

uniformly effective. At times the one WAC member was a very junior officer. Frequently the requirement was entirely circumvented when the defendant's counsel used his right of peremptory challenge to remove the one woman board member, particularly if he planned to base his client's defense on emotional grounds. Such practices became so common that some Army commanders recommended all-WAC boards for women. The commandant of the Command and General Staff School pointed out in connection with a local case that such boards should not include any male officers "since men do not seem to be able to mete out punishment to women."

Director Hobby did not incline to such an extreme, believing that Army officers' greater length of service lent valuable knowledge, that they would in time achieve the necessary objectivity, and that one WAC member would suffice. She therefore requested publication of a letter or circular inviting the attention of field commanders, and of the Judge Advocate General's Department, to the requirement for a qualified WAC officer on every board, which would necessitate provision of alternates in the event one was challenged. However, such a publication met with the objection of the Judge Advocate General, and was never promulgated. The Army Air Forces nevertheless invited the attention of inspectors to the requirement, and also informed them that it was considered "sound administration" to appoint a WAC officer as the summary court to hear charges against Wacs.³⁵

The Navy experienced an identical problem. The Bureau of Naval Personnel stated:

The administration of discipline was one respect in which it was definitely felt that the

"woman's point of view" should be represented, though this worked out somewhat differently than the men had anticipated . . . The Women's Reserve representative who had been provided for to guard against injustice . . . more often than not provided the saving element of objectivity to hold the line. It was often the experience that commanding officers began by manifesting a paternal tolerance of minor infractions of discipline and then felt somewhat helpless when they discovered that women would take advantage of this as readily as men. The sex difference introduces a certain amount of misplaced chivalry to upset the objectivity with which one man would view the inadequacies of another. . . . The best that could be done was to introduce the detached appraisal of Women's Reserve representatives. . . .³⁶

Since the same problem occurred in higher courts, the Director sent to the Judge Advocate General a list of forty-four Wacs who were lawyers, with the suggestion that he might wish them to attend his school at Ann Arbor so that some might be qualified to sit on the Army's highest Boards of Review. The Judge Advocate General refused the offer, stating:

The Boards of Review constituted by the Judge Advocate General, pursuant to AW 50½, are statutory boards composed of members of the Judge Advocate General's Department. . . . I do not deem it practicable or desirable to change the membership of such a board merely for the consideration of a particular class of cases . . . to appoint members of the Women's Army Corps to such boards is not now contemplated.

He also refused to send WAC lawyers to Ann Arbor, saying:

The legal fields in which a member of the

³⁵ (1) WD Cir 289, 9 Nov 43. (2) Quotation from Memo, Maj Selma H. Herbert, Command and General Staff Sch, for Col Boyce, 29 Jul 46; incl is CG opinion. (3) Memo, Actg Dir WAC for Dir Pers ASF, 7 Jan 44; Memo, JAG for Dir MPD ASF, 31 Jan 44, SPJGO. SPWA 250.4 (1945-46). (4) AAF Manual 120-2, WAC Insp, Hq AAF, 10 Apr 44.

³⁶ WAVES Hist, pp. 116-23.