The Draft: Graduate Schools Fear Effect of New Law

The new draft law is no friend of the American university, and graduate school deans are just beginning to discover why.

"Utter chaos," says one dean, and a recent memo from the American Council on Education reflects more calmly: "Unless changes are made by amending either the statute or the regulations, enrollment in the first two years of graduate and professional schools next fall will be limited to women, veterans, men physically disqualified and those over 25."

In short, the new draft law, passed last summer by Congress, is going to hurt American universities badly. The law disappointed a long line of reformers because it contained only one major change: the gradual elimination of most graduate school deferments. This addition seemed trivial to the reformers, but to deans and students, who remained oblivious to what was going on in Washington, it is now emerging as a monster. The normal intake of students into graduate school could be disrupted for as long as 2 to 3 years, until present college seniors and first-year graduate students have fulfilled their draft obligation.

The new law will not empty the graduate schools. First, the act did not touch students who are now in their second year of graduate study; they will, at the discretion of their local boards, be permitted to complete their degrees. Second, under the act, the National Security Council has the power to add to the five areas of graduate study already sanctioned by Congress for continued deferment: medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, osteopathy, and optometry. The Selective Service System has already reportedly recommended that broad deferment be given the natural science and engineering students. That proposal will be considered by the Interagency Advisory Committee on Critical Occupations and Essential Activities, which is doing the staff work for the National Security Council. However, this group, composed of representatives from Selective Service and the departments of Commerce, Agriculture, Defense, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare, may or may not accept the Selective Service's advice.

But even if it does, universities would still stand to lose large numbers of their graduate students in the social sciences and the humanities. Many business and law schools would suffer equally.

Faced with such an enormous drainage from their campuses, educators are virtually powerless to ask for relief. Most graduate school deans and university presidents are "responsible" men, who feel they should, regardless of their feelings about the war in Vietnam, defer to the official "national interest." They feel impelled not to ask for unlimited graduate deferments; that sort of request would appear self-serving. Moreover, it would also openly flout the intent of Congress expressed in last spring's draft debate—that graduate schools should not become blanket exemptions from the draft.

One avenue of action offers some hope: altering the order (or method) of military induction. Under the present order, among eligible men in the age group 19 to 26, the oldest are called into service first. This system virtually insures that all of next June's college graduates and first-year graduate students (last year's college graduates were offered 1-year graduate deferments to give universities 12 months in which to adjust to the new law) will be drafted if they are physically qualified and not eligible for a new deferment. The average age of induction now is about 20½ years, and because these college graduates are mostly in the 21–23 age range, they will become the oldest men in their local draft board pools and, therefore, the first to be called.

To change this order is to make it possible for some graduate students to be passed by. There are a number of ways to realign the present system, and all of them involve drafting a "prime age group," probably men between 19 and 20. Under one system, advocated by the administration during last year's draft debate, a lottery (called a Fair and Impartial Random Selection—a FAIR system) would be established to select which 19-year-olds would serve. Even now, with the high demands of the war, there are more 19-year-olds than the military needs, and the fundamental problem is to decide which ones to take. Another system, supported by the House Armed Services Committee, would use date of birth as the method of selection; at any given time, the oldest 19-year-olds in a local board's pool would be called. In each of these plans, students who had been given college deferments would be assigned a "constructive" age of 19—that is, treated as if they were 19. A third method, mentioned by some educators, would involve setting up ratios; for every monthly draft call, x percent of 19-year-olds would be taken, x percent of 20-year-olds, and so on.

Reversal of the order of induction is not just the brainchild of worried university administrators. The military has always preferred younger men, because they take better to discipline and have fewer worldly responsibilities (like a wife or a career) to keep them worried. Last winter, a special presidential commission on the draft, chaired by former Deputy Attorney General Burke Marshall, recommended drafting 19-year-olds. Virtually no one disagreed. But because the new Selective Service Act specifically prohibited the introduction of a lottery, the Pentagon decided to keep the present "oldest-first" system. It thought the House committee's alternative selection plan involved inequities.

No *specific detailed* lottery plan was presented last session; Congress was expected to approve the concept of FAIR and allow the administration the flexibility to establish the new system by executive fiat. The House committee, in particular, didn't like this approach and wanted to see something on paper. The administration is now free to submit new legislation for a lottery in the coming session; the chairmen of both Armed Service committees have pledged to give any new bill quick consideration.

No one knows, of course, the answers to the key questions. Will the administration submit new legislation? And, if it does, will the treatment this session be any different from the treatment last session?

In the meantime, all is uncertain for students, faculty members, and administrations. They do not know who is

going to be drafted, or when. Many students are applying for graduate school admissions and fellowships as if the Selective Service Act didn't exist, because there is not much else they can do. Administrators will have difficulty planning class sizes, budgets, and fellowship programs when they believe that many of their prospective students—without knowing how many—will never make it to campus. And there probably will be some repercussions on undergraduate teaching, when faculty members cannot get enough teaching assistants to handle sections in large introductory courses.

Even a shift to the pool of 19-year-olds (with selection made either by lottery or by the House committee's system) would not altogether end the confusion. Because they will be given a "constructive age," college graduates and graduate students do not escape entirely under this system just because they are over 19. Substantial numbers will still be inducted. Betty Vetter, head of the privately supported Scientific Manpower Commission,* has made some rough calculations about the effects of shifting to the pool of 19-year-olds. She figures that, under certain possible circumstances, as many as 60 percent of the college graduates would probably be inducted.

It is obvious that, with various assumptions about the size of the draft-age pool, the size of the draft call, the number of volunteers, and the number of deferred areas of graduate study, the result can easily change. The student may have very little idea what his chances of being called are, especially if the administration's lottery plan fails and the Pentagon decides to resort to the plan of the House committee. The present law aggravates this problem because it does not let the student enter school with a guarantee of completing a full year of study. The old 1-S-C deferment, which allowed him to finish the year, disappeared with the old law. Come September, any student who takes his chances by entering graduate school in the fall could be drafted anytime during the year, his time and possibly his tuition being lost in the process. Will he want to take that risk, or wait a year until his time of maximum vulnerability to the draft has passed?

University administrators are finally beginning to feel the weight of these questions. Two weeks ago, in Boston, the Association of Graduate Schools (AGS) passed a resolution asking that students be informed at "natural times of transition" (the last year of high school, the last year of college) of their chances of being drafted. The association supported a lottery and asked that graduate students who have begun a degree program be allowed to finish.

The American Association of Universities, meeting at the same time in Chicago, considered the AGS resolution but decided not to adopt it; instead, the AAU will send representatives to Washington to speak to government officials. According to AAU spokesmen, the association's representatives will only plead for a speedy clarification of the present situation, not advance a favored plan for changing the draft. Even this goal, however limited, may be difficult to achieve. If the administration decides, for example, to submit a new lottery plan, it can move no more quickly than Congress does, and the next session does not open until January.

Probably the best the universities can do is hope. Many of the changes they are supporting have already fared rather poorly in Congress. Only an administration that is convinced of the inherent advantages of another induction system—one approaching the military ideal of younger induction—will want to assume the political problems of reopening the draft issue before a hostile House. Any cause for change will probably have to be made on its military and manpower merits alone. The universities, increasingly identified as centers of resistance to the war, would probably not be at their most persuasive before the Armed Services committees.—ROBERT J. SAMUELSON

*The best summary of the new draft act can be found in a small pamphlet prepared by the Scientific Manpower Commission, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.; 25 cents.

APPOINTMENTS

George W. Stroke, professor of electrical engineering, University of Michigan, to professor of engineering and medical biophysics, State University of New York at Stony Brook. . . . **Lindsay S. Olive**, professor of botany, Columbia University, to professor of botany, University of North Carolina. . . . A major reorganization of the University of Pittsburgh has led to the following appointments: **Charles H. Peake**, vice chancellor of the academic disciplines, to acting provost; **A. C. Van Dusen**, vice chancellor of the social professions schools, to vice chancellor for program development and public affairs; **David Halliday**, dean of the division of natural sciences, to dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; and **Francis S. Cheever**, dean of the School of Medicine, to vice chancellor for the health professions. . . . **Edward F. Bland**, clinical professor of medicine, Harvard Medical School, to clinical professor emeritus. . . . **Hendrick W. Bode**, soon to retire as vice president of the Bell Telephone Laboratories, to Gordon McKay professor of systems engineering, Harvard.

RECENT DEATHS

Robert Boggs, 65; former dean of New York University Post-Graduate Medical School; 25 October.

Harold W. Glattly, 65; former chief surgeon of the First and Second Armies, and executive secretary of the prosthetic-orthotic education committee, the skeletal system committee, and the genito-urinary system committee, Division of Medical Sciences, National Research Council; 26 October.

Carl C. Kiess, 80; professor of optics and spectroscopy, Georgetown College Observatory; 16 October.

Lawrence Litchfield, Jr., 67; retired president and board chairman of the Aluminum Company of America; 28 October.

Bayes M. Norton, 64; professor of chemistry, Kenyon College; 25 October.

William H. Perkins, 73; former dean, and professor emeritus of preventive medicine, Jefferson Medical College; 22 October.

Robert B. Sosman, 86; professor emeritus of ceramics, Rutgers University; 30 October.

Joseph Stoeckeler, 59; principal soil scientist, U.S. Forest Service; 16 October.

Willem A. van Bergeijk, 37; professor, center for Neural Sciences and department of zoology, Indiana University; 8 October.

Stephen S. Visher, 79; professor emeritus of geography, Indiana University; 25 October.

Adam H. Zimmerman, 65; former chairman of the Defense Research Board, Ottawa, Canada; 30 October.

Erratum: In "Resonance rotation of Venus" by I. I. Shapiro (28 July, p. 423), the word "included" in the second line of the abstract should be "inclined." The longitude of feature 1 in Table 1, under present determination, is "12.1" whereas the correct value is "128.1."