

word came from The Quartermaster General, who ruled that Waacs were not eligible for burial with a flag, military honors, or an escort to accompany the remains home. After conducting a Waac's funeral, an indignant American Legion post protested: "It would probably interest you to know that, at this particular Waac's funeral, she was given full military honors regardless of what her status is, even though she has passed on into another world." To this a harassed War Department made no reply, probably believing that it was difficult enough to determine a Waac's status in the present world without pursuing the matter further.⁹

There were minor points without number in which Waacs did not receive all of a soldier's privileges. Under the new military pay scale, the WAVES were able to offer recruits \$50 a month, whereas, the Auxiliary legislation limited the WAAC to \$21 a month. A particularly serious discrepancy was the matter of disability benefits and retirement. Soldiers and Waves who suffered disabling injuries or illnesses were entitled to lifetime pensions and hospitalization, but Waacs, under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, were entitled only to a few dollars' compensation. Under the law, the Army could give a Waac hospitalization only until her disability was pronounced permanent, at which time she must be discharged and ordered to leave the military reservation. She had no right to a pension or to veterans' hospitalization.¹⁰

The Auxiliary Disciplinary System

Even had these lesser administrative difficulties not existed, there was another, important enough in itself to have invalidated the Auxiliary system, and not capa-

ble of solution by any course short of full Army status; this was the question of establishing a legally sound and equitable WAAC disciplinary system.

It had been known since passage of the legislation that Waacs, like other civilians, could not legally be made subject to court-martial and to the Articles of War unless they were "in the field." This was not even a matter of discretion; no citizen of the United States could legally be tried by military courts unless he had military status or unless he accompanied an army in the field. When not "in the field," the WAAC had its own code of conduct, which was extremely strict but which was limited to civilian punishments for infractions—fines, reprimands, restrictions, or discharge (white or blue); it could not legally subject members to court-martial, imprisonment, or dishonorable (yellow) discharge.¹¹

During the autumn of 1943, Judge Advocate General decisions began to make it clear that Waacs could almost never be considered "in the field" unless they were overseas or in the unlikely event that they should accompany an army on maneuvers.¹² One station commander did actually try a Waac by court-martial on the grounds that his station on the Eastern seaboard was subject to attack and therefore "in the field," but by the time the

⁹ Ltr, OQMG to 6th SvC, 21 Dec 42; also Ltr, N. J. American Legion Post 16 to WAAC Hq. SPWA 293 (12-10-42).

¹⁰ Senate Com on Mil Affairs, 78 Cong, 1st sess, *Hearings on S 495*, 3 Feb 43, p. 18. For six months after discharge, pay and allowances continued if dischargée was hospitalized; no provision was made for hospital expenses in excess of WAAC pay scales. WD Memo 35-46, 24 Jan 46. WDWAC 705. Also Min, mtgs, Jun-Jul 42. WA 300.3 (4-29-42) sec 2.

¹¹ WAAC Regs, 1942 (Tentative), sec 47.

¹² Memo, M. C. M., N. K. B., C. E. F. for Dir WAAC, 15 Dec 42, sub: Interpretation of "In the Field." SPWA 016.2.