runs a system that is closer to the communist system than the world you

all live in. Its one that provides a stable environment, provides care in these many dimensions - health, housing - everything is regulated, and it comes from a central authority.

In many respects that is a counterbalance to the other kinds of risks that I've described. You see this sometimes in the stereotype at the other end of the spectrum, of the absent minded professor, who is involved in fundamental intellectual risk taking - thinking great thoughts, sticking his neck out in all kinds of ways - when the mundane aspects of his everyday life seeks the comfort of regularity of routine, and doesn't in any way risk; again, in consonance with the law of conservation of risk.

This attitude towards risk in the military also explains some of the aspects of the kind of camaraderie when we see people wearing uniforms. People need, in the military, a feeling of loyalty to one another as they confront those risks. They need to have a strong sense of who is friend and who is foe. In fact, their commitment to one another is ultimate. In a military organization, almost uniquely in American life, we empower some people to ask other people to go out and do things that have a high probability that some of them will lose their lives. That is something that we don't normally experience elsewhere.

It leads to the second characteristic, which is the extremely strong sense of the collective; of the intimacy of the group; and of its unity, one to the next. In some respects, the military reminds me of a small town, or a feudal organization, or Japanese society. It creates bonds of relationships which endure over the course of an entire career. People at the beginning of their career, and because the organization does not permit lateral entry, by and large, the people who come in as junior officers today, will be the admirals and generals of thirty years from now. The people who come in as junior enlisted men and women will rise to become the senior enlisted people a quarter of a century later. Everyone knows this, and relationships between these people in any given year group will meet one another time and again in the course of those years.

This gives rise to something that is very different than what exists in the civilian world; where in the civilian world, people are very individual, and they engage in a series of transactions with one another, doing one thing, and then going off and doing another thing, and never seeing that same civilian again - or seeing them for several years and then moving elsewhere and not encountering them again.

In the military, these aspects are much more relational. There is a much deeper set of relationships. That set of

relationships expands not only in terms of over a long duration of time, but it expands in every dimension. These people live together. Their lives will depend on one another. No wonder, in these contexts, there is that creation of a sense of trust, and of boundary, that is different than what exists in the civilian world.

Many civilians in corporations will engage in some collective action with other people, but the military operation demands of a ship, or an Army or Marine division, a degree of collective interaction or collaboration that is very different; that only works when the whole organization works. One doesn't fight a war alone, in a sense, one doesn't fight with only a small handful of people who know. One needs to frequently rely on other people, whom in fact you don't know well at all, but in whom your fate rests in the most intimate kind of way - so achieving a degree of assurance in that respect.

The relationship expands in another dimension as well; which is, there is no boundary between being a military person, and being off duty, in the way that being a professor at Reed and in your private life are sharply distinguished - well, not all professors distinguish their private lives... (laughter)

There is a sense, when you are in the military environment, that all the time, you are carrying the military honor with you, and that it is a twenty-four hour experience, a total experience. I come back to the notion that it is like the small town, in a sense. You are not able to differentiate very easily, and draw a boundary in this small town, that the large city offers. It is a different kind of totality.

All of these factors create a different kind of world than you all inhabit in typical, everyday life. One of the things that strikes me as very important to the American way of life, is that a substantial number of people inhabited that world - the military - for a period of time, and then left it, and came back into the mainstream of civilian life. World War Two is an obvious example of that. At the end of the war, a majority of American men had the military experience. In the course of the 1950s and the 1960s, half of American men had the military experience. As a result of the Vietnam War, when the war was over in the early 1970s, at least 4 out of 5 American men had that experience.

Now, however, that experience is by no means pervasively shared. The typical year now has some four million American people turning eighteen. The military takes in 200,000 people a year to active duty. Its not so much a consequence of the end of the draft in 1972, as it is a consequence of our becoming a more

professional military, and a smaller organization; so that now we take in five percent of Americans, and women as well as men are taken into the military, and women as well as men share political power.

I think those are all very healthy developments; but the effect is whereas the majority of Americans by the end of World War Two had the military experience, now only five percent do. This will lead to an increasing gap in the kind of appreciation of what the military is like, and that gap concerns me.

One of the things that concerns me about it, is that it comes hand-in-hand with the tendency to stereotype what military service is, and what military people are about. I remember when I first came to the Pentagon - I had been teaching at Harvard Law School - and I was stunned to discover that there were many generals on the Army Staff who had powers of articulation and persuasiveness, and analytical abilities that more than equaled those people at Harvard Law School. If I was stunned, you can imagine how the Harvard Law School faculty felt! (laughter)

There were those qualities, and I realized that I had some visions about what military people were like that were not well founded. The polling data suggests again and again that Americans share a very high respect for members of the military. But, frequently, I find stereotyping that belittles them.

I went, last weekend, to see the movie *American Beauty*. It seems to me that the treatment of the Marine in that movie is an example of the extreme stereotyping I just described. Without getting into the particulars, and ruining the plot for those of you who haven't seen it, the basic point is that the audience readily accepts the notion of military people as stick figures, with derogatory attributes, including, for example, obsessive control desires, repressed emotions that they don't get at, and a narrow-minded kind of stupidity; that, if they were consistently ascribed to Jews, or Blacks, or Gays, or women, you would all stand up and scream about it.

It seems to me there is a tendency, nonetheless, to accept that kind of description of military life, and accept it altogether too casually. The phenomenon of the boundary makes it harder to appreciate what is happening, and the disadvantages that are embedded in the circumstances.

This worries me... it worries me a lot. I ask myself what it is that the military can do about it, and it seems to me there are a number of answers; and I'm working on some of those answers. It's to increase the degree of integration between military education and civilian education; most military officers

go on to get graduate degrees. We can encourage that happening more and more in the context of civilian institutions, and invite civilians into the military institutions of higher learning, for their own integration.

We can increase the availability of housing in which both military and civilian live - so there won't be a tendency to create closed enclaves that separate out these groups.

I'm proposing, more radically, that in the Marine Corps we take a certain segment of officers who look like they're going to be the superstars of the future Marine Corps, and ask them to spend a year outside the Marine Corps, working in non-governmental organizations, in press entities, in foreign cultures, in business corporations. Part of my motive is that I think these have more and more relevance in the missions that Marines will perform, in places like Rwanda, and Somalia, and so forth. But part of it is, also, that I think this will increase that contact across this boundary, in ways that we can value.

On the other side of the coin - and this is the thought I would really like to leave you with - it seems to me that if we are going to transcend this boundary, and make of it a membrane in which there is really good flow back and forth, we are going to very much need you; for you all, in institutions like Reed, to pay attention to this set of issues. It does not seem to me, in a democracy, to be a healthy thing - a tolerable thing - to have a military that the mainstream in society is not touch with, or stereotypes.

It calls for institutions like Reed to turn their intellectual energy more toward these areas, to teach about the subject, and acquire it. It calls for individuals to stand out against the use of stereotypes. And, it calls for more people to think about this as a career, or as an activity for several years that is extraordinarily richly rewarding; to experience those kinds of things, and return then to civilian life, able to convey some sense of what the military is about.

The world I've described - the world of risk - has within it the joys of accomplishment, a sense of mission, and a sense of meaning, that is different from, and in some respects transcends, anything in the civilian world. It is the deepest sense of camaraderie, in a way that tends not to be evident in the civilian world, with an intimacy between people, and a mutual commitment, which is extraordinarily poignant. It has with it a sense of honor, which is not typically spoken about in the civilian world. People don't usually talk about being honored that they work for a given corporation, or a particular law firm.

The reality is that you do have that sense of honor about being in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, and it comes from sharing inside that boundary, in a tradition that has been around for years - in fact, longer than the Republic itself - back before we had a Congress, or before we had a president.

My sense is, our appreciation for those kinds of careers, and our enjoyment of them, will make us a richer society; and, therefore, some fraction of the people here ought to be doing what some fraction of them did in World War Two, which is to participate in this institution, and transcend the boundary.

I labeled this talk, in a moment of Reed-like bemusement, a talk which I called "Sociology 101: An Introduction to the Military"; but, really, its not, from my end, an effort to offer a single course. It is meant to entice you to go on; experience the gradual version of this, if you will; and above all, to do something which is more fundamental, which is to go out there and apply it in everyday life, and think about the meaningfulness of this world, in which you do not happen to be participating; and about the rewards of that participation - for the democracy, for the military, and really, for yourself. Thank you. (applause)

Question: There is some very disturbing polling data indicating a serious rightward lurch in the political attitudes in much of the military - a substantial shift in the military that used to think of itself as independent.

Answer: Such a good Reed question, Steve (McCarthy) - if they were moving to the left it would be a development, but to the right it's a lurch! (laughter) The data that Steve McCarthy is referring to comes most recently from a study done by two professors in North Carolina who did have an interest in military sociology. They collected data from what they called the lead officers, and showed that the tendency was for people who had previously considered themselves as Independent voters, now, increasingly - perhaps at levels of sixty percent - registered themselves as Republicans. The reciprocal number were Democrats, with a smaller, contracting number calling themselves Independents.

I think that tendency toward politicization is probably real. I can tell you that, as a Pentagon employee, and as a Democrat, I don't see much of it in the everyday kind of context. There isn't a politicization within the military in the sense that they are working differently with a Democratic administration than they would with a Republican administration; or that I could tell you, by and large, which of the officers working for me are Republicans, or which Democrats.

My sense is that this particular issue isn't all that troublesome - though as a Democrat, I wish they were Democrats... The issue that is troublesome is the degree to which there is a feeling of distance from the mainstream of American society, on the basis of cultural values and worries. There is a good book about this by a Wall Street Journal reporter by the name of Tom Ricks, who looked at Marine Corps training and described not only the really remarkable transformation of young people who came into the Marines and acquired values that I think all of us would applaud - values associated with a sense of self worth, discipline, achievement in good kinds of ways, valuing the people around them - really admirable kinds of developments.

At the same time, he observed, they became more and more critical of those they had left behind. They viewed them as selfish and self concerned. That potential gap is an important one. I think it needs to be addressed by more of this kind of interaction of the type that I've just described tonight.

A concern that I have in this regard is that magnitude of the interaction is just too modest.

Question: You mentioned in your very interesting talk that the draft has not been in existence since 1972. I was very surprised to see in the post office the other day a poster that said something to the effect of, young man, you need to register, or we will fine you to the tune of something like \$250,000. Can you explain to me the context of the registration process, and why it might be necessary in this day and age?

Answer: It's a fund-raising ploy. (laughter) It is the legacy of a different period. We had draft registration when we had the draft. The argument was that we ought to continue draft registration because we don't know when, if ever, we will need to resume a draft. There was a lengthy debate in which I participated about whether women should register as well as men. The long and short of it is that, faced with extremely long and eloquent arguments from people like me, and me, (laughter) - that women should register as well as men - Congress said, no, that's a terrible idea, no; and so only men register.

There's been an intense debate within the Congress in recent years about whether or not to do away with registration entirely. I think that most people see it is functionally of very limited value. But I think some people see it as having very symbolic value - and some functional value. It gives you some information about that male population, and an ability to reach out and send them literature, to potential recruit them, or just make them aware of the military.

I don't think of it as a terribly vital issue in American life. I think of it as a kind of situation like when you reach a crossing line in a race, as we did with the Soviet Union in 1989, when - essentially - the Cold War ended; you don't stop right away, you keep going, but slow down, and I think registration has that characteristic at the moment.

Question: What do eighteen-year old men think about this?

Answer: Well, if any eighteen-year olds here would like to speak to that... I think they generally think of this as a mild burden. Most are indifferent to it, and most don't think of this as a terribly serious problem. There aren't, of course, a significant number of active prosecutions on this.

Question: I wonder if you think the military's values and its group definition are relevant in our world of 2000? Does the military need to develop a more integrative value system, as I think you suggest that we should... (remainder inaudible)

Answer: This underscores an important fact, which is a significant number of military people are able to transcend that boundary and reach out. They are better at doing that than civilians are at reaching in. Part of it is because they have more cause to do it, as for example, as you say, you can pick up the phone and talk to the Chinese. A lot of the leadership in the military is in favor of reaching out - for example, to the Chinese. The military in fact tends to travel and reach out to foreign audiences much more than civilian populations.

The military also places great emphasis on the bonds of solidarity across military organizations. Sailors who meet other sailors from around the world tend to have an immediate affinity for one other, from their common profession. So there is that kind of reaching across. I think, also, the military tends to understand that in a democracy they need to reach out to the political world - they need to be involved with Congress, and key interest groups, and the like.

My problem is that the flow in the other direction tends to be extremely modest across this barrier. Even the physical barrier of the uniform tends to inhibit people; tends to - dare I use the phrase in this context - gun shy. I think the military can appreciate that there are integrative values of just the kinds that you've described. It's General Marshall who makes up the Marshall Plan, for example. Its military people who are saying we need to pay more attention to things like the Law of the Sea treaty; we need to reach out with our foreign aid, and our international State Department kinds of skills. I think that's very rewarding, and I do believe, as Jane Jacobs

suggested, that these value systems can live alongside one another. The problem again, I think, is how much are you all reaching out in these other kinds of ways to reach them. That's an integrative effort that we all need to make.

Question: Mr. Secretary, could you speak to the banning of military recruiters from public schools?

Answer: I know that it is a hot issue right now, in Oregon, and in some other places around the Country. I view it as a highly undesirable thing, to restrict recruiters and not to give them access to high schools. I think that first, because of the kinds of reasons that I've just described. It's an extraordinary shutting out of an important part of American society from another very important part of American society.

It think of it secondly in terms of the fact that its kind of a free rider - we all benefit from the security provided by our military forces, and yet we indulge here, and say we won't support them.

A third problem that bothers me is that insofar as it relates to Gays, and about military policy towards Gays. One can see the legitimacy of the argument one way or the other here, but this is a Congressional determination. Its not the military that made the judgment on the policy about Gays, it's a vote of Congress, and it reached a political resolution. One can fall on one side or the other, and want to change that, but the place to do that is in an argument to Congress. It's not sensical to cut off our nose to spite our face and say that we won't let you recruit here.

And fourth and finally, it bothers me because its an unfair act vis-à-vis our kids in our schools. Here is something that I think is a wonderful experience, particularly on the enlisted side for people who have graduated from high school, and for one reason or another aren't going to college. When you see people who have had this experience, and you talk to them, it's in a very high frequency of cases a wonderful and positive thing. I don't want to exclude them from that, and it strikes me as sad. And so, for those reasons, I'd like to see that policy change.

Question: Good evening, Mr. Secretary. I'm actually a military veteran. I was discharged from the military on the 28th of May, this year - that' probably a little rare, among this audience...

Answer: I actually tried to dig up the numbers from Reed, and so far as I can see you have two colleagues... (laughter)

Question (continued): I'm surprised there are that many! As you can see, I've crossed the membrane, and let my hair grow again. (laughter) I wonder if you could address the issue of falling recruiting numbers in this country. I've had a lot of problems, myself, getting my education benefits after getting out of the Navy. The Veterans Administration is terribly slow, and I realize that is not necessarily the Navy's business, but I know people who have been thinking about joining the military, and they've discovered, through me, that it is incredibly difficult to get that money in their hands. I wonder if you might address if that issue has been brought up (remainder inaudible).

Answer: Well, first of all, you are the first person in the history of Reed College to quote as a source, the *Navy Times*. (laughter) But, more power to you - I can only imagine what the headline will be on the *Navy Times* when they hear about this...

Actually, I kind of like this paper, that is independent, and comments on the internal doings of the Navy. The basic point you raise is an important one, and there is a very intense struggle going on to recruit. The Navy this year recruited 53,000 people. The Navy and the Marine Corps were the only two services to make their goals. Both the Army and the Air Force had significant recruiting difficulties. The year before that - the year before I became Secretary - the Navy had significant recruiting difficulties as well. I'm sure that we'll have them again at some time in the future. It's just a very hard thing to do.

We are recruiting a thousand people a week. That's a remarkable number to be bringing in. Of those thousand people, nine out of ten of them will be high school graduates, all of them will have test scores in at least the top two-thirds of the population - most of them will be in the top half of the population - they will be people that meet much higher moral standards than most of the population as a whole, on the average, and they will be people that meet much higher physical standards than most of the population as a whole, on the average.

So this is a big challenge, and it is a real difficulty for us. I think there is some gap between what recruiters, in trying to persuade people to come in, promise, and what we can deliver in a number of situations. From my standpoint, there is something more fundamental, and that is we need to transform what it means to be a Sailor, or a Marine in today's force. Since we ended the draft in 1972, we realized that what we needed to do was to recruit people differently, pay them better, to advertise, and so forth; but we didn't change the way in which the service itself functions. We didn't change the way in which we treat people. We didn't change the way in which we value labor.

The key to changing that is getting away from the psychology of conscription that I believe still infects the military. We are just now starting to treat people's labor as an exceptionally valuable thing. The system has ingrained in it that it used to have unlimited amounts of essentially free labor. Therefore we put people in poor standards of living conditions. The military is famous for making people "hurry up and wait." There's a kind of mis-matching going on between the things we train them for and the things we ask them to do. And we generate an under-valuing of them, in general, and then eventually they leave with the kind of frustrations of the kinds of things that you've just described.

If, instead, we could transform how we treat them, appreciate them as professionals, generate a world in which they receive more training, and are in fact valued in their work - then, I think, we will have created a much more valuable institution. In the year or so that I've been Secretary, I've been trying to do this.

We have, for example, starting this month, giving recruits that come into Boot Camp, a description of the training they are going to receive in the service, and we have gone to the American Council on Education, and we have received college credits for that training. So now people know how many college credits they will earn during the course of their first tour of duty in the Navy, and in fact we can get them halfway to an AA degree. If they're nuclear trained, we can get them all the way to an AA degree.

Question: I was wondering if you could talk to the President of Reed College about getting them to accept my experiences in the Navy! (laughter)

Answer: I'm happy to do it, but I know what he'll say - first, he'll tell me to be brief! (laughter) My point is that there is a basic transformation here that is very important, that we can effect, and there are many other examples of where we are making progress on this. The point you make, even though only partly whimsical, is an important one. Why is it - how is it - that society values this training? I can tell you that the Microsofts of the world want to hire someone from the Navy and the Marine Corps. I can tell you that, for instance, a Marine Corps credential is an extraordinarily valuable in Wall Street investment banking. I can tell you that there are pockets of society which are very appreciative of what this means.

But there are large numbers of segments of society that regard this as less the badge of honor that it really is; and that is a further indication of what I've been talking about.

Question: I wonder if you could speak briefly of the use of our military in peacekeeping forces. And, I wonder if you could address both the policing and the political aspects of this, both for our forces within the United States, and for our forces in Europe, where, in time, this will likely increase.

Answer: I approach this fairly narrowly as Secretary of the Navy. It seems to me, my job is to create a Navy and Marine Corps that will do what we - our executive branch and our legislative branch - want done. The center of decision-making should be in those areas. The amazing thing for me is, the Navy and Marine Corps area always there for America. It doesn't matter what they are asked to do in this sense. They do it. Whether its flying these mission over Iraq, providing support for what's happening in East Timor, dealing with a civil war in Rwanda, its an amazing record that encompasses dealing with earthquake and hurricane relief in Honduras. It encompasses anti-drug work in the Caribbean. It's an astonishing contribution to national life.

It seems to me natural, as an American, that we would debate certain things. Is it right to do counter-drug? Is it right to engage in these peacekeeping operations? Should we have been engaged in the effort in Kosovo, to protect the Kosovars? I think those are very legitimate issues, but I don't have a particular monopoly on wisdom with respect to that.

I can only say one thing about them from my position as Secretary of the Navy, and that is, if you want us to do that, we can and will do that. It's a decision that other people need to be making, but we need to be supportive in doing that. Don't ask us to do them, and treat us as if we were a free good, and not recognize that there are costs associated with this - in terms of manpower, in terms of dollars, in terms of wear and tear on our people. Give us that support, as well, if you want us to do that. Give us the political support of the Nation that has made the judgment, and say, well, we'll honor it - even if we disagree with it when it got done; because that's the essence of the political process.

Don't take it out on us by undercutting that, when you've asked us to perform that mission. We didn't ask for it, but we'll be there to do it. Its analogous, in some respects, to the discussion we had just a few minutes ago, about high school recruiting. I didn't make up - the Navy didn't make up - the policy on Gays... it's a National decision. If we change the

National decision, okay; but while it occurs, let's not undercut the support for this organization. That's the part of it that worries me.

Question: Mr. Secretary, I've been ruminating about the statistic you used about eighty percent, four out of five adult males, in the World War Two time frame, having served in the military. It occurred to me that, for all intents and purposes, the period you picked was one in which the U.S. was at war. It strikes me that there is a long and deep-seated historical suspicion of a large standing army, as opposed to a "by need," volunteer forces that's created... (remainder inaudible).

Answer: I think it's a very right point that prior to World War Two, if you put aside the spasms of war, in the interludes of peace, the American attitude has been, starkly, we don't want a large professional army, there has been less participation in American life.

I think the difference is that prior to World War Two, we were in a situation in which the physical distance between America and the rest of the world, and the nature of industrial warfare, was such that we could afford the lull before we built up our forces. We could see it coming, even when we had a surprise attack at Pearl Harbor. You could take a year or two and get stronger, bring America's industrial might to bear, bring people into the military and train them, and produce a fighting force that was better than any other in the world - and more than equal to its task.

But in the modern world, where distance is vastly less important, where things happen much faster, I don't think you want to create a military that relies on two years of building up, in order to get the equipment, and get the training, and get the people. I think that's an outmoded form of operation that carries with it substantial risk. In this sense we're in another dimension of risk assessment, but my feeling is this is an arena in which I don't want to err on the side of doing too little - I'll err on the side of doing too much.

What we've done is to say we can very dramatically reduce the size of our force as it existed at the time of the Cold War. We can take what used to be 2.2 million people in the active duty military, and make it 1.3 million; we can take a reduction of, say, forty percent or so; but we won't take a reduction to the point where we have a skeleton force. I think that's a right judgment.

The problem in terms of the interaction is we're going to end up with five percent of America in the military. I happen to

think that's fine. We'd better live with that. I don't want to take in fifty percent because I'm some kind of social engineer, and en route, spend money on people who don't do useful things, to bring them into the military and put their lives at risk when I don't need to. I'll settle for a professional military. But I'd better get out there and make sure that in this changed world, where only five percent, instead of fifty percent, are going to have military experience, I'd better get out there and make sure there are bridges between that military society and that civilian society - or I'm creating an entity within that larger whole that risks being distanced from it.

In a democracy, I think that's a very grave risk; not this week, or next month, or because there are more Republicans than Democrats, but over the course of the next twenty years, in the next forty years, in the kind of world our children will inherit, I don't want that gap. That's what scares me.

Question: Could you please comment on Senator McCain's comments this evening during the debate? He mentioned he was very concerned about excessive spending in terms of the carrier the Navy didn't want, but it was going forward, and the high numbers of military that are on food stamps.

Answer: I didn't actually hear Senator McCain's comments this time, but I am familiar with his general point of view. I'm very sympathetic to two propositions that he advances, both of which you referred.

When we submit a budget to Congress, usually after a great deal of internal anguish about where we will put the money, it will be reduced in some dimensions and raised in some others - in ways that are reflective of the interests that exist in someone's district. The Congressmen will argue, with some truth, that they are doing also what they think is strategically important; but there is a high correlation between their views about this, and where their employment benefits from building things, and the like.

Having said that, I would much prefer a world in which everyone took the recommendations that I am making about spending money. But I can't say that I regard this as an inordinately high price to pay for living in a democracy. In some instances, Congressmen put money into things that, over time, prove to be quite valuable. The experts were mistaken in where they would have allocated the money. In some instances they've put money into things that prove to be wasteful.

It's a price of democracy, and the notion that in the end those judgments will be made by people who are representative.

So I join Senator McCain in applauding his effort to reduce it, but I don't feel that it is some deep flaw that could and should be eradicated.

The point about food stamps... what Senator McCain is saying is something that is striking to a lot of Americans - that a significant number of military personnel are on food stamps. Some of that is ascribable to the peculiarities of the law about food stamps - it doesn't count military housing as a benefit to income. Some of it is just a reflection of the fact that military salaries for very junior people are still not as high as they could be. We've just had the largest pay raise - 4.8 percent - that we've had since 1982. Another way of putting the point is that since 1982, this is the first time we've had a really good pay raise.

We need to address that and provide more support for junior Sailors, Marines, Soldiers and Airmen. For me, even a more vibrant indicator is the number of military personnel who work two jobs; people who are Sailors by day, and deliver pizzas at night - or are working in fast food places, or stores, in order to make ends meet. In my view, that's not the way America wants to treat its military. John McCain is on to a right point when he emphasizes the desirability for providing more support for them.

Question: I spent the past four years in a junior ROTC unit in a state that does a lot of recruiting in the schools. I found that it built a bridge at a very early point. I left having a much better understanding of what it involves (remainder inaudible):

Answer: I'm glad you raise it, and I think it's a need thing. We've tried to expand the number of these junior ROTC programs, and I've got a small batch of ideas that I haven't tried to lay out here, that I'm enthusiastic in this arena; this certainly is one that I think is very good.

Your more general point is also right, that dealing with younger people is also very helpful in these ways. In the Navy and Marine Corps, for example, we have really encouraged, and so have the other services, mentoring programs. The amount of tutoring that is done by Sailors and Marines is in the millions of hours. We named a ship after putting out a contest to school kids - they had to send in their ideas for names. We've run science projects on the Internet, where people can track Navy experiments. We've had school classes coordinate with ships, and know where that ship was as it traveled around the world.

So I think there are a lot of ideas in this arena that are potentially very rewarding. Access to the schools is an extremely helpful thing. It's not, from my end, a kind of propaganda thing where you recruit everybody you have contact with - it isn't that at all. It is simply to increase the depth of understanding.

Let me conclude by saying that I want to re-emphasize that in a basic sense, I came from the Reed world; I came from a world as a law professor, when I first came to the Pentagon. I am so deeply impressed with the quality and character of the men and women who make up the military service. It's very rare to see people come to a ship and not respond that way. Overwhelmingly, when Congressmen who don't have any military experience, or journalists, or community leaders - from the clergy, for example - come out to a ship, they are dazzled by what they see.

The average age of a Sailor on a carrier is nineteen. The responsibility we give to young people in the military is unrivaled. The people who step up and assume that responsibility are such models for American society.

You know, I was thinking when Jan introduced me, and so kindly talked of me as a model of someone who has invested in the community, and in the larger world, that really the word model seems to be very applicable in my case, is in its original notion, a small scale version of the real thing. That's what a model is... (laughter) In that sense, I really do think I'm a small scale version of what really is the real thing - which is these people out there, in these kinds of ways. If I've succeeded in anything tonight, if its in making you think a little more about that, and maybe live it a little bit more, I'll be absolutely delighted.

Thank you very much. (applause)