

social concept of a woman's duties to her husband, parents, or child, but others were applying the men's "care or support" rule concerning financial destitution.¹⁰ The Office of the Director, after study of the problem, believed that the Army should not attempt to ignore the different social responsibilities of men and women in American civil life, but should accept and acknowledge the difference in an amendment to the Army Regulations. This proposed amendment would have allowed a woman to be discharged:

. . . when, by reason of death or disability of a member of her family, she becomes the person primarily responsible for the care of a child or disabled or ill adult who is a member of her family. . . . In such case the evidence required need not include evidence that discharge is necessary to prevent or relieve financial destitution, but . . . that [it is] necessary to provide that type of care which is normally the responsibility of a woman to provide.¹¹

Such a rule would have been quite similar to that used for the WAVES, who—although making no changes in published regulations—required such cases to be routed to the Bureau of Naval Personnel, which treated them more liberally on the grounds that "it was felt that an ill parent would typically depend more on a daughter in the house than on a son."¹²

This concept was not acceptable to G-1 Division, except as it applied to the wives of "dependent" veterans. For all other types of dependency—parents, children, relatives—the rules on destitution remained unchanged. For discharged husbands the reaction was sympathetic, and the Army Regulation on dependency was amended to allow the wife of a disabled veteran, or of a soldier awaiting disability discharge, to be discharged to care for him, provided that medical authorities

certified that her presence would aid in his recovery. This provoked some dispute between husbands and medical authorities; shortly before the end of the war, an amendment provided that the wife of any veteran, disabled or not, could be discharged upon presenting proof of her husband's discharge from the armed forces or Merchant Marine. This policy was announced jointly by both military and naval women's services.¹³

Discharge for Misconduct

The delicate problem of prescribing WAC standards of conduct and morals had not fully taken shape until the end of the WAAC. In general the Auxiliary's discharge rules had been far more strict than comparable Army Regulations. The original WAAC Code of Conduct, in addition to the usual enjoinders against mutiny, riot, fray, desertion, and disrespect, also made it an offense to be found drunk in uniform or otherwise to bring discredit upon the Corps, either being grounds for various punishments including discharge.¹⁴

Director Hobby later directed that "drinking unwisely or without moderation" be considered such a violation,

¹⁰ Draft of Memo, G-1 for TAG, 5 Jun 44, in WDWAC 220.8. Prepared by Office of Director for G-1 signature, but not approved by G-1. See M/R.

¹¹ Memo cited n. 7.

¹² WAVES Hist, pp. 52 ff.

¹³ (1) RR 1-1, par 12d. (2) WD Cir 146, 17 May 45. (3) Joint Army-Navy Agreement on Policies for Separation from Service and Leave or Furlough Status for Women in Armed Forces Whose Husbands Are Discharged Veterans or Overseas Returnees, 24 May 45; (4) Women's Reserve Cir Ltr 4-45, Members of Women's Reserve Married to Servicemen Returning from Overseas, PERS-170-MEK. WDWAC 370.01. (5) Memo, Col Boyce, G-1 Div, for Dir WAC, 11 May 45. WDWAC 220.8.

¹⁴ WAAC Regs 1942, sec V.