

was filling. Actually, at almost all Army stations, there appeared to exist a deep-rooted idea that there should be a "women's share," which should be equal to the "men's share"; that women should in fairness have the same percent of each grade that men held. In practice this caused widespread inequities, since all women sent to a station might be so unskilled that they merited no ratings, or they might all be so skilled that all merited ratings.

In checking on the application of the directive, the Air Forces found male office helpers promoted above the Wac who ran the office, and WAC cooks refused the rating that male cooks received, all on the grounds that the "women's share" was held by stenographers in headquarters. Another Air Forces directive promptly made it clear that the grade went with the job, regardless of the sex of the occupant. Elsewhere the idea of a share appeared too well fixed to suppress; even such a WAC authority as General White, on a visit to North Africa, directed that the theater provide "the same ratio of grades for WAC personnel as is provided for male."⁶

The Army Service Forces and the Army Ground Forces, for this reason, never chose to follow the Air Forces' system, but divided military grades into male and female, and maintained separate allotments for the WAC unit. The motive was frankly stated as a fear that women, if not limited, would eventually collect more than their "share" of grades, since they usually filled skilled jobs and were more permanent employees. As a matter of fact, in application the result was exactly the opposite: Wacs were fairly latecomers in the Army, and many commands were already so overstrength on rated men that promotions were frozen; thus the Air Forces Wacs

fared no better than male latecomers, while the Service and Ground Forces Wacs had a reserved quota and were promoted even though men inducted at the same time could not be. The well-integrated Air Wacs were shortly outstripped in ratings by the segregated ASF and AGF Wacs, and complained frequently at the loss of "our grades."⁷

The Office of the Director WAC

Second of the integration problems to be resolved was that of the reduction of WAAC Headquarters to form the new and smaller Office of the Director WAC, which had advisory duties but no operating functions. Only about 25 officers and 20 civilians were allotted the new Office of the Director; the remaining 75 officers and 46 civilians were scattered among the various Army Service Forces offices which now handled all operations.⁸ With them went the files of their sections. All individual 201 files were sent to The Adjutant General, who was thereafter responsible for cases concerning individuals: initial assignment, transfers, promotions, filling of requisitions, classification, discipline, and discharge, as well as for answering inquiries from the public concerning the status of individuals. With this responsibility The Adjutant General received Capt. Clara G. Han and her assistants, who had been managing classification and assignment in the WAAC.

As for policy decisions concerning any

⁶ D/F, G-1 for TAG, 18 Oct 43. WDGAP 320.2 WAC (9-10-43), in WDCSA 291.9.

⁷ See details in chapters on services concerned.

⁸ M/R, 15 Feb 44, Justification for Civilian Positions for FY 1945. WAC files.