



Center for Military Readiness — Policy Analysis —

March 2014

Defense Department Deliberately Moving to Implement Policies Known To Harm Military Women

Recently revealed information, and more that is likely to emerge, shows that the Department of Defense is imposing controversial social policies on the armed forces that will do great harm to military women and men, and will weaken our military instead of strengthening it.

Incremental plans for "**gender diversity**" in the combat arms will have the greatest harmful impact on enlisted women, who outnumber female officers five to one. Army Chief of Staff **Gen. Ray Odierno** bragged in a recent interview about the progress of "*social engineering*" to move "*low-ranking females*" into "*all-male organizations*." ¹ The general and others are not listening to the more than nine out of ten women who said in an official Army survey that they do not want this.

The Pentagon is moving ahead with incremental plans to order (not "allow") uniformed women into currently all-male combat fighting teams such as **Marine** and **Army infantry, armor, artillery, and Special Operations Forces**. While generals acquiesce and Congress fails to ask questions, this unprecedented social experiment is advancing in stages without transparency or evident concern about the harmful consequences for women, men, and future military missions.

The goal is not pro-women or pro-military; it is politics. We are watching something worse than the alleged "war on women." In the armed forces, military women are being betrayed.

Defense Department reports indicate that women will suffer more debilitating injuries and be exposed to conditions that increase risks of assault. Officials know this, but they seem unconcerned. Women also will experience undeserved resentment when officials dissemble about double standards, which inevitably will be used to create the illusion of "equality."

Congress has the constitutional responsibility to demand transparency, to conduct vigorous oversight, and to intervene before the administration makes unilateral policy changes that do irreversible harm to women, men, and the institution of the military. It is long past time to start asking questions, to obtain and review additional information that military officials have so far refused to reveal, and to challenge what is happening before it is too late.

1. Military Women Do Not Want To Serve in the Combat Arms

A recent survey of Army personnel thoroughly discredited the idea that most uniformed women actually *want* to serve in land combat fighting teams that currently are all-male.

- In 2013, the Army surveyed nearly 170,000 women, and found that only **7.5%** of the **30,000** who responded said they would take a combat arms position, such as the infantry, if it were offered. This means that **92.5%** of women want nothing to do with such assignments. Most probably do not know, however, that personal choice will not be an option. ²
- At a HASC Personnel Subcommittee hearing on July 24, 2013, **Rep. Loretta Sanchez** (D-CA) asked Marine **Lt. Gen. Robert Milstead** whether close combat assignments could be voluntary

for women. The general said No, "*That's why they're called orders.*"

- Even though "voluntary" combat for women would not be an option, a major survey of Marines seeking opinions on women in **ground combat element (GCE)** units repeatedly suggested that such assignments would be "voluntary." An inadequate 5-page summary of the results of 122 questions asked reported little evidence of support for women in direct ground combat.³
- The Marines have previously reported that studies of youth propensity to serve in the military have shown significantly less inclination among young women. Furthermore, if women served in combat roles, **29%** of potential female recruits said they would be *less likely* to join, compared to **12%** who said the opposite.⁴ Past Marine recruiting efforts targeted to women reading sports and fitness magazines were not successful.

2. Three Pull-Up Test Not Suitable for Female Boot Camp Trainees

Pentagon civilians and military leaders keep claiming that sufficient numbers of women will meet "gender-neutral" standards before they serve in the combat arms. Now comes reality, revealed at the **Marine Corps Recruit Depot** at Parris Island, SC.

- Even with a full year's notice and extra training, **55%** of female Marine boot camp trainees, compared to **1%** of the men, were unable to perform three pull-up exercises as part of a new **Physical Fitness Test (PFT)**.⁵ As a result, it was necessary to reinstate flexed-arm hangs, instead of pull-ups, as an option for women-only.
- This problem began in 2012 when the Commandant, **Gen. James Amos**, set in motion a one-way process based on unrealistic expectations. If it is too much to require female recruits to do three pull-ups in basic training, it is a thousand times worse to expect women to serve in Marine ground combat elements such as the infantry and Special Operations Forces.
- In a June 2013 Report to Congress, the Marine Corps stated that their plans for women in land combat would involve "*gender-neutral*" standards. The "catch" was in the fine print. Contradictory footnotes explained that in Physical Fitness Tests, obstacle courses, and **Combat Fitness Tests (CFTs)**, "*gender-normed*" requirements and scores would be used "*to account for physiological differences between genders.*" Double-speak such as this belies claims of "gender-neutrality."⁶
- The 1992 **Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces** concluded that gender-normed requirements were acceptable to reduce injuries in basic, pre-commissioning, and entry-level training – *provided* that women were exempt from the combat arms. Now that the Administration has ended that exemption, making women eligible for direct ground combat units, gender-specific training allowances have become untenable.

3. Equal Success Eludes Women at Officer and Enlisted Infantry Training

In 2012, General Amos announced a multi-phased program to assess the feasibility of women serving in the combat arms. The process is supposed to be careful and "measured," but the Marines have not produced any metrics or empirical evidence that women are or can be trained to be interchangeable with men in "tip of the spear" combat teams that attack the enemy.⁷ In fact, most indicators are to the contrary:

- Since 2012, fourteen female lieutenants have volunteered for the demanding Marines' **Infantry**

Officer Course (IOC) at Quantico, VA. All deserve credit for trying, but none has completed the course and only one made it past the first week.⁸

- To date, about 40 enlisted women Marines have passed the **Infantry Training Battalion (ITB)** course. The **ITB School of Infantry (SOI)**, conducted at **Camp Geiger, NC**, is far less demanding than the Infantry Officer Course at Quantico.
- A September 24, 2013, Marine Information Briefing indicated that the ITB program for enlisted personnel would include gender-normed PFT and CFT tests. Gender-specific allowances for women in those tests contradict and nullify claims that training requirements are "the same" and "equal" for men and women.⁹
- As recently as September 3, 2013, the Marine Corps website provided descriptions of training events during each week of the ITB course. Formerly-displayed details have been replaced with a single paragraph that does not provide specifics describing the current ITB course, including its PFT and CFT elements. Marine officials have refused to provide detailed information, raising questions about the definition of "gender-neutrality" on the ITB course.¹⁰
- Official discussions about "gender-neutral" standards refer to *minimum* requirements, not *maximum* levels of accomplishment that are gender-normed and different for men and women. For example, under the Physical Fitness Test that the Marines reluctantly suspended, the minimum standard was three pull-ups for all. To earn a perfect score, men were expected to do twenty pull-ups, but women would do only eight.¹¹ Disparities such as this create an *illusion* of equality, which is not acceptable in training for the combat arms.
- In additional phases of the research project in 2012 and 2013, the Marines tested hundreds of male and female volunteers in what were called "common physical performance standards," and "proxy test batteries" simulating combat. Data resulting from this research has not been made available for examination by Congress and independent experts, but on March 12, 2014, Gen. Amos nevertheless announced a new phase called the **Marine Corps Force Integration Plan (MCFIP)**.¹²

4. Questions About Gender Norming in "Exception to Policy" and Pilot Programs

Gender-normed Physical Fitness and Combat Fitness Tests are not the only "catch" being used to create "gender-neutrality" during research phases called "**exceptions to policy**" (ETP), or "pilot" programs.

- Male-only designations have always been a surrogate for specific "standards" in heavy-duty combat units, which are not needed because average men have the strength and stamina to do the job. "Gender-neutrality," therefore, has been interpreted to mean that women should not be asked to meet physical standards either.
- A senior officer in the 3rd brigade, **4th Infantry**, has reported first-hand observations of how this works in field artillery and combat engineer companies. Women are not asked to lift 95-pound rounds or heavy Bradley components, he wrote, because "*It wasn't a formal requirement for the males, so they're not making it a requirement for the females.*"¹³
- Navy **riverine** units engage in land combat from small boats. According to the *Virginian-Pilot*, riverine training for women incorporates gender-specific **Physical Readiness Test (PRT)** standards for fitness and a multi-phased Combat Fitness Test that assigns higher scores to

women for training performances that would cause men to fail.

- Some female riverine trainees reportedly were unable to perform specific tasks associated with the job, such as climbing ropes, scaling high walls, and dragging male colleagues in combat-like situations. Several were nevertheless deemed qualified for riverine assignments.
- In this and other ETP communities, instructors always flatter female trainees with effusive praise in the presence of reporters. Their own careers depend on making the experiment a "success." But Pentagon pressure to achieve "gender diversity metrics" may be creating a false sense of accomplishment, especially if women are denied information about disproportionate injuries and higher risks in actual combat.¹⁴
- Another way to change standards is to eliminate the toughest requirements without notice. In 2012, for example, the Marines dropped the three most demanding tests out of six "common tasks" that were originally planned for their **Women in the Service Restriction Review (WISRR)** research program.¹⁵
- "Equality" also can be achieved by accepting for the combat arms some men who would otherwise fail, in order to acquire women performing at the same levels. In time, this practice lowers standards for all.
- In the "**Soldier 20-20**" project, **Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC)** is trying to determine the *"physical components of specific military tasks and occupational specialties."* This implies that physical requirements of heavy MOS's will be matched to individual abilities. The Army has attempted this before, but the **Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS)**, which has attacked and blocked what they see as "barriers" to women, are sure to do so again.

5. Disproportionately High Risks of Injury

Physical differences go beyond upper body strength measured with pull-ups. The combination of anatomy and physiology predisposes women to a higher risk of stress fractures, pelvic injuries, and knee damage. It is unseemly for Army and Marine generals to be forcing young women into the combat arms, where disproportionate numbers of them are expected to suffer more bone fractures and other debilitating injuries.

- In a 2012 briefing, a Marine official confirmed that women have **20%** less aerobic capacity, **47%** lower lifting strength, **26%** slower road march speed, plus attrition/injury rates during entry level training and discharge (break) rates that are **two times** those of males. These findings are consistent with more than 30 years of empirical studies and reports in the U.S. and the United Kingdom.¹⁶
- A 2011 **Navy** study found that **1 in 367** female recruits were diagnosed with pelvic stress fractures in training, versus **1 in 40,000** male recruits. The Army's experience with these kinds of injuries is nearly **three times** that of the Navy.¹⁷
- The **Veterans Administration** already has begun making preparations for escalating numbers of bone, joint, and ligament injury claims from women in direct ground combat MOSs that used to be all-male.¹⁸ Army officials have stated that disability costs are "staggering."

- A May 2013 Army **Technical Bulletin** analyzed intrinsic risk factors for injury during **Basic Combat Training (BCT)**. The strongest evidence, supported by five or more studies, indicates that "female gender," "low aerobic fitness," and "low muscular endurance" are factors contributing to the highest risks of injury in BCT. ¹⁹
- The same Technical Bulletin reported that women are more likely than men to be disabled, and are about **67%** more likely than a male soldier to be discharged for a musculoskeletal disorder. Such discharges have been as high as **140 per 10,000** female soldiers per year, compared to about **80 per 10,000** male soldiers. Congress should decide whether it is ethical to knowingly subject women to higher, unequal risks in the name of "equality."

6. Olympics Reflect Realities of Anatomy

Some advocates have claimed that specialized training can help women achieve at current male levels. The world of sports, however, provides clear evidence that fitness and strength training alone cannot compensate for inherent physical differences related to gender.

- In the **2014 Sochi Winter Olympics**, male and female athletes used different or gender-modified courses, except in "extreme" sports such as snowboard cross, halfpipe, and moguls. Both genders were skilled and daring, but according to the *New York Times*, at the **Extreme Park** there were at least **22** accidents that required medical attention or forced athletes out of the competition. Of those, **16** – almost **73%** – were women. A Russian freestyle skier broke her back in a training crash and is now paralyzed from the waist down. ²⁰
- With drawings and graphs, the *Washington Post* recently illustrated the findings of major studies comparing the capabilities of Olympic-caliber male and female athletes. Undisputed findings refute the unsupported theory that training alone can compensate for physical differences between men and women. Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) tears occur in female athletes 2 to 9 times as often as male athletes. ²¹
- **Rear Adm. Hugh P. Scott, MC, USN (Ret)**, who has done extensive research on medical issues facing military women, has summarized the reason behind inherent gender differences. *"Because women have ten times less the amount of testosterone than men, they have smaller muscle fibers that result in the development of smaller muscles."* ²²
- The **U.S. Army Research Institute of Environmental Medicine** did a major study on this subject in November 1997. The "**Natick Study**" found that some women, given specialized, intense training, can perform at minimal levels normally achieved by untrained men. This unimpressive result did not meet expectations of feminist advocates in Congress, so it was quickly forgotten. ²³

7. DoD Report Discredits Theories About Military Sexual Assaults

Defense Department data discredit claims that forcing women into the combat arms would help in reducing sexual assaults.

- According to a 2013 Defense Department study, female veterans who were exposed to close combat violence (i.e., death, physical maiming, or abuse) reported sexual assaults at rates twice as high as other military women (**2.1%** vs. **4%**). The same study found that women would have more difficulty avoiding even-higher risks for sexual assault and harassment. ²⁴

- According to the 2013 report of the **Sexual Assault Response and Prevention Office (SAPRO)**, between 2004 and 2012, numbers of completed assault cases including civilians **nearly doubled**, from **1,700** to **3,374**. Cases of sexual assault among military personnel escalated from **1,275** to **2,949**, an increase of **129%** between 2004 and 2012.
- Separate estimates of "unwanted sexual contacts" (USCs), which are based on survey reports, are many times higher. In 2013 the Pentagon reported a **35%** jump in reported sexual assaults from 2010 to 2012, based on anonymous surveys.
- In 2013 Congress approved more than thirty measures to deal with sexual misconduct, some of which may be helpful and others problematic. Still, human failings on both ends of the sexual misconduct spectrum, ranging from romantic relationships to sexual assaults, will not be eliminated by spending millions more on sexual assault programs and training.
- The armed forces may be suffering the cumulative consequences of many years of social experiments with human sexuality, particularly since the 1990s. Instead of being objective, as other engineers must be, Defense Department social engineers are implementing policies that will extend problems of sexual assault and misconduct into the combat arms. Congress also has failed to consider how predictable losses due to pregnancy will affect small fighting teams.

8. Qualifying Standards Will Be Questioned and Changed

Pentagon officials keep insisting that standards will not be lowered if women become eligible for the combat arms. They also pledge to "set women up for success." Neither promise can be true as long as the ultimate goal is to achieve what the Pentagon-endorsed **Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC)** recommends.²⁵

- Instead of being blind to racial and gender differences, the MLDC recommends race and gender consciousness, and assigns higher priority to "equal opportunity," not military readiness. The 2011 MLDC report recommends that a "**Chief Diversity Officer**" (CDO) be appointed, and promotions should be contingent on meeting "gender diversity metrics" (another name for quotas).
- At a January 2013 Pentagon news conference, Joint Chiefs Chairman **General Martin Dempsey** said that the Pentagon intends to assign "*significant cadres*" of women to achieve a "*critical mass*" in direct ground combat units. Dempsey further noted that if a particular standard was found to be "*so high that a woman couldn't make it,*" officials would ask the services, "*Does it really have to be that high?*"²⁶
- Even if the honest answer is "Yes," compliant generals will continue following orders to achieve "gender diversity metrics," on which their future careers will depend. Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) requirements are being "validated" to promote social/political goals, not to maintain high standards or to strengthen the armed forces.
- The 2014 **National Defense Authorization Act** includes language that calls for "gender-neutral" outcome-based standards, which are not defined or enforceable. The well-intended measure would not prevent the services from using standards that are "equal" for men and women but *lower* than they are now.
- There are several ways to create the illusion of "equality:" a) Eliminate the toughest requirements; b) Gender-norm scores to give women more points; or c) Obscure low scores by

evaluating the performance of gender-mixed groups instead of individuals.

- Commanders might also comply by d) Retaining men who would have washed out otherwise, just to achieve what former Joint Chiefs Chairman **Adm. Mike Mullen** called "*diversity as a strategic imperative.*"
- As a result, men will be less prepared for the physical demands and violence of close combat, and women will suffer more injuries and resentment they do not deserve. None of this is necessary, since Pentagon records going back decades have shown that military women are promoted at rates equal to or faster than men.²⁷
- For the same reasons that most civilian women do not aspire to be CEOs, there are fewer female flag and general officers. Extreme measures to increase their numbers, at the expense of enlisted women, are not needed or justified.

9. Selective Service Obligations Would Affect Civilian Women

According to legal experts, a change in female military personnel's eligibility for direct ground combat likely would result in federal court decisions favoring litigation challenging young women's exemption from **Selective Service** and a possible future draft.

- In 2013, a men's rights group called the **National Coalition of Men (NCM)** rushed to file a lawsuit in a California U.S. District Court, citing the Pentagon's new women-in-combat policies and asking that young women be included in Selective Service registration and a possible future draft. The judge dismissed the case, primarily because the administration's plans to make women eligible for the infantry are not yet complete.
- Incremental plans to eliminate all of women's exemptions from direct ground combat are on track for completion in January 2016. The **Supreme Court's** 1981 *Rostker v. Goldberg* precedent, which upheld male-only Selective Service registration primarily because women were not eligible for direct ground combat, will no longer be valid. Women will be "similarly situated" with potential male draftees.
- At that point, a men's rights group or the **ACLU** will file another lawsuit to force women into Selective Service, and they likely will win.²⁸ Congress will be left with two choices: abolish Selective Service, or accept a court order to include women on the same basis as men. A decision such as this should be made by Congress, not the federal courts.

10. Conclusion: Sound Priorities and a Plan for Action

To truly honor and respect military women, Congress needs to show concern and support for the **92.5%** who want to serve their country, but don't want to be treated like men. They should also show support for men who deserve high, uncompromised standards in the combat arms.

The need for responsible oversight in Congress could not be greater. The House of Representatives has not had a serious, open hearing on women in combat since **1979, 35 years ago**, and the **Senate** not since **1991, 23 years ago**. Months have passed since the Obama Administration first announced radical changes that will do great harm to military women and men.

The Armed Services Committees have the duty to review the results of recent research done by the Marine Corps and Army, and demand transparency in the Pentagon. There should be hearings with independent experts, and serious consideration given to questions of values: *Is violence against*

women acceptable, as long as it happens at the hands of the enemy?

Members of Congress should put the brakes on the administration's incremental plans, which are excluding Congress from major personnel policy decisions that should be made by elected officials, not acquiescent generals or the courts. Then there should be comprehensive hearings with independent experts, and consideration of the need for **Sound Policy for Women In the Military**, which would:²⁹

- Differentiate direct ground combat from contingency combat "in harm's way."
- Codify women's exemptions from direct ground combat, with the stipulation that policy may not change without votes of approval in the House and Senate.
- Retain high, uncompromised training standards in the combat arms.
- Preserve women's exemption from Selective Service and a possible future draft.
- Support both men and women in the military with sound priorities and policies that recognize both military necessity and the unique contributions of women.

As of now, *nothing* stands in the way of female soldiers and Marines being forced into infantry battalions, or civilian women being made subject to Selective Service obligations by court order. America and her citizens, especially women in the military, deserve better than this. ■

Endnotes:

1. Interview with *Army Times*, [Straight Talk From the Chief](#), Dec. 30, 2013, pp. 13-14.
2. Lolita Baldor, AP, [Few Women Want Combat Jobs](#), Feb. 25, 2014.
3. [CMR: Survey of Marines Fails to Show Support for Women in Direct Ground Combat Units](#), Feb. 2, 2013.
4. [USMC Women in the Service Restrictions Review, DACOWITS Brief](#), 22 Sep 2011, Col. John Nettles Slide #8, titled "Women Involuntarily Assigned to GCE - Impact on Recruiting and Retention" Available on the DACOWITS website, <http://dacowits.defense.gov/>, Reports & Meetings/Documents.
5. AP: [Marines Delay Female Fitness Plan After Half Fail Pull-Up Test](#), Jan. 2, 2014, and James K. Sanborn, *Marine Corps Times*: [Marine Corps Struggles With Challenge of Making Women Do Pull-ups](#), Jan. 27, 2014.
6. USMC: June 2013 [Report to Congress](#), p. 2, footnotes #3 - #6
7. For a full analysis of this research program, see [CMR Special Report, Defense Department "Diversity" Push for Women in Land Combat](#), October 2012.
8. *Marine Corps Times*, ["Four More Women Drop Out of Infantry Officer Course,"](#) Jan. 10, 2014.
9. CMR Policy Analysis, [Double Think About Double Standards](#), Nov. 2013, pp. 3-4. In the gender-normed Combat Fitness Test, which is part of the enlisted **School of Infantry (SOI)**, women receive higher scores for unequal performance. In the "Maneuver Under Fire" event, for example, a male trainee would earn a minimum score, 60 points, for completing the "MANUF" in 3 minutes and 58 seconds. A female would earn 88 points for completing it in the same time. Similar performances in the "movement to contact" (MTC) and "ammunition lift" (AL) tests at levels equal to or slightly lower than the male minimum (MTC-84, AL-75, plus MANUF-88), would earn for women an overly-generous, gender-normed total: **247** points. The resulting "2nd Class" rating would be awarded but not earned in the same way that men attain 2nd or 1st Class ratings.
10. USMC public affairs officials have not explained why the current ITB website omits detailed information previously provided; nor have they answered questions about the current ITB physical requirements.
11. Marine [ALMAR 046/12](#), Nov. 27, 2012.

12. Jim Michaels, *USA Today*, "[Experimental Force Will Test Marine Women in Combat Arms.](#)" Mar. 12, 2014.
13. The e-mail to CMR continued: "No one wants to direct a woman to do what she almost certainly cannot . . . We had the impression that standards would be set and all soldiers would have to meet them. It has not worked out that way.
14. Dianna Cahn, *Virginian Pilot*: "[Four Women Undergo Warfare Training in N.C.](#)", May 19, 2013; AP, Lolita Baldor, "[Women Heading to Riverine Combat Jobs](#)", Nov. 7, 2013; Petty Officer 1st Class Dustin Diaz, Defense Video & Imagery System (DVIDS), "[Women, Men Complete Riverine Training](#)", Sept. 17, 2013. "[None of the female trainees] managed to climb the ropes," reported the *Pilot*, "but they were satisfied." Officials claim that program standards remain unchanged, but female trainees who could not climb ropes and walls were advanced nonetheless.
15. CMR Special Report, *supra* note #6, pp. 15-17.
16. **William J. Gregor, Ph.D.**, "[Physical Suitability of Women for Assignment to Combat and Heavy Work Military Occupational Specialties](#)", 26 April, 2012.
17. **Col. Barbara A. Springer, PhD, PT, OCS, SCS**, and **Major Amy E. Ross, MD**, "[Musculoskeletal Injuries in Military Women.](#)" Borden Institute, 2011, p. vii, quoted by Bryant Jordan, Military.com.
18. Bryant Jordan, Military.com, "[Data Predict Spike in Female Troop Injuries](#)", Jan. 13, 2014.
19. "[Prevention and Control of Musculoskeletal Injuries.](#)" TB MED 592, May 2011, p. 10.
20. John Branch, *New York Times*, "[The Harder They Fall: Shared Slopes Take Bigger Toll on Women.](#)" Feb. 18, 2014. Also Reuters, *New York Times*: "[Olympics Russian Skier Paralyzed in Sochi Fall](#)", Feb. 26, 2014. America's All-Volunteer Force relies on average recruits, not athletic stars who are rarely interested in the military.
21. *Washington Post*, Health & Science, "[National Gender Performance in Sports - Fit But Unequal](#)", Feb. 24, 2013, and Springer, *supra* note #16, p. vii.
22. **RADM Hugh Scott, MC, USN (Ret.)**, letter titled "[Physical and Physiological Issues Associated with the Assignment of Women to Direct Ground Combat Units.](#)" June 22, 2012.
23. The Natick Study was funded with \$144,000 dollars inserted in the 1995 defense budget by **Rep. Patricia Schroeder** (D-CO). The five-month study chose 41 civilian women and subjected them to extensive Olympic-style conditioning far more demanding than the usual health club routines. Generalized conclusions about the effects of specialized training are merely speculation unsupported by empirical evidence. More background information is available in the CMR Report titled "[The Amazon Myth - Natick Study Stretches Science](#)", available at <http://cmrlink.org/CMRDocuments/TheAmazonMyth-April1996.pdf>.
24. Andrew Tilghman, *Navy Times*, "[Female Combat Vets Report More Assaults](#)," Oct. 14, 2013.
25. *From Representation to Inclusion, Diversity Leadership for the 21st-Century Military*, Final Report, March 15, 2011, p. 18, and pp. 97-98.
26. CMR: "[Seven Reasons Why Women-in-Combat "Diversity" Will Degrade Tough Training Standards](#)" Jan. 24, 2013.
27. [Defense Department Report to Congress on the Review of Laws, Policies and Regulations Restricting the Service of Female Members in the U.S. Armed Forces](#), February, 2012, pp. 3-4. Excerpt: "The Department reviewed all available information from the Military Services and did not find any indication of females having less than equitable opportunities to compete and excel under current assignment policy." Members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who advocate gender integration at their level should surrender their own seat and ask the president to appoint a high-ranking female officer to take their place.
28. CMR Policy Analysis: "[Registration of Women for Selective Service and a Possible Future Draft](#)", May 2013.
29. CMR: "[What Congress Can Do: Sound Policy for Women in the Military](#)", 2013.



The Center for Military Readiness, an independent public policy organization that specializes in military/social issues, has prepared this CMR Policy Analysis, which is not intended to support or oppose legislation. More information is available at www.cmrlink.org.

James Robert Webb, USMC, (Ret) – Former Infantry Sergeant and son of former Virginia Sen. James H. Webb, Jr.)

"...Plain and simple, if you admit women into the Infantry, you must ask them to be men. This is completely unfair, as women are not physically just smaller men - they are completely different. Now, this is not the same as equality in society - that is a completely separate issue.... [T]he Infantry is probably the least politically correct and most exclusive group in America. It's allowed to be, it HAS to be.... More to the point, if the calculus is altered, our people, my peers, die. So, if we have the most capable and lethal ground combat force on the planet, it isn't broken. If it isn't broken, what are we trying to fix?" – [Women in the Infantry](#), Feb. 11, 2013.

Kingsley Browne – Author and Professor of Law, Wayne State University, MI

"Being in a war zone is considerably more stressful to women than to men. A study of male and female support troops in the Gulf War, none of whom had seen combat, found that women reported significantly more psychological stress than men, especially stress in anticipation of combat....Reports from Iraq suggest that, indeed, women are suffering PTSD at approximately twice the rate as men, despite the fact that they have experienced considerably less combat danger. Moreover, the form of PTSD that they suffer tends to be more severe than that suffered by men." – *Co-Ed Combat: The New Evidence that Women Shouldn't Fight the Nation's Wars*, Sentinel, 2007.

Lt. Col. Robert L. Maginnis, USA (Ret) – Author, National security and foreign policy analyst, and combat veteran.

"The experience of other countries...can be of limited applicability to the U.S. military. There is also a great deal of politically motivated overstatement in reports about women in foreign combat forces....less consequential powers may get away with allowing fashionable opinion to shape their military policy. The United states, on which the stability of the world depends, does not have that luxury." – *Deadly Consequences: How Cowards Are Pushing Women Into Combat*, Regnery, 2013, pp. 86, 95.

Mackubin Thomas Owens, USMC (Ret) – Editor of *Orbis*, journal of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, and a Marine infantry veteran..

"The Greeks identified another form of love: *eros*. Unlike *philia*, *eros* is individual and exclusive. *Eros* manifests itself as sexual competition, protectiveness, and favoritism. The presence of women in the close confines of a combat unit unleashes *eros* at the expense of *philia*. As the late **Charles Moskos**, the great military sociologist, once commented, '*When you put men and women together in a confined environment and shake vigorously, don't be surprised if sex occurs.*' ...Mixing the sexes and thereby introducing *eros* into an environment based on *philia* creates a dangerous form of friction in the military. The destructive effect on unit cohesion of amorous relationships can be denied only by ideologues." – *Weekly Standard*, [Co-Ed Combat Units: A Bad Idea on All Counts](#),

Kathleen Parker, Author and syndicated columnist, the *Washington Post*

"Women have performed admirably throughout history in a variety of roles that have included combat situations, which is not the same as directly engaging an enemy. But there are other ways to promote women without pitting them against men, who, if women *are* given special treatment, will resent them to the endangerment of all. That our Congress is accepting this change without any debate isn't progress. It is a dereliction of duty and, one is tempted to say, suggestive of cowardice." – *Washington Post*, [Combat Puts Women at Unique Risk](#)," Apr. 13, 2013.

Capt. Katie Petronio, USMC – Veteran of combat engineer battalion support, Iraq and Afghanistan.

"As a combat-experienced Marine officer, and a female, I am here to tell you that we are not all created equal, and attempting to place females in the infantry will not improve the Marine Corps as the Nation's force-in-readiness or improve our national security....As a young lieutenant, I fit the mold of a female who would have had a shot at completing IOC [Infantry Officer Course], and I am sure there was a time in my life where I would have volunteered to be an infantryman....Five years later, I am physically not the woman I once was and my views have greatly changed on the possibility of women having successful long careers while serving in the infantry. I can say from firsthand experience in Iraq and Afghanistan, and not just emotion, that we haven't even begun to analyze and comprehend the gender-specific medical issues....[S]hould the Marine Corps attempt to fully integrate women into the infantry, we as an institution are going to experience a colossal increase in crippling and career-ending medical conditions for female." – *Marine Corps Gazette*, [Get Over It! We Are Not All Created Equal](#), July 2012.

Heather MacDonald - Fellow, Manhattan Institute

"Any claim that our fighting forces are not reaching their maximum potential because women are not included is absurd. Only someone deliberately blind to human reality could maintain that putting men and women in close quarters 24 hours a day will not produce a proliferation of sex, thus introducing all the irrational passions (and resulting favoritism) of physical attraction into an organization that should be exclusively devoted to the mission of combat preparedness. Reported "sexual assaults" will skyrocket, and of course it will only be the men who are at fault." – *Chicago Tribune*, [Wrong on Female Warriors: the New Policy is a Disastrous Mistake](#), Jan. 25, 2013.