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PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

I should be noted that the theme of the 101st General Conference of the National Guard Association of the United States was "The National Guard Connection." This Annual Report provides an opportunity to cite number of significant stabilization efforts that demonstrate that this "connection" has evolved into a mutual support arrangement of great importance to the Federal government as well as to the several States. In the aftermath of Hurricane David, National Guardsmen from South Carolina, Florida, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands spent more than 6,500 man-days on disaster relief duty. Following Hurricane Frederic, Florida, Mississippi and Alabama Guardsmen spent more than 11,000 man-days aiding and protecting the citizens of their States.

Perhaps one of the most unique examples of the State-Federal Connection occurred when 76 Puerto Rico National Guardmen were placed on Federal active duty to provide disaster relief to the Dominican Republic in the wake of Hurricane David. Also, during September, members of the National Guard moved a quantity of dangerous, radioactive tritium from a private storage place in Tucsan to the Navajo Army Depot.

If the National Guard of the several States had not been there to perform those missions, Federal military forces would have had to do so. The U.S. government today is a far more centralized government than envisioned by our founding fathers. Federal control has followed Federal dollars into every nook and cranny of State and local government. However, I detect a growing belief that some things can be done better at State level. I sense a growing resistance to Federal control of all aspects of American life.
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The National Guard is larger than all of the other components of the Selected Reserve combined. The success of the Guard in achieving high levels of readiness under State control, while supported largely by Federal dollars, is a State-Federal connection that really works.

This report consists of a brief summary of NGAUS legislative activities, and updates our continued opposition to proposed Department of Defense legislation which we regard as "disincentives" to participation in Guard and Reserve programs. In reviewing the resolutions adopted by the 100th General Conference in St. Louis, and the readiness deficiencies of the National Guard, other reserve components and the active military establishment, the Executive Council concluded that the Association's highest legislative priority must be improvement of the military manpower situation.

America's military manpower situation is grim. The Secretary of the Army stated in testimony that the Army is short of combat personnel in Europe. The Army is experiencing an obvious shortfall in recruiting this year. Even the Air Force for the first time is short of its manpower goals.

The Army's Individual Ready Reserve is a disaster area. Speaking of the IRR, General Bernard Rogers, then Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, told the House Armed Services Committee: "...we must decry for the IRR. There is no solution that we have today, either in operation or on the horizon, that will provide us the means to overcome that major deficiency of the shortfall in the IRR which means that we do not have a manpower base of mobilization, which is so essential."

The Army Guard and the Army Reserve remain understrength. Even the Air National Guard, which is achieving its authorized strength goals, is seriously short of personnel in critical technical skills. And those who are most optimistic about the capabilities of the Selective Service System admit that the system cannot produce the first trained man for Army units earlier than M-Day plus seven months.

The shortage of pre-trained manpower for mobilization makes the Army incapable of sustained combat in a high-intensity NATO war.

There are many critics of the All Volunteer Force who cite racial imbalance, high numbers of personnel in the nontraditional categories, low education levels, and significant shortages as examples of the inability of the Nation to maintain the peacetime regular Army. But it seems to us that the question to be addressed is not "Can the peacetime Army be maintained by the AFP?" The question must be "Can the Total Army be mobilized to fight a short-negotiation war in NATO?"

The answer to that question is, "No!" The lack of an adequate mobilization base of pre-trained manpower clearly demonstrates that the AFP cannot work.

The NGAUS joined the Association of the United States Army in urging the adoption of H.R. 264, which was introduced by Representative G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery of Mississippi.
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