

Vandenberg and Brig. Gen. Dean C. Strother; Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, Vice Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Rear Adms. Herbert L. Pugh, Walter A. Buck, and Earl E. Stone. General Eisenhower stated:

When this project was proposed in the beginning of the war, like most old soldiers, I was violently against it. I thought a tremendous number of difficulties would occur. . . . Every phase of the record they compiled during the war convinced me of the error of my first reaction.

In tasks for which they are particularly suited, Wacs are more valuable than men, and fewer of them are required to perform a given amount of work. . . . In the disciplinary field they were, throughout the war, a model for the Army. . . . More than this, their influence throughout the whole command was good. Carefully supervised, presenting a picture of model deportment and neatness, their presence was always reflected around a headquarters in improved conduct on the part of all.

In the event of another war, which would be even more truly global than the last in its effects upon the entire population, it is my conviction that everybody in this country would serve under some form of call to duty. . . . I assure you that I look upon this measure as a "must". . . . You are at perfect liberty to quote me privately and publicly in this matter.¹¹⁴

General Eisenhower strongly opposed the substitution of Reserve for Regular status, adding:

The history of the Army shows that . . . there was tremendous resentment on the part of line officers originally when surgeons were given rank and called colonels, etc. . . . We have long since outgrown that and I believe that type of argument no longer has any validity.

Appearances were also made by the current heads of the various women's services, and statements were submitted by former Director Boyce and by various

women's groups including the WAC's National Civilian Advisory Committee. The wartime WAC leaders—Colonels Hobby, Bandel, Rice, Woods, Goodwin, Davis, and Strayhorn—were not asked to testify or to submit statements; the same was true of the wartime heads of the WAVES, SPARS, and women Marines. When privately approached by members of Congress to inquire whether such an invitation should not be issued by Congress, since it had not been issued by the armed forces, the wartime WAC leaders discouraged such action. While personally uninterested in peacetime service, most did not feel justified in barring it for any women who wished to remain. More important, they feared that their opposition to peacetime service might mistakenly be construed as a condemnation of the WAC's wartime record, or of future service by women in national emergencies.¹¹⁵

In the following weeks, the Senate stood firm in its earlier approval of Regular Army status. Before the voting, the House put up a final fight on what appeared to be the basic point of opposition—the fear that women would command men. One member, a Navy veteran, stated:

There is not a member of the House Committee on Armed Services who has not received a telephone call or a call in person from enlisted men objecting to the idea of having to take orders from a WAVES officer.

Another stated:

I heartily concur in all of the laudatory remarks. . . . But . . . what we are asked to approve today is an organizational change in the structure of the Armed Services which is as extreme and far reaching as any ever con-

¹¹⁴ House Com on Armed Servs, *Subcommittee Hearings* on S. 1641, 18 Feb 48, incl Ltr, CofS to Chmn HR Com on Armed Servs, 30 Jan 48.

¹¹⁵ Intervs, 1949–50.