

**THE BURDEN OF THE DRAFT:
THE VIETNAM YEARS*
PATRICIA M. SHIELDS**

Southwest Texas State University

Journal of Political and Military Sociology 1981, Vol. 9 (Fall):215-228

This study explores the draft during the Vietnam era. Using a national longitudinal sample of young men who were draft vulnerable over the period, it estimates the likelihood of being drafted for whites and blacks. Unlike other studies, it uses pre-service traits in the analysis.

The burden of the draft did not fall evenly upon young men of the period. Individuals who unfortunately possessed combinations of draft vulnerable personal characteristics—for example, black high school graduates—paid a higher than average price. The strength of the draft pressure variable, however, demonstrates the overriding importance of military demand. Men who were draft eligible during periods of high draft calls were least able to use the many deferment avenues. Hence, the fortunes of war or the luck of the draw was an important factor in determining who was drafted.

The spectre of the draft once again hangs over young men 19 and 20 years of age. Indeed, with the advent of draft registration in the summer of 1980, the possibility of a return to conscription seems closer than at any time in the last 8 years. Not since the Selective Service System was dismantled and the All Volunteer Forces (AVF) established has the issue of conscription been so debated. President Carter responded to the Afghanistan Crisis by renewing draft registration. After heated debate, Congress agreed to fund registration for men only. Debate over the draft is not new. During the late 1960's, social scientists joined other groups advocating an end to the draft. The political decision to end the draft was based in part upon the analysis of social scientists.

This paper reviews the equity arguments surrounding conscription. In addition, the likelihood of a young man being drafted is empirically tested. The results of this study should provide new insight for the current debate.

CONSCRIPTION AND THE BABY BOOM

Young men of the Vietnam era were born and reached maturity during a period characterized by international crisis (WW II, Korea, Berlin, Cuba). The

* The research was conducted while the author was a Research Associate at the Center for Human Resource Research, The Ohio State University. This paper is based on data from the National Longitudinal Surveys, a project sponsored by the Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Researchers are encouraged to use their own judgements; hence, this paper does not necessarily represent the official position of the Department of Labor. The author wishes to thank Rufus Milsted for valuable computer assistance and Timothy J. Carr, Andrew I. Kohen, Herbert S. Parnes, Celia Morgan, and several other colleagues for helpful comments on earlier drafts. Responsibility for interpretations and conclusions rests with the author.

draft was seen as a necessary policy variable, for it permitted able young men to be drawn quickly into service in event of an emergency. Throughout the 1950's the equity issue seldom received public review. Nearly everyone served. At that time the armed forces required approximately 70 percent of the nation's young men to meet its manpower needs (Davis and Dolbeare, 1968:130). However, in the early 1960's, as the first of the baby boom children reached maturity, a manpower surplus began to appear. This abundance of manpower created serious problems in the choice of who was to serve. During this period of relative peace, the Selective Service took on a new official function or purpose. It deferred men in order that they might train and study and in this way serve the national interest.

If the international arena had remained relatively calm, perhaps questions concerning the equity of the system would not have been raised. However, the escalating Vietnam War and the dramatic increase in draft calls of the mid-1960's brought the policies of the Selective Service to the public's attention. The concept of selective service as well as the institution and its policies were challenged.¹ Two important examples of public scrutiny are the 1966 Chicago conference on the draft and establishment of a National Advisory Commission on the Selective Service (referred to here as the Marshall Commission). Both the Chicago conference and the Marshall Commission questioned the equity of the then current system. It was argued that higher income men could effectively avoid service through the student deferment. The Marshall Commission contended that young men who had sufficient income to take advantage of the college deferment then had the additional opportunity to extend their deferred status indefinitely through graduate school, and through occupational or dependency deferments.

These findings, growing public pressure, and the increasing manpower demands of the intensifying war led to the elimination of the graduate student deferment and a reduced list of deferred occupations. But these changes were a stop-gap measure. By the Fall of 1969 the lottery was initiated, and by 1973 virtually all armed forces new entrants were volunteers.

EQUITY AND THE DRAFT

Equity in the context of the draft can be evaluated in several ways. First, equity would imply equal probability or risk of selection among men of the relevant age. Second, the risks associated with service, i.e., combat, injury and death, should be distributed evenly among members of the armed forces (Canby, 1972:22).

It has been well documented that the burden of the fighting fell most heavily upon low income, poorly educated individuals. Army records show that a college graduate had a 42% chance of a Vietnam tour versus 64% for a high school graduate and 70% for a high school dropout. Furthermore, a survey of Chicago neighborhoods revealed that men from low-income neighborhoods were three times as likely to die in the Vietnam conflict as men from high income

1. See for example, *The New York Times* (January 3, 1966), *Newsweek* (April 11, 1966), *Reporter* (June 16, 1966), *Newsweek* (July 10, 1967), Klassen (1966), Chapman (1967), Tax (1967), The U.S. National Advisory Commission (1967).

areas (Baskir and Strauss, 1978:7). The survey characterized avoiders, evaders, draftees, and reluctant volunteers as victims of the system.

THE LIKELIHOOD OF BEING DRAFTED

Equity in a conscription system implies an equal likelihood of being drafted among young men of the relevant age. In the United States, race and social class are important perspectives from which to judge equity. Do individuals of different races and social classes face the "risk" and have the opportunity to enjoy the benefits equally? An objective of this section is to address aspects of ex-ante equity.

For the most part, variables used are divided into two broad categories: (1) Selective Service and military demand factors, and (2) personal characteristics.

The Selective Service established minimum eligibility requirements for health and mental ability as well as a deferment system that enabled a young man temporarily or completely to avoid the draft and/or consequent pressure to enlist. During the Vietnam era, as the level of fighting fluctuated, so did the need for recruits. Armed forces manpower demand was reflected in the level of draft calls. Selective Service and demand factors utilized in the model include health status, mental ability, educational attainment, fatherhood, and draft pressure.

Personal characteristics associated with the dependent measure include socioeconomic family background (SES), geographic environment, and the knowledge of the draft system. The former is particularly useful in assessing the equity question. In summary the model takes the following form:

Probability of

being drafted = f(Education, Health, Mental Ability, Draft Pressure, Fatherhood, Geographic Residence, Socioeconomic Status, Knowledge of the Selective Service Process)

Both high and low levels of education and mental ability are expected to be negatively related to the dependent measure. High values on these variables are associated with the student deferment, while low values correspond to the mental ability exemption. On the other hand, noncollege youths who met the minimum IQ standards, e.g., those with 10-12 years of school, are expected to be drafted at higher than average rates. The health exemption and the hardship deferment led us to hypothesize a negative relationship with the draft for fathers or individuals with health limitations.

Throughout the literature of the mid and late 1960's there were frequent references to discrimination in draft policy along socioeconomic lines (Davis and Dolbeare, 1968; Little, 1969; and the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, 1967). It was argued that the demographic composition of the local draft boards, the conscription/enlistment quota system, and the student deferment were the chief causes of the low rates of service among upper income youths. Davis and Dolbeare describe local draft board members as part of the elite in the local community.² Furthermore, the local board had great discretion

2. Nearly half of all the male, predominantly white board members were over 60 and two-thirds were veterans. The educational attainment of board members was comparatively high and the dominant occupation groups were professional and proprietors, managers, and officials (Davis and Dolbeare, 1968:57-58).

over draft classification decisions,³ especially those involving occupational deferments. These facts led Davis and Dolbeare and the Marshall Commission to conclude that local board members favored young men who, like themselves, were from the upper class.

Draft quotas were derived from the 1-A pool. Lower class youths had a greater likelihood of being classified as 1-A since they were less likely to attend college or be eligible for occupational deferments. Hence, an inverse relationship is hypothesized with SES.⁴

All in all, the relationship between geographic region and the likelihood of conscription is unclear. Nevertheless, there is reason to suspect that during the Vietnam era local draft boards in large metropolitan areas drafted eligible urban poor while upper class suburban youths were protected from conscription (Davis and Dolbeare, 1968:64).

The demographic characteristics of draft board members from northern urban cities are cited as the rationale for this hypothesis. The draft board demographic characteristics seldom matched those of the population they served. It was a Selective Service policy that once a local draft board member was appointed, that position was retained until he resigned. Consequently, it was not uncommon for men to have tenure as board members of 15 to 25 years (Davis and Dolbeare, 1968:64). Hence, the draft board composition retained the characteristics of an earlier period while urban whites migrated to the suburbs and blacks moved into the north central cities (Little, 1969:15-16).

Finally, it is hypothesized that if an individual understands the Selective Service System as well as the consequences of being a member of the armed forces, he will choose to avoid the draft. For example, if a young man understands the military alternative, he will be able to evaluate his own probability of being drafted (e.g., army, combat, etc). He will also understand the potential advantages of the armed forces such as technical training, medical care, and the G.I. bill. Hence, he would try to avoid the draft either by enlisting or through the many deferment avenues.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The data used in this study make it a unique contribution to the literature. Past studies suffer from the problems of retrospective information (Baskir and Strauss, 1978). Longitudinal data are employed in this study; hence pre-service characteristics are more accurately measured. Furthermore, these data complement studies such as that of the Marshall Commission which relied upon data from an earlier period. The National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS) of the labor market and educational experiences of young men are used in this study. The NLS is a multistage probability sample selected from the civilian non-institutional population of young men aged 14 to 24 when first interviewed in 1966.

Two slightly different universes are used in this study. Both are a subset of

3. Davis and Dolbeare (1968:79) estimated that between 10% and 30% of these decisions were at the discretion of the draft board.

4. It should be noted that the high incidence of disqualification among the poor may have led to below average draft rates among the lower SES grouping when ineligible are included in the analysis.

the total NLS sample—young men who were (1) 21 to 27 years of age in 1973⁵, and (2) not veterans when they entered the sample in 1966. This group is fairly representative of all non-veterans of the period. Hence, we can look at the young men as a whole and determine the likelihood of being drafted. The second universe further restricts the above sample by excluding men who were permanently exempted (classified “4-F”) from the armed forces. The permanently exempted youth were eliminated from the universe to ensure comparability with past studies. Moreover, exclusion of this group from analysis permits exploration of another facet of the issue, namely whether the armed forces drew more heavily from any one group after the ineligible are excluded. For example, while the armed forces may not have drafted blacks disproportionately, they may have drafted “eligible” blacks in greater than average numbers. Generalizations are possible for the entire Vietnam era because annual (1966-1973) interviews were conducted⁶ during a period that corresponded closely to the Vietnam era (1964-1973).

The analysis is explored utilizing multiple classification analysis (MCA), a version of multiple regression analysis with all the explanatory variables expressed in categorical form.⁷

The dependent variable was constructed utilizing the respondents' self-reported method of entry. The independent variable set was created using pre-service characteristics rather than relying on retrospective information. Since individuals born in different years were vulnerable to the draft at different times, it was necessary to use a common pre-service life cycle referent. Education was chosen to pool cross-sectional information because it linked directly to the student deferment. Pre-service educational attainment is measured as of the year the young man stopped full-time continuous enrollment. This is the year he is theoretically draft eligible. For those who did not graduate from high school, pre-service characteristics are measured as of the year corresponding to their eighteenth birthday. Pre-service characteristics such as draft pressure (1=draft eligible in 1966, 1967 or 1968)⁸, fatherhood (1=dependents other than wife), and region of residence and health (1=health limits school or work) are measured as of the year of draft eligibility. A measure of a young man's understanding of the Selective Service system was not available directly. Hence, this concept was measured using the respondents' knowledge of the world of work score.

5. It should be noted that the lottery went into effect in 1970. The men in this sample were 18 to 24 in 1979; the youngest were old enough to be college freshman. During the 1979 lottery, college students retained their student deferments. Hence, for this sample the lottery had relatively little influence.

6. There were no interviews conducted in 1972.

7. Statistical problems with the use of dichotomous dependent variables in regression analysis (MCA is a special form of regression) necessitated using logit to confirm the MCA results. Logit and MCA results are not directly comparable. A technique was developed which transformed the coefficients generated by MCA and logit. A comparison of the transformed results revealed that the predicted direction and magnitude of the logit and the MCA coefficients were, with few exceptions, similar. Since the MCA format lends itself to easy interpretation, MCA results are presented in the text (Shields, 1977: Appendix C).

8. 1966, 1967, and 1968 were the years of the highest draft calls.

RESULTS

As anticipated, blacks were drafted at higher rates than whites regardless of eligibility status (See Table 1). The difference, however, was small. Among the eligible (those not classified 4-F) 8 percent of the whites and 10 percent of the blacks were drafted. When the sample included 4-F's, 9 percent of the blacks and 7 percent of the whites were conscripted. Since the results were similar, and because critics such as the Marshall Commission claimed the burden of the draft fell most heavily on the eligible poor, the "eligibles" will be the group discussed in the remainder of the text.

Very few variables achieve statistical significance in the model designed to explain the likelihood of being drafted (See Table 2). The hardship deferment and draft pressure variables were significantly related to the likelihood of being drafted for both racial groups. In addition, there was similarity between blacks and whites in the factors that were not significant in predicting conscription: mental ability, civilian occupational information, socioeconomic status, and geographic region of residence.

Educational attainment and health are the only measures which have differential impact by race (as measured through the F-ratios associated with the contribution of each variable). Education is significantly (at the .05 level) related to the probability of a black being drafted but not so for whites. Aside from the overall difference, there are noteworthy racial differences in the rate of conscription within education categories.

As the non-significant F-ratio suggests, whites of different educational levels share the burden of the draft evenly. For example, the difference in the draft

Table 1. GROSS RESULTS: THE PERCENTAGE WHO WERE DRAFTED BY RACE AND ELIGIBILITY

	Percent Total ^a	Sample Size	Percent Eligible ^b	Sample Size
Whites	7	2,646	8	2,467
Blacks	9	1,141	10	953

^aThe universe consists of respondents who were (1) 21 to 27 years of age in 1973 and (2) not veterans when they entered the sample.

^bThe universe is the same as "a" and respondents were omitted from the universe if in any survey year they were classified as 4-F or not eligible for service.

Table 2. THE LIKELIHOOD OF A NON-EXEMPTED YOUNG MAN BEING DRAFTED INTO THE ARMED FORCES DURING THE VIETNAM ERA: MCA RESULTS

Whites				
Characteristic	Number of Respondents	Unadjusted Percent	Adjusted ^b Percent	(F-ratio) t-ratio
<u>Education</u> ^a				(1.70)
0-8	94	7	8	-0.09
9-11	322	10	9	0.79
12	996	10	9	1.50
13-15	562	8	8	-0.13
16	363	2	4	-2.41**
17+	130	4	8	-0.17
<u>Fatherhood</u> ^a				(6.24)##
No children	2307	8	8	2.47**
Children	160	2	3	-2.47**
<u>Draft Pressure</u> ^a				(40.12)##
High	870	14	13	5.80**
Low	1597	5	5	-5.80**
<u>IQ</u>				(1.60)
Low	175	12	9	0.43
Medium	1018	10	9	1.88
High	616	5	7	-0.96
NA	658	6	7	-1.22
<u>Residence</u> ^a				(1.04)
NE Central City	160	5	4	-1.79
NE Other	431	6	7	-1.17
NC Central City	193	7	8	-0.11
NC Other	574	10	9	1.26
South Urban	333	6	7	-0.98
South Rural	399	9	9	0.50
West	377	10	10	1.47
NA	0	c	c	c
<u>Health Problems</u> ^a				(6.26)##
No	2217	8	8	2.49**
Yes	250	5	4	-2.49**
<u>KOWW</u> ^d				(0.66)
Low	554	9	9	0.78
Medium	1053	7	7	-1.27
High	819	8	9	0.64
NA	41	7	6	-0.36
<u>SES</u>				(0.68)
Low	397	10	9	0.87
Medium	900	9	8	0.60
High	1095	6	7	-1.05
NA	75	7	7	-0.46

Table 2 (Continued). THE LIKELIHOOD OF A NON-EXEMPTED YOUNG MAN BEING DRAFTED INTO THE ARMED FORCES DURING THE VIETNAM ERA: MCA RESULTS

Characteristic	Blacks			
	Number of Respondents	Unadjusted Percent	Adjusted ^b Percent	(F-ratio) t-ratio
Total or Average	2467			
Grand Mean			8	
Adj R ²			.03	
F-ratio for the Model				(4.26)
<u>Education</u> ^a				(2.70) #
0-8	95	3	4	-2.17**
9-11	253	9	8	-1.70*
12	407	15	14	2.82**
13-15	140	10	12	0.68
16	48	2	7	-0.83
17+	10	c	c	c
<u>Fatherhood</u> ^a				(5.49) #
No Children	845	12	11	2.31**
Children	108	2	4	-2.31**
<u>Draft Pressure</u> ^a				(35.97) ##
High	372	18	18	5.64**
Low	581	6	6	-5.64**
<u>IQ</u>				(1.00)
Low	202	17	14	1.59
Medium	202	11	10	-0.27
High	20	c	c	c
NA	529	8	9	-1.07
<u>Residence</u> ^a				(1.02)
NE Central City	77	10	11	0.10
NE Other	46	9	8	-0.55
NC Central City	160	14	14	1.69*
NC Other	21	10	8	-0.38
South Urban	311	10	10	-0.17
South Rural	291	10	10	-0.36
West	45	4	4	-1.44
NA	2	c	c	c
<u>Health Problems</u> ^a				(0.03)
No	904	11	10	-0.16
Yes	49	10	11	0.16
<u>KOWW</u> ^d				(1.68)
Low	559	10	11	0.56
Medium	297	12	11	0.36
High	82	6	4	-1.93*
NA	15	c	c	c

Table 2 (Continued)

<u>SES</u>					(0.32)
Low	456	11	11		0.55
Medium	303	11	9		-0.83
High	75	8	10		-0.17
NA	119	12	12		0.44
Total or Average	953				
Grand Mean			10		
Adj R ²			.05		
F-ratio for the Model					(3.26)

Universe: Mentally and physically eligible (not classified 4-F) respondents 21-27 years old in 1973 who were not discharged from the Armed Forces prior to 1966.

^aThe characteristic is measured as of the year of draft eligibility.

^bAdjusted by multiple regression technique of holding constant all other variables shown in the table.

^cPercentage not shown when the category contains 20 or fewer respondents.

^dKOWW stands for "knowledge of the world of work".

Statistically significant at the .05 level.

Statistically significant at the .01 level.

* Category is significantly different from the grand mean at the .05 level.

** Category is significantly different from the grand mean at the .01 level.

rates among high school graduates, dropouts, and those with some college was only one percentage point. College graduates are an exception; they were drafted at one half the average rate (4 percent). On the other hand, the likelihood of being drafted varied substantially across educational categories among blacks. One of the more interesting findings suggests that a disproportionate burden of the draft fell on black high school graduates. Fourteen percent of black high school graduates were drafted. This is significant at the .01 level. Unlike high school graduates, blacks with less than high school education managed, to a limited extent, to escape the draft (8 percent of the blacks with 9-11 years of school completed were drafted). Among young men with less than a high school education, whites faced a higher likelihood of conscription. Whites with 0 to 8 years of school completed were twice as likely to be drafted as similar blacks (8 percent for whites versus 4 percent for blacks). On the other hand, draft rates of white and black high school dropouts (9-11 years of school completed) are within one percentage point of each other. It is interesting that regardless of whether a white graduated

or dropped out of high school his chances for the draft are similar. Black high school students, however, increased their likelihood of being drafted 6 percentage points by completing the twelfth grade.

The findings with respect to the health status variable are also of interest. Health is a powerful predictor among whites but is not correlated with black conscription. Only four percent of the whites with health problems were drafted compared to 11 percent of the blacks. Since all those with serious health problems (draft classification, 4-F) were excluded from analysis, this suggests that whites were better able to convert marginal health limitations into temporary (1-Y) deferments. Why were blacks unable to do the same? Perhaps the racial difference stems from the health measure. There may be a discrepancy between a black youth's perceived health limitation and the armed forces health standards. On the other hand, the explanation could stem from discriminatory practices during the pre-induction physical examination. One could also speculate that blacks with marginal health problems do not bring their complaint to the attention of the armed forces physician (during the pre-induction physical) under the assumption that their health problems would not be sufficient to disqualify them from the armed forces. Finally, blacks may be at a "disadvantage" in their ability to deal with the predominately white medical "system". (Rice, forthcoming) Whites are more likely to be treated by family physicians and have complete medical histories. Perhaps, more importantly, a white youth had friends and acquaintances who had successfully used the health deferment to avoid service. Whites were then able to use this knowledge in obtaining their own health deferment.

Although region and urbanicity of residence failed to achieve statistical significance for either racial group, black conscription rates in the Northern central cities were approximately twice those for similar whites. In the Northeastern central cities 4 percent of the whites were drafted as compared with 11 percent of their black counterparts. In the North Central region 14 percent of the black central city residents were drafted versus 8 percent of the similar whites. This evidence lends support to the hypothesis that draft boards in the northern cities discriminated unfairly against blacks.

The draft equation does not capture the full impact of conscription on the lives of young men. Indeed, many youths vulnerable to the draft enlisted to avoid conscription. Volunteering had advantages over conscription. The risks of combat were reduced. Choice of branch service was available and opportunities for training were greater.⁹

Selected portions of a similar enlistment equation are presented in Table 3. The results demonstrate that Selective Service criteria and military demand (Draft Pressure) were strong enlistment motivators among blacks and whites. The strength of these variables, however, differed by race. White enlistment was more strongly draft motivated. Variables representing draft pressure, the health exemption, and the hardship deferment were all significant at the .01 level. Only draft pressure and the health status variable were significant for blacks, and then at the .05 level. Furthermore, whites were more likely than blacks to enlist during periods of high draft calls (28% for whites versus 24% for

9. A major disadvantage associated with enlistment was increased duration of service.

Table 3. THE LIKELIHOOD OF A YOUNG MAN ENLISTING IN THE ARMED FORCES DURING THE VIETNAM ERA: SELECTED MCA RESULTS

Characteristics	Whites		Blacks	
	Number of Respondents	Adjusted Percent	Number of Respondents	Adjusted Percent
<u>Draft Pressure</u> ^a				
High	870	28**	372	22*
Low	1,597	14**	581	16*
<u>Fatherhood</u> ^a				
No children	2,307	20**	845	19
Children	160	7**	108	13
<u>Health Problems</u> ^a				
No	2,217	21**	904	19*
Yes	250	3**	49	8*
<u>Education</u> ^a				
9-11	322	12**	253	19
12	996	21	407	21
16	363	23	48	9
Total				
Grand Mean	2,467	19	953	19

^aThe characteristic is measured as of the year of draft eligibility.

*Category is significantly different from the grand mean at the .05 level.

**Category is significantly different from the grand mean at the .01 level.

Source: Patricia M. Shields, "Enlistment During the Vietnam Era and the 'Representation' Issue of the AVF", *Armed Forces and Society*, Vol. 7, No. 1; 1980: 140-141. The enlistment equation also includes the following variables: IQ, Residence, Potential Wage, Unemployment, Socioeconomic Status, and a more exhaustive educational classification.

blacks). A reverse trend is true when "the draft" is the dependent measure.¹⁰

After controlling for other factors, only 4% of whites who had completed college were drafted while 23% enlisted (an enlistment rate above average). This suggests that white college graduates without deferments chose to fulfill their obligation as enlistees rather than be drafted. Black college graduates, on the other hand, were more likely to be drafted and less likely to enlist than their white counterparts.

For the most part, results of the enlistment and draft equations parallel one another (See Table 2 and Table 3). Draft pressure is a strong predictor in both

10. It should be noted that whites were also more likely than blacks to use health problems and children to escape the draft.

models. Regardless of racial status, young men who were draft vulnerable between 1966 and 1968 entered at rates well above average. Likewise the military was successfully avoided through fatherhood and minor health problems. However, whites were better able to translate these potential deferments into permanent civilian status. Blacks with marginal health problems or children were drafted and enlisted at higher rates than similar whites.

The influence of the education variable was not complementary across the draft and enlistment models. Rather, education had a neutralizing influence. For example, white college graduates successfully avoided the draft, but entered in significant numbers as enlistees. White high school dropouts behaved quite differently. It would appear that they favored taking their chances with the draft in lieu of enlistment. Hence, the observed low enlistment rates and high draft rates. Interestingly, compared to similar whites, black college graduates and high school dropouts exhibit an opposite trend. Finally, it should be noted that both whites and blacks entered the armed forces in significant numbers. Whites were more likely to bear the burden as enlistees. Blacks, in contrast, paid the price as draftees.

CONCLUSION

These results imply that fairness with respect to service, or *ex-ante* equity, was not achieved by the Selective Service System during the Vietnam era. The greater probabilities of being drafted among high school graduates and those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are consistent with army records and the Baskir and Strauss results.

Throughout history, armed forces manpower policy has responded to goals such as national security and equity (Gerhardt, 1971). These results are unique in that they demonstrate the influences of both factors. The burden of the draft did not fall evenly upon young men of the period. Individuals who unfortunately possessed combinations of draft vulnerable personal characteristics—for example, black high school graduates—paid a higher than average price. The strength of the draft pressure variable, however, demonstrates the overriding importance of military demand. Men who were draft eligible during periods of high draft calls were least able to use the many deferment avenues. Hence, the fortunes of war or the luck of the draw was an important factor in determining who served.

As long as the possibility of international conflict exists, the draft will be an ever surfacing issue. Dissatisfaction with the All Volunteer Force (AVF) has intensified the current debate. Critics of the AVF feel it is ill-prepared, too expensive, poor in quality, and nonrepresentative in its recruits, and it will face even more serious problems as the manpower pool declines in the late '80s and early '90s. (See for example: Keeley, 1978; Kyle, 1980; Woosley, 1980). On the other hand, supporters of the AVF argue that its problems stem from underfunding. Furthermore, a peace time draft can never be justified. Arguments include immorality, loss of individual freedom, inefficiency and the inequities inherent in a draft.¹¹

11. Senator Mark Hatfield (R-OR) is one of the most outspoken and eloquent critics of renewed draft registration (See Senate Hearings, 1980:4-12).

If those who support a return to the draft prevail and we see a major policy shift in the future, the findings of this study suggest some policy implications. First, the mistakes of the student deferment should not be repeated.¹² A mixed volunteer-lottery system coupled with minimum health and ability standards would be a more equitable and effective method of meeting the manpower needs of the armed forces.¹³ Second, special care should be taken to insure equity in the implementation of minimum health standards.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, Frank; Morgan, James and Sonquist, John
1967 Multiple Classification Analysis: A Report on a Computer Program for Multiple Regression Using Categorical Predictors. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.
- Baskir, Lawrence and Strauss, William
1978 Chance and Circumstance: The Draft, the War and the Vietnam Generation. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Canby, Steven L.
1972 Military Manpower Procurement: A Policy Analysis. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company.
- Chapman, Bruce
1967 Wrong Man in Uniform: Our Unfair and Obsolete Draft and How We Can Replace It. New York: Trident Press.
- Congressional Digest
1980 "Controversy Over Proposed Draft Registration: Pro and Con." April: 99-128.
- Cooper, Richard V.L.
1977 Military Manpower and the All-Volunteer Force. R-1450-ARPA. Santa Monica, California: Rand.
- Davis, James W. and Dolbeare, Kenneth M.
1968 Little Groups of Neighbors: The Selective Service System. Chicago: Markham.
- Gerhardt, James M.
1971 The Draft and Public Policy: Issues in Military Manpower Procurements 1945-1970. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press.
- Harvard Study Group
1967 "On the Draft." Public Interest 9: 93-99.
- Janowitz, Morris and Moskos, Charles
1979 "Five Years of the All-Volunteer Force: 1973-1978." Armed Forces and Society 5: 171-218.
- Keeley, John B.
1978 The All-Volunteer Force and American Society. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Klassen, Albert D.
1966 Military Service in American Life Since World War II: An Overview. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Kyle, Deborah M.
1980 "FY 81 Manpower Budget: Plugging a Six-Inch Leak with a Two-Inch Cork." Armed Forces Journal. April: 10-12.

12. The influence of the occupational deferment was not explored in this study. The author recommends that it also be absent from any draft system.

13. Under the current Selective Service Act, if we return to the draft, the student and occupational deferments will be eliminated. Ministry, conscientious objection and hardship claims will be considered as will physical and mental exemptions. The system would use a lottery to determine the order of induction (Leepson, 1980:432).

- Kohen, Andrew I.; Grasso, John T.; Myers, Steven C.; and Shields, Patricia M.
1977 Career Thresholds, Vol VI, Longitudinal Studies of the Educational and Labor Market Experiences of Young Men. U.S. Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration, R and D Monograph No. 16, (NTIS PB 250512/AS).
- Kohen, Andrew I. and Shields, Patricia M.
1980 "Reaping the Spoils of Defeat: Labor Market Experiences of Vietnam-Era Veterans" in Figley and Leventman (Eds.) Strangers at Home: Vietnam Veterans Since the War. New York: Praeger.
- Leepson
1980 "Draft Registration." Editorial Research Review (April): 427-444.
- Little, Roger D.
1969 Selective Service and American Society. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- National Advisory Commission on Selective Service
1967 In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves When Not All Serve? Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Rice, Mitchell F.
Forthcoming "Black Health Care: Another Look at an Old Problem." Texas Journal of Public Health.
- Selective Service System
1967 The Selective Service System: Its Concepts, History and Operation. National Headquarters, Selective Service System, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Shields, Patricia M.
1977 Determinants of Service in the Armed Forces During the Vietnam Era. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Human Resource Research, The Ohio State University.
1980 "Enlistment During the Vietnam Era and the 'Representation' Issue of the AVF." Armed Forces and Society 7: 133-151.
- Tax, Sol
1968 The Draft: A Handbook of Facts and Alternatives. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Useem, Michael
1973 Conscription, Protest and Social Conflict. New York: Wiley.
- U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations
1980 Military Draft Registration: Fiscal Years 1980-81. 96th Congress, Second Session. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Walton, George
1967 Let's End the Draft Mess. New York: David McKay Company.
- Woodsley, James
1980 "Bagging the All Volunteer Force." Armed Forces Journal (Feb.): 17-19.

