

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):
1998-0095-F

FOIA Number:
1998-0095-F

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential
Library Staff.**

Record Group/Collection: Dan Quayle Vice Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Deputy Chief of Staff's Office
Series: Porter, Richard W., Files
Subseries: Subject File

OA/ID Number: 21807
Folder ID Number: 21807-024

Folder Title:
Gay Rights

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	27	15	7	2

Will fight for rights

On Tuesday, May 5, Democratic voters in the District of Columbia will vote in the D.C. Presidential Primary. I am asking for your support next Tuesday because I know you share my commitment to fundamental change.

Recently, the Gertrude Stein Democratic Club endorsed my presidential candidacy. I am grateful for the Stein Club's support, as I am for the significant contributions several Washington Gay male and Lesbian individuals and D.C. delegate candidates have made to my campaign locally and nationally.

For 12 years, the Republicans have told us the problems of some Americans are not their problem. They have divided us — by race, by gender, by sexual orientation — so we would be mad at each other and not at them. I'm not going to let them get away with this anymore.

We can't afford four more years of political bickering while pressing problems here at home go unsolved. More finger-pointing isn't going to solve our problems — and they're not going to be solved by politicians content to blame others instead of rolling up their sleeves and facing the job head on. Our problems aren't going to be solved unless we come together — as one American people — united in common purpose to create fundamental change in this country.

All my life I have fought for change — and for a fairer, more inclusive society. I've always stood up against bigotry, injustice, and hatred. As president, I will fight for the civil rights of all Americans, regardless of their sexual orientation, race, creed, color or gender.

As president, I will work to guarantee the civil rights of Gay male and Lesbian Americans. My Administration will:

- Repeal the ban on Gay men and Lesbians serving in the United States Armed Forces. Any patriotic American should be allowed to serve their country in the armed forces regardless of sexual orientation;
- Issue an executive order banning discrimination based on sexual orientation in federal hiring and contracting;
- Sign the federal Gay civil rights bill as long as it respects freedom of religion by exempting religious organizations and provides clear standards of evidence of discrimination that can be used in court. Unless the bill contains such clear

standards, proof of discrimination will be left up to the courts and the Equal Opportunity Commission to determine. Their decisions may not reflect the same commitment to civil rights that inspired the original legislation.

I believe that further delay in the fight against AIDS is unconscionable. As chair of the National Governor's Association, I formed the first working group of governors to develop a policy on AIDS. I worked hard to create an AIDS action plan adopted by the Governor's Association, which called for education and prevention efforts at the local, state, and federal levels. As Governor of Arkansas, I have been a strong advocate of increased education about AIDS. As president, I will:

- Offer a sweeping national health care reform plan in the first 100 days of my administration. The plan will insure everyone — regardless of pre-existing conditions or ability to pay;
- Press for an aggressive program of education and prevention, research, voluntary testing, and treatment;
- Create a national AIDS education program, similar to the one already in place in Arkansas, so there's open and honest discussion in our schools;
- Devote the necessary resources to research, and to producing treatments and a cure;
- Increase global cooperation to ease the suffering AIDS is causing around the world;
- Provide the moral and executive leadership the AIDS issue demands.

Please join my cause — our cause. I want to be a part of a nation that is

coming together, not coming apart. I want to see more communities where people look out for each other, not just for themselves. And I want an America that once again brings out the best in us, not the worst. That's what this election is really about. Thank you for your support.

Governor Bill Clinton (Ark.)
Bill Clinton for President Committee
Mid-Atlantic Headquarters
Washington, D.C.

Editor's note: Gov. Clinton's letter was submitted to the Blade for publication without his signature. Ann Walker, press secretary for the Clinton campaign in D.C., said she was authorized to confirm that Gov. Clinton had read and approved this letter.

The Vice President

Quayle Contends Homosexuality Is a Matter of Choice, Not Biology

By KAREN DE WITT
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 13 — Sounding the conservative themes that were paramount at the Republican National Convention, Vice President Dan Quayle said today that homosexuality was most often a personal choice and not determined by biology, and that it was "a wrong choice."

Appearing on the ABC News program "This Week," Mr. Quayle touched on subjects that included the Republican stance on abortion and homosexual rights and aid for hurricane victims in Florida and Hawaii. He reiterated that President Bush would veto, as promised, appropriation bills that exceed the Administration's budget requests.

Mr. Quayle also defended Mr. Bush's assertions that taxes would not be raised in a second term, even though they were raised in 1990, and the Vice President reasserted his own support for a Pennsylvania statute that restricts but does not ban abortions.

In the clearest statement yet of his own beliefs on homosexuality, Mr. Quayle said, "My viewpoint is that it's more of a choice than a biological situation."

When pressed on where he stood, Mr. Quayle said: "I think it is a wrong choice. It is a wrong; it is a wrong choice. I do believe in most cases it is a choice."

Some recent medical studies indicate that homosexuality may be genetically determined.

In any case, Mr. Quayle sought to emphasize the debate, pointing out that the Bush Administration had a policy of nondiscrimination against homosexuals. He contrasted this with a Democratic Party platform position that calls for affirmative-action programs for homosexuals. Mr. Quayle said this would lead to intrusive questioning of people's sexual preferences.

The President "will have a policy of nondiscrimination," Mr. Quayle said. "But, obviously, the gay and lesbian activists are a constituency of the Democratic Party, and Bill Clinton has made a pledge that he will hire gays and lesbians, and the only way that he can do that, to have the kind of a situation, is to ask someone their sexual orientation. We don't think it's anybody's business."

George Stephanopoulos, Mr. Clinton's spokesman, countered the Vice President's comments, saying affirmative-action laws were needed to protect workers' rights.

As he has in recent speeches, Mr. Quayle endorsed a Pennsylvania statute that restricts but does not ban abortions. He described the Pennsylvania law as "a very logical approach to deal with a very sensitive, divisive issue."

READERS FORUM

Will fight for rights

On Tuesday, May 5, Democratic voters in the District of Columbia will vote in the D.C. Presidential Primary. I am asking for your support next Tuesday because I know you share my commitment to fundamental change.

Recently, the Gertrude Stein Democratic Club endorsed my presidential candidacy. I am grateful for the Stein Club's support, as I am for the significant contributions several Washington Gay male and Lesbian individuals and D.C. delegate candidates have made to my campaign locally and nationally.

For 12 years, the Republicans have told us the problems of some Americans are not their problem. They have divided us — by race, by gender, by sexual orientation — so we would be mad at each other and not at them. I'm not going to let them get away with this anymore.

We can't afford four more years of political bickering while pressing problems here at home go unsolved. More finger-pointing isn't going to solve our problems — and they're not going to be solved by politicians content to blame others instead of rolling up their sleeves and facing the job head on. Our problems aren't going to be solved unless we come together — as one American people — united in common purpose to create fundamental change in this country.

All my life I have fought for change — and for a fairer, more inclusive society. I've always stood up against bigotry, injustice, and hatred. As president, I will fight for the civil rights of all Americans, regardless of their sexual orientation, race, creed, color or gender.

As president I will work to guarantee the civil rights of Gay male and Lesbian Americans. My Administration will:

- Repeal the ban on Gay men and Lesbians serving in the United States Armed Forces. Any patriotic American should be allowed to serve their country in the armed forces regardless of sexual orientation;
- Issue an executive order banning discrimination based on sexual orientation in federal hiring and contracting;
- Sign the federal Gay civil rights bill as long as it respects freedom of religion by exempting religious organizations and provides clear standards of evidence of discrimination that can be used in court. Unless the bill contains such clear

standards, proof of discrimination will be left up to the courts and the Equal Opportunity Commission to determine. Their decisions may not reflect the same commitment to civil rights that inspired the original legislation.

I believe that further delay in the fight against AIDS is unconscionable. As chair of the National Governor's Association, I formed the first working group of governors to develop a policy on AIDS. I worked hard to create an AIDS action plan adopted by the Governor's Association, which called for education and prevention efforts at the local, state, and federal levels. As Governor of Arkansas, I have been a strong advocate of increased education about AIDS. As president, I will:

- Offer a sweeping national health care reform plan in the first 100 days of my administration. The plan will insure everyone — regardless of pre-existing conditions or ability to pay;
- Press for an aggressive program of education and prevention, research, voluntary testing, and treatment;
- Create a national AIDS education program, similar to the one already in place in Arkansas, so there's open and honest discussion in our schools;
- Devote the necessary resources to research, and to producing treatments and a cure;
- Increase global cooperation to ease the suffering AIDS is causing around the world;
- Provide the moral and executive leadership the AIDS issue demands.

Please join my cause — our cause. I want to be a part of a nation that is

coming together, not coming apart. I want to see more communities where people look out for each other, not just for themselves. And I want an America that once again brings out the best in us, not the worst. That's what this election is really about. Thank you for your support.

Governor Bill Clinton (Ark.)
Bill Clinton for President Committee
Mid-Atlantic Headquarters
Washington, D.C.

Editor's note: Gov. Clinton's letter was submitted to the Blade for publication without his signature. Ann Walker, press secretary for the Clinton campaign in D.C., said she was authorized to confirm that Gov. Clinton had read and approved this letter.

The Vice President

Quayle Contends Homosexuality Is a Matter of Choice, Not Biology

By KAREN DE WITT
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 13 — Sounding the conservative themes that were paramount at the Republican National Convention, Vice President Dan Quayle said today that homosexuality was most often a personal choice and not determined by biology, and that it was "a wrong choice".

Appearing on the ABC News program "This Week," Mr. Quayle touched on subjects that included the Republican stance on abortion and homosexual rights and aid for hurricane victims in Florida and Hawaii. He reiterated that President Bush would veto, as promised, appropriation bills that exceed the Administration's budget requests.

Mr. Quayle also defended Mr. Bush's assertions that taxes would not be raised in a second term, even though they were raised in 1990, and the Vice President reasserted his own support for a Pennsylvania statute that restricts but does not ban abortions.

In the clearest statement yet of his own beliefs on homosexuality, Mr. Quayle said, "My viewpoint is that it's more of a choice than a biological situation."

When pressed on where he stood, Mr. Quayle said: "I think it is a wrong choice. It is a wrong; it is a wrong choice. I do believe in most cases it is a choice."

Some recent medical studies indicate that homosexuality may be genetically determined.

In any case, Mr. Quayle sought to de-emphasize the debate, pointing out that the Bush Administration had a policy of nondiscrimination against homosexuals. He contrasted this with a Democratic Party platform position that calls for affirmative-action programs for homosexuals. Mr. Quayle said this would lead to intrusive questioning of people's sexual preferences.

The President "will have a policy of nondiscrimination," Mr. Quayle said. "But, obviously, the gay and lesbian activists are a constituency of the Democratic Party, and Bill Clinton has made a pledge that he will hire gays and lesbians, and the only way that he can do that, to have the kind of a situation, is to ask someone their sexual orientation. We don't think it's anybody's business."

George Stephanopoulos, Mr. Clinton's spokesman, countered the Vice President's comments, saying affirmative-action laws were needed to protect workers' rights.

As he has in recent speeches, Mr. Quayle endorsed a Pennsylvania statute that restricts but does not ban abortions. He described the Pennsylvania law as "a very logical approach to deal with a very sensitive, divisive issue."

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01. Memo	Re: Policy of Nondiscrimination Against Gays (1 pp.)	08/09/92	PRM	

Collection:

Record Group: Quayle Vice Presidential Records
Office: Deputy Chief of Staff to the Vice President
Series: Porter, Richard
Subseries: Subject Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Gay Rights

Date Closed: 4/18/2005 **OA/ID Number:** 21807-024

FOIA/SYS Case #: 1998-0095-F

Appeal Case #:

Re-review Case #:

Appeal Disposition:

P-2/P-5 Review Case #:

Disposition Date:

AR Case #:

MR Case #:

AR Disposition:

MR Disposition:

AR Disposition Date:

MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
 P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
 P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
 P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
 P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
 P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
 (b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
 (b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
 (b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
 (b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
 (b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
 (b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
 (b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
02. Memo	Re: Policy of Nondiscrimination Against Gays (1 pp.)	08/09/92	PRM	

Collection:

Record Group: Quayle Vice Presidential Records
Office: Deputy Chief of Staff to the Vice President
Series: Porter, Richard
Subseries: Subject Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Gay Rights

Date Closed: 4/18/2005	OA/ID Number: 21807-024
FOIA/SYS Case #: 1998-0095-F	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #:	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
 P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
 P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
 P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
 P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
 P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
 (b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
 (b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
 (b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
 (b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
 (b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
 (b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
 (b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

BILL PASCOE

WASHINGTON TIMES

July 29, 1992

Pg. G1

Marching toward combat?

Report awaited

In the wake of recent revelations about sexual harassment in the armed forces — both the now-infamous Navy Tailhook scandal and, just last week, the release of new information regarding 24 female soldiers who were sexually assaulted by U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf — the question of assigning women to combat roles has come back to the front burner.

Providentially, we just happen to

Bill Pascoe, a political consultant, is a columnist for The Washington Times.

have a blue-ribbon presidential commission to study the options and make weighty recommendations.

The commission is known as the Herres Commission — named after its chairman, retired Air Force Gen. Robert T. Herres.

(Many conservatives already are wary of Gen. Herres, remembering his role as then-vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in trying to gut SDI funding in the mid-1980s; they rue his apparent willingness to cave in to liberal pressures.)

Given the revelations of harassment, many commentators have addressed the basic questions regarding a woman's suitability for combat. But frankly, whether or not women have or don't have the physiological, emotional and mental toughness to endure combat as well as men is

something about which we need to know little; for it is merely the political consideration, not the physiological, that requires women to be left out of combat.

To make the point, consider the following scenario, if women were to be assigned combat roles:

It is 1998, and in the afterglow of Western victory in the Cold War, U.S. armed forces have been slashed. But a new threat arises, one which necessitates a quick and speedy mobilization of more forces than are comfortably available. U.S. political leaders plan to issue a call for a military draft.

But now that women have been assigned roles in combat, the attorney general reminds them, it would be unconstitutional not to draft them, too; for not to do so would

be to discriminate against men on the basis of gender.

Faced with the constitutional and legal requirement either to draft women or not to draft at all, who among us doubts that the choice of our political and military leaders would be not to draft at all? For who, among us believes our political and military leaders would allow their mothers, sisters and daughters to be impressed into military service?

A military draft, after all, is a form of forcing people to do something they would not otherwise choose to do. (If enough people had chosen to do what is the goal of a military draft — to create a large enough combat force — there would be no need for one, would there?) By its very nature, it relies on the coercive power of the state to achieve its goals.

And while it may be one thing to allow women voluntarily to choose a life in the armed forces, it is quite another thing to coerce them into serving in the military.

Though this scenario may sound far-fetched, in fact it is not. Cases have already made their way into the courts regarding the alleged gender discrimination suffered by men drafted for military service; and the courts have ruled that only the fact that women do not serve in combat roles allows the government to draft only men without being guilty of discrimination.

Thus, the courts have made clear, if women were to be assigned combat roles, there would be no way the armed forces could undertake a draft without including women, too.

Clearly, therefore, the result of allowing women into combat roles would be to forswear forever the option of a military draft — which would drastically reduce the ability of the federal government to project power abroad.

COMBAT...from Pg. 6

Perhaps more importantly, removing the government's ability to draft in time of national military emergency would reduce the government's ability to threaten to project power abroad; and this would be even worse, for it is much more often the threat of force than its actual use that works to achieve our policy goals.

History is full of examples. In fact, this dynamic is the basis of deterrence, the politico-military strategy that undergirded U.S. national security policy for the latter half of the 20th century and that won the Cold War.

Shorn of the ability credibly to threaten military action abroad, a U.S. president would find himself less and less able to manipulate geopolitical scenarios to the advantage of U.S. interests, and would be forced more and more often into an agonizing choice between allowing U.S. interests to be jeopardized or actually

committing forces abroad, merely to prove the threat credible.

Thus, the unintended result of the liberals' attempts to gut U.S. power projection capabilities and thereby reduce the likelihood of U.S. forces being committed overseas could actually be an increased likelihood of such deployments in the future.

Though the commission report is not slated to be released until mid-November, the first draft will be presented at an open meeting of the commission on Oct. 2, and the final draft will be presented for comment on Oct. 22 — fully two weeks before the election. If President Bush's team doesn't take notice soon, they're going to have a major embarrassment on their hands with the pro-family community in this country just 12 days before the election.

And what's worse, as with virtually all of the president's wounds, this one, too, will be primarily self-inflicted — all 15 appointees on the commission were chosen by Mr. Bush.

Jim Baker, call your office

*SUZANNE FIELDS

Imperfect war and warriors

The "mother of all battles" has turned into the mother-in-law of all battles. She won't go away and she makes life a lot more complicated than anyone thinks necessary.

Operation Desert Storm turns out to have been considerably less than the perfect war that we saw on television. Not only does Saddam Hussein continue to violate United Nations regulations, but we're learning that some of our own servicepersons had major personal problems in the sand, too.

At least two dozen U.S. Army women were raped or sexually assaulted while serving in the Persian Gulf — and not by the enemy. The U.S. Army Criminal Investigation Command describes some of the cases in a report obtained by The Washington Post.

A male sergeant grabs a female private's privates as she walks to her "vehicle." He drags her through the night at knife point into the desert and rapes her.

A male captain assaults a female private, 24, in his tent. He "French kisses" her and unbuttons her

Suzanne Fields, a columnist for The Washington Times, is nationally syndicated.

WASHINGTON TIMES

July 30, 1992

Pg. G-1

blouse, fondling her above and below the waist.

A female soldier, 22, on a rest-and-relaxation holiday on a cruise ship at anchor off Bahrain, is raped by a stranger while she sleeps in her cabin. She never learns his identity.

Another female specialist, who engages in "consensual sex" with a soldier at the back of a bus, is suddenly attacked by another soldier who forces her to submit to him, too.

When two soldiers, a man and a woman, share guard duty and a blanket to keep warm, the man begins to fondle the woman as she sleeps. A female private is thrown on a bed and raped by a male private.

These are ugly pictures of men at war turning on their own women, offering no mitigating excuses. Every war has savage stories, and the men are often punished as the awful beasts they become.

But Operation Desert Storm adds a new dimension to such incidents, raising questions that we've never had to confront before. With 11 percent of the military services made up of women, the politically incorrect question everybody avoids asking is whether women belong in such close quarters with men on a battlefield.

To raise the question is to be accused of punishing the victim or condoning the assault. But that's neither fair nor to the point of the question our senior military chiefs ought to be asking, but are afraid to.

To the astonishment of most of the rest of the world, we've embarked on a remarkable cultural experiment, throwing healthy young men and women closely together in remote places where restraints are

WARRIORS...Pg. 8

WARRIORS...from Pg. 7

not only unfamiliar, but often not even encouraged.

Is this remarkable cultural experiment wise? Is it sound? Is it, over the long run, even possible? That depends on whether you see the armed services as another equal opportunity employer, like the public-works department or the game and fish commission, or an agency charged with the security of the country.

When The Washington Post suggested that these revelations would be discussed by the presidential commission studying the effects of assigning women to combat, certain feminists were enraged.

These feminists don't understand that women can't have it both ways.

Men at war acting like men at war are the fleas that come with this particular dog. When Army Maj. Rhonda Cornum recently told the presidential commission how she was sexually abused as a prisoner of war in the Gulf conflict the impact was felt by everyone.

The president's commission asked a military historian from Israel to testify about the experience of women in the Israeli army. Women once fought with men, but not since Israel has become a nation. His government would never consider assigning women to combat units because such a move would undercut readiness and effectiveness.

"The very fact that this issue is being discussed in the United States!" testified Martin Van Creveld, "shows that you don't really take the military seriously."

WOMEN IN COMBAT

Arguments Against

Bottom Line:

A. Putting women in combat will reduce combat readiness by undermining unit cohesion, morale, and discipline.

B. More importantly, putting women in combat will also undermine significantly and eventually destroy the value system that sustains healthy families and that in turn sustains a stable society.

Arguments For

Bottom Line:

Traditions and values that distinguish sex-roles must be jettisoned or privatized in order to ensure that women have exactly identical roles and exactly the same opportunities that men do in any career field they choose including the military.

There are no military reasons to warrant changing the traditional policy limiting combat roles to males only. Currently faced by a need to greatly reduce their numbers, the services have more than enough well qualified males to serve in combat billets, and they are having no difficulty recruiting all the talent needed from out of the male segment of the population. There is no actual military need to bring women into combat positions.

Women POWs are more vulnerable than men; women captured in war face special risks their male counterparts do not. The special trauma of rape and sexual abuse on women in the military is underscored by the campaign of Barbara Franco to obtain veteran benefits and treatment for post-traumatic stress syndrome stemming from rape experienced while serving in the Army. ("Women in military: A battle for respect" Philadelphia Inquirer, July 12, 1992, pg 1)

Women should be allowed to do anything men do. Gender is an irrelevant characteristic. The only relevant consideration should be an individual's ability to perform. (First class midshipman at USNA, Los Angeles Times, June 28, 1992, pg 4)

Sexual abuse of a female POW is no more tragic than abuse suffered by male POWs. It is not even as bad because it is not disabling, disfiguring, life-threatening or even excruciating. "Everyone's made such a big deal about this indecent assault. But the only thing that makes it indecent is that it was nonconsensual. I asked myself, 'Is it going to prevent me from getting out of here? Is there a risk of death attached to it? Is it permanently disabling? Is it permanently disfiguring? Lastly, is it excruciating?' If it doesn't fit one those five categories, then it isn't important." (Maj. Rhonda Cornum, in "Women warriors as captives" Washington Times, July 10, 1992, pg F3)

Arguments Against

3

Arguments For

Because the moral code of Western civilization regulates sexual manners by teaching men that they must treat women with special respect and requiring men to be responsible to protect women from sexual assault, males in POW groups of mixed gender are more likely to break than those in all-male POW groups. Male POWs forced to choose between divulging information or protecting a female POW from sexual assault resist with less resolve and are thus more likely to give in.

Women recruits (currently) are not told they should expect rape and sexual abuse as a POW to be an "occupational hazard." (Phyllis Schafly, USA Today, June 15, 1992, pg 12) When women cannot go into combat they ought not, and should not, have such expectations.

Placing women in combat puts them at great risk of harm, sexual violation and assault. Society should not place women in harm's way during wartime. (Wesley Pruden, Washington Times June 29, 1992 pg A4)

Implied: To avoid the possibility of manipulation by the enemy, males in the military should be trained to ignore the moral code to protect females under POW conditions.

What happens to POWs is a private affair. Women, as individuals, should decide from themselves what risks are acceptable. (Cdr. Rosemary Mariner, in editorial, USA Today, June 15, 1992, pg 12)

Combat exclusion prevents women from doing things but does not prevent them from being captured in war. (Cornum) "When men protect men, they get medals." (Army Capt. Carol Barkalow, USA Today, June 15, 1992, pg 12)

Arguments Against

4

Arguments For

According the moral code of Western civilization (the code of chivalry), men (both as individuals and as a social category) have a moral duty to protect women from the risk of rape and sexual assault. This duty (to protect women from assault) is part of and cannot be separated from the civilizing moral principle which regulates sexual manners and directs the power of natural biological and psychological differences between males and females by requiring men to treat females with special care and respect. (See Samuel Francis "Women warriors as captives" Washington Times July 10, 1992, pg F3) Placing women in combat (1) separates the duty of males to respect females from their duty to protect, (2) lowers the male duty to respect females until it cannot be distinguished from the duty of males to respect males (i.e., until there is nothing "special" about the way males treat females), and (3) undermines the civilizing moral code that regulates the sexual power arising from the natural differences between males and females in part by separating the sexes in combat and requiring males to treat females with special regard.

Implied: Society should not decide on acceptable risk levels based on gender. Women should not be deprive of military career opportunities simply to avoid the risks of war. (Re: Mariner, in editorial, USA Today, June 15, 1992, pg 12)

Implied: The code of chivalry which requires men to protect women and treat them with special respect is as outdated as the "Neanderthal" code which allows men to have their way with women without moral or cultural restraint.

Implied: Men in professional settings should be able to ignore sexual differences, to work alongside women in any circumstance (even combat) without regard to natural biological and psychological differences, and to restrain their passions without treating women as "special."

Implied: There is no reason men (as a category) should treat women (as a category) as special. Natural biological and psychological differences between males and females are essentially irrelevant to the manner in which any human treats another human with respect and dignity. I.e., males should treat females no better, no worse and no different than males.

Arguments Against

Placement of women into combat units will introduce a new and fertile source of disciplinary difficulty with which the all-male combat forces do not now need to contend. "Traditionalists now argue that the scandals [sexual harassment of military women] illustrate just why women should not be integrated into the armed forces at all." ("Women in the military: A battle for respect," Philadelphia Inquirer, July 12, 1992, pg 1)

5

Arguments For

Women in combat will eliminate the resentment men now feel because of the barr. "Because most men at sea cannot point to differences in promotions or pay between themselves and Navy women on shore, many feel women's presence in the service makes men shoulder heavier burdens. (Tom Mariner, Los Angeles Times, June 28, 1992, pg 4)

Arguments Against

If males and females are required to serve together in combat, consensual sex on the battle field will be impossible to control. "The leadership cannot control carnal behavior. There are so many places a boy and a girl can go on a ship to be alone." (Ariel Morales, sailor on USS Kennedy, in "Women at sea" Chicago Tribune, July 26, 1992, pg 1) Even if sexual activity is consensual, sex among members of a military unit will mangle trust, discipline and morale. "Sex between service members undermines those critical factors that produce discipline, military orders, spirit and combat effectiveness. Mix boys and girls, gays and straights in close quarters such as the barracks or the battlefield, and both sexual contact and the consequent breakdown of morale are inevitable." (David Hackworth, "The Case for a Military Gay Ban" Washington Post, June 28, 1992, pg C-5) "Putting men and women together is a natural situation somewhere else.... But not on a warship. It's going to create a big morale problem." (Ariel Morales, see above)

6

Arguments For

Implied: Either (1) military discipline should be adequate to prevent consensual sex between men and women serving together whether in barracks or the battlefield; or (2) whatever consensual sex takes place between members of a military unit ought not to affect trust, discipline and morale.

Arguments Against

7

Arguments For

Putting women in combat will aggravate the sexual harassment problem. But, legitimate efforts to rid the military of sexual harassment will become explosive if women are also sent into combat. The mix simply cannot be achieved without destroying morale, discipline, unit cohesion and fighting spirit. The reason: sexual harassment can never be completely eliminated in an environment where life & death intimacy is mixed with sexual tensions under pressure. To force both at the same time will cause combat units to "strip gears" and "grind apart."

"Putting women in positions where they could be an amorous distraction to men could affect your concentration. It could affect a fellow pilot or the guy who fixes your plane. It could kill you." (Naval aviator, Los Angeles Times, June 28, 1992, pg 4) "I would have a problem with my men focusing on what they need to do.... Lives will be in jeopardy." (Samuel Long, Navy Chief on USS Kennedy, in "Women at sea: Rough sailing?" Chicago Tribune, July 26, 1992, pg 1)

"Sexual harassment will continue to be a problem in the military services as long as women are barred from combat duty" (Cdr. Rosemary Mariner, "For Women in the Navy, Rough Waters Run Deep" Los Angeles Times June 28, 1992, pg 1). The barr is a primary cause of sexual harassment. The problem cannot be eliminated without removal of the primary cause: the exclusion of women from combat.

Implied: Men in the military should be able to ignore gender differences. Those who cannot do so should be reeducated or dismissed.

Arguments Against

8

Arguments For

Assigning women to combat inevitably lowers fitness standards and hence fighting standards (Pruden, Washington Times June 29, 1992 pg A4) It is false to create a distinction between standards of fitness and strength in the combat environment. Fitness is a subjective concept composed of strength and endurance, with strength serving as the principle factor upon which endurance depends. "Tests of men and women entering West Point class of 1980 found that, on average, the upper body strength of women is 56 percent of the strength of men, their leg strength is 80 percent, and their gripping strength is 69 percent After eight weeks of intensive training, male plebs demonstrated 32 percent more power in the lower body and performed 48 percent more work at the leg press than female plebs." Brian Mitchell, journalist, quoted in "Unequal chance of survival" Washington Times, July 17, 1992.

Because female strength/fitness is so clearly below male standards, women do not have (and cannot have) the same chance of survival in combat. Females in combat are necessarily at greater risk than males in the same situation.

Implied: Putting women into combat will not lower fitness standards needed for success in war. Females require less strength than males to reach equal fitness. So fitness standards should vary by gender, while strength requirements for combat should be independent of gender and determined by what is needed for fighting effectiveness.

Implied: The survival rate of women to men in combat does not matter.

Arguments Against

9

Arguments For

It is impossible not to treat women in the military differently because female biology necessarily affects their professional readiness. "They should ... not be given special treatment....[But] if it's their monthly period, they get bed rest." (A sailor stationed in Norfolk, Va., in "Women in military: A battle for respect" Philadelphia Inquirer, July 12, 1992, pg 1) When American troops were deployed to the Persian Gulf, "military women experienced a not-ready rate that was three to four times higher than that of men...primarily due to pregnancy." (In "Women fall short on battle readiness" Washington Times, July 28, 1992, pg 1)

A lot of pressure against putting women in combat comes from "wives. They don't want their husbands locked up on ships with a bunch of women." (Warrant Officer Walter Turner, in "For Women in the Navy, Rough Waters Run Deep," Los Angeles Times, June 28, 1992, pg 4) Mixing sexes aboard Navy vessels would be "like leaving your wife at home, then throw in 10 to 15 members of the opposite sex, lock all the doors, give them food and don't let them out for six months. It wouldn't work." (Robert Spiller, sailor on USS Kennedy, in "Women at sea" Chicago Tribune, July 26, 1992, pg 1)

The services should be able to abandon all sex-specific distinctions and set physical requirements based on specific jobs. (Kay Krohne, corporate sex relations specialist, in "Women in military: A battle for respect" Philadelphia Inquirer, July 12, 1992, pg 1)

Implied: The attitude of wives doesn't really matter. Either they are imagining the risks of infidelity, or they should trust their husbands more, or they should be taught to accept the risks of infidelity when they marry a man in the military. Military husbands should reeducate their wives to think correctly, or they should get out if the strain on family life is too much to take.

Arguments Against

10

Arguments For

Equal opportunity cannot be implemented fully by a military service without compromising the primary purpose of its existence--to kill and defeat the nation's enemies. (Re: Pruden, Hackworth) "The military has always been a bastion of maleness. You need a heightened sense of masculinity, of bravado.... We have to be careful about how much we want to de-macho the military. (Charles Moskos, in "Women in military: A battle for respect," Philadelphia Inquirer, July 12, 1992 pg 1)

Masculinity is necessarily related to the training of good soldiers and the development of effective combat performance. Thus, efforts to force combat units to relegate gender identity to irrelevance cannot be done without reducing or destroying combat readiness. "We are asking men in combat to do an essentially irrational thing--go out and put themselves in a position where they are likely to get killed. One of the few ways to persuade men to do that is to appeal to their masculinity. You cannot have an androgynous military.... Just think about what it would mean to demasculinize combat. The effect on combat effectiveness might be catastrophic." (Charles Moskos, sociologist, "Male-dominated culture" Air Force Times, July 20, 1992, pg 10)

Implied: There is no necessary incompatibility between the pursuit of equal opportunity for women and the combat readiness of the nation's military services. "Men feel threatened. If women go into these nontraditional jobs and do them well, what does this say about men? Men begin to question their masculinity." (Tanya Domi, Capt. US Army ret., in "Poison in the Top Ranks" Washington Post, July 8, 1992, pg C-29)

Implied: Masculinity is not necessary to prepare good soldiers. Women can be just as violent and aggressive in combat as men. Men can be just as violent and aggressive without emphasizing masculinity.

Implied: It is possible to have an androgenous military without affecting combat effectiveness. It is not necessary to appeal to a man's masculinity to motivate peak performance in combat.

Arguments Against

11

Arguments For

If combat exclusion is lifted for women on the principle of equal treatment, then equal treatment will require non-voluntary assignment to combat. Men are subject to mandatory combat assignment and women would not be exempt. If a draft is necessary, equal treatment means that women unwilling to leave their homes or families will be forced to go into combat. Furthermore, "the courts have made clear, if women were to be assigned combat roles, there would be no way the armed forces could undertake a draft without including women too." Bill Pascoe in "Marching toward combat?," Washington Times, July 29, 1992, pg G1

Military services must discriminate (females, homosexuals, disabled) to serve a larger purpose. Such purposes include combat readiness, family stability, and the health of society as a whole. The military manages by category, not by individual opportunity; as a category females in combat only harm the ability of military services to fulfill their national security mission.

Demand for equal opportunity. (Re: Cong. Pat Schroeder, Cong. Berverly Byron, Cdr. Mariner, et al)

Implied: Either women in the military should not really be treated equally (their opportunities to volunteer for combat will be assured, but they will be protected from mandatory assignment), or women subject to a (possible) draft should not be treated equally (men have to go, women only if they want to), or women who do not wish to leave their homes and/or do not believe it is their role to fight the nation's wars (i.e., women who do not wish equal treatment regarding combat duties) will nevertheless be forced into combat to accommodate the wishes of other women demanding equal treatment.

Just as in matters of race, separation is inherently unequal (Mariner, Los Angeles Times June 28, 1992, pg 1). And this inequality is not justifiable. It is unfair (inconsistent) to give women equal rank and pay to men but not expect them to take the same risk and responsibility. (Cornum)

Arguments Against

12

Arguments For

Civilian standards of fairness and equality do not apply where the body bags are filled. (Hackworth, "Gay Ban" Washington Post, June 28, 1992, pg C-5)

Will undermine the fighting spirit and effectiveness of U.S. combat units. (Hackworth, "Gay Ban" Washington Post, June 28, 1992, pg C-5)
Relations across the sexual divide are fundamental, strong, and largely subconscious. Mixing genders in combat compromises the element most essential to combat readiness--undiscriminating, total, selfless trust among members of a combat team. Since basic sexual identity cannot be erased (and is usually enhanced) under the pressures of combat, the mixing of genders in military combat units creates a highly significant risk that threatens morale, discipline and combat readiness.

It has always been the duty of men, because of their superior strength, to protect and defend their women and children; we should not strip them of their wonderful, unique ability (Tammie Herbert)

The exclusion of women from combat "sets women up in a very definite second-class status." "You have laws that limit their abilities to compete regardless of their talent. (Caroline Beach, military policy analyst, in "Poison in the Top Ranks" Washington Post July 8, 1992, pg C-29)

Implies: Placing women in combat will not have an adverse impact on combat readiness and fighting spirit. Any adverse factors can be attributed to bad attitudes and out-of-date thinking that should be dealt with either through sensitivity training, or if necessary dismissal from the service.

Implied: Superior strength is no longer a significant factor for many jobs in today's highly technical military.

Implied: Jobs in which strength superiority is determinative should be eliminated wherever possible.

Arguments Against

13

Arguments For

Sexual harassment is one thing; the exclusion of women from combat is another. Elimination of sexual harassment promotes the idea that men should treat women with special respect, while removing the barr against women in combat requires the opposite notion--that women should not be given special treatment. There is nothing inconsistent about efforts to eliminate sexual harassment while barring women from going into combat.

Unit cohesion is a key to group effectiveness and thus is critical to combat readiness. But efforts to create unit cohesion cannot succeed if they contravene higher loyalties and values such as religious beliefs (concerning male headship and gender roles) or family values (like male duty to protect females and treat them with special respect). (Dr. Devilbiss, Statement, Presidential Commission, June 9, 1992)

The exclusion of women from combat is the reason for sexual harassment. Women in the military cannot be fully "legitimized" until the exclusion is eliminated. (Dr. Roush, Statement, Presidential Commission, June 9, 1992)

Putting women in combat will remove the drive behind sexual harassment. (Re: Mariner)

Implied: Higher loyalties that contravene unit cohesion in mixed gender groups must be superceded by loyalties that support the requisite cohesion. Religious beliefs or values on which one was raised that undermine the acceptance of female leadership or that require special treatment of females by males must be overcome and discarded by reeducation and indoctrination.

Arguments Against

14

Arguments For

In order to establish unit cohesion and military discipline, the placement of women in combat will require that traditional sex-role cues be ignored, suspended, erased, or even reversed within the military services. (See Devilbiss, Statement, Presidential Commission, June 9, 1992) But sex role cues are needed to maintain a stable and healthy society. In particular, male duty to treat females with special respect and to assume responsibility for assuring their protection is necessary to restrain the libidinous energies of the male population and to channel these energies into responsible male leadership and dependable male provision for the family--the most fundamental building block of any society. Stable, healthy families cannot be maintained without a fostering of the prerequisite sex-role cues. And a stable and healthy society cannot be maintained apart from stable and healthy families. Thus, placement of women in combat and suspension of sex-role cues in the military will surely hinder the ability of future generations to establish healthy families and will eventually undermine the stability and health of society as a whole. Simply put, placement of women into combat undermines and will eventually destroy the value system that sustains healthy and stable families.

Implied: Traditional sex-role cues such as male treatment of women as special and male responsibility to protect females are not important, and can be discarded or reversed without any adverse consequence.

Implied: The principle of male duty to treat women as special and to assume responsibility to protect females is not necessary to channel male sexual energies into responsible behavior. In particular, these sex-role cues are not necessary to establish and maintain stable and healthy families.

Implied: Placement of women in combat and suspension of sex-role cues in the military will not hinder the ability of future generations to establish healthy families and will not threaten the health of society as a whole.