

## Responsio:

As promised, gentlemen, I will now give you the answer before you vote.

Mr. Dehner's remarks supporting the affirmative of the question; that is, making the point that developments in the world of PMSC's are a threat to democracy, seems a strong argument for the view that PMSC's are a danger. To summarize what I see as the salient points, and I see them as really two significant ones; they are first, a lack of accountability, visibility, and controllability all over the world as their actions, like it or not, represent the United States' defense and diplomatic activities in wide variety of circumstances well beyond the oversight of our, or for that matter, any governments usual management of such activities. And second, he couples that argument with another well-reasoned point about what he sees as the reduced capabilities and general degradation of the quality of our own uniformed services as some of their members, and some of their skill sets are now siphoned off by these companies rather to be utilized by such companies rather than by our directly controlled uniformed services. His sardonic opening and closing remarks regarding to whom we should pledge our allegiance these days indirectly raises the control question of who should properly oversee these corporations: the SEC perhaps, or perhaps the Small Business Administration. Or – anyone – for the Centers for Disease Control?

Mr McGavrans' remarks, on the other hand, take what seems to be a *realpolitik* view; that the United States has, since the beginning, done this sort of outsourcing, for not necessarily outstanding reasons, but rather from the point of view of necessity. He argues that, since the collapse of the draft from its baggage of endless white collar deferments, and the senseless slaughter of blue collar not even grade school grads on the killing fields of Asia, our military needs have exceeded the pool of willing competent individuals. While he does not directly say so, one of his points expands quickly to the fact that the technology of warfare has steeply increased over the past few decades, and thus, the outsourcing of the work to technologically capable organizations only makes sense. The fact that those organizations have the capability because they got them from personnel coming from our uniformed services into corporate service goes unmentioned but that is not really crucial to his point. His points tend toward a *realpolitik* view that this is only business as usual driven by necessity; that this is an effective solution at lower cost than maintaining a larger standing military to handle all the needs we seem to have. And, while he later moves into parody and cynicism, he does step on Mr. Dehners remarks regarding the degradation of our national capabilities. But Mr. McGavran does not ascribe the degradation to the contractors whom he sees as solutions to, rather than causes of, the problem of the United States degraded capacities.

While Mr. McGavrans arguments are strong and make good sense in describing the why of the situation, I find the weight of Mr. Dehner's concerns conclusive. His clarity regarding the

flaws in the solutions, to the problems that Mr. McGavran argues we are solving, carries the day. The correct answer is that indeed PMSCs are, or could become a threat to our democracy, unless the people through their elected officials, bring control over them and face the necessity of stopping the degradation of our own command and control over anyone acting militarily or diplomatically on our nations' behalf.

Gentlemen, now that I have provided you with the answer, how say you?

Those who agree that the rise of PMSC's is a danger, raise your hand.

Those who accept the premise that this is just a manageable evolution, please raise your hand.

(40 agreed they were a danger 5 disagreed, and thus 14 remained on the sidelines)