

### October 2006

Modern culture has witnessed many changes in human beliefs and behaviour. Even the conduct of war has seen dramatic innovations, not just in terms of sophisticated weaponry and the destruction that it wreaks, but also in the practical definition of the combatants.

War is bad enough as it is but why make it even worse by expanding the combatants to include women? Indeed, why would any society countenance women actively participating in war in combat roles? What has led to this new role for women? Is this role symptomatic of a deeper change in the role of women in society? Does it represent a step forward towards greater equality or a regressive step for society as a whole? Does the participation of women in combat roles make for more humane warfare or a further coarsening of civilization?

*“On May 18 2006 Canada lost its first female soldier in Afghanistan during a firefight with Taliban insurgents. Capt. Nichola Goddard, of 1st Royal Canadian Horse Artillery based in Shilo, Man., became the seventeenth Canadian to die in the country since 2002, and the first female combat death since the Second World War. Goddard, 26, was serving with Task Force Afghanistan and was attached to the 1st Battalion Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry (1 PPCLI) Battle Group. She was married with no children.”*

[http://www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/20060503/afghanistan\\_carbomb\\_060517/20060517?hub=TopStories](http://www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/20060503/afghanistan_carbomb_060517/20060517?hub=TopStories)

This news report drew shocked responses and provoked a brief public debate on the merits and appropriateness of having women in combat roles. The articles that follow are drawn from a variety of sources. They address different components of the issue of women in combat roles.

**Barbara Kay, National Post, Wednesday, May 24, 2006**

*Canadians accepted Captain Goddard’s death without ambivalence because she was a career soldier, on a necessary, well-executed mission, who had willingly undertaken the risk of combat duty. She left no children behind. Her death could not be imputed to lesser physical strength or other female handicaps. Most importantly, she died instantly, and with dignity. Had she been*

*captured (like American PFC Jessica Lynch in Iraq in 2003) and raped or tortured, Canadians would have experienced anguish of a very gender-specific kind.*

*The government does not promote gender equity in nursing, teaching, library science or child-care, because these are all intrinsically female professional bastions. Intrinsically male bastions, however, are regarded as fertile ground for cultural “re-education,” and now even military spokesmen docilely toe the feminist line as expressed by one retired woman lieutenant: “In this modern era of equality of the sexes, [soldiering] has no gender.”*

*[that is a]...pretty notion, but a falsehood nonetheless. The Forces need women in most occupations, but for combat purposes most women are inferior to men in both body and spirit; and most uniformed women self-select out of combat, just as most civilian women self-select out of other male-dominated high-risk professions.*

*By all accounts, Captain Nichola Goddard was a great combat soldier who defied such generalizations. But our recruiters and policy-makers would be well-served to understand just how exceptional this woman was.*

<http://www.canada.com/nationalpost/news/editorialsletters/story.html?id=784e17fb-577a-46b4-acce-3080eb70e552>



**Capt. Nichola Goddard, Canada’s first female combat fatality in Afghanistan**

## The Israeli Experience

*The Israeli army had found, he said, that women were particularly effective in certain non-combat roles. Since they tended to be more fastidious than men over detail, they were more useful in certain intelligence work, for example. But the Israeli army no longer used them in combat for three reasons: First, when they are captured, they are almost always raped. Second, men behave irrationally when a female member of their unit is threatened or wounded. Third, a combat soldier is trained to kill people, and killing is incompatible with the Israeli view of womankind.*

*What's noticeable in all this is the readiness with which the modern bureaucratic mind sacrifices practical reality in the service of ideological dogma, even at the cost of danger to human life. Some fire departments, for instance, have reduced their requirements of physical strength to meet an imposed quota of women. Dragging a heavy fire hose up a steep, slippery roof requires a certain physical strength. This necessity, however, is simply ignored.*

<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1639519/posts>

### The failure of women in combat

*Yet, women are not suitable for combat duty. This was recently confirmed by a new study by the British Ministry of Defence, which upheld the British military's 1997 decision to exclude women from combat roles. The reason is that women have a far lower capacity to develop muscle strength and aerobic fitness than men. In fact, only 1% of women can equal the performance of the average man. Women have to work between 50% and 80% harder than men to achieve the same results. Thus, women cannot meet the load-marching and other combat duty tasks. Any reduction in standards would pose unacceptable risks to the effectiveness of the forces.*

*Pity the Canadian military, however. In February 1989, a three-member Human Rights*

*Commission, which included feminist, Jane Banfield Haynes, a sociologist at Toronto's York University, conducted a hearing on the question of women serving in combat roles in the Canadian military. Completely ignoring the Canadian Forces' own studies that had results similar to the 2002 British study, it concluded that feminist ideology should hold sway, and, therefore, women should serve in combat roles in the Canadian military. This conclusion was based on the following:*

*... the Canadian Armed Forces held stereotypic views about women's capacities and capabilities and as a result adopted paternalistic policies to give women special but not equal treatment.*



Female Israeli soldiers on patrol

*The Associate Minister of Defence at that time was Mary Collins, MP, who also happened to be the Minister Responsible for Women's Issues. She, of course, did not want the sisterhood descending upon her head by allowing an appeal of this decision. So the ludicrous decision of the Tribunal stayed, and it has, over the years, caused enormous trouble and end-*

*less expense for the Canadian military.*

[http://www.realwomenca.com/newsletter/2002\\_sept\\_oct/article\\_3.html](http://www.realwomenca.com/newsletter/2002_sept_oct/article_3.html)

### Women Don't Belong In Ground Combat

*Putting women in military combat is the cutting edge of the feminist goal to force us into an androgynous society. Feminists are determined to impose what Gloria Steinem called "liberation biology" that pretends all male-female differences are culturally imposed by a discriminatory patriarchy.*

*History offers no evidence for the proposition that the assignment of women to military combat jobs is the way to win wars, improve combat readiness, or promote national security.*

*Women, on the average, have only 60 percent of the physical strength of men, are about six inches shorter, and survive basic training only by the subterfuge of being graded on effort rather than on performance. These facts, self-evident to*

anyone who watches professional or Olympic sports competitions, are only some of the many sex differences confirmed by scholarly studies.

<http://www.eagleforum.org/column/2005/june05/05-06-01.html>

### Should Women Soldiers Serve in Combat?

Joel Hilliker, May 26, 2006

Though civilian leaders constantly speak of the “new warfare” being a tidy, push-button, technology-driven business, reality has never matched that fiction. War is brutal, physical, demanding and deadly. Politicians can easily overlook that fact in the midst of relative peace. But their eagerness to plunge women into the nightmare of warfare is, in fact, disregard for women masquerading as support for women.

Some female soldiers recognize this – too late – and are not impressed. As one of them said, “Those feminists back home who say we have a right to fight are not out here sitting in the beat, carrying an m16 and a gas mask, spending 16 hours on the road every day and sleeping in fear you’re gonna get gassed.”

The number of women accepting more-combat-related jobs is just a fraction of the number of such jobs that have been made available to them. By and large, they don’t want those jobs. Army surveys show that 85 to 90 percent of enlisted women strongly oppose policies aimed at thrusting women into combat. The drive to open those positions to women has come from a small group of hard-core careerist women and feminist civilian leaders.

In essence, the feminist dream is to see women viciously tortured and killed alongside men.

Women face greater danger than men in most combat situations. Physical limitations make them likelier to be injured, captured or killed. This reality also endangers the men who are forced to fight alongside them. (Elaine Donnelly says bluntly, “No one’s injured son should have to die on the streets of a future Fallujah because the only soldier near enough to carry him to safety was a 5’2”, 110-pound woman.”) And

when women are captured, experience has shown that they are treated far worse – unimaginably worse – than male prisoners of war. Though feminists lobby hard against rape generally, they “bravely” insist that, since women are duty-bound to serve as combat soldiers, rape in war cannot be stopped. Jessica Lynch, a poster child for women in combat, was allegedly beaten, raped and sodomized in captivity.

Consider soberly: The military agency that trains pilots in survival, evasion, resistance and escape as prisoners of war actually includes a component to desensitize male soldiers to the screams of their women cohorts.

Of course, these same men are then expected to treat women soldiers with utmost respect and dignity, in keeping with all of the “sensitivity training” they have had forced upon them in the new, feminized military.

In the “brutish,” non-politically correct world of yesteryear, the strong were obligated to serve

the weak. A traditional-thinking male seeks to protect a woman. An honorable man shields a female from danger and hurt. This attitude, to the feminist, is contemptible. And in a gender-integrated theater of combat, it introduces a host of complications. A leader is expected to view that woman not as a woman, but simply as a soldier – a grunt whom he

must be able to send into harm’s way. In the up-is-down moral climate of today’s military, his reluctance to pitch her into the lion’s den is considered backward.

The military is the most respected institution in America. It possesses some of the finest, most dedicated and self-sacrificing individuals the nation has produced. But woe be unto us if we fail to recognize how its effectiveness is being fatally undermined by a failure to beat back and restrain the virulent and invasive forces of feminization that enfeeble our modern society.

<http://www.thetrumpet.com/index.php?page=article&id=2192>



Female Russian soldier in training

## The Issue of Equal Rights

*But there is an issue at stake here greater than military necessity. The issue is citizenship, and it is the same issue behind gay marriage. Are all citizens subject to the same rights and responsibilities? Are some citizens more equal than others? Shall we treat each other as citizens or as members of groups, some of whom may be excluded from full rights and responsibilities simply because others don't like them?*

[http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/opinion/224653\\_womenincombat18.html](http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/opinion/224653_womenincombat18.html)



Female American soldiers in training

## Contrarian Arguments

*Aside from the well-known physical strength requirements and hardships associated with combat arms (reference the above Miller quote), what are the social implications changing this anti-male bias?*

*Let's face it, men are more expendable. A woman can bear 1 child a year. How many children can a man father in a year? If women in Europe had been drafted and forced in combat positions on a random basis as were the men in WWI or even in the recent Iraqi-Iranian War (Iran took heavy losses with mass infantry assaults), the ability to repopulate their respective countries would have been severely crippled. Civilian casualties can be bad enough, but battlefield losses in these situations would be devastating.*

*We already have examples of what happens when females are taken prisoners. Major Cornum in the Gulf War was on a helicopter flight that she was not supposed to be on and was taken prisoner. She was repeatedly raped and sodomized by her captors. We saw in Bosnia that the Serbs put the captured women into camps and repeatedly raped them until they became pregnant before freeing them. This is not the typical treatment of male POW's. Apparently our enemies and potential enemies are not con-*

*cerned with political correctness and discrimination.*

*Should the military continue to allow a female to get a discharge if she becomes pregnant? Obviously this is an out for a woman who gets drafted and assigned to a combat position. This, in effect, would allow a woman to opt out if she didn't want to go to war -- an option that a male doesn't have. Even worse, what if she waits until after basic and after she arrives to the unit. Suddenly that unit is short of its assigned strength. This causes a lot of resentment even in non-combat units when pregnant women are put on light duty or profiled and not allowed to go into the field.*

*The key to remember here is that often men do not have a choice whether to serve in combat positions that are now barred to women. If that barrier is lowered then women will not have that choice either. It won't be a matter of the women who want to serve in combat will get a shot. It will be a matter of women getting drafted and (in what appears to the common soldier as a bizarre method) randomly being assigned to combat as the military sees fit.*

<http://www.amazoncastle.com/feminism/ss2.shtml>

## Ideology?

*Is this progress for women? Is it what women want? And is combat, or even close ground support, the role God envisioned for those He created to nurture the next generation? A 1992 Roper poll found that most Americans prefer to "go slow" in making such radical changes. Of those surveyed, 52 percent said women should have "special exemptions" from combat. While 44 percent said they supported a woman's right to serve in combat, 47 percent were opposed. The poll reported that 93 percent of respondents oppose pregnant women serving in direct combat roles, and 69 percent would not want single mothers to serve in such roles.*

*Unfortunately, the feminist agenda is not equality or fairness or improving the natural order, but the grinding down of traditional moral values and the eradication of the family as we know it. Mothers already have the single most important job in the world -- bearing, rearing, and nurturing the next generation. For thousands of years civilizations have sacrificed to make the role of wife and mother a valued and respected position. Angry, embittered, secular liberals have come a long way in tearing down the pedestal on which women have been placed, and at the present rate they will shove our daughters and granddaughters into the line of fire as sacrificial lambs to their outrageous utopian dreams.*

<http://www.leaderu.com/issues/fabric/chap25.html>

## Other useful sites to consult

[http://www.fathersforlife.org/feminism/ideology\\_in\\_art.htm](http://www.fathersforlife.org/feminism/ideology_in_art.htm)

<http://experts.about.com/q/Military-Law-927/women-serving-combat.htm>

<http://www.mugu.com/cgi-bin/Upstream/horowitz-fem-mil>

<http://userpages.aug.com/captbarb/combat.html>

### Questions

1. a) Are women suited, physically and mentally, for combat?  
b) Based on the above articles summarize the main arguments for and against women serving in the armed forces?  
c) Are the arguments based on ideology or on practical considerations?  
d) Which arguments are particularly strong in favour and which are the most persuasive against?
2. Do traditional roles of men and women hold any clout in this argument? What if any role does ideology play in the debate?
3. Are the stereotypes helping the feminists in their approach as society steers towards ridding itself of these gender roles? Are feminists trying to get what they can't have for the sake of getting it?
4. How will women benefit from being allowed to participate in combat?
5. How does lowering the standards of physical testing in the army threaten the overall safety of Canada and the members of the army?
6. Is equality a legitimate argument for allowing women in combat roles?
7. Should the potential of women to get raped if captured be a reason for keeping women out of combat roles?
8. Is it inevitable that women will be able to combat effectively and their numbers in the army will grow? Would this be due to the feminist movement pushing for equality or genuine interest in the average woman wanting to combat?

### Further Research and Activities

1. Should women be excluded from any aspects of armed forces services? Why or why not?
2. Further compare and contrast the role of women in the armed forces in different countries like Canada, Israel, Iran, China, Brazil, Germany. What do their policies reveal about the legal and social status of women in those countries? Is the treatment of women in these

countries differ in other respects?

3. How has the role of women during war been portrayed in movies, novels, history books, comic books?
4. Is violence on the rise or on the wane in society since the onset of a feminist struggle for equality of rights? Is there any correlation between the two phenomena for good or bad?



Female Canadian soldier in combat.

---

---

## Canada's population woes

Editorial, *The Interim*, September, 2006

Statistics Canada reports reveal (once again) that Canada's birthrate continues to decline, to a record low of 10.5 live births per 1,000 population in 2004, down from 10.6 the year before. Yet, the fertility rate – the number of children a woman will have in her childbearing years – remained the same in 2004 as it did in 2003, at 1.53 children per woman. That is well below the "replacement level" of 2.1 children demographers say a healthy society requires to merely maintain its population over time.

Economists say countries with fertility rates significantly below replacement level will have a difficult time meeting the financial obligations

required by an aging population in terms of pensions and healthcare costs, because there won't be enough workers to sustain the government programs to assist the elderly.

Canada's response, like that of many European nations, is to have massive immigration provide the necessary workers. But that is a temporary solution, because these immigrant workers are themselves close to retirement age. Furthermore, while visible minorities and immigrants have a slightly higher fertility rate, StatsCan noticed that such populations quickly regress to the societal norm and have smaller families themselves as they adopt the social mores of their new countries. In 2004, visible minorities had average fertility rates of 1.7 children, down from 1.94 in 1996. This is in contrast to what happens with immigrants in the United States where, according to a report from the Centre for Immigration Studies, many newcomers have higher fertility rates than not just their fellow Americans, but well above the country from which they emigrated.

Canada's future is quite literally at stake. Not having children deprives the Canada of 2020 and beyond of workers (and taxpayers), thereby threatening our economy (and social programs). It puts the country at a competitive disadvantage as the talent pool of future employees – teachers, scientists, doctors, nurses, politicians – is significantly smaller. It also robs children of siblings and the joys of larger families; Dr. Leon Kass, a former bioethics advisor to the U.S. president, has warned that the very concept of an extended fam-

ily – cousins, aunts and uncles – might disappear within a century.

For all the concerns that economists and demographers have about depopulation, few are willing to identify its two main causes: many pregnancies end in surgical or chemical abortions and women are delaying or simply saying no to motherhood for whatever reason. The anti-child mentality that abortion engenders has taken root and it will take a seismic cultural shift to turn things around, but turn things around we must. We quite literally cannot afford society's continued indifference to Canada's trend toward depopulation.

### Questions

1. What is meant by "replacement level" in terms of demographics?
2. According to economists what negative impact does a fertility rate below replacement level have on a society?
3. How has Canada sought to correct the problem thus far and with what success?
4. How is Canada's future jeopardized by the low fertility rate?
5. What may account for this low fertility rate?
6. What positive incentives could governments offer to reverse this trend toward depopulation?
7. Would a higher fertility rate be in our national interest? Why or why not?

