

eral Dalton, as well as through other ASF divisions. Disapprovals of policy recommendations by General Dalton or by Requirements Division, ASF, excited increasingly unfavorable comment from other commands in matters which concerned them solely, or would not normally have received Army Service Forces' comment.¹⁰

Move to General Staff Authorized

In February of 1944, as a result of these complaints, Director Hobby went personally to General Somervell to ask clarification of her office's status. He asked her to present the problem in writing, which she did, attaching as corpus delicti some three defunct policy papers which she had addressed, supposedly directly, to the General Staff, all of which had been disapproved upon General Dalton's recommendation. All three concerned policies that were Army-wide, and one was solely an Air Forces proposal.¹¹

Upon receipt of the Director's protest, General Somervell immediately recommended in writing to General Marshall that the Office of the Director be moved from his jurisdiction to that of the General Staff. General Somervell stated, "The office of the Director WAC is concerned primarily with matters affecting policy for the WAC which are applicable on an Army-wide basis in three major commands."¹² When later acquainted with his action, Colonel Hobby stated that, if allowed to comment, she would have expressed ready concurrence.¹³

As a result, General Marshall called Director Hobby in for a conference and directed that the Office of the Director be moved to G-1 Division, War Department General Staff, effective 1 March 1944.¹⁴ Because of the small size of G-1 Division,

the Director's Office again had to be reduced in size, this time to the Director and four—later only two—other officers, including Major Rice as Deputy.

The Meek Report

The move was still in process, with office furniture not yet installed, when General Somervell's office received a lengthy written report, which it forwarded to General Marshall. The report was in the nature of a sweeping criticism of the conduct of the WAC program to date, alleging that Director Hobby and her advertising advisers had overlooked many obvious means of improving recruitment, had failed to improve the WAC uniform, and had allowed the WAC to fall far below the WAVES in public esteem. This study came to be called the Meek Report after its author, Mr. Samuel W. Meek, a member of the advertising agency of J. Walter Thompson, a competitor of the firm that handled official WAC advertising, Young & Rubicam.¹⁵

The Meek Report alleged, among other things, that the public was not aware of the urgency of the Army's need for Wacs;

¹⁰ Specific examples in following text.

¹¹ Memo, Dir WAC for CG ASF, 5 Feb 44, sub: Functions of Dir WAC, with atchd papers. SPWA 314.7, Hobby files.

¹² (1) Memo, CG ASF for CofS, 9 Feb 44. Styer Files, Drawer 2197, DRB AGO. (2) Incl to Memo, Dir WAC for CofS, 21 Mar 44, sub: Comment on Public Opinion Concerning WAC, Tabs A to J atchd. WDGAP 341 (1944). (3) Min, Gen Council, 21 and 28 Feb 44.

¹³ According to statement of Deputy Director to author.

¹⁴ Memo, G-1 for CofS, 14 Feb 44. Approved by CofS, 19 Feb 44. WDGAP 320 WAC, in CofS 324.5.

¹⁵ Manila Folder with 45 pages of surveys and statistics with atchd note, "HJK" to Gen Somervell, 21 Mar 44, and pencil notation: "Not to be use [sic] without my personal OK. BS." Somervell Files, Hq ASF, A46-257, DRB AGO.