

Women: From Kitchen to Combat?



HOW SHOULD WE ADDRESS THE
CHANGING NEEDS OF OUR
MILITARY?

7 PM, FEBRUARY 23, 2017

Community Room, Municipal Bldg., 243 S. Allen St.

ISSUE OVERVIEW

For centuries of recorded history, men and women were separated into very different jobs. With the advent of the Agricultural Revolution, men swiftly took the positions of physical labor while women were locked more and more into homebound operations, tending to their children and their domestic sphere.

However, when it came to war, women have almost always played just as important of a part as the men on the battlefield. Although it was frowned upon for women to physically fight alongside men on the field, women made their mark by working as nurses, laundresses, and cooks, working behind the scenes and going through the same hardships as the men. There were also unique battlefield instances, such as in 1400s France, when Joan of Arc led the French army into battle, and when Molly Pitcher made a name for herself by taking over her husband's cannon in the American Revolutionary War - but women, in general, were officially restricted to non-combat roles.

As time has passed, women have grown their importance in the military by expanding their range of accepted roles. Starting officially during World War I, women gained the ability to complete medical or clerical work for the military. On the upward trend, women became such an integral part to the military that by 1979, there were standardized enlistment standards for both sexes.

Women continued to expand their presence and importance even as the Pentagon officially banned women from serving in specific ground combat units, because of the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars that began to force non-combat women onto the battlefield anyway. In 2013, real legislative progress began as Leon Panetta, the Secretary of Defense at the time, removed the ban on women and directed the military to review their "occupational standards and assignment policies"

to open all combat roles for women for no later than January 1, 2016 (FAS document). And two years later, the gates were blown open: the new Secretary of Defense, Ashton Carter, ordered the military to open all combat roles to women with no exceptions.

These changes have not necessarily been accepted across the board with open arms. There are significant concerns for many people in our community about the differing abilities of men and women, and how we should properly create a space for women in these roles. Some are doubtful of the equal treatment, and concerned for how the army environment treats women, whereas others simply think that the structure of the military needs to evolve to better allow the complete integration of women. This change has faced immense scrutiny from all sides, for a variety of reasons.

One major factor of contention were the controversial reports done by the U.S. Marines on performance of women compared to men in various military tasks. As the wording from the National Defense Authorization Act of 1994 stipulates "that women shall be excluded from assignment to units below the brigade level whose primary mission is to engage in direct combat on the ground, as defined [in the document]." Direct ground combat is defined as "engaging an enemy on the ground with individual or crew served weapons, while being exposed to hostile fire and to a high probability of direct physical contact with the hostile force's personnel."

Now, although this recent military opening has been a real game-changer in terms of equality, to say that the military is just allowing women into combat would be erroneous and disrespectful to the countless women who have served in fighting roles in the military for an important reason. That reason being that the recent changes are specific to ground combat units. This means that women have been serving

countless physical military positions in the past, just not ground combat units. We should celebrate those women instead of making the blanket statement that no women have ever served in any sort of combat position in the military.

With that consideration in mind, today, we will be deliberating on this topic within three central frameworks. Firstly, with regards to the physical requirements for women in the Army, and whether or not physical requirements in the

army should be modified in order to accommodate for the greater variety. Likewise, there has been great concern with regard to the effective integration and equal opportunities for women in the army, and the second approach will be considering this issue under the lens of how to build a fair and equally rewarding for both men and women everywhere. Finally, we will be evaluating the phenomenon of “mom guilt” and address how being a parent impacts members of the army societally, especially in the context of being a mother.

APPROACH I: PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR WOMEN

Introduction

On January 24th, 2013, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta removed the ban on women in certain areas of combat. With the lifting of the ban, the 1994

Direct Ground

Combat

Definition and

Assignment Rule

(DGCDAR) was

repealed, which

had included the

statement that

“the vast

majority” of

women in the

military could

not perform same physical tasks as men

(Schaefer). Although by 2013 women had already

served and died in many combat positions there

were a few positions in which they were still

prohibited from serving. The ban removal was

preceded by a 1991 ruling that removed limits on

women to combat via aircraft, and created a

Presidential Commission on the Assignment of

Women in the Armed Forces. Additionally, that

was followed by the 1993 National Defense

Authorization Act, which established ‘gender

neutral performance standards’ for all recruits. By

1994, women could be assigned anywhere above the

brigade level,

although they could

not be “exposed to

hostile fire.”

(Kamarck) In spite of

this, during

Operation Desert

Storm, 16 women

died and two were

taken prisoner. Cases

like this were what

led to Panetta’s

order. Under Panetta’s order, all combat roles had

to be open to women by Jan. 1st, 2016. Now, there

are 220,000 positions open to women. (Ghose)

Many people saw this as a step forward for women’s

rights and the feminist movement, but it has raised

complex questions about gender integration and

nature of women’s service in the military. Part of

the order reinforced that “For occupational

specialties open to women, the occupational



Figure 1: Women running from explosion on the battlefield.

performance standards must be gender-neutral as required by P.L. 103-160, Section 542 (sic) (1993).” (Kamarck) There has been controversy surrounding these physical standards, and concern as to whether unnecessarily difficult requirements designed to evaluate male performance are keeping women out of positions in which they could serve effectively. The percentage of women who comprise the U.S. military, just 15 percent, is objectively low, and in many foreign countries that number is under 10 percent (Fredenburg). As will be detailed, there are also several studies which have proven that women are discharged at higher rates and also experience more physical injuries than men, possibly as some argue because of the gender-neutral standards. Additionally, women naturally suffer from PTSD at two times the rate of men in the general population (Cramer). Women in the military also experience higher rates of disorders such as depression and anxiety than men (Kamarck). Noticing these discrepancies, at a news conference in 2013 amid discussion over Panetta’s mandate, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Army Gen. Martin Dempsey said, “If we do decide that 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 to the secretary: Why is it that high? Does it really have to be that high?” (Scarborough). This opened the door for suggestions that the physical requirements should soon be lowered or amended in some manner, although Panetta subsequently stated that no such action would be taken, and physical requirements

have not fluctuated greatly since 2013. However, this does not signify that changing the requirements could not be a possibility in the future. Indeed, there are several approaches to this issue that have been proposed to better facilitate women’s integration into the military and set appropriate standards, which are detailed below. This issue is very controversial because the possibility of lowering or modifying physical requirements is closely tied to combat readiness, individual preparation, and national defense. The issue being so controversial also causes the age-old question to recur in the minds of many of, can women handle the pressures and physical strain of combat? Ensuring that combat personnel are ready for the challenges that they face involves a tremendous amount of work, and conflict arises as many point out the immense costs and logistical issues of amending physical standards to accommodate women's integration into combat positions.

What Can Be Done?

1. One possible way to ameliorate the problem of women reaching the physical standards is to lower them for both men and women. Some, such as Gen. Dempsey, suggest that if standards are far too challenging for women to reach, then the Army should explain why they are so high in the first place. Especially for very elite squads like the SEALs and the Army Rangers, this is a huge issue. For the Special Forces Selection and Assessment (SFAS), the requirements are

rigorous. [Recruits](#) have to carry a 50 lb. rucksack for 12 miles and complete five mile run in 9-minute miles (Scarborough). According to a Green Beret who had gone through the process, “the (SFAS) selection programs follow an archaic tradition that over values physical fitness and undervalues quality soldiers who are not necessarily built for such a test.” (Scarborough). This prompts the possibility that standards could be lowered for both men and women. In fact, in 2015 amid controversy about the standards’ accuracy in predicting combat readiness of soldiers, one requirement in the 2015 National Defense Authorization Act required that physical standards “(1) accurately predict performance of actual, regular, and recurring duties of a military occupation;” to encourage further review of the policies. (Kamarck). Additionally, Gen. Martin Dempsey, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has suggested in the past that if standards were to be lowered, they would be lowered for both men and women, and not just women. Dempsey is a proponent of keeping men and women in combat positions on equal standards in order to facilitate integration, regardless of what those standards are. He had also brought up the possibility of “two tiered system of standards” in response to type of war that the recruits are training measuring how soldiers will perform in combat. (Ghose). However, there is a huge amount of opposition to lowering standards because it could

for. (Kamarck). His focus on this type of reform has sparked the discussion that SFAS standards and those for other military occupational specialties could possibly lowered for both genders in the near future. One possible upside to this solution is that men and women would remain under equal standards, as fomenting equality between and women and a establishing positive dynamic has been central to the military’s goals in integrating women in the past couple of decades. In this aspect, it would be preferable to lowering standards exclusively for women. However, this could be seen as a step backwards in the integration that various groups have worked very hard for, especially since 2013 when Panetta repealed the combat ban. Some feel that women should rise to the occasion instead of the military making their job ‘easier.’ If the lowering of physical requirements for both men and women were to occur, it would be primarily influenced by women’s advocacy groups or other military advocacy groups calling the fairness of these standards into question. Additionally, the fact that some of Marine Corps’ new gender-neutral standards were actually *higher* than previous standards for men suggests to some that they should be lowered again, as they are now unnecessarily high for both genders and are not adequately reduce effectiveness of elite squads like the Rangers and SEALs, and endanger the safety of soldiers when they enter into combat, if they do not have

adequate preparation. In fact, Secretary of the Navy Ray Maybus recently suggested that it would “endanger...the safety of the nation”

(Kamarck). For this reason in particular, lowering standards for both genders remains extremely unpopular among most government officials.

Table 5. Marine Corps Initial Qualification Standards

Minimum Standards for Non-Combat and Combat MOSs

	Pull-ups	Timed run	Crunches	30-lbs ammo-can lifts	Timed 880-yard sprint	Timed 300-yard shuttle run
Standard IST	2 (men) 12 second flexed arm hang (women)	1.5 miles in 13:30 (men) 15:00 (women)	44 (both men and women)	N/A	N/A	N/A

2. Another possibility would be that physical requirements for just women could be lowered. This has been prompted by many of the challenges that women have faced under the gender neutral standards. In a 2010 study, 18 percent of women had to visit the doctor during their training, compared to 10 percent of men. Additionally, in 2008, 27 out of 227 women suffered stress fractures during gender-integrated basic training, while stress fractures did not occur in any of the 83 men. When tested for signs of mental exhaustion and burnout, women scored higher on burnout scales compared to men. (Schaefer). This is evidence that many of the tasks that combat soldiers required to perform in training are far more taxing on the female body than on the male’s. To further support this line of evidence, in 2012 the Marines experimentally opened the Infantry Training Battalion and Infantry Officer Course, 29 women enrolled and exactly zero were able to graduate. 98 percent of women who dropped the course did so due to failure to pass the physical requirements, and one due to injury. In other countries, this remains a problem. A study by

the Royal Society of Medicine on the British military found that injuries drastically increased for women “when the undertake the same arduous training as male recruits.” (Fredenburg). This raises questions that although females may struggle to pass the physical requirements in training, they could possibly still complete the combat tasks. An example from a recent Congressional report: to indicate adeptness at rappelling out of a helicopter, one fitness standard would be for both men and women to do pull ups, yet it may be that women would excel at rappelling out of a helicopter even if they are unsuccessful at doing pull ups. This would suggest that standards to be differentiated to accurately evaluate performance in combat. (Kamarck). Perhaps, women should physiologically simply not be expected to undergo the same sort of training as men, as it could endanger their own safety and unnecessarily increase the chance of injury or illness. Although in the U.S. there is a lot of opposition to lowering requirements solely for women due to the long

battle to establish gender neutral standards, some experts are weighing in that it could be the right option. Some see that a quota system could be coming in the near future, and with the implementation of that may bring the introduction of lower standards to meet this quota (Bennett). Already, the Marine Corps gender integration plan has required that ground combat battalion needs 2 female officers. (Bennett). One reason this could work is that it would increase the number of women in the army passing the test, creating more diversity within individual MOS's and a overall better pool of recruits. Moreover, it would naturally reduce the risk of injury and illness for female recruits, and may also decrease burnout rates as well as psychological strain. Some countries, such as Norway, Denmark, Canada, and South Africa have employed a variation of this strategy and implemented a system that gives preferential assignments to women, thereby increase the chances that they would complete the training.

3. A final solution would be to keep requirements at the current level for both men and women. It looks like this will probably be the case, at least for the time being, because in February 2016 Army and Marine Corps leaders held a meeting in which they promised not to lower restrictions for women. (Philpott) And as Navy Secretary Ray Mabus put it so bluntly, "I will never lower standards." (Schogol). Many other countries have similar physical standards and gender neutral requirements and have experienced great success

(Kamarck) However, one drawback of employing lower standards for women only is that it could reinforce inequality, misogyny, and a culture of sexual violence in the military, as men and women would not perform equal duties. To illustrate this issue, in a 2011 NPR interview, Sgt. Kayla Williams described that the combat exclusion was "exacerbating gender tensions" within the services and that she felt as if it resulted in women being seen as "less than fully soldiers." (MacKenzie) However, opposition to creating separate standards for women come from those who state that if women want to be involved on the same level as men in the military, they should be capable of fulfilling the same requirements as men despite the research proving a difference in what women can physiologically handle. Many take this research to another level to back up the "if women can't handle the training, then they certainly shouldn't be in combat" perspective.

integrating women into the military, like Canada and Denmark, so the United States is on a well-tread path. This avenue would be positive because it would maintain a culture promoting equality for men and women, and many women in the military are able to surpass the the current standards and value the equality of the gender-neutral requirements. Indeed, a detailed report by the RAND corporation found that "Gender-neutral standards may actually reduce barriers to integration because they help to establish an equal foundation among all new recruits." (Schaefer) Many others in

government support the current levels, with Sen. Tammy Duckworth summarizing the basic argument of many in Washington: "Don't adjust for age and don't adjust for gender. Make it for the job. If the job requires that you have to be able to lift 80 pounds and march 20 miles in a certain amount of time, then set it for the job." However, with this course of action, the military would not do anything to ameliorate the dismal number of women passing the tests in certain military occupational specialties, or the much higher discharge rates that women have compared to men. Of course, there are tradeoffs with this approach. Currently, only 15 percent of the military is made up of women, and obviously, this would be doing nothing to up those numbers at all. ("**Representative Duckworth: About Time for Women In Combat**"). In fact, even in the best-case scenario at the current rates of progress, by 2030 just 8 percent of the Marine Corps will be female by 2030 (Ghose). This suggests that perhaps the current levels need to be reevaluated in the Marine Corps in particular to see if they are having a significant negative impact on integration. Maintaining the current physical requirements also reinforces higher injury and illness rates: as mentioned in the previous option, the risks are very high. In one study on Operation Iraqi Freedom women were found to be almost twice as likely to suffer from non-combat related disease and injuries and are twice as likely to be medevac'd out of combat. Additionally, non-deployment rates for women are 3-4 times higher than that of men. (Fredenburg). Perhaps to up the

numbers of women in the military a solution would be to institute the quota system as previously suggested to get a certain number of women into each specialty. A downside to this approach is that the quota system has faced past opposition and would be a tough sell for many in the Trump administration and for higher-up military officials, but it would not be impossible to achieve. However, Congress would have to repeal a ruling prohibiting quota systems within the military. Another possibility is that maybe while keeping at the current level the U.S. could pursue other means of supporting women in combat positions - one study on Norwegian military found that physical strength was not even predictive of women's success in combat - instead teamwork, focus, mental and physical endurance, leadership, and competence are more predictive of performance by women in these occupations. (Schaefer) The United States may want to consider re-evaluating the physical requirements, as Norway and other countries have done, to make sure there is not an inordinate amount of emphasis placed on factors that do not really indicate whether women will be successful combat soldiers. Finally, there also exists the possibility that both men and women could receive extra pre-enlistment training in order to prepare them for the rigors of the physical requirements. An upside of this avenue would be that women could receive extra support in passing the requirements and the risk of illness or injury could be reduced; at the same time, they would still be able to work on the same physical standards and

pass the gender-neutral requirements that took so long to institute in the military.

Conclusion:

To conclude, many of the most viable solutions come from finding common ground in this issue through making moderate adjustments instead of drastic changes to physical requirements such as tailoring women's armor, or providing extra pre-enlistment fitness support so that they have better chance of passing requirements and are less prone to injury. The Australian military has recently had some success making changes to women's rucksack weight and uniform fit. It may be beneficial for the U.S. Congress to provide extra funding to the military in order to finance lighter body armor and helmets, or better pack systems to increase mobility and be more supportive to women engaging in load-carrying activities. Additionally, in several other countries, militaries supply women with extra training fitness, sometimes before enlistment, and

sometimes after enlistment. (Schaefer) As stated above, this could keep men and women on the same standard while ensuring that women stay healthy and possibly have an edge up in passing the requirements. The institution of a quota system may also be a viable solution to enhance women's integration into combat positions and, potentially, result in the relaxation some of the most rigorous physical requirements. Finally, if any changes do get implemented, it would be beneficial to do extensive "pre-implementation pilot studies" to determine if these standards will be effective before they are instituted, instead of relying on intuition or prior results (Kamarck). Regardless of what the future holds for the future of gender-neutral physical standards, Congress should periodically or frequently require the analysis and evaluation of current requirements to ensure that they remain predictive of combat success and do not create barriers for women's integration.

APPROACH 2: EQUAL TREATMENT

In this view, the most important issue in the debate over putting female soldiers in combat is gender equality. The ideology behind this opinion dates back to the Seneca Falls Convention of 1848, where leaders of the nineteenth-century women's rights movement drafted the Declaration of Sentiments, which borrowed the language of the Declaration of Independence, but substituted "women and men" into the famous phrase "all men are created equal". More significantly for a discussion of what jobs military women are allowed to hold, the Declaration of Sentiments also asserts that man has "monopolized nearly all the profitable employments. . . . He closes against her all the avenues to wealth and distinction which he considers most honorable to himself." According to this approach, it is unjust to reserve combat postings for male soldiers -- women deserve the opportunity to hold the same jobs as men.

The restrictions on women in combat positions were lifted in 2013, but this approach demands that the military give women and men equal opportunity to succeed in those positions. This requires fair policies with regard to equipment, promotion, and health care.

What We Can Do

Equipment

The equipment and uniform that a soldier is given is a key factor in the way that they are able to serve. Prior to women being allowed to serve in the military, inequality of uniforms wasn't a problem because the uniforms were designed for the all male military. Now women were faced with ill-fitting uniforms that could cause chafing, leave areas of the body exposed to enemy fire, or even aggravate injuries. Females are 20 percent more likely to report musculoskeletal disorders, something that can be at least partly attributed to ill-fitting uniforms. The solution for this problem was to adjust the design of the uniforms and body armour that were being issued to female soldiers to make them less baggy or tight and adhere better to the general size of a female body. These reworked designs ensure that female soldiers are as well protected and able to perform their duties as their male counterparts.

Promotion

Even after women were allowed to officially serve in the military, there were still positions that they could not hold. Women wanted to be able to be promoted for the service that they had given in the areas in which they were allowed to serve, but certain promotions required experience in areas that women were not allowed to be in. A study

published by the Rand Corporation in 2012 stated that female officers had lower rates of promotion and retention than male officers did. Because women were not allowed to apply for all combat positions until 2016, they could not get some of the combat experience that allowed their fellow male

soldiers had which made them eligible for those promotions. The solution that came to this issue was the announcement that women would be allowed to apply for all combat positions, giving them the routes they needed to gain the experience for these promotions.

Benefits & Trade-Offs

- Equipment
 - Benefits
 - Appropriate equipment helps soldiers perform better in the field.
 - Trade-offs
 - Multiple uniform designs could raise costs for the army.
- Promotions
 - Benefits
 - A larger number of qualified candidates are eligible for officer positions.
 - Early in 2017, 3 females graduated from Ranger School and the first female officers graduated from Infantry Basic Officer Leadership Course
 - Trade-offs
 - There is more competition for officer positions.

APPROACH 3: MOM GUILT AND SEXUAL ASSAULT

Women now make up roughly 15 percent of the armed services. According to a 2002 report by the Government Accountability Office, as many as 1 in 10 active-duty women become pregnant every year.

For many women, the conflict between soldiering and motherhood extends well beyond that first year. Repeat deployments force them to make complicated decisions about when or whether to have children. Women can take a voluntary discharge and leave behind their military careers.

Army medic Amy Shaw says the choice is wrenching. "I grew up with a mom that stayed at home every day. That's the way I always pictured myself. So, it was a lot for me not to call it quits and to get out," Shaw says.

"I call it my great balancing act," says Jennifer Williams, a first sergeant with the 10th Mountain Division, based in northern New York who, after 11 months after a deployment to South Korea, had to again leave her husband and 3-year-old daughter, Reilly — this time for a 15-month tour in Iraq. "When I first came back from Korea, I had wanted to have a second child. And my husband said, 'You need to know your deployment schedule first, because I can't be home with a newborn and a toddler — I'm sorry, I can't do both at the same time,'" Williams says.

Lack of Support

The Soldier and Sailor Relief Act of 2003 focuses on protecting soldiers against credit card debt, job loss and loan repayment. Unfortunately, it is woefully inadequate in protecting soldiers' custody of their children, which is by and large left up to state laws. The result is that military moms who are fighting for custody are largely on their own.

In the courts, military moms have an even tougher time than civilian working mothers. Some argue that working mothers shortchange their children; military mothers are required to make even greater sacrifices than their civilian counterparts. Very rarely is the civilian working mom asked to leave her children for a year at a time. Very rarely is the civilian working mom confronted with the knowledge that when she comes home at the end of a deployment, her child will not know her or will be taken from her. But somehow, more likely than not, civilian mothers with grueling hours on common office jobs who are away from their homes countless of the day aren't claimed as unfit parents.

Army-wide statistics are not available on mothers losing custody of their children because the Army **does not** track these cases. And unless both parents are service members, the military justice system is unable to effectively engage in mediation on behalf of mothers who are fighting court battles to regain custody of their kids. Divorce affects military women at **three times** the rate of military men. As a result, there may be a very high number of military mothers who lose custody of their kids in civilian courts.

In the case of Tanya Towne, a member of the National Guard, who had just returned to New York from Iraq only to be told that her 12-year-old son had moved to Virginia with her ex-husband Richard Diffin, and that Diffin now had permanent custody of the child. Because Diffin had moved to another state and gotten a judge to agree that military service was highly disruptive and unstable, Towne lost custody. Neither New York State nor the military were able to help her regain custody. She spent over \$6,000 and countless hours traveling in an attempt to get her son back, but failed. Her ex-husband's lawyer had argued that Tanya Towne

chose to be a soldier, and that leaving her children for military service is no way for a mother to act.

So while civilian moms do sometimes find their "choice" to work invoked in child custody debates, civilian moms are usually at least present to defend their cases, not a thousand miles away in a war zone wondering how a judge could deem her an unfit parent and take her children from her. On the flip side, fathers are not thought less of or punished because they desire to wear a uniform after becoming a parent. Mothers should not endure this, either. Yet military mothers are punished for serving our nation, some of which rely solely on their military work as their family's source of income.

Making Moves

Army officials say they are trying to help military moms. They've promised to cut deployment times for all soldiers, from 15 months down to a year.

When Army Secretary Peter Geren appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee last February, he faced questions about body armor and budgets. And lawmakers also pressed him for answers about babies.

"New mothers are facing a continued difficult decision between motherhood and their service to

their country," said Sen. Ben Nelson (D-NE). The lawmaker questioned Geren about the Army's policy of deploying female soldiers to Iraq just six weeks after they give birth." Clearly that has to be reviewed because it's got to have some impact on people deciding whether to get in or stay in, if they have to get an extended deferment in order to have a family," Nelson said.

Geren told the Senate Armed Services Committee that he hopes to give new mothers slightly longer deferments after giving birth — allowing six months before overseas deployments instead of four." We have tasked the Army staff to examine that policy and examine the impact of a change in that policy," Geren says.

What can be done

As Army Secretary Peter Geren stated, laws need to be put in place to further protect moms in the armed forces who choose to serve their country after choosing to become mothers. For some, it is their only source of income and for some, it is just truly what they love to do like any other mom in any other career. Either as an extension of the Soldier and Sailor Relief Act of 2003 or a separate bill, soldier moms should be protected by law from shaming and custody battles based solely on the premise of their participation in the military.

REFERENCES

- "Alarming New Proposal for Women in Combat." *Faith Family America*. N.p., n.d. Web. 20 Feb. 2017.
- Fredenburg, Mark. "Putting Women in Combat Is an Even Worse Idea Than You'd Think." *National Review*. N.p., 16 July 2015. Web. 17 Feb. 2017.
- Ghose, Tia. "Women in Combat: Physical Differences May Mean Uphill Battle." *LiveScience*. Purch, 07 Dec. 2015. Web. 17 Feb. 2017.
- "Here's Exactly How The Military Could Lower Standards For Women In Combat." *The Daily Caller*. N.p., n.d. Web. 17 Feb. 2017.
- Kamarck, Kristy N. *Women in Combat: Issues for Congress*. Rep. no. R42075. N.p.: Congressional Research Service, 2016. Print.
- MacKenzie, Megan H. "Let Women Fight: Ending the U.S. Military's Female Combat Ban." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 91, no. 6, 2012, pp. 32–42., www.jstor.org/stable/41720932.
- Myre, Greg. "A Brief History Of Women In Combat." *NPR*. NPR, 25 Jan. 2013. Web. 17 Feb. 2017.
- Parker, Kathleen. "The Few, the Foolish." *The Washington Post*. WP Company, 04 Dec. 2015. Web. 20 Feb. 2017.
- Philpott, Tom. "Service Leaders Pledge Not to Relax Combat Requirements for Women." *Military.com*. Sean O'Melveny, n.d. Web. 17 Feb. 2017.
- "Putting Women in Combat Is an Even Worse Idea Than You'd Think." *National Review*. N.p., 16 July 2015. Web. 20 Feb. 2017.
- "Representative Duckworth: About Time For Women In Combat." *Tell Me More*, 28 Jan. 2013. *Opposing Viewpoints in Context*, Accessed 18 Feb. 2017.
- Scarborough, Rowan. "Military Is Advised against Lower Standards for Women." *The Washington Times*. The Washington Times, 06 Feb. 2013. Web. 17 Feb. 2017.
- Schaefer, Agnes Gereben, Jennie W. Wenger, Jennifer Kavanagh, Jonathan P. Wong, Gillian S. Oak, Thomas E. Trail, and Todd Nichols. *Implications of Integrating Women into the Marine Corps Infantry*. Rep. no. RR1103. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2015. Print.
- Writer, Tom Cramer VA Staff. "Veterans Health Administration." *PTSD Study: Men Versus Women -- Veterans Health Administration*. N.p., n.d. Web. 18 Feb. 2017.

FIGURE 1:

http://media.npr.org/assets/img/2013/01/24/32426771_slide328ebc21f0becad63cf18ad0ddc726b379bbda8-s1000-c85.jpg

SUMMARY

WOMEN IN COMBAT

How should we adapt to the changing needs of our military?

PRE-DELIBERATION QUESTIONNAIRE: <http://bit.ly/predelq>

Women have always played a vital role in the military as nurses or clerks, but it has not been until very recently that they have been allowed to fight alongside men on the battlefield. This change has brought about many consequences in different forms. These consequences include whether or not women can keep up physically, whether they will be treated and invested in equally, and whether they will disrupt the morale and cohesion of military.

Firstly, on the physical side of things, should current military standards for men be tweaked to accommodate women? Some argue that the current standards are unnecessarily difficult and viable women could serve effectively if the standards were lowered. Other people rebuke

that women are just too risky because they are more prone to mental disorders and physical injuries such as PTSD and ACL tears. Secondly, there is the question of equality. How can we assure that women will have the equal opportunity to suitable armor, even if this causes more financial stress to the military? Will women truly be treated equally even with society's beliefs that they are weaker? Lastly, thousands of miles away from the battlefield, how do we as a society combat the possibility of "mom guilt," or the guilt that mothers feel after leaving their newborn children for extended periods of times?

With those three considerations in mind, we must try our best to contemplate possible courses of actions and their benefits as well as repercussions.

APPROACH ONE:

<i>Overcome the physical challenges to integrating women fully into the military...</i>	<i>However,</i>
<i>Since Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta issued his 2013 mandate, the door for women in military combat positions has been fully opened. Studies have shown that women experience higher rates of musculoskeletal injury, illness, and behavioral disorders than men in the military and often struggle to pass the rigorous gender-neutral physical requirements, especially in some of the more elite combat specialties. More could be done to give female soldiers the support they need and to ensure that they are not being unnecessarily prevented from serving in combat by physical fitness standards, but...</i>	<i>Many options that could allow women to better integrate into combat positions are extremely costly, logistically difficult, and may not even be able to produce the desired results. The possibility of lowering physical standards for some specialties is extremely unpopular and many argue that it will endanger the safety of combat soldiers and the nation as a whole.</i>
<i>Potential Solutions</i>	<i>Tradeoffs</i>
<i>Institute the Quota System in order to spark an increase in the number of women serving in some military occupational specialties</i>	<i>Although it would not be extremely difficult to overturn, the military is not allowed to impose the quota system for any group. There is not a lot of support for this measure among Department of Defense heads and advocacy groups. It also may delegitimize current physical standards.</i>
<i>Congress could provide funding for extra support to female combat soldiers, including pre-enlistment fitness support and modifying equipment and uniforms that could impact their performance on physical tests</i>	<i>This is costly, would require a significant amount of logistical planning, and would take a long time to implement. Then it must be determined if this would require fitness support offered to men, as well</i>
<i>Reevaluate physical requirements currently in place that determine whether people are combat ready in</i>	<i>Conducting studies on the effectiveness of physical requirements would be lengthy and expensive. There is</i>

<i>order to focus more on teamwork, focus, leadership, and mental endurance</i>	<i>also a significant chance that the results will be inconclusive</i>
<i>Lower physical requirements for women in certain Military Occupational Specialties or exempt certain MOS's from gender-neutral requirements</i>	<i>This could undermine the work the military has done to establish a culture of equality within the military, and could instigate issues related to inequality, misogyny and sexual violence. Additionally, lowering standards for women could impact their combat readiness</i>

APPROACH TWO:

<i>Overcome the physical challenges to integrating women fully into the military...</i>	<i>However,</i>
<i>Demand that the military give women and men equal opportunity to succeed in those positions. This requires fair policies with regard to equipment, promotion, and health care.</i>	<i>This approach will require a large shift in numerous people's attitudes and mentalities, and in many ways will be expensive.</i>
<i>Potential Solutions</i>	<i>Tradeoffs</i>
<i>Offer equipment specially designed for women. Make women eligible for all promotions by allowing them to serve officially in combat.</i>	<i>Multiple uniform designs could raise costs.</i>
<i>Make women eligible for all promotions by allowing them to serve officially in combat.</i>	<i>Competition for officer positions would increase.</i>
<i>Require military health care providers to stock IUD birth control devices.</i>	<i>IUDs are expensive and increased use could raise costs.</i>

APPROACH THREE:

<i>Advocate for guidelines and laws to tailored to women's issues</i>	<i>However,</i>
<i>Many of the issues women tend to face more than men in the military including mom guilt and sexual assault are typically swept under the rug. Typically, if the women themselves try and push for their causes it's considered being insubordinate and people tend to question why they even bother serving in the first place. Because of this they need to be advocated for and have laws put in place to protect them.</i>	<i>On the other hand, a lot of women feel like they should be treated equally as men. They don't feel the need for extra laws to protect them. They'd much rather just put up with the sacrifices they inadvertently sign up for when they put on their uniforms. Also, the military sometimes doesn't see the need or have the budget to go the extra mile for female soldiers.</i>
<i>Potential Solutions</i>	<i>Tradeoffs</i>
<i>A law could be implemented extending the amount of time new moms can be deferred after giving birth.</i>	<i>Some women may want or need to return as soon as possible for financial or personal reasons. Those cases would have to be evaluated individually.</i>
<i>An act can be put in place to provide legal support for military moms that makes courts evaluate all the factors of their motherhood rather than, solely</i>	<i>The military may not want to budget for that kind of involvement because it may become a liability if moms are found negligent and data begins being collected on those findings.</i>

<i>considering their choice to serve as negligence or bad mothering.</i>	
<i>Women who plan to have children can have shorter time period contracts that way if they get pregnant or plan to, they have time to defer or if they need to take breaks they can do them in six month intervals, for example.</i>	<i>This another extra mile that the military would have to drastically alter their system for. Budgeting, organization, and tradition wise they may not see it as worth it.</i>
<i>Sexual harassment and sexual assault cases must be recorded and monitored closely so policymakers know exactly what aspects of their policy is flawed.</i>	<i>Although close attention may be paid to the statistics behind sexual assault and harassment in the military, not all numbers may be completely correct, also, even with correct statistics, there may not be viable solutions to the issues.</i>
<i>The policies set by the department of defense should reinforce the consequences given to perpetrators violating the sexual assault and sexual harassment policies should encourage victims to report the crimes committed against them.</i>	<i>A majority of the women who report being a victim to sexual assault and sexual harassment experienced retaliation of some sort, therefore, many women feel deterred from reporting the crimes they fall victim to.</i>
<i>Unsolved cases should be reviewed and benchmarked to ensure that everything is being done to bring sexual assault and sexual harassment policy violators to justice.</i>	<i>Not at all cases, even when reviewed and benchmarked with other cases can be solved.</i>

POST-DELIBERATION QUESTIONNAIRE: <http://bit.ly/postdelq>