

# A STUDY OF THE ACTIVITIES AND MISSIONS OF THE NBPRP

report to  
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

PUBLIC RELEASE OF THE STUDY OF THE CIVILIAN  
MARKSMANSHIP PROGRAM

A study of the Civilian Marksmanship Program prepared by the Arthur D. Little Company has been received by the Department of the Army.

This study is a comprehensive review of the Army's Civilian Marksmanship Program. Although no final action has been taken on the study, it will be the basis for further consideration by the Department of Army Staff and the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice to determine those actions necessary to carry out those recommendations which may be approved for implementation.



Arthur D. Little, Inc.



A STUDY OF THE ACTIVITIES  
AND MISSIONS OF THE NBPRP

Report to  
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

January, 1966

C-67431



## SECTION I

The purpose of this section is to provide the reader with a background description of the mission, function, organization and programs of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice (NBPRP) and its implementing agency, the Office of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship (DCM).

The NBPRP was created by Act of Congress in 1903 at the request of a group of officers and members of the National Rifle Association (NRA) with the support of Elihu Root, who was then Secretary of War. The NRA was organized as a nonprofit membership corporation by a group of National Guard officers in New York in 1871 and, until 1908, had a board of directors composed of the state Adjutants General. The NRA's primary objective, to foster better marksmanship in our Armed Forces through civilian training, has remained a major purpose of the organization. In 1894, the NRA was designated the official governing body for rifle shooting in the U. S. by the International Shooting Union (ISU). The NBPRP has been in continuous existence since 1903, and is currently authorized under Title 10, U. S. Code, Sections 4307-4313, and AR 920-15.

The principal mission of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice is to promote among able-bodied citizens, not reached through training programs of the active components of the Armed Forces of the United States, practice in the use of military-type individual small arms; to promote matches and competitions in the use of such arms; to issue in connection therewith necessary arms, ammunition, targets, and other supplies and appliances; and to procure and award to winning competitors trophies, medals, badges, and other insignia. In the execution of this mission the NBPRP is charged with encouraging and supporting small arms target practice throughout the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, for the purpose of training the citizenry in the use of military-type individual small arms, particularly to the

end that those individuals who may be called upon to serve in time of war will be qualified as finished instructors and marksmen, and to create a public sentiment which emphasizes the necessity of marksmanship training with military-type individual small arms as a means of national defense.

A. Organization and Composition of the NBPRP

The NBPRP consists of not less than 21, nor more than 25, members appointed by the Secretary of the Army from the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, Reserve Officers' Association, National Guard Bureau, Selective Service, National Rifle Association, and the country at large. These members serve without compensation other than reimbursement of necessary authorized expenses. Each member is appointed for a term of three years, with one-third of the membership terminating annually. Members may serve a maximum of two successive terms and may be reappointed after a break in tenure.

Each group represented on the NBPRP nominates its own members in numbers designated by the President of the Board to fill vacancies. The National Rifle Association is the nominating agency for all civilian members representing both the NRA and the country at large. Membership in the NRA is not a criterion for appointment of military members of the NBPRP. All nominations to the NBPRP are referred to its Executive Committee for review and recommendation prior to submission to the President of the Board for final approval and appointment.

The Secretary of the Army appoints the President of the Board who is normally the Under Secretary or from the Assistant Secretarial level. In that capacity the President acts for the Secretary of the Army concerning the activities relating to the program of the NBPRP, including approval of expenditures by this Board.

The NBPRP as a body is limited to making recommendations to the President of the Board. Members are generally chosen, however, who are of such stature that their opinions carry considerable weight in view of their position within the organization they represent and their association with marksmanship activities.

Section 4307, Title 10, U. S. Code, authorizes the President to detail an officer of the Army or Marine Corps as Director of Civilian Marksmanship. The President of the NBPRP selects the Director of Civilian Marksmanship who is responsible for the implementation of the Civilian Marksmanship Program as approved by the President, NBPRP, including making all contracts, preparing and defending annual budget requests, making recommendations relating to policies of the Board, acting as Chairman of the National Match Fund Council, arranging for the award of trophies and medals in competitions sponsored by the Board and coordinating National Match Planning. This officer is normally a commissioned officer of the Army.

Two standing committees are maintained within the Board. The President appoints an Executive Committee consisting of not less than three members of the NBPRP at the first Board meeting each year. A representative of the Office, Assistant Chief of Staff, Force Development, Department of the Army, normally is appointed Chairman of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee acts for the Board on all matters referred to it during such times as the Board is not in session. The President of the Board also appoints a Budget Committee at the first meeting each year consisting of not less than three members of the Board. The Budget Committee advises the Executive Officer on the preparation and defense of budget requests and on other budgetary matters pertaining to the activities of the NBPRP. The President of the Board and the Director of Civilian Marksmanship are ex-officio members of all committees and the Budget Officer in the Office of the DCM is an ex-officio member of the Budget Committee.

The NBPRP holds two meetings annually for the transaction of its business. Normally one of these meetings is held during the National Matches at Camp Perry, Ohio.

#### B. Organization of the Office of the DCM

As the implementing agency for the Secretary of the Army, the Director of Civilian Marksmanship is responsible for carrying out the policies recommended by the Board and enunciated by the Board President.

The office of the DCM provides administrative support to the NBPRP; handles correspondence dealing with the individual civilian shooter and clubs; enrolls clubs; plans and arranges for issue and maintenance of arms, ammunition, and supplies to civilian clubs and authorized schools; receives reports and monitors civilian marksmanship activities; plans for and issues shooting awards; maintains liaison with Army Material Command agencies and other military support agencies and the NRA; maintains match records and individual marksmanship qualification records; and assists the Director of Civilian Marksmanship in carrying out his responsibility for

1. Initiating, developing, coordinating, and recommending appropriate actions on matters pertaining to:
  - a. Organization of civilian rifle clubs;
  - b. Policies and procedures governing the enrollment of civilian clubs and schools in the civilian marksmanship program fostered by the NBPRP and implemented by the DCM;
  - c. Policies and procedures governing the issue or sale of rifles, ammunition, targets, and other supplies and materials required in the conduct of small arms marksmanship training;
  - d. Bonding of clubs and schools to which Government property is issued on a loan basis;
  - e. Proper accountability of property issued to civilian rifle clubs and schools;
  - f. Policies and procedures governing award of marksmanship qualification badges, medals, and trophies approved by NBPRP in execution of the programs of marksmanship training and competition sponsored by the Board;
  - g. Requests of schools and authorized civilian organizations to use government-owned rifle ranges at military installations throughout the United States; and
2. Conducting a continuing review of major policies of the NBPRP as related to those of the NRA to insure proper correlation between the two organizations on matters pertaining to nationwide civilian marksmanship training programs fostered by the NBPRP and executed in collaboration with the NRA.



The DCM office maintains records on DCM-affiliated clubs, arms issued by serial number, national and international award winners, and shooters who have won their distinguished rating. Its club records are entered on IBM punched cards and it utilizes the services of U. S. Army Information and Data Systems Command to make computer analyses of these records.

Three Executive Officers report directly to the DCM. Of these, one serves as the Executive Officer of the NBPRP and acts in the capacity of the DCM in his absence. He is located in the DCM office in Washington, as is the Executive Officer, Civilian Marksmanship, who is responsible for administering the DCM club program. The Executive Officer, National Matches, is housed at 2nd Army Headquarters, and is responsible for the planning and conduct of the annual National Matches. Up until the past year, this officer maintained liaison with the DCM, but reported to the Second Army Area Commander; however, this arrangement has been changed so that he now has a direct reporting relationship to the DCM. Although at present he is still on the Second Army TD, it is appropriate that he be carried on the DCM rolls for administrative purposes. A fourth staff officer, the Budget Officer, completes the supervisory staff of the DCM office. The authorized complement of DCM supervisory, technical, administrative, and clerical personnel is shown in Table I-1 on page 6.

C. Programs Administered by the DCM

1. The Club and State Association Issue and Loan Program

DCM-affiliated clubs are eligible to receive the following quantities of arms on a loan basis (depending upon the number of club members):

	<u>Senior Clubs</u>	<u>Junior Clubs</u>	<u>Cadet Schools (except ROTC)</u>
Rifle U.S. Caliber .30 M1	4-8		1 per cadet
Rifle Caliber .22	4	4-10	10
Pistol Caliber .45 M1911A1	4		

In some cases the above allotments are increased if the club makes a special application to the DCM and presents sufficient

TABLE I-1

AUTHORIZED DCM STAFF

1	Colonel	Director of Civilian Marksmanship
1	Colonel	Executive Officer, National Matches
1	Lt Col	Executive Officer, National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice
1	GS 12	Executive Officer, Civilian Marksmanship
1	GS 12	Budget Officer
1	GS 8	Administrative Assistant
1	GS 8	Assistant for Program Planning
1	GS 8	Secretary
1	GS 8	Purchasing and Contracting Agent
2	GS 6	Unit Supervisors
1	GS 5	Administrative Aide
3	GS 5	Supply Clerks (Typing)
2	GS 5	Clerk Typists
2	GS 5	Correspondence Clerks (Typing)
2	GS 4	Correspondence Clerks (Typing)
2	GS 4	Supply Clerks (Typing)
1	GS 4	Clerk Typist
1	WB 5	Warehouseman
<hr/>		
25		Total Staff

justification for their request. For example, an increased allotment might be approved in the case of a particularly large club, if sufficient Government arms are available.

Annual ammunition issues to DCM-affiliated clubs are made on the basis of quantities shown in Table I-2. Initial allotment is based on the entire club membership while subsequent issues are based on the number of members who have fired a DCM qualification course for record the preceding year. Targets are also issued on the same basis. A club may divide up its ammunition (and target) allotment by type any way it sees fit, using these ratios.

TABLE I-2

BASIS FOR AMMUNITION ISSUES  
(Rounds per Member)

<u>Ammunition Type</u>	<u>Senior and College Clubs</u>	<u>Junior Division of Senior Club</u>	<u>Junior Clubs</u>	<u>Cadet Schools</u>
Cal. 45	150 <u>or</u>			Determined by DCM, based on enrollment and supply
Cal. 30	150 <u>or</u>	150 <u>or</u>		
Cal. 22	300	300	300	

In Chapter VI we explain in detail the requirements the club must meet in affiliating with the DCM. In brief, the primary requirement is that the club must be affiliated with the NRA and thus must meet the NRA's club membership qualifications. Through this requirement, the NRA has the responsibility for ascertaining the character and responsibility of the club officers and the legitimacy of the club's intentions and membership. NRA-affiliated clubs wishing to affiliate with the DCM must then submit to the DCM a roster of club members, a report assuring that it has access to adequate range facilities, and a signed agreement that it will comply with the anti-discrimination provisions of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The only exception made in these requirements is that schools with a Corps of Cadets need not affiliate with the NRA, but can apply directly to the DCM. Table I-3 gives a breakdown of membership and type of DCM-affiliated clubs as of 2 September 1965.

TABLE I-3

DCM-AFFILIATED CLUBS AND MEMBERSHIP  
(2 September 1965)

<u>Type of Club</u>	<u>Clubs</u>		<u>Membership</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Senior	2,720	46.5	151,302	36.8
Senior with Junior Division	566	9.7	89,372	21.7
Junior (includes public high schools)	2,457	43.9	161,933	39.3
College	78	1.3	6,018	1.5
Cadet Schools	<u>33</u>	<u>.6</u>	<u>2,679</u>	<u>.7</u>
Total	5,854	100.0	411,304	100.0

Source: DCM records (computer run SAOAS-69)

State NRA Associations (now about 50 in number) are also eligible to be issued the following arms for selection and training of teams to represent the state in the National Matches:

Rifle U.S. Cal. .30-NM or Cal. 7.62 mm-NM	8 per State Association
Pistol Cal. .45 M1911A1-NM	6 per State Association

As with the club program, the arms issues to the State Associations may be increased above the amounts shown if a sufficient reason is given (e.g., particularly large teams in large or heavily populated states). The State Associations are also given ammunition allotments to conduct tryouts and for team member practice for the National Matches. The amounts of these issues are determined by the size of the team and by the available supplies of ammunition.

2. Sales of Government Arms, Ammunition, and Supplies

This part of the DCM program is available to any individual member of the NRA (about 670,000 members as of January 1965) as well

as to clubs affiliated with the NRA. Information on the availability and prices of such Government arms and supplies is made available to NRA members through distribution of the DCM Price List which is issued twice a year and through DCM notices published in the NRA magazine, The American Rifleman.

The DCM office has responsibility for establishing policies and procedures for administering the sales program, but outside of printing and distributing the Price List, has little additional role in the sales program. Individual NRA members must send their arms-purchase requests to the U. S. Army Weapons Command, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, and their requests for ammunition to Ammunition Procurement and Supply Agency, Joliet, Illinois, for processing. The inclusion of the purchaser's current NRA membership card or facsimile verifies his eligibility to purchase. Ammunition Procurement and Supply Agency and U. S. Army Weapons Command and the various Army depots administer the shipment of purchased arms and ammunition.

### 3. Civilian Use of Military Rifle Ranges

As authorized by Title 10, U. S. Code, Section 4309b and implementing AR 920-20, all ranges which have been constructed wholly or partly with funds provided by Congress are open for use by those in any branch of the military or Naval service of the United States and by all able-bodied citizens of the United States under prescribed regulations. The only reason allowed by AR 920-20 for denying such use of a military range is if the range is required for the use of the Army or other controlling service. In carrying out these provisions, the DCM provides liaison between civilian organizations desiring the use of range facilities and the installation at which the range is located. The DCM processes these requests and, when satisfied as to the responsibility of the organization, furnishes the club president or secretary a letter addressed to the Commanding Officer of the installation approving the application subject to such regulations as the Commanding Officer may prescribe. The civilian organization then contacts the installation Commander and arranges for

suitable firing dates. In the case of National Guard or unoccupied installations, the DCM requests permission from the state Adjutant General or other agency concerned and notifies the requesting organization of the result. If permission is granted, the latter then arranges all details with the Commander or agency concerned.

#### 4. National Matches

The Secretary of the Army is charged by law with responsibility for conducting the National Matches. He has delegated the responsibility for planning and conducting the Matches to the President of the NBPRP. The actual planning and administration of the Matches is carried out by the National Match Executive Officer who reports to the DCM.

The National Matches consist of the Small Arms Firing School, the National Trophy Rifle and Pistol Matches, the NRA National Rifle and Pistol Championship Matches, and all ceremonies, activities and official events connected therewith. The National Matches last for approximately 30 days and are held each year at Camp Perry, Ohio, usually during the month of August. These Matches represent the national championships, both for the military and for the NRA, which is the national sports governing body for rifle and pistol shooting in the United States.

The Small Arms Firing School was started in 1918 as a means of making shooters into good instructors. Current methods of instruction employed by the U. S. Army are stressed in this school. The most important function of this school is to develop instructors who can properly train others in their communities and organizations in the use of small arms, including both rifles and pistols. The school is conducted by the Advanced Marksmanship Training Unit of the United States Army. An appropriate certificate indicating satisfactory completion of each course of instruction is given by the Small Arms Firing School to those who meet the qualifications established by the NBPRP.

The National Trophy Rifle and Pistol Matches, for which national trophies and medals are awarded by the NBPRP, consist of the following:

- a. National Trophy Individual Pistol Match
- b. National Trophy Pistol Team Match
- c. National Trophy Individual Rifle Match
- d. National Trophy Rifle Team Match
- e. National Trophy Infantry Team Match

The National Rifle Association Rifle and Pistol Championship Matches are events for which trophies and medals are awarded by the NRA and are as follows:

- a. Pistol and revolver matches
- b. Smallbore rifle matches
- c. Junior-tyro rifle matches and schools
- d. High power rifle matches
- e. Special events

Appropriate opening ceremonies and award ceremonies are conducted as an official part of the National Matches. Entry fees are not charged for any National Trophy Match or for the Small Arms Firing School. They are, however, charged for the NRA championship matches and other related events.

Figure I-1 on page 12 indicates the distribution of responsibilities among the various organizations which play significant roles in the conduct of the National Matches.

#### 5. NRA Regional Championship Matches

Subject to approval by the NBPRP, the National Rifle Association is authorized to sanction individual rifle and pistol matches in which credits towards distinguished designation may be achieved. These matches are open to any citizen of the United States 16 years or older on the date of the match. Military personnel are responsible for complying with the eligibility rules of their own service.

The DQM provides ammunition for issue to competitors in all





matches included in the NRA regional tournaments in which credits towards distinguished designation may be achieved. In the event that Government funds are not available for this purpose, the cost of transportation and other charges incidental to shipment of ammunition must be borne by the tournament sponsor. Where ammunition is not available for free issue to competitors in these matches, arrangements are made by the DCM with the nearest Department of the Army agency to provide for the sale of competition and sighting-in ammunition to match sponsors in these particular matches. In this event, the competitor is charged the current-cost-to-the-Government price of the ammunition.

## SECTION II

### A. Background

The primary aim of any marksmanship training sponsored for national defense purposes is to train potential combatants and prepare instructors of combatants so that they may function effectively in the national interest in case of war. Until the likelihood of armed conflict is eliminated this requirement will persist.

In spite of recent technological developments in the modes of waging war, the Army's Light Weapons Infantrymen (LWI) and the Marines are almost certain to be employed in any "shooting wars" in which our nation becomes embroiled. Since the basic individual weapon of such combat arms is the rifle, it is important that the men in such units become thoroughly proficient in its use.

A fundamental question in determining how much to spend on training is what degree of proficiency is desirable or even "good enough." We were surprised to find that no desired objectives or even minimum standards of rifle marksmanship proficiency have been set for either units or individuals going into combat. Therefore, as far as we could tell, no one has yet been able to "price out" the value of achieving a given level of marksmanship proficiency in a rifle company, platoon, squad, or, perhaps even more difficult, in an individual rifleman. Thus, it is difficult to justify on a cost/benefit basis the investments made in teaching riflemen how to shoot. To make the problem even worse, the training program for the LWI is getting more complex and crowded, and the different subject areas to be covered compete for precious time in the limited amount available in Basic Combat Training and Advanced Individual Training. Allocations of time, personnel and resources to rifle marksmanship training in the Army must be adjusted then in a compromise with other training requirements.

If the Army's marksmanship training program were totally effective,

that is, if there were sufficient time, facilities and competent instructors to turn out enough completely capable combat riflemen by the time they were needed (including periods of major, national mobilization), then there would be little, if any, justification for a civilian marksmanship program. On the other hand, the shorter the time for mobilization and training and the fewer the trained instructors available, the more valuable is a civilian marksmanship program which contributes to the development of qualified instructors and to the marksmanship training of young men apt to enter military service and be assigned to a rifle unit. The results of our interviews and literature search suggest that due to various compromises, the processes of training and selection employed by the military services in preparing units for combat still leaves something to be desired in the proficiency with which members of rifle units use their weapons in combat.

## B. Benefits to the Military from the Civilian Marksmanship Program

### 1. Effect of Prior Marksmanship Training and Shooting Experience on Army Basic Marksmanship Training

The results of our study indicate that the Civilian Marksmanship Program sponsored and supported by the Army, directed by the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice (NBPRP), and administered by the Director of Civilian Marksmanship (DCM) contributes significantly to the development of rifle marksmanship proficiency and confidence in the ability to use a rifle effectively in combat on the part of those who participate in the program or benefit indirectly from it. Unfortunately, only a relatively small percentage of Army trainees appear to have been members of DCM-affiliated gun clubs (just over 3% of our sample) or received any marksmanship training prior to entering service (32%).

Our analysis of the Marksmanship Qualification Scores and questionnaire information from over 12,880 Army trainees at four Army Training Centers indicates that trainees who were gun club members prior to entering the Army achieved significantly higher scores (mean score of 57.1) than trainees who did not belong to a gun club (mean score of 48.4). In comparing other differences between trainees who

were previously gun club members and those who were not members, we found that previous gun club members:

- Are more apt to enlist
- Are more apt to prefer a combat outfit
- Are more apt to choose outfits where they are more likely to use their rifle (Infantry and Airborne)
- Liked firearms and shooting more
- Had more shooting experience
- Received more marksmanship instruction
- Are more confident of their ability to use their rifle effectively in combat
- Are more likely to want to become a marksmanship instructor
- Competed in more and higher level shooting matches

The differences noted above are even greater and more apparent when trainees who belonged to gun clubs affiliated with the DCM are compared with trainees who were not members of gun clubs.

Table II-1 shows the number and percent of Army trainees who were categorized as Unqualified, Marksmen, Sharpshooters, and Experts by gun club membership categories (not a member of a gun club, member of a gun club not affiliated with the DCM, and member of DCM club). Of the total sample of trainees, 15.4% qualified as "Expert," while 68.6% of trainees who were members of DCM-affiliated clubs qualified as "Expert."

Table II-2 presents the frequency distribution of trainees' rifle qualification scores by gun club membership categories. The mean score of each of these three groups is as follows:

Non-gun club member	48.4
Gun club member, not DCM	53.6
Member of DCM-affiliated gun club	61.3

The differences among these means are significant at the .01 level.

The data below indicates the nature of various groups queried and the percentage who were members of a gun club before entering

service and the percentage who belonged to DCM-affiliated clubs:

	<u>Per cent Gun Club Members</u>	<u>Per cent DCM Club Members</u>
12,880 Army Trainees at 4 ATC's	6.5%	3.1%
130 Army Basic Rifle Marksmanship Instructors at 4 ATC's	8.5%	5.5%
1,280 Officer Candidates & Officers in Basic Course, Ft. Benning	9.2%	8.6%
1,816 Cadets at the U. S. Military Academy	17.9%	9.1%
116 USMC Primary Marksmanship Instructors at Parris Island and Camp Pendleton Recruit Depots	15.5%	10.3%
95 USMC Coaches, Instructors, Instructor/Shooters at Wpns. Trng. Bn., Quantico	23.0%	18.0%
101 Coaches, Instructors, Instructor/Shooters at AMTU, Ft. Benning		26.0%

The dramatically increased density of DCM support is obvious as the groups become more specialized and selected as marksmen and marksmanship instructors.

In our questionnaire study of Army trainees, we found that the more marksmanship instruction trainees received prior to service, the higher their record scores. In another analysis we found that trainees with more than 5 hours of prior instruction got higher scores (mean score of 55.4) than those with less than 5 hours of prior marksmanship instruction (mean score of 47.5). Of the 4,168 trainees (32.4% of the sample) who reported getting some marksmanship instruction prior to entering the Army, 57% said they got their instruction from a member of an organized gun club, and 47% said their instructor was either a qualified NRA instructor or a serviceman on active duty. These figures indicate that members of organized gun clubs furnished instruction to approximately three times the number of trainees who were actually members of gun clubs.

Table II-1

COMPARISON OF TRAINEE GUN CLUB MEMBERSHIP  
CATEGORIES VERSUS MARKSMANSHIP CATEGORIES

(Percentages are based on column totals)

Marksmanship Category	Membership Categories			Total
	Not Member of Gun Club	Member of Gun Club but Not DCM	Member of DCM Gun Club	
Unqualified	284 2.4%	3 0.7%	1 0.2%	288 2.2%
Marksman	3679 30.6%	68 15.1%	16 4.2%	3763 29.3%
Sharpshooter	6475 53.9%	253 56.1%	104 27.0%	6832 58.1%
Expert	1585 13.1%	127 28.1%	264 68.6%	1976 15.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>12023</b> 100.0%	<b>451</b> 100.0%	<b>385</b> 100.0%	<b>12859</b> 100.0%

Chi-square: 979.7

Level of significance: .01

Table II-2

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF MARKSMANSHIP QUALIFICATION  
SCORES OF TRAINEES IN THREE GUN CLUB MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIES

<u>Score</u>	<u>Membership Categories</u>		
	<u>Not Member of Gun Club</u>	<u>Member of Gun Club but not DCM</u>	<u>Member of DCM Gun Club</u>
5	0	0	0
6	1	1	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	1	0	0
11	1	0	0
12	1	0	0
13	3	0	0
14	1	0	0
15	4	0	0
16	9	0	0
17	5	0	0
18	7	0	0
19	4	0	0
20	14	0	0
21	5	0	0
22	7	0	0
23	11	1	0
24	32	0	0
25	29	0	0
26	27	0	0
27	34	0	1
28	45	1	0
29	42	0	0
30	142	1	0
31	109	0	1
32	122	3	2
33	173	0	0
34	213	7	1
35	229	2	3
36	250	2	0
37	237	4	0

Table II-2 (Cont.)

<u>Score</u>	<u>Not Member of Gun Club</u>	<u>Member of Gun Club but not DCM</u>	<u>Member of DCM Gun Club</u>
38	255	5	2
39	265	8	1
40	307	4	0
41	289	11	0
42	380	7	2
43	331	5	2
44	377	9	2
45	494	9	3
46	470	12	5
47	462	14	2
48	476	15	6
49	507	17	9
50	475	17	2
51	453	18	4
52	462	22	4
53	438	11	6
54	466	24	5
55	438	19	7
56	387	17	9
57	332	17	8
58	333	25	14
59	282	16	20
60	344	22	15
61	278	15	16
62	199	16	19
63	167	17	24
64	145	11	37
65	132	12	31
66	74	10	28
67	69	8	17
68	57	3	21
69	38	2	15
70	20	3	12
71	25	2	8
72	13	3	6
73	9	2	4
74	5	0	3
75	3	0	5
76	3	1	2
77	1	0	1



Table II-2 (Cont.)

<u>Score</u>	<u>Not Member of Gun Club</u>	<u>Member of Gun Club but not DCM</u>	<u>Member of DCM Gun Club</u>
78	1	0	0
79	0	0	0
Totals	12021	451	385
Mean Score	48.4	53.6	61.3
Std. Deviation	9.70	9.19	8.30
		<u>Difference between means</u>	<u>w</u>
Non Gun Club and Non-DCM		5.2	1.9
Non Gun Club and DCM		13.0	2.1
Non DCM and DCM		7.8	2.8

Differences are significant at the .01 level.

In a further assessment of the effect of gun club membership (and the several factors associated with such membership) upon marksmanship training in Basic Combat Training, we selected from one ATC the four training companies with the highest percentage of previous gun club members (Group A) and the four companies with the lowest percentage of previous gun club members (Group B). We then compared the qualification scores of all trainees in Group A who had no prior experience in shooting with the scores of the similarly inexperienced trainees in Group B. The mean score of Group A (high percentage of gun club members) was 39.9. The mean score of Group B (low percentage of gun club members) was 34.6. The "t" test of the difference between means is significant at the .01 level.

This suggests strongly that the benefits of gun club membership, especially DCM-affiliated gun club membership (since these members get more instruction and shooting experience), extend beyond the benefits to the member himself. One possible explanation of the difference in mean scores described above is that marksmanship instructors do not have to spend so much time with the relatively experienced shooters and thus can concentrate more on those inexperienced trainees who need more instruction and coaching. Also, it is possible that the more experienced trainees share their knowledge with and provide additional coaching to those who need it most.

In an attempt to place some degree of value on the higher levels of marksmanship proficiency achieved by trainees who were previously gun club members, we reviewed the literature and conducted individual structured interviews with 34 distinguished combat commanders. There was a strong belief that an individual's knowledge of his own marksmanship proficiency is definitely correlated with his confidence in his ability to use his rifle. It is important to note that this relationship works both ways. A serviceman who demonstrates minimal proficiency with his rifle tends to have a correspondingly low degree of confidence in his ability to use his rifle. Further, there was almost universal agreement that the degree of a serviceman's con-

confidence in his own marksmanship skill is significantly and highly correlated with the degree to which he actually uses his rifle in combat.

While it was generally agreed that it would be quite difficult to develop valid quantitative statements of how a unit's degree of marksmanship proficiency influences its combat effectiveness, nevertheless some definite qualitative relationships were expressed. When asked what they believed was the correlation between the number of highly proficient riflemen in a rifle company and that company's ability to inflict casualties on the enemy in a fire fight, our respondents were largely agreed that the correlation was positive and quite significant.

Since our society appears to feel strongly about our own war time casualties, we set up a question which attempted to relate marksmanship skill not only to the ability to inflict casualties on the enemy, but also to our own casualty rate. This question was asked: "In similar combat conditions where all other factors are equal, which of these three rifle platoons would you expect to suffer the most casualties? The least casualties? Why?"

<u>Platoon</u>	<u>Composition</u>				<u>Would Suffer</u>	
	<u>Expert</u>	<u>Sharp-Shooter</u>	<u>Marksman</u>	<u>Unqualified</u>	<u>Most Casualties</u>	<u>Least Casualties</u>
A	40%	30%	30%	---	_____	_____
B	10%	40%	40%	10%	_____	_____
C	10%	10%	40%	40%	_____	_____

There was practically unanimous agreement that Platoon A would suffer the least casualties and Platoon C would suffer the most casualties.

Thus, a chain of relationships was established which indicates that, in general, the more marksmanship instruction, practice, competition and shooting experience individuals get before entering service, and the greater the density of such prior experience in the population of young men entering service, the more effective rifle units will be

in combat and the fewer casualties they will suffer. Since the DCM program stimulates and supports broader prior service experience in shooting and provides and supports marksmanship instruction, it appears to have significant value.

Until more direct study and research is applied to the question of how incremental degrees of rifle marksmanship proficiency relate to a unit's combat effectiveness, and also to the question of "how much it's worth" for a unit to attain higher levels of combat effectiveness, we believe it will be extremely difficult to "price out" the value of the DCM program in terms of a quantitatively expressed cost/benefit relationship. However, if the consensus of our literature search and our interviews with distinguished combat commanders is correct, and we believe that it is, any appreciable reduction in U. S. casualty rates in a "shooting war" would appear to be worth a considerable dollar investment in the programs which contribute to that reduction.

It is the opinion of the Arthur D. Little, Inc., study team that any resulting improvement in "kill-ratios" (a term employed recently in describing combat operations in Viet Nam; see Time, "South Viet Nam: A New Kind of War," October 22, 1965, page 28) is the most direct and important benefit of higher levels of marksmanship proficiency and thus of contributions of the DCM program.

We believe that those aspects of the DCM program which relate to the stimulation of broader interest and participation in rifle shooting among the youth of our country (primarily club activities) should be emphasized more and pursued even more effectively to reach a greater percentage of those young men likely to enter military service.

Further, it would seem most desirable to institute early selection and assignment procedures which would insure optimum utilization of this developed interest and skill in rifle marksmanship by those combat arms where such interest and skill is most valuable.

## 2. Contributions of the Civilian Marksmanship Program to the Development of Competitors for International Competitions

The NBPRP and DCM programs contribute substantially to the emergence and development of competitors for international competition. Key elements in this contribution are the club and competition programs which stimulate interest and facilitate participation in shooting on the part of young men. This is essential in generating a broad base of participants from which a number of international caliber shooters can emerge. Support of regional competitions and of state teams by the DCM contributes to the development of a broad pool of increasingly qualified shooters and instructors. In order for shooters to progress to the point where they can qualify for international competition they must systematically engage in competitions with shooters of at least equal caliber. Top shooters in junior, school and college competitions are quickly identified by marksmanship units such as the AMTU which can contribute further to their development. Of the 12 men comprising the 1964 Olympic shooting team, 9 were reported to have benefitted directly from DCM programs before entering military service.

In reviewing recent rosters of U. S. shooting teams which participated in various international competitions, it is readily apparent that the great majority of team members and competitors are members of the Armed Forces. By far the greatest use made of international caliber shooters in the military, when they are not engaged in preparing for and participating in competitions, is in instructing other shooters, conducting marksmanship clinics, and in some cases preparing training manuals on marksmanship. Of the 16 men in the International Rifle Section at AMTU, only one is not classified as either an instructor, a coach, or an instructor/shooter.

In our interviews with key Army and Marine Corps officers in marksmanship training centers, we learned that the military values the contributions of those shooters who excel in international competitions. Those individuals who have won significant international

competitions and championships acquire additional luster to their reputations and increased credibility as instructors. We also received direct testimonials regarding the value of "feedback" information and knowledge developed by top international competitors to their associates and fellow instructors and shooters. Commanding officers at the Weapons Training Battalions at U. S. Marine Corps recruit depots emphasized in particular the value and usefulness of the knowledge and influence accumulated by top competitors in both national and international competitions.

3. Benefits to the Military through Sponsorship of Shooting Teams Representing the United States in International Shooting Union Championships, Olympic, or Pan-American Games

The following quotation appears in the Arthur D. Little, Inc., report to the U. S. Olympic Committee under the section entitled Foreign Governments' Involvement in Sports:

"Three factors appear to be chiefly responsible for the intensifying national interest in sports: (1) a heightened interest in international athletics as a means of promoting understanding and good will among nations; (2) the viewpoint of the emerging nations that achievements in sport represent a means of attaining recognition in the world; and (3) the apparent decision by the Communist nations in the early 1950's to project for political reasons a positive image of physical vigor and athletic excellence by aggressive sports development and successful participation in international competitions."

It is significant to note that development of successful shooting teams is either a major goal of or important to a number of nations who wish to project an image of growing strength, competence and power. This is probably because shooting is essentially a military art and thus success in international shooting competitions connotes a national defense capability rather directly. In the 1964 Olympic Games, only four sports had more nations represented in competition than shooting.

President John F. Kennedy recognized the need for coordination

of programs having an effect on our position and performance in international circles. In August, 1963, under Executive Order 11117, he established the Interagency Committee on International Athletics within the Executive Branch of the Federal Government "to collect, exchange, and review information concerning amateur athletics that might tend to affect the foreign relations or general welfare of the United States."

In the course of our study for the U. S. Olympic Committee, we interviewed and obtained information and observations from representatives of the Interagency Committee on International Athletics; the Conseil International du Sport Militaire (CISM); the Interservice Sports Council; and from the Special Assistant to the Director for Special Activities, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. The last named individual presented a statement to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, December 12, 1963, which reviewed military participation in Olympic Games, Pan-American Games, and CISM events, and requested a four-year appropriation to support such participation. Justification for such an appropriation included considerations of international relations, prestige implications to the military, and the fact that in the last several Olympic Games, 20% of the competitors have been supplied by the Armed Forces.

In the 1964 Olympics, one-half of the U. S. Olympic Team consisted of Army marksmen. Competing in four different shooting events, these men won for the U. S. two gold medals, a silver medal, and three bronze medals. In the eyes of U. S. citizens, one of the most popular victories in the 1964 Olympics was that of 2nd Lt. Gary Anderson who defeated the Russians in the 300-meter free rifle event.

In reviewing rosters of teams competing in ISU World Championship competitions, Olympic Games competitions, and personnel assigned to the International Rifle Section at the AMTU, it is obvious that almost all of these personnel are career officers or NCO's. This observation was confirmed by Colonel Peot, Lt. Colonel Keifer, and Lt. Colonel Pullum. Since these career servicemen represent an exceptional group of in-



structors and shooters rather highly saturated with benefits from various aspects of the DQM program, investments made by the DQM in training and developing these personnel are not wasted nor lost to the military after only a short term of service by the recipients.

#### 4. Benefits to the Military from the Support of Participation of Military Personnel in the National Matches

The National Matches at Camp Perry are regarded as the "World Series" of shooting in America. The advantages to the military departments accruing from participation in the National Matches include the following: (1) The process of preparing and qualifying for the National Matches stimulates a continuing source of knowledgeable and qualified marksmen and potential instructors in marksmanship at all levels; (2) Such competitions are directly related to the development of an essential combat skill; (3) Successful performance in National Matches presents a public image of military services capable in the use of their individual weapons; (4) Individual and team achievements are a source of pride to the individual, to the unit, and to the military services; (5) The Matches serve as an effective arena for testing shooting techniques and training methods; and (6) Successful shooters in the National Matches add luster to their reputation which makes them more believable and effective as marksmanship instructors.

While the successful shooters and teams in the National Matches acquire considerable prestige in the "shooting fraternity," potential public relations advantages with the general public are dissipated because of relatively little nation-wide coverage of the National Matches in the news media.

Military personnel who qualify for participation in the National Matches demonstrate a significantly higher level of re-enlistment than Army personnel in general and also a higher re-enlistment rate than that of the Regular Army. This fact represents a conservation of valuable talent and skill essential to the development of better shooting proficiency throughout the military services. National Match com-



petitions in 1965 involved 858 Regular Service entries, 1,053 Reserve and National Guard entries, and 3,046 civilians (including juniors and police).

5. Side Benefits Accruing from the Civilian Marksmanship Program

The organized shooting groups of U. S. law enforcement agencies which are affiliated with the DCM believe that the DCM program is quite valuable to them in supporting marksmanship training and practice and in stimulating participation in shooting competitions.

The impact of the NBPRP and the "reach" or pervasiveness of the DCM club program throughout the country has a positive but rather slight effect on the social and cultural acceptance of guns and shooting in our country. It is desirable to further this effect through better and more extensive communication and more effective public relations and promotion. This appears to be particularly important at the present time because of the volume of "anti-gun sentiment" expressed in newspapers and periodicals in the last two years. A "bibliography" of recent articles of this kind is presented in the Technical Appendix.

C. Cost of the Civilian Marksmanship Program (DCM)

The total gross cost of the Civilian Marksmanship Program (DCM) adjusted for profits on ammunition sales is approximately \$3,670,250 for calendar year 1965. This cost is funded by all of the military services and is considerably offset by revenues returned to the Treasury from the sales of certain weapons to NRA/DCM clubs and individuals. The three military departments share the cost of this program in the following manner (a more detailed summary of applications and sources of DCM funds is presented in Table II-3):

U. S. Army	\$2,667,850	72.8%
U. S. Navy	698,700	19.0%
U. S. Air Force	303,700	8.2%

Table II-3

Summary of Applications and Sources of DCM Funds

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Army</u>					<u>Air Force</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>DCM</u>	<u>2nd Army</u>	<u>Army Material Command</u>	<u>Other Army Sources</u>	<u>Navy</u>		
<u>I. Costs</u>							
A. Headquarters	155,350	29,600					184,950
B. Match Support							
1. National	197,150	1,816,250	36,000	272,800	234,900	160,200	2,717,300
2. State and Regional	1,000			13,500	45,300	19,300	79,100
3. International	20,000						20,000
C. Clubs	85,500		37,000	213,400	446,000	124,500	906,400
D. Sales	<u>459,000</u>	<u>1,845,850</u>	<u>80,900</u>	<u>499,700</u>	<u>726,200</u>	<u>304,000</u>	<u>3,988,650</u>
<u>II. Income</u>							
A. Profit on Ammo. Sales							
Net Cost	<u>459,000</u>	<u>1,845,850</u>	<u>153,900</u>	<u>(290,600)</u>	<u>698,700</u>	<u>(300)</u>	<u>318,400</u>
Total							<u>3,670,250</u>

Cost Recapitulation

A. By Service:	%
Army	72.8
Navy	19.0
Air Force	8.2
	(100%)
B. By Program:	
Headquarters	4.7
Match Support	72.1
Clubs	23.2
Sales	-
	(100%)

Based on the major program elements, the funds are allocated as follows:

Match support	72.1%
Clubs	23.2%
Headquarters	4.7%
Sales	<u>0.0%</u>
Total	100.0%

A reasonable case can be made for the elimination of a very large item of cost charged to the DCM program which is that for the pay and allowances for support personnel in the National Matches. If this cost of \$1,466,150 is subtracted, this brings the net cost of the DCM program to \$2,204,100.

Another case can be made for crediting the DCM program with the income from the DCM weapons sales program. The annualized return over the last three years from this program is approximately \$1,680,000. If this is subtracted from the cost of the DCM program, this would further reduce the total net cost of the DCM program to \$524,100.

The only weapons which are made available for sale under the DCM sales program are those which are both (a) suitable as a shooting weapon for a Civilian Marksmanship Program, and (b) excess to current military requirements.

The quantities and types of weapons which are considered excess to current military requirements vary from year to year, depending upon the current world military situation, performance of existing suitable weapons, and other factors. Weapons which are considered excess to military requirements have four potential dispositions: (a) use in military aid programs, (b) inventory for potential mobilization, (c) sale under DCM sales program, and (d) scrap. Practically speaking, however, small arms that are safe to fire are never scrapped.

Prices on DCM sale weapons are determined by the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. Weapons which are fully serviceable and meet the standards for government issue are designated "Condition A" and are priced at procurement cost plus a packing and handling charge. Weapons

which are safe to fire but are considered uneconomical to rebuild in order to meet military service requirements are designated "Condition F" and are priced according to comparable commercial weapons, but such factors as available quantities and desire to eliminate stock are also considered. A packing and handling charge is also added to the sales price of "Condition F" weapons.

In accounting for the cost of the Civilian Marksmanship Program, there is at least a theoretical reason why the DCM could take some credit for ammunition issued back to military shooters at the National Matches. We can only estimate the amount of this possible credit, possibly an amount of \$50,000 would be reasonable. If this is credited to the DCM, it would further reduce the total actual cost of the DCM program to approximately \$475,000.

Thus, depending upon the validity of and the extent to which the credits described above are applied to the cost of the DCM program, the cost to the government per DCM-affiliated club member runs from \$1.14 to \$8.70, based on the June 30, 1965 membership count of 417,000 individuals. Even these figures tend to overstate the per person cost since our questionnaire data from Army trainees suggest that many thousands of people in addition to actual DCM members receive training benefits from DCM-club personnel and programs.

#### D. Administration of the Civilian Marksmanship Program

There is currently no means for the NBPRP or the DCM to conveniently and systematically examine the various DCM programs in detail, evaluate their benefits and costs, and consider changes or new programs (possibly more consistent with national interest) in terms of the budgetary implications of such changes. In addition, the DCM has little planning, budgetary, or administrative control over aspects of its programs that could generate income to defray the total program cost. The DCM programs would benefit from more systematic liaison between the DCM and the various agencies affected by, participating in, and having financial responsibilities for parts of the DCM program. Several studies and individual efforts have been made recently by some of these various agencies for the

purpose of streamlining operations and reducing cost. The DCM should contribute to and be represented in the consideration of such changes.

In the past, it has been difficult for the DCM to document either the concrete benefits or the full and accurate costs of its several programs. Because of this it has been vulnerable to criticism on the grounds that the total program obviously costs more than was represented in the DCM budget. Now that concrete benefits and their related costs have been defined, we believe that the NBPRP (and the DCM) should take a positive attitude toward its program's importance to the country's future and establish a sound budgetary planning function which can provide for the more effective exploitation of programs and activities of concrete benefit to the defense posture of the United States.

We recommend that the DCM be given full program responsibility and authority for all activities related to its legal mission as prescribed in Army Regulations and as directed by the NBPRP. The DCM should be established as the DCM Program Office. This DCM Program Office should have the responsibility to develop a five-year program and a budget plan for review by the NBPRP and its Budget Committee. It should then make annual reviews of all existing programs or activities and assess their progress, effects, and importance. Adjustments or modifications in program content and emphasis can then be made in the light of more concrete information.

The DCM Program Office, in being assigned full budgetary responsibility, should be given the authority to establish reporting procedures for obtaining, on a routine basis, information from the various Army agencies concerned with and contributing to the DCM program. This should also include authority to establish an active liaison program with such agencies so that all parties concerned could contribute to the formulation of policies and procedures affecting the success of the total DCM program.

E. Evaluation of the Adequacy of Controls in the Civilian Marksmanship Program

1. Interviews with Officials of 100 Clubs Affiliated with the DCM

We had three objectives in interviewing rifle club officials.

Our primary purpose was to evaluate the adequacy of club control procedures regarding individuals having access to DCM arms and ammunition, to check the safeguards taken in storing this equipment, and to check the club membership requirements relative to compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and to insure that personnel participating in the program are not members of any organization which advocates as any part of its program overthrowing the government of the United States by force or violence or never have been convicted of a crime of violence. Secondly, we wished to determine how the clubs perceived and utilized the benefits derived from the DCM program and what value they placed on these benefits. Finally, we sought opinions from those at the grass roots level on how well the program is working and how it could be improved.

Since our major objective was to test the adequacy of controls, we decided that, within our budgetary constraints, this would be best accomplished by studying in depth through personal interviews a relatively small percentage of the total clubs enrolled with the DCM. We did not attempt to obtain a sample which would be representative of all DCM clubs. Instead we selected from an IBM print-out sheet furnished us by the DCM which gave statistics on each club enrolled with the DCM, 100 clubs in areas where problems of control were apt to be most critical. We chose clubs in areas of the country that have been known to have problems with racial tensions and violence, extremists and subversive groups, and high crime rates. We also chose a much higher proportion of clubs which had reported incidents of loss or theft of arms to the DCM in order to determine the circumstances surrounding problems of this kind. We selected a much higher percentage of senior clubs and a lower percentage of junior clubs than is characteristic of DCM clubs in general. In addition, we attempted to obtain an even distribution among large, medium, and small clubs and roughly a 2:2:1 split between city clubs, suburban clubs, and rural clubs.

Our impression of the club officers we interviewed is that they are typically enthusiastic devotees of the sport of shooting. We

found no instances of direct orientation toward any political programs or extremist activities and, in almost all instances, club officers readily responded that it was club policy to reject applicants known to have extremist views.

These general impressions were reinforced in our series of systematic interviews with police and other civic officials. We found no instances where the civic officials linked clubs or club members to criminal or politically extreme elements.

It was quite striking to us that membership in these clubs is drawn principally from middle or lower-middle income groups. Occupations held by the officers we interviewed included all the professions, the trades, and various law enforcement agencies.

It was evident from the clubs that we visited that shooting clubs are organized and run in a manner similar to other U. S. sports and other volunteer organizations. Club officers are among the most active members in the club and typically have been members and have held an office in the club for five or more years.

As a rule, however, shooting clubs differ from most other sports organizations in that they have a greater overriding concern for safety and for avoiding involvement in incidents which would place them in an unfavorable light in their community. These factors, plus our overall impressions that shooting club officers tend to be quite conscientious and responsible people, lead us to believe that, by and large, the officers are able to maintain adequate controls over membership and to insure that proper safeguards are taken with government arms and ammunition. This impression was reinforced by having a records check made by local law enforcement agencies on the entire membership of a selected group of clubs. Therefore, we conclude that if it can be demonstrated that shooting club officers are responsible citizens, they can be relied upon to maintain adequate controls over the club membership and activities.

Club procedures on screening applicants for membership vary with



the size of the club and its rural or urban location. Typically, the smaller or rural clubs rely mainly on informal procedures and familiarity with the applicants as members of the local community. The urban and larger clubs typically use more formal procedures, e.g., references, review boards, probationary periods, and police checks. In general, we felt that the system employed by most clubs was adequate relative to the club's environment. We rated only 11 clubs out of the 100 as having casual or no screening procedures.

In some of these ten clubs the screening procedures were sufficiently lax that we were not convinced that the clubs were making conscientious efforts to try to keep out members of extremist or militant groups. However, it must be stressed that we found no evidence that members of militant extremist groups actually belonged to any of these clubs.

We cannot answer unequivocally the question of whether the clubs we interviewed would or would not practice racial discrimination with the exception of 16 clubs that already had admitted Negro members and 24 other clubs which had other nonwhite members. We were not able to uncover that overt discrimination had taken place. However, five clubs implied or stated that they would discriminate against Negroes if they applied for membership. Our evidence in two of these cases is that the clubs resigned from the DCM program after being asked to sign a statement of compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. In two other cases, club officers indicated that the applicants must be accepted by a unanimous vote of the membership and that there were members who would probably reject an applicant on the basis of his race. In the fifth case, the club was a part of a fraternal order which maintained a discrimination clause in its membership bylaws. While it may be that a few of the clubs which we visited would bar applicants on the basis of race if they were faced with such applications, we believe that the majority of shooting clubs have not had Negro or other nonwhite applicants. The recent DCM Directive requiring compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act probably will enable the DCM to



identify those clubs whose members feel strongly about admitting non-whites. As of 1 November 1965, out of about 4,000 responses to the DCM's Civil Rights directive, only 16 clubs elected to drop from the program rather than sign the compliance agreement. Of these 16, two were clubs we had interviewed in our sample.

Storage and check-out procedures for DCM arms and ammunition vary considerably, depending upon the size of the club, the availability and proximity of storage and range facilities, the shooting habits of club members, and procedures which have worked well in the past. There appears to be no one method in either rural or urban areas which consistently proves to be the most feasible and safe. Rather than attempting to evaluate club controls against preconceived standards, our opinions concerning their adequacy have been influenced by the specific administration of the given procedure and by the attitudes of club officers about the need for safeguards. Typically, the storage and handling of DCM arms and ammunition is identical to the procedures taken in caring for the members' own equipment. This is not surprising in view of the fact that club officers are bonded and held financially liable for any losses of DCM arms which may occur. Our interviewers spot-checked issued DCM arms by serial number in practically all of the clubs interviewed. After inspecting club and individual member storage facilities, we judged that only eight clubs did not have reasonably sufficient protection against theft. There was no instance where there was insufficient protection from weather; the arms appeared to be in good condition and in most cases, were exceptionally well cared for.

Of the 99 clubs which had DCM weapons on loan and/or ammunition issued, 72 were rated by our interviewers as having good safeguards, 24 were rated as fair, and three as poor. Although this is a respectable record for DCM clubs, we believe that a small increment of additional effort by a few clubs would result in completely adequate storage procedures. In those cases where there was carelessness in arms or ammunition storage, we believe that the presence of our interviewer had a positive effect in stimulating remedial measures.

We believe that only 10 clubs had loose controls regarding withdrawal or checking out of DCM arms and ammunition (includes access, check-out procedure and usage, and designated responsibility for controls and inventory).

In order to measure the benefits clubs derive from being affiliated with the DCM, we rated each club according to the extent to which the DCM program is responsible for members' participation in the club's shooting program. We judged the importance of the DCM program to be vital for 48 clubs, moderate for 40 clubs, and minimal for only 12 clubs. However, within these overall ratings a number of important observations should be made.

Our impression of most senior clubs is that DCM arms and ammunition constitute a minor part of the total number of arms owned and ammunition purchased by club members. The chief use made of DCM equipment is to help a new club get a shooting program started, to familiarize club members with military equipment (which they would otherwise not have occasion to use), and to facilitate entry into the sport by new shooters by removing the need to make a heavy initial investment in equipment. We found only one senior club that centered its entire shooting program around almost exclusive use of DCM arms and ammunition. We estimate that about 27% of all senior members would be unable to participate in club shooting programs without DCM support.

Within these senior clubs there are also important distinctions to be made concerning the value of the DCM program to various types of shooters. First there is the active shooter who is highly interested in either competition or hunting. This type of person usually has a high investment in reloading equipment and has a large supply of privately owned arms. While the free issue and loan program is helpful to this type of shooter, it is not of major importance. Rather, he tends to place higher value on DCM sales of ammunition and arms (providing his shipping charges are not excessive) and on DCM-sponsored competition. The other type of member is the casual shooter

or hunter which we believe represents at least 25% and often as much as 75% of the membership of a given club. This type of shooter enjoys club activities and gets out to the range fairly frequently but has not committed the time or investment in shooting to the point where he has a high stake in developing his ability to shoot. Although we infrequently contacted this type of shooter in our sample (since a casual shooter will seldom assume the responsibility of office), we believe that the greatest value of the DCM program to him lies in the arms loan and ammunition issue provision. Moreover, we feel that a higher proportion of casual than competitive shooters are dependent upon the DCM for their continued participation in marksmanship activities. Therefore, the DCM program tends to keep more of these people interested and active in shooting. This appears to be significant in interesting the children of such shooters in the clubs' junior shooting programs.

In contrast with senior clubs, most junior clubs or junior divisions of senior clubs rely to a major extent on the use of DCM arms and ammunition in conducting their instructional and competitive programs. We estimate that about 57% of all junior members would be unable to participate in club shooting programs without DCM support. It is also in the junior programs that the Army appears to be getting its most direct value from the DCM program in terms of pre-service training. As an extreme example of what can be accomplished through a well organized junior program, we contacted a Boy Scout Council Camp in Kentucky which each year has about 1000 Scouts who fire the DCM Qualification Course utilizing only ten .22 Caliber rifles and an average issue of 100,000 rounds of ammunition per year from the DCM. The success of junior shooting programs, however, depends largely on the availability of dedicated adult leaders and instructors. Because of the scarcity of such individuals, we feel that a number of the junior clubs which we visited appeared to be operating below their potential capacity. For want of such individuals, many senior clubs we visited have never attempted to form a junior shooting program. We

realize, however, that the NRA is actively working to encourage senior clubs to sponsor junior programs. To the extent that the DCM program encourages more adult participation and provides instructor training facilities at the annual Small Arms Firing Schools, it also has a positive effect in alleviating this problem.

In evaluating the administration of the DCM programs, club officers tended to give very high ratings to the program as it is now constituted. Nearly all clubs gave a very high rating to the appropriateness of the relationship between the DCM program and the NRA. Slightly lower ratings on the same scale were given to the appropriateness of reports required by the DCM, but significantly lower ratings were given concerning the adequacy of information received about the DCM program. Increasing the flow of information to the clubs and to the general public is the major improvement necessary in the DCM program as noted by these ratings. It was also felt that better understanding and rapport could be established if the DCM minimized its use of military language in its club communications.

There were relatively few specific complaints about the DCM program. The three most frequent ones were (a) delays in receiving ammunition (often it is not received until after the shooting season is over), (b) the high charges for freight delivery, primarily for targets, but also for ammunition, and (c) extensive correspondence requirements with the DCM office to obtain information and to make corrections in reports and order forms. Most often mentioned suggestions for improving the DCM program were (a) provide more and better ammunition, guns, and supplies, (b) assist clubs in finding range facilities, (c) develop more and better communication with the clubs, (d) give the program more publicity and promotion to the general public, and (e) provide more regional clinics for instructor and competitor training.

## 2. Adequacy of the Overall Control System

We made a comprehensive study of the present control system and of the functions carried out by the various elements in the system,

the state NRA Associations, the state Adjutants General, the NRA headquarters, and (where utilized by the Adjutants General), the State Police. We also conducted a number of interviews with members of Congress and their staff assistants, with FBI and Treasury officials, and surveyed by questionnaire state Public Safety or State Police organizations in 20 states. In addition, we compared DCM arms loss records with the loss records of National Guard armories. This section sets forth our impressions and judgments of the adequacy of the present control system and our conclusions regarding desirable improvements.

At the outset it should be emphasized that, based on (1) our personal interviews with the officers of 100 DCM-affiliated clubs and with police and civic officials in the vicinities of these clubs, (2) our interviews and correspondence with FBI, Treasury, and State Police officials, and (3) our contacts with several members of the Congress (a few of whom are critical of the DCM program), we were unable to uncover a single incident where a DCM-affiliated club or its members have been convicted of using firearms, ammunition, and/or government property improperly or where DCM arms have been used in crimes of violence. We believe that our investigations were sufficiently thorough to uncover information regarding such incidents if they had occurred, especially in view of the publicity that currently would be attached to an unfavorable incident involving firearms or a shooting club. Therefore, we conclude that NRA/DCM control procedures have at least been adequate in the past. In spite of this record, the NRA recently emphasized a need for more thorough investigations on the part of the state Adjutants General, some of whom have been unable (because of staff limitations) or unwilling to thoroughly investigate and process club applications for NRA affiliation. In the last year the NRA also outlined in detail the investigation procedures on club applications expected of the state NRA Associations and emphasized its request that these procedures be followed.

There is no question that the present control system can be improved in several areas so that the risks of improper use of DQM equipment can be minimized:

1. There is a wide variation from state to state in the depth and effectiveness of club investigations because of the varying degrees of cooperation which the NRA receives from its State Rifle and Pistol Associations and from the state Adjutants General. The Adjutants General and State Associations, in turn, receive varying degrees of cooperation from state and local police agencies in terms of their ability to obtain and convey police records to the NRA, which is a civilian organization and not an official investigating agency.
2. On the basis of the information now furnished the NRA (name, age, address, and occupation), it is extremely difficult, and in some cases impossible, to be positively sure that club officers do not have police records. Most police agencies cannot make a thorough records check without having a set of ten fingerprints for each individual or at the very minimum, information on date of birth and physical characteristics. Since the police agencies cannot make a positive identification with the information furnished, the NRA bases its final decision by relying on the word of the club officer as to whether he is the person to whom the record applies. This approach is obviously not effective in identifying hardened criminals or militant extremists.
3. Because of the difficulties in gaining cooperation from some of the agencies involved, an extreme delay sometimes occurs between the time a club applies for affiliation and the time that it is accepted. As



a recent example, applications of seven clubs have been delayed for more than six months by the California Adjutant General's office pending a determination of the seriousness of crimes for which one or more officers in these clubs have been arrested or convicted. Delays of this kind undoubtedly detract from the advantages of joining the DCM and the NRA. To the extent that the NRA may be willing to assume more risks of unfavorable publicity than the Army, it may be willing to accept less stringent control measures than the Army in the interest of increasing its membership and obtaining more support for its shooting programs.

We believe that the Army can alleviate these difficulties by taking primary responsibility for having an investigation made of clubs wishing to affiliate with the DCM and by making moderate changes in the kinds of information it requires of the club. In all other respects, the essential steps of the present system of controls should be maintained. That is, the control procedure should consist of a police records check of club officers, of endorsements from two community leaders, and of a personal meeting with club officers and members. Moreover, clubs should continue to be required to affiliate with the NRA to be eligible for DCM affiliation; this will ensure continued club support for and liaison with the national sports governing body for shooting and the many relevant activities it promotes.

By being the initiator of requests for State Police checks, the Army would have an advantage over the NRA in that it is a Federal agency and, as such, has official access to police records. In spite of this, the Army may expect to encounter some states that will not cooperate fully, but in these cases it could resort to a records check by the FBI.

The DCM is also in an equal or better position than the NRA to obtain cooperation from state NRA Association officials and to make

personal visits with applying clubs since most state Associations are recipients of DCM arms and ammunition which are used in state matches and in selecting and training state Rifle and Pistol teams. However, to compensate for the inability of state Association officers to meet with clubs in states where no Associations have been formed or in areas inaccessible to Association officers, the DCM should appoint and use its own field representatives to meet with applying club officers and members. There is a need for such field men to maintain better liaison and channels of communication with the clubs, regardless of the need to investigate newly applying clubs.

One approach which might be considered in providing field representation for the DCM is to assign this role to a member of the headquarters staff of each numbered Army Area. For example, this function might be added to the job assignment of the Army Area marksmanship coordinator or a member of the public relations staff. The DCM should direct and maintain close liaison with these individuals and be responsible for rating them in the functions they perform for the DCM. This approach would provide six field representatives, headquartered within reasonable time and distance from most clubs in their Army Area, who would be accountable to the DCM for making field checks, for assisting in maintaining personal contact with the clubs, and for facilitating club use of military ranges. A less desirable alternative would be for the DCM to have only a coordinating relationship with these Army Area staff men.

As for information changes, we recommend that the DCM require that each officer of applying clubs submit his fingerprints. In most areas of the country, fingerprints can be obtained free of charge at local police stations and this requirement should pose little inconvenience on the part of club officers. After the club is affiliated, each new person who is elected to office should also be required to submit his fingerprints. We are convinced that clearance and endorsement of club officers is sufficient to assure the DCM of the legitimacy of a club's intentions and the quality of its administration.



Another minor change which we recommend concerns the membership rosters which each club is required to submit annually. In order to simplify the problem of updating these rosters and yet improve the information which they contain, we recommend that street addresses be eliminated for all members except club officers and that date of birth be substituted for age of each member.

We recommend that the DCM should arrange periodic meetings with its affiliated clubs or groups of clubs, by employing a combination of state Association officers and DCM field representatives. These meetings would serve as a means of maintaining personal contact with the clubs, of insuring that the missions of the NBPRP and the DCM are being carried out, and for discussing procedural changes and ways to improve the program at the club level.

A final recommendation concerns the DCM program for the sale of Government arms and ammunition. Currently, this provision is available to any individual member of the NRA. We recommend that the sales privilege be extended to any member of a DCM-affiliated club, regardless of whether he is an individual NRA member. If the member does not belong to the NRA, however, he should have his purchase order endorsed by an officer of the DCM-affiliated club. In addition, clubs should be able to qualify for additional small allotments of ammunition as long as they can document by name and date the use of such issue for hunter safety programs, youth programs, or by potential club members. We believe these measures will accomplish several objectives. First, they will provide an incentive for shooters to join DCM- and NRA-affiliated clubs, which are the root and main source of strength for all of the instructional and competitive programs carried out by the DCM and the NRA. Second, such measures will assure that some safeguards are maintained for screening of individuals who have access to this part of the DCM program.

F. The Organization, Composition, and Mission of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice

The mission of the NBPRP is one of broad national significance. While

the benefits of its programs are numerous and substantial, the potential benefits are even greater. Its policies and programs should be designed and promulgated with the benefit of counsel and recommendations from a variety of parties-in-interest in addition to those of the NRA and the military. The primary need at present is for improved communication and more effective involvement with the general public in order to create the public sentiment which will insure continued support for and greater involvement in its programs.

We recommend that representation on the NBPRP be broadened. We suggest consideration of leaders in the U. S. Department of State, particularly those interested in and concerned with our international prestige; representatives from the U. S. Department of the Interior who are leaders in planning for broad scale recreation programs; information specialists, public relations counselors, or communications leaders such as publishers, newspaper editors, USIA representatives, etc.; prominent educators; persons knowledgeable in designing youth programs and other strategies for grass roots sports development, such as the Chairman of the proposed National Amateur Sports Foundation or the President of the U. S. Olympic Committee; etc. This type of representation in addition to that from the military and the NRA would help to assure a balance among the several programs and activities of the DCM, would silence critics who contend that the NBPRP is a "closed fraternity" of NRA and military people, and would insure a greater variety of considerations regarding matters affecting public or national policy. We recommend that the Secretary of the Army appoint the six representatives on the Board from the Country At Large after soliciting nominations from a variety of sources.

The aims and purposes of the NRA are quite similar to those of the NBPRP. The network of NRA clubs is the primary vehicle through which the DCM applies its programs and benefits in stimulating shooters and shooting activities. NRA club officers and members provide range facilities, instruction and manpower on a volunteer basis to carry out the club programs of the DCM. The NRA magazine, "The American Rifleman," is an excellent organ for informing, stimulating, and communicating with individuals in-

terested in various aspects of shooting. Therefore, it is not only appropriate but essential that the NRA and the NBPRP achieve effective liaison and work closely together. We endorse the arrangement through which the NRA provides three members to the NBPRP.

G. Major Conclusions

1. Shooting experience, and particularly marksmanship instruction, with military-type small arms prior to entry into military service contributes significantly to the training of the individual soldier.
  - a. Information regarding prior shooting experience and marksmanship proficiency after basic training appears to have as yet unrealized value in the selection and assignment of trainees to combat units where the primary weapon is the rifle and to marksmanship training units.
2. The DCM programs stimulate and support broader participation in organized shooting activities of affiliated club members 12 years of age and older all over the country.
  - a. The marksmanship instruction, supervised practice, safety training, and competitions (including club, inter-club, state, regional, and national matches) sponsored and supported by clubs, the NRA, and the DCM are of particular value to the military.
  - b. As of 30 June 1965, 5,902 gun clubs were affiliated with the DCM. Of the 417,576 members of these clubs, 58% were in the age group 12-25 years old.
  - c. Only a small proportion of Army trainees (32% of our sample) had any marksmanship instruction prior to entering service. Only 6.5% belonged to an organized gun club and only 3.1% could say definitely that they belonged to a gun club affiliated with the DCM. While these are considerably larger proportions than most experts had predicted, in view of the substantial benefits (to the military) accruing to members of DCM-affiliated clubs, more

effort should be extended to expand participation in club membership and programs, particularly in younger age groups.

- d. Members of organized gun clubs provided marksmanship instruction to three times the number of trainees who reported being a member of a gun club.
3. The primary contributions that the Civilian Marksmanship Program makes to the military departments in developing competitors for international competitions are the following:
    - a. Stimulating wider interest and grass roots participation in shooting which results in a broader pool of potential competitors;
    - b. Sponsoring and supporting coaching clinics, Small Arms Firing Schools, and competitions for the development of instructors of potential competitors; and
    - c. Sponsoring and supporting state teams and a hierarchy of state, regional and national matches. Intensive competition at this level is necessary for the development and identification of international caliber competitors.
  4. Benefits to the military departments through sponsorship of shooting teams representing the United States in International Shooting Union Championships, Olympic, or Pan American games are related principally to: international relations; service prestige, esprit de corps, and public relations; and the enhancement of the credibility, influence, and therefore the effectiveness of successful competitors who serve as marksmanship instructors. In recent years, 75 to 90 percent of the members of international shooting teams have come from the military departments.
  5. Benefits to the military departments from the support of and participation of military personnel in the National Matches include the following:

- a. Since the National Matches are regarded as the most important marksmanship competition in the United States, additional effort is extended in preparing for these matches by Reserve teams, National Guard teams, and Active Service teams in all branches of the military services;
- b. Knowledge and experience acquired through preparation for top level marksmanship competitions contribute significantly to the effectiveness of military marksmanship instructors;
- c. National Matches serve as an effective arena for testing shooting techniques and training methods;
- d. Information on developed training methods and shooting techniques which has been validated by successful performances in National Matches is collected and published by the Army Marksmanship Training Unit in a series of manuals on marksmanship and marksmanship instruction; and
- e. The National Matches are regarded as the culmination of the competitive marksmanship programs carried on in the various military departments. Conclusions of the Army's study in 1964 of its competitive marksmanship program were as follows:
  - (1) "It provides a continuing source of qualified marksmen and potential instructors in marksmanship at all levels.
  - (2) The program is directly related to promoting an individual combat skill.
  - (3) It presents a public image of an Army capable in the use of its individual weapons.
  - (4) Individual and team achievements are a source of pride to the individual and the unit.
  - (5) The program develops outstanding competitors to represent the Army in Inter-service, National, and International competitions.
  - (6) It provides a means for the individual to raise his proficiency with small arms other than through the annual qualification program."

- f. Potential public relations values inherent in the performance of military personnel competing in the National Matches are not exploited nor thoroughly capitalized upon. Coverage of the matches by nation-wide news media is quite limited.
6. Other principal side benefits from the Civilian Marksmanship Program include the following:
- a. Law enforcement agencies with organized shooting groups affiliated with the DCM regard the program as "quite important" in supporting their marksmanship training and in enabling their personnel to participate in organized shooting programs;
  - b. Many DCM-affiliated gun clubs throughout the country provide NRA designed "Hunter Safety Programs" to neophyte hunters in an organized effort to reduce shooting accidents among hunters;
  - c. The DCM program as it now operates contributes in only a small way to the social and cultural acceptance of shooting in America. In light of the many recent "anti-gun" articles in newspapers and periodicals in the country, the mission of the NBPRP and the public relations aspects of the DCM program take on added importance. The skills and resources allocated to improved communication with and understanding on the part of the general public should be extended.
7. The recent Civil Rights directive issued by the DCM will result in improved control over those club membership policies in order to insure compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.
- a. We found no instances in which overt discrimination had in fact taken place.
  - b. It appears that only a very small number of Negroes or other nonwhites have applied for membership in DCM-affiliated clubs, especially in the South.

8. While NRA and DCM control procedures have been improved and tightened up recently, we believe that there are other areas where improvements in control procedures are desirable in order to insure that personnel participating in the program are not members of any organization which advocates as any part of its program overthrowing the Government of the United States by force or violence, or never have been convicted of a crime of violence.
  - a. Control procedures in effect apparently have at least been adequate since our extensive contacts with police and civic officials, interviews and correspondence with FBI, Treasury, and State Police officials, and our contacts with several members of the Congress and their research assistants failed to uncover a single incident where a DCM-affiliated club or its members have been convicted of using firearms, ammunition, and/or government property improperly or where DCM arms have been used in crimes of violence.
  - b. If it can be demonstrated that shooting club officers are responsible citizens, they can be relied upon to maintain adequate controls over the club membership and activities. Therefore, the main thrust of screening and control procedures regarding the affiliation of gun clubs with the DCM should be focused on club officers.
  - c. There is considerable variation from state to state in the depth and effectiveness of investigations of club officers because of the varying degrees of cooperation which the NRA receives from its state rifle and pistol associations and from the state Adjutants General. These groups, in turn, receive varying degrees of cooperation from state and local police agencies in terms of their ability to obtain and convey police records to the NRA.
  - d. On the basis of the information now furnished the NRA (name, age, address, and occupation), it is extremely difficult, if



not impossible, to be positively sure that club officers do or do not have police records. Most police agencies cannot make a thorough records check without having a set of ten fingerprints for each individual or at the very minimum, information on date of birth and a full description of physical characteristics.

9. There is a need for more direct and effective communication and interaction on the part of the DCM with affiliated clubs, especially clubs newly affiliated. More attention needs to be directed toward helping clubs get organized and adopt programs which will support and carry out the missions of the NBPRP and exploit fully the advantages of affiliation with the DCM as well as to assist in the screening of club officers and monitoring club activities in previously affiliated clubs.
10. The present system of funding the programs of the NBPRP and the DCM, including the same sources of budgetary support, appears to be quite appropriate.
  - a. While the funding system and sources are appropriate, there is currently no means for the NBPRP or the DCM to conveniently and systematically examine the various DCM programs in detail, evaluate their benefits and costs, and consider changes or new programs in terms of the budgetary implications of such changes.
  - b. The DCM has little planning, budgetary, or administrative control over aspects of its programs that could generate income to defray the total program cost.
  - c. The DCM programs would benefit from more systematic liaison between the DCM and the various agencies affected by, participating in, and having financial responsibilities for parts of the DCM program.
  - d. The DCM has been vulnerable to criticism in the past because of the fact that it has been difficult to document either the concrete benefits or the full and accurate costs of its several programs.



11. We consider that the requirement that clubs enrolling with the Director of Civilian Marksmanship be affiliated with the National Rifle Association is quite appropriate.
  - a. The aims and purposes of the NRA are quite similar and complementary to those of the NBPRP. The network of NRA clubs is the primary vehicle through which the DQM applies its programs and benefits in stimulating shooters and shooting activities. NRA club officers and members provide range facilities, instruction, and manpower on a volunteer basis to carry out the club programs of the DQM. The NRA magazine, "The American Rifleman," is an excellent vehicle for communicating with individuals interested in various aspects of shooting, including the advantages of affiliating with the DQM. Therefore, it is not only appropriate but essential that the NRA and the NBPRP achieve effective liaison and work closely together.
  - b. It is quite appropriate that the NRA provides three members to the NBPRP.
  - c. The NRA is the national sports governing body recognized by the International Shooting Union and thus it has the responsibility for sanctioning all national championships and tournaments for the purpose of selecting representatives on teams for international competitions.
12. The National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice should continue with some minor changes.
  - a. There is a need for broader representation on the NBPRP. There is a need to build in those capabilities and interests which will result in improved communication and more effective involvement with the general public in order to more effectively fulfill the mission of creating the public sentiment which will insure continued support for and greater participation in the NBPRP programs.

## H. Major Recommendations

1. We recommend that the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice (NBPRP) should be continued with some minor changes in its organization and in the administration of the Office of the Director of Civilian Marksmanship.
  - a. The membership of the NBPRP should be broadened to include parties-in-interest other than the NRA and the military departments. Representation of capabilities and resources mentioned in the body of this report should result in an increased capability of the NBPRP to carry out its missions effectively.
  - b. The Secretary of the Army should appoint the six representatives on the NBPRP from the Country At Large after soliciting nominations from a variety of sources.
  - c. The NRA should continue to provide three members to the NBPRP.
  - d. The NBPRP should develop and promulgate more effective programs to facilitate the social and cultural acceptance of shooting in America.
  
2. The DCM should be established as the DCM Program Office and given full program responsibility and authority for all activities related to its legal mission as prescribed in Army regulations and as directed by the NBPRP.
  - a. This DCM Program Office should have the responsibility to develop a five year program and a budget plan for review by the NBPRP in its budget committee. It should then make annual reviews of all existing programs or activities and assess their progress, effects, and importance.
  - b. The DCM Program Office should also be given the authority to establish reporting procedures for obtaining, on a routine basis, information from the various Army agencies concerned with and contributing to the DCM program. This

should also include authority to establish an active liaison program with such agencies so that all parties concerned could contribute to the formulation of policies and procedures affecting the success of the total DCM program.

- c. We recommend that a more inclusive system of accounts be set up so that the true cost to the government of the DCM programs can be accounted for on a regular and complete basis. This should entail provisions for credits to the DCM program for all revenues returned to the Federal Government.
3. The Department of the Army should provide for field representatives for the DCM.
    - a. Members of the headquarters staff in each numbered Army Area Headquarters might be assigned the role of DCM field representatives. This function might be added to the job assignment of the Army Area Marksmanship Coordinator or to a member of the public relations staff particularly interested in marksmanship activities.
    - b. These field representatives should be responsible for assisting and maintaining personal contact with clubs in the Army Area, for facilitating club use of military rifle ranges, for stimulating organized shooting programs within clubs, especially for junior age groups, and for more effective administration and liaison of the check-out procedures of officers of clubs applying for membership in the DCM.
  4. The DCM should take primary responsibility for investigations made of clubs wishing to affiliate with the DCM.
    - a. Checks and investigations of personnel in clubs applying for affiliation with the DCM should be focused on club officers.
    - b. Information used in clearing applying club officers should

be more complete and lend itself more effectively to efficient check-out procedures. We recommend that the DCM require each officer of an applying club to submit his fingerprints. After the club is affiliated, each new person who is elected to office should also be required to submit his fingerprints.

- c. In all other respects, the essential steps of the present system of controls should be maintained. That is, the control procedure should consist of a police records check of club officers, of endorsements from two community leaders, and of a personal meeting with club officers and members. In addition, clubs should continue to be required to affiliate with the NRA to be eligible for DCM affiliation. This will insure continued club support for and liaison with the national sports governing body for shooting and the many relevant activities it promotes.
5. Those aspects of the DCM program which relate to the stimulation of broader interest and participation in rifle shooting among the youth of our country should be emphasized more and pursued even more effectively in order to reach a greater percentage of those young men likely to enter military service.
    - a. In designing its programs and in allocating resources, the NBPRP and the DCM should give consideration to more emphasis to club activities. This should include stimulation of membership, more emphasis on junior programs, and further extensions of marksmanship and coaching clinics, and local and regional competitions.
    - b. In view of the very considerable support to state, regional, and especially National Matches, the NBPRP and the DCM should capitalize further on the public relations benefits inherent in these competitions and the potential for using films, short subjects, TV coverage, etc., in stimulating greater interest and participation in organized shooting activities in the country. Since the current interest of the general

public in international competitions is high, opportunities to capitalize further upon the public relations value of successful performances of members of international shooting teams should be extended.

- c. Any member of a DQM-affiliated club, regardless of whether he is an individual NRA member, should be enabled to purchase government arms and ammunition through the DQM sales program. However, in order to maintain a screening and control procedure over such orders, any such member should have his purchase order endorsed by an officer of the DQM-affiliated club to which he belongs.
  - d. Consideration should be given to enabling clubs to qualify for additional small allotments of ammunition issue as long as they can document the use of such issue for hunter safety programs, youth programs for non-members, or for other community programs to stimulate further interest and participation in shooting.
6. Since there are no minimum marksmanship proficiency standards established for rifle units going into combat and since no one has yet been able to "price out" the value of achieving a given level of marksmanship proficiency in a rifle unit, we recommend that consideration be given to defining and carrying out needed research in this area.
- a. Consideration should be given to making "quality control checks" on the marksmanship proficiency of rifle units going into combat. If data is gathered to measure the combat proficiency of units with varying degrees of marksmanship proficiency, this information should be valuable "feedback" in adjusting marksmanship training standards and in evaluating the need for improved selection of individuals who will be more effective in combat.

