AD A043084

COPY AVAILABLE TO DDC DOES NOT
PERMIT FULLY LEGIBLE PRODUCTION

A CASE FOR WOMEN IN COMBAT

MAJOR LARRY BERRONG

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

DDC
RECEIVED
AUG 19 1977
B

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

AD No.
DDC FILE COPY

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER

2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.

3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER

4. TITLE (and Subtitle)

A Case for Women in Combat

5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED

Final Report, ~~10 Jun 77~~

6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER

7. AUTHOR(s)

Berrong, L. B., Maj, USA

Larry B. Berrong

8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

Student at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027

10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS

U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
ATTN: ATSW-CD-P

12. REPORT DATE

10 Jun 77

13. NUMBER OF PAGES

8

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)

15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)

Unclassified

15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

N/A

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

Student research paper at CGSC 1977.

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Females, Attitudes (Psychology), Discrimination.

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

The author suggests that qualifications other than sex be used to determine assignment to combat. Women should have the prerogative to decide whether they want to serve in combat. The Army should take action to resolve the situation before the courts and Congress take away the opportunity to choose.

ACCESSION for
NTIS White Section
DDC Buff Section
UNANNOUNCED
JUSTIFICATION
BY
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES
Dist. AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL
A

037260

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

ACCESSION for
NTIS White Section ☑
DDC Buff Section ☐
UNANNOUNCED ☐
JUSTIFICATION
BY
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES
Dist. AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL
A 23

In the summer of 1975, I attended a seminar about the Officer Personnel Management System (OPMS) conducted by Major General Gard, who was then Commander of MILPERCEN. The purpose of the seminar was to provide a forum for a two-way exchange of information between General Gard and officers stationed at Fort McClellan, Alabama. During one discussion, a WAC Captain informed the General that her greatest ambition as an officer was to command a combat unit.

I do not recall the General's exact response, but I do remember that neither it nor subsequent group discussion dealt effectively with the issue the Captain posed. I cite this personal example because it made me acutely aware that we face precisely the same dilemma in the Army today-- we are not dealing effectively with the issue of women in combat.

Why do we not allow women to serve in combat roles? Would it be a threat to our collective male egos or is the weaker sex really that much weaker? I examine some of these questions and propose a more realistic course of action for the Army in subsequent paragraphs. Preceding that, however, it is necessary to be familiar with just where we, the Army, stand right now on this subject.

Current Department of the Army policy regarding women in combat is delineated in a recent TRADOC message (Appendix 1).

The restriction on employing women forward of the Brigade rear boundary is lifted but women still cannot serve in Category I Units (Appendix 2).

This is a tremendous move forward from the days when women could work in clerical jobs, hospitals and maybe as drivers. It is also a continuation of the gradual evolution during this decade which has seen the Army open "more of its specialties (90%) to women."[1] We remain reluctant, however, to remove all barriers to equality and let the ladies participate in battle.

The most often repeated reason for not committing the "fairer sex" to the front lines is that they are not strong enough physicallly. While this is certainly true of some women, it can also be said of a large number of men. On the other hand, many women are sufficiently strong to fight and history is replete with examples of those who have distinguished themselves in battle.

Two such examples occurred during our revolutionary war. "For 18 months, Deborah Sampson Gannett fooled the Fourth Massachusetts Regiment, masquerading as a male soldier. Wounded several times, she nursed herself to remain undetected. Her secret came out at Philadelphia when she fell ill with a fever. The attending physician kept the confidence and she

was honorably discharged October 23, 1783 as Robert Shurtleff, her assumed name."[2] Molly Pitcher, actually named Mary Hayes, took over for her wounded husband during the Battle of Monmouth, New Jersey, on June 28, 1778."[3]

In my view, the real reason we do not allow women in combat roles has nothing to do with their lack of strength. Rather, it has to do with infringement on a traditionally male role. It has to do with visions of the knight of old protecting the fair damsel; the cowboy rescuing the pretty young gal from the Indians; and the doughboys during WWI and the GI's in WWII defending family and flag.

Male ego demands that we remain the protector and the female consequently, the protected. Having the female side by side with us in combat is a real threat to our "Machismo." Some evidence of this phenomenon is apparent in the following exerpt from John Laffin's book, Women In Battle, as he attempts to explain why famous women soldiers are relatively unknown:

> "Perhaps one reason is that the chroniclers of war have nearly all been men and as males they have not wanted to give too much emphasis to the very fact that women are capable of fighting. They resent the intrusion of women into what clearly should be the one impregnable male bastion. The score or so women whose exploits are

known in detail have been regarded as freaks."[4]

Considering the stranglehold men have over authority in the military, it is a marvel that the gradual evolution, that I mentioned previously, to our comparatively liberal current policy ever occurred. In fact, it would not have without the pressures applied by the volunteer army recruiting problems and the women's liberation movement.

The Army's inability to attract a sufficient number of qualified males has dictated that we rely more and more on the growing female labor pool. We have enjoyed such great success in this venture that higher standards are required of women than of men-- which is another manifestation of discrimination. The chart below taken from a Soldiers magazine article on Basic Initial Entry Training (BIET) demonstrates the results of requiring a high school education and higher GT scores for women:

BIET PROFILE CHART

Variable	Men	Women
Age (years)	19.2	20.0
Height (inches)	69.1	64.3
Weight (pounds)	151.3	126.9
Education (years)	11.6	12.3
Glasses (percent)	22.4 yes	47.6 yes
	77.6 no	52.4 no
GT score: General Technical	101.9	114.5

Participants in BIET were taken directly from the pipeline. No one was hand-picked so they should represent a good cross section of incoming recruits. The BIET men had a size and weight advantage; the women had better education, higher GT scores and an extra year of age and experience."[5]

The second reason for the progress we have made thus far in expanding women's roles in the Army is the pressure that the women's liberation movement has brought to bear on society in general for equal rights. Ultimately it is this force backed by the National Courts that is going to require the Army to allow women to serve in combat, if they are qualified.

The courts have consistently ruled during the last two decades that job standards must be realistic. They "must be reasonably related to the job to be filled and must be applied impartially to all who make their interest known."[6] This does not mean that standards should be lowered to allow women to serve in combat units, but rather that women who can meet realistic standards should not be discriminated against.

This leads to my proposal-- establish realistic job requirements for combat jobs and enforce them uniformly on all who apply, both male and female. It is certain that at present most women are physically weaker than most men. Whether this can be attributed to upbringing or innate physical characterist

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

is irrelevant. What is relevant is that some women are strong enough mentally and physically to be combat soldiers. Accordingly, they should be given equal rights to serve as they choose.

The number of women who would elect to exercise the prerogative to be combat soldiers if it were made available would probably be few. Maybe, the only one to step forward would be the WAC Captain I mentioned earlier. The number who would respond is not important-- what is important is that another barrier to equality needs to be removed. We should do it now before the courts order that it be done.

FOOTNOTES

[1]George Henderson, Human Relations In The Military: Problems and Progress (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1975), p. 74.

[2]US News and World Report, "Women's Forgotten Role In The Revolution" (Washington, D.C.: US News and World Report, Inc. Vol. LXXXI, No. 1, July 5, 1976), p. 36.

[3]Ibid.

[4]John Laffin, Women in Battle (New York: Abeland-Schuman, 1968), p.11.

[5]Dapartment of the Army, Soldiers, "BIET: Shoulder to Shoulder", (Vol 32, No. 4, April 1977), p. 7.

[6]O. Glenn, Stahl, Public Personnel Administration, (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1971), p. 31.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Henderson, George, Human Relations In The Military: Problems and Programs. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1975.

Laffin, John. Women In Battle. New York: Abeland- Schuman, 1968.

Moore, Frank. Women of the War; Their Heroism and Self-Sacrifice. Hartford: S. S. Scronton and Co., 1867.

Stahl, O. Glenn. Public Personnel Administration. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1971.

Department of the Army. Soldiers. Vol. 32, No. 4, "BIET: Shoulder to Shoulder." April 1977.

US News and World Report. US News and World Report, Inc. Washington, D.C.: "Women's Forgotten Role in the Revolution." Vol. LXXXI, No. 1, July 5, 1976.