



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 10, NO. 11, SECTION 2

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JUNE, 1977

## E.R.A. and the Military Academies

Under pressure from the women's lib movement, Congress passed a law ordering the U.S. military academies -- West Point, Annapolis, and Colorado Springs -- to admit some women, starting in the summer of 1976. Before passage of the law, U.S. military leaders unanimously opposed this reversal of our men-only policy, which had been proved valid for 200 years.

But military officers must obey the law and echo national policy whether they agree with it or not. Military officers are now required not only to admit women to the military academies, but to tell the American public that "this is a wonderful new policy," "it's working out splendidly," and "the women cadets are doing just as well as the men."

Every military officer knows that, if he does not say these things, even though they are lies, his career will be ended and he will get the same humiliating treatment that President Carter dished out to General John K. Singlaub, one of our most highly decorated war heroes, after he dared to give a truthful answer to a *Washington Post* reporter about the military facts-of-life in Korea.

It is abundantly clear that the American people will never be given the truth about the folly of admitting women to the military academies by any military officer on active duty. He wouldn't dare.

Occasionally a retired military officer dares to speak out against this policy. For example, General William Westmoreland in May 1976 said: "Maybe you could find one woman in 10,000 to lead in combat, but she would be a freak, and we're not running the Military Academy for freaks. . . . I don't believe women can carry a pack, live in a foxhole, or go a week without taking a bath."

Such frankness is not characteristic of military officers even when they are retired. They know that they are subject to court-martial even after retirement. A lifetime of obedience to the principle of "civilian control of the military" has taught them the habit of keeping their lips buttoned.

So, when you read news stories about how splendidly women cadets and midshipmen are performing in the military academies, you should recognize this as

a combination of (1) the same type of women's lib propaganda that gushes forth daily from the pages and the programs of the pro-lib media, combined with (2) the statements of military officers who feel compelled to support a mistaken national policy in order to avoid getting the General Singlaub treatment.

### What Would ERA Do?

In the 1976-77 academic year, West Point admitted 119 women out of 1,485 cadets. (By May 1977, only 88 were left.) The Naval Academy at Annapolis admitted 81 women out of 1,292 midshipmen. (By May 1977, only 64 were left.) The Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs admitted 157 women out of 1,593. (By May 1977, only 130 were left.)

If the Equal Rights Amendment is ever ratified, however, that sort of quota or "tokenism" would become unconstitutional. The military academies would be compelled to admit equal numbers of women and men. If the academies do not do this immediately, the militant women's lib radicals, with their high-priced legal talent, will litigate to achieve court-ordered reverse discrimination to bring this about. Based on what Federal judges have ordered in police department and industrial cases, their chances of winning would be excellent.

The result would be destructive of our military defenses and of the morale of our fighting forces. The rights of the majority of the American people, as well as of the individual men who would be denied admission, would be trampled on by the radical women's lib minority.

It should be clearly kept in mind that the purpose of the military academies is NOT to provide free college and travel for deserving young men and women. The purpose is to produce a highly-trained elite corps of officers to lead American troops in battle in the defense of our country. History, logic, common sense, and all available evidence teach us that this task is performed better by men than by women. If ERA is ever ratified, it would result in sacrificing the defense of America to the strident demands of a selfish little pressure group.

# Putting women in foxholes

By Hanson W. Baldwin

*Hanson W. Baldwin is one of the most distinguished military writers in America. For many years, he was the military editor of the New York Times, and his articles appeared frequently in other journals. He is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy. This article appeared in the Waterbury (Conn.) Sunday Republican of March 28, 1976, and is reprinted here with permission.*

In the "most significant change in their history"—a change with portentous implications for the future of the armed forces and perhaps for the country—the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, and the U.S. Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs—are going co-ed.

An amendment to the Defense Appropriation bill, approved by Congress last year on a voice vote (despite the unanimous objections of the services) requires the admission and training of women on the same basis as men "except for those minimum essential adjustments" necessary "because of physiological differences."

Make no mistake about it, this vote-getting ploy may well mark a watershed in U.S. history.

It is my belief that this change is destructive—not constructive—to the military and to our past way of life. If it is fortified and perpetuated by the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment, the internal problems the services face—already greater than in any prior era—will be tremendously magnified, and the nation's family structure—the basis of any stable society—will inevitably be weakened.

Let us look, first, at the military, and specifically, the service academies.

## No trade schools

The academies have as their only raison d'être the production of professional officers for the combat forces. They are neither trade schools nor liberal arts colleges; their fundamental purpose is to produce the hard core of the nation's trained and dedicated fighting men to preserve the best traditions and experience of the past while developing the leaders of the future. If the academies deviate from this fundamental purpose, they are not worth their cost; Yale, Harvard, MIT, UConn are better suited for the scholar of tradition than West Point, Annapolis or Colorado Springs.

The maintenance of this fundamental purpose is the first problem the academies face in carrying out the co-ed law. For, on the books is another law—still unrepealed—which makes a built-in conflict inescapable. The service schools exist to produce professional combat officers, yet an existing law prohibits women from serving on combat ships or flying aircraft in combat. There is no law prohibiting

women in foxholes, and the legislation that precludes women from serving aboard combat ships or planes can be repealed or nullified by passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. (Either alternative will introduce other and more serious problems to the services.)

But, as things now stand, women are to be forced against the services' wishes into combat schools for professionals, but then after expensive training, winnowed out and assigned to non-combat duties—a waste of time and money.

This is one problem. A second, which the new law dismisses in a phrase, is simply but significantly attributable to the difference in genders.

## Costly to taxpayers

The "minimum essential adjustments" due to "physiological differences" which the co-ed law permits will cost the taxpayers hundreds of thousands—probably several millions—of dollars for separate rooms (in the same dormitories), new uniforms, separate wash-room and toilet facilities, beauty parlors, etc.—all intended to buy the votes of Women's Libbers. More important, the "minimum . . . adjustments" mean an inevitable reduction in standards.

Physical aptitude tests for admission to the service academies already have been altered to meet one physiological difference between male and female in arm, chest and shoulder muscles. Few women, for instance, can do pull-ups. Instead of this requirement for male candidates, women will do a new test, specially tailored for them, called "flexed arm-hangs." Nor is there any minimum requirement—other than general good health—in these tests; norms for females—quite different from and lower than, norms for males—will gradually have to be developed.

The new law will not mean—indeed, cannot mean—equality of the sexes, for there is no such thing; men and women are different, and personally, I say, with the French, *Vive la difference*. But it will mean; inevitably, it must mean—separate and preferential treatment for the women in the program at the expense of the men, and more important, at the expense of the overall quality of the officer corps.

A kind of unavowed but tacit quota system—as un-American when applied to

the sexes as it is to the races—will be developed. In fact, already each of the academies has set its tentative quota of female cadets at (variously) 80 to 150, and if anything like this number is actually admitted it will be at the expense of stronger (physically) and perhaps better fitted (mentally and academically) male candidates. And women in the academies will add a divisive minority; they will not promote esprit or enhance cohesiveness.

The Navy, at least, already has a touchstone by which to gauge some of the effects of the new law. A recent article in the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings (September, 1975) by Lt. Richard P. Shipman, USN, entitled "The Female Naval Aviator: A Free Ride?" outlined some of the problems which the politically motivated effort to put women into the same military billets as men have produced. Last year, under pressure from the politicians, the Navy opened the doors to women aviation cadets, to be assigned—when they had won their wings—to non-combat aircraft, i.e. transports, etc.

## Preferential treatment

Lt. Shipman points out that the women receive "equal pay and opportunity but are not statutory and physically able to produce the equal qualification and performance." He reveals that none of the eight women accepted for pilot training were able to meet the minimum physical training standards at the Pensacola pre-flight school, yet all the male candidates were required to meet the normal standards. Even more important, the women were not needed; their admission was purely politically motivated; there are plenty of male candidates for Navy wings. These women—now flying, but limited to shore duties—occupy desirable billets, much sought after by male aviators after long absences from their families in protracted periods of sea duty.

There is thus little room for doubt that women candidates for the service academies, like women aviators will—indeed, MUST—receive preferential treatment if they are to be included among the hitherto all-male ranks. Different and separate standards for male and female must be established; the immutable law of nature simply has made man different from woman, and the military tasks women fill should be carefully selected for, and even tailored to, their capabilities.

# es will weaken armed forces

Unquestionably, those capabilities are many, and there is no doubt but that women can fill many military occupational specialties.

Spurred in part by the feminists and the prods of ambitious congressmen, and, in part, by the services' frantic search for "bodies" to replace draftees and to fill the ranks of the all-volunteer forces, the armed forces already count almost 100,000 females in uniform, almost five per cent of their total strength—a number expected to increase to 130,000 in 1978, some 6.2 per cent of the total. These women are filling all sorts of non-combat jobs as air traffic controllers, mechanics, parachute riggers and so on, in addition to more traditional roles in administration and supply, and as nurses, doctors, lab assistants. Many of them are filling these jobs with great ability—in some cases better than their male peers—and are freeing men for combat duties.

**“... a ‘democratic army’ is a uniformed mob.”**

But it is nevertheless clear that women in the armed services in large numbers already pose problems which may—and sometimes do—loom larger than the ones they have been enlisted to help solve.

And one thing the services can do without today is more problems. Probably never in their history have they faced such severe threats to their internal morale and discipline and effectiveness. The thin line that distinguishes elite military forces from an armed mob can be easily over-stepped, particularly in an over-permissive society and an over-liberal democracy.

The old will 'o the wisp of a “democratic army” is a contradiction in terms; there CAN be an army of a democracy, but a “democratic army” is a uniformed armed mob.

Yet many of the trends and events, much of the atmosphere, of the recent past have been pushing the services across this thin line. The “fragging” of officers and non-coms and the refusal of duty by army units in Vietnam, the race riots and fights between men in uniform in this country and the extensive mutinies in the Navy were so wide-spread a few years ago they almost reached a point-of-no-return.

The reductions in standards for recruiting—specifically the enlistment (in attempts to meet the needs of the all-volunteer services) of low mental category minority groups—led to some of the worst moments in the history of the armed forces. Sabotage, once a virtually unheard of crime in the services, was



**“Stop muttering about what this man’s army is coming to and pin that hem.”**

rampant. The Senate Internal Security subcommittee recently reported that in the decade 1965-75 there were 5,256 sabotage incidents in the Navy alone.

Things are better today, though by no means good. Two dangerous trends still persist—to politicalize the armed services and to use them to force social reforms. (The co-ed law for the service academies is part of both.) The chimera of egalitarianism in uniform is still the goal of some of the liberal vote-scrambling politicians who support them. Radical civilian groups are still doing their best to “democratize” the Army.

Public service unions have announced their intention of trying to unionize the armed forces—first the Reserves, then, perhaps, the regulars—a project that, if carried out, would reduce to absurdity the very idea of any armed forces (which is perhaps what its sponsors hope to do).

As the co-ed law goes into effect, racial tensions and drugs are still the prime problems in the services. Polarization of the races in uniform, though slightly

eased, has continued (most marked in the Army in Germany, and aboard some of the Navy’s largest ships), and the use of drugs—on and off duty—is widespread, with “pushers” in uniform actively promoting drug sales to soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines.

### Women worsen problems

The “band of brothers” ideal, which kept our services high-stepping, proud outfits for years, has gone irretrievably; discipline is still in many units too permissive; the chain of command has been impaired and the non-com and petty officer, the backbone of any military organization, is too often frustrated, disgusted or inexperienced.

Women in the services in large numbers simply worsen—they do not improve—these problems. Sexual frictions create jealousies and divisions (often of the worst kind); they exacerbate and do not ease, racial tensions. And, to other indiscipline, one must add, the threat of sexual promiscuity.

If women join the combat arms there is not much doubt that combat effectiveness will be reduced. Can one seriously anticipate that the cutting edge of the sword will be keen and bright in an infantry platoon, which includes a sizable group of women? And how would you like to command a fighting ship, with perhaps five to six per cent of its crew women?

As Americans usually do when the pendulum swings we are attempting to push the revolution in values—which has brought much good as well as considerable harm to our generation—to extremism.

No other armed services in the world assign women to combat roles in peacetime; none, except Russia, and the Montagnards and some Viet Cong and South Vietnamese units (who kept their families with them in the field), used women in combat during war. Britain employed thousands of women in uniform in many capacities in World War II; their combat duties, however, were largely limited to helping man anti-aircraft guns in Hyde Park and around London, and in service during the blitz, on the Home Front.

Even beleaguered Israel—certainly in more need for soldiers than nearly any other nation—does not use them in front-line combat. It drafts a few women, but uses them only in supportive administrative, supply, technical, medical and similar roles, which require very little training. Contrary to popular impression, the use of women in the Israeli armed forces is far more restricted and far greater attention is paid to the fundamental differences between the sexes than is true in the U.S. armed forces today.

#### Political motivations involved

Yet the forced, politically-motivated admission of women to the combat schools of the armed forces—the service academies—is surely leading to, and is plainly intended as, a means of opening any and every job in uniform to women. And, if the Equal Rights Amendment is ratified, or the law prohibiting women in combat ships and planes is repealed, the floodgates are opened and, I believe the military effectiveness of the armed services, even now, too low, will be seriously degraded.

The credibility of deterrence is an issue; are we really in earnest about maintaining high-spirited, well-disciplined, combat-effective armed forces? I do not believe it can be done with the battle of the sexes superimposed upon the battle of the races and all the other tensions and troubles that have been plaguing our armed forces.

Women in combat jobs would have an ancillary but definite effect upon our already strained and fractionalized Ameri-

can society.

Phyllis Schlafly and others who have helped to lead the recent successful counter-attack against the strident Women Libbers believe that the co-ed law for the service academies must be viewed as part of the attempt to force passage of the mis-named Equal Rights Amendment. Certainly if the amendment is passed, there is general agreement among both legislators and lawyers that women WILL serve in combat jobs, and—according to both congressional studies and to Selective Service Headquarters judgments, they would clearly be liable to the draft if it should be re-instituted at some future time.

I happen to believe that the ERA is counter-constructive. It could well lead to a flood of litigation; it might well tear down the fabric of legislation painfully erected over many decades to protect, rather than exploit, women, and it will, if endorsed, insure a very troublesome period for our whole society.

#### *“Women in combat . . . is a revision to a primitive society.”*

Women in combat, a concept that would be nourished by ERA, is retrogression, not progression; it is a reversion to a primitive society, not a step towards an advanced one. And it would surely help to undermine still further what is anathema to the feminists—the distinct roles of the sexes in our society. For Man and Woman—both, I think, glorious and complementary genders—we would substitute the neuter, Person. Midship-Persons, Cadet-Persons, Soldier-Persons would be the stalwart defenders of our liberties.

It just won't wash. The family, since the caveman—and particularly since the influence of church and state endorsed the concept—has been the basic building block of stability. Yet, if the traditional

male role of the father, as principal bread-winner, protector and fighter, is smudged or obliterated; if the female tends to fill this role, family stability, already imperiled in too many American homes, will be further eroded. Women in combat and passage of ERA would probably represent an additional step towards family disintegration.

The marked erosion in the ties of black families—noted by Daniel P. Moynihan—would be unquestionably extended to the whites. Fathers might well tend to drift away; equal rights, to far too many women, would mean, ultimately unequal obligations.

I am, like my father before me, an “Old Fashioned Fellow,” and rather proud of it. I do not want to see, if we should have—as we shall—more Korea-Vietnams, a long-list of female casualties. (Sixteen U.S. nurses died in World War II, four American women in Korea, nine in Vietnam.) For women have provided in the past the yeast of our society; they have given American civilization its polish and its gleam. I do not want to see this tarnished.

I happen to believe that the past does have pertinence to the present, and that some of the idealistic, indeed, chivalrous, notions of yesterday should be perpetuated in the future. That old familiar saying—common to most of the nations of the West and expressed in our unwritten law of the sea, “Women and children first”—has to me a peculiar appropriateness. It distinguishes our society from the brutes.

I would like to see it continued as a symbol of our nation tomorrow.

I do NOT want my wife or daughters drafted.

The co-ed amendment and ERA are signposts to a road of danger. Let us look and weigh and measure before we pass the point-of-no-return.

*A full set of 25 different Phyllis Schlafly Reports on ERA is available at \$3.00.*

#### The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

Published monthly by Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: For donors to the Eagle Trust Fund -- \$5 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 15 cents each; 8 copies \$1; 50 copies \$4; 100 copies \$8.