

TUESDAY AFTERNOON

Ministries, when it works with a local church, provide assistance in securing funds both for capital expenses and for local and wider mission.

The Report Committee on the Stewardship Council has passed on to the Stewardship Council the following matters and offers them to the General Synod as a matter of informal record:

- a. The present trend of the Stewardship Council away from abstract presentation in audio-visual films is appreciated.
- b. The Stewardship Council is commended for the calling of the Rev. Earl D. Miller to the position of Secretary for Media and Its Use. The Council is requested to continue its efforts to interpret the function of this position to the Conferences and to the local churches.
- c. An evaluation of the Speakers Bureau, the Office of Summer Camp Mission Personnel and the Office of United Church Tours is asked with a view to studying the possibility of consolidation of these areas of work.
- d. It is asked that consideration be given to the development of two themes in the Christian Enlistment materials. It is also requested:
- e. That continued exploration be made with other denominations and COCU as promotional materials are prepared to permit variety in both content and design.
- f. That additional efforts be made to personalize contacts between missionaries and people in the local churches.
- g. That the Council seek greater correlation and simplification of materials; that larger posters and chart presentations be offered to local churches for more creative use.
- h. That the Council, if possible, have available for previewing at Conference meetings materials being produced so that explanations and illustrations of the use of these materials may be made, especially to ministers entering a Conference.

The recommendations were adopted by vote, *seriatim*, excepting items 1 and 4 which the Moderator ruled were properly for consideration under proposals to amend the Bylaws. It was

69-GS-93 VOTED: The General Synod adopts the recommendations of the Report Committee on the Stewardship Council, with the exception of items 1 and 4.

The General Synod recessed at 12:00 noon until 1:30 p.m.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, JULY 1, 1969

The Seventh General Synod was called to order at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, July 1, by Moderator Daniels.

1. Action on the Pronouncement on "The Selective Service System"

The Moderator presented the Chairman of the Committee on Pronouncements, the Rev. Ellis Graber, who introduced the Rev. Huber F. Klemme of the Council

TUESDAY AFTERNOON

for Christian Social Action staff. Mr. Klemme commented on the Pronouncement as it had been proposed and upon changes which had been made in the original draft. The Rev. Edmund W. Nutting of Maine, Scribe of the Report Committee, made further comments on the revisions. Dr. Lewis I. Maddocks, Executive Director of the Council for Christian Social Action, gave a detailed summary of reports received from Conferences, churches, and delegates, after study of the proposed pronouncement.

The Rev. Merrill Q. Ressler of the Pennsylvania Southeast Conference moved a substitute pronouncement which called for the abolition of the Selective Service System. The substitute was seconded and debated at length. Former soldiers and chaplains and other delegates spoke of the conflicts experienced by young men facing the draft and about the desirability of moving toward a voluntary system of military service. Some spoke against the amendment because of the realities of the time, believing that these would influence a reform in Selective Service. Others believed that the American heritage demands a vote for the substitute pronouncement.

The motion for the substitute was put to a vote and was lost.

The insertion of the word "military" before the word "conscription" in the next to the last line of the proposed pronouncement was accepted.

When the motion to adopt was to be put to a vote, a division of the house was requested. With 492 favoring, 8 opposing, it was

69-GS-94 VOTED: The General Synod adopts the Pronouncement, "The Selective Service System."

The full text of the Pronouncement is included in the Appendix.

2. Presentation by the Council for Lay Life and Work

The report to the General Synod by the Council for Lay Life and Work was in the form of a film: "'You. . . with me. . . in the world'—a consideration of the opportunities and responsibilities of the people of God in the world as we find it." The film was presented by its writer, director, producer and narrator, Mr. E. James Robertson, director of radio, television and films for University Extension at the University of Wisconsin.

The persons who had appeared in the film were introduced. They were Mr. John R. Kernodle, Jr., a delegate from the Southern Conference and a student at Andover-Newton Theological School; Mr. William Davis, electronics engineer, Denver, Colo.; Mr. John Haas, naval architect, Fairfax, Va.; Mrs. Robert Forbes, elementary school teacher, Portsmouth, Va.; Mrs. David W. Harmon, housewife, Falmouth, Me.; Mr. Douglas Chalmers, owner-president of Golden State Rubber Latex Corp., Newport Beach, Calif.; Mr. Thies Lording, retired school superintendent, East St. Louis, Ill.; and Harry L. Hamilton, managing editor of *American Agronomy Journal*, Madison, Wis.

3. Action on the Report on the Council for Lay Life and Work

Mr. Dale T. Bennett of Greensboro, N.C., and the Rev. George Thomas of Boston, Mass., Chairman and Scribe respectively of the Report Committee, presented the Committee's report, as follows:

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

A Pronouncement adopted by the Seventh General Synod

July 1, 1969

"A pronouncement is a declaration of Christian conviction on a matter of social principle, approved by the General Synod and directed to the churches and to the public." (63 GS 18)

Recognizing that the Selective Service System raises many issues of justice and of the rights and responsibilities of all citizens, the Council for Christian Social Action adopts the following statement and recommends it for adoption by the Seventh General Synod. The reasoning in this proposal leads to three major conclusions: (1) that we return to our historic policy of voluntary armed forces; (2) that Selective Service be invoked only in times of national emergency so declared by the Congress; and (3) that the Selective Service System be revised to eliminate its many inequities.

I. Theological Foundations

The Christian Church, directed by its Lord to seek both peace and justice, knows that both require costly efforts. In the present world, armies and military establishments are one method by which nations seek to protect themselves and fulfill international obligations. Christians hope and work for a world in which old methods of military coercion and threat will give way to more peaceable methods of establishing world order. But so long as nations maintain armies, their ways of doing so raise major issues of justice, which are the concern of the Church.

Any society must find ways of distributing its burdens among its people. Christian faith knows that, whether voluntarily or by necessity, men are members of one another. Scripture and experience lead us to reject any individualism that ignores the responsibility every man has to society and any collectivism that regards persons only as instruments of the society. Government is one method by which society tries to harmonize the demands upon the individual and the securing of his freedoms. A people concerned for justice seeks the best governmental devices for sharing the costs and duties of society, allowing the maximum interaction of personal freedom and social responsibility. In this process the Church has a special responsibility, coming directly from Christ, to champion the poor, victims of prejudice, and all those whom society is likely to ignore or silence. Faithfulness to God and concern for men require us to seek justice for all.

II. The Restriction of Conscription to National Emergencies

Throughout their history the American people have regarded military conscription as an emergency measure for times of national crisis. Many of the

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

citizens of this nation, emigrating from European countries where conscription was in effect, found one of the evidences of American democratic freedom to be the absence of compulsory military service.

Now the once exceptional practice has become the routine. For more than a quarter of a century (with a hiatus in 1947-1948) the United States has been drafting citizens for military service.

We do not here maintain that there should never be a military draft. Military conscription has been used in our national history, with public approval, as a method of assigning manpower during times of crisis. However, we challenge the use of the draft as normal public policy. We ask for a return to the American tradition which regarded military conscription as an emergency device. The only justification for military conscription is an emergency that requires the exceptional mobilization of the nation's resources and manpower—an emergency to be determined not by executive fiat but through a declaration by the Congress as the major representative voice of the American people.

We offer two reasons for our stand:

1. Military conscription is an infringement on personal freedom, justifiable only in times of national crisis. It is more drastic than governmental appropriation of property; it appropriates the person, not merely his property. It deprives him of the freedom to choose his place and way of earning a living. It subjects him to a system in which his behavior, for obvious reasons, is largely prescribed. It subjects him to risks, sometimes to the virtual certainty of death. It commands him to do things, including the killing of other men, that he may believe to be morally offensive.

To say this is not to pass judgment on men who thoughtfully choose to enter military service. On the contrary, we recognize that those who freely serve in the armed forces have helped to safeguard our own freedom and that of others as well. But military conscription (with its implication that men are not likely to serve without compulsion) takes away from the dignity of the conscientious volunteer. It lets society avoid facing its obligation to pay fairly for the service it expects from some.

2. A selective draft is inherently unfair. It requires an immense service, perhaps including death, of some men while leaving others free to choose their own goals and ways of life. We recognize that men have social responsibilities and that society must sometimes impose the fulfillment of those responsibilities. But in the case of the draft the imposition is capricious. Therefore, any selective draft is justifiable only in an emergency democratically determined by the people's representatives.

For these reasons we urge a return to the American tradition in which the draft is the exception rather than the normal procedure.

III. Reform of the Present Selective Service System

When military conscription is declared necessary, the Selective Service System should be organized and administered within the framework of principles which are consistent with the theological and historical considerations referred to above.

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Among these principles are the following:

1. Every attempt should be made to eliminate the prolonged uncertainty every draft-eligible young man faces between the ages of 19 and 26. A method should be devised which provides maximum opportunity for the registrant to be free to plan his education and/or career without fear of interruption by immediate induction. The proposal to reverse the present order of call from induction of the oldest first to the youngest seems to be consistent with this principle.

2. The system of selection should eliminate the recent inequities of the present policy where the final determination varies greatly among local draft boards. We believe that the most equitable method of following the principle is a system of an impartial random selection on a national basis.¹ A greater degree of uniformity should be provided in the law as to procedures, regulations, and guidelines for classification of registrants.

3. Deferments of students should be so designed as to prevent complete exemption from or evasion of responsibility under the Selective Service System.

4. Revision should be made in the present Selective Service System to eliminate from its operation all elements which have the effect of discriminating against those of a particular race or economic class. For example, membership on all local and appeal boards should reflect the economic and ethnic composition of the community and area they serve.

5. Under no circumstances should the draft be used as an instrument for discouraging dissent or protest against the political, social, economic, or military policies of the government, nor should military service be used as punishment for such activities.

6. Deferments of young men because of their occupations should be discontinued.

7. Exemptions of clergy, ministerial and pre-ministerial students should be repealed.

8. Every attempt should be made to revise the Selective Service law to eliminate the many procedural inequities which presently exist in order to protect the rights of individual citizens. Specifically, the law should do the following:

a) Require the publication of an informative and readable booklet detailing the legal rights as well as the responsibilities of registrants and the procedures of the system. Such a publication should be distributed at government expense to all registrants;

b) Allow the registrant's lawyers to appear with him at a fair hearing on any decision affecting his rights and on any appeal decision. It should give fair notice of the action proposed to be taken at all such hearings; permit counsel to participate fully, to call and examine witnesses, and to confront all adverse evidence; and cause a record of the entire proceedings to be made for the purpose of appeal or judicial review;

c) Provide for legal services (as by a pool of lawyers) to registrants, similar to the public defender system;

¹ Such was recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service (Marshall Commission).

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

d) Subject decisions of the Selective Service System to scrutiny in judicial review by the normal standards which require that administrative determinations be supported by some substantial evidence in the record to sustain a test of their validity and lawfulness in the courts; and

e) Permit a registrant to seek such judicial review before being ordered to report for induction. He should not need to wait until the government has either inducted him—possibly wrongly—or charged him with a crime in order to test the validity of the Selective Service determination.

Conclusion

The present Selective Service System is in need of drastic revision if even minimum safeguards are to be obtained, not only to protect individual freedom but also to provide for national security. In recognition of this need, we call upon our members, churches, and Conferences to urge the United States Congress to work immediately toward reform of the present Selective Service System along the lines suggested here and to work for the return to our historic policy of voluntary armed forces and toward the abolition of military conscription except in times of Congressionally declared national emergency.

(69 GS 94)