

House Armed Services Committee
Subcommittee on Personnel
Hearing on Women in Service Review

Statement of Elaine Donnelly
President, Center for Military Readiness

Wednesday – July 24, 2013

2212 Rayburn Office Building

2:00 PM

Index

Introduction	3
A. Sound Policy for Women (and Men) in the Military	5
1. Clarify the Definition of "Direct Ground Combat"	5
2. Codify women's exemptions from direct ground combat assignments	6
3. Differentiate Gender-Specific (Gender-Normed) Training From "Gender-Neutral" Training	9
4. Review All Research Data Generated by the Women in Service Reviews Since Jan. 2012	9
5. Preserve Women's Exemption from Selective Service	10
B. The Need for Congressional Oversight and Questions About Women in Land Combat	11
1. Question "Critical Mass" and "Diversity Metrics" Goals Set by the MLDC	12
2. Question the Extension of Sexual Assaults and Misconduct Into the Combat Arms	14
3. Question Expected Defense Department Costs for Implementing Gender Integration Plans	15
4. Seek Independent Analysis of the Results of Social Change in the Military	17
5. Question Claims About the Militaries of Other Countries	18
Conclusion	18
Appendix - The Experience of Other Allied Countries	20
• Great Britain	20
• Australia	20
• Canada and Other Countries	22

House Armed Services Committee – Subcommittee on Personnel

Hearing on Women in Service Review

Wednesday, July 24, 2013 – 2:00 PM – 2212 Rayburn Office Building

Statement of Elaine Donnelly, President, Center for Military Readiness

The Center for Military Readiness, an independent public policy organization that specializes in military/social issues, appreciates this opportunity to submit for the record this statement on the various plans being implemented to assign women to direct ground combat units. I am a former member of the 1992 Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces, and of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS).

On January 24, 2013, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta announced that he was unilaterally revoking all remaining Defense Department regulations exempting women from assignment to direct ground combat battalions such as the infantry. Secretary Panetta directed the military service chiefs to provide by the following May reports on how to implement his mandate to gender-integrate currently all-male fighting units by 2016.

There are many reasons why the services are hesitating and delaying implementation of plans to gender-integrate direct ground combat units that currently are all-male. To state the obvious, this is an unnecessary, bad idea that cannot be justified in terms of military necessity. The Pentagon's peremptory announcements have not provided any empirical evidence, based on actual experience and not theory, to support assertions that this is "the right thing to do."

Forty-five individual leaders and organizations affiliated with the Military Culture Coalition (MCC) signed a joint letter expressing concern about unprecedented policy changes announced in January, which was delivered to the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee on April 1, 2013.¹ Signers of the MCC letter asked the committee to intervene before the administration's incremental plans resulted in women being involuntarily assigned into "tip of the spear" direct ground combat units such as Army/Marine infantry, armor, and artillery and – with inevitably-"adjusted" standards – Special Operations Forces and Navy SEALs.

The MCC letter also expressed concern because, 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

¹ [Military Culture Coalition Letter to HASC Chairman Howard P. McKeon](http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/ChairmanMcKeonLtr-040113.pdf), April 1, 2013, available at <http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/ChairmanMcKeonLtr-040113.pdf>

possible future draft. In *Rostker v. Goldberg* (1981), the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of male-only Selective Service registration primarily because women were not eligible for direct ground combat.²

Any decision to change policies regarding women in land combat and concomitant eligibility for Selective Service should be made not by federal courts, but by Congress, the branch of government authorized by the U. S. Constitution to make policy for the military. (Art. 1, Sect. 8). The administration's pretense of implementing women-in-combat plans incrementally, between now and January, 2016, is an affront to Congress because it pointedly excludes elected members of the House and Senate from the decision-making process on Selective Service and other major issues.

MCC-affiliated organizations were disappointed that during the May mark-up of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2014, the committee missed opportunities to establish sound policy for both women and men in the military. As far as we know nothing has been said or done to intervene on behalf of military women who do not wish to be treated like men in the combat arms, and on behalf of civilian women who should not be made subject to Selective Service obligations without an accountable vote of Congress.

The Women in Service Reviews released so far are premised on unsupported assumptions about physical differences that are not likely to change, with little discussion of complicated, unresolved issues involving human sexuality that are also unlikely to change. The plan of action is moving in only one direction, in compliance with recommendations of the largely-civilian, Defense Department-endorsed Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC).³

Pentagon authorities continue to speak for radical changes from only one perspective, as directed by the President of the United States, and all subordinate military departments working on the Women in Service Reviews are subject to unusual constraints that have withheld specific research results from Congress, military personnel, and the American people.

The administration's unilateral plan of action is an affront not just to Congress, but to the majority of women and men in the combat arms whose views have not been heard or respected. To truly honor and respect military women, Congress should take responsibility for this issue. The Executive Branch is making irreversible decisions that will inevitably compromise standards, reduce the effectiveness of sustained combat operations, increase the incidence of

² CMR Policy Analysis: [Registration of Women for Selective Service and a Possible Future Draft](http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/CMR_PolicyAnalysis-May2013.pdf)
http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/CMR_PolicyAnalysis-May2013.pdf

³ [From Representation to Inclusion, Diversity Leadership for the 21st Century Military, Final Report](http://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=11390), March 15, 2011, available at <http://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=11390>. Instead of being blind to racial and gender differences, the MLDC report recommends race and gender consciousness. It repeatedly pushes for "diversity metrics," which are supposed to enforce race- and gender-conscious "*inclusion*" that goes beyond EO, and "*needs to become the norm.*" See Executive Summary, p., xvii and p. 18.

violence against women, and put both men and women at great risk, especially in the combat arms. Instead of watching passively, Congress should take a leadership role in advocating for sound policies that strengthen and improve the All-Volunteer Force.

A. Sound Policy for Women (and Men) in the Military

Respect for women in our military is greater than ever, and rightly so. They have served in unprecedented roles "in harm's way" with great courage and personal sacrifice. Uniformed women, including those in the enlisted ranks who don't want to be treated like men, deserve more than flattery and unrealistic expectations.

In reviewing this issue, Congress should assign highest priority to military necessity – not self-interested careerism, political illusions, or ideology that denies differences between men and women. The following are suggestions and background to mandate and implement Sound Policy for Women in the Military:

1. Clarify the Definition of "Direct Ground Combat"

National discussions about this issue have been hampered by confusion about what "combat" means. The first step in achieving sound policy is to use clear and accurate definitions. In the recent wars, military women have been exposed to danger and injury. More than 140 have given their lives in the wars since 9/11.⁴

As the Pentagon has acknowledged, however, women have not served in direct ground combat (DGC) units that are at issue today. These are the fighting units that *attack* the enemy with deliberate offensive action. DGC missions go beyond the experience of being "in harm's way" in a war zone – what could be called "incident-related" or "contingent" combat.⁵

For example, women who have driven in convoys threatened by IED attacks have experienced incident-related combat, for which they needed to be prepared. Female engagement teams

⁴ CMR: [Grim Total of Military Women Killed in War](#), <http://www.cmrlink.org/articles/print/35891?author=0&image=0&domain=0>

⁵ [USMC Close Combat Manual MCRP 3-02B](#), available at <http://www.combatical.com/p/overview-of-close-combat.html>, provides this definition: "Close combat is the physical confrontation between two or more opponents. It involves armed and unarmed and lethal and nonlethal fighting techniques that range from enforced compliance to deadly force. The purpose of close combat is to execute armed and unarmed techniques to produce both lethal and nonlethal results. Unarmed techniques include hand-to-hand combat and defense against hand-held weapons. Armed techniques include techniques applied with a rifle, bayonet, knife, baton, or any weapon of opportunity." The Presidential Commission reported this definition, quoting MCO 1300.8P, in CF 1.9, p. C-34: "For assignment purposes, direct combat action is defined as seeking out, reconnoitering, or engaging in offensive action." The other services provided similar definitions that distinguished deliberate offensive action from the experience of being "in harm's way" in a war zone.

(FETs) also have performed security and intelligence missions, working with women and children in ways that men cannot.

Conditions in the Middle East have changed since front-line Infantry and Special Operations Forces liberated Baghdad in 2003 and Fallujah in 2004. Nevertheless, the missions of direct ground combat (DGC) units, which attack the enemy with deliberate offensive action, have not changed. Threats from potential adversaries such as North Korea and other belligerent states still require readiness to fight in harsh conditions on the ground.

All military communities that may be involved in incident-related combat deserve the best training and recognition for their service "in harm's way." Combat arms units that attack the enemy, however, have different missions and requirements, including physical strength beyond the capabilities of most women. Congress should support *both* communities by codifying clear definitions and reality-based principles that would *improve* the All-Volunteer Force.

2. Codify women's exemptions from direct ground combat assignments

As stated in the Appendix to this paper, there is no evidence in modern military history or anywhere in the world that gender-integrating these units would constitute sound policy for women or men in the combat arms. Direct ground combat fighting units include Army and Marine Infantry, Armor and Artillery forces, plus Special Operations Forces and Navy SEAL battalions. All require high levels of physical strength in harsh conditions, and strong team cohesion based on mutual trust for survival and mission accomplishment.

To quote the late Lt. Gen. Victor "Brute" Krulak, a visionary Marine, "*Congress should draw the line at the point of the bayonet.*" Tough "gender-neutral" training for combat arms battalions has only been possible because DGC-designated units are all-male.

Instead of allowing the Obama Administration's gender-based "diversity" agenda to radically change training and assignment practices in the combat arms, Congress should codify women's exemptions from assignment to these units, while specifying that changes may not be made without express permission from Congress. Such an approach would recognize lessons learned since September 11, 2001, as well as realities of ground combat mission requirements that have not changed.

3. Differentiate Gender-Specific (Gender-Normed) Training From "Gender-Neutral" Training

Some military officials have used the misleading phrase "gender-neutral," which suggests identical training for both men and women. The Congressional Research Service has recognized that the phrase "gender-neutral physical standards" raises questions depending on how it is defined:

"A plain reading of the term suggests that men and women would be required to meet the same physical standards in order to be similarly assigned. However, in the past, the services have used this and similar terms to suggest that men and women must exert the same amount of energy in a particular task, regardless of the work that is actually accomplished by either."⁶

A misleading vocabulary of gender-neutrality is still being used to disguise the existence of gender-specific (gender-normed) training that uses different requirements or scoring systems for men and women. A case in point is the 14-page document released by the U.S. Marine Corps on June 18, which includes equivocation and contradictory language in the fine-printed footnotes and other official documents:⁷

- Footnote #3 on page 2 defines "Gender-Neutral Standard" as *"Performance-based, not specific to gender; used to measure results."* This applies in heavy lift/carry events in which all trainees must perform the same task in the same amount of time.
- Contradictions begin in footnote #4, which claims that the Marines Physical Fitness Test (PFT), starting in calendar year (CY) 2014, *"will be comprised of three gender-neutral events designed to measure general physical fitness (dead-hang pull-ups, crunches, and a 3 mile run.)"* Then the note admits that the PFT is *"gender-normed for score in order to account for physiological differences between genders. Example: A male Marine must run 18:00 or faster to achieve the maximum score on the 3-mile run; a female Marine must run 21:00 or faster to achieve the maximum score on the 3-mile run."*
- In a November 2012 ALMAR message announcing the new PFT tests, Gen. James Amos set forth requirements for earning a 100% score on the PFT that are clearly gender-specific, not gender-neutral. In order to get a 100% score of the PFT, women will have to do eight pull-ups but men will have to do twenty.⁸

⁶ David F. Burrelli, Congressional Research Service, 7-5700, R42075, ["Women in Combat: Issues for Congress,"](http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42075.pdf) May 9, 2013, p. 11, available at: <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42075.pdf>.

⁷ [Report](http://www.defense.gov/news/MarineCorpsWISRIImplementationPlan.pdf) presented by Col. John Aytes, USMC, June 18, p. 2, available at: <http://www.defense.gov/news/MarineCorpsWISRIImplementationPlan.pdf>. Lt. Gen. Richard P. Mills, Deputy Commandant, Combat Development and Integration, said that gender-specific differences in the requirements for male and female PFT trainees "are gender neutral." Contradicting that statement, he added, "The scoring is gender norm (sic) because there are physical differences between males and females." The misleading statement is comparable to saying that men and women who work out in the same gym on the same machines are doing gender-neutral exercises, even though weights and resistance levels are different "because there are physical differences between males and females." See USMC Base Quantico report by Lance Cpl. Tabitha Bartley, titled ["Bye Bye Flexed Arm Hang,"](http://www.dvidshub.net/news/98555/bye-bye-flex-arm-hang#.Uetlq-LD_nk) Dec. 3, 2012. http://www.dvidshub.net/news/98555/bye-bye-flex-arm-hang#.Uetlq-LD_nk

⁸ ALMARS Active Number 046/12, "Change to the Physical Fitness Test," 12 November, 2012, signed by Gen. James Amos, USMC, Nov. 27, 2012.

- Footnote #5 includes the same double-speak, simultaneously describing the Combat Fitness Test (CFT) as having three "*gender-neutral events*" to measure fitness. The events, however, are admittedly "*gender-normed for score in order to account for physiological differences between genders.*"
- Footnote #6 does not use the phrase "gender-neutral," but it admits that women are allowed to use "a step" on certain obstacles in order to account for height differences between average men and women. The note continues, "*Times required to pass the event are adjusted to account for physiological differences between genders.*"

These and similar gender-specific requirements on physical tests help to reduce injuries among women, and they can be justified in basic and entry-level training on that basis. The Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces called for gender-specific standards in basic, pre-commissioning, and entry-level training, but not in preparation for military occupational specialties that require great physical strength and endurance.⁹

The commission's recommendation regarding entry-level training remains valid, provided that a) the program does not supply personnel to physically-demanding occupational specialties; and b) women are exempt from direct ground combat.

Absent clarification, indications are that training standards are likely to be changed, in subtle ways, without notice to Congress. For example, the services could:

- a) Omit or phase out without notice the toughest physical tests in infantry and Special Operations Forces training. Joint Chiefs Chairman Gen. Martin Dempsey has already signaled this would happen when he said in January that all standards will be "*questioned*" if they are "*too high*" for women to "*make it.*" Regardless of what is said today, successors to current military leaders will be selected to implement the Administration's gender diversity agenda.¹⁰
- b) Use gender-specific requirements or scoring systems that treat men and women differently by recognizing "equal effort" rather than equal performance. Gender-

<http://www.marines.mil/News/Messages/MessagesDisplay/tabid/13286/Article/134672/change-to-the-physical-fitness-test.aspx> .

⁹ Report of the Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces, November 15, 1992, Recommendation Issues F and G, p. 53.

¹⁰ For example, a Marine briefing presented to the DACOWITS in September 2011 indicated that hundreds of men and women would be tested on six "common tasks" comparing physical abilities. In 2012, however, the six tests were reduced to three, the most difficult ones omitted without explanation. See CMR, "[Seven Reasons Why Women-in-Combat 'Diversity' Will Degrade Tough Training Standards](#)" April 21, 2013, available at: <http://www.cmrlink.org/articles/print/36488?author=0&image=0&domain=0>.

normed standards can be justified in entry-level military training, but not in "tip of the spear" combat arms battalions that attack the enemy with deliberate offensive action.

- c) Accept into Navy SEAL and Army Ranger teams less prepared men who would otherwise wash out. Over time this process would degrade tough, male-oriented standards – just to accept a few women under "equal" standards that would be reduced to minimum levels.

The scenario marked (c), which is likely to be adopted in order to achieve "gender diversity metrics," would make standards "equal" but lower than they are right now. Gender-normed double standards would leave men less prepared for the intense demands of close combat on land, putting lives and missions at greater risk. Standards in elite fighting teams also would be affected if they are compelled to retain men who would otherwise be assigned elsewhere.

Truthfully acknowledging gender-specific standards in early stages of training, which is not considered preparation for direct ground combat, would reduce resentment caused by perceptions of double standards. Conversely, if women's combat exemptions are *not* codified, all gender-normed training programs or scoring systems, including separate obstacle courses with lower bars or special "assists" for women, should be eliminated. ¹¹

4. Review All Research Data Generated by the Women in Service Reviews Since Jan. 2012

In response to the January 2012 policy changes announced by Secretary Panetta, Gen. James Amos, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, announced an extensive, multi-phased research project called the Assignment of Women to Ground Combat Units Research Plan. ¹² The project was designed to (a) Monitor and analyze the results of certain exceptions to current policies; (b) Survey the opinions of Marines on current policies regarding women in combat; (c) Compare the physical capabilities of men and women performing common tasks; (d) Test female volunteers on the Infantry Officer Course (IOC) at Quantico, VA; and (e) Review the requirements of closed military occupational specialties (MOs).

For unexplained or unsatisfactory reasons, however, the Marines have withheld most of the non-personal data and results of research done in 2012, even from members of this committee. With the exception of an inadequate summary of survey results obtained by the AP, and infrequent news reports about three pairs of female Marine officers who (along with a

¹¹ [Photos](http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/OCS_ObstacleCourse-Quantico.pdf) of the Marine Officer Candidate School (OCS) obstacle course at Quantico, VA, are available at: http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/OCS_ObstacleCourse-Quantico.pdf

¹² Gen. James Amos, USMC, ALMAR, April 23, 2012, [Assignment of Women to Ground Combat Units](http://www.marines.mil/News/Messages/MessagesDisplay/tabid/13286/Article/109426/assignment-of-women-to-ground-combat-units.aspx), available at <http://www.marines.mil/News/Messages/MessagesDisplay/tabid/13286/Article/109426/assignment-of-women-to-ground-combat-units.aspx>. This project was analyzed in detail in the [CMR Special Report: Defense Department "Diversity" Push for Women in Land Combat](http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/CMR%20Special%20Report%20-%20January2013.pdf), January 2013, available at: <http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/CMR%20Special%20Report%20-%20January2013.pdf>.

significant portion of men) were not able to succeed on the Infantry Officer Course at Quantico, VA, non-personal data resulting from research done by the Marine Corps and other branches of the service has not been released for independent review.

The services claim to have learned a great deal about the results of "Exceptions to Policy" or ETPs allowed since January 2012. According to news reports, however, it appears that the primary evaluators of ETP have been military women themselves, and the primary criteria is whether women are satisfied, not combat readiness and effectiveness.¹³

This guarded process does not live up to promises of a careful, measured, and responsible approach to this issue. Indeed, practices that interfere with responsible congressional oversight and independent, public review call into question the soundness of assertions that ordering women into land combat battalions is "the right thing to do."

5. Preserve Women's Exemption from Selective Service

During his January 2013 news conference, then-Defense Secretary Panetta dismissed a question about Selective Service, admitting that he did not even know the person who heads the Selective Service Administration.¹⁴ On April 11, 2013, the Pentagon's report to this committee acknowledged a turning point when circumstances would change to an extent that litigation to include women in Selective Service obligations and a possible future draft likely would succeed in court.¹⁵

Women in Service Review reports released on June 18, however, did not mention the issue. Nor did the Pentagon briefers acknowledge or express concern about the issue during their news conference on that day.

The landmark Supreme Court ruling, *Rostker v. Goldberg* (1981), recognized the purpose of Selective Service registration: to prepare for the contingency of a future draft of combat troops.

¹³ Dan Lamothe, *Marine Corps Times*, "Fit to Fight? Corps Rolls Our New Plan to Test Women's Suitability for Combat Jobs," July 1, 2013, and Thomas Brennan, *Jacksonville Daily News*, "Secretary of Defense Holds Closed Discussion With Female Marines," July 19, 2013. Also see *Virginian Pilot*, Camp LeJeune, "[Four Women Undergo Warfare Training in N.C.](http://hamptonroads.com/print/677945)," 19 May, 2013, available at: <http://hamptonroads.com/print/677945>.

¹⁴ CMR, "[Stealth Attack on Military Women](http://www.cmrlink.org/articles/print/36560?author=0&image=0&domain=0)," February 21, 2013, available at: <http://www.cmrlink.org/articles/print/36560?author=0&image=0&domain=0>.

¹⁵ The last paragraph states, "*The positions covered by this notification are not positions with a primary mission to engage in direct ground combat. As positions in combat specialties, such as infantry, still remain closed, the rationale in the Rostker decision should still apply – over 230,000 positions remain closed to women, and consequently, men and women are not similarly situated for purposes of the Military Service Act.*" Absent a law or regulation that exempts women from the infantry and other DGC units, a federal court could decide that the situation described in this April 11 memo no longer applies.

Because women historically have been exempt from combat, the Court upheld their Selective Service exemption because *"Men and women...are not similarly situated for purposes of a draft or registration for a draft."* That status has now been changed unilaterally, with nothing tangible in law or policy standing in the way of women being subject to Selective Service obligations on the same basis as men.

On April 13, 2013, the National Coalition for Men (NCM) filed a lawsuit in a California U.S. District Court, challenging the legality of male-only Selective Service registration. Citing the policy changes announced by Secretary Panetta, the NCM asked the court to *"end the sex-based discrimination in its military draft registration program and to treat men and women equally."* Even if the court dismisses this premature case, the administration is unlikely to defend the law over time. Both President Barack Obama and Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel are on the record in favor of equal Selective Service obligations for women.

Courts are not predictable, but unless Congress restores women's combat exemptions, federal courts are likely to overturn the *Rostker* precedent. Even if Congress tries to affirm men-only registration, the defining fact that men and women are now "similarly situated" with regard to combat still would remain.

Instead of allowing federal courts to decide the issue, Congress should act to establish sound policy. Although many expect that there will not be a time when a draft will be needed, a future national emergency beyond the capacity of the All-Volunteer Force would be complicated even more if women are subject to Selective Service obligations.

B. The Need for Congressional Oversight and Questions About Women in Land Combat

At the June 18 Pentagon news conference, military officials announced near-total capitulation to feminist advocates of what has been called a "gender-free military," under orders from President Barack Obama. An Army public affairs officers' email indicated that the surrender ceremony was originally scheduled to take place at Fort Benning, the storied Home of the Infantry, on June 6, the Anniversary of D-Day. Someone must have realized that the optics of that date would be all wrong, so the announcement was postponed until June 18.

On that day there was almost no mention of the brutal realities of modern war – past, present, or future. Instead, the discussion seemed centered on Amazon Warrior Myths. The meme assumes without evidence that women are interchangeable with men in direct ground combat training and in actual wartime operations, and that issues involving human sexuality can be successfully mitigated in the combat arms, despite decades of experience to the contrary in other armed forces communities.

On June 18, Maj. Gen. Bennet Sacolick, Force Management Director for the Special Operations Command, expressed primary concern about *"social, cultural, and behavioral"* issues, particularly *"the men and their reaction to women in their formations."* He offered no solution

for the problem, except for an unserious remark that was an affront to his own troops, "*The days of Rambo are over.*"

Should the military substitute the image of bare-headed *GI Jane* Demi Moore for the bare-chested *Rambo*, Sylvester Stallone? Neither image reflects reality or the professionalism of the Delta Force or Navy SEALs.

Thomas Sowell showed far more wisdom in a column titled "Sex and the Military," which criticized the notion that the issue centers on "*whether women can do the same tasks as men with equal efficiency.*" Wrote Sowell, "*The real question is whether either sex functions as well with the other sex around.*"¹⁶

For decades, military officials have repeatedly recommended that direct ground combat units remain all-male, and with good reason. With a whimper and not a bang, however, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have changed course, without explaining how gender-integration would improve the readiness of infantry battalions. It is up to members of this committee to go beyond perfunctory, essentially one-way Defense-Department-centered hearings.

Tough questions need to be asked about Defense Department policies regarding women in the military, inquiring about the assumptions behind the following issues and likely consequences of unprecedented policies that will impose new burdens on women and men in the military. For example, members of Congress should:

1. Question "Critical Mass" and "Diversity Metrics" Goals Set by the MLDC

Former Joint Chiefs Chairman Adm. Mike Mullen often described "diversity" as a strategic imperative."¹⁷ In January 2012, administration officials endorsed goals of the Military Leadership Diversity Commission (MLDC), which is pushing women into direct ground combat in order to achieve gender-based "diversity metrics," another name for "quotas." The 2011 MLDC Report admitted plans for non-remedial "diversity management," enforced by a "Chief Diversity Officer" (CDO) reporting directly to the Secretary of Defense, to promote "*diversity metrics*" and to hold all officers accountable for achieving them."¹⁸

¹⁶ Thomas Sowell, "[Sex and the Military](http://www.combatcal.com/p/overview-of-close-combat.html)," Townhall, June 12, 2013, available at: <http://www.combatcal.com/p/overview-of-close-combat.html>

¹⁷ John K. Kruzel, Armed Forces Information Services, "[Mike Mullen Speaks About Diversity in the Military](http://thesop.org/story/military/2009/10/08/mike-mullen-speaks-about-diversity-in-the-military.php)," Oct. 8, 2009, available at: <http://thesop.org/story/military/2009/10/08/mike-mullen-speaks-about-diversity-in-the-military.php>.

¹⁸ MLDC Report, Executive Summary, pp. xvii and xviii, and pp. 97-106.

This concept is a radical departure from the military's honorable tradition of recognizing individual merit – the key to successful racial integration in the military. None of this is necessary to promote women's careers, since Defense Department reports have consistently shown for years that women are promoted at rates equal to or faster than men.¹⁹

On January 24, 2013, Gen. Martin Dempsey called for a "critical mass" or "significant cadre" of women in previously-all-male units – a phrase usually interpreted to mean 10-15 percent. To assign even half that number into direct ground combat units, commanders will have to incrementally modify male-oriented programs of instruction to accommodate women.²⁰

The MLDC was authorized by Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act for 2009, but there is no reason to believe that Congress was authorizing the full range of recommendations made in the MLDC's 2011 report, including the recommendation for women in land combat. The MLDC charter, subsequent authorizations and funding should be revoked, and Congress should insist the Defense Department enforce Section 543 of current law mandating that the *"Armed Forces [and] the Secretary of Defense... (2) may not use any gender quota, goal, or ceiling except as specifically authorized by law[.]"*

Efforts to achieve the goal of a "critical mass" of women in formerly all-male DGC battalions would have the inevitable effect of modifying and lowering standards over time, making ground combat training programs less effective in preparing both men and women for the contingencies of war. During this process Congress will not be informed of changes made, or have the opportunity to intervene.

Extensive tests in the United Kingdom as well as the United States, over the past thirty years, have indicated that efforts to prepare significant numbers of women for potential infantry/Special Operations Forces assignments would steeply increase debilitating injuries in training as well as during deployments.²¹ The only solution will be gender-normed standards

¹⁹ 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: *"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."*

²⁰ Memo from General Martin E. Dempsey, CJCS, [Subject: "Women in the Service Implementation Plan,"](http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/DempseyLetter.pdf) 9 January 2013, available at: <http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/DempseyLetter.pdf>

²¹ If the Marines actually try to implement a system of identical treatment in physical training, serious injuries among women are likely to skyrocket. This is what happened when the British Army conducted an 18-month test of "gender-free" training in 1997-98, in which the British attempted to train men and women with identical "gender-free" standards. This experiment with "gender-free" training was expected to make the case for women in land combat, but due to the high level of female injuries, together with other factors, British military authorities reached the *opposite* conclusion, and decided to restore "gender-fair" (normed) training.

The 2002 Gemmel Report, published in the Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, concluded: *"Despite reducing the number of women selected, the gender-free policy led to higher losses from overuse injuries. This study*

with different requirements or scoring systems, or equal-but-lowered standards – far less demanding than male-oriented standards are right now.

In the end, attempts to keep standards the same in tough training for the combat arms would be futile, due to feminist pressure. High standards perceived as "barriers" to women's careers are unlikely to withstand questions such as that put forth by Army Gen. Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: *"If a particular standard is so high that a woman couldn't make it, the burden is now on the service to come back and explain . . . why is it that high? Does it really have to be that high?"* Since the stated goal is to achieve "diversity metrics" and "success" for women, the answer will be "No."

2. Question the Extention of Sexual Assaults and Misconduct Into the Combat Arms

In January Gen. Dempsey made the unsupported claim that assigning women to DGC units would reduce sexual assaults. This argument is a peculiar throwback to feminist arguments made in the Navy's post-Tailhook scandal period. The remedy for alcohol-fueled misconduct by male and female aviators partying at a Las Vegas convention was thought to be gender-integration in naval aviation.²²

Twenty-two years later, the Tailhook theory has been discredited. Women are as close to the fight as they can be, and respect for them is higher than ever. Rates of sexual misconduct and abuse, however, are soaring with no end in sight.²³

Some commentators have suggested that the problem won't be stopped until the military, including direct ground combat units, achieve a "critical mass" of 33% women in the ranks.²⁴

confirms and quantifies the excess risk for women when they undertake the same arduous training as male recruits, and highlights the conflict between health and safety legislation and equal opportunities legislation." See Ian M. Gemmell, JR SocMed 2002 Jan. 95(1):23-27. PMID: PMC 1279143, Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, Jan. 2002, [Injuries Among Female Army Recruits: A Conflict of Legislation, Abstract](http://cmrlink.org/CMRDocuments/gemmell-JRSocMed2002.pdf), p. 1, available at <http://cmrlink.org/CMRDocuments/gemmell-JRSocMed2002.pdf>. There is no reason to believe that American women are stronger than their British counterparts. The November 1997 US Army Research Institute of Environmental Medicine report, referred to as the Natick Study, did not meet expectations of its sponsors.

²² Colonel W. Hays Parks, USMC Reserve (Ret.), U.S. Naval Institute Magazine *Proceedings*, Sept. 1994, pp. 89-103, and Elaine Donnelly, *National Review*, "The Tailhook Scandals," Mar. 7, 1994.

²³ Since the first annual report of the Sexual Assault Prevention & Response Office (SAPRO) in 2004, confirmed assaults involving military personnel have risen from 1,275 to 2,949, an increase of 129%.

²⁴ Army Col. Ellen Harding, and Anne Coughlin, Professor of Law at the University of Virginia School of Law, *Christian Science Monitor*, "To Prevent Sexual Assault in Military, Add More Women," July 8 & 15, 2013, p. 36. The authors suggest that the 33% "critical mass" goal also should apply in high-ranking positions. Following their recommendations, some members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should surrender their stars and allow qualified women to take their place.

Pressures to achieve this dubious goal will ensure involuntary assignments of women to the combat arms in numbers sufficient to achieve "diversity metric" goals.

Given what is known about human relationships in war, it is far more likely that sexual misconduct and assaults will *increase* when chronic problems evident in all other communities are extended into direct ground combat battalions. The cause will not be women – it will be poor judgment and flawed leadership among White House and Pentagon officials who are putting gender politics above the best interests of national security and the troops they lead.

3. Question Expected Defense Department Costs for Implementing Gender-Integration Plans

On June 18, spokesmen for all branches of the services announced they will review and validate 335 primary military occupational specialties (PMOS) by December 2013.²⁵ This will be only the beginning of efforts to square the circle of physical differences with actual assignments that treat men and women as interchangeable in all combat roles. Bureaucratic talk of "phases," "pillars," and "lines of effort" seem detached from reality, since physical differences between men and women do not fit expectations of gender-neutrality in a "New Gender Order."

More than thirty years of tests and studies in the U.S. and Britain have repeatedly confirmed physiological differences that would disadvantage women in training for the combat arms. None of the studies concluded that average women might achieve "equality" in tough infantry training, much less in actual combat operations.²⁶

In a September 2011 briefing before the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Armed Services, a Marine Colonel informed the DACOWITS that on average, women have 47% lower lifting strength, 40% lower muscle strength, 20% lower aerobic capacity (important for endurance), and 26% slower road march speed. In addition, both female attrition/injury rates during entry level training and discharge (break) rates were twice those of men, and non-deployability rates were three times higher.²⁷

²⁵ Report presented by Col. John Aytes, USMC, June 18, pp. 2-3.

²⁶ An Information Paper titled "[Physical Suitability of Women for Assignment to Combat and Heavy Work Military Occupational Specialties](http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/Gregor-Info-Paper-20120508.pdf)," prepared by William J. Gregor, Ph.D., Professor of Social Sciences at the School of Advanced Military Studies at Fort Leavenworth, KS, lists some of the studies done by military leaders in several countries. Available at: <http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/Gregor-Info-Paper-20120508.pdf>.

²⁷ [Power-Point Presentation](http://dacowits.defense.gov/Reports/2011/Documents/DACOWITS%20September%202011%20Committee%20Meeting/16%20USMC%20WISR%20DACOWITS%20Brief.pdf) to the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS) 22 Sept. 2011, p. 7, available at: <http://dacowits.defense.gov/Reports/2011/Documents/DACOWITS%20September%202011%20Committee%20Meeting/16%20USMC%20WISR%20DACOWITS%20Brief.pdf>.

In a letter to HASC Chairman Howard P. McKeon, Rear Adm. Hugh P. Scott, MC, USN (Ret.) wrote that although intense training can make women stronger, underlying physical and physiological factors would be detrimental to the safety of women and to the operational effectiveness of the unit.²⁸

Nevertheless, the services have pledged to expend considerable time and money following orders to "make it work." Before they do, Congress should ask tough, specific questions about expected expenditures that will detract from funding for other necessities to support mission readiness. For example:

a) The U.S. Marine Corps stated on June 18 that it will develop a system of "physical screening tests" for use at the local recruiting station or in basic training. If this cannot be done at local recruit centers or in basic training, *"the Corps will rely on the successful completion of MOS school to determine the awarding of the MOS."*

This system sounds like a revival of the Military Entrance Physical Capacity Test (MEPSCAT), which was established and dismantled decades ago due to opposition from the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS) in 1982. Adding more burdens on recruiting stations, and introducing practices that assign women to PMOSs for which they are not suited, could become a costly fiasco wasting limited resources and time.²⁹

b) The Marines plan to implement plans for "Integration Education" – presumably to modify attitudes and behavior of men who joined the Marine Corps to defend America, not to be re-educated and socially engineered.

c) According to a January 24 memo issued by Army Chief of Staff Gen. Raymond Odierno, the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Analysis Center is leading a study that will examine the institutional and cultural barriers related to the process of gender-integration in previously all-male units, *"in order to develop strategies to overcome these barriers."* General Robert W. Cone, who heads TRADOC, has said, *"Besides physical ability, Army officials will look at "traditional impediments" – the attitudes regarding the acceptance of women into previously male-only jobs....The Army will take "proactive measures to mitigate resistance to women going into these specialties,"* the general said. Apparently forgetting the need for men in the military, the general added, *"We want the right environment for women."*³⁰

²⁸ June 22, 2012, letter titled "[Physical and Physiological Issues Associated with the Assignment of Women to Direct Ground Combat Units,](http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/hscott-mckeon-wicc.pdf)" available at: <http://cmrlink.org/data/sites/85/CMRDocuments/hscott-mckeon-wicc.pdf>

²⁹ Brian Mitchell, *Flirting With Disaster*, Regnery Publishing, 1998, p. 109.

³⁰ David Vargun, Army News Service, "[Army Training Commander Promises Fair Standards for Combat Jobs,](http://www.defense.gov/News/NewsArticle.aspx?ID=119105)" Jan. 25, 2013, available at: <http://www.defense.gov/News/NewsArticle.aspx?ID=119105>.

d) General Max Thurman, who came up with the famous Army recruiting slogan "Be All You Can Be," used to say that ours is "not an all-volunteer Army, but an all-recruited Army."³¹ There are no indications that recruiting rates would improve if female soldiers were involuntarily assigned to infantry battalions.³² Nor are there any indicators that active-duty men or women would be more likely to remain in the military if women were ordered into the combat arms on what could only be an involuntary basis.

The Women in the Service Restrictions Review (WISRR) survey done by the Marine Corps in 2012 was less useful than it could have been because it repeatedly asked questions about a non-existent voluntary women-in-combat policy that would not be workable, desirable, or necessary.³³ Detailed results of the 2012 survey have been withheld from the public, but the 5-page summary obtained by the AP did not include any indication that women or men in the military would be more likely to stay in the armed forces if policies changed.³⁴

Before plans are allowed to proceed, Congress should insist on detailed findings from surveys of active-duty troops already done on this subject, and additional surveys to measure the propensity to serve of both male and female potential recruits.

4. Seek Independent Analysis of the Results of Social Change in the Military

Since 1991-1992, when the Persian Gulf War deployed an unprecedented number of military women to the Middle East and the Las Vegas Tailhook scandal rocked the Navy, decades of

³¹ Quoted by Christopher L. Kolokowski, Letter to Naval Institute *Proceedings* magazine, "Winning the Battle, Losing the War," Sept. 2012, p. 83.

³² The December 2010 Youth Poll 20 Report of the Defense [Department Joint Advertising, Market Research & Studies \(JAMRS\)](#) found that the propensity of young women to serve in the military is only about a third that of men. See Report No. 2011-05, Sept. 2011, Table 3-4, Propensity by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender, p. 3-7, available at: <http://www.jamrs.org/reports.php>. In [a presentation](#) to the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS) on 22 Sept. 2011, Marine Col. John Nettles showed findings indicating that if women could serve in combat roles, 29% of potential female recruits said they would be *less likely* to join the military, compared to 12% of women who said they would be *more likely* to join. See p. 8 in slide presentation available at: <http://dacowits.defense.gov/Reports/2011/Documents/DACOWITS%20September%202011%20Committee%20Meeting/16%20USMC%20WISR%20DACOWITS%20Brief.pdf>.

³³ The 1992 Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces investigated the "voluntary" option for women in combat and reported as follows: "In an all-volunteer force, if combat positions are opened to women and men are involuntarily assigned to those combat positions, then women should also be involuntarily assigned to those same positions. Different assignment policies would have a deleterious effect on morale, as women would have the privilege of volunteering for combat, but not the burden of being involuntarily assigned." Commission finding (CF) 4.13, p. C-127.

³⁴ CMR: [Marine Survey Fails to Show Support for Women in Land Combat Units](#), Feb. 2, 2013, available at: <http://www.cmrlink.org/articles/print/36504?author=0&image=0&domain=0>

social change in the military have occurred without serious review. The last full committee hearing on the subject occurred in the House Armed Services Committee in 1979, 34 years ago. There have been numerous hearings on problems like sexual misconduct in the military, but no open hearings inviting independent military and civilian experts to present formal testimony about misguided policies that may be contributing to that problem.

The Department of Defense has already signaled that it is not interested in an independent, objective review. Instead, the RAND Corporation, known for producing several rubber stamp reports supporting the cause of women in combat, has been directed to produce a report that is supposed to be "non-biased" but, according to pattern, surely will be the opposite.³⁵

The House and Senate Armed Services Committees should conduct extensive hearings and an objective review of both historic data and research findings compiled in 2012, which will give insight into scores of issues not mentioned in this analysis.

Members also should ask questions of Special Operations Forces commanders to obtain more information on why Lt. Gen. Sacolick expressed more concern about "*social, cultural, and behavioral*" issues than he did about physical ones.

Proponents of further change should bear the burden of proof in showing how such changes would *benefit* both military women and men, while *strengthening* combat arms in the All-Volunteer Force.

5. Question Claims About the Militaries of Other Countries

During the June 18 Pentagon briefing, Marine Col. Jon Aytes said the Marines are researching the experiences of other nations with women in combat, such as Israel, Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom, suggesting that the U.K. has "*taken many years to do what we're doing in a relatively short time.*" Actually, the British Ministry of Defence formally decided twice to keep the combat arms all-male.

Israel conscripts its soldiers, but it does not deploy or assign women to direct ground combat missions far from home. Canada and Australia are valued allies, but they do not have elite fighting forces comparable to ours. Any review of this subject should consider the policies of potential adversaries, not allies alone. More information is available in the Appendix.

Conclusion

The issue today is not women being in war zones, where they have been, without question, serving with great courage "in harm's way." The issue now is assignment of women to direct

³⁵ CMR: [Rubber Stamp RAND Report Promotes Women in Combat](http://cmrlink.org/articles/print/34501?author=0&image=0&domain=0), Oct. 1, 2007, available at: <http://cmrlink.org/articles/print/34501?author=0&image=0&domain=0>.

ground combat units, such as infantry battalions and Special Operations Forces that seek out and attack the enemy under fire. Any decision to change assignment policies should be based on the needs of the military and national security, not media pressure or the ideological goals of mostly-civilian "diversity" advocates.

A female Marine gunnery sergeant who spoke to the 1992 Presidential Commission was asked whether women should be in the infantry. "*Not if it's not good for the Corps, Ma'am.*" The gunnery sergeant's concise reply, repeated today, sets a standard that should be applied in all policy matters affecting our women and men in the military.

* * * * *

The Center for Military Readiness is an independent public policy organization that specializes in military/social issues. More information on the topics in this statement are available at www.cmrlink.org.

Appendix - The Experience of Other Allied Countries

Great Britain

In May 2002, the **British Ministry of Defence** issued a report that explained the rationale for the decision to retain women's exemption from direct ground combat, concluding that "*only 0.1 percent of female applicants and 1 percent of trained female soldiers*" would reach the required standards to meet the demands of direct ground combat roles.³⁶ The report continued:

"The military viewpoint was that under the conditions of a high intensity close-quarter battle, group cohesion becomes of much greater significance to team performance and, in such an environment, the consequences of failure can have far-reaching and grave consequences. To admit women would, therefore, involve a risk with no gains in terms of combat effectiveness to offset it...."

"[T]he Secretary of State for Defence concluded that the case for lifting the current restrictions on women serving in combat roles has not been made for any of the units in question. Taking the risk that the inclusion of women in close combat teams could adversely affect those units in the extraordinary circumstances of high intensity close combat cannot be justified."

Eight years later, the British reviewed the issue again, and came to the same conclusion. Among other things, the 2010 U.K. Ministry of Defence *Report on the Review of the Exclusion of Women From Ground Close-Combat Roles* reaffirmed that "*[Women's] capability in almost all areas is not in doubt...But these situations are not those typical of the small tactical teams in the combat arms which are required deliberately to close with and kill the enemy.*"³⁷

If the United Kingdom was able to apply sound principles to this issue not once, but twice, the American Department of Defense should be able to apply sound principles and do the same.

Australia

³⁶ [Women in the Armed Forces](http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/10B34976-75F9-47E0-B376-AED4B09FB3B3/0/women_af_summary.pdf), Directorate of Service Personnel Policy Service Conditions, Ministry of Defence, May 2002, available at http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/10B34976-75F9-47E0-B376-AED4B09FB3B3/0/women_af_summary.pdf.

³⁷ [UK Ministry of Defence Report on the Review of the Exclusion of Women From Ground Close-Combat Roles](http://cmrlink.org/CMRDocuments/RptOnReviewOfExclusOfWomenFromGrndClose-CombatRoles-Nov2010.pdf) - 2010, November 10, 2010, p. 5, Point #18 and #19, available at <http://cmrlink.org/CMRDocuments/RptOnReviewOfExclusOfWomenFromGrndClose-CombatRoles-Nov2010.pdf>.

The Australian push to assign female soldiers to land combat units was the direct result of a sex scandal at the nation's military academy. In April 2011, amid the fallout from a series of military scandals at home and abroad, Defense Minister Stephen Smith proposed that all military positions be opened to women, including the infantry and Special Operations forces.³⁸

The Australian Human Rights Commission's Sex Discrimination Commissioner, Elizabeth Broderick, seized the opportunity to produce a report recommending that sexual harassment and abuse be remedied by ordering gender "diversity" for women in all-male combat units.³⁹ Broderick's report, titled *Review Into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force*, is full of attractive photos of smiling women in uniform and a list of 21 recommendations.

This report (and a second one that the Australian Department of Defence recently presented to the DACOWITS) primarily promote combat assignments as the best way to reduce problems with sexual harassment and assault and to promote women's careers.⁴⁰ Neither report offers a solid rationale for the five-year plan in terms of military necessity, other than "*the Army is going to do this.*"

Due to a lack of interest among Australian women – not a single one volunteered for the new positions – Human Rights Commissioner Broderick recommended that women be offered a "try before you buy" 12-month sign-up option. Ms. Broderick also recommended that "occupational segregation" be countered with programs to recruit a "critical mass" of women, and to offer them flexible "workplace" schedules.⁴¹

Far from being "ahead" of the United States, Australian leaders are implementing flawed priorities for the wrong reasons, adopting the full range of "remedies" that have not worked to

³⁸ Matt Siegel, *New York Times*, "[Australia Says It Will Open Combat Roles to Women](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/28/world/asia/australia-will-allow-women-to-serve-in-frontline-combat.html?_r=1&pagewanted=print)," Sept. 27, 2011, available at http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/28/world/asia/australia-will-allow-women-to-serve-in-frontline-combat.html?_r=1&pagewanted=print. "In the most notorious case, a male cadet at the elite Australian Defense Force Academy was caught streaming video of himself having sex with a female cadet to his friends via Skype without her knowledge." Also see: BBC News Asia, "[New Sex Scandals Hit Australia's Military Forces](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-16524952)," 15 Jan. 2012, available at [http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-16524952?print=true](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-16524952).

³⁹ Elizabeth Broderick, *Review Into the Treatment of Women in the Australian Defence Force*, Australian Human Rights Commission, 2012, formerly available at http://www.humanrights.gov.au/defencereview/ADF_report/.

⁴⁰ Australian Government Department of Defence, [Brief to DACOWITS](http://dacowits.defense.gov/Reports/2012/Documents/DACOWITS%20September%202012%20Committee%20Meeting/September%20Meeting%20Binder.pdf) 27 Sept. 2012, "Changes to How Women Are Employed in the Australian Defence Force," available at: <http://dacowits.defense.gov/Reports/2012/Documents/DACOWITS%20September%202012%20Committee%20Meeting/September%20Meeting%20Binder.pdf>.

⁴¹ Misha Shubert, *Sydney Morning Herald*: "[Women To 'Try Before They Buy' Combat Roles](http://www.smh.com.au/action/printArticle?id=3584203)," Aug. 26, 2012, available at <http://www.smh.com.au/action/printArticle?id=3584203>.

mitigate social problems in our own military. Australia is a valued ally, but it should not become a role model for radical cultural change in America's armed forces.

Canada & Other Countries

In February 2013 National Public Radio prepared a useful summary showing that most of the smaller countries that "allow" women to serve in close combat units are not directly involved in aggressive combat actions comparable to those led by the United States.⁴² The 1992 Presidential Commission interviewed representatives of several NATO allies, and produced similar findings.

Circumstances varied widely, but the Presidential Commission reported, *"Historically, those nations that have experienced or actually placed women in close combat situations, (Soviet Union, Germany, and Israel) [did so] during times of grave threats to their national survival. After the crisis passed, each nation adopted policies which excluded the employment of women in combat."*⁴³ (In 2001, Germany complied with an order of the European Court of Justice to eliminate restrictions on women in their military.)

In Israel, which has conscription and exists under constant threats, most able-bodied citizens, including women, serve in the military. Women who train men for combat positions are considered "combat multipliers," not combat soldiers. Some women have been deployed to patrol the border, but these missions do not involve direct ground combat against the enemy.

In establishing equal opportunity as the primary consideration in formulating military personnel policies, representatives of countries such as Denmark and the Dutch Armed Forces clearly stated that their primary concern was equal opportunity, not combat effectiveness.⁴⁴ After meeting with a Canadian delegation, the Presidential Commission reported, *"In a 1989 decision by the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal, all combat positions in the Canadian Forces (CF), except submarines, were opened to women. The primary consideration was equal opportunity. No attempts were made to consider the impact on operational readiness or unit effectiveness. No credence was given to a military study (SWINTER), ongoing during the time of the decision, which indicated difficulties would be anticipated."*⁴⁵

⁴² Joshua Keating, National Public Radio, "[Foreign Policy - Women on the Front Lines](http://www.npr.org/2012/02/13/146802589/foreign-policy-women-on-the-front-lines)," February 13, 2012, available at <http://www.npr.org/2012/02/13/146802589/foreign-policy-women-on-the-front-lines>.

⁴³ Presidential Commission Report, CF 1.104A, 1.105, 1.106, 1.125, 1.129, pp. C-61 through C-67, and Canadian Trip Report, 28-31 July and International Trip Report, 16-25 September, pp. C-21 through C-31.

⁴⁴ Presidential Commission Report, CF 1.104A, 1.105, 1.106, 1.125, 1.129, pp. C-61 through C-67, and Canadian Trip Report, 28-31 July and International Trip Report, 16-25 September, pp. C-21 through C-31.

⁴⁵ *Ibid*, CF 1.129, p. C-67.

Countries that have decided previously or in recent years to assign women to combat positions in the ground, naval, and air forces have done so primarily for reasons of "equal opportunity," (now called "diversity") rather than military necessity.

Unlike Denmark, the Netherlands, Canada, and other allied nations, the American Armed Forces cannot afford to make similar tradeoffs, elevating "equal opportunity" above military necessity. This is especially so when potential adversaries in a dangerous world are not operating under the same "diversity" rules.