



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 12, NO. 9, SECTION 2

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

APRIL, 1979

The Plan To Put Women In Combat

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

Having been a professional soldier for the greater part of my life, protection of America's lifestyle has been a natural and inseparable part of my daily living on the battlefield and in peacetime. This splendid way of life has been a guidepost for me in upholding my sacred duty to protect our birthright. The efforts to malign the concept of family, the dignity of womanhood, and our national security are not unfamiliar to me. I have had to live with the equal rights movement in the midst of the U.S. Army where it is fostered and goes along rampantly and unbridled, virtually unopposed.

I am most pleased to speak to a group of Americans who are concerned about where our country is heading, and also are doing something about it. As such, you have become a rallying point for the survival of the grand freedom we enjoy. This workshop gives me a chance to tell you what is really going on in our Armed Forces with respect to the use of women in the military. You will hear very little of what I am going to tell you through the major news media, because most of them are part of the all-out drive to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment. Let there be no doubt about this.

It strikes me forcibly that 200 years is a very short time in the span of history for a nation to have reached such heights of liberty and abundance for its citizens. Down through these 200 years, it has been the spirit of people like you, who fight to retain our American heritage, that has fueled the fires of our splendid freedom and guarded our Republic's lifestyle.

Today I speak to you about the current trend and direction of the equal rights movement in the military, its adverse impact on the combat effectiveness of our military force structure, and the degradation to which our women will be subjected if they are drafted and placed in combat or combat-supported roles. I will talk primarily about the Army, but what I say also applies to the other services, for it is our whole defense posture that is under attack. When I speak of the policies and actions our Armed Forces are taking, I am referring to Administration officials (including President Carter), the civilian leaders of our Department of Defense and the Department of the Army, and senior military officials of high responsibility. I am not referring to the majority of loyal members of our Armed Forces, officers or enlisted personnel, who must obey the directives and orders passed on to them.

Combat Is My Business

My expertise in speaking on this matter stems from experience. Combat and preparation for combat were my business. I have served as an infantry commander in three separate combat tours, all at the fighting level. I have personally participated in hand-to-hand combat and have seen men fight and die on the battlefield. I have had women in my command, have observed their performance at first hand, and have had to contend with the disruptive effect on military discipline and combat efficiency brought about by the women's liberation movement -- a movement fully supported and promoted by the top echelons of our government.

Proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment are reducing combat effectiveness through their strenuous efforts to implement the goals of ERA. ERA proponents are trying to prepare the American public to accept the idea of drafting women and placing many of them in combat units. ERA proponents are using the volunteer Army as a mechanism to mislead Americans into believing that war and combat roles are natural to women.

Before I go any further, I would like to say there are some women, certainly in the minority, who like the military, like to live and work with men, and have given excellent performance in certain non-combat positions such as clerks, telephone operators, computer technicians, supply supervisors, nurses, and the like. World War II is ample proof of this. However, these roles do not satisfy the objective of the women's liberation movement which is to make women equal with men in *all* sectors of military activity, regardless of the damaging effect it has on fighting spirit or combat efficiency. In fact, avid supporters of ERA have little concern for our defense posture; they are willing to weaken or sacrifice it if it conflicts with the goals they seek.

Using the Army For Women's Lib

The top command structure of our military forces, the Pentagon, is now saturated with ERA proponents and under the complete control of avid supporters of the women's liberation movement. Members of various women's organizations, such as NOW (National Organization for Women), have been placed in key man-

power positions of authority where they formulate and direct policies concerning U.S. military readiness posture. The result is that U.S. readiness revolves more around promoting the women's liberation movement than it does in meeting the military capability of a potential enemy. As an example, Kathleen Carpenter, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for equal employment opportunity, works closely with Sarah Weddington, President Carter's advisor on women's affairs.

Ms. Carpenter is well known to veterans because she threatened to cut off all governmental support to the Veterans' Administration unless the Veterans of Foreign Wars opened its membership to women.

The aim of these Pentagon civilians is to condition the American people into accepting the drafting of women and eventually placing them in combat roles. Having done so, they can then expand the unisex syndrome to all areas of American life. What better medium could be used to accomplish this feat than our Armed Forces who must obey to the letter the directives of higher civilian authority -- an authority which is today adamantly dedicated to *the forced equalization of the sexes?*

Manipulators of this strategy were convinced that there were no roadblocks to obtaining total sex integration in an all volunteer force since those in authority dictate what would be done, and senior active-duty military personnel would not openly object for fear of destroying their careers. A totally sex-integrated military force, which was falsely publicized as a tremendous success, is the kind of image-making which the women's liberationists believe will gradually mesmerize the American public into accepting the premise that women can do anything men can do. This drive did not stem from the Pentagon alone. The Pentagon always moves in the direction of the Commander-in-Chief, the President. The Secretary of Defense, like every Cabinet member, receives his orders from the President and his advisors.

The Myth of Women in Men's Jobs

The All Volunteer Force was to be the ideal vehicle through which total sex-integration would be accomplished -- for who would seriously challenge what the military did with women volunteers in a war-weary post-Vietnam era where the public mood was non-interest in the military, no more entanglements in foreign wars, and more emphasis on pardoning draft evaders and deserters than on national security.

In spite of the effort to propagandize the American public with the great success of the All Volunteer Force and its large component of women, the plan has backfired. The myth that women do as well as men, or even better in some cases in the all-male traditional roles, is beginning to show up as the falsehood it is. The military services are unable to recruit sufficient women soldiers to enlist or to remain in the jobs that require those skills. Women are finding out how tough this training is and that they will spend considerable time in the field. As a result, they are avoiding non-glamorous career management fields such as air defense, artillery, tank mechanics, line pole climbers and the like, causing large concentrations of females in medical and administrative fields.

In a desperate attempt to overcome this shortage in the combat support areas, the Army is now experimenting with a program which offers special bonuses, free education, and a term of service reduced from three to two years, in order for women to accept unnatural roles. This approach is also failing: approximately 50 percent of women enlistees are not finishing their tour of service. The reasons customarily given for quitting by female drop-outs are that the physical requirements were too tough and they thought that, after they had finished basic training, they would not be required

to do similar strenuous work again in their units.

Increasing the Percentage of Women

The Pentagon began to talk about the declining birth rate and to argue that a shortage of military-age males requires us to fill these gaps in the volunteer Army with women. To convince the American public that women can perform all jobs in the military as well as men, one of the greatest psychological warfare efforts ever devised was launched through the national major news media. The first step was to order a series of tests and evaluations to substantiate predetermined conclusions that women are fit to fight on the battlefield. When the studies came back showing women in general are inadequate in this area, they were sent back for re-evaluation.

The next move was to have senior civilian defense officials and military leaders hail the sex-integrated All Volunteer Force as a great success. To strengthen the credibility of these false pronouncements and conclusions, contracts were made with prestigious foundation think tanks to produce studies reinforcing these predetermined conclusions. The Brookings Institution and the Rand Corporation are good examples.

Their recommendations were that womanpower in the services should increase from the current 120,000 to 600,000 to fill non-combat and combat-support roles -- and that once combat roles are accepted, the female percentage could be raised even higher. This recommended ceiling figure in the Army alone would mean replacing 25.7 percent of our Army male soldiers with women (176,000 out of 774,000). These recommendations come from the same sources which hailed the All Volunteer Force as a tremendous success. Today, even top defense officials have to admit it is a dismal failure: they cannot meet recruiting goals and the quality is low.

The Plan to Draft Women

The Pentagon now realizes they cannot force sufficient female volunteers into combat support jobs, let alone place them in combat units, which is their ultimate objective. So they are turning to the draft. Female draftees will not have a choice of jobs as the volunteer does.

Having seen their plans fail during the last year, these same officials have begun to redirect their efforts toward a strategy that calls for the draft of women. This plan has been in the making for some time. The Army Chief of Staff, General Bernard Rogers, has consistently voiced his opinion that, if Selective Service is reinstated, consideration should be given to drafting women. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General David C. Jones, always talks in terms of registering *people, not men*, for compulsory service. A Selective Service spokesman stated to the House Armed Services Committee almost a year ago that they are working on plans to draft women if ERA passes and that only a slight change in the regulations would be needed.

Since July 1978, an alternative plan has been in the mill which calls for a scaled-down draft system covering both men and women, and calling up a token force of 2,000 persons each month, with concurrent recruiting efforts as heavy as those in the All Volunteer Force. This plan is designed to get the American people accustomed to the idea in small doses, by a process of gradualism. Sponsors of this plan think that drafting men and women in small increments would not be so shocking and would tend to minimize strong resistance.

To mollify further any public resistance to compulsory military service, government officials and some members of Congress are calling for some form of mandatory national service for men and women. It is hoped that this plan will divert attention from the distasteful picture of women being forced into the Armed Forces. Equating military service

with that of any other national activity tends to cover up the stark reality of drafting women and lessens public apprehension over it.

Only recently did this plan manifest itself to the American public when the Secretary of Defense, Harold Brown, asked the House Armed Services Committee to register women as well as men for the draft. Very shortly thereafter, all Chiefs of the military services went before the House Armed Services Subcommittee for Personnel and Manpower and recommended that women be required to register for the draft.

The Two-Phase Draft Plan

There it is, ladies and gentlemen. Because of the consistent failure to reach the goals of the women's liberation movement through the voluntary armed forces and the all-volunteer Army's inability to meet recruiting goals, the Administration is falling back upon the draft. However, this will not be pushed too quickly because a Presidential election is coming up in 1980. Notice that President Carter said that any new registration system *should include women* as well as men. But he neutralized this statement by also saying that he did not foresee this happening.

The strategy is clear. It is to be conducted in two phases. First, before the election, institute only a stand-by system, which includes the registration of women, but no call-ups. Or institute nothing, but talk about it. After the election, begin implementation. Notice the timetable: begin conditioning the people before the election, then implement the policy after the election.

If the draft is ever implemented and ERA is ratified, all barriers will be removed from placing women in combat roles. The proponents of ERA may tell you that this will never happen, or that only a few women will be put in combat since all military assignments are made based on the soldier's physical profile and his trained skills. Even though these are the rules, anyone who has ever been in combat knows that a large number of people are always improperly assigned due to the fact that the pipeline replacements do not flow evenly, they never arrive when needed, and the nature of casualties is never so predictable that one can requisition the proper type and exact number to fill the job vacancies required. The normal procedure is to reach into the locally available *non-combat* resources in order to replace combat shortages.

For example, after my company had been thrown off its position by a large Communist Chinese attack one early morning, we had only 42 men left out of 197. Since there were no combat-type replacements at hand, I was forced to muster my *non-combat* type personnel such as clerks, cooks, and vehicle drivers for the counterattacking force needed to eject the enemy from hill #266. Other examples where this was applied on a larger scale were the D-Day invasion at Normandy, the Battle of the Bulge in World War II, and again in the Chosen Reservoir during the Korean War. The point to be made is that, when the situation is critical, *non-combat* women who are locally available in support units *will* be used.

What Combat Really Means

Now let me comment on what placing women in combat roles will mean to them and to military combat effectiveness. The combat environment is an ugly one. For the ground soldier, it is characterized by drudgery, indignity, and anonymous horrors. It calls for an antic toughness that women do not normally possess. Battle is primitive, vicious, brutal and exhausting. It is coupled with depression and crippling fatigue, which together create terror in the soldier's heart and make him wonder, as he sees the night coming down, if he will see the edge of dawn. His feelings fluctuate

from despair to extreme hate and bitterness, and those emotions tend to bring forth his most animal instincts.

If he is fighting in the Mekong Delta, he must endure living in mosquito-infested paddies, immersed in filthy waters up to his waist and armpits, for continuous periods of 24 to 48 hours, where he is subject to fungus, bacterial infections, and immersion foot. The skin breaks out with tiny red-scaled vesicles on the foot and other parts of the body. The feet become swollen and the top layers of dead skin come off in silver dollar-size patches. These conditions are aggravated by body leaches which the soldier must also endure. The loss rate for male casualties in this environment averaged 50 percent.

If he is fighting in the hills of Korea, he is subject to bitter cold, frostbite, and diseases such as the plague which result from living in rat-infested bunkers. In the highlands of Vietnam, he is plagued by bamboo viper snakes, torrential rains, jungle rot, malaria and the like. If his mission turns to the Middle East or Africa, he suffers from filth, relentless heat, and the dryness of the deserts. In Europe it is the deluge of mud, the slime of dripping dugouts, and the weariness of continuous marches along hot dusty roads. These are only some of the ugly living conditions of the ground combat soldier's daily environment, let alone the nightmare of having to face mortal combat.

These are not the kinds of conditions in which we wish to place anyone. But can we, as a civilized people, even begin to entertain the thought of sending our women into such an environment against their will?

To survive these conditions and at the same time to function effectively against a determined enemy, it is mandatory that the individual soldier be in top physical condition, with a long-term inborn stamina that will not wane after long grueling hours of trudging toward the objective. Our soldiers must have the kind of strength that keeps them fit to fight *after they reach* the enemy, regardless of the obstacles they must overcome beforehand.

Push for Women in Combat

The concerted drive to convince the public that women can do as well as men in combat is in full gear. Listen to the statement made by the Secretary of the Army, Clifford Alexander, who has never been in combat and only had six months' active military service as a Private First Class in the Army National Guard. "There are few things that men can do that women can't. By law, they don't fight. My personal opinion is contrary to what the law says." The Chief of Staff said, "I see no reason why women cannot serve effectively in combat roles further to the rear."

The Pentagon has even gone so far now as to undertake studies to redefine combat. This will make it easier for women to qualify for the combat zone. You can hardly pick up a magazine or newspaper without an article purporting to "prove" that some female service person has as much capability in physical strength as the male soldier. *U.S. News & World Report* carried a front cover with the headline, "Women in uniform -- can they save the military?," obviously designed to convey the message that women soldiers are the answer to our declining combat efficiency. Many of us have read about the five-month pregnant Marine who marched 20 miles in basic training with a machine gun tripod and 400 rounds of ammunition on her back. And I am sure many of us saw the CBS television movie, "Women at West Point," which went to great extremes to give the impression that all military physical obstacles can be overcome by women as well as men.

Exceptions Don't Make The Rule

Certainly there are some women who have the physical strength to surmount various physical obstacles in the short

term, but they are exceptions to the rule. Also, I ask the question, would that pregnant Marine be marching in such good condition four days later, ready to engage an enemy in hand-to-hand combat? Combat is not a hodge podge of isolated actions such as jumping out of an airplane in a parachute and then returning to the barracks, or firing a rifle on the range, or making one long march and then returning to a hot shower, or lifting 100 pounds once or twice with a rest in between. Combat is a long, grueling, *sustained* effort to overcome all of these things under the most trying conditions and for great periods of time. This kind of strength is not normally part of a woman's physiological makeup, and no kind of training can give it to her.

All kinds of tests -- field tests, training tests, and readiness tests -- have been conducted over and over again, showing conclusively that women are not fit for combat. By nature, women are smaller, slower, physically weaker -- particularly in upper body strength. Women are less aggressive and less combative than men. It takes upper body strength to throw a grenade effectively, to dig a foxhole, to hack a path through the thick jungle with a machete, to fight an enemy soldier with a rifle butt and a bayonet, or to pull oneself through a long, narrow tunnel with heavy demolitions in order to flush an enemy sniper out of his hiding place.

Yet the power of the women's liberation movement prevails in the Pentagon, and truthful results are rejected or suppressed. ERA proponents argue that women may be weak in some areas of physical strength, but they are better educated and score better in aptitude tests. There is some truth to this since all females must have a high school education to qualify for the service. But the fact is that education is not the ingredient that wins battles for the ground soldier. Simple tactical plans, guts, stamina, and brutal physical force are what brings victory. What is so ironic about all this is that most of the motivated volunteer female soldiers do not want to go into combat. It is the women liberationist leaders who will never have to go into combat who are pushing so hard for this.

The Wrong Way to Fight Wars

I need not tell you what this will do to U.S. national security. Equality, whatever that is, is unobtainable in the Armed Forces, as long as male backup is necessary. Assigning a woman to combat, and then having to back her up with another man, is no way to run a combat force. The last thing fighting soldiers need in combat is part-time help and on-lookers getting in the way.

I only wish those who push for placing women in combat could see it as I have. Are they ready to see their daughters and wives exposed to the wrath of the enemy because they could not dig into the hard ground in time for protection? Should they have to hear the screams of burning human torches trapped in the entanglements of barbed wire after napalm cans are exploded?

Must they become the victims of suffocation in a covered position resulting from burned-out oxygen due to white phosphorus? Are we really ready to have them face the cold steel bayonet of the male enemy soldier or be horribly mangled in a trapped mine field which no one can penetrate? Think of that young 18-year old moist-eyed girl filled with homesickness as she watches the fading twilight and wonders if the sun will ever rise again. Must our daughters be made to hear that dreaded noise of artillery beating like a kettle drum, which sounds like two steel needles pressing on the eardrums?

Have the ERA proponents thought about what our women would suffer as POWs at the hands of an enemy who uses the pressure water hose technique of blowing one's stomach up like a balloon in order to extract military information? What a trump card our enemy would have in

blackmailing the United States while holding a large number of women prisoners! How can we reconcile our moral perceptions of women with these immoralities of war?

No one who has seen real combat could believe that our Congressmen and governmental leaders would talk about drafting women and placing them in combat. Yet they are doing this very thing today.

History is pitiless. It makes no allowances for nations, however civilized they may be, if they refuse to recognize the need to protect themselves with a strong military force. Virtue, innocence, equal rights, and cultivation of the arts have never been sufficient in themselves to guarantee survival. The chronicles of the past are punctuated with the records of states and civilizations which lost their will and capacity to survive because they destroyed the dignity of mankind. The American people must not allow our leaders to bring us to such a state.

Let's Reinforce Our Success

An old military maxim, which all professional soldiers know only too well, says: Reinforcing failure is a sure way to doom on the battlefield. However, *reinforcing success is the key to victory*. As we celebrate our success in preventing the ratification of the ERA during the legally-authorized seven-years' time span, you and I must now *reinforce this success* by redoubling our efforts, energized by the experience that we have gained, and win a victory for womanhood and for America.

This speech was delivered by General Gatsis at the Pro-Family Workshop held at the Shoreham Americana Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 23, 1979. We believe it deserves the widest possible circulation.

General Gatsis is one of the most highly decorated officers in the U.S. Armed Forces and knows military combat from first-hand experience on the battlefields of several wars. 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 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 counterattack 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 our most effective units. 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. Among his many awards are the Distinguished Service Cross (the nation's second highest decoration for valor) and the Distinguished Service Medal (the highest decoration for meritorious service).

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.