of students. Unique in its conceptualization, stimulating in its editorial apparatus, this book provides teachers with a new approach to the endlessly-fascinating history of our public order.

WOMEN IN THE MILITARY: AN UNFINISHED REVOLUTION. By Jeanne Holm.[1] Novato, Calif.: Presidio Press. 1982. Pp. xvii, 435. Paper, $12.95.

WOMEN AND WAR. By Jean Bethke Elshtain.[2] New York: Basic Books. 1987. Pp. xvi, 288. Cloth, $19.95.

WEAK LINK: THE FEMINIZATION OF THE AMERICAN MILITARY. By Brian Mitchell.[3] Washington: Regnery Gateway. 1989. Pp. viii, 232. Cloth, $17.95.

ARMS AND THE ENLISTED WOMAN. By Judith Hicks Stiehm.[4] Philadelphia: Temple University Press. Pp. viii, 331. Cloth, $29.95; paper, $16.95.

John M. Rogers[5]

To what extent should women be soldiers? The question could not be more timely, as we see cutbacks in military personnel strength, and as we read about American women soldiers having engaged in firefights in Panama and being deployed in Saudi Arabia. Is the issue how to obtain fair treatment and equal access to power for women, or how to have the most effective military force? I was not surprised to find in these four books a correspondence between each author's characterization of the nature of the problem and her or his opinion on the ultimate issue. Indeed, these authors tend to exemplify stereotypes of military women as compromising, academics as effete, military men as male chauvinistic, and feminists as radical. In other words, they take predictable positions.[6] Holm's and Elshtain's books prepare the reader for the differing views of an

1. Major General, United States Air Force Retired.
2. Professor of Political Science, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
3. Reporter, *Navy Times*.
4. Provost, Florida International University.
5. Professor of Law, University of Kentucky.
6. For the record, your reviewer is a Field Artillery major in the U.S. Army Reserve, whose sister is a pilot in the U.S. Air Force. My views of course do not necessarily represent those of any service or person other than myself.

anti-feminist, Mitchell, and of a feminist, Stiehm, on the question of women's role in the military.

Jeanne Holm's *Women in the Military: An Unfinished Revolution* is essentially a bureaucratic history of women in our armed forces, focusing primarily on the period from the beginning of World War II to the beginning of the Reagan Administration. The earlier portion of the history relies heavily on a study by Mattie B. Treadwell on the Women's Army Corps in World War II. The later portion edges toward being a firsthand narrative for the period when Holm herself was centrally involved in women's military affairs as an Air Force officer. In thirty-three years of service, she rose to the rank of Major General; from 1965 to 1973 she was the Director of the Women's Air Force. She was later Special Assistant for Women to the President, and served three years on the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services.

Holm for the most part avoids colorful stories about military women, and instead describes the changes in relevant statutes and regulations, and in how they were implemented, and to a certain extent the personalities involved in supporting, opposing, and administering these policies. Her book sounds authoritative, although it is only lightly footnoted.

Holm's history is dispassionate in its treatment of a number of issues. Should women be organized separately? Should there be a woman line director in each service? The trend has been away from both, but not without objections along the way. Should there be minimum or maximum quotas based on gender? Though sometimes useful, they are ultimately inefficient in Holm's view, and she chronicles the unrealistic nature of many quotas over the years. Should women be drafted if men are? This was considered during World War II and less seriously during the Korean War. Holm describes the debate resulting from President Carter's decision to register both men and women, and makes a strong affirmative case—even assuming that women are excluded from "combat" roles. Such roles are performed by a relatively small minority of military members, and whatever means are appropriate for filling the remaining important spaces with the best people ought to apply to both men and women.

Holm's unifying theme is that our military personnel needs can best be met by using women extensively. Even if there is a draft of men only, recruiting women and treating them well in the service reduces the number of men who have to be drafted. In the absence of a draft, use of women volunteers increases the quality and lessens the cost of military personnel. Holm chronicles the fluctuating ex-

tent to which these premises have been recognized by military and civilian leaders. Along the way she debunks some of the arguments used to resist a broader female role in the military.

The arguments against increasing women's role include notions that women are not suited for hardship assignments overseas, that their turnover rates are much higher than men's, and that pregnancies result in too much absenteeism. According to Holm, women have demonstrated their ability to perform overseas in hardship assignments such as New Guinea and Vietnam. High turnover rates have resulted at least in part from assumptions or indeed requirements that women leave the service when they marry or, later, when they have dependent children. Female absenteeism, allegedly increased by pregnancy and child care, has nonetheless consistently been lower than male absenteeism.

Holm contributes a little to the stereotypical view of women when she repeatedly emphasizes the importance of the style of women's uniforms. I was startled to learn that failure to anticipate difficulties in women's uniforms during World War II was "one of the greatest miscalculations of the war." The Army field uniform for women in Vietnam was less feminine than that of the Air Force, and thereby "lowered the desirability of military service for women and the prestige of the army as compared with the other services, namely the Air Force," although the Air Force uniform "when diving for cover in a bunker . . . was a mess." In addition, Holm is ambivalent on the somewhat related question of whether it is legitimate to assign women overseas partly for the purpose of improving male morale.

For someone in Holm's position in the 1960s and 1970s to have urged a combat role for women would have undermined the credibility of her efforts on other women's issues, and over the years other service women line directors were actively opposed to combat for women. Holm refrains from debating the issue in her book, although she had urged removal of the statutory restriction in order to permit service flexibility. Indeed, her case for including women in any draft carefully assumes that women will continue to be excluded from combat. But she does make four points at the close of her book that help to focus the discussion.

First, the statutory exclusion of women from combat applies only to the Navy and the Air Force, not the Army. Second, there is no bright line between "combat" and "noncombat" jobs, particularly in light of increases in the range of weapons. Third, no matter where such a line is drawn, women will be subjected to the horror and death of war. And fourth, fewer and fewer jobs that might be

called "combat" require a degree of physical strength and stamina that is beyond the capacity of most women.

Apart from a few fleeting references, Holm does not analyze the possibility that sexual relationships and jealousies may interfere with the teamwork and disciplinary structure of combat units. Perhaps this reflects her Air Force orientation; the problem might be less serious in the Air Force than in an infantry platoon. But she ignores the concern even in her discussion of the Army's experience with women soldiers during World War II, although she does refer darkly to smears, gossip, and a "slander campaign."

Answers to questions about gender roles are often determined by one's starting point. For instance, whether abortion should be legal logically depends on the extent to which one considers a fetus to be a person, but in practice one's attitude toward abortion usually determines one's characterization of the fetus, rather than vice-versa. Whether women should be sent into combat may turn not so much on the effectiveness of sexually integrated combat units as on who has the burden of proof: Should "equal opportunity without regard to gender" (or even "equal power to women") be the norm from which deviation must be justified, or should the norm be the way our culture has expected it to be done, the way our adversaries and our allies do it, and the way we have won (and lost) battles in the past?

To answer this, one might begin by taking a deep look at the cultural roots of our society's assignment of different wartime roles to women and men. Although Jean Bethke Elshtain's *Women and War* may have been an attempt to do so, for the most part it succeeds only as a parody of academic writing.

Professor Elshtain uses fancy words with an abandon that rivals that of Mrs. Malaprop. For a while I thought the whole thing was a put-on. "Trope" (pp. 49, 97, 214, 230, 256), "mimesis" (pp. 60, 136, 176, 198, 202, 240, 256), and "figuration" (pp. 100, 104, 143, 192, 237) seem to be her favorite words. Other words are often misused, occasionally in hilarious ways: "penultimate" to mean "ultimate" (pp. 56, 59, 136, 154, 233), "deploy" rather than "employ" (pp. 144, 182n, 214, 246, 252), "elide" instead of "slide" (pp. 108, 152), "akimbo" instead of "askew" (p. 19), and "salient" to mean "relevant" (pp. 77, 159).[7] You will need a very good dictionary to find "sacralize" (pp. 125, 133, 257) or "bellicist" (pp. 77, 80,

7. When she speaks figuratively of the pieces of a gigantic puzzle having been "gerrymandered" to fit, she thoughtfully misdefines "gerrymandered" in parentheses as "an edge smoothed over here, a sharp defining angle serrated, an unseemly protuberance hacked off" (p. 49). Old Elbridge Gerry may be rehabilitated yet. And how does one serrate an angle?

111, 134, 136, 192, 232, 253), and "agentic" (p. 74n) isn't even in my unabridged version. I didn't even look for "Europeanwide" (p. 82). Other words do not quite fit in her sentences, thereby giving the impression of having been plucked from a thesaurus.[8] And I loved it when she said that certain conflicts occurring in A.D. 500-1000 took place in "what was to become Europe" (p. 132).

The pretentiousness of Professor Elshtain's prose makes it hard to tell what her book is even intended to do. Her stated intention is to "explore diverse discourses and the political claims and social identities they sustain." A bit later she explains, "[i]n the sense I here evoke, women have structured conflicts and collaborations, have crystallized and imploded what successive epochs imagine when the subject at hand is collective violence." Got it?

After a meandering introduction to the cultural image of men as "Just Warriors" and women as "Beautiful Souls," Chapter 1 is a short autobiography. The author saw the movie "Joan of Arc" when she was eight, read Ernie Pyle avidly as a young teenager, and later kept a journal in excerpts of which we read her reactions to current events of the 'fifties and 'sixties.

Elshtain then describes how the ancient Greeks, Machiavelli, Rousseau, Mary Wollstonecraft, Hegel, Clausewitz, Marx, Lenin, and the author's international relations professors treated war, and their (occasionally presumed) respective assignments of war roles to women and men. Ancient Greek epics find a "resonant analogue" in the movie "Shane," while Aristotle's "man without a *polis*" has a "contemporary variant" in "Rambo," and Clausewitz's widow's preface to *On War*, disclaiming responsibility for Karl's ideas, presaged Geraldine Ferraro's denial that she had knowledge of her husband's business dealings.

Elshtain describes the attitudes of Southern and Northern women during the American Civil War, and the unifying effect, for good or ill, that World War I had on the American polity. She goes on to treat the development of pacifism from Christ to the present, and to find that Augustine's concept of a just war has been stretched far beyond its original limited compass. Elshtain then contrasts some historical evidence that women make good fighters, such as female mob violence in seventeenth century New England and the combat activities of Soviet women's units in World War II, with the more traditional view of women as noncombatant nurses, factory workers, and patriots willing to sacrifice their husbands and sons.

---

8. *E.g.*, "conflate" (p. 125), "deflections" (p. 134), "adjudicate" (p. 228).

Likewise, Elshtain finds evidence that men are not always marauding and bellicose, despite the resurgence of military toys and the popularity of the movie "Top Gun." Beyond the conscientious objectors, there is the image of the compassionate tough guy whose primary loyalty is to his comrades. Elshtain throws in here a discussion of how women have written about war without having experienced combat, and draws an interesting analogy between the inability of men to describe combat to noncombatants and the inability of women to describe the experience of childbirth to men.

In her last chapter she recognizes that women have diverse points of view about whether war should be fought, and if so, what women's roles should be: to be protected by men, to encourage and sacrifice men, or to fight along with them. She describes women's peace movements, and recounts briefly the recent growth of the female role in the American military. Although against the draft, she favors drafting women if there is to be a draft, on grounds of "simple justice" and "as one way to relocate male and female selves to provide for a freer play of individual and civic capacities, in the hope of breaking the warrior/victim symbiosis." She finally advocates that both man and woman become the "chastened patriot" who will "deviriliz[e] discourse, in favor not of feminization . . . but of politicization." "This citizen is skeptical about the forms and claims of the sovereign state; recognizes the (phony) parity in the notion of *equally* 'sovereign states,' and is thereby alert to the many forms hegemony can take; and deflates fantasies of control."

Brian Mitchell's *Weak Link* treats the issue of women's place in the military from the radically different perspective of an infantry officer who has left the service to expose "[t]he feminization of the American military" as "perhaps the greatest peacetime military deception ever perpetrated." In Mitchell's world, women are for the most part smaller, weaker, less aggressive and competitive, better behaved, more interested in clothing and appearance, and far more charming. If you agree that these differences exist to a significant extent, and especially if you like things that way, then you will probably be shocked by the picture Mitchell draws of the unprecedented expansion of the role of women in the American military.

His initial summary of the historical background of this growth since World War II does not contradict, and in fact relies upon, Holm's. MacArthur did indeed say that WACs were "my best soldiers," but only some proponents of women in the military are "willing to pretend that he meant what he said." Repeated failures to recruit women to desired strengths reflect lack of female interest in military service, rather than poor treatment in the service

or unrealistic goals. Mitchell then describes in regretful terms how the simultaneous political developments of the elimination of the draft and the growth of the women's movement required an unprecedented boost in the recruitment of military women.

In two discouraging but believable chapters, Mitchell then relates the way in which the service academies dealt with the congressionally mandated admission of women. There was a blatant double standard for women and men in the first integrated class at the Air Force Academy with respect to such factors as physical fitness, and the intensity and frequency of upperclass harassment, while Academy officials repeatedly insisted that women cadets were treated the same as men. The double standard was less extreme at West Point and Annapolis, though there are several examples. At all three academies Mitchell relates a lowering of standards relating to physical activity or stamina, and a general lessening of the toughness of the academy experience. He also contends that sexual attraction had insidious effects: In addition to "fraternization" problems, the academies were "charmed" by the presence of women:

> Women brought the world into the academies, the world with all its mystery, romance, jealousy, and pain, with all its delights of gazing at feminine forms from afar, of flirting, of fumbling in a private darkness. Women were not just one part of the world hitherto excluded, as black males had once been excluded; women were the world itself, they were what life was all about. In comparison, the ancient military glory of the academies seemed parochial and quaint, and the traditions that attended that glory seemed purposeless and anachronistic. Their virtue and distinction was gone. They would never again mean as much to those who went there. Never again would a graduate's last conscious thoughts be of "the Corps, and the Corps, and the Corps."

Returning to the military as a whole, Mitchell asserts that when another war seemed imminent in Korea in 1976, women soldiers flooded their commanders with requests to transfer to the rear, and in many cases, the requests denied, they abandoned their posts anyway and headed south. Others reported for duty with their dependent children. The story is unattributed, but disturbing if true. It introduces Mitchell's attack on studies used to justify a large female role in the military. A Carter Defense Department "infiltrated" by feminists was receptive to studies such as a Female Artillery Study, in which handpicked volunteers, all weighing over 110 pounds, showed ability to perform certain artillery assignments. According to Mitchell, the test was conducted under ideal conditions, and even so only the tallest women were able to perform the test's most difficult task, loading a ninety-five-pound projectile.

More to Mitchell's liking was the work of the Army's Women

in the Army (WITA) Policy Review Group, set up early in the Reagan Administration. The Group assessed every position in the Army for the probability that the soldier filling it would see "direct combat,"[9] then identified which specialties required assignment to those positions with the highest combat probability. Twenty-three additional military specialties were closed to women as a result. The group also established physical strength requirements for each military specialty in the Army, based upon Labor Department classification of jobs according to lifting requirements and evaluation of tasks found to be required by each specialty. The idea was to test recruits for physical strength prior to assigning a specialty. Unfortunately, only eleven percent of recruited Army women would be strong enough to fill the "heavy" or "very heavy" jobs that account for more than three-fourths of the positions in the Army (p. 125). Political opposition to the group's work, claims Mitchell, resulted in a very watered-down implementation. Thirteen specialties were reopened to women, and the physical capabilities test developed to implement strength requirements was reduced to a recruiter's "counselling tool."

Rejecting the "party line" that the expansion of the military role of women has been successful, Mitchell advances eight reasons for its alleged failure: physical limitations, medical differences, higher attrition rates, pregnancy, motherhood and marriage, fraternization, homosexuality, and psychological problems. He concludes with an even more fundamental objection: the intellectual underpinnings of the very women's movement that has resulted in the massive increase of women in the military are inconsistent with the military endeavor. Feminism has pacifistic and egalitarian elements that are at odds with military discipline and hierarchy. Brave men in uniform, Mitchell concludes, must stand up and oppose "full sexual equality in the military, before the next war," in order to "stop the disastrous triumph of ideology over reality."

Such belligerence may profitably be contrasted with Judith Hicks Stiehm's calmer and more studious advocacy. In *Arms and the Enlisted Woman*, she presents the results of her study of the recent role of women in the American military. Her relatively careful research methods, attention to detail, and willingness to provide her sources enhance her credibility. Ironically, they also provide evidence that sometimes does not support her positions, and on occasion supports Mitchell's.

9. Defined as "engaging an enemy with individual or crew-served weapons while being exposed to direct enemy fire, a high probability of direct physical contact with the enemy's personnel, and a substantial risk of capture" (p. 121).

Stiehm begins on a personal level, incorporating an autobiographical essay by a woman who enlisted in the Air Force and stayed for six years, and summarizing perceptions drawn from interviewing hundreds of enlisted women and men in the summer of 1982. In doing so, she telegraphs the way in which she will respond to a number of the arguments made by people like Mitchell. The rest of her book, however, is "structured more as male officers would structure it."

First she uses an elaborate categorization of service women by the four-year period in which they entered the service, primarily to explain from different experiences the differences in views among military women about the proper woman's role in the military. For instance, the "antifeminism of both senior and junior women," though "ironic and contrary to their own interests," is rooted in their respective experiences. Many senior women have "low expectations based on years at the periphery"; very junior women are "now experiencing the negative aspects of equality and the resistance to it that were suppressed or overlooked from 1972 through 1980."

Stiehm then ruefully characterizes the early-80's slowdown and reappraisal of the military role of women as a "backlash" and a breach of faith. This is followed by four chapters, respectively, on opinion polling results, litigation and legislation, research studies, and accession data. The results of polls of military men and women are particulary interesting; they permit the reader to form independent conclusions. For instance, in a 1979 Defense Department survey, fifty-six percent of Army enlisted men (twenty percent of women) thought that women get their complaints handled faster than men. (Numbers for enlisted personnel from the other services are comparable.) Most Army enlisted men (fifty-two to fifty-three percent) thought that women cannot take criticism or discipline, and expect special tratment, while only fourteen percent of Army women thought so. Only thirty-six to thirty-seven percent of Army enlisted men thought that women will work extra hours when needed or that they can supervise as well as men, while more than twice that number of women thought so. Stiehm observes that given these results, "one might expect women to be dissatisfied with the military," but in fact women are not much more alienated by military life than men. Of course, this is only an anomaly if one assumes that the women are perceiving the situation accurately, and that the men's responses reflect bias. "Perhaps [enlisted women's] life expectations are low; perhaps the military is more equitable

than civilian life; or perhaps they *are* being favored and appreciate it" (emphasis in original).

Stiehm reports other interesting opinion surveys. Again, they reveal that men tend to have low opinions of women in the military. For instance, before a field exercise in Germany in which women participated,

> Men predicted that they personally would do excellently, that men in general would do almost as well, and that women would do just about two-thirds as well. When the test was over, they reported being confirmed in their views about themselves and men; however they [unlike women] thought women had done less than half as well!

Stiehm repeatedly attributes such results to male bias.

Her chapter on litigation and legislation is best skipped. She is not a lawyer, and it shows. For instance, damage actions are not distinguished from suits for injunctions, and *Frontiero v. Richardson* "was only a 'due process,' not an 'equal protection,' decision."

She examines several research studies, criticizing the WITA Policy Review Group (admired by Mitchell) for making little reference to the earlier studies criticized by Mitchell. Physical strength requirements determined for each military specialty

> ignored the fact that women were not to be in combat, that most work is teamwork, that the military has always found it possible to work with small men, and that new techniques and modified equipment could make it possible for women to do tasks that are now difficult or impossible . . . . The study argued that 92 percent of the women in the Army were physically unfit for the very jobs held by over half the women in it!—even though field studies had not shown that women's presence affected performance.

Stiehm obviously regards the field studies as casting doubt on the Policy Review Group study, but the reverse is at least equally likely. She strongly suggests that the Policy Review Group study was intended to result in minimizing women's participation in the Army (p. 149), but Mitchell suggests that the field studies were biased in the other direction (pp. 98-99, 116).

Subsequent chapters deal with recruitment data, and public opinion polls. Stiehm confronts the gut issues, however, in her chapter on "Biology, Sex, and the Family." Here it is perhaps most instructive to compare her views with Mitchell's. He argues that women generally have less strength, speed, and endurance. The only question, then, is the extent to which these qualities are necessary to accomplish military tasks. Mitchell relies on an Air Force study and anecdotal information to demonstrate that, despite the growth of technology, many military jobs still require more physical strength than most women possess (pp. 156-60). In her characteristically more thorough fashion, Stiehm describes how each branch of

the service has dealt with strength testing in the late 1970s and early 1980s. There is no denying that women on average are weaker. For instance, virtually all Air Force male enlistees, but fewer than thirty percent of the females, could lift seventy pounds to six feet. What Stiehm challenges is the relevance of strength to most modern military tasks. The Air Force, for instance, found that twenty-eight percent of its jobs required the ability to lift seventy pounds six feet. Stiehm blames this on the fact that equipment has been designed for men. She implies that strength requirements determined for many important Army job specialties have been exaggerated in order to exclude most women (p. 201), and that strength categories have been tinkered with to include all men in most categories (pp. 202-203).

But what really undermines military conclusions about job strength requirements is their implication that large percentages of women can't perform all of the tasks of a large number of jobs. That *can't* be the right answer:

> 92 percent of women were expected to be ineligible for more than three-fourths of the Army's jobs on physical-strength grounds alone, yet in 1982 over half the Army's women were serving in those very jobs! Their lack of strength had not previously been a primary complaint, nor was there any evidence that it affected unit performance.

Mitchell says men make up for women's physical limitations when they can, and the autobiographical essay that Stiehm finds "authentic" reflects this. Stiehm's answer? Other nations have men of smaller average stature, and they make do; we can similarly use women. Considerations of physical strength might be balanced by other desirable qualities such as education. "It is almost as though" strength requirements are used as a ruse to discriminate against women.

On other issues as well, where Mitchell relies on a difference or problem peculiar to women or caused by the presence of women, Stiehm acknowledges the difference or problem, but asserts that it is really no different from other differences or problems that the services face. Mitchell: pregnancy interferes with military duty (pp. 169-71). Stiehm: yes, but for men other factors such as poor motivation, second jobs, and time lost (disproportionately by men) for disciplinary reasons are dealt with by the military (pp. 211-12). Mitchell: single mothers typically can't fulfill all their duties and meet readiness requirements (pp. 171-75). Stiehm: there are more single fathers than single mothers in the service (p. 216). Mitchell: but that includes divorced men without custody who are paying child support.

Is there a reasonable compromise between these two positions? How about this: women should have access to every position in the services, but more care should be taken to avoid double standards. All physical, mental, emotional, or family status requirements should be applied on a rigorous gender-neutral basis. But only those requirements that have a true gender-neutral basis should be retained. This would expand women's *opportunities* by permitting them to have combat jobs, but might result in relatively small numbers of women in the military because of statistical differences in the strength, attitudes, or family status of women. There would still be vigorous debate between people like Stiehm and Mitchell, but it would no longer be over fundamental policy. Instead it would be over what physical, mental, emotional, or family status requirements are in fact needed to accomplish the mission. The debate would of course involve subjective perceptions, but it would be significantly more objective than the question of whether female status alone should determine anything.

Unfortunately, things are not even that easy. Mitchell argues that men are attracted to the military because of its "intensely masculine and deeply romantic character," while women have more prosaic reasons for joining (pp. 184-85). Men "derive a profound sense of personal importance from their role as protector" (p. 184). Mitchell even argues that men are biologically more aggressive than women (pp. 186-88). Such "psychological" differences suggest that women are less suited for military occupations. Apart from the biology, Stiehm again accepts the basic premise. What Mitchell calls psychological difference,[10] Stiehm attributes to "myth." According to her, men find that "violence or the threat of violence is . . . connected with and sometimes necessary to the establishment of their gender identity," while women are more certain of their social role as mothers. Related "myths" are that warriors are protectors, and that each "man" takes an equal chance of dying. Stiehm and Mitchell agree that the large-scale presence of women in the military undermines such "myths." The question is whether that is good or bad. Stiehm suggests that it is good because it may lead to fewer wars. We need to think, she suggests, about whether the alternative to war being manly is war ceasing to exist. The presence of enlisted women may ultimately cause society to question its reli-

10. Such differences are supported by one of the surveys Stiehm describes. One question put to a group of Amy personnel was, "If enlisted women were allowed to go into combat, what do you think you would do about going into combat?" There were five choices ranging from "would do anything to get to go" to "would do almost anything to keep from going." Forty-two percent of enlisted women (versus sixteen percent of the men) said they would do almost anything to keep from going (p. 100).

ance upon violence, upon "national boundaries impervious to migration," and upon "allowing men to hold a monopoly on the means of violence." Here Stiehm supports by example Mitchell's allegation that many feminists are primarily concerned not with military efficiency or even equal treatment, but with pacifying the world by taking power from men. Whatever may be the merits of such an underlying agenda, it is not the basis on which popular acceptance of an integrated military has been sought, nor is it sufficiently supported by any constitutional theory to warrant judicial imposition of an integrated military. So as a practical matter, "myths" about efficiency or equality would have to be provided to achieve the result.

It may be misleading, however, to look only to the relatively polar views of the anti-feminist and the feminist, where each accepts significant psychological differences between men and women. A moderate might conclude that such differences, though real, are not great. Many women are aggressive; many men are submissive. And a large number of military jobs don't require much in the way of "macho" activity.

Even so, proponents of sexual integration must consider the effect that men and women have on each other as men and women. For Mitchell the problem is one of close social contact across wide differences in rank. Traditionally such fraternization has been frowned upon because it can interfere with the effectiveness of hierarchical relationships. The presence of women soldiers makes such problems enormously more difficult to control:

> Military customs and regulations are no match for the forces that draw men and women together in pairs without regard for differences in pay grade. Cupid mocks Mars. Lust and love laugh in the face of martial pomp and the pretensions of power.

Once again, Stiehm basically accepts the premise. But for her, the problem is cast in terms of sexual harassment as well as fraternization (pp. 205-09).

Sexual attraction between persons of different ranks undoubtedly interferes with the organizational efficiency and discipline that are the reasons for the ranks in the first place. In the integrated civilian workplace, the problems also exist, and they are dealt with. Just how much more difficult are the problems where organizational efficiency and discipline are *extraordinarily* important, and where rank cannot always be "left at the office," but is often "worn" on a 24-hour-a-day basis? What is the effect on a 72-hour maneuver, for instance, of a platoon leader's being jealous of a squad

leader's obvious attraction to a soldier that the platoon leader has a "crush" on?

One solution might be to keep women out of those military jobs that place heavy reliance upon day-and-night personal bonds created by discipline and leadership, and instead to put women only in jobs that are more like civilian positions. Perhaps the current restrictions on women in combat serve as a rough substitute for this purpose. If so, then combat restrictions may survive "intermediate" constitutional scrutiny.

Instead, Stiehm repeatedly suggests a different solution: segregation by gender (pp. 204, 208), even to the point of reserving the Air Force for women (pp. 6, 237).[11] Most readers will find this too radical. It gives the lie to a rationale based on equal opportunity for individuals. Stiehm reasons that if some specialties are reserved in effect for men because of physical strength requirements, then fairness requires that some jobs not requiring such strength be effectively reserved for women (p. 204). Overqualification would thus become disqualification as a matter of policy.

On the other hand, if separate-but-equal is not an acceptable solution, then much of Stiehm's analysis implicitly supports limiting the female role in the military. One might have expected Mitchell's furious contentions to have been dissolved in the rational light of Stiehm's careful study. Instead, this reader is left with the uneasy feeling that there is a serious problem here: "fairness" in the context of women's opportunities in the military may be more inconsistent with efficiency than we have ever found it in other contexts.

THE SPIRIT OF MODERN REPUBLICANISM: THE MORAL VISION OF THE AMERICAN FOUNDERS AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF LOCKE. By Thomas L. Pangle.[1] Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press. 1988. Pp. 344. $24.95 cloth; $14.95 paper.

Robert Faulkner[2]

This book will be unusually illuminating for thoughtful students of American constitutional arrangements. I say this confidently, although Professor Thomas Pangle's work says little about

11. Curiously, she finds the need to reintegrate basic training "almost self-evident" (p. 237).

1. Professor of Political Science, University of Toronto.

2. Professor of Political Science, Boston College.