

company such exemption caused the duty to fall even more frequently to the remainder of the women, sometimes as often as every two or three days. The reaction of Army section chiefs was almost unanimous. As one staff director reported, "The Army officers said it was impossible to let them do KP. Offices had let men go and could not spare the girls even for a half-day."⁹ The usual field solution was to assign a few members of the company on a permanent basis to do KP and other menial roster duty for the office workers.

This solution was not acceptable to Director Hobby, who noted:

With the new standards for recruiting, it would be unfair to have permanent kitchen police. . . . From now on we are not going to get the people who are suited for permanent KP's unless there is selective service for women.

Even if low-grade personnel was accidentally admitted, it was her opinion that American citizens who were induced to volunteer for military work should not find themselves forced to perform menial nonmilitary services for other volunteers. The Director stated:

We are in danger of building up a caste system in the WAC, whether we like it or not. . . . [It] is undemocratic and unfair to the women.

This view was supported by Deputy Director Rice:

We need to build in the company a spirit of respect for the job no matter what the job is. Everyone should take her turn at KP.¹⁰

The Navy reported an identical problem among the WAVES, and attempted to solve it by recruiting women as seamen (utility) expressly for this work, but this failed when "morale was chronically poor . . . too few would volunteer to enlist

therein and those who did became dissatisfied when they discovered the nature of the work." Finally the seaman rating had to be dropped, and the work returned to a roster basis.¹¹

As the only remaining solution, Director Hobby therefore asked publication of a circular requiring WAC noncommissioned officers, who were ordinarily exempt, to share KP with the other women in order that no woman would be too frequently absent on this duty. This recommendation was not favorably considered by Military Personnel Division, ASF, since "The privates cease to regard the noncoms with the respect which they are due if the noncoms are forced to work in the kitchen side by side with them."¹² General Dalton's opinion was not concurred in by the Director, who held the view that, except for the few command cadre positions, there was no reason why a truck driver should regard a stenographer with respect, or one member of the company be afforded more privileges than another on the grounds of superior education or skills. British services had entertained the same opinion, and had gone so far as to make a training film in which a rated office worker was reprimanded by

⁹ Stf Dir MDW, at Jun 43 Conf. Min, Stf Dirs Conf, 15-17 Jun 43. SPWA 337 (6-1-43). Also opinions of all other reporting officers.

¹⁰ All quotations from Min cited n. 9.

¹¹ (1) Memo, Gen Faith for Dir WAC, 14 Aug 43, also draft of Memo, 17 Aug 43; (2) Memo, Dir Pers ASF for G-1, 14 Sep 43. SPWA 220.6 KP. (3) WAVES Hist.

¹² (1) Memo, Col Catron for TAG through ASF and G-1, 7 Oct 43. SPWA 320.2. (2) T/S, Dir Pers ASF for G-1, 22 Oct 43. SPGAS 210.3 WAC-65. (3) D/F, G-1 for ASF, 25 Oct 43. WDGAP 220.3 WAC. (4) Memo, Dir WAC for G-1 through ASF, 4 Nov 43. SPWA 320.2. (5) WD Cir 289, 9 Nov 43. (6) T/S, ASF for G-1, 24 Nov 43. SPGAS 210.3. WAC. (7) D/F, G-1 for ASF, 29 Nov 43. WDGAP 220.3 WAC. All in AG 320.2 WAC (10-7-43) WAC Regs, and most are also in SPAP 220.3 WAC.