



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 12, NO. 1, SECTION 2

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

AUGUST, 1978

How the Pentagon Promotes E.R.A.

by Brigadier General Andrew J. Gatsis (U.S. Army, Ret.)

The women's liberation movement is flourishing in the U.S. Armed Forces, where it receives official encouragement. Administration personnel are using the all-volunteer force as a mechanism to promote the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) and to mislead Americans into thinking that war and combat roles are natural to women.

It is a well-known fact that some women in the Armed Forces have performed well in certain non-combat positions such as clerks, telephone operators, computer technicians, nurses, and the like. World War II is ample proof of this. However, these roles do not satisfy the objective of the women's movement, which is to make them equal with men in all sectors of military activity regardless of the damaging effect it has on fighting spirit or combat efficiency. Avid supporters of ERA have little concern for our defense posture and are willing to weaken or sacrifice it if it conflicts with the goals they seek.

Total Sex Integration

Today our all-volunteer forces are moving steadily toward total sex integration. It is the unisex syndrome with ERA as its central goal, fully supported by the Department of Defense, that has brought this drive about -- not the reason given by the Defense Department, which is that there are not enough qualified volunteer males to fill shortages. This fabrication is used solely to justify bringing large numbers of women into the Armed Forces and is based on the false premise of a judicious use of peoplepower.

The Department of Defense cannot meet its male recruiting goals because it is looking mainly for high school graduates -- a qualification that has nothing to do with making a good ground combat soldier. If all the male resources are dried up, and the top defense leaders are so concerned with filling shortages, why haven't they taken the obvious approach of requesting reinstatement of the draft, even though it is a politically unpopular issue?

It is the duty of the Department of Defense to strive for the best defense possible, regardless of political trends or pressures. Instead, the Pentagon has adamantly defended for years an all-volunteer force in which male shortages have been continually filled

with increasing proportions of women. The Senate Armed Services Committee finally had to direct the Defense Department, just recently, to study the reinstatement of some form of draft. At this point, one has to ask the question: What interest do our top defense officials have at heart, that of our national security or that of satisfying political requirements and advancing the cause of ERA?

As the combat effectiveness of our defensive strength diminishes through the influx of large numbers of women into military units, an intermediate goal of the women liberationists is served -- using the Armed Forces to condition the American public into accepting the full military use of women as a *normal activity prior to ERA passage*. If this plan can be fulfilled, and the ERA is ratified, then the people's resistance to drafting women and placing them in combat will be weakened.

To accomplish this mission, the leadership in the Pentagon has ordered a continuous series of studies, tests, and evaluations. In essence, these studies are designed to substantiate pre-drawn conclusions that women are fit to fight on the battlefield. Even though some studies such as Max Wac, Reforger 77, and EWITA (Evaluation of Women in the Army) continue to crop up showing that female soldiers are inadequate in this area, the top leadership does not accept them and sends them back to the Army for further study.

To strengthen the credibility of the false conclusions manufactured out of the testing elements, prestigious foundation think-tanks and educational institutions are contracted to reinforce these findings. The Brookings Institution is an excellent example. In a recent study, it hailed the modern volunteer army as a great success (although the Senate and House Armed Service Committees announced it is a dismal failure) and recommended that the current female strength of 55,000 be increased to 200,000 in our modern volunteer army of 774,000.

The irony of using such agencies is that they consist primarily of Ph.D.s and intellectuals who have no military expertise and are about as qualified to judge military combat efficiency as a plumber is to conduct heart surgery. This twisted stratagem, combined with a publicity blitz through the major news media, attempts to convince the American people that a combat-

effective sexually-integrated military force is an accomplished fact.

Women in Combat

Today the effort to permit women to serve in combat units is relentlessly pursued. Only recently the Department of Defense requested Congress to take immediate steps to allow women to serve on combat ships and aircraft. Current army policy now allows assignment of women down to combat support units and in the combat zone. With 90 percent of all military jobs now open to women, evaluations and studies continue in preparation for taking that final step of authorizing women to serve with the fighting elements.

The reason that this last objective has not yet been reached cannot be attributed to a slowdown of effort by the military, but rather to the fact that it is impossible to fool the people into believing women are physically equal to men. Here lies the main barrier to placing female soldiers in ground combat units. But make no mistake about it, hard-line proponents of ERA, with the help of the Secretary of the Army and weak senior military officers who are afraid to speak out against the administration, are determined to accomplish this feat regardless of what the people think.

This concerted drive clearly manifests itself in the form of continuous publicity which highlights all women's activities in the services. High governmental officials announce frequently that women soldiers are doing as well as their male counterparts. All public relations personnel know that a woman must be in the forefront of almost every military photograph or TV film. In a recent speech to a graduating class of helicopter aviators at Fort Rucker, Alabama, which was a long way from being the first to graduate women, I was photographed several times with the one woman in the class, but only once with the male honor graduate. The newspaper, *Army Times*, often pictures a woman soldier, dirty, crawling on the ground in combat attire, as if that position came naturally for her. On the front cover of the June 5, 1978 issue of *U.S. News & World Report* is a woman with her face freshly made up, dressed in a new combat uniform and combat gear obviously never used in the field before. The caption reads: "Women in uniform -- Can They Save the Military?" The obvious inference is that the military is in deep trouble and that its only salvation lies in more women soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines.

There is little doubt that the all-volunteer force has hit an all-time low in readiness and combat effectiveness, but the last thing it needs is more women to exacerbate the situation. The problem of too many women in the services, aggravated by improperly assigning them to physically demanding jobs, is one of the reasons our Armed Forces are in the sorry state that they are.

Combat is Different

What is so blatantly ignored is the crucial difference — violence — between combat and any other activity. Violence calls for force, and force calls for physical strength. War is not fought under ideal conditions where the normal necessities are present to help one along in his work. Battle is primitive, vicious, and fought under harsh conditions. Physical strength is needed to dig a foxhole or latrine, to hack a path

through the thick jungles with a machete, to climb a slippery 70° muddy mountain slope with a 30-pound flame-thrower strapped on the back, to carry a 40-pound mortar base plate down the deep rocky slope of a ravine, to lift heavy camouflage nets for placement over large gun pits, to move heavy cooking field ranges, or to cut and carry huge logs for constructing defensive and living bunkers, just to mention a few army tasks.

Granted, there may be rare exceptions when a woman might be able to lift a 58-pound shell, but this doesn't mean she can do it all day. Because she can fire a machine gun doesn't mean she is able to displace it quickly, with its heavy belts of ammunition, to meet an enemy break-through.

The majority of the tasks mentioned above are not limited to soldiers in the front-line units, but are also required tasks for members in combat support and non-combat service organizations.

Complete combat effectiveness calls for self-sufficiency in *all tasks* required of that job by *all soldiers*. Women cannot perform all tasks because they lack upper body strength, cannot sustain in the field for long periods of time, and are not fast enough to do what is necessary to survive in combat. To accommodate these deficiencies, physical standards have been lowered. The cover-up phrase used by the Department of Defense is that "minor physiological adjustments are needed to compensate for female differences." Do the military services expect the Soviet assault units to make similar arrangements to accommodate our women soldiers?

Documented medical facts show that cardio-respiratory differences exist between men and women. The size of the heart and lungs, oxygen content and uptake, hemoglobin content, body temperature, and sweat gland functions place women at a much greater disadvantage in enduring extremes of heat and cold which are the constant companions of the ground combat soldier.

What kind of stand do you think the fighting men of the 23rd Infantry at Chinyong-ni, in the frozen hills of Korea, or the non-combat service units in the overpowering heat of the jungled Philippines, half starved, racked with malaria epidemic, would have made if their units had been 50-percent female?

Long, wearisome marches are an integral part of combat, despite all the means of mobility in the army today. The small frame of a woman makes the 30-inch marching step difficult and wears her down faster than her male counterpart. No adjustments can make her plight easier. Weak warriors become a burden on others, diminishing fighting power and increasing the likelihood of casualties. Obviously those people who say they would rather fight together with women than some men have never experienced *real* combat.

Physical Standards Lowered

How are the standards lowered so that the female recruit can be accepted? First of all, commanders are informed by their superiors that women can do the job *but it takes them just a little bit longer*. Time is crucial in combat when lives are at stake. The second new ground rule imposed on to training commanders is that they must institute the self-pace approach, where advancement goals are set more in accordance with the capability of the individual student. Runs at West

Point, which were previously geared to the average male with demanding standards, are now conducted in three groups, with pacing adjusted to the ability of the runner. A minimum physical training program is now set in the army so that all soldiers, regardless of sex, age, or grade, can pass it. In pugil stick training, women are allowed to fight only other women. How does this prepare them to fight men? These are only a few examples of lowered physical standards.

If all the praising remarks our senior government and some military officials are making concerning woman's ability to meet the physical stresses of armed conflict are true, then why in recent crises of heavy snow did the army refrain from sending women with men to do the heavy work? These tasks were certainly not as demanding as those in combat!

After the ax murders in Panmunjon, Korea, why did the army make the support unit there all male? Was it compassion for womanhood that caused Hitler to send 12- to 16-year-old boys and 60- to 70-year old men against the Soviet army in 1945, when there were available hardened, military-age female SS units? Why did Israel pull women out of combat units after their one and only experience with them in 1948? Why are women not assigned to guard duty alone even in a peacetime environment?

Problem of Pregnant Soldiers

When we speak of security we are talking about instant combat readiness for deployment. Units are having their combat readiness eroded by women soldiers not pulling their share of the load. For example, the army has been consistently pressing the Department of Defense, to no avail, to grant authority to discharge pregnant soldiers, since an annual average of 15.2 percent of the women in the army are pregnant and an additional 6 percent are non-deployable because of sole parenthood or other reasons. Upon the call of an alert, who do you think is going to fill that void of 21 percent on an instant notice? Obviously, the male soldier is going to take up the slack and try to do his job at the same time, which will result in doing neither well.

This policy is also having a disruptive effect on the continuity of unit and individual training. Servicewomen in the middle to advanced stages of pregnancy are exempt from nuclear, biological, and chemical training and cannot accomplish weapons qualification for one obvious reason -- they can't shoot lying in a prone position on the ground. They must often be excused from field training because of morning sickness, the need for special diets, the necessity to wear maternity clothes, or the likelihood of increasing accident exposure for both parent and unborn child. The average duty time lost by a pregnant soldier is 105 days a year, an absence which cuts down the unit's productivity, not to mention the \$27 million which soldier pregnancies have cost the army in the past two years.

A survey made by the Army Administrative Center at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, reveals that even when pregnancy-related lost time is excluded, women are away from their work three times as much as men. The main reasons are the injuries resulting from female inability to cope with physically demanding tasks; feigning sickness to avoid facing up to strenuous physical work; remaining home to take care of sick children;

and the inability to participate in field exercises when having menstrual problems.

Major readiness problems are growing by leaps and bounds. One needs only to visit some of the military installations when they have an alert and see the orderly rooms filled with children in the middle of the night. It looks more like a nursery than a military headquarters. This situation is also beginning to affect the morale of the units. Because the female soldier is more than just an inconvenience, she is resented. The problem is further irritated by the male soldier who tends to think of her as an onlooker who requires equal pay with the men but works only part time. Because he must compensate for her physical limitations, he becomes annoyed at and insensitive to her. When these problems are explained to the Secretary of the Army, he closes his eyes to all of this and says it is nonsense.

E.R.A. Leaves No Choice

The facts discussed in this article illustrate the folly and futility of the disastrous course the ERA has enunciated. Its damaging effect from a military standpoint is two-fold. First, it erodes our national security, and, second, a free society proposes to oppress women by drafting them against their will and placing them in an environment totally alien to womanhood.

Do not think for one moment the draft will not be reinstated in peacetime or war, or that women will not be drafted if ERA is passed. In the spring of 1978, a Selective Service spokesman stated before the House Armed Services Committee, "We are working on plans to draft women if the ERA passes. Only a slight change in wording of the regulations will be needed to include women in the draft pool." And the current Army Chief of Staff has already stated, "If Congress restores the draft, very serious consideration should be given to drafting women." Even proponents of ERA agree that under ERA women will be drafted by Selective Service on the same basis as men.

If this doesn't bother you, think of the drudgery, indignity, and horrors of life for your daughters and granddaughters in a rifle company. Do you desire to have them subjected to all the filth, slime, and degradations of combat where they will be subject to brutalization by some of the dregs of our own army as well as that of the enemy? Does any husband wish to know that his wife is sharing a foxhole with an unknown soldier under the most primitive war conditions where man's inhibitions are most likely to fall away? Can our nation tolerate seeing our women callously placed in body bags and moved with the mass of corpses to grave registration sites? To allow such a nightmare would reach the peak of infamy.

Even if women are prohibited from joining combat units, certainly U.S. citizens do not wish to see them subjected to the brutalization of a war zone totally incompatible with their physiological and psychological make-up.

We must understand what is at stake. The American people are not always immediate in their judgments, but there are some indications that our nation, which has given to a higher percentage of its people more of the good things of life than any other system since man came out of the caves, will not stand supinely by and allow the dignity of its womanhood to be washed away.

Shall We Send Mothers Into Combat?

by William A. Rusher

It almost beggars belief, but apparently -- despite the forests of pulp and oceans of ink that have been consumed in the debate over the so-called Equal Rights Amendment -- many supporters of this appalling proposal really and truly don't understand what it would do.

I was watching Phil Donahue's popular television interview program the other day when his special guest was Phyllis Schlafly, ERA's brightest and most pertinacious critic and, very likely, its nemesis. Mrs. Schlafly, a wonderfully knowledgeable and energetic Illinois housewife, happened to remark that ERA would compel the Army to draft women for combat duty right along with men in any future war.

Donahue, whose own sympathies were all too obviously with ERA, protested: Even if women would have to be drafted, they clearly wouldn't have to be used in combat situations, would they? On the contrary, Mrs. Schlafly replied with a patient smile, the ERA amendment would prohibit any distinction whatever, based on sex, in the treatment of male and female draftees. If men were ordered into combat, women would have to be, too.

Donahue thrashed around, running his fingers through his handsome shock of silver-white hair. Was Mrs. Schlafly actually contending that the commanding general in some future Vietnam would have to order his female soldiers up Hamburger Hill or whatever? That, to Donahue's deepened distress, turned out to be exactly what Mrs. Schlafly was contending.

A young woman in the studio audience came to Donahue's rescue with a question: Congress has always exempted women from the draft in past wars; wasn't it obvious that they would continue to do so if the draft were revived in some future conflict? Mrs. Schlafly pointed out, gently but firmly, that past exemptions of women from the draft were based on statutes; but the Constitution takes precedence over any statute. If the Constitution is amended to prohibit any discrimination in treatment based on sex, then any statute that hereafter seeks to exempt women from the draft (or even combat) would be unconstitutional.

By this time Donahue had gotten his breath back, but he was still halfway up Hamburger Hill, trying to picture his kid sister, in fatigues, hugging the ground a few yards away as enemy shells whistled overhead. He just couldn't do it, and so tried another tack: Generals don't have to order obviously ill-qualified soldiers into combat, do they? Couldn't they exclude female GI's from combat on the grounds that they're too short, or something like that?

Mrs. Schlafly, who might be no great shakes on Hamburger Hill but in her own way is an expert shot, dropped Donahue with one right between the eyes by pointing out that Audie Murphy, the most decorated U.S. soldier in World War II, was shorter and more slightly built than most of the women in the studio audience. Hereafter the Pentagon would have to give up its Audie Murphys, if it wanted to keep women out of combat by such indirect tactics.

By now Donahue had completely lost sight of home plate and was swinging at anything that moved. Well, what if some big tough babe with grenades hanging from her belt really wanted to join the boys in the

assault on Hamburger Hill? What was wrong with that? Nothing at all, Mrs. Schlafly replied sweetly, provided her decision was voluntary. Plenty of women join the armed forces every day, and the Pentagon can use them in combat if it so wishes and they agree. But ERA would deprive every American woman of any choice in the matter: If, in a future war (as in World War II), the U.S. were to draft fathers with five children and send them into combat, it would under ERA have absolutely no choice but to do the same for mothers.

Donahue's expression clearly revealed what he didn't quite dare say: that this would be ridiculous. And so, of course, it would be. But it will also be the supreme law of the land, beyond the power of any statute to change, if this meat-ax amendment passes. Do ERA's supporters know this? Apparently many don't. I hope they learn, before it is forever too late.

Copyright, Universal Press Syndicate.

William A. Rusher writes a newspaper column distributed by the Universal Press Syndicate and is the author of *Special Counsel* and *The Making of the New Majority Party*. A graduate of Princeton University and the Harvard Law School, he is a lawyer and the publisher of *National Review* magazine.

Brigadier General Andrew J. Gatsis (U.S. Army, Ret.) knows as much about military combat as anyone in the United States. He entered the U.S. Army in 1939 as a private and served as a professional combat infantryman for 36 years. After several years as an enlisted man, he entered and was graduated from West Point. He served with two Airborne Divisions as a paratrooper. He commanded an infantry rifle company in combat during the Korean War where he personally led a counter attack on Christmas Day, 1952. He served again in the Vietnam War as an infantry battalion commander, where his brigade earned the reputation for being one of the most effective units in Vietnam. In peacetime years, he served as an intelligence officer, an instructor of military science, and deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for Plans and later Commander of the U.S. Army Support Command in Hawaii.

General Gatsis is one of the most highly decorated officers in the U.S. Armed Forces. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross (the nation's second highest decoration for valor) and the Distinguished Service Medal (the highest decoration for meritorious service). Among his many other awards are two Silver Stars, four Legions of Merit, two Distinguished Flying Crosses, three Bronze Stars, 27 Air Medals, two Army Commendation Medals, and two Purple Hearts.

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.