PS1 for 2/4/88#THE FOLLY OF WOMEN IN COMBAT

Women in military combat suddenly has become a trendy subject in the news. The laws and regulations that exclude women from military combat duty are said to be unfair because they thwart the advancement and ambition of women.

The American taxpayers do not spend billions of dollars to maintain the U.S. Armed Services so that young men and women can enjoy opportunities for education, travel and training in job skills. The U.S. Armed Services have only one purpose: to defend our country against its enemies, and this means being at all times ready to fight and kill the enemy on the battlefield.

The armies of all potential enemies are almost exclusively male. Sending American women out to fight and try to kill enemy men is contrary to all historical experience, common sense, and the American culture.

If there is any subject on which this poor planet earth has plenty of experience, it is fighting wars. The lessons of hundreds of wars speak with a thunderous voice that wars can best be won by trained, disciplined, healthy, vigorous, risk-taking young men.

There is no evidence for the proposition that coed combat assignments in armies and navies will promote national security, improve combat readiness, or win wars. Anybody who wants to advance a contrary hypothesis has the burden of proof to demonstrate otherwise.

Even Hitler and the Japanese, when they ran short of manpower, found it more efficient to use underage and overage men in combat than female troops. Of the thousands of books written about World War II, no one ever wrote that Hitler or the Japanese could have solved their manpower shortage problem by using women in combat.

The only two nations that used women in combat in modern times, the Soviet Union and Israel, have both abandoned the policy because it

doesn't work. We should study their experience and find out why.

In the heyday of the feminist movement in the seventies, the U.S. Army tried putting female and male recruits through coed basic training. That nonsense has been abandoned because it retards the achievement of both males and females.

Women have only 60 percent of the upper body strength of men. Women simply cannot perform the simple tests of strength that servicemen are routinely required to perform, such as chin-ups.

At any one time, ten percent of the women in the Armed Services are pregnant. Babies are wonderful little bundles of joy, but they don't do much for the combat readiness of our troops. If we had real combat, nobody knows what kind of a retreat from reality would result.

The desire of military women for combat is in inverse relation to their rank. That is, the female officers seek their ""career advancement'' to be promoted to high rank and pay in the peacetime army, but female privates are not demanding assignment to the combat infantry.

Between 1948 and 1969, the percentage of women in the military, even including nurses, never exceeded 1.5 percent and averaged 1.2 percent of the total active strength. Women never came close to reaching the 2 percent limit set by the law. Congress lifted the 2 percent ban in 1967, but women did not reach 2 percent until five years later, after U.S. troops were pulled out of Vietnam.

The most insensitive people in the nation today are the female officers who agitate for combat roles -- knowing full well that the enlisted women who lack a college education will suffer the brunt of a change in the combat policy. Or, perhaps these female officers are dreaming of an army in which women officers will hold the command positions, while men would do all the dangerous, dirty, often-fatal combat jobs that are assigned to enlisted personnel.

The Armed Services should not be used as a social experiment in equal employment opportunity. Should we, for example, apply the handicapped law to the military services for the sake of ""fairness'' or ""equality''?

But, we hear some of the editorialists argue, don't women have just as much right to die for their country as men? Dying for your country is not the purpose of the Armed Services; their mission is to make enemy troops die for (BF)their(end BF) country, and men are demonstrably better at that task than women. Ask any real man who has personally experienced combat if he wants his daughter assigned to combat.

If the men in the U.S. Armed Services are too wimpish to stand up to the foolish feminists and their unnatural demands, how can we count on our Armed Services to stand up to the Russians?