ORAL HISTORY OF
COLONEL ELIZABETH R. SMITH, JR. (USA Retired)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COLONEL ELIZABETH R. SMITH, JR (USA Retired)

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Colonel Smith was born in Ravenna, Kentucky on December 27, 1926 and grew up in Irvine, Kentucky. She received her Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Kentucky in 1948 and her Bachelor of Law degree from the University of Kentucky in 1950. Colonel Smith was admitted to the Kentucky State Bar after her graduation and she practiced law in Irvine, Kentucky for a short period of time until she entered the Women's Army Corps in 1951.

Colonel Smith entered the Army as a second lieutenant and attended Officers Training School at Fort Lee, Virginia from 1951 through 1952. Upon her graduation from Officers Training School, Colonel Smith served as executive officer and commanding officer, WAC Detachment, Fort Eustis, Virginia from 1952 until 1954.

Colonel Smith's initial assignment to legal work was as a legal assistance officer in the Office of the Staff Judge Advocate, Northern Area Command, Frankfurt, Germany, from 1954 until 1957. She then attended the JAGC special course (basic course) at The Judge Advocate General's School in 1957. Colonel Smith was one of the first two women to attend the special course and she graduated first in her class.

After the basic course, Colonel Smith was assigned to the U.S. WAC Center, Fort McClellan, Alabama from 1957 until 1959. At the WAC Center, Colonel Smith first served as an instructor and then as commanding officer of company B, a WAC basic training company.

Colonel Smith's assignments subsequent to June, 1959, were exclusively to legal work. From June of 1959 until 1961, she serve as a claims officer at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. In July of 1961, Colonel Smith was one of the first women permanently detailed to the Judge Advocate General's Corp.

From 1961 through 1964, Colonel Smith served as Assistant to the Director of the Academic Department at The Judge Advocate General's School. She then remained at the school and attended the Judge Advocate Career Course (Advanced or Graduate Course) through 1965. After the Career Course, Colonel Smith served until 1966 in the Personnel Law Branch, Military Affairs Division, office of the Judge Advocate General in Washington, D.C.

In 1966, Colonel Smith was assigned as the Command Legal Counsel to the U.S. Army Recruiting Command, a

position she held until her retirement in 1978. Upon her retirement, Colonel Smith moved to Newport News, Virginia, where she presently resides.

On 10 July 1972, Colonel Smith was promoted to the grade of Colonel. She was the first and, thus far, the only woman to be promoted to Colonel in the Judge Advocate General's Corps.

Colonel Smith received the Army Commendation Medal and the Legion of Merit. While in the Army, Colonel Smith authored the following articles:

The Code of Conduct in Relation to International Law, 31 Military Law Review 85 (1966).

The Role of a Judge Advocate on a Commander's Staff, Women's Army Corps Journal (April-June 1972).

The Army's Moral Waiver Program, Juvenile Justice (Journal of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges) (August 1972).

Not a Viable Alternative (The "Army or Jail" Syndrome of Some Law Enforcement Agencies), US Army Recruiting and Career Counseling Journal (April 1973).

INDEX

ORAL HISTORY OF COLONEL ELIZABETH R. SMITH, JR.,
USA Retired
January 13-14, 1989

A: I was born on the 27th of December, 1926, in Ravenna, Kentucky, which is the twin city of Irvine, Kentucky, where I actually grew up. After about six months, we moved to Irvine, Kentucky, where I lived until I entered the Army in 1951. My dad ran a grocery store at the time and mother did nothing. Later on my father was elected police judge. I remember occasionally sitting in his courtroom, but I did not know what was going on. My mother, through Franklin Roosevelt and through political connections at that time, was appointed postmaster when the other one died. It never occurred to me that it was unusual for a woman to have that position and to do anything. In fact, all the time I was growing up it never occurred to me that women did not do everything. No issue of it was ever made. I never heard any talk about it. So I just assumed women did whatever they wanted to do, wherever they wanted to do it, and whenever they wanted to do it. I was used to my family being lawyers or ministers and I certainly wasn't inclined towards the ministry. So, I aimed towards the law. It never occurred to me to do anything else. I could not think of anything that would not be boring. I thought the law would be interesting because I would be on my own and make my own decisions. So, I pointed toward the law from the beginning and I took Latin in high school which seemed like a good idea at the time. I didn't know Latin was a dying or dead language. I was

interested in English, the language. I liked language. I like words. And it all seemed to go along with the law.

When I entered the University of Kentucky in 1944, I took prelaw and aimed towards law school. At that time we had a six year program. The first three years were spent studying the arts, with an emphasis on subjects that would lead to the law. The first year in law school went towards my AB (Bachelor of Arts) degree and then, of course, at the end of three years of law school, I received my law degree. I didn't get the impression there that women were that highly regarded in the law. I do remember one particular professor who really sort of went out of his way to ridicule women in his class or permit them to fall into a situation where he could make light of them. It did not bother me, but it was the first time I really ran into the fact that somebody might not enjoy a woman lawyer. There were several of us in law school. We were unique. I found law school very difficult because I went right from high school into college and straight on to law school. In retrospect, I think a break would be good before anyone goes directly to law school so that you have some understanding of the real world, business world. I think I would have enjoyed working in a lawyer's office as some type of clerk. You sort of get the feel for the law and the courtroom. When I came out of law school, I could hardly find my way around the courthouse. From a practical standpoint, I had all the theory but I could see when I went back home to Irvine, to practice law, that the court clerk was going to be my biggest friend as far as

finding my way around the courthouse. It was at the university that I had a woman friend who was married to a former officer who was in World War II. We had been close friends all of our lives. They were Jess and Davis Gardner. Jess had been in the Army, a tank officer, I think, but he loved the Army. He was always talking to me about the Army. But, of course, in 1950 we had the Korean War and I was very concerned about the war and felt I ought to do something about it. In talking to Jess he encouraged me greatly and thought that I would like to join the Army. It was the thing I should do. So, I applied for the Army and was scared stiff at the prospect of entering anything that big. I had never been a joiner in my life. I don't like to join organizations particularly. I went ahead and applied and I had many interesting experiences. During the application process, I was the only woman at Fort Knox being examined. It was very frightening to have a complete physical examination in this strange place with these strange people. I was daunted by that experience. The next interesting experience I had in trying to get into the Army was going to Fort Meade for my interview. Now this was late 1950, I guess it was late 1950, and I was going through the application process and the Board of Officers interviewing me consisted of a couple of women, I think, and a man. They were very interested in my views on race because I was from Kentucky and the south. They were very interested in how I would react to serving with black people, how I would react to living with them and socializing with them. I felt the great interest was because I came from Kentucky and was

not accustomed perhaps, which I wasn't at the time, to that kind of experience. I guess it was rightfully so that they were interested because integration in the Army probably had gotten underway in 1948 under Truman, when he was still new. They were working on it. It was an interesting thing to be talking about this. I had never talked about this before to anybody. I never thought about having a race problem. It just wasn't part of my experience.

When I actually entered the Army, I didn't tell anyone other than my immediate family that I was doing this, until I knew whether I was accepted or not; but other people began to find out because they had to do a background check on me. All of the older people in my little home town of 3,500 were thrilled at the thought of me entering the Army, particularly the older women. The older the women were, the more excited they were at this great challenge, this opportunity to leave home and be in the Army and be a woman soldier. I was simply amazed at these eighty-year-old ladies who were thrilled at the prospect of me entering the Army. I think the men were a little more daunted by the idea. I think my father was disappointed that I was not going to return to Irvine, Kentucky, and practice law and be in politics. I am a Democrat and have been all my life and I could not have lived if I hadn't been a Democrat because of my family. My father was active in politics, constantly. He was party chairman in our county. He held the political position of police judge, through election, for two terms. He had some influence at

the state capitol for getting roads fixed in our county and so forth. I know that had I returned to Irvine, I would have been drawn, inevitably, into politics and may have been supervised a little too much by my dad. The Army was interesting to me and provided an opportunity to get away. Now I had no promises of being a lawyer in the Army, but it just did not make sense to me that the Army, being a somewhat sensible organization, would not at some point use my talents, my ability, my training and education. So, I figured I would just take the chance in coming in and doing whatever I had to do and eventually working my way into the law.

While waiting to hear from the Army, I was home from about February until September. When I looked back through my files a few years ago, I was amazed that I had quite a bit of work. I used the office of an older lawyer who had converted himself to a farmer, so I had his office and his law books. I had clients who would come to me. It surprised me. Being a woman lawyer in my home town, up in the hills of Kentucky, people don't "cotton" necessarily to women doctors and lawyers. But we had a woman doctor in our town who was "the doctor." Everybody loved Dr. Virginia. So she maybe paved the way for me at home.

Q: Were you the only woman lawyer?

A: Yes. Oh, gosh, they had not seen a woman lawyer in their lifetime. I was it, and I am still the only woman lawyer they have ever seen. They were pleased but they did not know I was going to enter the Army.

By that time, I knew that I was, but that it would not be until September. Some of the older people were coming to me and telling me that they wanted me to run for city attorney or county attorney. That is the way young lawyers in Kentucky start out - city attorney, county attorney, state legislature, and then maybe the biggie, Congress; but to start out, you have got to be in one of these offices. It is just the sort of thing you ought to do. You can get clients that way too. Your name gets known. You get publicity. You make speeches. You go to groups. A young lawyer has to start out someway, to get clients, to get money. I even had some Republicans coming to me, women, not men, saying that they would vote for me if I would run. Then, finally, they all learned that I was going to leave town for the Army. My dad never ever expressed disappointment, but I knew that he was disappointed. I think my mother was concerned because she felt the reputation of women in service might not be so good. She was concerned about that. But, of course, I reassured her that if she and Dad had done their job, they did not have to worry about me. I thought I could cope with whatever I found. In my heart of hearts, I wondered, but I had no idea what it would be like.

Q: What did you know about women in the Army?

A: They just sort of had the reputation of having loose morals. All these men all over, they must have loose morals. Surely, when you put a hand full of women amidst a lot of men, they are liable to go "hog wild" - sex rampant in the barracks and all

that, I suppose, drinking, and swearing. Women would pick that up from the men and do that too. I will never forget being on the train going to Fort Lee, Virginia. I was absolutely literally scared stiff, but when I got there, everybody else was scared stiff too. I was immediately reassured because none of us knew what we were into. It was interesting. All of these women were professional women. They were teachers, airline stewardesses, businesswomen, college graduates. We were all college graduates, about 100 of us. And we all had entered because of the war, because of patriotism, really. There were blacks in our midst and this was a new experience for many of us. It didn't bother me in the least. It never occurred to me that it should bother me. But I knew that they had two people to each cubicle, and they rotated your cubicle mate. They rotated all of the black women into my cubicle during the period of the six months' officers' training. They did this with the other Southern girls, too, I am sure, and maybe with the Northern girls too. I am sure we were observed closely to see how we interacted - no problem. We all had things in common. We were all college graduates. They were as qualified as I. The fact that I was a lawyer was irrelevant. Intellectually, socially, in every way, we were all equals and we were all in it together.

Q: This was in the WAC Corps?

A: That's right. We were in the Army, but it's like the Signal Corps and the WAC Corps. We were all separated into the Women's Army Corps. Officers'

training was physically difficult, but wonderful. I had never met the physical challenges before and I loved it. I was healthier during officers' training than any other time because we really had to physically put out with the marching, the parading, the drilling and the formations, what have you. It was very physically demanding, field training, all of that. It was alien to all of us. I guess we all got through it so well because we all were together and we all went through it together. When you share a common challenge, it is exhilarating, particularly when you get through it. But all through this training, people were being dropped out, washed out. We were all commissioned Second Lieutenants, understand, but we were not "in like Flint." You could be washed out. You could come home in the evening and two or three more people were gone. They had gone that day through the interview process, the classroom process, interactions, inability to adapt, all that sort of thing. Some people just could not "cut it." They didn't know what they were getting into, I guess. I think out of a hundred and one or two, 78 of us finished training.

Q: Did they have a physical training program? Did they test you on it?

A: Yes. It may not have been as demanding as it is now. I have no idea what it is like now, but it was to me, very demanding. Pushups and squats, and all that sort of stuff under very demanding officers, all of them. They were all fairly young officers in their late twenties or early thirties.

Q: Male or female?

A: All females. All female officers and cadre. They were very demanding. You really had to put out. There was much saluting, much ma'aming and siring. That didn't bother me. Where I came from in Kentucky, you called the clerks in stores, "ma'am." When I was working in the post office after school for a couple of hours, I was a high school student, old people called me ma'am, so I didn't think it was unusual at all having to call other people ma'am. I had ma'amed sergeants. I ma'amed anyone that walked.

It was also interesting running around policing the post. We always ran around having to pick up cigarette butts and paper and all of that and, of course, scrubbing, waxing, mopping, dusting and cleaning out latrines. Doing all of that was, I felt, good training because we were going to have to require other people to do the same. It was useful that we had to go through exactly what we would have to require others to do someday. If it wasn't too demeaning for us, it would not be too demeaning for anyone else, I suppose.

When I finished there, I got orders to go to Fort Eustis, Virginia, which is quite close to here, only a few miles up the road from Newport News, Virginia.

Q: When was this?

A: That was in February of 1952. It was my first assignment as an officer. Initially though, two weeks after officers' training, all of us were sent back to our home communities for two weeks' recruiting duty. They thought having us all flood back to our communities in uniform would be helpful to the recruiting effort. I got the flu and was not able to do a whole lot, but I ended up being interviewed on the radio and making speeches, as I recall, to students. I don't know that I was particularly effective or that this program was effective, but I think just the showing of the uniform, perhaps women in uniform with bars on their shoulders, was thought to be helpful to the recruiting effort.

Q: Was it recruiting for women?

A: Yes. It is interesting in wartime, how the country does not worry about having women do all sorts of things. In wartime, you can fly planes and drive trucks and repair trucks and fly helicopters and repair them and they don't ask any questions. It is only in peacetime that you have the luxury of putting women back in offices, perhaps. But in wartime they don't ask questions. If you can walk and breathe and you happen to be a woman, that is irrelevant. You can do the job. In wartime, they didn't worry about having a lot of women in the service. They wanted the women in service because the men were in Korea fighting. So, maybe the recruiting effort was of some use, but I was eager to get on to my first assignment. I was eager and frightened, wondering again, if I was up to the job

and, on the surface appearing quite confident and quite capable as one always does at a new assignment. My first commander happened to be my platoon officer from officers' training. I don't know if she had asked for me, or what, but it was sort of helpful that I knew someone there. My job was really just to be her second-in-command. I did training classes, inspected the barracks, helped in the supply office, and prepared elimination board proceedings for unfitness or unsuitability. We did not have any homosexual problems, as I recall, there. In fact at that time, I am not sure I knew what a homosexual was, but that didn't seem to be a problem then. I don't recall running into that kind of problem until later on with men - men having the problem. But we would eliminate women for unfitness or unsuitability.

Q: What were the reasons?

A: Oh they were just inept, couldn't adapt, poor job performance, lack of respect, no discipline, or insubordination - just a routine pattern of being unable to adapt. They got through basic training but were now out on the job. All of our girls were working in offices and coming back to our barracks at night. We were where they lived, ate and slept and we were just responsible for their administration. They worked elsewhere.

Q: Where they were working, were they working with men?

A: Yes, primarily men. There were very few women officers at that time, at least at Fort Eustis, as

I recall. We may have been the only two. There might have been one or two others, but that's about it, plus nurses, of course. Nurses were accepted, taken for granted, because they healed the sick and took care of you when you were hurt. It was an interesting learning time, just to learn how to get along. When that officer left a new one came in, a captain. She made it her business to really train me and tried to teach me more about the Army from a practical standpoint than I knew before. She was a very good teaching commander, as I recall. When she left, I became the commander for awhile. That period of time was really rather uneventful. The most contact I had with the law was preparing board proceedings and counseling women who were having problems. I think legal training and dealing with people brings some expertise to counseling people. That was a rather uneventful two year period, frankly.

Q: As one of two or maybe a few more women officers, how were you treated?

A: Very well. Because we were unique, I guess, and because the boss treated us well. That's really a key - if the Battalion Commander appears to have respect for you and the Commanding General, who used to drop into our own little headquarters, has respect for you.

Q: Do you remember his name?

A: Duffie. I don't know whether he is still living or not. But if the Commanding General and your

immediate commander, male-type, appears to have respect for you, listens to you, supports you, as he would male officers, then everybody falls into line.

One thing was interesting. We used to march up to the parade ground on payday to get talks on VD and AWOL. Male company guideons would carry streamers for however long they had been without VD, or who had the lowest VD rate. It was interesting. I think the talks on payday were aimed at keeping down drunkenness and drunken driving and saving one's money, that sort of thing. It was interesting to go up to Parade Field for these purposes.

Q: Did your company have a guideon?

A: No, we really didn't. I don't know why, but we did not have that kind of thing.

Q: What kind of social activities were available for you?

A: The officers' club was the center of social activity which we frequented and there were parties. Group parties were encouraged, I guess sponsored, and held at the officers' club. There was much more of that in the early days of my career than later on. Of course, this was a post where you had troops, and I think you have more comraderie, perhaps, among the officers and more uniform interest, perhaps, than at some other installations. It was pretty good, as I recall. I had a particular fellow that I was going with. I had no idea at the time, but he

seemed to think he was going to marry me. He had not told me, but on his way to Korea, he stopped off in my home town to talk to my parents. He gave them that impression and then they told me. I was a little startled because I had no intention of returning with Donald to the corn fields of Iowa or Illinois, where he lived. He was going to be a farmer and drive a tractor and I was not going to do that. This was a very interesting experience. Everyone but me seemed to have the idea he was going to marry me. That's a backhanded way of going about things but we did not continue our relationship after he went to Korea. It sort of dwindled away; absence did not make my heart grow fonder.

I applied for overseas and went over to Europe in March of 1954. At that time, we had two full colonel women in the Army. The Director of the Women's Army Corps was a full colonel. The other full colonel was a WAC staff advisor in Europe, as I recall, Mary Milligan. There were about 13 lieutenant colonel women in the Army and more majors and lots of captains and lieutenants. Frankly, lieutenant colonels were like gods. When you talk about a full colonel, that's even beyond god. When I went to Europe, I was sent down to Heidelberg, which was headquarters of the U.S. Army Europe, where Colonel Milligan's office was. They were going to assign me to MOS, that was a supply officer, because I had carried that back at Fort Eustis where I had been supply officer of the unit for a while. They were going to assign me to some quartermaster outfit. When she saw that I was a lawyer and when she looked at my records, she did

not think being a supply officer was appropriate at all, so she called around through the JAG officers in Europe to find me a job in a law office. She found that in Northern Area Command, Frankfurt, Germany, they were desperate for a lawyer. Their civilian lawyer was returning to the United States. He was the legal assistance officer for the command and they had a big booming business in that regard. They were desperate to get a lawyer, male, female, JAG or non-JAG. She got me assigned to my first legal assignment and I shall be forever grateful to her. She had me over to her apartment for lunch. I met her mother. She was extremely kind to me and I was extremely in awe of her because she was a full colonel. As far as I was concerned, that was even better than meeting a general because she was a woman and at the top of her grade in the Army. She had come in during World War II, obviously. When I went up to the Northern Area Command, they were a little bit atwitter at having a female Army lawyer coming to them, and they weren't sure what it was going to be like, having me there.

Q: Do you know if there were any other female attorneys at that time:

A: I think there were one or two. I think Mary Attaya was in the Army somewhere at that time and maybe Nora Springfield. I think there were about three of us, perhaps. I think Nora Springfield at that time might have been a major, she ultimately made lieutenant colonel, perhaps, but I can't be sure. There were probably three of us. There had been more, I think, in World War II, but they are no

longer on active duty, as I recall. I went there and I had a German secretary. I immediately started work because there was no time not to start work.

Q: At the time were you wearing WAC brass?

A: I was a WAC, WAC Branch, and not detailed or assigned to the JAG Corps at all. I was just a lawyer. There was a booming legal assistance business. In the I. G. Farben building where Northern Area Command was. There was also the V Corps which had all the male combat troops in Europe. They had a legal office too, but for some reason the young fellows in the combat units all around Frankfurt came to our office for legal assistance and they kept coming. They did not seem at all bothered by me being a woman. People who came to see me were in very great personal trouble of some sort, frequently divorce problems. When these young men would come in to me, they might be visibly startled for a minute that I was a woman, but they had too much to worry about to be concerned about me being a woman. When I began asking them questions and talking to them and they realized I knew what I was talking about, they relaxed completely and spilled their guts. I continued to have a booming business, a terrific workload of legal assistance. Of course, there were wills and powers of attorney, but so many were personal problems. Frequently, their problems would be at the unit level, where commanders were not acting as commanders, where first sergeants were not acting as first sergeants. They were forgetting to take care of their troops. I would be frequently on the

phone calling a finance office, or personnel office, or a unit directly, to indicate I had a man there who had such and such a problem and what could they do about it. So, frequently, it wasn't really a legal problem, per se, but a problem, that needed to be resolved by somebody, perhaps the IG, perhaps the chaplain. They ended up in my office and getting into my office from the outlying areas was not always that easy; so, I just tried to do what I could to get them in touch with the right people, Red Cross maybe or wherever they could get a loan.

Another big part of my job there as legal assistance officer, that just happened to seem to go along with that particular job title, was being legal advisor to the adoption board for the command. Every military person who came into the Northern Area Command area, which was a large part of northern Germany, to adopt a child who was physically in that area, had to apply to a military adoption board for permission. Up until May of 1955, we were still an occupying force. We were still in the mode of being an occupation force. I can't recall when this kind of adoption board ceased, but I know that a large part of my time and efforts as legal assistance officer was also spent as legal advisor to the adoption board. There was a personnel officer on the board and a chaplain. The chaplain was the chairman, I guess. He was a full colonel named Wildman. We reviewed their files. They had to bring in files, I suppose similar to what they would have to produce to a social services officer here in the United States, to get clearance to adopt a child. Commander's recommendations, other people's

recommendations, a financial statement, debts owed, and those kinds of things were in the file. We interviewed the wife as well as the husband who wanted to adopt a child. We had couples coming from England, North Africa, the United States, from all over the world almost, who were military people coming there because there were a lot of kids available for adoption in that area of Germany. I don't know why. I'm not saying they were GI-German babies. There were just a lot of babies for adoption. So, I got rather well acquainted with the procedures in effect at the German level. We had a German man assigned to our JA office as interpreter and he assisted us a great deal in our contacts with courts, German courts, and adoption agencies so that we could interface with them. We would, on occasion, turn people down for adoption because of what was in their files. I would get calls at home, sometimes from England or elsewhere in the country or world, or France, inquiring about the adoption agency, the procedures and what have you. People were really seeking to adopt babies during that period of time. It was my first experience with that. It was interesting interviewing the couples and talking with them. My first JA left me in that position and then we had a new JA come in. I think his name was Dougherty, I am not real sure. I think he is dead now. He decided he wanted to rotate me among all the offices so I would get a broader experience. He is the one who gave me some military justice experience, very limited, very short term. I did a few defense cases, a few minor prosecutions. I recall going out as defense counsel for five fellows before an

Article 32 investigation. I felt I had achieved a victory when I got them to refer it to a special court instead of a general court. That was really my victory, the victory I hoped to achieve. That was really limited military justice experience. He also rotated me into the administrative law office so that I would see everything that came into and out of the JAG office. I read every CID report that came into the office. It was a broadening experience. I got a better feel of what our entire office was doing. It happened that Lieutenant John O'Connor, husband of Justice Sandra O'Connor of the Supreme Court, was my colleague in the JAG office there. He was a very competent young lawyer, very methodical, very slow moving and talking, but very, very good. I do not recall Sandra at all, just John, John J. O'Connor. We had a very dynamic captain, Captain James Simon, who ultimately became a colonel, in the military justice system primarily, who if I had been court-martialed I would have asked for. He was really dynamic and great. I had good relations with people in the office. They loved to kid me a lot. We had a civilian lawyer, Mr. Loeb, who twirled his red moustache frequently and literally chased me around the office from time to time. I think he was glad I never let him catch me and I wasn't going to let him catch me, but it was an interesting experience. I liked him a lot. He was very bright, very smart, probably smarter than all of us, but he did have this little thing about women. He did enjoy women. He never really seriously expected to catch me, but he did enjoy the chase. Everyone in the office enjoyed teasing me. I tend to blush easily no matter how much experience

I have or what I know. I blush very readily and they loved to embarrass me as much as possible, but not in a mean way. We had a good office really. I did get to go out to outlying commands, primarily with the adoption board as I recall.

I am trying to remember this now. For some reason I was able to do some traveling. I think it was as a member of the adoption board. We would go out to be closer to the troops out in the eastern part of our command, the V Corps. We handled the adoptions for all the commands. It did not matter whether they were Air Force, Navy, Marines, or what have you, we were it because the Army was in charge of that physical geographic area. I am trying to think of something particularly interesting. It was all interesting to me. When I first went there I shared an apartment with another WAC officer in the Transportation Corps. As it happened I had known her at Fort Eustis, too. We had a maid, full-time, who came and did our shopping for us and walked my dog, a long-haired Dachshund. Everyone in Germany had a Dachshund. I would take my dog for a walk. The Germans would walk by you impassively if you walked along the street except if you had your dog with you. Everyone admired anyone who had a dog. Whatever the German word was for beautiful, that's what they called my dog. I had great exchanges in sign language with Germans who loved dogs. My first impression of Germany when I went there was that they were all business people. Everybody in sight carried a briefcase. It took me awhile to realize that the briefcase carried bread, cheese, and wine. They ate voraciously on buses and trains. It was

just odd. I thought they were all business people until I saw them opening up their briefcases, and there was the food. Opera was a great part of my life there. About every two weeks I went to a Frankfurt opera house. It was inexpensive. It was gorgeous. It was wonderful. It was like letting loose a child in a candy store, to have opera at your finger tips. It was as common for Germans to go to opera as for someone here in the United States to go to a movie or to a football game. It was just wonderful. That was the highlight of my three years. I extended a third year to stay in Germany. I liked my work and I enjoyed opera.

Q: At this point had you decided to make the Army a career?

A: To backtrack, I think I applied for RA at Fort Eustis and I almost withdrew my application because I did not like the way the Army treated someone I knew. I can't recall the circumstances, but I thought it was terribly unfair and wrong; but then my commander at the time, Captain Aiken, talked me into going ahead and I did so I guess I was already RA. While I was in Germany I decided that I liked being in the JAG Corps and I thought the only way I am going to be able to get in JAG work, and stay in it, is to have the basic JAG course. Normally, you don't apply to the JAG for the basic course, but I did. I applied to go to the basic course. It was then called the special course, I think at the JAG School, and I got it.

From Germany I went to the basic class. I enjoyed it more, I think, than my male counterparts did, because their first experience in the Army was with the special course, while I already knew a great deal about the Army and about JAG work. While there were school solutions, I knew that there were other more practical useful solutions. Not everything that is legal is wise. I think this was when I formulated one of my basic principles. Just because something is legal doesn't make it a good idea, does not make it wise. In any case, I loved the special course. I think I was one of the only people who loved the special course. I got to talk about things from a practical view. I got to ask questions from my own experience to see what my instructors had to say. It was fun hearing other ideas. I enjoyed it very much. I enjoyed my association with the fellows and with Mary Attaya, who was my classmate. She was real crazy and had a great sense of humor, but was sort of weird. She was a fervent follower of the Salvation Army, and on occasion she was out on street corners beating drums for the Salvation Army, not while we were at the JAG School, but where she came from. I don't know of many people who get out with the Salvation Army people on the street corners, I guess in their uniforms, banging a drum, but Mary did. She was still rather worldly, you understand, but anyway I thought this was an interesting person. But, I loved the JAG course.

Q: Were you two the only women?

A: Yes, we were the only women in the course.

Q: How many total were in the class?

A: It was a very large class. I think in terms of fifty to eighty. There were a lot of fellows. It was a big class as opposed to an advance course going on at the same time which was very small, just a handful.

Q: Do you remember anything in particular that you would want to talk about regarding instructors, or the Commandant, or your treatment?

A: I was treated fine. I never thought of myself as different. It is interesting. I was always treated very well. My observation really in those early days is that if you could do the job, you were accepted. I think you really had to demonstrate you could do the job more, whereas a fellow might be able to goof off a little. I don't think it would be noticed if a man made some small errors in judgment. As a woman, I really didn't feel downtrodden or anything. I just felt that I must do my very best at all times, maybe not to let everybody down in the female world, or let my folks down, or let anybody down really. A lot of people really were interested in me, back in my hometown, and I didn't want to let anybody down. So, I always tried to do my best, but I found acceptance wherever I went, really. The key is you had to be competent to do it. If you were competent, people didn't worry about what gender you were. If people don't need someone so badly, they can worry about whether you are black or white or male or female, but when

someone is needed they don't ask questions, and wherever I have gone I have been needed. It just happened.

Q: You finished first in your class?

A: Yes.

Q: What were your feelings on that?

A: Great.

Q: How did the guys react?

A: They didn't seem to be bothered by that. Maybe they expected me to be first too. They may have thought because of my previous practical experience, why wouldn't she be first. I don't know, but I don't recall any resentment or anything like that. I enjoyed being first. It was thrilling and great because back home in our hometown paper, they could print that "hometown girl makes good," and they were pleased. It really did Irvine good to have someone from that little town make good in the outside world.

Q: What was your rank at the time?

A: First Lieutenant. At the University of Kentucky, which wasn't as big as it is now, the Dean of Women, the Assistant Dean of Women and the house mothers were the same ones who were there when I attended. They knew me and they were pleased. They had all given me glowing recommendations when they were

getting a background check on me. I am sure whoever did the background check didn't care about all of those things. They just wanted to know if I could be trusted. People did speak well of me. The special course was just the special course-study, study, study.

Q: Were most people there First Lieutenants?

A: Yes. I think they had been commissioned directly as First Lieutenants, whereas I had come in as a Second Lieutenant, WAC and gone up to First Lieutenant just in the course of time, keeping my nose clean.

Q: Was Mary Attaya a captain?

A: She may have been. I can't recall. I think so, she had been in longer than I had. I don't recall what her work had been. I was assigned from the special class to Fort McClellan, Alabama, which was the WAC Center. I'm not sure it is still called that. It was the WAC Center. All WAC basic training was conducted there and they had advanced courses for women too. My initial assignment was as an instructor, but, to tell you the truth, the first few weeks I was there, I was sort of on special assignment, you might say, to the commander of the center. It was a strange situation I walked into. Every previous assignment prepared me for the next. I walked in and I was in the midst of an investigation into homosexuality at the WAC Center by the post CID, the Post Commander, and the post JAG. I had never met, as far as I knew, a

homosexual. That was not part of the language where I had been. There were male homosexuals and I read innumerable CID reports with awful stuff in it about men, but I had seen nothing on women when I went to the WAC Center. The situation had gotten out of hand as far as investigating was concerned. Men seemed to get very uptight when women were thought to have engaged in lesbian relationships. They would get real panicky. It seemed to be a bigger thing, at least at that time, if women were involved. CID would just walk into company after company at will. It was almost like the CID was in command. The Post Commander was in a twitter and the post JAG was atwitter and I felt that rights of the suspects and accused were being abused. I felt the commander of the WAC Center was not in command of her center. So, I became in effect her unofficial legal advisor because it was sort of the post versus the WAC Center. So, I began giving the commander advice and trying to devise procedures that could be put into effect so that there was some semblance of order in the investigation, some coordination between Post Commander and WAC Center, some legal consideration given to the accused and their rights. I ended up writing a letter to the Commanding General of Third Army, who was then over McClellan, making some complaints about procedure being handled by the Post Commander and the post JAG.

Q: Was the letter from the commander of the WAC Center?

A: No, it was from me. I recently read it again, but I forget exactly what I said. General, whoever the

Third Army Commanding General was, a three-star at the time, must have referred it to the Inspector General. The Inspector General, Third Army, came down to interview me and others and I was, you might say, the subject of the investigation because of my allegations against the Post Commander and the post JAG. The outcome was that I received a letter back from the Third Army Commander patting me on the head and hitting me in the rear, accepting that my motivation was wonderful but I had gone about it in the wrong way and all that. Still it did achieve something because the witch-hunt atmosphere began to dwindle away. During this period of time, I felt that I would be followed and that anything I had would be searched and read, so I locked things in the trunk of my car. I slept with my papers under my pillow. I carried my briefcase with me at all times. I never let it out of my hands. I had all sorts of notes and stuff in there. I ended up being legal advisor to one or two of the suspects, I guess, or something like that. I can't remember. That's so long ago, but it was really so bad that I did not feel that I, as unofficial legal advisor, would not be the subject of having things searched, the phone tapped or something. It was that bad at that post at that time. I sort of enjoyed my opportunity to practice law, so to speak, because I was only a first lieutenant and I was giving advice to lieutenant colonel and major WACS. It was a wonderful, auspicious beginning at the WAC Center for little ole me because I achieved some measure of respect and status despite my lowly grade. I was being listened to by senior officers and that was good. It didn't really get me anywhere, you

understand, but it did help because when you are just a first lieutenant at a post full of first lieutenants and captains and a few majors and lieutenant colonels, you are pretty low on the totem pole. I did write up procedural guides for handling investigations and the rights of suspects. Then I went on down to my real assignment which was at the WAC training battalion where all young women newly enlisted in the Army went for basic training.

Q: The guides you wrote, were they for the WAC Center?

A: Yes, the WAC Center.

Q: You mentioned that you had been unofficial legal advisor to the WAC Center Commander and then also apparently counsel to people who were suspected of homosexuality. While you were there at the WAC Center, could you be legal advisor to the commander and suspects?

A: Well, the Post Commander actually appointed the elimination boards, and the post JAG would designate one of his lawyers to serve as recorder on the elimination board. The Center Commander was not in the chain of command for the board procedures. The Post Commander had his own legal advisor, the post JAG. My position was simply to help the Center Commander cope with what the post was doing. They were in sort of an adversarial relationship at the time I arrived at Fort McClellan. That really ceased after a period of time, perhaps with the change of people, I don't know. It really did not take too long for all of this to die down, but they

continued to use me at WAC Center headquarters for legal advice on matters. I looked through my files and found I had provided the WAC Center Commander with some instruction sheets for people conducting pretrial investigations, acting as summary courts-martial, preparing charge sheets and conducting investigations under Article 32. I prepared some suggested procedures for her. I then recommended that if she thought they were useful, she get a prior review by the post JAG before using them since, of course, military justice procedures at Fort McClellan were carried out by the post JAG. I provided some unofficial legal advice to the WAC Center Commander all of the time I was there. I also provided advice to others because I was a lawyer. When I finished what you might call my unofficial special duty at the WAC Center Headquarters, and I went down to the WAC training battalion to actually perform my duties there, I was an instructor, primarily in military justice.

Q: What was the result of the homosexuality investigation?

A: Some people were eliminated, but procedures were also changed. The CID did more coordination with the WAC Center Commander before walking into her command and making demands.

Q: So, it was not found to be a wide-spread problem?

A: No, it wasn't. As I recall there were a handful of women.

Q: Was it receiving much publicity?

A: No, none. Things didn't get out, like they do now. Nowadays, nothing is a secret. If you don't want something to be on the front page of the Washington Post, don't talk about it. In those days, things like that, maybe they weren't even of interest to the general public or the local newspapers. I don't know. It wasn't something that was really known outside. It was certainly causing a lot of unrest within the WAC Center because it just seemed to be a pervasive attitude, a witch hunt-type atmosphere. There were all women there. Obviously, if a couple of women, or a group of women, went to eat dinner, they weren't all having a homosexual relationship. With the CID and the post JAG and the Post Commander being so atwitter about this problem, everybody felt ill at ease socializing with each other, which is ridiculous and inappropriate. That kind of witch-hunt atmosphere did not revive during my two years there at the WAC Center. It was an unhealthy atmosphere, an inappropriate atmosphere, and an unnecessary atmosphere. As women became more widespread in the Army, I thought men would not get quite so excited when they did something wrong or they appeared to have done something wrong.

I taught military justice to the WAC basic trainees and I loved it. I tried to use physical demonstrations of offenses and do it in sort of a dramatic fashion so that it wasn't so boring. I would try to describe how you have an attempt to do things showing when the offense actually occurs as opposed to just an attempt to commit an offense.

I tried demonstrating preparation for an offense which did not go past the point of preparation and thus it did not become an attempt. Buying the matches is not attempted arson. Striking the match and lighting a bunch of gasoline filled rags probably is an attempt. If it succeeds, it's arson. Anyway, I tried to demonstrate by bringing in matches, striking matches, doing things that would sort of startle them and get them to thinking by doing something untraditional. Of course, one always had to have lesson plans, but it did not bother me that there would be people in the back of the room observing to see if I was going by the lesson plan. I still did my own thing my own way. If it succeeded, it was okay. Nobody questioned it. Had I not been doing a good job, I guess they would have said, "Lieutenant Smith, would you please conform to the lesson plans?"

When I was promoted to captain, I was then designated as Commanding Officer of Company B, a WAC training company. I loved it. I think, other than being a JAG officer in the Army, being a Commander is the next best job because you are responsible for everything. You are responsible for all your troops, all your cadre, your training, your sergeants and your second and first lieutenants, as well as being responsible for the training of the WAC basic trainees. It was a daunting, frightening job because, of course, I had never been a commander.

I interviewed every basic trainee within the first day or two of their arrival at the company, always

with the first sergeant having me in sight. It was important and I cautioned all of my lieutenants to always be visible to one other person so that none of these trainees could make allegations against me that I had struck her or made a homosexual advance. One always had to protect oneself from unwarranted allegations by someone who is disgruntled. That was one thing that I required of my officers, that they always had their sergeant, not necessarily in the same room with them, but in sight. I don't recall that I had anyone in the room with me unless I was counseling someone or interrogating them or what have you because I didn't want them to feel that uncomfortable. The basic trainees all had to write a biographical sketch which I went over when I interviewed them. I talked to them about everything, long enough so that I would get acquainted with them; and when I saw them the next time at the mess hall, I would call them by name. I felt it was very important. They felt they had lost their individuality already by coming in, away from home, into this strange environment with all these people yelling at them, barking orders, and what have you. I felt that if the company commander who was a captain, sort of like god, knew them, they would feel better. The only time I was sort of a god to anybody else was when I was a captain company commander. When I was in the mess hall, I would pass by and say "Private Jones" or "Private Smith" or whatever their name was. It was quite awe-inspiring that you knew their name, among all these people because a platoon would be about thirty. You would fill up with maybe three to five platoons.

If you could call everyone of them by name within their first week there, it was really startling.

Q: One hundred and fifty?

A: A hundred I guess. We were awfully full when we would have five platoons. That's a lot of people to cope with. Three platoons were ideal, but we often had five. I could spot frequently the ones I knew were going to be problems through those interviews, from the first interview. It was important, through this cycle of basic training, to try to weed out those who were really not going to adapt, or could not adapt, or who were trouble makers before they got out into the real world. This was the last time they would be that closely supervised. It was really important for the sergeants and the lieutenants to really be on their toes and observing these people.

Q: What types of things did you notice in the interview that indicated you were going to have problems?

A: I don't know what it was. I can't recall. I would carefully review their bio sketch and then I would, in the interview, elaborate on some of the things and ask them questions. It was the way they spoke, the way they looked at you, the way they didn't look at you, just their whole demeanor. I would always visit classrooms and I would observe them all and their demeanor in classrooms. I would, of course, more closely observe those that I had sort of spotted and the sergeants and lieutenants had told me were potential trouble makers. I would observe

them in the classroom situation, in the mess hall, in formations, and in the field, noting their responses to their instructors and to each other. I could spot them. You just get a feel after you have interviewed, thirty people, thirty people, thirty people, over a period of fifteen months time. Believe me, by the time I finished that I could spot them, almost instantly. There were some that you really tried hard to work with, to bring them out, because for some reason you wanted them to make it, and if they went back home, there was nothing back there. You would have some go AWOL. You would have barracks thievery. You would have insubordination, what have you. I don't recall any really terrible sins. Maybe I shouldn't say this, but I will. Someone had done wrong and I had them in, and I was going to describe to them the Article 15 procedures and their opportunity to demand trial by court-martial. You could explain the difference between these two to make it very desirable to demand trial by court-martial, you know, that they would have an impartial officer who did not know them, who would listen to them, but did not know them. So, you could point them toward demanding trial by court-martial, where you knew they would get a stricter sentence and you would be better able to get rid of them at the end, as opposed to the Article 15 which would be minor. I felt probably my legal training permitted me to describe the difference and to think of describing the difference to make it desirable to ask for summary court; and those that I did not want to go to a summary court and destroy their careers, I would really try to make it seem wonderful to get an Article 15. And yet I would

describe them literally as to how the summary court would go because they weren't going to go to a special. Whatever they did, it wasn't worth going beyond a summary. So, they weren't going to go to a special or general, but a summary would not be good on their records and really could stop them dead in their tracks.

Q: Did they have the right at that time to turn down a summary?

A: No. They didn't. They could turn down Article 15, period. I had a battalion commander who used my legal expertise too, just as advice. Throughout my tour of service, people frequently have come to me, rather than to the IG or the chaplain. Somehow, I have this something that causes people to think they can just spill their guts to me and they do spill their guts to me. I will keep their confidence. It has nothing to do with the lawyer-client relationship. I simply will not reveal a confidence, but if they are going to talk to me about wrongdoing, I am. I have no compunction about that and I tell them this. They are not coming to me as a lawyer because I did not really, particularly at Fort McClellan, I did not have legal status as a lawyer. I felt that I had an opportunity to effect changes frequently and I did effect some changes when I could because of the fact that everyone knew I had the confidence of the WAC Center Commander. It is very helpful to have the confidence of the commander. You can work miracles through persuasion. I do recall a little insubordination on my part which did not get me too

much in trouble, but I was always annoyed at screwy rules - screwy rules that really were not proper for the troops and maybe I was getting tired at this stage. We were ordered to go a parade without raincoats. It was going to rain, I knew it was going to rain, and I was not going to have my troops get wet. I said my troops were going to wear raincoats. They were the only troops on the parade field in raincoats. The battalion commander almost had apoplexy because she was standing next to WAC Center Commander and I am sure the WAC Center Commander turned around and said "why is Company B in raincoats?" The battalion commander probably turned around and said, "find out why company B is in raincoats." So, when we got back, somebody asked me why they were in raincoats and I said because it was going to rain and I was not going to have my troops get wet. Everybody should have been in raincoats.

Q: Did it rain?

A: I think it did. But, that didn't matter, they should not have been in raincoats because the order was no raincoats. I was just all atwitter for some reason about the welfare of my troops at that point. The battalion commander really dressed me up and down but I did not get a court-martial or anything like that. It was a wonderful experience to be a company commander because you had the opportunity to see a young woman come in at the bottom of the heap and many of them truly were. At the end of eight weeks, they were straight up, they were proud of themselves, they looked good, they talked good,

they acted good, they had self confidence. I really enjoyed when the parents came for graduation and, of course, I would have to give this inspirational graduation speech which was pretty well boiler plate by the time I finished. How can you say anything new about going out and conquering the world after 15 months of speaking to all of these graduating companies? The parents would be so proud. They would come in and thank me so much for doing this for little Susie or little Nancy and it was really heartwarming to see the transformation. Maybe you don't think about it but there is a transformation, not only physical, but inside, as they are able to meet the challenges that you provide them. You know, there is yelling, there are orders, and there are screwy things you require them to do like cleaning out the bottom of the latrine with a toothbrush, but, the thing is when they are the best marching company in the battalion, boy, that does wonders for morale. They can really lord it over the guys in companies C and A and what have you. It is really exciting to be the best marchers, the best cleaners, the best this, the best that. It is wonderful to give them little goals to be the best at. You have to bring them up from that bottom because they don't know their left foot from their right foot and many of them have never heard the word "no" in their lives. It is amazing how many of those women would come there who had never been required to do anything in the world. They may not have had money or they may have had money, but nobody along the way had ever said no to them and we said no a lot. We had them doing things they did not want to do, and, if they wanted to stay in here

with us they were going to have to do it, or they were going back home. To have them saying, yes ma'am, or yes sir to their parents for the first time in their lives would be startling to some of those parents, but their kids were saying yes ma'am, and yes sir, to them. It was also surprising to a lot of their parents that they would have clean shoes, they pressed their own uniforms, they polished their own brass. Some of them had never made a bed in their lives. Some of them had never used lipstick. I don't know whether we had at that time little classes on using cosmetics and stuff, but I am sure the sergeants told them about it, someone told them about it, because they looked better when they left. They combed their hair. They looked clean, neat and nice. The only thing that bothered me was that, after basic training they were going to go downhill, because after they got to a field unit there would be no one there who cared that much about them or who gave them that much supervision, guidance, advice or assistance. They would get to a field unit where they would sleep and eat and could walk to the office and come into contact with people who had varying standards. They would meet some men and women who did not care if they looked nice, dressed nice, or acted nice. They would meet officers, particularly male officers, who, during my experience, were always so hesitant to yell at a woman. That was so bad because the woman could get lazy and could get away with murder. That could create dissension in the office, particularly within a unit, if the men got different treatment from the women. It always annoyed me that men would let women off easier than

men because they couldn't stand to see women cry. I don't know whether that is still true or not but even when I was still on active duty, a woman could get to a man so quick if she just put on an act - poor downtrodden little me, particularly if their commander was a woman. A wonderful male officer was being spoken to and asked to save them from the bad old hatchet back in Company C. I have a feeling that there still may be a little problem with that in the Army, I don't know. It was still a problem when I was around, and it would annoy me terribly. I would talk to men about this practice of theirs and tell them not to fall for it. A woman could cry buckets with me at the company and, of course, they would, and I would just hand them a little box of Kleenex and tell them to blow. Let them cry their eyes out and then get along with the business. It is an act and a woman can use it. Now women cannot want to get ahead in the world and then when, the going gets tough, rely on this female ability to get sympathy from a man. A man knows he is being played for a sucker. He can't help it and he is going to resent it later when he thinks about it. He is going to think of women as having to have separate treatment.

Q: When you talked to men about it, what was their reaction when you said, "don't be soft on women?"

A: "Oh, Liz. Liz, what am I going to do?" They are just suckers sometimes, not all of them, some of them. They say, "Liz, you are too hard-hearted."

Q: At Fort McClellan, the WAC Center was there, but was the post all women?

A: No, there were women who had finished basic training, working in post jobs, who were doing office-type jobs and medical-type jobs for the post hospital. They had their own separate unit, Headquarters and Headquarters Company. I can't recall whether they were under the WAC Center Commander or not for administration. Maybe so, I just don't recall.

Q: Did women at the post outnumber the men?

A: No. It was mixed.

Q: How was it different from being at Fort Eustis where there were very few women compared to where you are now, a place where there are a lot of them?

A: The men certainly had more to pick from as far as socializing is concerned. There was a lot of mixing between men and women at the enlisted clubs. The girls would go there when they would have some free time. There was a lot of socializing at the club. The club again was the center of social activity for the women of the WAC Center as well as the men on the post. There was a good social life there because there were men and women of the same age in similar jobs. So, there was a pretty good social life, even for me. I don't know that I was a little older than the other girls. I can't recall how old I was. I never have felt old at any age but the social life was nice.

Q: You were there 1957 through 1959?

A: Yes. We had a lot of men coming in for reserve duty so we had men coming in of varying ages and experiences and that sort of perked it up in the summer - the social life really. There was more social life there than you would think, being all women down at the center, but it was good. I just enjoyed the demands of the command. I liked having all of that responsibility. I will never forget coming back from field training one day. We all had on these huge heavy packs, helmets and stuff, and we got almost to the company when retreat sounded. We had to stop. I was on a little hillside and the troops were facing me to get orders. I guess after retreat was over or something, I fell over backwards with all of my gear on. From a prone position, I said, "about face." My cadre and officers were laughing out loud. I said, "You are all at attention." That was the funniest thing that ever happened to me. The troops kept themselves quiet. My cadre and officers did not. We made it back to the company and I just laid into my cadre and officers about breaking attention in front of the troops and stuff. Then when it was all over with, we all had a good laugh. They never forgot that and neither did I. It just became the story of the old lady that fell backwards, while in gear, and had to have help getting up. There were always funny things happening when we were training. Sometimes things that the trainees could laugh at too. I am sure that the trainees all giggled themselves sick that night about the old lady falling down in

formation. That was while I was still at Fort McClellan. It seems to me from then on, I did JAG work. I went from there to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

Q: You were still not yet detailed to JAG?

A: No. Then I got a legal assignment to the SJA office at Fort Leavenworth?

Q: How did you get that assignment?

A: Well, there were JAG officers interested in me, I guess from the time I was in the special course. General Hodson was. He was not a general at the time. It seems to be that he must have been head of career management in the JAG Corps at the time. I am not sure when he was a full colonel. But General Hodson was interested in me, and I forget who else. It might have been Bill Fulton, I can't really remember. I may have contacted the JAGO, The Judge Advocate General's Office. I am not sure how I got the assignment. It might have been the WAC career development people in the Pentagon who may have gone to the JAG career people to get me into the legal pattern. I think there probably was coordination between those two. I am sure I asked for a legal assignment. I had really wanted to be at Fort McClellan because I wanted to see what it was like. I felt that my legal training would help them there in some way and it did. Every step of my career has been prepared for by my previous assignment and by my legal training. It has always been useful to somebody along the way. They needed

someone at Fort Leavenworth and I guess it just worked out fine for me to go there. I was still a WAC. I was there two years. I was claims officer. That was my primary responsibility there. I was accepted. I was also used as an Article 32 investigating officer on occasion. I did not do any military justice work there, as I recall, primarily claims. In this job, which is probably different from what it is for a JAG officer who handles claims now, I don't know, I looked at every damaged piece of furniture in every apartment. I was in every apartment of every student who came there to Command and General Staff College. That's where the C&GSC is. So, I knew all those guys and their wives. I guess I knew their wives better than them. I liked that work too because I learned a lot about furniture, and about people, and I got widely acquainted with a lot of people. I instituted a lot of procedures in the claims business and tried to expedite it and make it easier, working closely with the transportation officer. I handled the claims personally myself and had a secretary. We prided ourselves on expediting the payment. I investigated personally automobile accidents and accidents involving the fixed-wing aircraft which has been damaged. I was involved with that in some way. I guess the thrust of my time there was in trying to streamline the procedures for the men, they were all men at that time I think, who came to the Command and General Staff College. They had enough on their minds, and their wives too, being there for a short time with their kids. I felt the primary job of the post was to support the Command and General Staff College. I was going to do my

part to support it, so I tried to expedite it all and handle it well.

Q: Was the Disciplinary Barracks there, then?

A: Yes. I had occasion to go over there and interview prisoners quite a bit. They had claims too. Stuff was lost from where they were sent from to the disciplinary barracks, so I met a lot of prisoners and handled their claims. I felt I was maybe adding to the morale of prisoners or something by doing well. You always had to find your motivation for doing whatever job you were doing and mine was helping folks.

Social life at Fort Leavenworth was wonderful. There were many men there in the short and long courses who were legitimate bachelors by divorce or widowhood or just had never married. There were foreign officers and plenty of people to date. Kansas City was nearby. There were the Kansas City Athletics and there were all sorts of good things to do. That was a very good assignment though probably not one I would want to repeat. I am not that thrilled with claims work, but it was interesting. I am glad that I learned about claims. One should know about everything that JAG officers do. You never know when you are going to be an SJA and need to know what everybody does and have done it. Without any help from me, I got assigned from there to the JAG School.

Q: In the office at Fort Leavenworth, were you the only woman?

A: Yes, the only woman officer. I was included in the social activities. I was invited to general officer parties too on occasion. I might not have gotten invited to some of those if I had not been a woman. Sometimes I think I have gotten in on good things by being a woman, social things particularly. You get to know the wives. I like that. Anyway, Fort Leavenworth was an interesting JAG assignment, just another piece of the apple to learn about.

Q: In that office, were there any problems with being a woman in the office or on the post?

A: No. It's strange. Now, maybe there were problems I wasn't aware of. You know, how different people think of you and perceive of you is different. I never seemed to have any problems. I was never conscious of any problem, let me put it that way. I don't know how I got to the JAG School as Assistant to the Director of the Academic Department. A male major had preceded me and I was a captain when I went there. His name happened to be Smith, too. John Smith was my predecessor. I was assistant to a brilliant man, Russell Fairbanks. Russell Fairbanks is now a law professor, and has been for years, at some place like Tennessee, maybe the University of Tennessee. A lot of the JAG School men went on to become law professors somewhere when they got out of the Army.

Q: It was in 1961 when you went to be assistant to the Director?

A: Yes, I'm getting ahead of myself. In July of 1961 I was detailed to the JAG Corps.

Q: How did that happen?

A: I applied, I guess. They opened up permanent detail in the JAG Corps to women. They couldn't get me commissioned directly in the Regular Army for assignment to the JAG Corps, but this was a great step forward to be permanently detailed to the JAG Corps. What this meant was that your career would then be controlled by JAG and not WAC.

Q: Up until this time WAC controlled your career?

A: WAC assigned me, in coordination with JAGO, but WAC career management obviously was working in my behalf? They assisted me. Somebody brought it to my attention or I read in some publication about detailing to JAG, and I am sure that I applied immediately, as soon as it came open. In fact, JAGO may have told me about it. I think there were two of us women detailed to the JAG Corps. I don't remember who the other one was.

Q: The first two women, permanently detailed?

A: Yes. Right. In fact, I think ultimately there were three of us. Nora Springfield might have been one of them. Mary Attaya probably was the other, and then me. I don't think there were any other women around at that time that I am aware of who got detailed to the JAG Corps.

Q: So, now JAG would take over your assignments?

A: Exactly, from July 1961 on.

Q: Promotions and everything else too?

A: Well, I was still on the WAC list at that time.

Q: Could you explain a little how the WAC Corps worked?

A: I think it was by statute at that time - the promotion list. I still had to be on the WAC promotion list although I was career-developed by JAGO. It was a strange situation. My OERs, of course, would be written, were written already, by JAG officers, the SJA at Fort Leavenworth and the Deputy JA. They were endorsed, I presume, by the Post Commander and Chief of Staff, I don't know.

I went to the JAG School as Deputy Director of the Academic Department. I was deputy to Russell Fairbanks who was then, I think, a full colonel already. He was a brilliant man, very demanding of the people who worked for him, which was good. I learned from him too. He did not suffer fools gladly. You always knew where you stood with him. He was never unreasonable. He knew what he wanted and he wanted what he wanted, so he ran the Academic Department right down the line the way he wanted it run. I handled all the scheduling of the special and advance courses. I think the advanced course was called the career class at the time. I took care of the guest speakers. I prepared the letters that went to guest speakers. I sort of kept track

of the progress being made by the various division chiefs, in military justice, international law, and so forth, in revising their textbooks and getting them to the printer. I handled, you might say, guest speakers. One highlight of the guest speaker program, I thought, was Professor Edwin Patterson. We adapted his text on jurisprudence at one point for the, I guess, career course and we had him as a guest instructor. I usually took care of Professor and Mrs. Patterson at social events. I made sure he had whatever he needed in the way of materials. I saw that his place in the schedule fitted what he wanted. He was an older man. He is dead now. His wife is too. We became friends. He was a very nice gentleman. He was a noted scholar in his field at one time. I don't know whether his text is still considered a valid text or not. It may not still be used in the career course, but he was a noted jurisprudence scholar in his time. That was an interesting period. I listened in on guest speakers. I learned a lot. We had a lot on procurement particularly. A lot of different people came in on that subject. I handled a practical exercise called JAG-X. I don't know whether they still have that for special classes or not. It was a practical exercise which was supposed to give them experience in handling everyday questions and problems that come up during the course of an SJA's day. It went on for two or three days, I guess. They divided up into groups and would be given certain problems. We would have employees of the school and faculty members, as actors coming in for legal assistance, for claims, with procurement questions, administrative law questions,

international law questions and stuff like that. They would have to handle them as best they could, like they would in a real office. I just assisted the Director in directing the Academic Department. That was my mission in life for three years. It was interesting.

Q: Who was the Commandant?

A: There were several. I don't remember the first one, but John F. T. Murray was Commandant at one point. I can't remember, frankly, the others during my tenure there. I was there a long time, three years on the staff and faculty and then one year. At the end of my third year, I went into the career course as a student. That was a hard year because I was out probably for a total of thirty days because my dad was very seriously ill and he ended up dying during that period. I remember finishing my thesis in the waiting room outside the intensive care unit at the hospital in Lexington, Kentucky. The Director of the Academic Department at that time was Toxie Sewell, who is now an instructor, maybe a Dean, at some law school in the South somewhere. He was very kind to me, letting me have so much time off from the career course to do this. I had to be there, because I am the only child. I was with mother at the hospital two separate times in December and early January and then back again in February. I made my lowest grade in the career course in administrative law.

Q: While you were Assistant to the Director, during 1961 to 1964, you were promoted to major. Was that a JAG promotion?

A: No. I think that was probably a WAC promotion, based on JAG OERs and files, and my performance and work in the JAG Corps.

Q: So, even after detail your promotions would be through the WAC Corps? Were you wearing JAG brass?

A: Yes. Later on, I think it changed. I would have to look back in the files to see on what promotion list I was on subsequently. But, initially, I was still on the WAC promotion list. It is hard to recall when things changed as to promotion lists. I just don't remember.

Q: You switched brass with the detail?

A: Yes. I was wearing the JAG insignia, right. For all intents and purposes, I had everything that you did if you were commissioned directly in the JAG Corps.

Q: Was attending the career course, as a major, unusual? I've read something that indicated it was.

A: No, not then. There were majors and captains.

Q: Was it unusual for you to stay after having been Assistant to the Director?

A: Probably so, but I guess I may have said I felt the need to have the actual career course. I felt it should be on my records that I had that advanced course.

Q: So, you did ask for it?

A: Probably. I can't recall. I am sure I said that's what I wanted to do. Maybe they wanted to give me constructive credit for it, but I am sure that I would have insisted on going to the course itself. I felt I should have it under my belt. I needed the experience, the association with the other officers and to have it on my record. I just thought it was a good idea, another step career-wise. I felt that if I ever went to the Command and General Staff College, which I really wasn't too keen on having to do, you needed to have each level of the courses on your record that the men have. At that point, I thought that I should begin to conform a little bit.

Q: Were there other women on the staff and faculty while you were the Assistant Director?

A: The Adjutant was a WAC and the Personnel Officer was a WAC.

Q: But they were not JAG?

A: No. We did not socialize together. Now, Margaret Jebb and I had been in officers' training together but I don't think we hit it off somehow. She had been there before I came. When I came, I was

somehow a threat because I was a JAG officer. I had a little different status.

Q: A threat professionally?

A: Personally. I don't know. It was ego, or something. I think somehow I seemed to be a bother to her, being there. We had gotten along fine before, although we had only known each other casually, but we were not friends at the JAG School. I really was with the fellows. I took my coffee breaks with the fellows. I was just with them, and I went to parties that they had. Of course, I am sure she must have been invited too, but I knew the wives. Somehow, I knew the wives there. They were all very nice to me. Everybody was nice to me.

Q: And the other woman on the staff?

A: We just didn't have anything in common. She must not have stayed there long after I came, because I don't remember her much.

Q: Do you remember her name?

A: Captain Trible. I think she was okay. We just didn't have anything in common and we had no reason to get together. I was friends with one particular officer in the procurement law division. We lived nearby in apartments. He loved my dog. We just did things together as friends. We did not have a particularly close relationship, man to woman, but we were close friends. He really did like my dog, I think, almost more than me. The career course

was interesting. I did benefit from it. I liked it. It was odd that I got my lowest grade in the administrative law division and then was assigned to what was then called Military Affairs Division in JAGO, the Judge Advocate General's Office. I recall when I had an initial interview with whoever was TJAG, at the time. I don't remember his name. I simply said, "Look, I had the lowest grades in administrative law and I just want you to know that." I was going to the Administrative Law Division. I don't know why I didn't think he would know that and I thought he ought to know it. It did not make any difference, frankly. That was the best career assignment you could have, an assignment to the Administrative Law Division. Career-wise, I think, it was one of the best assignments you could have. It was far better than the Military Justice Division, International Law Division, or anything else because a commander's "meat and potatoes" is running his post, camp, or station, and he is going to be in the area of administrative law far more than the courts-martial. Anybody can do court-martial. I think it takes real talent and ability to do Administrative Law because it's off the "seat of your pants." It is just a lot of common sense. Also, it involves following a lot of the civilian law. The principles are quite similar. I was very fortunate to get that assignment, because at one point the head of the Military Affairs Division was Colonel Larry Williams. He became The Judge Advocate General later, but he was the Chief of the Military Affairs Division then. My immediate boss was Lieutenant Colonel John Folawn; he was Chief of the Personnel Law Branch in that Division. So I

went through John Folawn. Somebody was the Deputy, but I don't know who and Colonel Williams was the Chief.

Q: Before we get too far into your next assignment, can we go back to the career course for a moment?

A: Sure.

Q: How many women were in your career course?

A: I was it. I was the only woman.

Q: Out of how many?

A: I would say 25 or 30. I would have to look back at the class picture.

Q: Do you remember where you finished in that class?

A: No.

Q: Colonel Murray seems to think you finished first.

A: In the basic class, yes, but not the career class. I don't know where I finished. I did not do as well, I felt, because I was out for those 30 days. I could work on my thesis for those 30 days but I missed quite a bit.

Q: How long was the course?

A: I think September to June, an academic year.

Q: Speaking of your thesis, what made you choose the Code of Conduct as your topic?

A: I don't know. I like that topic, Code of Conduct. I don't even remember the rest of the title. I loved it and I loved the research I had to do for it. I ended up buying almost every volume of book that I ever looked at to write my thesis. I love the constitutional law area and the Constitution. I loved that area of the law. I thought I could relate to that real well. It was the only subject on the list that I thought I could write on. It was terribly interesting to me, the research that I did for that. I loved it--going back into legislative histories and back into the Constitution, way back. I loved that. I enjoyed writing it. My thesis ended up being printed in the Military Law Review and it was used as a research tool in the Pentagon when they were looking into the Code of Conduct in connection with prisoners of war in the Korean War. I don't know what was going on at the time, but for some reason, the Code of Conduct became a hot subject in the Pentagon just after I wrote that thesis. I got contacted by people in the Pentagon who were working on some kind of commission revising the Code of Conduct or determining whether it was relevant or something. I don't know. It seemed to be useful. It sort of felt good that it didn't just go into a military law review and gather dust.

Q: Was a thesis required in the course at that time?

A: As I recall, it was.

Q: How was your treatment and relations with the other students--all male students?

A: Just fine. Strange, isn't it? I'll get into the first time I felt a difference in treatment because I was a woman later because it happened at JAGO. It was professionally educational to be in the Administrative Law Division. It was not personally rewarding in that you did not have clients you were dealing with. Reams of paperwork came into the Administrative Law Division requesting our opinion on everything under the sun that you can imagine and out we would roll our opinions. Where they went, you didn't know; who got them, you didn't really know, you didn't see faces. You talked to people on the phone and became very familiar with them in doing your research when you were dealing with them; but you never saw these clients and you didn't know who they were. In came the questions and back went the answers. So, you didn't get any personal sort of feeling; the only thing you could get was a feeling that you had written a good opinion, maybe, if it got through the various stages. Your opinion had to go through the chief and deputy chief of the division. I would like to mention one thing I picked up from my work there. We would write back "no legal objection" to something. Then, to our little note for ourselves on our retained copies, we would say, "boy, what a lousy idea this is, for all these reasons." But, we would not tell our client this. We limited ourselves to "no legal objection." I guess we thought we would be meddling if we said anymore. From my experience there, from then on, I never stopped telling people, "no legal

objection to this; however, for the following reasons this is an unwise idea. It is fraught with policy problems, political problems, congressional problems, public relations problems," and then I would tell them what they were. That was derived from my experience of not saying all of those things to our clients in the Pentagon. Now, we may have said those things orally to our clients, by that I mean "we" being division chief or TJAG; but in our formal written opinions, we did not convey those policy objections, the possible political ramifications, or public relations ramifications. We would just say, "no legal objection" in maybe one sentence. Our note for retained copies might go on for half a page which would contain our research tools on which we based our "no legal objection," things like legislative history and chapter and verse. I really improved my research and writing techniques there, as well as from having worked on a thesis at the JAG School. Every stage of my career prepared me for the next one. My work on my thesis prepared me for writing opinions in the Administrative Law Division because they had to be very stylized and very formal. The research was tremendous because we had a huge Army library in the Pentagon. We had our own JAGO library. We had our former opinions to go back to. We had lots of research to do and I do enjoy that research. Looking at Congressional Records, Committee Reports and all of that was very educational and very interesting. I loved it. I learned a lot from it. I was there from June of 1965, I believe, until October 1966. I was there probably long enough. But I thought I needed more time there when they

told me they were going to reassign me to be a legal judge advocate somewhere.

Let me get into something here. We had company grade officers, male. We had field grade officers, male. Then there was me, field grade officer, female. All of the field grade officers always went to coffee together. The company grade officers went to coffee together. This was the first time I felt a distinction, I think, because I was a female. The field grade officers never ever, not once, asked me to go with them. Ever. The company grade officers did, but I didn't go. I guess I may have stayed and covered the office along with someone else. That is the first time I felt there was a distinction being made because I was a woman.

Q: Were you the only woman?

A: Yes, and I had too much pride to assert myself. I have never ever pushed myself where I thought I might not be wanted. I had never thought about that before. That was the one place where I felt that, I would have to say, being a woman made a difference. It was not because I was a major because it was logical I would go with the men and that it would not be the company grade guys. That is just the way the office was divided up--company grade and field grade. It did not impede my progress. It did not stop me from doing my work or interrupt my work at all. I thought, myself, it was, at least, rude and impolite; and aside from professionalism, I thought it was wrong.

Q: It didn't affect the working relationships or did it?

A: No, it did not. Maybe it did in that I might be awfully sure of my footing before saying anything. I would not feel my way; whereas, with a colleague with whom I felt at ease, and felt complete social plus professional rapport, I might mull over things. I would be less likely to mull over things aloud with one of the field grade officers. I might mull it over with one of the captains, who were just as sharp as the rest of us but just happened to be a captain. Only really sharp people were there. I felt that I was in very good professional company. They were all bright, everybody, and you had to be to opine on what we were asked to opine on. I recall opining on the fact that there could only be literally, one full colonel, Regular Army, in the Women's Army Corps. There would have to be a statutory change to have it different. That's from the legislative history.

Q: That one female colonel was the Director?

A: Director of the Women's Army Corps, yes. At that time Lyndon Johnson wanted to promote his secretary who was a reserve lieutenant colonel. The only way Lyndon Johnson could have promoted her to full colonel was to use his presidential authority as Commander-in-Chief, but within the other statutory authority, there was no authority to promote her. That is what brought the question up. It seems to me he ended up not promoting her. The WAC Director asked for this opinion. They were all upset, and

I would be too, that he wanted to promote this woman who was a secretary to full colonel, when other women in the Army, who deserved to be full colonel, did not have the opportunity. I resented the idea, myself, but that wasn't why I wrote that opinion. It was TJAG's opinion, but I wrote it. This is funny--that they gave the question, and I ended up writing an opinion back.

Q: Do you think they gave it to you on purpose?

A: Probably, but I was glad to have it. I loved it. I enjoyed it thoroughly. It was fun.

John Folawn called me in, I guess in September 1966, and said that I was being selected to be the JA at the Army Recruiting Command down in Hampton, Virginia. I was appalled that they really thought I was ready to be a judge advocate. I thought I needed more time in the Administrative Law Division, that I needed time somewhere. I don't know what. But TJAG felt I could do the job and John Folawn said, "you are ready, Liz." So, I went down to our representative in the Army Library and gave him a list of books that I wanted to have in my library of the Recruiting Command. They did not have their own internal JAG. They were using the CONARC SJA at Fort Monroe. It is now TRADOC at Fort Monroe, but at that time it was Continental Army Command. There were no two commands, TRADOC and FORSCOM. CONARC handled training and forces too. So, the Recruiting Command used the SJA office at Fort Monroe because they had come out of Fort Monroe. The recruiting command had once been just a

division, I guess, and a part of CONARC. Then, it was made a separate command with its own commanding general and chief of staff, a whole staff, but they did not have their internal JAG. I was to be the first JAG of the U.S. Army Recruiting Command. So, I took my list of books down from our law library. It was wonderful. I had my own little wish list and the commander said I could have whatever I wanted. So, I went down and gave them a list of all the books I felt I had to have and I made copies of a few JAG opinions that I thought would be useful. I did research in the recruiting area before going down there.

Q: Were you still a major at this time?

A: Yes. I was a major but I had been selected for lieutenant colonel and the spot was an 0-5.

Q: Do you remember which promotion list that was?

A: Probably WAC, but again, all based on my JAG service. I went down to Hampton and, at that time, the U.S. Army Recruiting Command Headquarters was in an old NIKE missile site way out in the boondocks of Hampton where cows and horses grazed. The command had only been in existence, as a separate command, for a few months. I was in the command building. The most desirable place ever to have an office is in the same building as the Commanding General and the Chief of Staff. You take lesser quarters, but get close to the CG and the Chief of Staff. They already had a secretary for me and fortunately she was a "cracker-jack." She looked

like a dizzy blond, but she was smart as a whip; and she had worked as a secretary up in the command group. So, you see, I had a little influence already in command group. Well, when I went there to report, the Chief of Staff or Deputy went in to tell General Gunn, the CG and my first CG, that his judge advocate had reported for duty and General Gunn said, "send him in." They said, "it is a she." I think he must have already known, but he loves to tell that story. Anytime he is anywhere around me and anybody else is around, he tells them that story--"Send him in."

Anyway, I was the first JAG and my first question was a procurement question, about which I knew absolutely nothing. I had to draft an endorsement, which was going up to the Pentagon, for General Gunn and I used the word "militate." I said, "such and such militates against." He just fell in love with that word "militate" and he thought that was the greatest endorsement he had ever read and did I get off to a wonderful start. From that moment on, I was in on absolutely every action, practically, that went in or out of the headquarters. Everything had to go past "the Judge." I was "the Judge" from then on.

Initially, my big project was in the moral waiver area involving applicants for enlistment who had criminal or juvenile court records which, if they were of a certain nature, must have been waived for the applicant to be eligible for enlistment. So, I got quite deeply into this area and I ended up creating a folder on every state. I didn't have all

the state law, so I sent off to some place in every state for an extract of their juvenile court law and criminal law and procedures. I got everything I could on every state's procedures and had extract copies made of key court-type documents that came in with moral waiver procedures so that I would be familiar with them. That was one big first legal step--getting into that area. For a couple of years, I reviewed every moral waiver request that came into our command.

My second big project was in the habeas corpus area. At the time I went to the recruiting command, recruiting was secondary. Induction was primary. We operated the seventy-three Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Stations, called at that time AFEES. Every Selective Service registrant had to come in for preinduction processing to one of our AFEES. Every selective service registrant was ordered by his draft board to report to the specific AFEES that controlled people for his area to meet mental, physical, and administrative qualifications for entering the Armed Services. Administrative qualifications included the background check, particularly the moral area, conviction and juvenile record area. 1966 through 1968 was a big anti-Vietnam time. There were demonstrations and legal challenges. After someone was found by our AFEES as qualified for induction, they were returned to their draft board. The draft board then determined when they would be ordered in for induction. The most fertile areas for avoiding induction were the medical area and the conscientious objection area. Innumerable young men got religion the night before

reporting for induction and would file for a CO status; and after entering the service, they would go the CO route too. The medical area was another fertile area because there were a lot of medical conditions that rely on medical history and on opinions, psychiatric for instance. Many young men would claim to be homosexuals. They would claim certain orthopedic conditions, back problems, ear problems, eye problems, the type that require subjective determination--do you see, don't you see, do you hear, don't you hear. The psychiatric area is the same, you know, who is manic-depressive, who is not, who is schizophrenic, who is not. After a period of time, there were certain doctors in certain areas who always wrote the letters on behalf of the registrants, in the psychiatric area, the orthopedic area, and the eye and ear area. They would go the congressional route a lot of times. We had a huge congressional load and they would, in effect, create a medical appeal route within the military by writing to their congressman claiming to be medically disqualified and submitting their documentation. Their congressman would then write to us, down through our surgeon. We had a surgeon on our staff who would review the documentation; and we could, in effect, stop induction for a period of time, working with Selective Services. Another profitable route was that they would report and submit to induction; but before they could leave the station, their lawyer had been down to Federal court, filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus, and had the papers served on our commander so that we had to stop shipping them to the reception stations. That meant they were technically in our

commander's hands and he had ten days in which to show cause why the inductee should not be released back out of our control. Of course, the U.S. Attorney handled our litigation. There were varying procedures all over the country how this was handled. Our commanders did not know a habeas corpus from a "box in the ground." So, of course, my first step was to become an expert on the habeas corpus business. What is habeas corpus? What does it look like? What is the documentation? What is likely to happen? What procedures should be set up? How should we handle this? What should we do with the body when we have him in our midst? So, my first step was to become an expert and read up on habeas corpus, to talk to JAGO, the Judge Advocate General's Office and to U.S. Attorneys. I immediately wrote as quickly as I could a uniform regulation for the command to follow in responding to habeas corpus documentation--what they would do with the paperwork, who they would notify. They had to notify the U.S. Attorney. They had to notify me. They should notify their supporting judge advocate. This is something I have to get into. Remind me to do so. We hadn't had a network of supporting judge advocates but I'll discuss that later. At that time I was the Judge Advocate for the Command. We had five districts and under them were forty-seven recruiting main stations and seventy-three Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Stations all over the country. They were not on military installations. Maybe one or two were on military installations, but out in the boondocks. There was no handy judge advocate to run to. I had a booming telephonic legal business, all day long,

all over the country, responding to questions, many times about habeas corpus actions, many times about other things too. The habeas corpus business was the first thing to get a handle on and to figure out what to do with these guys. I put out a uniform command regulation, coordinating with TJAG and the Justice Department before publishing it because I had to have everybody on the same sheet of paper. I could not have U.S. Attorneys rejecting what we were doing, so I had to have the Justice Department telling U.S. Attorneys what we were doing and TJAG telling the rest of the Army's JA Corps what we were doing. I put out the regulation. I sent copies of the regulation to all the appropriate parties and sort of got a little order out of chaos. Ultimately we changed the Army regulation on the examining entrance stations and reception stations. It seems to me we got those inductees out of our hair somehow without having to keep them at the station. We did not really keep them at the station. We let them go home, as I recall, but we had them under our control. We had to account for them. What if they went AWOL? We had real problems with that sort of thing. We ended up putting them on the books of the reception stations as I recall. The orders were always cut simultaneously with induction, that is taking a step forward entering the military service, showing that you are now in the military service. You don't take an oath; you take a step forward. Orders were cut assigning them to a particular reception station; and once they were on the books of the reception station, they were out of our hands and we administratively did not have to carry them. Ultimately, I effected that, with lots of

coordination. So, we got a handle on habeas corpus cases. We had innumerable habeas corpus cases while they fought out in federal court conscientious objector claims, claims of selective service errors, claims of AFEES errors and processing errors. As a consequence, I read U.S. Law Week, Criminal Law Reporters, Selective Service Law Reporter, and every Fed. Supp. and every Fed. 2d that came out. I did not, literally, read cover to cover, but I read the headnotes of every case involving selective service in the military and administrative law that could be faintly connected with our kind of operation or the selective service operation. It was essential because we had to have our regulations changed to plug the loopholes they exploited when they were in the federal court. It was something that we were doing in our own processing. Even errors in selective service processing you could carry over into our area. This was the administrative law business. I had to work closely with the Selective Service System. I would meet with their lawyers about matters. In connection with all of this we had demonstrations at AFEES--inside of AFEES and outside of AFEES. We had incidents of hurling blood, throwing blood on our files and throwing artificial blood on our employees. We had a problem of controlling this sort of thing. The goal we were achieving was that no military person would lay a hand on a civilian. That was our policy and the Army agreed with us. This meant we had to have GSA guards in GSA buildings, U.S. Marshals in appropriate places, and civilian authorities and police officials to take care of this. We had to issue a regulation on the subject of dealing with

demonstrations. This required coordination with the Justice Department. I met with the Justice Department people, JAGO people, GSA lawyers and administrative people.

Q: GSA?

A: General Services Administration. They provided us office space since we were not on military installations. They procured our office space for us and they controlled the office space. In a completely GSA-controlled building, they had guards. They were responsible for law enforcement. We were not. That was my goal, no military person was going to act like a policeman. We were not going to have pictures in the papers of military people, great big sergeants, picking up little civilians and throwing them down, taking them out, or kicking them out the door. We would have pictures of sheriffs doing that, marshals and GSA guards, but not us. We were able to issue a regulation on demonstrations with which everybody agreed. Oakland and Los Angeles were really fruitful anti-draft areas with much anti-draft activity. We frequently had people trying to block the entrance to our AFEES. Of course, they did not have a constitutional right to block entrances. They had a constitutional right to demonstrate and to do their thing, but not to impede government operations and not to impede the normal citizen walking into a building. We did have wonderful pictures of young men climbing over demonstrators to get into the building, to be examined for induction and enlistment. That was good publicity which would show that there were

other people trying to do the "right thing." In retrospect, everybody has become a real hero. They all knew that Vietnam was wrong. Not everybody knew Vietnam was wrong at the time, nor said it, and certainly not everybody went around blowing up recruiting cars and recruiting vehicles and bombing AFEES. We had an AFEES bombed. People in their right mind don't go around bombing things just because their goal is just. Their goal may be to stop an illegal war, but you don't have the right to kill people, or to destroy government property or private property, or to hurt people. There were many zealots who were doing that sort of thing. We had to protect ourselves, but with civilian law enforcement, not soldiers. I had those three thrusts immediately--moral waivers, demonstrations, and habeas corpus actions, which were coming out of our ear. Those were exiting years, much more exciting than during the recruiting area later. The induction, the draft period, was exciting because I did have input to Army policy on what we would do. I helped write Army regulations on the examining and entrance stations. It was Army regulations, not our regulations, that govern those. I did have some input on how we would deal with it, law enforcement wise. I felt I was really professionally rewarded by being able to give advice to AFEES commanders right that minute. They would call up and ask what to do and I would tell them and they were going to do it. On the AFEES side, I never had them tell me wrong information or lie to me. They told me everything I needed to know, even if it was embarrassing, for me to give them legal advice back. They knew if it went wrong, I would go down the

drain with them. I would go to jail if they went to jail if they followed my legal advice. On the recruiting side, you got them feeding you information to get back the opinion they wanted. They soon learned that if they lied to me or withheld information, I no longer gave them legal advice. They could get it somewhere, but it would not be from me. If they went down the tube, they went alone. So, either they did not call me or when they called me, they gave me the truth. That is the difference between the two motivations. One wants to get warm bodies in and one is just doing the job of processing bodies picked by somebody else. We didn't gain anything by inducting more people today than yesterday; we did not have any quota for inductions. The Selective Service had a quota for inductions; we performed a function. Our AFEES were manned by Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps people, so we had all services involved.

Another big project I had to get settled was the supporting judge advocate network. As one lawyer for an entire command, I could not possibly write everyone's will or power of attorney. I could not handle all of the criminal justice needs. This was sort of a hit or miss thing. I worked with CONARC at that time, with their judge advocate. We set up a supporting judge advocate by name, not person but office, for every AFEES and Recruiting Main Station. This entitled them to contact that Judge Advocate Office for legal advice just like the post people did. We did this for every service. We did not set up an Article 15 chain to come up to the Commanding General of USAREC. The chain was from the

Recruiting Main Station commander, or AFEES commander if he was Army, to the District commander for the next step, review or whatever. There was an appeal which went higher, to the commander of the supporting installation or the Army Commander. It would depend. Sometimes it was the Army Commander. I guess for, maybe, Article 15's that was it, it went to the Army commander, V Army or Fourth Army or what have you. We had the Article 15's not coming up to USAREC, but coming up the other chain. Now if the CG of USAREC gave the Article 15, it was another matter. We did have a couple of occasions with recruiters, and I will get to that later, that was recruiting malpractice.

Things were exciting, literally exciting and exploding, during that draft era and we were right in the middle of it. It was the best job in the Army, at that time, for really reeling out the legal advice to people who were going to act on it right that minute. An effect would occur if I decided to do something or not to do something or write something or not to write something. Thus, it was essential that I perform pretty good and I think I was darn good. I will just say that, on the record. I don't think everybody could do that job then. I don't think every judge advocate would want to have to do that. It was essential and our people truly relied on my office. They just did. At commander's Conferences, I would be a guest speaker on the agenda to bring them any sort of new little twist to watch out for or to be aware of and to give them handouts. I briefed every new commander in the command, shortly after they took command. Every RMS

commander, every AFEES commander, every district commander, got briefed by me. Some of the district staff got briefed by me. I think they are now called Regions or Battalions, but terminology changes. I briefed everyone of them. I briefed almost every new staff officer who came on board in the headquarters. I can say that of the five Commanding Generals in my twelve years at USAREC, I had the confidence of every one of them, their respect, and their wholehearted support. They were in a job that had the "eye of Congress", because of their constituents; the "eye of the press" because of our activities in inducting people like Muhammad Ali; and the "eye of the public", because we had their kids coming in. Everybody was looking at us. Everybody did not like what we were doing most of the time because we were the in-point. We were the ones who actually sent them off to get in the uniform. I briefed every new Commanding General after General Gunn to let them know what to expect. I made it crystal clear to each one that I was their legal advisor, that they were my number one client, and that there would be nobody under them who would ever lead them deliberately into trouble or let them get into trouble if I knew about it. I would tell them it would never, ever happen because I would stop it. I made it crystal clear to everybody that I briefed that I was absolutely ruthless in protecting the Commanding General. Now had he been a thief or a liar, or an Oliver North, he would not have had my protection. I would have been in the Pentagon on an Oliver North long before Oliver got where he did. We had an Oliver North in our headquarters. I will tell you about him later. You

know, the end justifies the means type of guy, they are so dangerous. Everybody I briefed, I said, "I am utterly ruthless where the Commanding General is concerned. I am going to inform him if I learn of anything wrong being done in his name that could get him into trouble. Now, I am your lawyer when you need my help, but I am never going to help you get him into trouble and I will be the first one on your back if you are getting him into trouble." There are innumerable ways of getting him into trouble. He is going to take the heat if you do something down at Recruiting Main Station. He is going to be the boss who was blamed for recruiting malpractices, for anything that went on at AFEES and the mental testing areas, for taking a bribe to disqualify someone from the draft or from being recruited. I briefed all of them on the areas which they would come in contact with. I also briefed them on their supporting judge advocates situation and I gave them some examples of Administrative Law. I gave them examples of the kinds of problems they personally would run into in the recruiting business. I gave the AFEES commanders exact examples of what could happen in their place the kinds of things they had to watch out for because they were new. After they are on the job for six or eight months, they will tumble to these things, but these are the things that I learned about through my contacts with everybody. Believe me, everybody told me everything. Nothing went on that I did not know about. I learned things from secretaries, from lieutenants, from sergeants. I probably knew more, my one office knew more, than anybody else in the Command knew at one time because they knew what I

could do with it. They also knew I would keep their confidences. I did not ever reveal my sources unless I had to and they knew I had to. I would say, "I have learned such and such is going on in such and such a place." I would contact Recruiting Operations Division and say, "look, I understand you are preparing a regulation which you do not have me on for coordination. Please put me on for coordination." And if I got wind they weren't, I would call the Chief of Staff's Office and tell them, "I want to see such and such." Nothing that I ought to see went into the CG without me seeing it and there were things that I really didn't have to see, but the CG would send out and say, "Ask the Judge about this." Usually, it was not a legal aspect but he just wanted to get another unbiased opinion--from somebody who didn't have his guts poured into the piece of paper and wouldn't be defending his ego. With every Commanding General, I was in on absolutely everything. If I did not concur with something, it was just about the "kiss-of-death." There were always one or two officers who resented this bitterly and I felt it was because I was a woman. They didn't say so, but it did not bother me in the least because I had the confidence of the one who mattered, the CG. A Division Chief might as well get along with me because his papers weren't going to sail through if I didn't concur. Now, I don't mean that I would not concur for personal reasons, but if something was wrong with it, he wasn't going to get my cooperation. If I recommended changes, I would be amenable to hearing him talk about that, but something is going to have to be changed or it is not going to fly. It just

isn't. My CG's knew that I worked with the people in DCSPER and TJAG and they knew me and they knew my participation in things. They trusted things that came up many times because they knew I had concurred in it or I had written it or I was involved in it. I would frequently have calls from TJAG or DCSPER, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, and Action Offices, asking about something. We worked very closely together. I worked closely with the Selective Service System Lawyers and the SA lawyers. As I said earlier, what I learned from TJAG was that I was going to tell everybody what I thought about something. I might say, "there is no legal objection to this," but then I would really go whole hog with, "but for the following reasons, I recommend against this." If it was an unwise policy, I would point out the political aspects of it, the congressional aspects, or how it could look on the front pages of the Washington Post or the New York Times. Is this something we want to do? Is it something we have to do? It was legal, but how about such and such? If I could think of an alternative or some other idea, I would suggest it. I frequently would not concur, although there was no legal objection, because it was such a bad idea. We were just inviting a congressional inquiry into it. We were inviting the press to get into it. We were inviting the parents of the nation to rise up in arms. The rest of the Army would take a dim view of something we wanted to do and we could not work in isolation. Our command had to be in sync with everybody else. We had to think beyond our immediate noses. What we did didn't just affect Camp Podunk, it affected the whole country because

we were all over the country. I did nonconcur, many many times, with things because they were not wise. I did not worry if the Commanding General did not go along with my nonconcurrence when there was policy difference; that did not bother me so much, depending on how bad it was. If it was real bad, I would go in and talk to him. He never, ever, went against my legal objections. None of them. I might say "no legal objections, but for the following reasons," and the CG would say, "I will take the heat, I understand, I know this, but I think we ought to do it." It didn't hurt my ego or bother me at all. The main thing is that he had the benefit of my views. Other people often would not tell him what he didn't want to hear. He may have generated the idea that caused this paper to be written. Others would say, "the old man loves this idea. He likes it." I might be the only one around free to tell him what he didn't want to hear, either orally or in writing. So, I would do this. I never had a CG get mad at me, particularly because he knew I took in good grace when he disagreed with me and went ahead and did it. Of course, he knew he would go to jail alone. It was sort of a joke. He said, "well, I guess I will go to jail alone on that one. Liz didn't agree with me, but I did it." The CG had more experience, obviously, being generals than had staff officers. CGs had worked with Congress. They knew the ramifications. They knew that something we did could affect an appropriation bill or an authorization bill or some part of it. If you offended some particular Congress, they could really make it a hard time, dragging their feet on things we wanted done. You have to take those things into

consideration. Generals were much more practical, politically minded, and policy minded, sometimes, than junior officers who were all gung ho because the old man wants this done and we are going to go do it. They would jump off a roof if he said so. He says "jump." They say "how high?" They had that sort of attitude. I don't know how many times I would have action officers say, "but the CG wants this." He said it, he wants it. The colonel would come up and tell me, "look the CG wants it," and I would say, "I know. I want it too but it isn't a good idea." Strychnine is wonderful to kill rats, but you don't want to give it to people. Just because he says he wants strychnine everywhere, you don't do it, it kills people too. That was that. Anyway, I felt I was in an enviable position and that had the best job in the Army because I was so in the middle of everything. I was literally affecting Army policy on recruiting as well as on inductions. How many chances do you get to go beyond your post, camp, or station, like, at Fort Polk, or Fort Leavenworth, or what have you? I loved it. I really did. In my own headquarters I did some wills and powers of attorney. I did not try to get into everything else. I had to send them to Fort Monroe because I did not have time to do divorce counseling, and all this other stuff. I could not do it, so they handled wills and powers of attorney. They were pretty routine and no one had a big trust to set up and stuff. I was alone probably from 1966 until probably close to 1970 - 71.

Q: Why were you there so long?

A: Why not, it was wonderful. I resisted efforts to reassign me. I did not want to go anywhere else. Where else could I go and do all this and have the opportunity to do all this? I don't know of any other place where I would want to go.

Q: Was there talk on your promotion to colonel in 1972 of moving you because of the promotion?

A: Possibly, yes.

Q: Do you remember who?

A: TJAG, not the command, but TJAG. The command wanted me to stay. TJAG was making rumblings that they were going to reassign me no matter what.

Q: Do you know where they wanted to assign you?

A: It didn't come to that. I think our Commanding General wrote a letter or something, I'm not sure. When I was promoted to colonel, it was a big deal in the command, as well as locally. There was TV coverage of my promotion ceremony and newspaper coverage of my promotion ceremony. I got letters from people who had simply read about it or heard about it, people that I didn't know. I got letters from women. A woman lawyer wrote that she was so thrilled, proud, and pleased. It was just amazing. I had letters from people I had served with a long time ago, from people back home in Kentucky, and from people in other parts of the country. It must have been on the AP or UP because I got letters from

people far afield of normal learning about my promotion, congratulating me on being the only woman colonel in the JAG Corps. Even though I was on detail, I was the first. Women, particularly, seemed to be thrilled about it. So was my CG and the staff. It was a big thrill.

Q: Do you how many women colonels in the Army there were?

A: At one time there were only 13 full colonels in the Army. I think during the time I was at USAREC, that was pretty well it. There were a couple of us there.

Q: So, you were one of 13?

A: Yes, at one time, in the entire Army. When I entered the Army becoming a major seemed like a far off goal, and being a lieutenant colonel was almost out of the world, and to be a full colonel, was something. The value of it, of course, is that eventually I became senior to everyone in sight. That was wonderful. There was hardly any full colonel around who outranked me. That was a nice position to be in. You never literally pulled rank, but they always knew that you outranked them. That's always good too. I even outranked the Commanders out in the field, finally.

We had good people in our command. It was upgraded from the original beginning; the recruiting service used to be a dumping ground but no longer. We had general officers coming out of the regional level,

which is just below headquarters, and chiefs of staff had become general officers, and our CGs had gone on to get their third star. So, it was no longer the end of the road for anybody. So, that is how I was promoted and stayed with the recruiters.

Shortly before that, about a year before that, I had gotten my first assistant judge advocate, Lynn Lehmann, who was very fine. We still correspond. He was a captain and I am sure he felt ill-at-ease for a while being assistant to a woman. He was very good. He was very methodical, very cautiously careful. He was also a rebel. He had been a rebel in his previous assignment, but he was free to be somewhat of a rebel. He did not have to be a rebel. I didn't have any particular restrictions on him, but his desk was subject to search. Lynn was with me probably for a year or so and then he got out of the service and went back to Colorado. I received a new assistant, Alan Chaset, probably in 1972. Sometime in 1973, inductions ceased, and we literally got out of the induction business. AFEES then really turned to the volunteer Army which was a new thing for the Army, in effect. We not only had that break, but we had a physical break with the headquarters moving.

In early 1973 when inductions ceased, and I turned then more towards the recruiting effort in the command. There was a definite decision about the Volunteer Army--that it would succeed. There was not going to be any question of whether we would have a Volunteer Army. We would have one and it

would succeed. That was fine. We were just sort of getting underway with new ideas when it was announced that we would move from Hampton, Virginia, from the commercial building in which we had operated for, I guess, about five years to Fort Sheridan, Illinois. We all felt the move was simply a device to keep Fort Sheridan open, frankly, and most of us resented bitterly having to interrupt our operations. There would be, no question about it, a terrible interruption of operations by physically moving and leaving behind many of our key civilians who did not choose to go with us. It was very expensive for civilians to live on the economy in Illinois. It was around the Lake Forest-Highland Park area, in the suburbs of Chicago. It was a very wealthy area. Of course, the rentals would be very high and buying would be out of the question, probably. However, I found a house in Highland Park, not more than about a mile from the post, which I bought. It was a wonderful house with good neighbors. I sort of expected Northerners to be a little less friendly than us Southern folk but they weren't. They were friendly. Alan Chaset did not accompany me as my assistant, but he did go up on TDY from his duty station, which I believe was Fort Monroe then, to help me the first week or ten days I was there. I was going to have a new assistant judge advocate to meet me at the headquarters. I would have to hire a new secretary and other civilians to work for me. This was difficult because I did rely on my secretary a great deal. I gave her more and more responsibility and authority. Before I got my first assistant judge advocate, it was always my practice to have my

secretary do as much as possible, almost like a legal assistant. I trained them as best I could to always go the extra mile and to take as much off my shoulders as possible. I loved being able to send my secretary to staff meetings where there would be colonels, lieutenant colonels, majors, and generals. She would represent me at staff meetings when I or my assistant judge advocate could not go for some reason. I never made it a practice to miss staff meetings, believe me. Very interesting things took place there. Things were said and sometimes I could get wind of something new that was about to be launched by some zealot that I ought to be in on. I could put my two cents in as the subject came up or I could ask questions in front of the CG. I could raise questions with staff officers that would plant a seed in the CG's mind because, of course, he would be at staff meetings unless he was out of town on business. In any case, we all went to Fort Sheridan with fear and trembling, in a way, because as far as the Department of the Army was concerned, we were supposed to be operating in just a normal fashion. It really was irrelevant that we had new employees, new buildings and new offices. We did not have all of our files handy. We did not have all of our books handy. In fact, we were in the midst of construction in our offices. My offices were built around me as I worked, literally. The nice thing is I could also put my two cents in about how they would be constructed and the physical setup. I chose the paint and my employees got to choose the paint for their offices. In that respect, it sort of helped morale. In a way, all

of this adversity drew us all even closer together because we were going to triumph no matter what.

Another problem reared its head during this transition period and that was the beginning of what we called "recruiting malpractice." The emphasis, I hate to say body count, but the emphasis was on numbers. Nobody liked to use the term quota. We used the term objectives, but there was a body count. There were quotas and objectives. It was desperately necessary for us to achieve our goals. At that time, we had not had quite as much input into the selection of the recruiters themselves. They were primarily volunteers for recruiting duty. It took us several years really to build a recruiting force of the type of man and woman that we wanted--that would be quality people. We didn't always have quality officers in the early years of the recruiting command but we did beginning, I would say, with General McGovern who was the second CG of USAREC. He served at the Hampton Headquarters and General Henion, followed General McGovern. They were both major generals. General Henion went with us to Fort Sheridan. He was not to be with us much longer. I am not sure whether we had him for a full year or not. Perhaps we had him for maybe the next almost full year, so we did have that continuity of Commanding General. The AG people and I worked closely together in trying to devise uniform procedures for the investigation of recruiting malpractice. By recruiting malpractice, I mean effecting the enlistment of male or female applicants who were not qualified--tinkering with their mental examinations, concealing physical

defects, and concealing juvenile or adult criminal records. Rather than having the Recruiting Main Station commander investigating his own people, we started having investigators from other units investigating other units to try to get some impartiality into it. We were trying to get investigators who were not trying to save the recruiter who made his goal by improper means.

We also became heavily involved in advertising. We had been using advertising, obviously, to promote Army recruiting all along, but this became big business. We worked very closely with the advertising agency at that time, who then had handled the account for some years and had it again for some more years, N. W. Ayer. The procurement for the advertising contract was handled by the post procurement office not by Headquarters USAREC. We were the user agency. We were the client but the post procurement office handled and monitored it from the standpoint of procedures and paper work. However, our advertising division, which became directorate of advertising, had action officers heavily involved in work with the advertising agency itself up in New York and out on location, shooting films and film clips, preparing brochures, preparing posters, and what have you. It became apparent that we were going to have to be a little more conscious of the Standards of Conduct, Army Regulation 600-50. I don't know if that's still the number of it or not. I got involved in this. I began giving briefings to the headquarters staff on standards of conduct. I particularly briefed the members of the advertising directorate because they had lieutenants

and captains and civilian employees working hand and glove with members of the advertising agency out in the field. It was very easy to achieve a comraderie between those people so they became almost one. It really became necessary to remind these people of ours of things they should not be accepting from the agency people--gifts, mementoes, free dinners, free drinks, and what have you. They must remember that they are representing the Army; they are not employees of the agency. A lot of questions would come up in this area. I included that kind of briefing in my briefing of new commanders of Recruiting Main Stations when they made their official visit up to headquarters, USAREC, to get briefings from all of us. I really hit home on that business because the RMS commanders at the local level had some authority to use procurement of local advertising--placement of ads in newspapers and what have you. There was room for a little hanky-panky in relations with advertisers particularly those who wanted our business. We would have a flood of people coming into the headquarters wanting to sell us on being consultants because we became involved in setting up training programs for recruiting personnel and for the offices involved in it. We had a lot of agencies wanting to be consultants to us, to draft up training programs, and to draft up training programs at the lower level. There was just an awful lot of people who wanted our money. We received a lot of unsolicited proposals. We had to be quite careful in the handling of those. We would have offers, not just in 1973. I am not going to limit myself to that time, but I guess I am going ahead of the game into the next few years. We would

have offers from companies to fly our people around, just sort of as a courtesy, on their plane and offers of transportation on the ground. Of course, there are limits on the kinds of things you can accept under AR 600-50. Commanding General Henion, who was the commander in 1973, General William Fulton who preceded him, and General Forrester who succeeded him, were all very cognizant of the dangers and made it clear, through me, that they wanted strict adherence to the standards of conduct. Our general would not accept free Time or Newsweek subscriptions from them because we advertised in those magazines. They would have me write the letters back telling the magazines to cancel the subscriptions they had initiated without our blessing. They were very conscious of this sort of thing and the appearance of it to the subordinates. I couldn't be talking out of one side of my mouth on AR 600-50 and out of the other side of my mouth saying "Oh, general, it is okay to take this, that, or the other." So, the general could not take it, the private could not take it, and a GS-4 could not take it. We got along pretty good in this area until we got a particular Brigadier General in who was what I call the Oliver North-type. He felt that the end justified the means. The end is the Volunteer Army. The end is getting in recruits, meeting the objectives that the Department of the Army set for us. We ought to just give our troops anything they needed in the way of tools and help that was necessary to get the job done. He just felt it was really irrelevant--all of this standards of conduct talk about what you could accept and not accept from potential or actual contractors for our

business. We had many conversations on individual subjects in this area. I can remember saying to him once on the phone, "well you know, general so and so."

Q: Do you remember his name?

A: I will. I have replaced his name with Oliver North because I am so abhorrent of the Oliver North-type and we had one right in our headquarters, ahead of the time of Olly. His name was Montegue. He was a BG. He had been in the Department of the Army and I had been concerned about his coming into our headquarters because I had already gotten wind of how he operated. When he was due to come into our headquarters, I was very concerned about this influence that would arise because as the DCG he would be traveling around dealing with our subordinate commanders and recruiters. He could do a great deal of damage in the philosophy that might be spread, which would be counter to the philosophy of the CG. Sure enough, he was just exactly that way. I would learn of things he said out in the field, such as, "well, if I were commander here, we would do such and such" or "look, go ahead and do this, it is okay." I got wind of this from subordinates in the field. It got so bad that I went to General Henion, who was the CG at the time, and told him what I had heard Montegue was doing and how Montegue operated. General Henion was a very quiet man who did not always let you know what he was thinking. I respected him greatly. When I left him, I had no idea what he would do. I learned later from his secretary that he sent for Montegue

immediately and a very loud voice was heard. General Henion was not one to speak with a loud voice, but apparently he just lit right into Montegue on this area. I had told the CG that Montegue was being disloyal to the CG in what he was doing, saying, and how he operated. Apparently the CG let him know this and just lit into him. That sort of ended that. I did not hear too much of that. Then, General Montegue got very interested in the civilian firms with which we dealt. He was going to go up to the home office of one of these outfits that wanted our business. I don't think they had a contract yet, or it might have been on the verge of being awarded and just had not gotten through yet. He was going to go up. I learned that he planned to fly on their plane up to the home office. We even had a headquarters plane. We had commercial planes at O'Hare Airport and did not have to go on that plane. It was just convenient for him to go on that plane. I told him that this was improper and not in accordance with AR 600-50. I felt he was going to ignore that. In fact, I got wind of it through the Command Group people, the Deputy Chief of Staff or someone like that. They were in no position to go in and confront the Deputy Commanding General, so I quickly wrote a memorandum. I don't know if it was a memorandum for record of our conversation when I gave him the information or a memorandum to him. In any case, it reflected my advice to the DCG. I sent it down quickly to the command group and said, "give him a copy before he leaves these headquarters." They did, but he went anyway. At some point, somewhat later, there was a CID investigation based on someone from our

headquarters who had gone over to CID to make a complaint about General Montegue, not only in that particular area, but in another one. They got hold of my memorandum and they interrogated him. The upshot was that he ended up getting a written reprimand from the then Chief of Staff of the Army; he did not get his second star; and he retired before he normally would have retired. When he left, we had no one else like that in our headquarters, certainly not in a responsible position. General Fulton was the commander at that time. He succeeded Henion. He and I were involved in preparing the correspondence of the Department of the Army regarding General Montegue. I don't remember the substance. We were just involved in it. General Fulton was very appreciative of my assistance and completely supportive of all my efforts in the standards of conduct area. If there was any command in this Army that needed to be reminded frequently of the standards of conduct, all of them, it was our command, because we had money. We were so prone to being approached by outside commercial agencies. All of our action officers and all of our divisions really ended up getting an action involving commercial companies selling us something. Our Director of Logistics and our Director of Recruiting Operations for recruiting training programs got involved. Logistics got actions because they were involved in procuring space, usually through GSA, working with commercial firms in connection with GSA to procure space. They were in the housing business with funds mounting up. The comptroller was in the business of computers and what have you. We had an ADP

outfit, computerized, in keeping up with our numbers--our recruiting, our applicants. All of them had reason to be dealing with prospective contractors and contractors. I personally gave standards of conduct briefings to people in the headquarters above certain GS levels, all officers and maybe some top NCOs and whoever else anybody wanted to send. I would just lay down the law and everybody knew this. When I left, they did some kind of skit about standards of conduct because I was so deadly on it. That was a big activity--that and recruiting malpractice.

Freedom of information also came into play greatly. We were always inundated by freedom of information requests in the recruiting business, the advertising business and the personnel business. One of my assistant judge advocates at the time, Jerry Robertson, who replaced Alan Chaset, was my action officer on that. He gave briefings on the Freedom of Information Act to our headquarters personnel and handled all actions on that matter. Frankly, if I had a question, I usually asked Jerry because I didn't have time to memorize the regulation on the Freedom on Information Act, AR 345-20, I think, I'm not sure.

At some point, around 1974, we had a brain-storming session in the headquarters about how we needed to reorganize and what we needed to do to boost recruiting. All off the wall ideas were accepted. Well, I offered an idea that I thought would be wonderful. It was to provide a judge advocate to each of the five regions. This came to be. We got

five captains, one in each regional headquarters. A big thrust of their work was reviewing the reports of investigation into recruiting malpractice. They were, I felt, invaluable. We were in direct contact. They did not work for me directly. They worked for their commander, but I was their technical channel. We were in communication constantly by phone and I would have at least one conference a year of the five Regional Judge Advocates. They would come up to my office for us all to meet and I would have a formal agenda. I would usually ask the CG to speak to them and other members of the staff on subjects that the Regional Judge Advocate said they wanted to talk about with our headquarters people. We tried to work on the same "sheet of music" throughout the command. It was a very far-flung command. We were working in Samoa, Hawaii, Japan and Korea. We had teams there. We were everywhere. Those young men were, for the most part, quite competent and very helpful to the command. It really helped me a lot, having them down there. I had someone knowledgeable in the law that I could call. I can pass on something new that I had learned about or something to watch out for, or something to bring to their commanders' attention, you know, the latest little problem that seemed to be popping up here and there.

We began having a good deal of congressional interest in our recruiting malpractice. There would be hearings and I would participate in preparing the CG, or whoever was going to go to those hearings, with a list of all possible questions, like preparing the President for a news conference. We

would prepare the CG for his appearance, for his interviews with the press, or for his public appearances. We were always having to send up fact sheets on various subjects so that the Headquarters of DA would be apprised of all we knew about some particular incident. We ended up having, I think, three officers at one Recruiting Main Station involved in inflating their numbers in some way. I can't remember now, exactly. On the basis of the investigation, the CG, Major General Forrester, determined that he would impose Article 15 himself on those three officers. We flew up together to the headquarters of the Recruiting Main Station itself and he imposed the Article 15's on them there. They appealed. The appeal went to FORSCOM. FORSCOM and TRADOC by this time had replaced CONARC. The CG, FORSCOM, upheld the Article 15's, and my office, of course, processed the paperwork on those things up to DA. As I recall, they were to be filed in their 201 files. You could choose not to or you could choose to have it be a temporary record or a permanent record of your 201 file. Anyway, it seems to me we had to send the paperwork up to DA, I would, assume, for their 201 files. This has been about 12 years ago, so I don't remember. General Forrester was probably the most knowledgeable general we had in the area of congressional relations, public relations, and press relations. His motto is "if you don't want to see it on the front page of the Washington Post or the New York Times, don't do it." It does not matter whether it is legal. If you don't want to see it in print, don't do it. He was not adverse to reversing himself, if he had new information. From time to

time recruiters would ask for an audience with General Forrester to, in effect, appeal their prospective dismissal from the Recruiting Command for improper activities based on the report and investigation. In all such cases, I would have personally reviewed the investigation myself and the file supporting their elimination from the command. It wasn't an elimination from service, just from the command as a recruiter. There were certain procedures that had to be gone through; they had to be given due process. I would review the file. I would always sit in with General Forrester when he was seeing one of these sergeants and I always saw the sergeant first to prepare him for the meeting with the CG. I would warn them of their right not to make any statement they didn't want to and we would talk. I can remember in one instance I reversed my own opinion on the basis of what he said and how he said it. Before he went in, I went in to General Forrester and said, "sir, I feel that this man has been done an injustice. I feel that I was wrong in my opinion. I think he should be retained and given another chance." General Forrester did not agree or disagree. He said, "okay, Liz, send him in." So in he came. He had his day in court. He spoke his speaking. When he got through, General Forrester said, "we will let you know." And, that was it. "Liz, prepare an endorsement going back, telling them to keep him." Then on other occasions, after hearing a sergeant, General Forrester would reverse the decision against my opinion and I did not mind a bit because it was a judgment call based on a reading of the evidence. It would not be like you had caught somebody

climbing in a store window, robbing a bank, or something. It would be on the basis of testimony, statements, physical evidence and what have you. Reasonable minds could differ. I always felt it was good for the command to know that General Forrester was not a tool of his judge advocate because everybody knew that all the CGs had total confidence in me and that the Generals bought my advice in most cases. But, I thought it was healthy for the command to know and, believe me, the word would spread like wildfire, if a recruiter got to stay after everybody all up and down the line said "go." It was healthy for the command to know that the CG, who had the final say, would change the decision and that he would not go along, just routinely, with what everybody else said down below, that he would listen to a sergeant, change his mind, and let the sergeant stay. It didn't happen very often. I told General Forrester that I thought it was very healthy and that my ego was not upset and that I was not hurt. I would not go off and cry if he did not follow my advice.

Q: Going back to the move, the physical move from Hampton, up to Fort Sheridan, was there talk again of your not making the move with the Recruiting Command?

A: I could have avoided the move. Persons who did not want to make the move, did have an option of requesting reassignment, particularly the lower grades who would have to live off-post, because of the living conditions up there. It was going to be very expensive. They might have to live as far away

as Waukegan, Illinois. So, a lot of people did not elect to go. I did. Again, I was caught up in my work. We were right in the middle of the recruiting business and malpractice was beginning to get big. I just did not feel it was fair to General Henion to have him stuck with a new staff judge advocate who would know absolutely nothing about the history of what had gone on before. Continuity of knowledge in our command was somewhat important. We did have some civilians in key positions as Comptroller and Director of Logistics. They gave some wonderful continuity and I felt my continuity was essential because of all of the legal problems we encountered. I knew that this Montegue was going to join us up there and I could not bear the thought of letting him run rampant without anybody realizing what he might be able to do or what could be done. I was concerned about this advertising business that was getting bigger and bigger and bigger. I did not want to go to Fort Sheridan. I did not want to move, believe me, because I was going to have all new people--a new assistant judge advocate, a new secretary, a new clerk-typist. I would have a new office, and with my files and my books, I knew it would take some time physically to get set up. But, I would also be expected to march on at the same even keel. I was not keen on going because of those things. Professionally, I felt it was essential that I go. I am sure. I will be frank with you, I have never felt anyone was essential to anything. I was never the indispensable person. I did feel I offered a valuable service, but I never wanted to be the only one who knew anything. I made it a practice of having a staff meeting with my

civilians, GS-6, GS-5, and GS-4, and my assistants after a staff meeting. We would have staff meetings and we would go over things. I always wanted my assistant judge advocate to know everything I knew about anything even if he was not going to handle it. So, if I dropped dead one day or got sick, somebody would carry the ball on forward. It is a temptation to be the central person who can't be done without. You can't let that happen for the good of the office and the headquarters you are serving. This means, of course, they can get rid of you easily and not feel that they are going to miss you, because of the way you operate. But, you have got to operate that way. The SJA who keeps things private will have problems. My assistant knew about Montegue. My secretary knew about Montegue because I had to dictate to somebody. My secretary knew just about everything. There was very little my secretary did not know. My assistant always knew so that we always had continuity. I did have surgery at one point and was out of the office for almost a month. Of course, as you would imagine, I sort of knew what was going on. My assistant came to the house and brought me papers. People from headquarters visited and I knew what was going on. I kept up with stuff. The secretary would bring me everything that was flowing in and out of the office so I saw it. My assistant was the JA in my absence and I did not have anything to worry about. Jerry Robertson was a top-notch captain. He was very competent, very good and very cautious. He also could be outspoken even though he was a quiet-voiced person. He would not hesitate to say what had to be said. Of course, my people

knew I would protect them. They would not get bad ratings because of what somebody else did not like. They worked for me, not the Chief of Staff, and they could say what they wanted to to anybody that had to be spoken to. I would certainly protect them. Anyway, I went on to Fort Sheridan and it was just as bad as I thought it would be.

Q: Did the JAG Branch get involved as to whether you would move?

A: I think they probably asked me if I wanted to go.

Q: So, they didn't have any problems with it?

A: They did not push me. After I made full colonel and I didn't want to leave, I was never pushed by JAG to leave. I was quite happy to stay there. I felt professionally and personally well rewarded from my time in USAREC. I was promoted to full colonel while in USAREC. I received two legions of merit while in USAREC. The big thing was to have the support, respect, and confidence of my commander, which was essential. I always had that. As long as I had that, nobody could touch me, absolutely nobody. The CG was my rating officer and, let me tell you, anybody who has to work with fear and trembling about an OER is not going to be able to do a good job. I never worried about that. I never thought about it. I always felt that if I had to leave the Army suddenly for some reason, I could always work. I could always make a living. I did not have to be in the Army to do it. I was not going to operate my life worried about OERs.

I also did not have to worry about Chiefs of Staff. I always kept the Chief of Staff informed of what was going on, but I did not have to go through him to get to the CG. I could see the CG whenever I wanted to. I just called his secretary and, if it was really essential, the secretary could get me in. Believe me, it is good to know the general's secretary well and to be on good terms with the general's secretary because while there's a Chief of Staff and the secretary of the general's staff, the secretary can get people in. She can figure out how to get you in. If there was something I thought the CG needed to know right this minute, I would just go down and say, "Carolyn, I need to see the CG before he sees so and so," and in I would go. The CG rated me and the DCSPER of the Army was my endorser, I guess. At one point, earlier in my time there, I think I was rated by the Chief of Staff but that was changed. I think it is helpful if the CG rates the SJA. I don't know how that works out anywhere else, but it really is good, particularly, I think probably, for the male SJA, lieutenant colonel, who wants to make colonel and go on up in the Army. I think there is more concern among the male JAGs about that. One thing my successor, who was Lieutenant Colonel Charles Murray, asked me about on the phone before coming up, was who was my rating officer. I think I said the CG or something. He wanted to be sure he was rated by the CG. I am not sure. He was worried about OER stuff. I said, "well, I just can't get into that." That is not something I want to talk about with people. He was concerned already before coming up of the channels and so forth. Probably

there are JAGs in the Army who are somewhat concerned about that and, of course, you have to be, I guess, if you want to make a career in the Army. In my position, that was something I could not be concerned about. I had too many other things to worry about. I could not have protected the CG if I had been worried about being rated by the Chief of Staff or the DCG. The DCG that I was at odds with could have been my rating officer. It would not have made any difference.

Q: Why do you think males are more concerned with OERs?

A: I don't know, it just seems to be that way. I have not had that many dealings with females, maybe they do too. Maybe, they worry too, but my experience was with males. I felt there was a definite concern there. I don't know how free-wheeling a male JAG would have been in that same position. Maybe he would have accomplished the same thing in a different way. I don't know. I really don't. I ended up having two assistant judge advocates, one of whom was a woman, before I left. She was quite smart and was not hesitant either about speaking up. I would have to look up her name now. I should know it. It isn't that she is not memorable, she is. She had a child by a marriage which ended in divorce. She is now practicing law in Florida, I think in the State Attorney General's office. Captain Joanna Martin was her name. The first assistant I had after moving to Sheridan was Captain Bruce Howat. Following him was Captain Jerry Robertson. We were joined by a second assistant, Captain Kent Osborne, who was not particularly good.

I eased him out to the post JAG somewhat later. He wanted to do legal assistance. I told them that's what he wanted to do and he did that. He missed the contact with clients. Then, when Jerry Robertson left, I got Joanna Martin and we were joined by Captain Tim Reich. Tim and Joanna were a good team along with me.

Q: When you say Kent Osborne was not very good, do you mean just in that job?

A: He was a bit lazy. He was not thorough. He began to be a disruptive influence. Along with a civilian employee, he began sort of undermining me. He was a disgruntled type. We had the civilian employee for a short time. He and she would get together and I guess he would air his gripes to her. It began to bother the other employees in the office and me, particularly when he was not being thorough in his work. He was not getting it done in a reasonably fast period of time. Rather than make a big production out of it, because I felt he would enjoy a little fight about it, I simply eased him out. Of course, I did not give him good OERs. I gave him what you would call "faint praise."

Q: How did he take that coming from a woman? Do you think it made a difference coming from you?

A: He was not bad at the outset. He just sort of deteriorated. He had a very strong wife at home. Maybe he did not want a strong wife at home and a strong boss at the office. I don't know. He could not do anything about the wife, so maybe I was the

target. He was just not someone I felt I could trust. So, I just did not keep him. JAGO agreed and it was agreeable to the post JAG. I told the post JAG that we did not get along and that Kent said he missed having clients to deal with face-to-face, like in legal assistance, so he wanted to go over to the post who gave legal assistance for the post and our headquarters. It worked out all right with the post JAG and me. JAGO went along with it because it did not bother them. Of course, they had to come up with a replacement for me and that would bother them, but they did it.

Q: Through all your years with the Recruiting Command and the JAG Corps, I assume you had to counsel soldiers and write OERs, were there ever any problems in that you were a woman and they were taking orders from a woman?

A: No, that did not really seem to bother any of my assistants. I would suspect Lynn was suspicious when he first came, but not necessarily because I was a woman, but because he was suspicious of his former boss who was a man. He might have been suspicious of the way I might operate. Searching his desk was not something he liked. He did not know how much leeway he would be given. I don't think it bothered him having a woman boss. He would have been suspicious of any new JAG he worked for or how he would be treated as a person. I think Kent was probably the only one of my assistants who might have had a problem in that area. I don't know what his problem was. He had one. I don't know that it was me. I think it was him. He had the

problem. He was the only one I had a problem with. All the others performed in a very admirable fashion. I had no problem writing their OERs. They all got glowing ones. They were well endorsed, as I recall. Their endorsements might have been by the Chief of Staff. I don't remember.

Q: To change the topic, when we went from induction to the volunteer Army, had women been voluntary for the WAC Corps all along? We were never inducting women?

A: No, just men, and we were inducting primarily into the Army, but also the Marine Corps. We did not induct into the Navy nor the Air Force.

Q: When we switched over so that men also were all voluntary, there were certain numbers the Army had to meet. Was there a goal that a certain amount of the quota be women?

A: Yes, as I recall.

Q: Were they separate quotas or would the women count as a body on the total quota?

A: I don't remember. I really don't, but I will tell you, it was an interesting period of time, and maybe I've left out something about going to the volunteer Army. In meeting the Army's numbers, it helped to get lots of women in because their overall number included women. Yes, they were included. Within that, we might break it down. We would know there were so many potential women. We had all sorts of

market studies. It became like a business selling a product. We had market studies and we would then break it down. Demographics became very important so you would know where to put your recruiting stations, how many recruiters you needed and what kind of recruiters you needed. You did not want to put a recruiting station in an area that was dying, where residents were leaving or there weren't many people or where there were no big schools. The market forces became very important. This business of recruiting became a real science. The regulations began to change in the area of women having children, women having illegitimate children, entering with children, and having children after they got in service. Of course, the latter did not become our problem, but the whole area of the female began to change. The quality of women came to the forefront. Also it became important when people were emancipated so that they could enlist without parental consent. We were in a complete state of flux as we entered the volunteer Army stage. More jobs were open to women. They may have closed now, but more and more and more job openings were immediately available to women in the service. What was combat and what was not combat began to be talked about. Where women would serve and where women would hold command positions in the Army over men began to develop during this period of time. It was a big change in the outlook toward women. A lot more attention was paid to that. I remember working very closely with the female lieutenant colonel in the Recruiting Operations Directorate. At that time it was Virginia Chaffin. We worked very closely together and very closely with the

were great and the equal opportunity in the Army for women of equal pay and to learn a job helped recruiting. Many of them did not have that opportunity on the outside.

Q: Were there specific advertisements that got across the message that women in the Army are equal to men?

A: I am sure there were. I just can't remember. I just don't recall. We had so many brochures, posters, pamphlets, handouts, film clips, and films out that unless they were coordinated with me for some legal aspect, I just did not see them all. I must say my office was deeply involved in reviewing all proposed enlistment contracts and revising the DD Form 24. Our views were considered very important because we had a practical view of it as opposed to TJAG looking at it just from the legal lingo. We knew what problems we were trying to address, particularly in the contract area, to make it clear, and also the type needed for the kids and the type needed for the Army. We participated in writing the Army regulation on enlistment; most of it contained our language regarding enlistment contracts, commitments, and promises. Our office participated in reviewing all of that stuff. Either before our proposals went up to DA or when DA proposed to change something, they would send it down to our headquarters for review, and we worked with them on it. DA really relied on our professional expertise. When I say "our," I mean all of our professional expertise, the lawyer expertise, and the practical expertise of our headquarters in helping them write regulations and

DCSPER of the Army in developing policies for women in the Army. What was happening after they got in the Army was important to us in the recruiting business. We could tell them this. So, it was important to open up, to broaden the Army's regulations and the Army's treatment of women in order to help us attract the quality woman. Of course, we were always, I think, going after the woman who was a high school graduate. The thrust then began to be on the male high school graduate. We wanted more and more quality men and women. By quality, we meant in the education area really. I would have to refresh my memory a lot on this area. I was deeply involved in that. My memory does not serve me well of what we actually did but there was a lot of activity in that area.

Q: Were we having a problem recruiting then? Were we having a problem meeting the numbers we needed?

A: Yes. That is when our advertising budget increased. The number of recruiters increased. The quality of the officer personnel in recruiting began to be given attention and the quality of the recruiter himself. There was more concern regarding housing for the recruiter and more attention was paid to the recruiter's family. The happy recruiter recruits best. Incentives for the recruiter in the area of awards and awards programs were broadened and devised. It seems to me some incentive program referenced getting to the Super Bowl as a reward for the outstanding recruiters. There were all sorts of incentive programs. Some of them really off the wall and these got my office deeply involved because

recruiting force. I don't know how you would combat the view of that in the Army to the civilian populace. What overt advertising could there be.

Q: So, you didn't notice this having a detrimental impact on recruiting?

A: No, I really didn't. I wasn't so deeply involved in the recruiting business that I would know that. I don't think it was.

Q: In terms of the problems we were having recruiting generally, after the Vietnam war, were we having any problem meeting the women's quota?

A: No. We weren't.

Q: Why not?

A: I don't know. Let me pose some ideas. We had more equality for women in the Army as far as jobs were concerned. They had opportunity to earn the same as a man in the Army. You didn't get paid less because you were a woman. They had the opportunity to get education while being in service. The educational aspect was really hit hard in our advertisement, not only the military education they would get, but the opportunity to go to college off-duty on-base. Almost every installation has off-duty civilian college courses, or at nearby colleges. One of the incentives for enlistment was to have the Army provide a certain amount of money while you saved a certain amount of money to fund your later education. These educational incentives

a medic out to be a typist or a clerk-typist to a communications job. It became essential to us that commitments be fulfilled and if they were not fulfilled let the guy or girl out of the service. We became incensed if we found out. Our recruiters tried to follow up on their recruitments. If our people did not get the training they were promised, and if they also did not get to serve, at least initially, in what they were trained for, we felt it was undermining our recruiting effort. Furthermore, we felt that the rest of the Army did not fulfill a commitment.

Q: Was that considered a contract? If they didn't get training or an assignment they were promised, could they get out? Was that the way it was then?

A: Yes. Actually, if the commitments were not met, they could be offered other alternatives, and frequently they wanted to stay in. For some reason, sometimes, their commitment could not be met at the time they came in. Something happened, maybe the course was cancelled, maybe the training was all filled up. Glitches happened in the system. In any case, so often, the boy or girl would be willing to stay in the Army if they could be offered an alternative option of other kinds of training that they wanted. Efforts were made by the active Army to keep the body we gave them. For one who was enlisted improperly sometimes the Army would want to keep them and they would want to stay. It just depended on what the disqualification would be. If it was in the medical area, of course, they probably would not keep them. They would be sent back home.

of what you could give the recruiter and from what funds you could procure them. There were certain funds that provided for awards programs. Talking about rings for recruiters, like the Super Bowl football champion gets a ring, well, top recruiters had to have rings too. They became very desirable and, of course, we had more and more incentives for the recruiters to meet their goals. There were more and more incentives for the recruiter to cut corners to get those bodies in. Recruiting began to be more desirable because they got extra pay as recruiters. Just as you have extra pay for the solider in a combat zone, or hardship zones, recruiters got extra money for being in the recruiting business. I do not know what that is like now. I don't know what is going on. There was a real effort to boost the recruiting forces morale, to better support force, to get new vehicles for the recruiters, and to get good facilities for them.

Q: In discussions on policy and how we want to get women in the military, do you remember any of the decisions as to what it is we can make desirable about the Army to make the quality woman want to come in?

A: Right this minute, no, other than what would also apply to the men. After basic training and then specialized training, quite often soldiers, male and female, would not be assigned to duties for which they had been trained. A great effort was made on our part to have the Army fulfill the training commitment, and then use the people in that capacity rather than sending someone trained to be

is probably more common rumor because of the publicity. You don't see it in the press that male homosexuals are being eliminated from service at Fort Meade or Fort Podunk. You are always somehow going to read about two or three females eliminated from service because of being lesbians. You may also read about a little ring of lesbians at a post where there are ten thousand people, one thousand of them are women, and maybe three lesbians got out of service. So, big deal. You are going to find this anywhere. You are going to find this in a school, in a college or a university. You are probably going to find it among a large group of scientists, male and female. I don't know. Yes, I think that is probably the more predominant view than the loose morals. But women are so common in every occupation now that I would think that would be rather an old-fashioned view of loose morals.

Q: At the recruiting command, were there any particular efforts taken to combat either or both of those stereotypes of women in the military?

A: Well, I don't know of anything on the lesbian side to counter that, really, in advertising anyway. The women we had working in our command except at our headquarters, were all out on the economy living in civilian housing. There were no groups of women out there, military women working in recruiting. There were individual women, as well as men, in various towns and cities, so you did not have the opportunity to have any thing like this become known. We may very well have had lesbians in our recruiting force, but it was not a problem in our

In the mental area, I don't know. I am not sure what alternatives, if any, were offered by the Army for mental disqualifications. In the medical area, for example, a guy who had a disqualifying medical condition and was perhaps missing a foot, it is pretty obvious the Army couldn't keep him. Of course that should have been caught at the AFEES.

Q: You mentioned that when you first came in the Army, there was an idea that women who joined the Army were loose and had a bad reputation. While you were at the Recruiting Command, was this still a problem?

A: Not a big problem. I am sure that there are some people who would still have that idea, but they would have that idea probably about women in any large grouping where they were a minority with the men. I would like to assume it is only the less educated who would think that because you are a woman in the midst of a lot of men that you would immediately go to bed with them all.

Q: In reading, about the WAC Corps and in talking to people who were WAC, the other rumor they had to deal with, other than their being loose, was a rumor that they were lesbians. Was that true when you came in?

A: Right. Maybe that is why men always got atwitter when there was a suspicion that you had lesbians loose among the group. That always seemed to really get men more than having a male homosexual around. The male homosexual was just sort of routine, but a female just sent men up the wall. I am sure that

commitments, contracts and what have you to help the Army function along this area. They relied on our feeding them what they needed to know. DCSPER could not sit up there writing all this kind of garbage to go out to the rest of the Army when they did not know what was really going down at the AFEES, Recruiting Main Station and recruiting station level. So, we provided a very important function in helping devise Army policy in this whole area and then implementing and writing it. We really had a good time in this respect. How many posts, camps, stations or other commands write the Army regulations that govern them? We helped formulate all of that, so they were quite ready to give us all that we wanted and needed, to do our job--policy, regulations, money, and support. We had it from the DA level. We had an excellent working relationship with the DCSPER of the Army and TJAG. Whenever I was putting anything out in the legal area, I always got TJAG's blessing because then no other JAG in the Army could take issue with what I wrote because TJAG has already blessed it. Anything I wrote, like a regulation on the supporting judge advocates or on demonstrations, that another JAG might look at, for any reason, I got it blessed by TJAG before I published it. I would usually reflect in the body of the regulation, "this regulation has been coordinated and approved by TJAG of the Army." I didn't have all these little defense counsels and all these little prosecutors and all these other JAGs taking issue with what I was putting out. I would get TJAG's opinion on a subject, particularly when I wrote regulations on the disposition of people who, as a

result of reports of investigation were charged with recruiting malpractice. I would get TJAG's opinion not on the whole regulation but on key elements of it, before we would put them in. We would have a lot of defense counsels helping these little recruiters who were fighting these investigations and fighting their separation from recruiting service. So, it was helpful to have TJAG's blessing on basic substantive matters before you put the regulations out. I thought that was rather important.

Q: You mentioned that during this time at the recruiting command Army policy, not just those directed at recruiting commands, but Army policy as a whole, toward women was changing. For example, I know you mentioned pregnancy -

A: Illegitimate pregnancy. It was such a horrifying thought to men, I guess, and maybe to senior women too.

Q: What were the changes being made?

A: A waiver for women who had children. If they were illegitimate, I don't recall now what the significance was of having the child legitimately or illegitimately but women with a child, one or two children, could get waivers to join the Army. We tried to equalize the policy for men and women, still recognizing that the women usually were the primary care-giver for the children. We were trying to equalize the rules for women and men who had spouses and children. Joining when you had children

would require a waiver or one child would require a waiver. I don't recall whether it depended on the number of children. Men also would require a waiver because how could a male or female private support children on a private's pay? That was the basis for this concern about people with children. It might not be so important to an officer, who gets more money, but to your private and corporal and sergeant it mattered. They don't get too much money. The concern was whether they would become a burden to the Army once they got in and had this family to care for, particularly when they were in basic training and specialized training because the family would not be with them. The soldier would be living in barracks. So, the basis for all of that concern, which was a paternal concern in a way, and it was also the concern of the Army, was whether the Army's mission would be dragged down by having to care for families? Some how, it was just an old-fashioned view that women should not be entering the Army leaving kids behind.

Q: At that time, if you got pregnant while in the Army, were you put out?

A: Pretty well out.

Q: Even if you were married?

A: There began to be a case by case determination on the pregnancy issue. That whole area began to change and got more liberal, really. I know in our recruiting operations, the WAC officer in the recruiting operations directorate, who was the

honcho for women's recruiting, had a field day in this area working with DCSPER and broadening these rules. Of course, the active Army was broadening its rules within the Army. If we were going to bring in all these more women, they had to figure out how to cope with them. There was concern about the prejudice against women on the part of the commanders within the Army and the sergeants in the Army; so there had to be some schooling or training in dealing with women, watching out for women being mistreated by the male superiors. It was changing. The men were changing grudgingly, but it was changing because of the volunteer Army.

Well, I retired on 31 May 1978. I chose to retire then. I could have stayed on a few more years in the Army. I had twenty-six and a half years in, but my mother was increasingly needing my attention. I just knew that I could not continue on active duty and give mother the attention that she was going to need, she was physically getting less and less ambulatory. She needed to go to doctors, and needed me to see to her.

Q: Where was your mother?

A: With me. She has lived with me since September 1967. My dad died in February or March, 1965, and she lived alone for two years. She called me one day and said, "Elizabeth, I've sold the house; what should I put in the deed?" I said, "get a lawyer, mother." Anyway, she moved in with me. This was a remarkable transition for her--moving from where she had lived practically all of her life into an

Army environment, but that's the value I suppose of a tight-knit command. She was caught up immediately in all of the women's activities. She went to coffees, teas and wives' clubs. She was invited to every social function, every cocktail party and every parade formation. Incidently, while we were in the commercial building in the middle of Hampton, Virginia, General McGovern decided that we would have formation and parades. So, we would hold periodic parades behind the building in the parking lot, with the Fort Monroe Army band coming up to have this. Here we were, two little platoons marching behind the headquarters building and, of course, everybody had varying abilities to march. Mother was included in absolutely every function as though she were a spouse. She was part of the command and she became known as "mom." Everybody called her mom. Now, I don't think she could have made such a transition, from the life she had led to this one, if this had not occurred. From the general's wife on down and the general on down, they included her in all of their parties. Any party I went to, mother was invited too. She had innumerable cocktail dresses. Everybody knew her and the day I retired from the Army, at my retirement ceremony, General Forrester presented her with a gold medallion on a chain that said "USAREC Mom." It really was something. I never could have made it through the eleven years she was with me without it, because I was all consumed by my work. This was not a job that you could leave at five o'clock. Nobody in the headquarters ceased working. This was one of the hardest working commands that I have ever been in. The headquarters people were

top notch and you had people really working. Nobody really stopped working on Saturday and Sunday. I might not be working at headquarters, but I had work at home all the time. She shined my shoes, polished my brass, pressed my uniforms, cooked my meals, and saw that the house was cleaned by somebody. She saw that repairs were effected and everything was done. She also shopped with friends, ladies, and went to the functions, coffees and teas. She would frequently know something before I did. She was my spy amongst the ladies, who often heard things from their husbands before I did. It was a very successful period of time. Without mom, I would have had to have a full-time housekeeper. Of course, I would have lived in an apartment, I suppose, if I had been alone. The value of the spouse is enormous. The male, particularly, who has a female spouse, of course, has it made. A female with a spouse would not have the spouse at home keeping house and doing all of these things. Really, I don't know how I would have functioned personally without having that support at home. We also had a dog at the time. I can tell you the minute I had a regular apartment in Charlottesville, which was the first time I had lived off-post, I had a dog. From then on I had a dog. You really meet people with a dog. I am still corresponding with a family I met in Charlottesville through walking my dog, Elsa. Through all the years, and I left Charlottesville in 1965, I guess, we have been corresponding, twenty-three years. The friendship started just from walking my dog. That's the story of my career in USAREC, I suppose.

Q: Where did you retire to?

A: I retired at Fort Sheridan. We moved back here to Newport News. I had liked the area when we were stationed in Hampton. We had a home in Hampton, Virginia, and we sold that. It was too small. We had some problems with it and wanted another house. The former Comptroller of the Recruiting Command and his wife lived back here and were friends of ours and they helped us find this house. We just liked the area and knew people back here. Mother is ninety-four. She has outlived almost everyone she knew and had as a friend. Certainly we are the only family we have, she and I. I have a first cousin who lives in Florida but we have no other close relatives at all. There was no use trying to go back to Irvine, a small town, where I have nothing in common with anyone and all my friends have also moved away. Except for two very dear friends back there, we don't have any real close friends in Irvine. We would not have lived in our original house. Without that and without family there, we decided to move here.

Q: What do you do with your days?

A: I take care of mother right now. It was not that way initially, but it is full-time now.

Q: What did you do right after retirement?

A: I reveled in doing physical work. I ceased reading law. I have not read law. I have not read anything connected with the law. I don't want to read law.

I got out and worked with my hands in the yard, digging, mulching, and tending to flowers, shrubs, and plants. That was really very time consuming. We did go to some social functions, initially, with friends we had from USAREC days. I had always said that once I settled in a home, I did not care if I ever left the backyard and that is quite true. Reading, watching TV, physically working, and eating are the only occupations that interest me at the moment. I intended to write a book, a mystery novel, during the first three years of my retirement, but I really got caught up and mother began having some physical problems that pretty well occupied my time. I will have to postpone my writing. I will write a book one of these days, but not on my experiences in the military.

Q: Why not?

A: I don't think I have anything worthwhile to write about from my experiences in the Army, really.

Q: Did you ever think of yourself as forging a new road for women? You are the first and only colonel, at least as far as the JAG Corps is concerned, that we have had.

A: Only in the sense of that I did not ever want to do badly. I wanted to do well because I knew that I had a unique position as the legal counsel for a large command and being a full colonel--but my main concern was as a woman, never letting down women. I wanted to do well for myself, my family, my hometown, my State of Kentucky, and friends, but

also just not wanting to do badly because if I did badly, it would perhaps hold back other women, in some way, in the eyes of men who would question whether a woman could do the job.

Anyway, I really thought more in terms of a mystery. I am sure I would incorporate my experiences. Somehow, you do, in whatever you write, and whatever you say. You can always build on what is past. The only writing I do now is my annual Christmas letter which people say they enjoy because I write about ducks and birds. I get a lot of Christmas letters from people who talk about all these people who came to see them and that they went to see and "general this" and "general that." I don't know from beans about that and don't care. They talk about people's names I don't know, so I talk about the environment, birds and ducks, and, of course, what we are doing. I do think I will write a book one day.

Q: You say Christmas letter, is it the same letter to everyone?

A: I couldn't write that much to everybody. I correspond with people only once a year. I include my mimeographed Christmas letter. I get it typed by a secretary somewhere. I stick it in my Christmas card. I always write a personal thing on every Christmas card but the news of the family is in the Christmas letter about my dog, Lucy, and mom and me and the ducks and birds.

Q: Other than writing your mystery novel, do you have other plans?

A: No.

Q: What would you like to do?

A: I would like to see some opera.

Q: Where is your closest opera outlet?

A: Over in Norfolk and Richmond, but I would like to see the Metropolitan Opera. I have been to the Metropolitan Opera once in the old location. That was a thrill, a real thrill. I saw Madame Butterfly. I loved it. I have some tapes of opera but it is not the same thing as being there. I am big on TV and reading mystery novels, but I really just don't have time to do anything now except concentrate on mom. She really requires around-the-clock care. I give the care from seven in the morning until nine at night. Of course, I am able to get her out. As long as she is a little ambulatory, we get out, but I wonder what we will do if she is not ambulatory. It will be just another challenge along the way.

Q: When you watch TV, do you ever watch shows that deal with the military?

A: No.

Q: Do you avoid them?

A: No, I have just never been fond of war-type shows, especially the Civil War. I do not know why

everybody glorifies the Civil War. It is a blot on our history. I have never understood why we want to revel in the Civil War where brother fought brother, which happened in Kentucky, the border state. I don't want to watch anything to do with the war. I just don't want to see it. It is something I don't want to see. I don't want to relive anything. I don't know why we revel in this. I think it is love of blood and gore. I don't mind watching a military aspect of some normal show where you have the military in it. I am sure "Murder She Wrote" will have Jessica going to some Army post where one of her many nephews and nieces is on trial for murder or something. I enjoy "L.A. Law." I like that. I always like law shows, but not military shows. The military law shows are almost always so distorted in their procedure, I just don't want to watch something like that. I can't stand it. It gives such a phoney picture of military law.

Q: Has there been something you've seen, particularly with a woman in the military, that has irritated you or that you have liked.

A: Not about a military woman. I must say I am a bug on soap operas. I just love soap operas. It is absolute, pure escapism. There is a good soap opera, "The Young and the Restless" with good writing and good acting. It has a woman attorney in it now and she is being pretty well portrayed as a professional woman. I am sure we are going to the bedroom and we are leading there, just like all the women end up in that show. She is being

portrayed more accurately than most other shows have portrayed women lawyers, except for "LA Law." She is professional. She is obviously smart. She has other interests outside of law, which is good. I think she is probably the most true-to-life woman lawyer I have seen in a long time, and that is in a soap opera. Strange as it seems, soap operas always lead nighttime shows. The best shows on rape I have seen have been done on soap operas. They are much, much better. Elizabeth Montgomery is heralded as having done this wonderful nighttime show on rape. The "Young and the Restless" did a rape story, concerning every involved person's aspect, including legal, police, family, her boyfriend, everybody. They did it over a longer period of time so that it could be very well-developed. The support system for rape victims and everything was beautifully done. We have a story on "As the World Turns" about a homosexual male. He was just a part of the ordinary everyday life. It is being developed beautifully well showing how he conducts himself, how he tells people and their reactions to it. There are some who cannot accept him, just cannot accept him, because he is homosexual. That's very well done. There is an AIDS story in "The Young and the Restless." We have a female character who probably got AIDS through sexual contact with a male because she was promiscuous but it is not showing her in an unfavorable light. But we are seeing the reaction. She is married to a man. She told him before she married him that she had AIDS. He was initially stunned and he had to go off and sort of withdraw from her for a while, but he is coming to grips with it. He married her. Then it

shows his family members' reactions. One of his daughters was pregnant. She and her husband chose to live away from home. This was the type of town where everybody lives at home. They chose not to remain there because they were fearful of what it could do to the unborn baby. Even though they heard all the facts about AIDS and how it could be transmitted, they just chose to go a different route. There is another daughter and a son. The one daughter accepted it wholeheartedly. The son has not really yet been able to come to grips with the fact that this woman has AIDS. We are seeing the husband's friend's reactions to this and they are not being nice at all. You have a woman coming up to them at a table in a restaurant asking them to leave because the wife has AIDS and this woman is fearful of it. You can talk to this woman until she is "blue in the face" and she would not accept any facts about AIDS. The wife is not a danger to this other woman from just casual contact in a restaurant. Then you have this man's friends at the health club. At least one friend whose reaction is that he just can't believe that his friend would have married this girl with AIDS. You are just seeing all sorts of reactions. The story is being developed slowly, gradually, so you see the thing you read about in the paper and see in these noted cases.

Q: Let me ask you a question in regard to AIDS which, of course, is a big issue for the military right now. For example, testing, we are all tested--

A: You have a female officer who has refused to have someone witness her provide a urine sample.

Q: That was a drug test. We have random drug testing because drugs have a big impact on the military too. We have mandatory AIDS testing, every two years. If you are going overseas, you must have been tested within the previous six months. Do you think the military has a greater reason to be concerned about AIDS than the civilian population?

A: Perhaps so, particularly in the communal living situations. Yes, the military does because the military mirrors the civilian population. If you want to continue recruiting into the military, what are you going to offer in the way of protection in the minds of the parents to their kids coming into the military? To them the military looks like a bigger danger of their son or daughter contracting AIDS whether it actually is or isn't. It is more likely to cause their children to swear and drink and have loose morals, so why wouldn't they be more prone to get AIDS and get into drugs. They have, some of them anyway, already gotten into their minds, that joining this great big monolithic force and living in barracks close at hand with other people means that there is more likelihood of contracting something, particularly if you lose control of yourself. They don't realize that we don't all live in barracks anymore. Since it is known that you can contract AIDS through blood transfusions, there could be a feeling that in a military hospital you don't have the option of refusing to have that blood transfusion, whereas on

the outside you could insist on getting blood from some other source. It is just the idea that the Army has so much more control over the individual--that you might lose power to protect yourself from AIDS. I would think the military would almost have to take the lead in doing something about AIDS regarding testing things anyway. I am not so sure in my own mind that testing is going to do that much for anybody because apparently there is some period of time in which something can lie dormant and it will not be revealed by testing. People can carry the virus and not know it. I do not know the technical terms for all of this, but someone can be a carrier, perhaps, but not reflect it. There is too much uncertainty in what testing can show.

Q: What about the issue of homosexuals in the Army? There has been publicity lately about a court in California which said the Army had to retain a homosexual who a board said should be discharged. Also, there is an ongoing case involving a lesbian in the reserves and a court held that the Army was going to have to retain her. After the years of dealing with the rumors and dealing with actual cases, what are your views on homosexuals in the Army? Are they a danger to the Army? Should we still have the regulations?

A: When I first ran into homosexuality, it scared me to death because I did not know enough about it. I was really naive. I had a picture of homosexuals attacking other people, you know, of men attacking men and women attacking women to be sexually satisfied. I viewed it all with great alarm,

frankly; and maybe I should feel a little more sympathy for the men, although they did not view male homosexuals with that much alarm. They got rid of them, but they didn't seem to get too much atwitter. I think there are a lot of misconceptions about homosexuality. To tell you the truth, there is a lot of education going on in "As The World Turns" about homosexuals. You would be surprised how many college kids, teenage kids, and parents are watching soap operas. I tell you the truth, they are getting an education. This character is educating the public more than I am aware of anything else being done in this whole country. It is amazing to think everybody has such a dim view of soap operas. There is good drama in soap operas but they also introduce real life problems, dealing with them in a dramatic way. This is really good especially in the homosexual area. It might do the Army well to get tapes of the whole segment that involves a homosexual character. It might do well for a lot of people, educators and other to get hold of it. The homosexual character is just one aspect, just one person. He is being shown as being a guy who has his own lover. They have been lovers for years. They are monogamous. He is friends with families who have young male children. He felt it was his obligation to tell these older people that he is homosexual, that he is gay, and let them decide whether they want to have any more to do with him. He went to certain people to tell them he is gay because they have young boy children. There are two boys in two different families. He has told the one boy. He is shown being with the boys and he is shown in a normal way. He touches the boys

in a nonthreatening way. He is not touching people to make advances. It is just a normal touching. I don't know how many times I have put my arm around somebody. I have kissed the generals. We have all patted people on the back or put our arms around them. I think there is still a misconception that all homosexuals are going to go after every male of any age they see. They were perceived early in the Army as being a danger in the barracks to other males. There was a fear that homosexuals would climb on top of men at night or they would use force and maybe they did. I am sure that there are some that do that, but that is maybe the same type of person who would rape a woman. Maybe homosexual rape involves the same kind of compulsion as for men who rape women. I don't know. I'm speaking of the violent aspect of it, as opposed to the sexual gratifications. I think there needs to be education about homosexuality. Within the Army is the only place I know of where you can have any teaching about homosexuality. You can't gather a lot of school kids together. You would never have the PTA permitting a group of high school kids to be taught about homosexuality. They don't want them to hear about heterosexual sex and how to protect themselves against getting pregnant and all like that. So, you would never have the civilian populace, right at this moment, be willing to have their children taught about homosexuality. You would have the Jerry Falwells in the world committing suicide rather than let that happen, but the Army is in a position to figure out some training programs for teaching about homosexuality. At least to officers and key NCOs should be able, somehow, to teach about

homosexuality. It needs to be taught. What is homosexuality? What are the common characteristics of homosexuals? How do they conduct themselves? What are they likely to do? What is the average type of homosexual like in his sexual relations?

Q: Is teaching about homosexuality consistent with the Army policy that we won't have them in the Army?

A: I think the time is coming when there is no reason not to have them in the Army.

Q: So, you do foresee that change coming?

A: I do. I think the courts are going to force it on the Army unless the Reagan judges around the country have been permeated within the system too much. I think the Ninth Circuit is likely to be the one where you are going to have the broadening of the view. They have never viewed the military that favorably. During the draft days they did. I would think the Ninth Circuit will probably force the Army to take a second view. I do foresee, and I think it would be good if the Army isn't doing it already, studies being made of homosexuality. I don't mean from a prejudiced standpoint. I mean, literally, just like you would study AIDS, like you would study diphtheria, or like you would study the Legionnaires Disease. It is a condition of life, I guess, if you don't call it a disease, it is a certain condition of life that is generally not acceptable to most people. It is something that can be tolerated without violence and prejudice if it is something known about. Perhaps then we would be able to say

that it is possible that you have no more homosexuals attacking their same sex as you have men committing heterosexual rape. Not all men are committing rape and not all homosexuals are going to rape a man. You'll have it in prison, but you have violence in prison anyway. And, homosexual rape is simply a way of using power over somebody. It is probably similar to heterosexual rape, at least the motivation behind it. So, maybe homosexuality is nothing to fear. I don't know. There needs to be a study made. Aren't there probably young people in the Army now who would like to know about it? I don't know whether they should be afraid or not. We need to get away from demeaning the homosexual. That must be an awful feeling, not being able to admit you are gay because if you are then you are going to be an outcast.

Q: Moving on to another topic now, I believe that you knew General Overholt, who is our present TJAG.

A: He is the last man I would have ever picked to be a general officer, much less TJAG because he was a cut-up. We were in the career class together from September to June and saw each other periodically after that too. But I just never thought of him as having the serious quality about him that one would need to bring to TJAG at least on occasion. He was bright, smart, dynamic and energetic. I just never thought of him as being TJAG. I think of TJAG in light of all TJAGs I knew, and they were all pretty serious, and if they had a sense of humor, it did not show. They were mostly old guys in my day. I think TJAGs are becoming younger. Maybe I am just

getting older, but they look younger. That is about all I have to say about Hugh Overholt. I like him. He is a nice guy.

Q: Is there a JAG or more than one JAG that you remember, that particularly impressed you during your career or had an impact on your career?

A: I think Major General Larry Williams. He was Chief of the Administrative Law Division, which was then called the Military Affairs Division, when I was there. He seemed to take an interest in me as a lawyer and as a person. I know he had mom and I over for dinner, but even after that, after he was in TJAG's office, he took an interest in me. I don't remember if he was ever TJAG.

He was Deputy TJAG. He may have been TJAG. He visited our headquarters at Fort Sheridan two or three times. Of course, I always had him briefed and he met with the general, but he really seemed to enjoy just being with mom and me. He was interested in my career and I am sure he helped me at times when I did not know he was helping me. Then General Hodson was also supportive. I think at one time General Hodson was Chief of the Personnel Department, Career Department, in the JAG Corps. He was interested in my career and assisted me. Colonel John F. T. Murray was always supportive and interested. These men treated me as an equal. I was just one of the guys, I guess. I never really felt different in any way in my treatment by JAGs. General Williams had an unusual interest and concern for me and my command, and my position at USAREC.

I am not sure why, maybe because he realized it was a rather sensitive headquarters in which to be. I never received any word from any senior TJAGs about moderating my conduct or my manner of operating. I suppose they knew how I was operating, maybe from talking to my bosses. I just haven't had time in recent years to really think about the JAG Corps. I think John Folawn at Military Administrative Law Division was a big help to me. He also was interested in me. He told me that I could do the job at USAREC as Command Judge Advocate when I didn't think I was ready for it. He told me I was. That sort of gave me a little push, gave me a little kick in the rear. "Oh, get up off your duff, you can do it." I think we all need a little kick in the rear and a little pat on the head at the same time, from time to time.

Q: What do you consider your greatest success in your military career?

A: I think my performance as Command Legal Counsel at the Recruiting Command, overall, through the years. I have always felt that period of time was personally and professionally the most rewarding in my life. Absolutely. I had the opportunity to do a job, a challenge to do it well and to have to work mighty hard to do it well. I had the respect of my peers, subordinates and seniors. The job was rewarding and fun. No one could have survived in the U.S. Army Recruiting Command who did not have an enormous sense of humor. It had to be well-developed because we were on the verge of so many disasters every day that if you did not laugh and

joke about it, you would never make it. You would have a mental breakdown. And fortunately a sense of humor is part of my make-up and asserting it from time to time was a lot of fun. I think that my service at USAREC was it. Second, I would have to say being commander of Company B WAC Training Battalion, being a commander. It was very satisfying being responsible for everything in sight and having the opportunity to do your thing with people. I liked that. I think I sort of liked teaching people. That's probably one thing I liked, not being a teacher, just teaching.

Q: What about disappointments or regrets?

A: Gosh. I can't think of any, really. I really can't. I don't have any.

Q: Not only with regard to your career, what about personally?

A: Nope. Not really. I don't think so.

Q: You retired in 1970. You were a WAC for your full career?

A: Yes, I was, legally speaking, technically.

Q: Now there is no separate WAC. There is full integration. The OERs, promotions, assignments, and everything now is done by whatever branch you are. Do you think that is a change for the better?

A: Yes, I do. Professionally speaking it is. I think you miss the comraderie of being able to know a group of women who are sharing the same experiences and then having occasion to get together because you had common experiences. From a professional standpoint I think it is essential that it be like it is now--total integration, with everybody judged by the same standards, just as you indicated, for promotions, OERs, training, and everything. If you have separatism, then you are losing the ballgame.

Q: We do have separate and different physical standards.

A: I don't see anything wrong with that. I don't know. I just think, scientifically, there need to be separate physical standards. I'm not so sure that how many pushups you do or physical strength is that essential to being a soldier. Not all soldiers went to combat in Vietnam or in World War II. Not all soldiers were truck drivers or repaired big heavy trucks or lifted heavy equipment. I think you can have separate physical standards, for the job too, even between men. You wouldn't assign a ninety pound man to a job that required him to lift one hundred and fifty pounds of weight every day. He would have to have help. I don't know whether that is given consideration today or not. Why make such a big to do about the fact that most women, maybe, could not perform the same physical work that most men could? Not all men can do that either. I don't think there is anything wrong with having separate physical standards.

Q: By statute, women are still not allowed in combat positions, and Congress decides "combat positions." Do you think that is valid? Should women be kept out of any jobs, assuming they meet the physical requirements that a man meets?

A: Legally speaking, no. Practically speaking, perhaps. Until a long time down the road, I think it is just too much in the male mind. Whether they say it is or not, I think it is there. I suppose it is the same thing that is in the many male policemen who are fearful of having female policewomen be their partners and having to back them up in a shooting situation. It is just their idea that their lives are in danger because this woman may fold whereas a man wouldn't fold. It is a mental thing really, an emotional thing and, I guess, a biased thing. My view is that in wartime, if you have a shooting war, you are not going to have all of these nice things. You are going to have women in combat, because combat is going to be everywhere. I think it is wonderful if you think of the combat zone as a trench here and a trench there and people on each side of it. War isn't like that any more. Maybe, even as a practical matter, it is ridiculous to keep women out of combat positions. It would be better to get them ready for it. They are going to be there. Why not give it a try while we are in peacetime? Why not give it a try for, lets say a five-year period, because the Russians say they are not going to shoot us for a while? Why not give it a try in the Army, to have women in every possible position? Maybe it will

take longer than that in order for them to go through a whole career but why not start it and give it a try?

Q: What can we do to change this mental and emotional fear that men have?

A: Well, the leaders are going to have to change their minds--the Reagans, and the Bushes, and the men who are at the top in the Pentagon. They have to be convinced themselves, convincing to others. There have to be other leaders, professional leaders among the men who are convinced of this and who are eloquent enough to convince the Congress of this. It may be an impossible task because the Congress is responsible to the voters and they all want to stay in Congress. There are too many people out in the country who don't want to see women in combat. Mothers don't want to see their daughters there. Fathers, particularly, don't want to see their daughters there. I guess it is a mind change. Until it happens and you have people actually doing it, doing the jobs and being able to perform them in peacetime, it won't change. I guess you just have to see it tried. I am sort of feeling my way through here. Until it is done, how do you convince someone it can be done? I think you just have to see more and more women in command positions, over men, maybe some women mixed in too, but you have got to see women in command positions. Otherwise, how do you convince people that women are successful in their command positions? There have to be people who can speak to it, subordinates, who can speak well of women commanders. Word of mouth undermines

trial periods like that. I think it really has to be tried. It's like in wartime. Nobody ever thought anything of it in World War II when we had women flying planes; we had women ferrying planes all over the world. Women were doing things then that were nontraditional. After wartime ended, they couldn't do those things because "women don't do those things." They had done it. They did it. In the Korean War women came in and did all sorts of things as they were needed. When the volunteer Army came about, you had to expand the Army and women were needed to fill up the numbers, somehow we managed to cope with that and more of the jobs were opened. So it seems as peace comes along, they start thinking that women should not be doing all these things, but we ought to be thinking of when war comes. One more thought, just remember the time I got my first legal job, they desperately needed a lawyer at Northern Area Command in Frankfurt, Germany. They didn't have one and they took me. I wasn't a JAG and I was a woman. So, when there is need, somehow men can cope with having women do a job which is nontraditional. It's the same way with doing combat jobs. If they can do it, let them. Period, end of subject.

Q: From your experiences during your career, can you think of any changes in the JAG Corps that you would recommend?

A: No.

Q: What advice would you give to a young JAG officer who has just completed the Basic Course?

A: Well, to the extent that they have any control over it, I think they should have a completely broad experience. I would not be lured into getting into the Military Justice field and sticking with that, at least not until one gets much more senior. I would want to try to get into positions where I worked for some period of time in procurement, in administrative law, and military justice. Those are the three primary subjects. International law is somewhat limited as to where you can practice it. I think, except in JAGO and overseas, although I got into some of it too. I think it is essential to have experience, not just schooling, but experience, in all three of those fields. Claims is not really a profession exactly. Everything a JAG office does is worthwhile but procurement, military justice and administrative law are three primary areas of law they ought to get a broad experience in. I think Administration Law Division in JAGO is a great place in which to work because I think the most interesting questions, at the Pentagon and in the field, come in the administrative law area. It is like the commander is running a city or a state. You are a city attorney, you are a state attorney general. You are not all working that much in the criminal law area as other people in their offices are. They are rendering opinions on the authority of the commander to do certain things or the authority of the Secretary of the Defense or the Secretary of the Army to do things in the administrative law area to implement statutes and the regulations. I think the administrative law area is essential for a JAG,

especially TJAG, to have experience in because anybody can learn the rules in the criminal law area. That is a rather narrow area, I think. As far as real life is concerned, more people have questions in the administrative law area than they do about crimes, though it is an interesting subject for the newspaper. Procurement is a big business. I suspect you almost need to be a specialist in the criminal law area and in the procurement law area to dabble in it, but I think you need to have experience in both because you are going to have to supervise other lawyers in those areas as you go up in grade. You ought to have practical experience in all of those areas of the law in which you are going to have to supervise one day. One day you are not going to do all of the nitty-gritty work; you are going to have other people do it. You are the one who is going to see the CG. You've got to have some knowledge in all of this and retain some knowledge in all of these areas. I think a broad experience in the early years is essential.

Q: We have now in the JAG Corps, a contracts specialty, and it's sort of like a separate track. You go into it and then you are going to stay in contracts. Is that something you would discourage?

A: Not, I guess, if you were looking toward leaving the service. You would get good jobs in that area, particularly with defense contractors, I suspect. In a way, you have to think of how long you are going to stay in the Army and what position you are aspiring to hold, ultimately, before you leave the Army. Now, if you are only going to be in the Army

for as long as you can stay to get what you need to use on the outside, you would probably pick maybe the criminal law area as a specialty or the contract area as a specialty. When you get out, you could easily, in the criminal law area, go more readily direct into jobs as assistant prosecutors or defense counsel and quickly get work. In the contract area you could probably go into a "big bucks" business with defense contractors if that is what you were interested in. You are so up in the contract area. As far as getting jobs with corporations, being city attorneys or getting in the legislature, I think the administrative law area is the "meat and potatoes" of everyday life and everyday government. I think people who are really up on administrative law would also get out ultimately as senior officers and go into law schools, into law firms, into government or whatever they want. I think it is a broader area and better area to be rounded in. I think you need experience in all areas to go up the ladder to be an SJA and supervise folks in your office, to be able to talk intelligently about it to your CG, to be briefed by your junior officers and then be able to carry it on and be a TJAG, a Deputy TJAG, or Commandant of the School. I think you need a broad area, but I hate to see anyone avoid the administrative law area. I think being in the Administrative Law Division, TJAG's office, you see it at the biggest level. You see the biggest impact of the law on the operations of the Army. You see really key questions. You are more likely to have liaison with Congress your public relation people, your public information people, and your people at the Secretary of the Army level. It is just a key

area of ground work for JAGs, especially TJAGS, I think.

Q: Other than getting broad experience, is there any further advice you would give?

A: Be forthright with one's superiors in a manner that will work. It is better to have a reputation for being straightforward and hard working. Never be afraid to say "I don't know, but I will find out." I was always asked some "off the wall" questions like "what's the grounds for divorce in Montana?" Who knows? There is a book that will tell me that. I don't have to know everything. "What's the latest rule on this, that, or the other?" I don't have any idea. "What disposition can be made of juveniles?" I don't know, what state are you talking about? The lingo is peculiar. Nobody is an expert on juvenile court lingo, but I became somewhat of a semi-pro. Don't be afraid to say, "I don't know." But always be sure they understand, "I will find out. I will get back to you." I loved being able to say, "I don't know," particularly when I was a colonel. I could say it easier than a lieutenant feels free to say, "I don't know." Somebody would come in and ask me something and I would say, "I don't know," and then just sit back and leave them like that for a minute. And then I'd say, "don't worry, I will find out." To say, "I don't know" is good because no lawyer can know everything. When you are younger and less experienced, to say "I don't know" is a little scary to do, particularly to people who think you ought to know. I would not know any of the rules of evidence of criminal law right now. I know

there is hearsay and all that, but as far as putting them into actual practice I would be extremely rusty. I would have to really get up on it to go in and defend anybody. I wouldn't trust them with me. I guess saying "I don't know" and getting a broad experience and being forthright is the advice I would give.

Q: I want to delve a little more into women in the WAC and in the JAG Corps. From my research, most women had problems. They faced situations of sexual harassment--not being assigned a job because they were a woman, people not paying attention to them because they were a woman. You do not appear to have faced those types of situations, other than a couple of instances I will directly address later. Why is it that, for the most part, you did not have problems because you were a woman, specifically in the JAG Corps?

A: I don't know. I thought about that myself. I don't know. I have to say that I am sure there were those men who did not like to have to deal with me because I was a woman, but you have to go back to what I have said, over and over. A large part of my career was with the Recruiting Command and I had the confidence and respect of my commander. If the commander reflects that utter confidence in you, nobody under him is going to dare to do differently, at least not overtly. They are not going to get anywhere. They are not going to succeed. I have the ear of the commander, not that I am going to run to the commander about things like that; but even before that I was not always a colonel. I was not

always in USAREC. I was in other commands and I didn't have problems. I don't know why. I am not sure what sexual harassment amounts to. I do not appreciate dirty jokes. I never have liked dirty jokes. It isn't just in the Army. I have never heard a dirty joke that was funny. Really and truly. I have never heard a funny dirty joke, not on TV, in person, or among my colleagues, or anybody. I don't know why people like dirty jokes because they are not funny. The funniest things that I have ever heard and seen have not been dirty. I haven't ever had men in my presence speak in a dirty way about sex. I can't say that I am dignified, particularly. I have never thought of myself as a dignified person. Maybe people thought I was more innocent than I was. Maybe I convey an innocent demeanor or manner and they thought it would be embarrassing to me, rather than harassing to me. I don't know.

Q: Let me give you an example of sexual harassment as defined in the Army today. You mentioned the incident when Mr. Loeb, chased you around the office. That would qualify under the definition of sexual harassment in the Army today.

A: Well, maybe his actions weren't the kind of sexual harassment the Army is talking about. His chasing me around the room wasn't the same as somebody else chasing me around the room. I just thought it was funny, in a way. I didn't want him to catch me, you understand, but I don't think he really wanted to catch me either. There was more humor in the situation. I thought it was funny. I laughed.

Maybe that was what kept it from being real serious. I just thought it was funny. Maybe, I gave him the impression I thought it was funny and he wasn't serious.

Q: Do you think maybe part of the reason you didn't have problems was your personality?

A: Perhaps my personality, my reactions, and just the way I dealt with people all the time.

Q: If a woman were offended by that type of situation, what should she do?

A: Well, when he was through chasing, I would first of all say, "look, lets not do this anymore. Somebody can walk in. It would be embarrassing to both of us, in our positions, since you are the senior civil attorney here with us and I am the legal assistance officer." Really if I were bothered by it, I would go to the SJA. I would go to the boss, the one who could control the person's conduct.

Q: Would you wait to see if it happened a second time?

A: Yes, I would. I really would. I would want to give him a chance, whatever the situation was. It is just a good idea. He might not have realized how it seemed. Maybe he meant it or if I had taken it seriously, he might not have meant me to take it seriously. I think Mr. Loeb probably did it because I did seem innocent and he was taking advantage of that. Some people think that is funny.

Q: If a woman found something like that offensive, you don't think she should have to put up with that?

A: No, no, not at all. If I were offended by something, I would say something about it.

Q: Did any of the other women you knew throughout your career have any particular problems that you recall, as far as being a woman in the military? You mentioned that when you applied for RA and you felt someone had been treated wrongly, you almost withdrew your application. I just wondered if that was a woman you felt had been treated wrongly?

A: Yes, it was. It was at Fort Eustis, my first duty station. She was my former platoon officer. She was my Commanding Officer. I don't recall all the circumstances, but I felt she was berated for something by our boss, our battalion commander. It must have been something really serious that caused me to think twice about going RA. I just don't remember what it was. It might have been her personal conduct. I don't know - it is so long ago.

Q: You don't remember it being something related to her being a woman?

A: No, I don't recall that, no. It would have been in the area of fairness. I think Captain Aiken, the next commander, was the one who convinced me to go ahead and apply for RA. She probably talked to me in a very motherly fashion, or senior to junior fashion. Captain Aiken went out of her way to try to train me, upright, senior to junior, which one

needs sometimes giving me advice on how to conduct myself, how to be an officer. It was just something that I thought was unfair. I don't recall it being a woman-man thing.

Q: Did any of your friends feel that they didn't get a job or a promotion or something else because they were a woman that you remember? In general, even if it was not someone you knew, were you aware of any feeling by women in the military that they were not being treated equally?

A: Only what I heard and read. I can picture it happening, seriously. If the supervisor or commander who has the authoritative position over the person being harassed is not himself free of bias, you've got a real problem. Unless the supervisors and commanders are ready to conduct themselves properly as commanders and supervisors to stop whatever the problem is from occurring, you have a real problem. I am not unrealistic enough to think all supervisors and all commanders are straight guys right down the line -"you stop that, don't you do this, don't you harass." They have to be strong too and many of them would, perhaps, consider what was done was okay, that it was misconstrued by the woman. She was too sensitive and all that. I can see that attitude. I don't know what to do about it other than training or going to the next higher commander and he can do something about it. The problem is that you can be harassed in very subtle ways afterwards by the same people, who are annoyed that you caused trouble for

them. It is a ticklish situation. I don't have an answer for it. It is there.

Q: Let me describe for you another situation, that would be termed sexual harassment in the military--threatening one's career or job in return for sexual favors.

A: I wouldn't put up with that.

Q: That would be a court-martial offense. From my research, such incidents have occurred and the offender got away with it, whether the woman gave in, which from my understanding has happened, or whether she said "no" and then her career was hurt. Those are the obvious types of situations that have to be reported so the Army can deal with them in the proper way. What about things like walking down the road and being whistled at and hooted at? Is that something women should joke off, ignore, or take steps to prevent?

Q: Who is doing the whistling? What sort of people are doing the whistling?

A: The troops, hanging out of the barracks. Like at a construction site, people hanging out. What can you do about it? Order no whistling on the post and no hanging out of windows. Is it different if the troops are enlisted and the woman is an officer? It should be, in a way, because they shouldn't be hooting at a male officer either. That's a disciplinary problem. I guess if it's privates and corporals to private and corporals, I don't know

what it is, man to woman. That's a difficult situation to address because, walking down the street out here in Newport News, Virginia, you can have that situation. Personally, even when that happens or has happened, I have just ignored it. It wasn't as an officer that I was addressed or anything. You just have that from men. Whoever you are, whoever they are, it just happens. They think they have to do that to be macho. I don't know what the answer is to that.

Q: From my research, there are indications that there was a tendency that if you were a nice looking woman, more attractive than other women, you were treated better, both job wise and promotion wise, than other women. Did you find that to be true?

A: I can't say from personal experience; but from observation, I would say possibly so. It was not on a wide scale. I don't know what could be done about that. How do you know that the person who happens to be more attractive isn't also more competent than the other? That is a problem of proof, whether it is an administrative channel or a criminal channel. How would you ever prove that was the motivation unless you could demonstrate that the person who was more attractive was demonstratively not more competent, not more able or not more productive. You just have to have proof, and it may not be that easy. It can be over a period of time that a more attractive person gets better treatment and therefore advances or something. It is a very difficult situation to prove unless you've got witnesses, eyewitnesses, or

"ear witnesses"--persons who hear things, see things--or there is documentation of some sort to show that the less attractive person should have gotten the promotion.

Q: Do you think that could be a disadvantage of going from an all woman corps to full integration, or was there discrimination on the part of women superiors in the WAC Corps?

A: Could be. I don't know. I just don't. That is difficult to say because, even with the WAC Corps, you had women working in integrated offices with men and women. The only difference was that the women lived together at the barracks, just all women. You still had an integrated work force. They still needed the approval or recommendation of the male superior to advance, so even with the WAC Corps, you could have exactly the same thing and probably did. It just stands to reason. Logic tells you that there was sexual harassment then, and there is now. It is no different. I don't see any reason why there would be a difference.

Q: You were never married?

A: No.

Q: Do you think being in the Army had an effect on whether you got married? For example, did the demands of the job, the travel, or the type of man in the Army you were meeting affect your decision?

A: Probably. It is hard to say. Nowadays, you have older women with younger men. That would not interest me in the least. At posts, camps, or stations, you have young and mature. You don't have a lot of men in between, who are not married already; or if they are not married, they are not desirable. As I have said before, the best type of place for people like me, being a lawyer and in the Army, was a place like Fort Leavenworth where there were oodles of men, at least for short periods of time, who were available. They were divorced, or widowed, or just not married. They were dateable and dated. That was a good place. In the other locations that I have been, they just were not available. I was so immersed in my work, probably, that I would not have had the occasion to run into them. Being on a post, camp, or station, you would not run into the men of the civilian community. You would not be in a position to do so. I guess church is the best place to meet men, but you would probably have to go to a lot of churches to find the available men. I have been quite content to go along as I am through the years. Certainly, now, I am not so sure that I would be willing, even if mom wasn't here, to disrupt my life enough to start a new life with another person--a man or anybody, even a housekeeper maybe--if I had to have companionship of some sort because you have to adapt so much. I don't feel I have to be married to have friends and companions who are male. I can be friends without being married to them. To be married is another dimension. That really means literally having to change yourself. Just as he would have to change himself for us to come

together, shall we say? I don't know that I would even want to exert the effort. Why would I? Except for companionship in old age, why would I want to give up my freedom, as I consider it, and change myself so completely. Perhaps he would not like dogs. Perhaps the best man around would smoke. I would not want to be with a smoker or a man who uses sweet-smelling cologne. He would have to stop that because I am allergic to the perfume in cologne. Can you imagine all the changes one has to make? It is not so hard when you are younger, but if you are older you have acquired medical problems, personality quirks, likes and dislikes. I don't know whether it is worth having a twenty-four hour companion to change oneself enough to mesh with another person. I just don't think it is worth it.

Q: When you started out, did you think you would get married and have children?

A: I think I did, because that is what everybody did. You just did. And I probably would have married if I had stayed at home in a small town. I don't know. Men are pretty scarce in a small town.

Q: Do you think if you had not joined the Army, you would have gotten married?

A: It is quite possible. I would have been in one location and settled so it is quite possible.

Q: But considering your experiences, you don't regret not getting married?

A: No. I would have just done what was expected, really. I would have gone into politics probably. Chances are good that I might not have married because my life might not have been quite that different. To survive as a lawyer in a small town, you have to immerse yourself in all of these things and get into politics. If you ran for office and got elected, you would run for the next office. I might have gotten caught-up completely in a political life. I am the type of person who just can't give one hundred percent to everything.

Q: We have now a lot more women in the Army, quite a few of whom are married, with children. Some are married to other JAGs, or other military people--

A: I think the atmosphere is more conducive to marriage now, and one thinks of it as something one can do because women have been able to stay in the Army and have children. It was a different atmosphere when I came in the Army as far as married women in the Army and women with children in the Army. They just were not there.

Q: Do you think that is a change for the better or worse?

A: Oh, yes, for the better. It makes for a more normal community. I would find it very difficult. I don't think I could possibly stay on active duty and have a child and a husband. I really don't think so. The child would be number one and the Army would be number two; just like it began to be with mom. Mom was number one and the Army became number two. I

cannot give everything that I should give to more than one thing at a time, especially if it is that kind of thing. A person is that kind of thing. I don't think I am the type of personality that could have possibly stayed in the Army and done what I did and be married with a child.

Q: Do you think that is because of your personality? In other words, do you think a woman can "have it all" in the Army?

A: Yes. It depends on the personality of the person. There are women doing it. Looking back, I don't know how any of my secretaries were married with children and working for me because when they were in my office, from eight o'clock to five o'clock, they were totally dedicated to that. Now, how could they go home and cook supper, which they had to do, and take care of their kid? I do not know how that happened. I don't' know how they do it, or did it. I really don't. I don't think I could physically last doing that. When the child is sick, you have got to give the child attention. I would want to give the child attention and listen to what had happened that day, what had happened at school. How can you do that between five and ten at night, if you are going to go to bed at ten o'clock, a reasonable hour. I could not. I am not the personality that could do it. I would have to give the child all or nothing, and I would have to have a second child quickly or that one child would probably be too smothered by my attention. I would be too much of a mother. I have to watch it not to be too much of a mother to my dog.

Q: Is there any advice you would give to a new female JAG that would be different from what you would give a new male JAG just coming in?

A: Not really. My advice would be strictly from the professional side probably. It is such an individual matter of what you do with your personal life. It just depends. I don't know.

Q: Is there anything you think the female JAG would have to do differently?

A: I think for some foreseeable future, the woman has got to be better than the man, or always, as good as the best man. That is why I think it would be hard for me. I am just used to giving one hundred percent to what I am doing. I don't know how anyone can do that with a family. I think that with a husband alone I could have done that, but I suspect my work habits would have been a little different. I might have made a big point of getting more assistance sooner and delegated even more than I did, which I did quite a bit of. If I had a child I don't think I would have been on active duty long enough to be a full colonel, and I would not have had just one child. I would never ever want anyone to have just one child. I am an only child. That is not desirable. There should be two or more for the child's sake. The parents always think, "well, I can't afford a second child; I can't cope with a second child." You can do what you have to do. Have a second child. It may not always work out, but I do think you should have two children. I

definitely would have had two children. I would never have been on active duty one more year past that. I may have coped with one child; but, actually, I don't think I could leave my child with a day care center all day long, like so many mothers and secretaries had to do. I just don't think I could do that. I don't know how they did it, civilian or military. It isn't just peculiar to the military. You have civilian women doing that. I just look back at my secretaries. I had cracker-jack secretaries. I don't know how they coped. They did. They happened to have good kids.

Q: I note you wrote an article entitled "The Role of a Judge Advocate on a Commander's Staff" for the Women's Army Corps Journal in 1972. The issue of the proper role of a judge advocate frequently arises in the Graduate Course that I am in now. What is the judge advocate's proper role? Should it stop when the commanders says, "can I do this?" "Yes, it's legal" or "no it is not legal." Should we go further to talk practicalities and "yes, you can do it, but you don't want to because." Should we leave that up to the other staff officers who are advising the commander? What is the role of the judge advocate on the commander's staff?

A: My view is that the commander is the client, the number one client. The lawyer is trained to foresee consequences. The lawyer is trained to "war game," to foresee the possible consequences of several courses of action, and to choose a course of action that will cause the least adverse consequences. I don't think other members of a staff are trained

that way through their college education. Lawyers are trained in that way all through law school and that is the mind set of the lawyers--foreseeing what the opposition will do and who the opposition is. I think the lawyer on the staff should have in mind keeping the commander out of trouble not only through his own volition, but through the actions of other people, well-meaning people on his staff, who cannot foresee what kind of trouble the commander can get into. I don't mean criminal trouble, but career trouble. He may not get his next star. He may not go from colonel to BG to begin with if he has lousy judgment. This may happen because he has caused too many congressionals to flow into Congress. This may also happen because he has caused some congressmen on the appropriations staff or the authorization staff to hold up appropriations or money because the congressman is livid about what that dumb guy did down at Fort Monroe, Virginia. So, it is "legal smeagal." Look what he did, what the impact was on such and such. I think the commander wants his career to progress. In this day and time, if there is any commander who is not conscious of the way the public and the press and the Congress can affect his career, he is too dumb to go up; but his lawyer is the one person who ought to be able to talk to him as a client. "Now, sir, you are my client and I am talking to you as I would talk to the President of Ford Motor Company if I were his general counsel. I am telling you that what you want to do is legal, in a strictly legal sense, but I would like to throw out to you some considerations for you to mull over, that could impact on your decision. I have already arrived at

my recommendation; I recommend you don't do this even though it is legal. Point out the considerations and point out what he knows, maybe from having read the Congressional Record, what has gotten other people into trouble. Bring to his attention any JAG material telling about awful things that have happened to commanders or word-of-mouth information you know. It is possible. "Remember that guy over at Fort Lee who was in that procurement scandal," or if there is no real situation, maybe you can dream up one. "I know about a situation that occurred somewhere else with one of my colleagues and here is what happened." Try to relate examples of what could happen--the possible consequences, what the reaction of the congressman for this district might be, how it could impact on the local community and how it is going to look to the public. It is just like with the standards of conduct. Everything that is done is not wrong, but it may be perceived to be wrong. It looks wrong. It feels wrong. You sense it is wrong. It is not fair maybe. How will the public perceive it? How will it play in the press? Suppose you do this and it is reported on? This possible consequence occurs. How is it going to appear if the Washington Post prints it? Maybe it is just a small article on page three which is read by the PIO people in the Pentagon who include it in the clippings going to the Secretary of the Army, or to the Chief of Staff of the Army because he is about to come down here and make a speech. How will this be read by other members of the public, besides here in this locality? How will it read to the congressmen who are working on something in Congress

that maybe you do not know about or a bill that we are interested in. They might say, "My God, Jesus Christ, what is that guy down there doing?" The commander may have thought, "it just affects us here." The simplest thing can affect more, like painting his quarters with appropriated funds when it wasn't authorized or adding a new bathroom to his quarters. Maybe there is some fund you can stretch and say maybe that fund can be used. Is it worth it to stretch it, to do it, to have it get out, to not make the next promotion, to not go to the War College or to not get the assignment to U.S. Army Europe. You have to figure out what might appeal to this commander if something he wants to do, which is legal, is a lousy idea. You don't want to say, "General, that is a lousy idea." You don't put it that way. You try to couch it in a way so that you are trying to protect him and his career and his reputation and the reputation of the Army and of the post. You have to appeal to anything you can think of that will get through to this particular officer. Now the farther down the line you go, the less all of these people appreciate these ramifications. That is the problem of dealing with these staff officers. By the time this guy is a general, he is going to be a little more cognizant of all these things you are talking about, more so than a full colonel or a major, or lieutenant colonel. Probably the general has been in the Pentagon. He has been somewhere where he got involved with Congress and he knows how little-bitty things can make a Congressman furious, and if he happens to be the Chairman of the Committee, watch out. So, there is almost nothing anybody does

anymore that you don't have at least to think about the press and the public. General officers need to think about the Congress for sure. Everybody ought to think about the Congress because they have so much power over the purse and so much control over what can be done in the services. A dumb thing can impact on the appropriations for that particular post. So, I just think that the lawyer has to realize that the client is not the Chief of Staff; the client is not the Director of Operations and Management; the client is not the Comptroller. The client is the general. That is the whole point of the staff. They are there to help the old man make wise decisions and to implement them, and to write the regulations that tell everybody what the decision is and how to obey it. So, everybody's job is to keep the commander out of trouble and to help him do his job and make his decisions. They should not only be legal decisions. They should be wise decisions that will not impact on future decisions, that will not impede him in making future decisions, that will not cause him to lose something for his troops, or for his post, or for the Army as a whole.

Q: Is the client the commander or the Army?

A: I feel the commander is. The Army is people. Through the commander, the Army is the client. If the commander makes legal, wise decisions, the Army is well-served.

Q: What if they come into conflict?

A: I can't picture them coming into conflict.

Q: Suppose a commander wants to do something illegal, and your legal advice is "don't do it," and he says "I am going to do it." What's your role?

A: To try to argue him out of it. There may be other key members of the staff that he listens to, who can talk to him, not as staff officers but, maybe, man to man. There may be someone with whom he has a more personal relationship with whom he golfs or something, I don't know. I would try to enlist the assistance of the other people. Sometimes you can thwart the commander carrying out what he wants to do in subtle ways. It just depends on what the illegality is. Sometimes paperwork can drag or money suddenly isn't quite as available or we have to get the approval of such and such. That will take time. Sometimes a little lapse of time will give him a pause for a second thought and give you another try at persuading him out of it. If he is going to pick up the phone and call and do it right away, you have lost the ball game--he's done it. Then what you do about it depends on what the illegality is. I don't know how you pick between illegalities, but it just depends.

Q: Let's just say the commander is going to do something illegal and you try and talk him out of it. He insists he is going to do it. Do you owe client confidentiality to him or do you let the Army know what is happening?

A: I do not feel there is any client-confidentiality in that situation. He is not operating as a person.

He is operating as a commander, as an Army representative. I do not feel I have any obligation to protect him from his own illegality. He is the Army, so I am protecting the Army. If I could not use any other means of stopping him from doing it, then I would call TJAG and discuss it with TJAG himself. I probably wouldn't trust anyone below TJAG. I wouldn't go up to the next SJA. No, I would go to TJAG, himself, to talk about it. There may be some practical way of thwarting the commander before he does the illegality because, you see, that illegality is going to be public. Somebody is going to know it is illegal. It may be so illegal that it is obvious to the lowliest GS-3. Believe me, there is no way you can keep an illegality secret. Somebody is going to report it. Maybe that is the last argument with the commander to tell him that a disgruntled GS-3, a disgruntled corporal, or somebody will write his Congressman. It might be somebody who didn't get a transfer he wanted to get, someone who did not get a hardship discharge, someone who feels downtrodden or someone who isn't making much money and the general is. Somebody is probably going to report it and it is going to be investigated. Then it is going to be really public because when generals are investigated, it is never secret from the press. The Washington Post would be the first to print it because it is in the area of the Pentagon. Congress would be interested. I can't imagine that there are too many "Montegues" in the Army today. The problem with the Oliver North-type is that he is encouragement to those junior officers who are inclined to chafe at the rules and regulations and to feel the end justifies

the means. The problem is he had a commander who, had he been in the Army, would have been relieved from duty--and that's President Reagan. President Reagan has to be held accountable, and his Chief of Staff too. I don't care whose chain they reported through. Commanders often know things when they "don't know it officially." The Oliver North situation is devastating to the military. It presents such a poor example to junior officers and to some senior officers who want to do things. The idea that a good goal means you can get there in any way you want to is bad, whether you are in the anti-Vietnam or the pro-Vietnam category. You are never justified to bomb buildings, to hurt people, or to destroy public or private property because your goal you've decided, is just. You are just a bomber; you are just a destroyer; you are just disorderly. You have got to pay the consequences. You are not really an idealist if you are not ready to pay the consequences. I have been very concerned about the Oliver North case--very, very, concerned--and about so many people supporting him and calling him a national hero. I get mad every time I hear anybody say anything nice about Oliver North because he is going to be a millionaire out of all of this.

Q: You think that ultimately, he will have hurt the military.

A.: I hope the military will make him the example of what you should not do. He is not a man to be admired. I hope this is the party line within the military. I hope so, because he is not a hero. He

is a dangerous fellow and a zealot. Zealots are dangerous. They really are, whether their goal is religious or otherwise. In fact, religious zealots are even more dangerous than anybody. They think God is on their side and nothing stops them because God is for them. God is a Republican, I guess.

Q: Your name comes up quite often as someone that women JAG attorneys, should admire and desire to emulate. We haven't had a full bird colonel, female, in the JAG Corps except you and you made colonel in 1972 and retired in 1978. Why has there been no other female JAG Colonel?

A: I guess there just hasn't been time, maybe. Maybe somebody has not been in grade long enough, really. It is just a matter of time, I am sure. Your career pattern has to be similar to that of men. You have got to be able to go to the same schools and be eligible for colonel and then selected. I don't know if the Command and General Staff College is still a prerequisite for colonel. In fact, I was startled when I made full colonel because I did not go to Command and General Staff College. I thought that, alone, would hold me back from making full colonel. I was just delirious that I made full colonel. I couldn't believe it because I felt that since I wasn't in Vietnam and I didn't go to Command and General Staff College or War College, my career pattern was not normal. Maybe that is good too. The Army is able to accept that which is out of step with the rest. In a way, I probably was not in step with the party line of the JAG Corps or Army. I have gone my own way and done things that I felt

were right. I think if you feel things are right and honest and true, yourself, then do it. You have got to do what you think is right and not what somebody else thinks is right. You take the consequences for it, understand. Consequences of many of my actions could have been no promotions and an early out of the Army, really, because I would have gone nowhere. Fortunately, that didn't happen. I think I did what was right and it happened to be right maybe. I don't know. My right may not be your right.

Q: I don't have any further questions, is there anything that you want to add?

A: Well, I must say that it has been a lot of fun getting a chance to do all this talking. I don't think anybody has asked me about my career in the Army since I was born, really. I guess I took advantage of you to say all the things I would like to say. I have always felt very strongly about how I operated in USAREC and I have hoped that other people operate that way too. The only thing I can say is that I hope other people will have a similar experience, particularly having the support of commanders, because if a lawyer has the commander's respect and support, every body falls in line. Also, if you can get an office close to the commander, that is very desirable. I was in the command group building from the beginning and I think that is really helpful because the judge can run down real quick or people could run up to the judge's office. I was on the second floor. I made many trips. I was happy to make them.

Incidentally, there is something I forgot to mention about my term at USAREC. When the Chief of Staff was absent, I was often Chief of Staff at USAREC, despite the fact that I was a lawyer. I don't know if that happens very often or not, but I was acting Chief of Staff, quite a bit of the time during the last couple of years when I was on duty with the Recruiting Command. I rather enjoyed that. I don't think JAGs are usually Chiefs of Staff. It was fun. I appreciate this opportunity to talk. It has been a pleasure.