

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF WILLIAM STILL, "FATHER OF THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD"

**HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 11, 2003*

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of Mr. William Still and to celebrate the upcoming National Underground Railroad Family Reunion Festival. Mr. Still, known as the "Father of the Underground Railroad," was one of the primary architects of the legendary passage that assisted slaves in achieving their long sought freedom in the North.

From early childhood, William Still worked on his father's farm in Burlington County, New Jersey. When he was 23, he left the family farm for Philadelphia, arriving poor and friendless. But, as a testament to his determined nature and a foreshadowing of his future success, Mr. Still taught himself to read so by 1847, he was able to hold a secretarial position in the Pennsylvania Society for the Abolition of Slavery. While in this position, Mr. Still became directly involved in assisting African-Americans with their escape from the institution of slavery, and was able to provide boarding for many of the fugitives who rested in Philadelphia before continuing their journey to Canada.

William Still became well known for his hard work and dedication, and in 1951 when Philadelphia abolitionists organized the Vigilance Committee to assist fugitives traveling through the city, Mr. Still was elected chairman. During this time, Mr. Still used his house as one of the busiest stations on the Underground Railroad, being awoken endlessly and tirelessly throughout the night to provide fugitives with clothing and food. By some estimates, Mr. Still helped a total of 649 slaves obtain freedom. In addition, Mr. Still interviewed the fleeing slaves, including the famous conductor, Harriet Tubman, and kept careful records so that families and friends would be able to locate their relatives in the future. The result was his 1872 publication, *The Underground Railroad*; a seminal work documenting the perilous journeys slaves took for freedom.

In addition to his work on the Underground Railroad, Mr. Still, an active member of the Presbyterian Church, established a Mission School in North Philadelphia and organized one of the early YMCAs for black youth. Through these efforts, Mr. Still helped African-American youth embrace their newfound freedom, and it was with his strong leadership that the African-American community successfully made the difficult transition from the cruelty of slavery to the joys of emancipation.

In honor of his esteemed and gracious work, the William Still Underground Railroad Foundation, Inc., as requested by the Harriet Tubman Historical Society, is sponsoring the first annual National Underground Railroad Family Reunion Festival to take place in Camden, NJ and Philadelphia, PA from June 27–29, 2003. The three-day celebration will reunite descendants of conductors, abolitionists, stationmasters, fugitives, and all those whose ancestors were associated with the Underground Railroad in a public arena.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Mr. William Still, a man who

dedicated his life to ensure the freedom and survival of others. In addition, I offer my sincere admiration and appreciation to the William Still Underground Railroad Foundation for planning and sponsoring the first annual National Underground Railroad Family Reunion Festival.

COMMENDING ELROY CHRISTOPHER AND CLAYTON GUYTON FOR ACHIEVING A 2003 ROBERT WOOD JOHNSON COMMUNITY HEALTH LEADERSHIP PROGRAM (CHLP) AWARD

**HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 11, 2003*

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate, Elroy Christopher and Clayton Guyton, who stood up to drug dealers and opened a community center in their Baltimore neighborhood to save it from the ravages of crime and addiction. Mr. Christopher and Mr. Guyton are among an elite group of individuals from across the country selected this year to receive a Robert Wood Johnson Community Health Leadership Program (CHLP) award of \$120,000.

Elroy and Clayton met while doing volunteer grassroots work to change the environment of crime and drug abuse in Baltimore. In 1999, they combined forces to open the Rose Street Community Center in an abandoned row house and "take back" the predominantly African-American neighborhood from drug dealers who sold their wares openly on the street corner. Their goal was to create a "civil life" on the street where children could play safely and all residents could live without fear.

Despite regular threats, Elroy and Clayton continue to work with residents to help them get addiction treatment and job training. They run a tutoring program for youths in cooperation with nearby Johns Hopkins Hospital, they help organize computer workshops and Bible study classes, and sponsor community events such as cookouts and tree plantings.

They also created a program for court-ordered community service participants in which minor offenders clean up the streets in lieu of jail time. In the past two years, they have helped 100 men re-enter the community after being in prison.

"Before these two men began their work, Rose Street was a drug haven with open-air drug markets, intimidation of law-abiding citizens, and violence and murder," said their nominator, Polly Walker, Associate Director, Center for a Livable Future. "Theirs is a single-minded commitment to help others escape the cycle of poverty, drug and alcohol addiction, and crime."

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Elroy Christopher and Clayton Guyton for their accomplishments in founding the Rose Street Community Center and for their efforts put forth in achieving a 2003 Robert Wood Johnson Community Health Leadership Program (CHLP) award.

IN HONOR OF THE RETIREMENT OF DR. ANNA JOHNSON-WINEGAR

**HON. JIM SAXTON**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 11, 2003*

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the retirement of Dr. Anna Johnson-Winegar after 3 years of public service. Dr. Johnson-Winegar led a distinguished career, culminating as the Deputy Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Chemical and Biological Defense. In this position, Dr. Johnson-Winegar served as the focal point within the Office of the Secretary of Defense for all issues related to the highly critical Chemical and Biological Defense Program.

Dr. Johnson-Winegar received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Biology from Hood College, and Masters of Science and Ph.D. degrees in Microbiology from Catholic University of America. Along her career, she has served at the Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, the Office of the Director, Defense Research and Engineering, and the Office of Naval Research. She also participated as a biological weapons inspector in Iraq for the United Nations Special Commission, UNSCOM. In 1998 she received the Lifetime Achievement Award from Women in Science and Engineering. Dr. Johnson-Winegar came to her current position in October 1999.

In response to the President's emerging defense strategy, coupled with the events of September 11, 2001, Dr. Johnson-Winegar spearheaded a paradigm shift within the Department of Defense Chemical Biological Defense Program. Under her leadership and expertise, defending our men and women in uniform against the threat of biological and chemical attack has taken on a heightened priority at the forefront of defense planning. She has lead the effort to improve the overall capability to defend against weapons of mass destruction, from increasing and focusing research efforts which identify and mature promising new technologies, to fielding tested and proven equipment to the warfighter engaged in ongoing operations worldwide. In an era of increasing global threat, Dr. Johnson-Winegar has helped shape how this Nation will defend both itself and its soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines against the threat of chemical and biological warfare agents. We honor Dr. Johnson-Winegar as a true patriot whose many accomplishments serving our country have helped keep this Nation strong and secure.

FACTS, NOT POLITICAL CORRECTNESS, SHOULD DETERMINE MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICIES

**HON. ROSCOE G. BARTLETT**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 11, 2003*

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker: The men and women who serve in America's Armed Services performed exceptionally well during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

During the three weeks of initial heavy combat, members of the Army's 507th Maintenance Unit were ambushed along the lengthy supply lines within Iraq. The death, brief imprisonment, and serious injuries to three

women in that unit briefly captured the attention of the world.

Pfc. Lori Piestewa, a single mother of two toddlers, a 3-year old and a 4-year old, was killed in the attack. Pfc. Piestewa had joined the military 2 years earlier after being divorced.

Spec. Shoshana Johnson, a single mother of a 2-year old, had joined the Army to gain experience as a cook. She was held briefly as a POW. In gross violation of the Geneva Convention, the Iraqis videotaped and distributed footage of the clearly terrified Spec. Johnson and her fellow American captives being interrogated.

Pfc. Jessica Lynch joined the military to earn educational benefits to fulfill her dream of becoming a teacher. She is now recovering from serious injuries following her rescue from an Iraqi hospital by American Special Forces.

Spec. Johnson's family was shocked to find out that her Army career as a cook for a Maintenance Unit placed her in harm's way within enemy territory during the invasion of Iraq. It was news to millions of Americans that military personnel policies deliberately assign women to serve in units that are routinely deployed in harm's way.

As a scientist, I believe that government policies should be based upon facts. The facts are that men and women are different. As the only Member of Congress with a Ph.D. in Human Physiology, I can assert this as a matter of scientific fact. However, you don't need to be a scientist to know this is true. It is basic common sense.

The military is a profession where the stakes involved are a matter of life and death. On a battlefield, the differences between men and women have potentially life and death consequences. I would like to submit for the record and edification of my colleagues and the nation a number of documents examining the evidence of the impact of the differences between men and women on the battlefield.

Most of the documents have been organized by Ms. Elaine Donnelly, the President of the Center for Military Readiness, an independent public policy organization that specializes in military personnel issues. Ms. Donnelly is also a former member of the 1992 Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces, and of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS, 1984-86). For additional information, you may log onto the CMR website: [www.cmrlink.org](http://www.cmrlink.org).

Included among these documents are: "Army Gender-Integrated Basic Training (GIBT)—Summary of Relevant Findings and Recommendations: 1993-2002." Additional articles from major news organizations include: "No More GI Orphans," Editorial, *The Boston Globe*, April 9, 2003; "Mothers at War," Editorial, *The Washington Post*, March 25, 2003; "Mothers At Sea," Editorial, *The Wall Street Journal*, December 3, 1999.

I am also including an article by Anita Ramasastry, "What Happens When GI Jane is Captured: Women Prisoners of War and the Geneva Conventions," April 2, 2003. Ms. Ramasastry is an Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Washington School of Law in Seattle and the Associate Director of the Shidler Center for Law, Commerce & Technology.

I hope these documents will encourage our nation and policy makers to address this important issue.

All of these documents ask tough questions about the impact, costs and consequences of current military personnel policies concerning the assignments of men and women. A number of significant changes in military personnel policies affecting men and women were adopted during the previous administration. These policy changes did not receive public attention or scrutiny until Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

It is not an exaggeration to say that among policy makers, at least for the public record, there has been a reluctance to ask, let alone endeavor to discover the answers to these tough questions. This is a mistake.

The fear that the facts that we might discover about the real world impact of changes in military personnel policies might prove inconvenient or politically incorrect is no justification for ignoring the necessity to do so. From my previous work as a scientist and engineer and now as a Member of Congress, I believe public policies should be grounded in facts, not wishful thinking. This is especially true with respect to military personnel policies. We, as public policy makers, owe the individual men and women who sacrifice so much to serve in our military personnel policies that will enhance their capability to achieve the military's mission and to protect their lives. We can never forget that military service is a profession where the stakes can not be higher or have graver consequences.

I hope the material I have submitted for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD encourages a vigorous inquiry and debate about military personnel policies by both the public and government officials.

#### ARMY GENDER-INTEGRATED BASIC TRAINING (GIBT)—SUMMARY OF RELEVANT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: 1993-2002

In a slide presentation prepared for presentation to the Secretary of the Army on March 22, 2002, the Army Training and Doctrine Command claimed that GIBT is "effective" in terms of social benefits. TRADOC also conceded that gender-integrated basic training (GIBT) is an "inefficient" format for basic instruction of recruits. Inefficiencies associated with GIBT, some of which were admitted but downplayed by TRADOC in March 2002, include the following:

Less discipline, less unit cohesion, and more distraction from training programs.

Voluntary and involuntary misconduct, due to an emotionally volatile environment for which leaders and recruits are unprepared.

Higher physical injury and sick call rates that detract from primary training objectives.

Diversion from essential training time due to interpersonal distractions and the need for an extra week of costly "sensitivity training."

A perceived decline in the overall quality and discipline of GIBT; lack of confidence in the abilities of fellow soldiers; and the need to provide remedial instruction to compensate for military skills not learned in basic training.

Re-defined or lowered standards, gender-normed scores, and elimination of physically demanding exercises so that women will succeed.

Additional stress on instructors who must deal with different physical abilities and psychological needs of male and female recruits.

Contrivances to reduce the risk of scandal, such as changing rooms, extra security equipment and personnel hours to monitor

barracks activities, and "no talk, no touch" rules, which interfere with informal contacts between recruits and instructors.

No evidence of objectively measured positive benefits from GIBT, and no evidence that restoration of separate gender training would have negative consequences for women or men.

An admittedly "inefficient" method of basic training that produces little or no tangible benefits cannot be described as "effective" in military terms. This is especially so when findings of two major blue ribbon commissions on co-ed basic training have indicated otherwise.

GIBT was implemented administratively in 1994. It is possible to restore superior gender-separate basic training, which is both efficient and effective in military terms, in the same way. For the sake of military efficiency and the best interests of Army men and women, this should be done without further delay.

1. The need for women in the military is unquestioned and not relevant to the issue of Gender-Integrated Training. The real question is whether it makes sense to retain an expensive, inefficient form of Army training that offers minimal benefits in terms of military necessity.

The Final Report of the 1999 Congressional Commission on Military Training and Gender-Related Issues noted that "Whether [gender-integrated basic training] improves the readiness of the performance of the operational force is subjective."

A close look at data and testimony gathered by this and other recent studies indicate that there are no significant benefits from gender integrated basic training, but many problems and complications that detract from the primary purpose of GIBT.

2. The only argument offered by TRADOC in 2002 in favor of retaining GIBT is that male and female recruits prefer training together for social reasons.

Young people entering the services today are more "gender-aware" than generations past, and making recruits happy is not the purpose of basic training. Three years after the return of GIBT, sensational sex scandals involving everything from sexual abuse to consensual but exploitive relationships between cadre and junior trainees made headlines nationwide.

The 1997 Federal Advisory Committee on Gender-Integrated Training and Related Issues, headed by former Kansas Senator Nancy Kassebaum Baker, found that "... the present organizational structure in integrated basic training is resulting in less discipline, less unit cohesion, and more distraction from training programs."

The Kassebaum Baker Commission, whose members were largely independent and free of conflicts of interest, voted unanimously that gender-integrated basic training should be discontinued.

3. The 1999 Congressional Commission reported abundant evidence of inappropriate relationships and distractions in GIBT.

The Congressional Commission report cataloged numerous policies and practices, made necessary by GIBT, which create inefficiencies and detract from concentration. These include separate changing rooms, loss of informal counseling opportunities (due to the need to meet in the presence of a "battle buddy" on neutral territory), differences in needs and abilities, the need to enforce "no talk, no touch" rules, and miscommunications due to lost messages between platoon leaders. All have placed great stress on already overburdened instructors.

Collateral policies introduced to cope with these distractions make it more difficult for instructors to enforce necessary discipline. For example, special "hot lines" set up to receive anonymous complaints have ruined careers, caused several suicides, and driven a

wedge between Army men and women. Tolerance of false or exaggerated accusations is as demoralizing as sexual misconduct itself.

4. Problems associated with gender-integrated basic training (GIBT) cannot be resolved with "leadership" or "sensitivity training" alone.

Continuing a program that increases costs and complicates the training mission, while providing minimal benefits, is not responsible leadership. Military policy makers should establish basic training programs that encourage discipline, rather than indiscipline.

Excessive "sensitivity/diversity" training has become a jobs program for civilian "equal opportunity" consultants, paid for with funds diverted from more essential military training. When the 1997 Army Senior Review Panel (SRP) recommended an extra week of sensitivity or "values" education to counter sexual harassment, Army Times estimated the cost to be equivalent to that of three battalions of soldiers in the field.

Given today's threat environment, the substantial amount of time devoted to sensitivity training in basic training might be better spent on potentially life-saving training in areas such as antiterrorism and force protection.

5. Higher physical injury and sick call rates among female trainees create serious "inefficiencies" that detract from the primary goal of basic training.

Prof. Charles Moskos, a respected military sociologist and member of the Congressional Commission, wrote in the panel's Final Report: "I am particularly perturbed by the high physical injury rate of women trainees compared to men. Likewise, I am put off by the double-talk in training standards that often obscures physical strength differences between men and women. The extraordinarily high dropout rate of women in IET cannot be overlooked (nor should the fact that females are more than twice as likely to be non-deployable than are male servicemembers). The bottom line must be what improves military readiness."

In Great Britain in 1997, Army commander noted that co-ed basic training was causing many young women to drop out early, due to injuries to their lower limbs. Restoration of all female platoons for a one-year trial in 1996 reduced women's injury rates by 50%, and first-time pass rates increased from 50% to 70%. Incidents of sexual misconduct between instructors and recruits also decreased significantly. Col. Simon Vandeleur, commanding officer of the Army Training Regiment at Pirbright, Surrey, said that the move to train women separately "started as a trial, but has continued unquestioned, due to its success."

Recent Army figures indicate that female soldiers take sick calls at rates double those of men.

Extensive tests conducted with ROTC cadets indicate that a wide gap exists between the physical performance and potential of men and women. Among other things, testimony and charts prepared by training expert Dr. William J. Gregor indicate that only 2.5% of female ROTC cadets were able to attain the male mean score on the 2-mile run, and only 4.5% could do so on the strength test. Only 19% of all cadet women achieved the minimum level of aerobic fitness set for men.

6. Every commission study since 1992, including the 2002 TRADOC report, found evidence that real or perceived double or relaxed standards are demoralizing to all who are aware of them.

In the aftermath of the 1996 Aberdeen scandals, then-Army Secretary Togo D. West, Jr., formed a Senior Review Panel (SRP) to

study the issue of sexual harassment. The SRP was staunchly supportive of Secretary West's policies (which several members had helped to formulate), but nonetheless reported disturbing findings.

Among men surveyed, 60% were either "not sure" or "disagreed" that "The soldiers in this company have enough skills that I would trust them with my life in combat." The combined figure for women was 74%. In response to "If we went to war tomorrow, I would feel good about going with this company," 63% of the men said they weren't sure or disagreed, while 76% of the women said the same.

A 1997 congressionally authorized RAND study on GIBT was released in an edited version that differed greatly from the original draft. RAND originally found, for example, that gender-norming reduces female injuries but heightens resentment of double standards and degrades morale. In the chapter on "cohesion," the study declared "success" under a civilianized "workplace" definition, instead of the classic principle that "... group members must meet all standards of performance and behavior in order not to threaten group survival."

7. There is no empirical evidence that GIBT improves the quality of military training for male or female trainees.

According to surveys conducted by the Congressional Commission, 48% of Army recruit trainers said that the quality of basic training declines when men and women are in the same units.

When asked about the current quality of entry-level graduates compared to five years ago, 74% of Army leaders who responded to the survey indicated that "Overall quality" had declined, and 80% said that "Discipline" had declined.

8. GIBT always requires adjustments in standards to accommodate physical differences. Gender-normed qualification requirements reduce excessive stress fractures and other injuries among female trainees, but also have the effect of making training less rigorous for men.

Training standards frequently measure "team" accomplishments rather than individual performance, which contributes to mutual trust, teamwork, and genuine unit cohesion. Under this concept, which is stressed in the TRADOC slide presentation, stronger members fill in for weaker ones, and recognition is given for "equal effort" rather than equal accomplishment.

This means that some trainees are allowed to graduate simply by trying to accomplish given training tasks, such as scaling high walls or throwing practice grenades, even if they do not succeed. Claims that women's training is "exactly the same as men" ignore the reality of gender-normed scores and qualification standards that are inherently demoralizing.

The concept is inherently dubious, since trainees know that there are extra step stools, protective barriers, or gender-normed scores on the battlefield. Attempts to ignore that reality have hurt the credibility of Army leadership.

9. There is no evidence that GIBT would be more successful if women are actually "held to the same high standards as men."

This argument disregards the effect of political pressures from feminists who demand "equality," but are the first to demand "fairer" gender-normed standards so that women will not fail. In the past two decades, attempts to toughen training or match the person to the job were withdrawn because organized civilian feminists perceived them as threatening to women's "career opportunities."

The Army tried twice in the early 1980s to implement realistic strength standards,

commensurate with wartime demands, in occupations rated from light to very heavy. In both instances, tests showed that most women were unable to meet the standards for nearly 70% of Army occupational specialties. The recommendations were never implemented as planned because the former Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS) complained that such systems would have a "disproportionate impact" on the careers of female soldiers.

10. Numerous military and civilian studies done in the United States and in other countries have documented significant differences in male and female physiology that are relevant to military performance.

Numerous American studies have confirmed that in general, women are shorter, weigh less, and have less muscle mass and greater relative fat content than men. Women are at a distinct disadvantage because dynamic upper torso muscular strength is approximately 50-60% that of males, and aerobic capacity (important for endurance) is approximately 70-75% that of males.

A test of Army recruits found that women had a 2.13 times greater risk for lower extremity injuries and a 4.71 times greater risk for stress fractures. Men sustained 99 days of limited duty due to injury while women incurred 481 days of limited duty.

In the United Kingdom, major studies were ordered in 1998 to ascertain the feasibility of co-ed basic training. Army doctors found that eight times as many women as men were being discharged during basic training, due to injury rates that doubled following the introduction of identical training programs for both sexes. Differences in strength, bone mass, stride length and lower body bone structure caused women to suffer disproportionately from Achilles tendon problems, knee, back and leg pain, and fractures of the tibia, foot, and hip.

The "gender-free" system was ended in January 2002 because stress fractures for women rose from 4.6% to 11.1%, compared to less than 1.5% for male trainees.

11. Contrary to the claims of GIBT proponents, studies conducted by the Army Research Institute (ARI) in 1993-1995 did not confirm that mixed training produced better results.

After a 1993 pilot test at Fort Jackson, SC, commanders recommended the continuance of gender-separate training because they observed no improvements in fitness and military proficiency for men or women.

Later in 1993, the Army ordered a new 3-year study from ARI, this time to include an assessment of soldiers' attitudes toward mixed or separate training. Inquiries centered on measures of social/psychological interest (i.e., how well do people get along together?) instead of measures of military interest (i.e., how well will people trained in this way fulfill their duties, especially under crisis conditions?)

The latter 1993 ARI study proclaimed GIBT superior because it was found in separate-gender focus groups that the morale of women improved by 14 points. At the same time, however, the men's morale dropped by 17 points. The gap narrowed somewhat when subsequent focus groups were gender-mixed. ARI questions still focused on "touchy-feely" questions, i.e., whether others want to do a good job."

12. There are no empirical studies showing that women perform better in GIBT than they formerly did in separate-gender training prior to 1994.

After the initial 1993 study, the Army never again compared results of mixed versus separate training formats. Tests thereafter were to determine the best mix of males and females in a platoon (75/25, a ratio

almost never observed). Even before the ARI surveys of "attitudes" were complete, the Army announced its decision to discontinue gender-separate training, except for ground combat trainees, in August 1994.

When GIBT was implemented in 1994, the training regimen was adjusted to reduce the risk of injuries among female recruits. Meanings of the words "soldierization" and "proficiency" were re-defined, physical requirements were de-emphasized, and "success" was measured with new training exercises that would not disadvantage women, such as map reading, first aid, and putting on protective gear.

The Army informed the Congressional Commission, in response to a specific demand by Congress, that it has not, and does not plan to, objectively measure or evaluate the effectiveness of GIBT. Many officials taking this position were responsible for implementing and making a "success" of GIBT in the first place.

13. The Army slogan "Train as We Fight" is an important goal in advanced training. For basic training, however, "Train to Transform" is a more appropriate slogan. Basic training is the first step in a progressive, building block process of training soldiers to serve, fight, and win.

Within only a few weeks, young civilian recruits must learn to wear a uniform properly, have respect for authority, observe proper customs and courtesies, and accept and live by the core values of the service. Operational commanders should not have to spend time for remedial training in these matters, due to inadequacies at the basic level.

Maj. Gen. William Keys, USMC (Ret.), a member of the Congressional Commission, wrote in a statement to Congress that "Basic training teaches basic military skills such as physical fitness, close order drill and marksmanship. It is a military socialization process—civilians are transformed into soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines. This training provides recruits the basic military skills needed to integrate into an operational unit. It does not teach war-fighting skills nor should it be the staging ground for "gender" etiquette skills."

The slogan is also inconsistent with special "lights out" security alarms and other security measures, as described on Slide #18, which are not available in an operational environment. These include barracks guards who conduct "bed-checks" of GIBT trainees every 30 minutes and are changed every two hours.

14. The Marine Corps has demonstrated that a well-designed single-gender basic training program, with same-sex drill instructors, can be tailored to challenge male and female trainees to the limit.

Separate sex training increases "rigor" for all soldiers, forces female recruits to be self-reliant, and reduces the risk of demoralizing injuries that cause female recruits to drop out.

The Kassebaum Baker Commission found that the Marines' single sex approach was producing "impressive levels of confidence, team building and esprit de corps in all female platoons at the Parris Island base."

The Congressional Commission found that female Marine trainees scored significantly higher than any other group in commitment, group identity and respect for authority—all of which are important elements of military cohesion.

Separate housing and instruction improves the ability of male and female recruits to concentrate on transformation. As stated by then-Marine Assistant Commandant Richard I. Neal, "We don't want them to think about anything else than becoming a Marine."

15. There is no evidence that restoration of gender-separate basic training would "rein-

force negative attitudes and stereotypes," or hurt morale among female soldiers.

On the contrary, members of the Congressional Commission noticed that GIBT might be reinforcing, rather than eliminating, stereotypes. Female trainees frequently said that they liked training with the men because "The guys really help us." When asked how, they typically answered, "They motivate us. They lift heavy stuff for us. We trade—we do their ironing, and they clean our floors." Women Marines, by contrast, have to do every task themselves, without passing off dirty or difficult jobs to men. They must team up and find a way to lug heavy objects, and are motivated to climb walls by other women who have demonstrated that it can be done.

Separate-gender training develops self-reliance and confidence as well as teamwork. In the Marine Corps, female trainees must find ways to accomplish basic training tasks on their own, without assistance from male trainees to assist them with heavy loads.

Military historian S.L.A. Marshall has noted that "Authentic morale does not grow in its own soil, [with] combat efficiency as a mysterious byproduct. . . . [Rather,] high morale flows when the ranks are at all times conscious that they are service in a highly efficient institution." Attorney Adam G. Mersereau amplified the point as follows:

"[M]orale without combat efficiency is most likely an inauthentic form of morale, brought on by false confidence. . . . To try to build a military's morale without first, or at least concurrently, establishing a foundation of unshakable efficiency is a dangerous error."

The Congressional Commission found that among male soldiers in training, the most frequently mentioned recommendations for change were to separate males and females during basic combat training (BCT), make the training harder; and require recruiters to tell the truth. Female recruits called for an end to "battle buddy" restrictions, improved barracks, and more sexual harassment training.

16. Army women deserve the same high quality training as women Marines have today, and Army women had prior to 1994.

The drawbacks of GIBT conflict with the tradition of Army discipline and the current concept of Transformation, which depends on personnel who are stronger, more versatile, and better prepared.

Short-term costs for returning to single sex basic training would be minimal, and long-term savings related to fewer disciplinary problems and injuries could be substantial.

Sound policies regarding basic training should not be based on unrealistic theories or feminist ideology, including the belief that men and women are interchangeable in all military roles. Nor should gender integration be considered an "end" in itself. The Army needs to encourage competence in training, not egalitarianism at all costs.

17. It is possible that restoration of separate gender training would have a positive effect on recruiting for the volunteer Army.

The 1998 Youth Attitudes Tracking Study (YATS) found that the great majority of both men (83%) and women (77%) said it would make no difference to them whether basic training was conducted with or without the opposite sex. The YATS also found that young men, who constitute 80% of enlistees, are more interested in seeking physical challenge than young women, and they perceive the Air Force and the Navy as less physically challenging than the Marine Corps and the Army. Members of the Congressional Commission concluded that: "Only the Marine Corps and the Army have all-male training, and it is not unreasonable

to suppose that this enhances their image of being physically challenging. Overall, the results of the 1998 YATS suggest that the Army, Navy, and Air Force probably would suffer no loss in terms of recruiting (and might gain) if they decided to change, in whole or in part, from gender-integrated training to gender-separate training."

18. Military personnel policies are bi-partisan, but there is evidence of political support to "fix the clock" on this and other social policies implemented during the previous administration.

During the 2000 Presidential Campaign, the American Legion Magazine asked then-Texas Governor George W. Bush about his views on co-ed basic training. Candidate Bush replied, "The experts tell me, such as Condoleezza Rice, that we ought to have separate basic training facilities. I think women in the military have an important and good role, but the people who study the issue tell me that the most effective training would be to have the genders separated."

Dr. Rice, who is now National Security Advisor to President, Bush, voted with all other members of the 1998 Kassebaum Baker Commission to end co-ed basic training.

A mandate for change was evident in votes cast by military personnel, their families, and supporters, who were told by Governor Bush's running mate, Dick Cheney, that "help is on the way."

19. GIBT can and should be eliminated administratively, without further delay.

GIBT was not authorized by Congress after careful deliberation, but imposed by administrative directives written by former Assistant Secretary of the Army Sara Lister, a civilian lawyer who notoriously depicted the Marines as "extremist."

No one has seen a written order setting forth a logical rationale for the Army's action. Indications are, however, that the decision was accepted as a trade-off to head off even more egregious mandates being promoted by Sara Lister at the time; i.e., gender integration of multiple launch rocket systems (MLRS) and special operations helicopters.

In 1994, uniformed leaders of the Army implemented GIBT without dissent. One brigade training commander told the Washington Post that it was necessary to take the "Attila the Hun approach" with drill instructors that resisted. "I told them that gender integration was our mission, and any outward manifestation of noncompliance would not be tolerated."

Having invested so much in the process, some Army officials lobbied hard to defeat legislation, which passed the House in 1998, to implement recommendations of the Kassebaum Baker Commission. Nevertheless, during the March 17, 1998, HNSC hearing, senior officers representing the armed forces had difficulty making a convincing case for gender-mixed basic training.

20. This is not a question of turning the clock backward or forward. If the clock is broken, it should be fixed.

A five-year experiment with GIBT during the Carter Administration was summarily terminated in 1982 not because of lack of confidence in women's abilities to become soldiers, but because women were suffering injuries in far greater numbers, and men were not being challenged enough. Contemporary news reports indicated that GIBT was eliminated in order "to facilitate the Army's toughening goals and enhance the soldierization process."

Civilian oversight of the military includes the responsibility to set policies for the future, not to continue flawed policies of the past.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 9, 2003]  
NO MORE GI ORPHANS

Lori Piestewa died in combat in the Iraq war's first week. She was a single parent who left two small children. Shoshana Johnson, who was taken prisoner in the same clash, is the single parent of a small child. It is high time the Defense Department redrew its policies to stop single custodial parents—female or male—from being deployed in harm's way. The military should not run the risk that children will be orphaned or face extended separations from their single parent.

During the first Gulf War, Senator Barbara Boxer of California was so concerned that she sponsored a Gulf orphan bill. Boxer's measure would also have kept the services from deploying both parents when both a father and mother were in the military. The Pentagon resisted, however, and before Congress could take any action the war ended. About 80,000 children have a single parent or both parents in the services. Women still cannot serve in ground combat infantry, tank, or artillery positions, but since 1991 the Defense Department has opened up more front-line opportunities to women, who are more likely than men to be single custodial parents. In light of the Piestewa and Johnson cases, Boxer and others in Congress should force the military to ask why its policies place so many children at risk of being orphaned.

The issue brings into conflict the interests of the parent-soldier, the commanding officer, and the child. A parent seeking advancement might be reluctant to accept limits on assignments that could slow promotions. A commanding officer does not want to have several positions filled by soldiers who have to stay at the base when the fighting starts.

But it is the interest of the child in not losing a custodial parent forever, or for a long time, that should be paramount. Instead, the Pentagon, in opposing bills like Boxer's, worried about the abstract unfairness of granting single-parent soldiers the full set of career and educational benefits without the obligation of front-line service. The military does require that parents submit "family care plans" for alternative caregivers when they are deployed. But an alternate caregiver, whether it is a grandparent, aunt, uncle, or family friend, is not the same as a parent.

The late senator John Heinz of Pennsylvania favored limits on single-parent deployment in 1991. To critics who said that parent-soldiers knew what they were getting into, Heinz replied that it was "questionable whether an 18-year-old tantalized by offers of tuition money has any inkling; of what he or she is giving up in 'volunteering' to leave children yet to be born behind. Our righteous insistence that 'a deal is a deal' is reminiscent of the story of Rumpelstiltskin, the dwarf in German folklore who exacts a terrible price for helping a desperate young woman—her first-born child." A humane military would limit the sacrifices it asks of parents—and their children.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 25, 2003]  
MOTHERS AT WAR

Yesterday morning relatives of one of the American prisoners of war in Iraq, Army Spc. Shoshanna Johnson, went on television to say how much everyone missed her: her parents, her cousins and especially her 2-year-old daughter, Janelle. Spc. Johnson is a single mother, one of about 90,000 in the active-duty service. Lately such women have been featured in heartbreaking photos in *Air Force Times* and *Army Times*: Staff Sgt. Rikki Hurston, for example, feeding her four-month-old while her 8-year-old daughter looks up with wide eyes, clutching her moth-

er's kit bag. Sgt. Hurston was headed with her unit to the Persian Gulf. "Who knows when I'll be back," she said to the reporter; with her children she strove for more cheerfulness. More than ever, women are crucial to the U.S. military; they make up 16 percent of the force and perform key front-line jobs. But the increased integration comes at a price, in the form of tens of thousands of temporary orphans.

Almost 10 percent of active-duty service members are either single with children or married to another active-duty person, which means both can be called up. In the first Persian Gulf war this produced 36,704 children who had no parent left at home; this time the number is expected to be much larger. These children range from infants to teenagers. In school, many act brave and resilient; anxieties come out obliquely. Boisterous ones retreat and want only to draw strange pictures; an 11-year-old in Colorado has suddenly started failing some of his classes.

Most militaries in the world do not have women serving; those that do make allowances for family circumstance, infant children at home or two parents away. But this is a touchy issue for the U.S. military. Integrationists have fought hard over the past two decades to win full acceptance of women, who in many cases bristle at any notion that they should be treated differently. No one would want to let down her unit; besides, downsizing in the volunteer force means that any no-show is disruptive. During the first Gulf war, a presidential commission tried to address this question, recommending flexibility for the primary caregivers of children under 2. Then there was resistance; women were still a fairly new and unproven presence in many jobs. Now, and especially following this war, they will be tested and no doubt proven: "Now, you're the fighter pilot—not the female fighter pilot," Capt. "Charlie" recently told *Time* magazine.

If women are to continue their critical role in the armed services, which they should, perhaps it's time to loosen up a little on the deployment rule. Right now families are required to have a child-care plan in place in case of deployment. A commander can grant exceptions if no plan is available, but service spokesmen say they almost never do. Even if no family or friends are available, the Navy can place children in volunteer families resembling foster care, so it's difficult for parents to say no. Perhaps the flexibility could start slowly. For starters, the services could coordinate and try to stagger deployments of two parents; right now it's not even a consideration. Then maybe they could tackle the more sensitive issue of single mothers, giving, say, mothers of children under 2 a real option of deferring if they had no comfortable child-care available. Surely integration would survive that.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 3, 1999]  
MOTHERS AT SEA

Amid all the flotsam crossing our desk lately came one surprise: a new Defense Department report on women sailors. The study focuses on families in which the enlisted mothers of small children are away at sea five or six months at a stretch. Not surprisingly, small children who spend months without their mothers do not fare so very well.

As interesting as the findings has been the reaction: zilch. As it happens, these days a mom at sea is not so unusual. Of the 51,000 women in the Navy, 10,000 serve on ship-board. Many of them are single moms. The study, by Michelle Kelley of Old Dominion University, compared the children of women with land jobs to the kids of women who

serve on extended tours. Turns out that half of these Navy women were single or divorced. This meant that when they were shipped off to sea, many of their children, whose ages ranged from one to three, had no parent at home.

If you didn't even know this was a problem, you're not alone. The idea seems to be that to admit even the slightest difficulty with women in the service threatens to drag women back to the 1950s. So instead of an open debate we get the movie version. In "Courage Under Fire" actress Meg Ryan plays a heroic Army helicopter captain who leaves her daughter behind with grandma as she goes off to die in the Gulf War—and feels just fine about it.

Unfortunately, no amount of Hollywood glitz is likely to console the real-world children of these military moms. And, by the way, it's not just those children. An earlier Navy study showed that four out of 10 pregnancies of women on sea duty culminated in abortion or miscarriage. That compares to two out of 10 for women sailors on shore duty. The news comes in the wake of a controversial 1995 ruling from the admirals saying that pregnancy was compatible with a Navy career, meaning that pregnant women could even serve aboard ships up to their 20th week. To put it harshly, there is a sense here that some babies are being thrown out with the seawater.

Of course, the problems of the extended tour are by no means confined to women. Military families have long suffered from the prolonged absence of fathers. In his memoir, John McCain notes that one reason he found it so easy, as a child, to idolize his father was that his father wasn't around enough to mar the golden image. What makes the Mom-Goes-to-Sea story different is the all-too-frequent absence of any parent.

Could it be that the unwillingness to address this issue signals a belief that women will suffer from any retreat from the feminist absolute? Perhaps. Whatever the reason, there is a noticeable slippery-slope effect. Thus we must have not only a woman in the military, but a mother; not only a mother but a single one; not only a trip abroad but an extended one, and so on. As the White House wonk bleats in "Courage Under Fire": "She has to get the medal of honor. She's a woman. That's the point!"

Surely we are beyond that. The late 1990s are not, after all, the 1950s. No one is talking about keeping women out of the boardroom, or shutting them out of the officer's club. A little consideration for the realities of family life can only strengthen the cause of women. Owning up to the problem will, however, require courage. Maybe there should be a medal for that.

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN GI JANE IS CAPTURED?  
WOMEN PRISONERS OF WAR AND THE GENEVA  
CONVENTIONS

(By Anita Ramasastry)

Just over one week ago, American television viewers saw disturbing images of American soldiers who had become prisoners of war (POWs) in Iraq. Among those taken captive was Specialist Shoshana Johnson, an Army cook—America's first female POW in the Iraqi conflict. Meanwhile, two other women were missing in action—Privates First Class Jessica Lynch and Lori Piestewa. (Lynch was just rescued yesterday.)

Seeing Shoshana Johnson—thirty years old, and the single mother of a two-year old child—held captive in Iraq bothered me more than I would have imagined. Like the male soldiers held with her, she faces a ruthless regime. Unlike them, however, she may also be the target of misogynistic treatment, and a potential victim of sexual assault.

Anthony Dworkin recently discussed, in a column for this site, some of the protections the Geneva Conventions offer all POWs. But what, if anything, in the Geneva Conventions protects women POWs, in particular?

Before addressing that question, it's worth examining the history of women in the U.S. military in recent years, and of women as POWs, to provide some context for the Conventions' guarantees.

#### WOMEN'S ROLE IN THE U.S. MILITARY NOW AND IN THE PAST

Overall, more than 200,000 women currently serve in the armed forces. These women make up 15 percent of both the enlisted ranks and the officer corps, 6 percent of the Marines, and 19 percent of the Air Force.

These women serve in a wide variety of positions. In part, that is because in 1994, during the Clinton Administration, the Pentagon discarded the "Risk Rule," and authorized women to serve in any military post other than in frontline infantry, Special Forces, or armor or artillery units.

As a result, women reportedly now are allowed to hold 52 percent of active-duty positions in the Marines—about a twofold increase since the 1994 rule change. Women in the Army can hold 70 percent of such positions. And women in the Air Force and Navy can perform in 99 percent of such positions. For example, women in the Navy can now serve on ships, though not on submarines. Women in the Air Force can now fly combat missions.

American women have been in combat ever since Margaret Corbin replaced her fallen husband behind cannon during the Revolution. But this war promises to involve more women in combat than ever before.

Meanwhile, due to the nature of modern warfare, and the war on Iraq in particular, a soldier can be in serious jeopardy whether or not he or she is technically in a combat unit. There is no longer a clear "front" line.

Thus, support units, whose job is maintenance or supply, can find themselves in grave danger. For instance, Shoshana Johnson and her fellow POWs were a maintenance crew in a convoy that got ambushed.

#### WOMEN AS POWS THROUGHOUT U.S. HISTORY

Long before the 1994 rule change, there were women POWs. During the Civil War, for example, Dr. Mary Walker was imprisoned for four months by the Confederacy, accused of spying for the Union Army. (Doctor Walker is the only woman to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor.)

During World War II, more than 80 military nurses, including 67 from the Army and 16 from the Navy, spent three years as prisoners of the Japanese. Many were captured when Corregidor fell in 1942. The nurses were subsequently transported to the Santo Tomas Internment camp in Manila in the Philippines—which was not liberated until February of 1945. Five Navy nurses were captured on Guam and interned in a military prison in Japan.

Meanwhile, during the 1991 Gulf War, there were two American female POWs: an Army Flight Surgeon, Major Rhonda Cornum, and an Army Transportation Specialist, Melissa Rathbun-Nealy. Cornum was subjected to "sexual indecencies" within hours of her capture. (She was released eight days later, but said nothing in public about the sexual assault for more than a year.)

And women, like men, have been casualties of war. According to various reports, there have also been nearly 1,000 women killed in action since the Spanish American War. Women casualties include including two aboard the USS Cole when it was attacked by terrorists in 2000, sixteen in Desert Storm, and eight in Vietnam.

#### WOMEN AND THE LAWS OF WAR

The Geneva Conventions of 1949 govern the treatment of soldiers and civilians during armed conflicts. The Geneva Convention III relates to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. The August 1949 treaties, whose signatories include the United States and Iraq, took effect on October 21, 1950, after the Nuremberg war crimes trials in Germany. They continue to apply now.

With respect to POWs generally, Article 13 of Geneva Convention III requires that they "must at all times be humanely treated. Any unlawful act or omission by the Detaining Power causing death or seriously endangering the health of a prisoner of war in its custody is prohibited, and will be regarded as a serious breach of the present Convention." And Article 3 (common to all four Conventions) prohibits "violence to the life, health, or physical or mental well-being of persons" including torture of all kinds, whether physical or mental. Such acts of violence "remain prohibited at any time and in any place . . ." with respect to persons being detained.

The Geneva Convention III says relatively little about women—primarily because, at the time it was drafted, women were not involved on the battlefield to the same extent as men.

It does provide some privacy guarantees for women, however. Article 25 states that women prisoners must be housed separately from the men. And Article 29, which deals with hygiene and medical attention states that "[i]n any camps in which women prisoners of war are accommodated, separate conveniences shall be provided for them."

Meanwhile, Article 14 provides an equality guarantee of sorts for women POWs. It says that "women shall be treated with all the regard due to their sex and shall in all cases benefit by treatment as favorable as that granted to men."

As with domestic laws, there is a question as to how far this equality guarantee requires additional safeguards for women, beyond what men are entitled to. Some commentators argue that it does, for women have specific needs arising from gender differences, honor and modesty, and pregnancy and childbirth.

Other specific protections are also included. Women prisoners who are being disciplined are required to be confined in separate quarters under the immediate supervision of women—apparently to prevent any risk that an isolated women might be subject to sexual assault or mistreatment.

In addition, all women POWs who are pregnant or mothers with infants and small children are to be conveyed and accommodated in a neutral country. Shoshana Johnson, as the mother of a 2-year old toddler, would seem to qualify.

And more generally, under international humanitarian law, the ill-treatment of persons detained in relation to armed conflict is prohibited.

Meanwhile, civilians taken captive are meant to be afforded similar protections pursuant to Geneva Convention IV. Women are to be protected "against rape, enforced prostitution or any form of indecent assault." Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions, relating to civilians, notes that "women shall be the object of special respect and shall be protected in particular against rape, forced prostitution and any other form of indecent assault." One need only remember the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, however, to see that rape has often been used against civilian women during armed conflict. Finally, with respect to relief shipments for civilians, Convention IV notes that "expectant mothers, maternity cases and nursing mothers" are to be given priority.

#### POTENTIAL REMEDIES: RED CROSS FACTFINDERS AND WAR CRIMES TRIBUNALS

Iraq has claimed publicly that it is adhering to the Conventions. But the recent video footage of American POWs has given others a different impression.

In addition, past history leads to reasonable fears that woman POWs will be mistreated by Iraq in ways particular to their gender. Consider, for instance, the sexual assault suffered by Major Cornum. Will there be any recourse if women are, in fact harmed or mistreated?

The answer is: Perhaps during the war, and certainly after the war.

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)—which drafted the original treaties—serves as a fact finder with respect to possible violations. During war, the ICRC attempts to protect military prisoners of war, civilians caught in war zones, and wounded or sick service members.

An ICRC delegate who witnesses disturbing violations at a jail, hospital, or other facility has the duty to report it to the ICRC, who advise the victim what to do. Thus, if U.S. POWs are mistreated in Iraq, and the Red Cross is let in to see them, and they feel comfortable reporting their mistreatment, there may be some recourse for them.

But all of these contingencies may not actually become reality—and remedies may have to wait until the war's end. At that point, a special war crimes tribunal may well be created in order to prosecute individuals for "grave breaches" of international humanitarian law.

Not all violations of the law of war, indeed not all violations of the Geneva Convention, are grave breaches. "Grave breaches" are defined in the Geneva Convention III to include intentional killing, torture, or inhumane treatment.

Today, such breaches would include sexual violence against women POWs. Such violence, under international law, is criminal.

Both the Red Cross and the international community—through war crimes tribunals—should insist on strict adherence to Geneva Convention III, for men and women prisoners of war alike, and equally.

Unless women prisoners are truly protected equally—meaning that they are protected when it comes to gender-specific crimes and with respect to crimes with gender-specific additional impact—the equality of women in the military will itself be imperiled.

#### SEX CRIMES IN WAR MAY ALSO BE BREACHES OF INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

As the ICRC has previously stated, "although both men and women are subject to sexual assault, a distinction needs to be drawn between them. Sexual torture as such, particularly during interrogation, with its full spectrum of humiliation and violence can, and often does, culminate in the rape of the victim, and is more common with women prisoners. In male prisoners, direct violence to sexual organs is more common during this same phase."

To note this is not in any way to minimize the terrible things that may happen to male POWs. But it is to say that women do face a special risk: the risk of rape, and of being pregnant as a result of rape.

To cope with a pregnancy as a result of rape is terrible enough, and is made all the worse by being in detention. Women may also be forced to terminate their ongoing pregnancies against their will.

Other abuses inflicted on POWs, while not suffered solely by women, could be worse for women than men. They might include beatings, strip searches by men, intimate and abusive medical examinations or body searches, and sexual or gender-based humiliation (such as non-provision of sanitary protection).



Under international law, rape, sexual assault, sexual slavery, forced prostitution, forced sterilization, forced abortion, and forced pregnancy may all qualify as crimes.

**RAPE AS A WAR CRIME, AND A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY**

The crime of rape, in particular, has long existed under customary international law. Some treaties have mentioned rape specifically, whereas other treaties and international conventions have made reference to rape as a crime against humanity when directed against a civilian population.

The nineteenth century Leiber Code, for example, listed rape as a specific offense, and made it a capital offense. Later, World War II prosecutions, and the Geneva Conventions, reinforced the prohibitions on rape and other sexual violence, although the focus was on crimes of sexual violence against civilian populations.

Some evidence of sexual violence was presented before the International Military Tribunals, after World War II. Most notably, in the judgments of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, rape was first specifically referenced. Allied Control Council Law No. 10, which governed the prosecution of defendants at Nuremberg, listed rape as one of the enumerated acts constituting a crime against humanity.

In the Tokyo war crimes trials, acts of sexual violence and rape were not placed at a level that would allow them to stand alone. The Tribunal presented evidence relating to sexual atrocities committed upon women in places such as Nanking, Borneo, the Philippines, and French Indochina. Rape and acts of sexual violence were categorized as crimes against humanity because they amounted to inhumane treatment.

Today, the prohibition against rape and sexual violence in armed conflict is even stronger. In 1993 and 1994, rape was specifically codified as a recognizable and independent crime within the statutes of the International Criminal Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and for Rwanda (ICTR).

In addition, the ICTY and ICTR cases have also reinforced the legal basis for arguing that rape and sexual violence are both individual crimes against humanity, and violations of the laws and customs of war.

Finally, the new statute of the International Criminal Court also recognizes rape as crime against humanity when it occurs in the context of armed conflict.

I hope that all of the POWs are treated humanely, and come home soon. And I hope Shoshana Johnson is transported to a neutral country—as she is entitled to be, as the mother of an infant—if she continues to be held.

To ensure that these things happen, it is also important for the international community to make clear what obligations Iraq has with respect to all POWs, and the special obligations it bears to female POWs in particular.

**TRIBUTE TO REV. DR. GEORGE E. MCRAE ON HIS ELECTION AS PRESIDENT OF THE FLORIDA GENERAL BAPTIST CONVENTION**

**HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 11, 2003*

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues will join me in offering our

prayerful best wishes and congratulations to the Reverend Dr. George E. McRae of Miami, Florida, my Pastor and the Pastor of Mount Tabor Missionary Baptist Church, on the occasion of his election as the new President of the Florida General Baptist Convention.

Reverend McRae is perhaps uniquely qualified, by both education and experience, to carry out this important responsibility. He earned his Bachelor's degree at Bethune-Cookman College at Daytona Beach; His Master of Divinity degree at the Interdenominational Theological Center in Atlanta; and his Doctor of Ministry degree at Columbia Theological Seminary in Atlanta. In addition to his fourteen years as Pastor of Mount Tabor Missionary Baptist Church, Rev. McRae has served as Pastor of Shiloh Baptist Church in Daytona Beach; and the Bethlehem Baptist Church and the New Mount Zion Baptist Church, both in Palatka.

Reverend McRae has received numerous awards for his work, including the NAACP's Humanitarian Award and the Miami Herald's Charles White Spirit of Excellence Award, and he has lectured extensively. He was also featured in a front page article in the Wall Street Journal, which chronicled his work at Mount Tabor and the establishment of M.O.V.E.R.S. Inc.—Minorities Overcoming The Virus Through Education, Responsibility and Spirituality—which provides comprehensive treatment, education, counseling and housing assistance to AIDS victims and their families in low-income Miami neighborhoods.

In addition to these great achievements, though, Pastor McRae's highest qualification as leader of Florida's Baptist faithful must truly be the strength of his commitment to Christ's teachings, as exemplified by the caring and humanity of his ministry.

He is a person of great personal power whose very presence cheers those who are afflicted. He is a person of great vision who inspires people to help other people—from caring for the hungry in the church basement after Sunday services to making health care available, in their own neighborhoods, to people who otherwise could not afford health care, even if they had access to it. He is a person who has devoted a lifetime of energy and creativity to the betterment of others.

I extend my best wishes to Pastor McRae and his wife, Mary, for the sacrifices they have made to help others, for their caring and their leadership, and for taking on this additional burden and responsibility, which is so important to our families and our community.

**HONORING CHRISTY WHITNEY**

**HON. SCOTT McINNIS**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 11, 2003*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a deeply compassionate and sensitive woman. Christy Whitney has devoted much of her life to helping others in need as a Registered Nurse, and ultimately as CEO and President of Hospice and Palliative Care of Western Colorado. Today, I recognize Christy's years of service before this body of Congress.

Christy has touched many lives while working in the nursing profession for the past 27 years. As recognition of these years of dedicated service, she was recently named recipient of the 18th Annual Nightingale Award Celebrating Nursing Excellence. Coworkers nominated Christy for the award through an essay and several letters of recommendation. Peers noted that Christy has an intelligent and passionate approach to nursing, characteristics she shares with Florence Nightingale, the renowned nineteenth century nurse. Christy remains humble about her successes and emphasizes that her responsibility as an administrator is to create an environment in which others can perform their job well.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before this body of Congress today to recognize Christy's compassion and devotion to helping others. I would like to congratulate Christy on her prestigious award and the profound respect that she has earned from her coworkers. Her lifelong commitment to serving others certainly warrants the respect of this body and our nation. Christy has answered a noble calling by tending to those in need and I commend her for her selfless public service.

**HONORING JEFF HANCOCK**

**HON. SCOTT McINNIS**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 11, 2003*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a successful businessman who has provided Western Colorado with years of service. Jeff Hancock has devoted much of the past ten years to serving as CEO of the Grand Junction-based organization, Rocky Mountain Nurses, Inc. Today, I would like to honor Jeff's accomplishments and the impact he has had on the Grand Junction community by expanding his prominent full-service home health-care firm.

Rocky Mountain Nurses, Inc. was founded in 1995 as a small temporary nursing service. Through small business loans, it was recently able to add fifty new jobs in Mesa County. The firm is now located in a new corporate office, employs approximately 180 people, and has opened a medical equipment retail store. The expansion of Jeff's firm has allowed him to provide nursing services to more than 350 people per month. The U.S. Small Business Administration recently honored Jeff by selecting him as Colorado Small Business Person of the Year. He was one of 53 recipients of this award, and is currently in the running to be named as National Small Business Person of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before this body of Congress today to recognize the positive impact that Rocky Mountain Nurses, Inc. has had in my district. Jeff embodies the combination of ambition and altruism necessary to guide an expanding firm dedicated to serving the community. I would like to congratulate him on this prestigious award and the respect that he has earned from his peers. I wish Jeff all the best in his future endeavors.