

directives on housing and placement policies would be observed by the District Commandants." Although the WAVES director and field agencies desired to assign women to any job for which they were qualified, the Bureau of Naval Personnel arbitrarily limited assignments to certain approved jobs, noting:

The Women's Reserve had originally fought to have all rates open to women, but the Bureau rejected this contention. . . . Field activities, with a commendable desire to give the enlisted women similar opportunities for advancement to those open to men, for a time permitted Waves to strike for a wide variety of rates which had not been officially opened to them; and it became necessary for the Bureau to issue firm instructions.

The Bureau also determined that certain jobs such as control tower operator would be largely taken over by women, and trained and shipped personnel accordingly.<sup>3</sup>

The Army's policy, on the other hand, began at the time of the conversion to Army status with almost no limitation upon the station commander's power to determine WAC jobs, and added restrictions only as they were proved essential by experience. By the end of the war, the limitations that had grown up could almost be numbered upon the fingers of one hand.

#### *Restrictions on Nonmilitary Assignments*

Of these restrictions, the most important grouped themselves about the always-uncertain distinction between military and civilian jobs, which for women appeared to present a special problem, particularly since assignment to civilian vacancies had been permitted in early Auxiliary days.

The issue did not, as it frequently did in the Navy, concern the replacement of Civil Service personnel, which in the Army was absolutely forbidden, and for which Congressional critics remained always alert even had the Army grown lax. Paradoxically, Congress did not object to the practice in the Navy. The Bureau of Naval Personnel noted that it secured a "gentleman's agreement" from the Naval Affairs Committees that it might use Waves when it could not get Civil Service personnel for jobs in the Washington area. As a result, as much as one third of the WAVES' entire corps was assigned to civilian work in Washington, the bureau protecting itself by certification "that civilians could not be found to fill any given jobs for which Waves were requested by a Washington office." Such assignment did not prove wholly satisfactory, the bureau noting later that "use of WAVES for essentially civilian work soon became a morale problem and a detriment to procurement. . . . Many of the women could see that they were not directly replacing men."<sup>4</sup>

For the Army, the question concerned only the non-Civil Service jobs on field stations.<sup>5</sup> It was ordinarily forbidden to use soldiers in civilian-operated laundries, as post exchange sales clerks, as waiters in officers' messes (except as extra paid employment), and in other more or less

<sup>3</sup> WAVES Hist.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> For preconversion period: (1) Draft of Memo, Dir WAC for G-1, 4 Nov 43. SPWA 320.3. (2) Rpt of Insp, Colored Det, Ft. Knox, Ky., 6 Aug 43. SPWA 331.1. (8-20-43). (3) M/R, Faith, 8 Jul 43, sub: Rpt of Sp Insp. SPWA (11-16-43) Utilization. (4) Memo, Lies for Dir WAAC, 13 Jul 43, sub: Analysis of Insp Rpts. Proj 25, WAAC Plng Serv files. For postconversion period: (5) Memo, Dir WAC for Dir Pers ASF, 25 Aug 43. SPWA 222.6 KP, in Folder 22, WAAC Plng Serv files.