

in it, also results in inequalities and injustices to its members. . . . There is, finally, the important element of morale. Membership in the Army carries with it a natural and proper pride . . . for which service in an adjunct of the Army provides no satisfactory substitute.³⁷

General White in his testimony was even more specific on the administrative annoyances of an auxiliary system. He said:

We have found that we run into administrative, disciplinary,³⁸ and command difficulties. . . . The Army Regulations are not applicable to the Waacs. The Army Regulations are contained in a set of books as long as this table. It took years to develop them. Now we are faced with having to develop almost a parallel set of regulations to govern another part of the Army. . . . There are little things that are constant irritants. They are the same difficulties we had in trying to operate the Army Specialists Corps—people not in the Army working with and doing the same thing people in the Army were doing, on a different basis and in a different status. There are questions of relative rank, command, administrative records, and so forth. It just simplifies the whole operation of the Corps to have them all alike. In other words, in the Army we want one category of people.³⁹

No difficulty was encountered in the Senate, which passed the bill on 15 February 1943. The House of Representatives was another matter; its Committee on Military Affairs appeared hopelessly divided into two factions, which at public hearings fell to quarreling so vigorously that their chairman was obliged to remind them that such discussions should be taken up in executive session and not in the presence of Army witnesses.

One faction held with the congressman from Texas who said, "I spoke against it [putting the WAAC in the Army the previous year] four times from the floor. . . .

Then we went ahead and organized the other women's auxiliaries as integral parts of the other services; I feel that we are going to have to do this now, no matter how good my argument was before." However, a representative from Indiana argued that draftees should receive soldiers' benefits, but Waacs and men who volunteered should not because they were not "forced into the Army." He also maintained that Waacs should not get soldiers' benefits because they did not go into front lines; this provoked an argument over whether General Eisenhower and the men in his fixed headquarters were entitled to military status. A congressman from Ohio joined in objecting to compensation for both husband and wife if both were in the Army and both were injured.

It was also feared that a Waac's husband would get a government allotment whether he needed it or not, since the law provided this for a soldier's wife whether she needed it or not. On this General White observed, "I am inclined to believe that the Comptroller General, who at one time recently ruled, in effect, that women were not persons, would rule that husbands are not wives." The representative from Ohio also failed to understand why the Secretary of War could not legally make the authority of military courts applicable to civilian women without giving them military status and benefits; this brought on another futile discussion of what "in the field" meant.⁴⁰

It very shortly became clear that the

³⁷ Ltr to Hon. Andrew Jackson May, Chmn, House Com on Mil Affairs, 1 Mar 43.

³⁸ At the word *disciplinary*, Congressmen interrupted to inquire details, and discovered that General White was referring not to Waac misbehavior but to the legal and technical questions discussed above.

³⁹ *Hearings* cited n. 36.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*