

CHAPTER XXXVII

Evaluation and Recommendations

Neither the cost nor the worth of the wartime Women's Army Corps, Army of the United States, was ever officially assessed. Few of the Army's operating agencies, fiscal, procurement, or otherwise, kept a separate Corps accounting or a separate total of expenditures. From the viewpoint of achievement of full integration, there was no reason why expensive separate accounts should have been maintained; even if they had been, there would have been no objective manner of weighing them against that intangible—performance.

Cost to the Army

For the information of Congress, the General Staff, in its postwar planning, compiled a chart of the estimated relative cost of male and female soldiers under "normal" conditions.¹ This summary made clear that there was no reason why a woman soldier should cost as much as a man. Aside from the considerable saving of food, the major economy in the use of female personnel consisted in the lesser number of dependents or persons legally entitled to be considered dependents, with resulting savings not only in wartime allotments of salary but also in dependents' quarters, travel, and other costs. Since combat training could be omitted, the re-

quired training time was also shorter and less expensive, particularly when, in wartime, numbers of older women already possessing needed civilian skills chose to enter. Under normal conditions, and if the estimates to Congress held true, it appeared that the wartime Army of the future could save itself at least \$7,700,000 per year for each 100,000 women substituted for an equal number of male non-combatants.

In addition, if the estimates of commanders such as Generals Eisenhower, Eaker, and Devers were correct, the savings could be doubled by the use of only 50,000 women to substitute for 100,000 men in jobs in which women appeared to excel. In testimony before Congress every authority almost without exception stated that in such work one woman had in wartime offices replaced at least two men and possibly more. Such double savings, however, would apply only to part of the possible replacements. If it was necessary to extend the use of women to motor transport and mechanical jobs, no better than one-for-one replacement could be expected, while further extension to work in

¹ See accompanying chart. O Dir WAC, printed in House Com on Armed Services, *Subcommittee Hearings on S. 1641*, HR Rpt 238, 18 Feb 48.