

WOMEN AND THE COMBAT EXEMPTION

by

JUDITH H. STIEHM

A recent rereading of *Gone With the Wind* reminded me that for many Americans, especially women, combat is not so much an abstract idea as it is fiction. Because we have fought our wars outside of our country for more than a century, we have come to believe that whether women should be exempted from combat is a genuine issue—one that can be debated, decided, and acted upon. We have also come to believe that women *can* be excluded from combat—that they can be declared exempt and, more important, that men can implement that policy. Probably we believe this because both women and men want to believe it. Women want to believe they can be guaranteed protection, and men want to believe they can provide it. But a comforting myth of this kind can be dangerous. It can debilitate and it can cloud judgment. A strong society requires strong citizens; it cannot afford thoughtless, dependent women like Margaret Mitchell's Miss Pittypat, nor reckless, romantic men like her Tarleton twins. Clear vision is required whether it be informed by the honor of Ashley and Melanie Wilkes or the near-outlawry of Rhett Butler and Scarlet O'Hara. In thinking about a combat exemption, then, one must be realistic. One must consider current circumstances, the reasons given for exempting women from combat, and the implications of such a policy.

CURRENT CIRCUMSTANCES

Warfare has always required warriors, weapons, logistics, administration, and technology; still, for centuries the physical effort and sacrifice of the individual soldier have symbolized the strength of a nation. This is true even though no strategist has emphasized the physical size of individual participants in the development of battle plans. All have known that factors such as cohesiveness, loyalty, and intelligence are of far more importance. Today, however, as the issue of women in combat is examined in Congress and the Pentagon, we hear a good deal about women's small physical size as compared to men. We hear about it at a time when the commitment and competence of

uniformed women have earned them respect, responsibility, and a range of military assignments never before given. However, the increased participation of women is only partly the result of a concerted drive by the women's movement for military equality, and only partly the result of the commitment of policymakers to equity. It is the result, too, of demographic changes, which have produced a diminished pool of military-eligible 18-year-olds, and the adoption of the all-volunteer force. The unprecedented use of women in the US military, then, has resulted more from recruitment problems than from the political clout of women or the nation's desire for fairness.

Since women are so badly needed, resistance to their becoming career service members has been subdued. However, vigorous debate continues over their place within the military, focusing particularly on whether they should be exempted from combat. While the congressional restriction forbidding the use of Navy women on ships other than transport and hospital vessels has been eased, important limits on the assignment of women to sea duty remain. Air Force women are legally forbidden on aircraft engaged in combat missions, although they do fly; moreover, some served in combat zones in Vietnam, where they received combat pay. The Army has followed a policy of not assigning women to combat, but, interestingly enough, there is no congressional prohibition against its doing so. The point is, an exemption for women already exists. Removing it will require action. Inertia is on the side of continued exemption.

At present, few seem ready to answer an unequivocal "yes" to the question, "Should women serve in combat?" Even those who ordinarily oppose all forms of female exclusion seem loathe to urge full military participation for women. Often they say they believe that no one, male or female, should have to engage in combat. Such a position begs the question. Many proponents of changing the exemption say it will increase administrative flexibility. To most Americans, however, including military

women and men, the answer is clear. It is "No, women don't belong in combat." To most Americans the battlefield is just no place for a woman.

Such convictions can be strongly held even when they are buttressed with weak or little argumentation. Indeed, the imagery of many arguments against female participation in combat is derived from trench warfare or jungle encampments, even when the arguments undermine their own imagery by discussing the eight-to-five, civilianized, technological nature of today's military. At any rate, the belief that "it just isn't right" is persistent and widespread. Because it is, it is important to explore why it is held.

REASONS FOR EXEMPTING WOMEN

Reasons offered for exempting women from combat are numerous. Occasionally they are endowed with the subtlety and elegance which customarily adorn abstract thought.¹ Sometimes they are full of bombast and debater's points.² Sometimes they reflect experience.³ Often concrete and apparently simple assertions conceal complex meanings. We shall attempt here to interpret the meaning and implications of these highly various reasons.

A principal theme of those opposing women in combat is that women should not be subject to the suffering of war. Graphic descriptions of what people in combat endure usually accompany this argument, although no reasons are given as to why only *men* should suffer such horror. Still, experienced military personnel are serious when they argue against using women because they ought not to suffer, and they are especially serious when they argue that women ought not to suffer the ordeal of being a prisoner of war—the implication being that women will suffer sexual abuse as well as the customary abuse of that status. A related argument offered by some commanders is that they are not especially worried about the ravishing of women, but about how that will affect the judgment of other military personnel. Indeed, some seem to believe that worry over

having women taken prisoner is alone good and sufficient cause for keeping them out of combat.

But is the suffering of women so special? Does it affect men so much? Is it possible that women actually find female distress more distressing than do men, if only for empathic reasons? Is it possible that the aversion of men to the suffering of women is actually based on their feeling that when a woman suffers it is because men have failed to protect that woman? Is the pain they feel *for* women, or it is the pain of their own failure?

The fact is, in war men on each side hurt women on the other side terribly and regularly. They create enormous suffering among the victims in any war who are noncombatants—women, children, and the elderly. This seems to indicate that a desire to avoid hurting women has little effect on behavior. At best men do not want *their* women hurt.⁴ Thus, men do not seem to object to having women in combat per se. They may even attack the enemy's women and other civilians in preference to confronting a well-armed military. What men do object to is having women on their side. This is an important distinction. It means that even if some women are physically able, and are so moved by logic or by their sense of justice as to insist upon sharing war's risks, their offer will probably be refused. Men do not want the assistance of women in waging war.

Chivalry is another reason men are reluctant to have women fighting by their side. Still another is that in a tight situation, men do not want to have to depend on anyone they perceive as small and weak.⁵ Probably all humans in combat would be comforted if their compatriots were larger and stronger than they, and a man's chances of having a physically bigger buddy do increase if women are eliminated as combatants. Nevertheless, physical size is not necessarily a requisite for combat effectiveness.

We have been taught this by the Biblical story of David and Goliath and by such small-in-stature enemies as the Japanese and the Vietnamese; and we know this, too, from

the now largely technological nature of warfare. At present women may be less competent than men in handling certain military equipment, but the equipment is now built to an average male standard. This also means that some individuals are too large to be effective, and indeed there is a height maximum as well as a minimum for military service. Equipment redesign could greatly enhance women's performance, it would seem. However, it is not clear that it would enhance men's acceptance of women.

More important to victory than individual size is organization, cooperation, group cohesion, and pooled effort.⁶ Relatively small and weak but well-motivated men have fought effectively. One might think that women, too, if properly equipped and integrated into their units, could be effective as combatants. However, a strong argument is made that mixed-sex units by definition cannot achieve cohesiveness and cannot achieve the camaraderie of a unit of the same sex.⁷ The presence of women is said to produce jealousy and dissension between male group members. Even in a mixed-sex unit, it is argued, men can maintain their *own* unity provided that the women are segregated, but the overall unity of such an organization would be less than that of a single sex.⁸ Some argue, further, that women inevitably provoke chivalrous behavior and that this cannot be tolerated in combat for reasons of safety and morale (which is

Judith H. Stiehm is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Southern California. She is also Director of the USC Program for the Study of Women and Men in Society. A graduate of the University of Wisconsin, she earned the M.A. degree in American history at Temple University and the Ph.D. in political theory at Columbia University. Among Dr. Stiehm's published works are the book *Nonviolent Power: Active and Passive Resistance in America* (D.C. Heath, 1972) and the article "Invidious Intimacy," in the March-April 1976 issue of *Social Policy*. Her most recent book, *Bring Me Men and Women: Mandated Change at the US Air Force Academy*, is scheduled to be released by the University of California Press later this year.



diminished by the application of any double standard.) The thrust of all these arguments is that women should not be in combat because, if they are there, men function poorly. If this is the case, the problem would seem to lie not with the women but with the men, or with the group leader who lacks the ability to fuse a heterogeneous group of individuals into an effective, purposeful unit. Again, does the problem really lie with the stimulus or with the response?

There is probably another chivalry-related motive underpinning arguments against the use of women in combat. Think of a tennis match between a man and a woman.⁹ Usually the man wins. Often in such situations the woman is thought to hold back—to deliberately fail to win, even if only unconsciously. A less investigated but surely operative tension is the man's strong need not to be beaten by a woman, because his ability to perform the role of gentleman and protect her in other circumstances is then cast in doubt. Almost certainly this need helps him to raise his game or even play above his head. Now if one competitor is satisfied to play up to potential or simply to demonstrate competence or equality, while the other needs to demonstrate superiority, the former is sure to be disadvantaged in the competition. What are the implications for combat of man's need not to be beaten by a woman? If men feel great pressure to beat women opponents, it might mean that an all-male force facing an all-female or mixed-sex unit might try to outdo itself. This could lead the men to accept excessive costs. In addition, it is easy to see that soldiers might wish to avoid giving such a combative incentive to their enemies, for they would not want to encourage their foe to any unnatural effort. Any army prefers an enemy which has the option of surrendering to one which would prefer death.¹⁰

Other arguments come from a larger frame of reference. In discussing the volunteer army, Margaret Mead observed that no society places women in offensive warfare. She argued that one reason for this may be that women are too vicious and too violent.¹¹

This is because they have historically used weapons only in the immediate defense of the home. The resulting last-ditch, no-holds-barred kind of combat behavior may be appropriate to home defense but completely inappropriate to the more ritualized warfare which must be practiced if the human race is to survive. Men, Mead believed, are schooled, disciplined, and trained in certain rules of fighting which check unrestrained destruction. They learn not to fight to the finish; they fight for a more limited purpose—to establish hierarchy or to create order. Because of this they can be trusted to use violence, and also trusted to stop using it at the appropriate time.

The observation that women have always been associated with defensive warfare has led George H. Quester to an exploration of the meaning, i.e. the propaganda effect, of using women in combat. He thinks that the use of women is associated not only with being an underdog, but also with a fierce commitment to the justness of one's cause. Apparently women lend moral sanction to actions in which they participate. Thus, when women assume military roles, a nation signals the defensive nature and moral rectitude of its action.¹² Others concerned with symbols might fear that it signals desperation. In either case, the use of women conveys an ultimate message. If women are used routinely, their use would no longer communicate any special intensity of commitment, and the opposing side would have to find other ways to read the grammar of combat. Thus, the regular use of women would alter and perhaps temporarily reduce the tacit communication and concomitant bargaining which are part of war.¹³

A different argument was made in the Hoover Commission's report following World War II. There, the position was taken that women might indeed be trained to think and act as men but that to so train them could seriously alter society's equilibrium, which depends upon a balanced blend of masculine and feminine influences.¹⁴ This notion accords well with a theory of wholes as composed of opposites, of a society encompassing dichotomous sex roles.

Experts state on the one hand that an individual's gender identification is deep and stable.¹⁵ On the other hand, it is often suggested that women "lose their femininity" when they participate with men in "male" activities. What is interesting about this suggestion is that few such fears or regrets are expressed by the women participating in the activity. The women seem secure in their gender identification; they do not feel that they have lost anything by doing something new and often more challenging. The fact remains, though, that they are perceived as losing something. By whom, and why does it matter? Part of the answer must be that it is the observer's identity that is affected, rather than the participant's—that many men feel they lose their masculinity when women do what men do.¹⁶ Such men may not, in fact, be worried about women's femininity; instead, they may be worried about their own masculinity.

There is a curious difference between what is labeled masculine and feminine behavior. Women are their most passive, dependent, ornamental—in short, feminine—in the presence of men. They are their most masculine when making decisions, working, and studying in men's absence.¹⁷ Thus when women behave competently in mixed-sex work situations, they consider their behavior only natural because they act that way often, though usually not in a sex-integrated situation. They experience no sense of loss. However, men, who usually see women only socially when they are being their most feminine, often do not understand that the serious women around them are quite comfortable in effective working roles.

With men the situation is reversed. While they are gentlemanly in the presence of women, men are more likely to feel themselves "really" men in all-male groups. They may demonstrate or brag of their physical prowess, take risks, or tell obscene jokes. Since physicality and vulgarity diminish in the presence of women, men may consider integration as inhibiting or emasculating. Thus, if men feel they lose their masculinity in mixed-sex groups, it may

be natural for them to erroneously attribute a reciprocal deprivation to women. Women may also feel increased inhibitions in a mixed-sex group, but the direction of change is toward *enhanced* femininity. The key may be that both men and women feel compelled to be their most "essential" selves before the more valued male audience.

How might these phenomena affect the capacity of men and women to serve in combat? The effectiveness of women is apparently increased when they behave as they would in an all-female group. If resources, supplies, challenge, and all other factors were equal, women might conceivably do better in an all-female unit. For them, the advantage of a mixed-sex unit would be that all these other factors might more likely be equal. For men the effect is hard to assess. Men might be more realistic and disinterested in a mixed group where swagger is tempered by responsibility. However, in combat the irrational, sacrificial, emotional drive to show oneself "a man among men," to participate honorably in the organized mayhem of battle, does produce acts of extraordinary valor which might be lost in a mixed-sex group.¹⁸ The antics of a hero might look objectively foolish, even childish, but they do much to drive combat forward; and it might be that men would be less excessively masculine in the presence of women, that they would suppress their flamboyant and risky behavior, and that valorous individual acts would thus be reduced in number. In sum, it seems that segregated and integrated situations may affect the performance of women and men differently because of a variety of psychologically conditioned behavior patterns.

Let us assume that men need to feel masculine and women feminine. Now, if a woman's femininity, her uniqueness, lies in her capacity to bear children, she needs to demonstrate that capacity only once and that demonstration is absolutely definitive. It is good for all time and for all audiences. For men the proof of manhood is more difficult and unsure; depositing semen is a less heroic act than giving birth, and the status of fatherhood itself is rarely subject to empirical

confirmation. Sadly, the chief defining role for men in society has become that of warrior—a role that in wartime is risky, unpleasant, and often short in duration. In peacetime, however, men lack the traditional means of proving they are men. There is no *rite de passage*, such as killing a lion and wearing the pelt, which proves them. Instead, like Hobbes's natural man, they must continually and indirectly prove both that they are adult and that they are not women. Masculinity is, in fact, ephemeral, fragile, and dependent on women not being the same. It seems that it is women who are biologically defined and men who are the second sex. It is men who must "find themselves" and who depend on the "otherness" of women to prove that they are men. If women were to enter combat, men would lose a crucial identity which is uniquely theirs, a role which has been as male-defining as child-bearing has been female-defining. Yet "warrior" is not an inherently attractive role, and one wonders if a male would accept it if it no longer defined him as a man.¹⁹

A final and practical reason for not sending women into combat is related to the sexes' separate biological functions. Many lives are lost in war. New lives can, of course, be created, but it takes one woman to bear each new child each year, while one man can father a large number of children a year. Numerous women, then, are essential to the replenishment of population, but only a few men are required. Thus, women are arguably too valuable to a society to permit their being consumed by combat.²⁰

IMPLICATIONS OF EXEMPTING WOMEN

Many of the arguments against letting women participate in combat seem at first to be silly and sexist, but to the overall advantage of women. Still, if women insist upon being allowed to share fully in all aspects of their country's military forces, they must realize that they are asking for a radical change. It is a change which, among other things, will disorient men and deprive them of their only unique role. Nevertheless,

the most radical aspect of a combat policy change may not be in terms of women's participation in the military, but in their long-delayed and final acceptance as full citizens.²¹

Even though women received the vote 60 years ago, they have participated relatively little in government. One explanation might be that government pleases them as it is. A second could be that voting is not an important part of the political process and does not lead to participation in governance. A third could be that governmental participation comes only with participation in the state's unique function of exercising society's legitimate force (or at least eligibility or liability for such participation).²²

Citizenship has never been defined as simply being subject to a state's jurisdiction. Historically, citizenship has been rooted in what one contributes to the state, and the two principal contributions have been taxes and military service. Ownership of property was long a voting prerequisite, despite such reservations as those of Benjamin Franklin, who inquired who, exactly, the vote belonged to if a man could lose his suffrage upon the death of his mule. But voting has definitely been associated with military service. During the Civil War, male slaves joined Northern military forces and used that contribution as an important part of their pressure to gain both their freedom and the vote. Efforts to enfranchise women have also been most successful after war service. In both the US and the United Kingdom, women gained the vote following World War I. In France, World War II marked an important shift in the direction of equality for women. In countries like Algeria, too, rights were bestowed in a postwar era of gratitude, even though the culture was not, in fact, ready for the change.²³ Today many aliens find that the easiest way to obtain US citizenship is to join the US military.

The close link between formal citizenship and military participation becomes more obvious if one recognizes that the exercise of legitimate force is the unique function of the state, and that democracy in some guise has become the only legitimate form of government. The latter is true for at least two

reasons. First, complex, interdependent technological states require at least the passive cooperation of all citizens; even a small percentage of organized dissident citizens can paralyze any industrial nation. The special problem that confronts most governments is that citizens cannot quit or conveniently leave. Consequently, room must be found within the system for all, including opponents. Second, democracy has never been adopted simply because it is a good system, nor has it ever been adopted whole. Instead, it has been built piece by piece to accommodate newly arisen power centers lying outside of government. Churchill's observation that "democracy is the worst form of government—except all those other forms which have been tried from time to time" suggests democracy's crucial function—that it serves as an excellent ritual test, providing a way of choosing sides and estimating relative strength in both number and intensity of purpose.²⁴

Intensity of purpose does count in a democracy. It can be demonstrated by money, by time, by self-sacrifice, and by an organization with a credible potential for violent action. The last is important, and women, who are rarely collectively violent, may not realize that their lack of violence represents a political limitation. Women have almost no credibility with regard to the use of force; they are believed to have no capacity for forceful insistence or retaliation. They are considered to be and act like *de facto* pacifists. Accordingly, they lack a crucial political weapon. To illustrate, a Ku Klux Klan chapter on a US Marine base must be prepared for physical attacks by blacks. But has any exclusively male group ever dreamed of having to defend itself physically against women? Most find it unnecessary to defend themselves even verbally. The fact is, women can be and are ignored regularly and with impunity. Moreover, men who ally themselves with women often are ridiculed and sometimes punished for doing so.²⁵

This does not just happen. Women have been deliberately and often legally excluded from society's legitimate, organized,

planned, rewarded, technological force—the force applicable by the police and the military. Some suggest that women cannot use force. Yet in 1977 more women allegedly killed their husbands than vice versa, and the Symbionese Liberation Army women who kidnapped Patty Hearst dominated the FBI's "Ten Most Wanted" list for some time. Individually, then, women do use force. But society forbids them to use its legal force. Why? Is it possible that this represents the collective oppression of one sex by the other, just as rape is said to be a "conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear?"²⁶ Isn't the placing of virtually all weaponry in the hands of men basically an intimidating policy? When one is not permitted to have weapons but is "protected" by someone who does have weapons, it begins to sound like a protection racket is in full swing. Charlotte Perkins Gilman described this ancient dilemma of women in a concrete way.

A stalwart man once sharply contested my claim to [my] freedom to go alone. 'Any true man,' he said with fervor, 'is always ready to go with a woman at night. He is her natural protector.' 'Against what?' I inquired. As a matter of fact, the thing a woman is most afraid to meet on a dark street is her natural protector.²⁷

In this country the civilian government and the military have long worked in harmony. Our armed services willingly accept direction from unarmed, elected officials and their appointees. In the abstract this may seem unusual; in the concrete it *is* unusual, for in many countries the military *is* the government. In such countries, when women are barred from the military, they are effectively barred from government as well. This is as true for revolutionary governments (such as Algeria's) as it is for reactionary ones (such as Chile's).²⁸ After all, just what is the position of those forbidden arms in an armed society? How many and what kind of people would voluntarily choose such a position? And what are the chances of people being able to escape that status once it is imposed?

If one chooses to reject the possibility that men keep women unarmed in the interest of men, one might ask if the taboo is related to the role of women as primary child-rearer. Is it possible that society attempts to inhibit all use of force by those who raise defenseless infants and young children, just as it encourages chivalry in armed men? Or is force the ultimate sanction even in the most intimate and protecting relationship? After all, even the gentlest mother is able (if not always willing) to physically control her child. Or perhaps the problem does lie with mothering, but in a different way. Perhaps the fact that both women and men are raised almost exclusively by women leads to a shared human understanding that one is grown, i.e. an adult, at the point when one no longer submits to female authority. Thus, command over adults is not given to women, nor are the weapons which might guarantee their ability to command.²⁹

The implications of exempting women from combat thus seem to include the exclusion of women from full citizenship. They may also include the continuance of a massive ignorance of things military on the part of the majority of the nation's voters. Participation in the legitimate use of society's force seems to be a responsibility of all who wish to be full-fledged citizens, i.e. those who not only ratify decisions by voting but who would stand for or represent others. After all, those who represent must not only advocate but also be effective; and they must have the confidence of those who elect or appoint them. Acceptance of a combat responsibility is probably crucial to military understanding too, and understanding is essential to the proper support of the nation's military.

How ironic it is. Women can never be completely insulated from the horrors of war; yet by pretending to exclude them through "legal exemptions," we limit their full participation in the peacetime military. Thus, we limit their participation when military service is safest, and leave them ignorant and unprepared for responsibility in wartime emergencies—times when we will call upon all citizens to render whatever help is

necessary. Surely women—and men—need more fact and less fiction about citizens' responsibilities in national defense.

NOTES

1. Ali Mazuri, "Military Technology and the Masculinity of War: An African Perspective," *Impact of Science on Society*, 26 (No. 1/2, 1976), 71-75.
2. William F. Buckley Jr., "Women's Place: In the Foxhole," *Los Angeles Times*, 20 March 1978, sec. 2, p. 6.
3. James Webb, "Women Can't Fight," *The Washingtonian*, 15 (November 1979), 144-45.
4. The lengths to which men go to protect women from other men are sometimes amusing. For example, during World War II some WACs were zealously protected from their fellow soldiers by having their quarters floodlit and surrounded by barbed wire. The WACs must have felt like POWs! (Mattie E. Treadwell, *The Women's Army Corps*, Part 2 of *United States Army in World War II: Special Studies*, VIII [Washington: Department of the Army, 1954], 744.)
5. The mean height for males in the US is 5 feet, 8 inches; for females it is 5 feet, 3 inches. The difference between mean weights is 25 pounds. Most important, there is more difference among males than between males and females. See US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Weight by Height and Age of Adults," *Vital and Health Statistics Series 11*, No. 14.
6. Hannah Arendt discusses this eloquently in *On Violence* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1970).
7. E.g., see Richard Gilder, "The Case Against Women in Combat," *New York Times Magazine*, 28 January 1979, pp. 29-46 (rpt. in *Parameters*, 9 [September 1979], 81-86). Similar arguments were once made concerning mixed-race units. Interestingly enough, in that case, some officers favored integration more than the troops because they believed black soldiers were most effective when well dispersed. See Leo Bogart, ed., *Social Research and the Desegregation of the US Army* (Chicago: Markham, 1969).
8. For an interesting analysis of sex integration in small groups, see Carol Wolman and Hal Frank, "The Solo Woman in Professional Peer Group," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 45 (January 1975), 164-71; and Rosabeth Moss Kanter, "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women," *American Journal of Sociology*, 82 (March 1977), 965-90.
9. The King-Riggs tennis match in 1973 provoked a complex public response which has never been adequately examined.
10. One reason why Israelis have not put their women into combat since 1967 is said to be that they fear Arab men might never surrender if that surrender had to be to a woman. See James Michener, *Sports in America* (New York: Random House, 1976), p. 128.
11. Margaret Mead, "National Service as a Solution to National Problems," in *The Draft*, ed. Sol Tax (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1967), pp. 107-08.
12. George Quester, "Women in Combat," *International Security*, 1 (Spring 1977), 80-91.
13. One place where the human dimensions of rational calculation are discussed is in Thomas Schelling's *The Strategy of Conflict* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1960).
14. Treadwell, pp. 762-63.
15. See John Money and Anke A. Erhardt, *Man and Woman, Boy and Girl* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1972), p. 4.
16. In the case of women and men, imitation is *not* thought to be the highest form of flattery. In fact, when women act like

men, they are not called "manly" but "castrating." When the roles are reversed—when men act like women—the reaction seems less severe. Women may scorn men who behave as they do, but they do not feel themselves mutilated.

17. The behavior of wives of POWs is an example of this. While alone the women managed their families with competence. When their husbands returned, the women found it difficult to relinquish the authority they had been exercising. See Hamilton I. McCubbin and Barbara B. Dahl, "Prolonged Family Separation in the Military: A Longitudinal Study," in *Families in the Military System*, ed. McCubbin, Dahl, and Edna J. Hunter (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1976), pp. 112-44.

18. In conversations with Vietnam War fighter pilots, the "craziness" generated in male barroom bragging was cited as an important part of the willingness to undertake hazardous missions. Glenn Gray also discusses the communal experience as an appeal of battle. See J. Glenn Gray, *The Warriors* (New York: Harper and Row, 1959). "Organized mayhem" is the phrase used by James Webb, p. 144.

19. Amelia Earhart may have said it best: "The trenches, combat service in the air, transport jobs in advanced positions, and even the other, less brilliant arenas of activity in the theater of war, are the last remaining stronghold of men. I suspect that men might rather vacate the arena altogether than share it with women" (Pete Hamill, "The Cult of Amelia Earhart," *Ms.*, 5 [September 1976], 90).

20. This may be another reason Israel does not send its women into combat. Quester refers to this as a "primeval calculation."

21. Nora Kinzer, David Segal, and John Woelfel argue in

"The Concept of Citizenship and Attitudes Toward Women in Combat" (presented at the 5th Symposium on Psychology in the Air Force, 8-10 April 1976, at the US Air Force Academy) that the principal reason for women's combat service is to permit them to be full citizens.

22. Max Weber, "Politics as a Vocation," in *From Max Weber* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1958), pp. 77-78.

23. Judith Stiehm, "Algerian Women: Honor, Survival, and Islamic Socialism," in *Women in the World*, ed. Lynn Iglitzin and Ruth Ross (Santa Barbara: Clio Books, 1976), pp. 229-43.

24. For a thorough discussion of this subject, see Harold Nieburg, *Political Violence* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969).

25. Wolman and Frank, pp. 164-71.

26. Susan Brownmiller, *Against Our Will* (New York: Bantam Books, 1976), p. 5.

27. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, *The Living of Charlotte Perkins Gilman* (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1975), p. 72.

28. The only author I have found to make this connection is Ali Mazuri, a keen observer of African politics. Mazuri also points out that the growing power of Muslim OPEC nations bodes ill for the participation of women in government. Recall the deferential posture of Rosalyn Carter during her official visit to Saudi Arabia.

29. For a discussion of the effects of family socialization on women and men, see Nancy Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1978).

