Military Conscription: Perhaps the biggest example of sexism in Western Civilization today

*It must be stated from the outset that this article is purely against conscription and not voluntary military service. Voluntary military service can be a wonderful and fulfilling career. If you are young man (or indeed a young woman!) who is considering a military career, you should definitely look into it, as a military career just might be perfect for you. Also, if you did voluntarily enlist in the military, don’t you dare try to use the arguments in this article to justify desertion. Finally, to those of you who are defending or have defended your country, thank you for your service and your sacrifice!*

Perhaps the greatest example of sex discrimination present in the world today is that of military conscription. How can a society claim to be in favor of sexual equality while only requiring men to do military service? The point of this essay is to argue against both conscription in general, and also—and probably more importantly—against the sexist nature of conscription laws. It must however be stated at this point that from a purely men’s rights point of view, conscription is in and of itself acceptable provided that the conscription laws apply equally to both men and women. Having stated that, like most masculists, like me, favor the abolition of conscription altogether rather than expanding it to include women in order to right the sexist wrong of conscription policies as they currently exist in most of the countries which have them.

Let’s not kid ourselves: conscription is a form of glorified slavery. For those who think that this is an overstated (or even offensive) comparison, realize that the definition of slavery is involuntary servitude, and that’s exactly what conscription is. However, as was pointed out in the beginning of this article, military service is not in and of itself a bad thing, provided that it is done on a voluntary basis. In the same manner, slaves were often required to do farm work. Farm work is also not in and of itself a bad thing, nor is it degrading. Therefore, the objections to slavery were not over the fact that slaves were forced to do farm work; it was over the fact that they were not free to choose. The same thing is true with regards to military service; it’s only a bad thing if it is forced onto people.

There have been numerous arguments made in favor of conscription. One of the more common ones is that it is necessary for the defense of the country. However, this mentality is a throwback to the First World War. Back then, warfare basically consisted of throwing a bunch of poorly trained conscripts into the trenches and counting how many were left at the end of the day. This occurred day after day until one side declared that it had had enough.

This is not, however, what modern warfare is all about. After all, while the threat of external invasion has not gone away altogether, today this threat is nearly gone from the world. Instead, the threat to national security comes either from internal insurrections (for example, from domestic terrorist groups like the FARC in Columbia) or from external terrorist groups. This threat requires—especially the external terrorist one—a small, highly trained group of elite soldiers who are capable of sneaking into a foreign country, destroying a terrorist cell, and sneaking back out before anyone realizes that they were ever there. Conscripts who serve for a year or less are not capable of such operations. Indeed, think of all the money that is wasted on training people who are already counting down the days until they can leave before they even arrive, and leave the instant that they are allowed to, never to return. In an era when many countries are facing growing healthcare and pension expenses associated with an aging population, is this really the place where countries should be spending their money? Therefore, while there may very well be a few countries in the world which could claim that conscription is a necessary evil based on a national security argument, these countries are few indeed. And even in these countries, conscription is still an evil. As a result, these countries need to abolish conscription the absolute first instance that it becomes feasible. Moreover, if these countries truly need conscription, then it must be applied equally to women.

In addition to the national security argument, proponents of conscription have tried to make a number of other arguments in favor of its existence. The most common pro-conscription argument (after the national security argument) is that conscription is society’s last chance to catch people who are on the wrong track and to straighten them out. This argument is wrong for several reasons. First of all, it ignores the fact that prior to reaching draft age, people who need to have their lives straightened out have (at least until their mid-teens) attended (usually state-run) schools. Therefore, one institution—one which saw them over a number of years—failed to catch them and turn them around. If this failed to straighten them out, what’s to say that the army will succeed? And if the army fails, then what?

Also, it must be remembered that there are plenty of criminals and drug addicts in countries in which military service is required. Indeed, many of these people completed their required military service, and still lead a life of crime or drug addiction. Moreover, this argument also ignores the fact that many conscripts found their military service experience—especially if during a time of war—to be a very traumatic one, so much so that they later have trouble functioning in society. As a result, many turn to drug or alcohol and/or join criminal gangs. In short, in this regard conscription actually has the *opposite* effect.

Furthermore, this argument completely ignores the fact this would require the drafting of “the many” in order to reach “the few”. Besides, the type of people who are prone to a life of crime may very well prove to be the types who manage to get out of the requirement anyway. Finally, many—though not all!—of the supports of this argument are against extending conscription to include women, and it is quite sexist to assume that there are no women in society who are on the wrong track and need to be straightened out.

Another argument—and an even worse one at that—in favor of conscription is that it is a rite of passage for young men into adulthood. First of all, no rite of passage should ever be legally required. Besides, do we really need a rite of passage at all, let alone one like this? And if a rite of passage into adulthood is needed, then why is there no female rite of passage?

One of the sillier arguments in favor of conscription is that it gives men positive experiences and skills for life. However, whether a man has positive experiences in his life is up to him. It is not the role of a government to ensure that its citizens have positive experiences in their lives. Are supporters of this argument suggesting that each country should create a “ministry for positive experiences”? Besides, this thinking totally ignores the fact that if these conscripts were not in the military, they would probably not be sitting at home and watching television all day. Instead, they would probably be out doing things such as studying, working, or travelling. Don’t people have positive experiences from doing these things? Moreover, it cannot be ignored that many conscripts endure abuse and in general find military service to have been more of a negative rather than a positive experience in their lives. Finally, if military service is such a positive experience in the lives of conscripts, then why not extend it to women? After all, isn’t a shame not to require women to have such a positive experience in their lives?

Another silly argument in favor of conscription is that it’s great that everyone takes his turn defending the country. The alternative would be that only some do it. First of all, it was never *everyone*, as the law has always been sexist. Besides, while there is no doubt that society needs soldiers (and let’s all be thankful that there are people in society who wish to be soldiers), it is also true that society needs doctors, nurses, teachers, firefighters, police officers, carpenters, electricians, factory workers, farmers, and several hundred more occupations. No one is ever legally required to have any of these occupations. Without just one of these occupations, society as we know it would not function. Is it not also true that only some perform these needed occupations?

However, just as the supporters of conscription have tried to make weak arguments in its favor, those of us who oppose conscription have been able to make stronger arguments against it. The strongest argument against conscription is also the most obvious: it is a legal requirement, and societies should always keep legal requirements to a minimum. Also, since it is a requirement, the likelihood of abuse at the hands of military officials is much stronger. There are two reasons for this. First of all, since the conscript does not have the ability to leave, he will basically have to just endure the abuse (more on this later). Secondly, since there will always be a steady supply of new recruits, the military officials do not have to worry about stories of abuse driving away potential recruits. Also, one cannot ignore the fact that conscription interrupts schooling and careers. Moreover, it usually occurs right as young men are reaching adulthood, when they should be out doing things like travelling and finding themselves. Finally, since so many of the recruits do not wish to be in the military and furthermore resent being there, they will only put in a minimal effort. Should the security of a country truly be based on large numbers of people who resent being in the military and can’t wait to leave? Does that not just hurt the morale of the others there?

In addition to the arguments against conscription in general, there is also the fact that conscription laws have traditionally been sexist. Indeed, the modern state of Israel is one of the few (if not only!) places were women have ever been drafted. Even there the law is still sexist, as men have a three-year requirement, whereas women only have a two-year requirement. The sexist aspect of conscription has often, unfortunately, been overlooked whenever the merits—or more accurately the lack thereof!—of conscription are being debated. However, the time has long come to address the fact that conscription laws constitute one of the most (if not the most!) blatant examples of gender discrimination anywhere in the world today. How can societies which so claim to champion gender equality hold on to such an obvious example of sexism?

The good news is that conscription is on the decline worldwide. Indeed, in the case of Europe, the number of countries with conscription has gone from nearly all in 1994 to less than half today, with many of the countries which still have it either officially phasing it out or at least talking about phasing it out. As of now, only 14 European countries[[1]](#footnote-1) still require military service with no plans to phase it out. These countries are Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Moldova, Norway, Russia, Switzerland, and Ukraine. It is also important to note that some countries, like the Netherlands for example, never officially abolished conscription; they just stopped calling men up. Indeed, Dutch men are informed upon turning 17 that they have been included on an official conscription registry. While this definitely represents a huge improvement, it is still a sexist law which needs to be abolished.

In the case of Europe, citizens in member states of the European Union now have a powerful tool in the fight against sexist conscription laws. The EU has recently ratified the Lisbon Treaty, which is legally binding in all 27 member states of the EU. The Lisbon Treaty clearly states in several places that there is to be complete and total equality between men and women. Likewise, the Lisbon Treaty clearly forbids forced labor. Therefore, citizens in Austria, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, and Greece should now challenge conscription laws in court under the idea that they violate the Lisbon Treaty. After which, it should be made very clear to other countries such as Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, Moldova, and Georgia that they will have to abolish conscription if they ever wish to join the EU. Moreover, the Dutch (among others with similar situations) should also challenge their conscription on the grounds that it is sexist, even though it has been over a decade since anyone has been drafted in the Netherlands.

The abolition of conscription is not unique to Europe, as many of the countries of the Americas and other parts of the world have also abolished conscription in the same time period. In the case of the Americas, 9 countries: Bolivia, Brazil, Columbia, Cuba, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, and Venezuela still have conscription. In addition, the British territory of Bermuda also has conscription for its militia. As is also the case with Europe, a decade and a half ago nearly all of the Spanish-speaking countries had conscription. However, it is important to note that as is the case with some European countries, some of the Latin American countries which have abolished conscription have not technically abolished it; they have merely stopped calling men up. Nonetheless, this still represents a huge improvement.

At this point, it is necessary to examine a few particularly egregious cases of conscription from around the world.

The first case to examine is that of Russia. Even though former Russian President Boris Yeltsin promised in 1998 that Russia would abolish conscription, this sadly has not occurred. Instead, the abuse of conscripts in Russia has become legendary.

The most dramatic example of this occurred on New Year’s Eve in 2005, when a conscript, Andrei Sychev, was so badly abuse that his legs and genitals had to be amputated. The Russian state did later prosecute those involved and paid for genital reconstructive surgery for the victim, but what little comfort that must have been (Source: <http://www.theage.com.au/news/world/genital-rescue/2006/01/30/1138469635512.html>).

Another outrageous example of conscript abuse in Russia is a scandal involving Russian conscripts allegedly sold as prostitutes. In addition, there have been convictions of officers for using conscripts as slaves. Needless to say: “the violent bullying…results in hundreds of non-combat deaths and suicides every year” (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4674366.stm>).

However, the good news is that last year (2011) then President Dmitry Medvedev was forced to acknowledge that conscription would have to be abolished in Russia. He stated that it would probably be sometime in the 2020s (Source: [www.strategypage.com/htmw/htatrit/articles/20110414.aspx](http://www.strategypage.com/htmw/htatrit/articles/20110414.aspx)). However, it may have to be sooner, as draft dodging has become rampant and is no longer seen as unpatriotic. Indeed, it is seen as a logical form of self-preservation in order to avoid abuse.

Another case to examine is that of Cyprus. What makes the case of Cyprus disturbing is the requirement that teenage boys (and young adult men for that matter) obtain exit visas prior to leaving the country:

It is extremely important for male visitors with parents of Cypriot origin to confirm their status as to completing **Cyprus Army Conscription** obligations. When you leave Cyprus, your documentation will be scrutinised at your departure point, and if you do not have the correct documentation, such as an **Exit Visa**, then you may be detained and not allowed to travel. (Emphasis in original) [www.cyprusexpat.co.uk/article/id:2/cyprus-army--cyprus-army-service](http://www.cyprusexpat.co.uk/article/id:2/cyprus-army--cyprus-army-service)

Keep in mind, the above-mentioned requirement does not only apply to Cypriot citizens, but also to males who have a Cypriot parent. While such men could probably easily obtain such permits if they are not (and certainly have never been) Cypriot citizens, it is still an extra burden placed on men only.

One final case to examine is that of Singapore. Although this study has been mainly about Western countries, Singapore’s enforcement of its conscription law is so draconian that it must be examined. For one thing, like Cyprus, Singapore also scrutinizes young men leaving the country in order to be sure that they are not leaving for the want of avoiding conscription. However, in the case of Singapore, there is an even more outrageous example: it is not even possible to renounce Singaporean citizen until after having completed military service:

In addition, for a male citizen, the government may withhold the registration of declaration of renunciation of Singapore Citizenship under Article 128(2)(b) of the Constitution of the Republic of Singapore, the provisions which are listed below:

If the declaration is made during any war in which Singapore is engaged

Or

If the declaration is made by a person subject to the Enlistment Act unless he has:

1. Discharged his liability for full-time service under Section 12 of the Act
2. Rendered at least 3 years of service under Section 13 of the Act in lieu of such full-time service
3. Complied with such conditions as may be determined by the Government

What this essentially implies is that if the male citizen is subject to the Enlistment Act and has not discharged his duty for National Service (or equivalent service), the Government has the right to withhold his renunciation of Singapore Citizenship. ([www.guidemesingapore.com/relocation/citizenship/renouncing-singapore-citizenship](http://www.guidemesingapore.com/relocation/citizenship/renouncing-singapore-citizenship))

This requirement is especially egregious. After all, if a man is so eager to avoid military service to the point that he is willing to give up his citizenship—knowing full well that he will have almost zero chance of ever getting it back—then by all means he should be allowed to. How oppressive to force military service in such circumstances.

A Selective Service Registration

*It must be stated that nothing in this sub-chapter should be seen as encouraging non-compliance with the law. If you are a young man turning 18 in the United States, complying with this unjust law is probably your best option. Failure to comply—though laudable—will probably only hurt you in the end. However, if you did fail to comply, realize: you did nothing wrong!*

In the case of the United States of America, conscription has thankfully been far less common throughout the course of history than it has been in other Western countries. Indeed, it has not existed at all since January 1973. However, that unfortunately does not mean that there has been no sexist legal requirement for men with regards to the military in the United States of America. Instead, there is the unfortunate present of “selective service registration”. Within 30 days of turning 18, all men in the United States of America are required to register with selective service. This law even applies to all lawful permanent residents. Indeed, if a man becomes a lawful permanent resident in the United States prior to the age of 26 (at which point it is no longer possible to register) and fails to register, it is nearly impossible for him to ever obtain US citizenship.

Selective service registration was ended in 1975 by President Gerald Ford, two years after the military draft following the Vietnam War was abolished. However, in 1980 President Jimmy Carter brought it back in response to the Soviet Union’s invasion of Afghanistan. Today, the Soviet Union no longer exists, and it is the United States of America that is now in Afghanistan. Therefore, the very reason given for bringing back draft registration is simply no longer valid. And yet, it lives on.

Not only has the reason for bringing registration back long ended—the Soviet Union pulled out of Afghanistan more than two decades ago!—it is obvious that bringing back draft registration did not serve its stated purpose, as it took the Soviet Union nearly a decade to pull out of Afghanistan. Clearly this was not the reason that the Soviet Union pulled out of Afghanistan. And if it was the reason, then draft registration has long outlived its purpose. Besides, name one potential enemy of the US that is deterred by this system!

Not only is this registry totally irrelevant, it is also quite expensive. The US wastes over 20 million dollars a year on this (Source: the CATO Institute). While that may be a tiny amount of the overall budget, it is still a rather large sum of money that is being wasted, especially when one adds up the total amount over the last three decades. Think of what could have been done with that money. For example, that money could have been spent on hospitals for veterans. Besides, if such a registry were to ever be truly needed, think of how quickly and easily it could be started up again. There is therefore no reason to be keeping it on a continual basis.

As was stated previously in this section, it is nearly impossible to obtain US citizenship if a young man became a lawful permanent resident of the US prior to turning 26 without registering. However, the inability to obtain US citizenship is not the only thing that can happen to a man if he fails to comply. It is also nearly impossible to obtain a job with the federal government or many state governments. Such men are ineligible for all federally funded financial assistance to attend college. More recently, a majority of US states now require that men between the ages of 18 and 26 be registered in order to have a driver’s license. Indeed, note the information contained on the Virginia Department of Motor Vehicle’s website:

If you are a male U. S. citizen living in the U. S. or abroad or a male immigrant (permanent resident alien) residing in the U. S., and you are age 18 through 25, you are required to register with Selective Service System. With registration, you will be eligible for:

* Federal student loans and grants
* State student aid in the Commonwealth of Virginia
* Job training benefits
* Most federal jobs and jobs with the US Postal Service
* State jobs in the Commonwealth of Virginia
* US citizenship for male immigrants seeking citizenship

<http://www.dmv.state.va.us/webdoc/general/sss.asp>

First of all, note the poor punctuation with regards to spacing. Secondly, it is important to note that this information was not clearly posted on their website; it was necessary to search for it via the site map. Likewise, note how nowhere in the above-mentioned quote is there any reference to the fact that registration is unfortunately required in order for men between the ages of 18-25 to have a driver’s license in Virginia. Both of those facts clearly indicate that even the government realizes that this sexist nonsense is nothing to be proud of. Most importantly, note how disingenuously the above-mentioned quote is worded. It states “with registration you will be eligible for”. While this statement may well be technically accurate, it is worded in an inaccurate and incredibly patronizing manner. After all, registration does not make a man eligible for any of the above-mentioned items; it is just that failure to register makes a man ineligible.

While there is no question that driving is a privilege and not a right, it still begs the question: what connection is their between compliance with a sexist law and the ability to drive a car? For that matter, what connection is there between registration and financial aid for college? The answer is simple: the authorities in the US don’t have the courage to enforce this nonsense law. Indeed, since being reinstated in 1980 only 20 prosecutions have ever occurred, and none since 1986 (Source: <http://hasbrouck.org/draft/prosecutions.html>). As a result, the authorities have found a way to engage in “backdoor enforcement”. Such a system is truly disingenuous. If a country is going to have an unjust law, then it should have the courage to enforce it. At a minimum, they should just let the law wither away and become more of a suggestion. The worst thing that a country can do is to create a backdoor enforcement system by making life difficult on those who fail to comply without actually prosecuting them. Indeed, by refusing to hire men who are at least 26 years old and failed to register, the government is in essence punishing these men for a crime for which they were never even charged, let alone convicted.

In order to further encourage compliance, the US government has been running a series of irritating and quite frankly insulting radio commercials to encourage registration. In one commercial, a father tries to have a conversation with his son about life’s important topics. One of the topics he tries to discuss with his son is about girls. If he wants to talk to his son about girls, he should mention that they are privileged not to be effected by this sexist, useless law. The commercial ends with the announcer mentioning that you (a reference to parents) may have to repeat your message. How sexist and insulting to assume that teenage boys are stupid and have to have things told to them several times in order to understand!

Even more infuriating than this commercial are the ones in which women are telling men about the importance of registering. In one such commercial, a woman talks about how much she respects men who register and that we must all do are part to keep the United States safe. First of all, her “respect” is neither needed nor desired. Second of all, she mentions that we must *all* do our part to keep the US safe. That begs the question, what is her part? Basically, her part is getting paid to voluntarily do a radio commercial. Such women should be considered as anti-male. If nothing else, nobody likes to be patronized and her claiming that she “respects” men who register was incredibly patronizing.

What is also infuriating about commercials using women to promote this sexist law is that the US government is clearly trying to use female sex appeal to reach young men. This begs the question: where are the feminists on this? Are these not the same feminists who always become so livid any other time that female sex appeal is used to get the attention of men? Finally, imagine men being used in a commercial to promote a legal requirement that affected women only, not that such a requirement would ever be allowed to exist, nor should it.

Instead of being called “selective service”, this nonsense should be known as “sexist service”, or perhaps “selective equality”. Indeed, feminists who claim to believe in equality but who have no objection to the blatant sexism in this law are guilty of believing in “selective gender equality”.

However, rather than extending this law to include women, the best thing to do is to simply abolish it. After all, if the attacks of September 11 along with the subsequent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq did not necessitate the need for a draft—and they didn’t!—then clearly nothing will. In addition, the records need to be destroyed and no one should ever be required to state whether he complied with this sexist law.

B Military Conscription and the False Argument of Pregnancy

Some have tried to justify the sexist laws with regards to conscription with the argument of pregnancy. The argument is that since only women have pregnancy, it is acceptable to require military service of only men. These people believe the conscription polices of their respective countries are fair because: “women have pregnancy and men have the military”.

This argument is absurd for a number of reasons. First of all, there is the obvious fact that pregnancy is a choice whereas military service is a legal requirement; how can a choice be compared to a legal requirement?! After all, women can choose to serve in the military and never be pregnant. By contrast, women can choose to have children and never serve in the military. Likewise, women can also choose to do either both or neither. Therefore, women have four options whereas men have one legal requirement. Is this equality? Moreover, the supporters of the pregnancy argument need to be asked a simple question: if you think that it is fair to only require military service of men because women have pregnancy, then do you think that countries which don’t require military service of men are being unfair to women? After all, based on that thinking, women still have pregnancy, whereas the men have nothing. If the answer to this question is no, then how can both systems (requiring military service of men versus not requiring military service of men) be fair to both men and women?

Supporters of this argument point out that societies need to repopulate themselves, just as society needs to defend itself. However, while this point may seem logical at first glance, a closer inspection soon reveals that the mindset behind it is flawed. While it is true that societies need to repopulate themselves, that does not mean that there is a connection between this and the need that societies have to defend themselves. After all, would it be wrong for governments to levy higher taxes on men so as to pay for the health care costs associated with pregnancy? This example would actually constitute a stronger connection between pregnancy and a sexist law that goes against men.

However, this would also be ridiculous because—if for no other reason—it is a myth to believe that there is a connection between a specific tax and a specific budgetary expense. After all, in the end all money collected in taxes merely goes in the government’s coffers. There would therefore be no more connection between an extra tax on men and healthcare costs associated with pregnancy, as there currently is no connection between pregnancy and conscription. Since we all recognize the absurdity of the example of charging men extra taxes to pay for pregnancy related healthcare costs, can we not all now see the absurdity of the pregnancy argument with regards to justifying sexist conscriptions laws? Moreover, can we not all now also see how dangerous this pregnancy argument is in that it could be used to justify *any* discrimination against men? In addition, under this thinking could a government also *require* pregnancy of women? After all, societies need to repopulate themselves.

Likewise, failure to perform military service is often seen as unpatriotic. Is it therefore also true that women who refuse to have children are also unpatriotic? Also, if a man who is still young enough to perform military service were to apply for a foreign citizenship, he would often be expected to perform military service for his adopted country. This often even applies to men who aren’t citizens but merely permanent residents. By contrast, if a woman of childbearing age were to apply for a foreign citizenship, would the immigration officials ask her how many children she plans to have? Such a question would, understandably, by quite offensive. However, asking young men whether they would be willing to perform military service should be seen as equally offensive. It must also be mentioned that there are cases of women who have dual citizenship whereas their brothers do not, simply because their brothers are unwilling (as are their sisters!) to perform military service. Is this fair? After all, many of these women will never be pregnant.

Moreover, should men who promise never to cause pregnancy—even to the point of getting vasectomies—be exempt from conscription? After all, if it is possible and acceptable for women to never be pregnant and never be in the military, then why can’t the same thing be true of men?

Besides, while it is true that only men have military service, it is not entirely true that only women have pregnancy when one considers the fact that women understandably expect their husbands to look after them during their pregnancies. Indeed, it is the responsibility of men to care for the mothers of their future children during pregnancy. However, do these same women look after their husbands while they’re in the military by doing things like helping them to clean their barracks or bringing them water when they need it? Indeed, while pregnancy (for the most part) requires a woman to have been with a man and therefore gives her a man who can be reasonably expected to care for the mother of his future child, military service does not require a man to have a woman who could potentially look after him. Moreover, even if these women wanted to assist their husbands/ boyfriends during military service they wouldn’t even be permitted to do so. Therefore, in this sense men even have pregnancy—albeit at a much reduced level—whereas women still do not have military service at all.

Finally, it must be remembered that being pregnant, giving birth, and breastfeeding give mothers a special bond with their children that fathers will never have. Likewise, while women are always certain as to how many children they have and as to whom their children are, this is not the case with men. It is not uncommon for men to discover that their children really aren’t theirs, or to discover years later that they had children that they were unaware of and therefore missed out on raising. As a result these facts, many men actually consider the fact that pregnancy applies to women only to be a disadvantage for men. In short, this is a ridiculous argument in favor of sexist conscription policies on so many levels.

C Conclusions

Make no mistake about it: conscription is the glorified national sexist enslavement of young men. As a result, it is truly an abomination. It is sad that such an abomination could be permitted to exist in the 21st century. If you are a man who avoided conscription—even to the point of violating the law—realize: you did nothing wrong. Moreover, you did not disgrace your country. Instead, your country disgraced you! Indeed, shame on your country! If you violated such a law, that should not be held against you, since you should have never been placed in that position to begin with. Indeed, people who avoid sexist conscription laws should be considered in the same manner in which society views people who escaped from slavery. However, it is also very important to note that if you are a man who served as an unwilling conscript, you should never be considered as a traitor the cause of men’s liberation. Instead, thank you for your service to your country, even though it was wrongly forced on you against your will.

As for previous time periods, perhaps the case can be made that conscription was a necessary evil. After all, throughout history it was basically a case of conquer or be conquered; create an empire or become a part of someone else’s empire. In such an environment, perhaps societies sadly had no choice but to require military service. Furthermore, the fact that it only affected men was understandable, as in the past only men were in the military and only men administered governments. After all, no one was claiming in past centuries that gender equality was a good idea. Indeed, in the past very few would have even suggested such a concept. However, it’s now the 21st century! Both gender roles and conscription have long become dated concepts, and thankfully so. As was stated earlier, the good news is that conscription is on the decline throughout both Western civilization and the world as a whole in general. Furthermore, attitudes towards conscription in many societies have been changing over the last couple of decades, as many people have thankfully come to realize just how horrible conscription is. It can be stated with confidence that it is now only a matter of time until more—and hopefully someday all!—countries abolish conscription.

However, if societies insist on both keeping conscription and keeping it sexist, than perhaps this small proposal could be adopted into law: that only men be allowed to enforce conscription laws. After all, if the law only affects men than does it not make sense that only men enforce it? Furthermore, it is infuriating to see women enforcing sexist laws against men. Therefore, only male police officers should be allowed to arrest men on conscription violations, and only male judges should be allowed to hear such cases. This proposal, by the way, extends to selective service registration in the US. Indeed, selective service should adopt an official policy of hiring men only.

Another small proposal for societies which insist on keeping sexist conscription laws: such countries should give military veterans extra consideration when applying for government jobs. Indeed, it is already this way in the United States. However, the US military has been all-volunteer since 1973. Such policies are good, as societies should always give back to those who are willing to defend it. However, in countries with general sexist conscription, if such a policy were to be adopted, feminists would almost certainly immediately view this as being an unfair advantage for men, never mind that the legal requirement is and always has been extremely unfair to men. That, however, is sadly of zero concern to feminists, in spite of their erroneous claims that they believe in gender equality.

In the end, if societies truly wish to embrace the concept of gender equality—which every society should—then conscription laws which apply to men only can no longer be allowed to exist, as this is a huge contradiction. As the expression goes, if it walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, then it’s a duck. Therefore, if it walks like discrimination, quacks like discrimination, then it *is* discrimination. This is not just discrimination, but one of the biggest (if not *the* biggest) examples of discrimination in existence. Likewise, as has just been shown, the pregnancy argument is completely invalid and cannot be used to justify this sexist double standard. If you are a woman who supports sexist conscription laws, then you should be considered anti-male. And if that’s a little harsh then remembered, it is easy for you to glorify a concept which does not affect you. To all you women who agree that this is sexist and wrong, your support is truly heartwarming. The good news is that this dilemma (the concept of gender equality alongside a sexist conscription policy) has a very easy solution: simply abolish conscription. Problem solved!

However, at this point it is not enough to merely abolish conscription. It is also necessary to pardon all men who have been convicted of draft dodging, since all their only crime was avoiding a sexist and therefore unjust law. The same thing should also be true for men who did things like renounce citizenship or had themselves declared mentally insane in order to avoid conscription. These men should now be allowed to come forward and have these things reversed. In order to back this up, laws making it illegal to discriminate against those who avoided conscription also need to be passed. Likewise, constitutional guarantees should be passed to ensure that this never happens again. Finally, an official apology needs to be issued.

Sources:

The Age: <http://www.theage.com.au/news/world/genital-rescue/2006/01/30/1138469635512.html>

The BBC: [www.bbc.co.uk](http://www.bbc.co.uk)

The CATO Institute: [www.cato.org](http://www.cato.org)

The CIA World Fact Book: [www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook](http://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook)

Cypriot Expat: [www.cyprusexpat.co.uk/article/id:2/cyprus-army--cyprus-army-service](http://www.cyprusexpat.co.uk/article/id:2/cyprus-army--cyprus-army-service)

Department of Motor Vehicles, Virginia: <http://www.dmv.state.va.us/webdoc/general/sss.asp>

The European Union’s homepage: europa.eu

Guide Me Singapore: [www.guidemesingapore.com/relocation/citizenship/renouncing-singapore-citizenship](http://www.guidemesingapore.com/relocation/citizenship/renouncing-singapore-citizenship)

Hasbrouck.org: [hasbrouck.org/draft/prosecutions.html](http://hasbrouck.org/draft/prosecutions.html)

Nation Master: [www.nationmaster.com](http://www.nationmaster.com)

The New York Times Blog: <http://thelede.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/02/13/russian-soldiers-sold-for-sex/>

Selective Service System: [www.sss.gov](http://www.sss.gov)

Strategypage: [www.strategypage.com/htmw/htatrit/articles/20110414.aspx](http://www.strategypage.com/htmw/htatrit/articles/20110414.aspx)

The United States State Department’s homepage: [www.state.gov](http://www.state.gov)

War Resisters’ International: <http://wri-irg.org>

1. It is surprising difficult to obtain information on which countries have conscription and which ones don’t, as sources differ. These lists have been comprised after extensive searches of numerous sources. Although it can be stated with near certainty that these lists are accurate, they may not be 100% accurate. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)