

unnecessary, and that authorized issue of the types and quantities of food proven by experience to be needed by the average WAC unit.³²

Not only did such a master menu prove useful in improving appetite and controlling weight, but considerable saving to the Army resulted. During 1945, studies showed that the average cost per man per day was \$0.58015, and per woman \$0.52264. This, for the WAC strength of 100,000 as compared to an equal number of men, would result in a yearly saving to the Army of \$2,099,115.00, provided that WAC unit messes were maintained.³³

Clothing

Controversy over the main body of WAC Regulations was mild compared to that which accompanied the writing of the detailed uniform regulations after the Corps' entry into the Army, and which soon witnessed the Air Forces in mortal combat with the Ground Forces over lapel insignia, and the WAC in unsisterly dissension over the disposal of the necktie. Such commotion over articles of uniform was not unknown to the Army, where old-line officers could not recall any item changed without lengthy dissension. It was therefore not until the first days of 1944 that clothing regulations could be agreed upon,³⁴ and frequent amendments were necessary thereafter.

Director's Proposals

After the WAC's admission to the Army, possibly the most frequent cause of criticism was the continued use of the mismatched uniforms—nonmatching skirts and jackets of chocolate brown and mustard yellow shades—which women had

received during the early days of the expansion program. Many of these, turned in by the 15,000 women leaving at the conversion, had been repaired and reissued to new recruits. In late December of 1943 Director Hobby submitted to the Army Service Forces a plan to eliminate them, noting that "These uniforms, which are obviously not of authorized shades, have had definite reflections on recruiting and on the morale of the troops." Since there was now a surplus of uniforms of the authorized shade, she asked a liberal salvage policy, whereby women need not wait until mismatched items were badly worn before turning them in. This request was approved by The Quartermaster General, but disapproved by Requirements Division, ASF, since it was standard Army policy that earlier procurement must be worn out, and reissued as long as repairable, before new stocks were used.³⁵

The issue of secondhand clothing to new recruits was also a cause of criticism. The Director informed the ASF:

Innumerable reports to this office have indicated that the issue of used or substandard uniforms is disparaging to morale . . . and detrimental to enlistment in competition with other women's services.

Since other servicewomen got a clothing allowance with which to purchase new

³² Memos, OQMG for Dir WAC, 29 Jan 44, and 27 May 44. WDWAC 430 (1944).

³³ Memo, Dir Subsistence Div OQMG for G-1 Welfare Br, 26 Apr 46. OCMH.

³⁴ AR 600-39, 5 Jan 44, Prescribed Service Uniform. For discussion of detailed policy, see discussion below. See also Erna Risch, *The Quartermaster Corps: Organization, Supply, and Services, Volume I*, UNITED STATES ARMY IN WORLD WAR II (Washington, 1953).

³⁵ (1) Memo, Dir WAC for CG ASF, 21 Dec 43, with Ind, OQMG, 3 Jan 44; (2) Memo, Maj Mary Durr for Dir WAC, 26 Jan 44. SPWA 421 (1943). (3) Memo, Reqmts Div ASF for Contl Div ASF, 11 Feb 44. SPRMA, in SPWA 421 sec 2 (1942).