Wacky Times: An Analysis of the WAC in World War II and its Effects on Women

By JENNIFER NICHOL STEWART

At the dawn of the twentieth century American women were at the apex of a pointed fight for the vote. After gaining the vote they remained in a status that was anything but equal, or even reciprocal. Yet, the events of the Twentieth Century have altered the role of women of the world in considerable dimension. The events of World War II have often been pinpointed as a watershed – a precipitant event that separated women from social bondage and their contemporary role. The war has just as often been earmarked as a large-scale event that pushed women back in time several decades.

Some people claim that World War II was the defining moment in the Women's Right's struggle. These people point to such examples as the "Rosie the Riveter" girls, or the women who converged upon the workplace in response to the desperate demand for workers. They also point to the first-ever female military units, such as the WAAC/WAC, or the Women's Army Auxiliary Corp, later the Women's Army Corp. These were the first legal opportunities for women to operate in large-scale, diversified military occupations. Such scholars claim that the war marked a clear gain for women.

Yet, some people disagree with this hypothesis. Their point, opposite but equally valid, is that subsequent events do not support a claim that the war changed much, no matter how radical and promising things seemed during the fighting. The decade of the 1950s has often been iconized by the TV sitcom, "Leave it To Beaver" structure – happy family with a working father, perfectly domestic mother, and children whose trials and tribulations are always resolved in a half hour and never fail to make one smile. So how, these critics query, can the activities of women in the early forties directly influence the 1960s but leave no mark on the middle decade?

These are two equally respectable interpretations. And they are both wrong. And they are both right. First we will explore the interpretation which claims World War II was a watershed. The aftershocks of the war are still being felt over fifty years after the cessation of fighting. The social shakedown is but one aspect of these effects. Did World War II alter women's roles? The answer must be a resounding *yes*. Never before had women filled the workforce, civilian or military, in such large numbers. Opportunities were suddenly opened to the women of the early forties that, to their mothers and grandmothers, would seem ludicrous, and probably sacrilegious.

Much of this can be defined by the war itself. Total war requires a total commitment. It requires complete mobilization, and that means women, as well as minorities. Total war is an all-consuming threat, and requires the commitment not just of governments and money, but individuals. Total war is that which precludes normality. It demands that all of a nation's resources be committed to victory - and that means women as much as it does jet fuel. D'Ann Campbell, in an article entitled "Servicewomen and the American Military Experience," states that "every man, woman, and child of a nation must be involved, and large bureaucracies must plan, organize, and administer the war

---

JENNIFER NICHOL STEWART is a student at Emory & Henry College. This paper was written for the Marshall Scholar's Program at the George C. Marshall library in Lexington, Virginia.

effort." Thus, she continues, "the nature of total war in this century necessarily involves women both directly and indirectly in the war effort."[1]

A fully industrialized nation must wage war differently. Not only must it mobilize a war machine, but it must also meet its domestic needs. This mobilization presents a logistical problem, for a nation cannot shift its working mass to the fighting front and still populate its factories on the home front. The country must bring in new workers in order to transport its present workers to the fighting. This means the absorption of a heretofore-untapped supply of labor, namely, women and minorities. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn announced in a 1942 article that it was "a matter of patriotism, necessity, and arithmetic."[2] In other words, people wanted to win the war, but in order to do that, they would logically have to abandon much of their way of life.

This inclusion of women and minorities is exactly what did occur in World War II. Women went to work in factories and, for the first time, legally served in the military. As one newspaper touted of the birth of the WAAC, or the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps:[3]

> The Corp is designed to do hard, unromantic work all over the world, with telephone switchboards and typewriters, with adding machines and pencils, with washing machines and frying pans, women will relieve the men now doing these jobs – and release them for active fighting service.[4]

The theory, then, was that women would fill the positions that men vacated for the front in this bureaucratic war. As stated in "The Battle for Manpower" the war "must be won and under modern conditions of warfare that requires the mobilization of the total population."[5] The article notes that, "As in Russia and Great Britain women workers are here proving as efficient as men" and "Everywhere secretaries, waitresses, farm girls, housewives are running cranes, feeding machines, doing mechanical jobs that, a few months ago, would have been considered impossible for them to do."[6]

Contrary to Fascist philosophy, even Adolph Hitler found women necessary to the war effort – and not indirectly, for sexual purposes, but directly, as fighters and workers. As Campbell points out: "By the end of the war, Hitler had agreed to women serving in the military, even in anti-aircraft artillery units, and before the war's end (though too late to implement) he signed the papers to create an all-female infantry unit."[7] This led General H.H. Kitchener to state that, "If the women of either side should stop their war work, that side would lose."[8] Thus, this world war, this total commitment to victory necessarily involves the entire nation, either directly or indirectly.

Thus, women's roles were altered during the Second World War. No one can gainsay that, yet, the significance of this change lies not in the fact of the matter itself, but in the duration of the change. Did this alteration have a lasting influence? Whether or not the activities of the war years directly or indirectly influenced June Cleaver they certainly stand as precedent.

Total war is surreal. It requires the devotion of all a country's resources, and this means the abandonment of whatever stream of life the country previously had. It is clearly a break from the momentum of the previous. Mistakes are made when examining events such as World War II with expectations born of its 'time-frame.' Were women mass producers during the war? Yes. Were they before the war? No. Were they after the war? No. Total war is thus a kind of anachronism. It must be examined with ties to, but separate from, the immediate past and the immediate future.

Supporting this claim is President Franklin Delano Roosevelt himself. He stated in a speech given on Columbus Day 1942 that, "In some communities employees dislike to hire women. In others they are reluctant to hire Negroes. We can no longer afford to indulge such prejudice."[9] Roosevelt was prepared to back this stand up as well. Executive Order 8802 incorporated blacks into the military. Everywhere in America images of Rosie the Riveter encouraged women to enter the workforce. And Roosevelt enacted several military 'mirror' organizations for women, the first, and perhaps the most famous was the WAAC, or the Women's Army Auxiliary Corp, which became the Women's Army Corp in the summer of 1943, meaning that it was accorded full Army status.

Women in the Military

Branch of Service	Date of Activation	Approx. Number of Members
WACs	May 15, 1942	Approx. 271,000
Waves	July 30, 1942	Approx. 100,000
SPAR	November 23, 1942	Approx. 13,000
Marine Corp Women's Reserve	February 13, 1943	Approx. 23,000
WASPs	September 1942	Approx. 1,000
Army or Navy Nurse Corp	December 1941	Approx. 76,000[10]

Minority Women in the Military

Branch of Service	Approx. Number of Black Minority Members
WACs	Approx. 4,000[11]
Waves	2 Black Officers and 72 enlisted women
SPAR	Four black women accepted
Marine Corp Women's Reserve	No black women accepted
WASPs	None
Army or Navy Nurse Corp Army	Approx 500 black women;
Navy	Only four black women[12]

The WAAC/WAC and its Relationship to the War

The Women's Army Auxiliary Corp came into being in May of 1942. The bill was chiefly the result of the activities of Edith Rogers, though many worked with and supported her efforts. Among these were Chief of Staff George C. Marshall, who stated "there are innumerable duties being performed by soldiers that can actually be done better by women," and not the least of which was First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt, and Mary Bethune.[13] The votes were rather close, in the House it was 249 to 83 with 96 abstentions, and the Senate came to 38 in favor and 27 against, which was a bare 11-vote margin.[14] Regardless, the Bill passed and on May 16, 1942 Olveta Culp Hobby was sworn in as WAAC Director. *The New York Times Magazine* sums up the purpose of the WAAC rather simply, "women can do some of the jobs that men are now doing in the Army. By taking over these jobs they can release men for active or combat duty."[15] The article goes on to outline the WAAC organization, "WAACS are organized into platoons, companies, regiments. Officers' ranks are Director (Colonel), Assistant Director (Major), First Officer (Captain), Second Officer (1st lieutenant), and Third Officer (second lieutenant). Noncoms are First Leader (top sergeant), Leader (sergeant), Junior Leader (corporal)."[16] The article further states that "except for the fact that they get no training in firearms and tactics WAACS are like any other soldiers. Once they enlist they are in the Army for the duration."[17]

To join the WAAC a woman would be "between 21 and 45 years of age, between five and six ft. in height and not less than 105 lb. in weight. She must also be able to pass a physical examination and an intelligence test comparable to that required of an officer in the regular army" advertised another *New York Times Magazine* article.[18] All told, an estimated "350,000 women served in World War II with a peak strength of 271,000."[19] The women served both at home and abroad, and, as General Marshall notes, "No opportunity was overlooked to replace men with personnel of the Women's Army Corp, both in the US and overseas."[20]

Despite their theoretical possibilities, the women of the WAAC soon faced a dualistic, profoundly complicated public reaction. Support for the war was nearly unanimous so, on one level at least the women could be heralded. Yet, an abounding fear of this radical change pervaded. On the one hand, the military women were novel, a curious oddity that piqued the interest of the nation. On the other, they were instigators of fear, and victims of horrible criticism and belittling ridicule. Yet, the war continued and so did the women and they soon met with grudging respect from varied quarters. There was, however, irony. These women were a mainstay of the war effort, yet this ideology was contrary to every precept of American life prior to the declaration of war. A congressman from New York spoke of this change,

> A woman's army to defend the United States of America. Think of the humiliation. What has become of the manhood of America that we have to call on our women to do what has ever been the duty of men? The thing is so revolting to me, to my sense of decency, that I just cannot discuss it.[21]

Some even marveled that women could join without male consent, "I cannot understand how a married woman can enlist in the WAC without the consent of her husband."[22] Leisa Meyer even states that "the military, in many ways, usurped the patriarchal rights of servicewomen's husbands."[23] Though this overthrow was most likely generated by the

impracticality of obtaining a written approval from every woman's husband in wartime, it still illustrates the fact that the needs of this war were mowing down the social standards that stood in their way. But, at least for the duration of the war, patriotism silenced the patriarch, and women were legally active in roles heretofore unimaginable.

The criticism and mockery bestowed on these women is an expression of the American bewilderment at the sudden and intense infiltration of American women into hierarchical structures. However, public response took many forms. In an article entitled "Catholics vs. WAACS" different voices of the Catholic church are heard, from "the state will use the war as an excuse for assuming control of children" to its statement that WAACS were "no more than an opening wedge, intended to break down the traditional American and Christian opposition to removing women from the home and to degrade her by bringing back the pagan female goddess of de-sexed, lustful sterility."[24]

Others focused less on the WAACs relationship to the hereafter and more on their appearance. An article entitled "Female Corp Will be Chic in its Khaki" illustrates the American fascination with the 'newfangled' women in uniform. A brief article entitled "Army, How Firm a Foundation" glibly announced that they were "gratified to learn that the WAACs would almost certainly be issued three brassieres and two girdles apiece."[25] A later article would marvel at the cost of outfitting the women, listing "WAAC, $255.68; Navy Reserve officer, $250; Army Officer, $150; enlisted soldier, $153.91; Army Nurse $122.21; enlisted sailor, $118.95."[26] Still another article was interested in the food served at Fort Des Moines, "Wednesday night, July 29, would not be a poor night to date a WAAC-That evenings menu includes onions."[27] Some articles were even openly humorous, such as this article, "Observant Citizen," which claims "I like the uniforms- It's going to be a good influence to see one woman wearing the same style togs that another woman does and enjoying it!"[28] The article also claims, "Elmer had little comment to make on the WAAC rules to discharge members who expected blessed events. 'It's the first time the stork has been listed as an Axis partner.'"[29] Another smile comes from this little poem:

"The Waacs Drill Sergeant Speaks a Sissy Tongue"

I

You think you've a tough job
[break]
In Iceland or Nome:
I'll swap you the one
That they've slipped me at home:
I'm drilling the women
The best that I can,
But can't yell the things that
I'd yell to a man!

II

"Eyes right, ya gorilla!"
I once used to shout,
But that and "Hey fathead!"

Are both strictly out;
Of jobs in the service
The hardest is mine –
I've got to discard all
My old army line:
[break]

III

Did privates toe in? I
Could yell "Listen stupe!
You do that again you'll
Get socked for a loop!"
"Chins up, ya baboons!" was
My cry through the day,
But drilling the dames,
Well, it ain't the same way!

IV

"Eyes right! Are you cockeyed?"
I'd yell in loud tones,
But now its "Please try once
Again Mrs. Jones!"
"Hey! Throw out you chest!
Stow That barroom effect!
Are into the discard
[break]
They aren't quite correct!

V

"Hey mug! Wipe that grin off!"
I loved that so much,
But can't use it now
For it lacks the right touch;
"Ya bowlegged scarecrow!"-
Is off my routine;
It's now "Watch your form, if
You don't mind Miss Green!"

VI

"C'mon ya droop, get
Some snap in those knees!"
Went well in my old squads,
But NEVER with THESE!

"Your shirts out, ya dumbell!"
I can't yell no more,
Forgive me my groans
[break]
Its one helluva war!

VII

"That hat is no ale can!
To hang on one ear!"
Is now out of order
With "Pull in ya rear!"
But this is what slays me
And makes my head dance:
No more can I bellow,
"Hey pull up them pants!"[30]

Other articles focused more on the logistics of incorporating a new sex into military discipline, such as "She will be permitted to wear make-up in moderation. Should she find herself with child she may resign with the privilege of re-enlistment after delivery." The article also states "officers will be paid $50 a month. On graduation they will receive from $125 to $166.67 a month plus allowances. Auxiliaries salaries will range from $21 to $72 a month."[31] These amounts may seem small by contemporary standards, but for women of that era, just emerging from the Great Depression, it was exorbitant. These women now had a legal opportunity to be self-sufficient and independent. As Susanna Turner, an officer in the WAAC/WAC states, "I'll simply be rolling in wealth from now on and you simply must let me send some home to you since things are more expensive."[32] The idea that a woman should send money home was definitely a new concept for 1942.

The Women of the WAC and the War

These articles testify at least to the bemusement of the American public. Whether it was simply curiosity or jest the American people sat up and took notice of these women. Yet, how did the women themselves react? What was it like for them? Mostly, the women reacted to the situation with tolerance and enthusiasm. Rebecca Brockenbrough states that "we are all doing operational jobs and releasing the men for combat – what most of us came in the army for" but admits that "we five and three or four Red Cross girls will live together – the only women in this man's camp. I surely was glad to see those Red Cross girls and I don't mean maybe!"[33] Brockenbrough's relief illustrates her precarious situation. An officer, yes, but a woman quite obviously, and the war could not erase all social prejudices overnight. In fact, it seemed only to subdue them temporarily.

Another woman, Susanna P Turner, comments on some of her experiences at the first WAAC training center in Fort Des Moines, Iowa. She says:

> Formal inspection, when we worry over whether the towel is folded three or four times, the fold at the top of the bed 6" or 6 1\2," and whether the socks

> look best on the left or right of the locker – always tickles me when one considers the mess the world is in.[34]

Another WAAC claims of her group at Fort Des Moines, "We are as different as the states we come from and our pasts as varied."[35] These comments show the women adjusting to the rigid structure that their military lives must be as well as the lack of privacy.

Despite the women's excitement over this new life, their papers are peppered with comments that show their awareness of their rather tremulous status. Pollock comments about the inspection of a group of visiting men, "Maybe we didn't strike them as the flower of American womanhood either."[36] Susanna Turner shows an awareness of the situation in a comment that would in the years preceding, and immediately following the war, be taken as the ultimate of oxymorons, "we are to be ladies as well as soldiers."[37] Rebecca Brockenbrough's awareness is less audible. However, she does state, "they [the soldiers she worked with in Paris] were amazed when I said I did not approve of a 'soldier bonus'" and adds further "we have many differences of opinion."[38] Rebecca Brockenbrough also mentions something about the nature of the war itself on women, "I imagine it is a lonesome experience to be in a hospital in a foreign land and miles away from your unit. You don't have to be hit by enemy fire to be a war casualty."[39] Rebecca Brockenbrough's comments show not just the particular plight of women, but also echo the basic horrors of war. That she would have opportunity to experience these horrors, and that poignant experience should be something of a blessing in disguise, is one of the particular ironies of the situation.

Kay Somersby Morgan, an Englishwoman in the military, similarly says this,

> It may seem strange that on such an occasion I would hold the door, but it must be remembered that this was wartime and we were in uniform. Door holding, saluting and such were all part of that way of life. Although General Eisenhower still insisted on some of the peacetime courtesies, such as letting a woman precede him through the door, he accepted the rest as part of a very necessary military discipline.[40]

This shows the confused mores of the wartime era. In fact, Kay S. Morgan is careful to delineate between the two timeframes, which emphasizes the differences. All of the women's comments reinforce the notion that this war was a break from traditions of the past. They are somewhat uncomfortable in their positions, but are determined to do their part for the war effort. In some cases, maybe even more, as Rebecca Brockenbrough points out, "I asked them if they knew that WACs, after a full days work were going out to the hospitals and helping."[41] Rebecca Brockenbough also points out some of the male resistance to the inclusion of women in the war effort,

> Today we had a discussion on conscription of nurses. The wife of one of the boys was a nurse before she was married and he was rabid. He wrote her if her physical didn't knock her out to do everything she could to get out of it.[42]

Yet, conscription was a necessary means of getting the badly needed staff. No amount of protest from beleaguered husbands could erase this need, and none of the protests stopped the government from using them.

Charity Adams Earley brings to light another aura of anomaly, "One member of the Third Platoon was assigned to WAAC headquarters in the Pentagon because she had worked for a Negro adviser to the President of the United States and had been promised this assignment."[43] Earley's comments show the underlying consciousness not just of a woman soldier, but a black woman soldier. A veritable impossibility just a few short years prior.

Women Minoring in Warfare

If female soldiers were an oddity in World War II then black female soldiers were an oddity in exponential form. Leisa Meyer states that "African-American women's position as soldiers, however, was framed not only by gender ideologies that questioned women's right to trespass on a male domain, but also by racial ideologies that challenged the right of African-Americans to enter a bastion of European power and authority."[44] Yet they at least entered the WAAC/WAC in the same proportions as their male counterparts, a "10-percent quota."[45] Of the 440 women first enrolled at Fort Des Moines 39 were black. But the passage of protective legislation did not necessarily pave their way. Dovey Roundtree notes, "the most difficult part of it, the one that black women overcame, was to knock down the doors of the United States Post Office and get the application to apply. That was far harder for me than passing the mental alertness test."[46] Charity Adams Earley notes in her autobiography, "in the society of the forties, great effort was exerted to prohibit the appearance of Negroes in any activity that even smacked of the unusual, of being honorable, and especially of being first."[47] Yet, she soon adds, "I a Negro, had my picture on the front page of a white daily without having done anything criminal, a most unusual situation."[48] These accomplishments are not to deny the existence of racism in the United States military in the World War II era. As in previous wars blacks "were segregated in terms of housing, we were held back in terms of field assignments."[49] The blacks in the military of World War II met with even more constraints than other women. They literally had two fronts to deal with, sex and race. Yet, even they were somewhat tolerated for the duration of the war. Not to purport that this 1943 quote from the Office of War Information was actually realized, but it is a telling fact that the US was willing to employ even their most oppressed of peoples in an all-out effort to win: "American enthusiasm for production as a short cut to victory can probably be used to tear down much of the prejudice against Negroes, women and aliens, three groups not yet fully integrated into the workforce."[50] Instead, prejudices, quelled for the duration of the war, returned at its conclusion with a ferocity that would propel the United States into something just short of a revolution against race, and eventually gender, discrimination.

The End of the Beginning or the Beginning of the End?

Basically, the war years stand out as a kind of anomaly. We pinpoint 1945 as a year when everything changed. I would argue that 1945 was the year everything tried to return to something of its 'normal.' I would contest that the changes we see as so profound were actually delayed a few years while the entire country experienced something akin to post-traumatic stress syndrome. World War II may have been the precipitant

event in the women's movement, but its effect is somewhat diluted by the 1950s era where stereotypical images flooded the American landscape. The experiences of the WACs somewhat foreshadow this event. While the women are marginally accepted during the wartime era, gender confusion and resistance to change pockmark even these years. It can be argued that their efforts, while commendable, were born less of a societal acceptance of their qualifications, and more of desperation for victory. It is in this that the world of World War II is surreal. And it is for this reason that it must be studied with caution. Yes, the women of these years made advances, but not because society was willing for them to do so. Women advanced because the people had no other choice, and then were basically punished for it in the years following the war.

Franklin D. Roosevelt's effectual Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, remarked that he wanted to "warn men that when the war is over, the going will be a lot tougher, because they will have to compete with women whose eyes have been opened to their greatest potentialities."[51] Others, however, darkly foreshadowed the "coming war on women."[52] Whether or not June Cleaver was really artillery fire, she was idealized while women such as the WACs were ignored.

This aversion to women was not necessarily a conscious affront. Women and minorities were accidentally absorbed into the war machine. They were called upon as they were needed, not as an automatic extension of war activities. In fact, the question is not so much that there were women involved in the war effort, but that there were so many women, in such visual roles. Why, one must even acknowledge the presence of First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt. Eleanor Roosevelt is often supposed to be the guiding spirit behind her husband, and indeed her activities certainly attest to the fact that she was an integral part of Roosevelt's Presidency. But Eleanor Roosevelt is intriguing for another reason. She has been described as "Aunt Ella to the millions," or, in other words, "the one to whom anyone turned when trouble struck."[53] Eleanor Roosevelt stands as a peculiar byproduct of the World War II era. A strong woman who was an advocate of the people, often at her own expense, is somewhat strange for the era.

Whether or not World War II changed women forever is less an issue. The country was not prepared for the commitment total war demanded of them. They were thrust into the fight, and found that they had to scramble to catch up. Thus, to effectively combat the Axis war machine, women and minorities were called upon. This mass employment created a country that was, socially, economically, and to a certain extent politically, a tails version of the heads before, and even after, the war. The confusion and debate surrounding the WAC experience merely details this conflict and exposes the war years as, basically, an anachronism of their own time. The women of the WAC and the other military groups like it were then basically victims of the war. As Harold Ickes says, they had a taste of their potential, which would haunt their later years, but, as Rebecca Brockenbrough says, there were casualties of war that had no contact with enemy fire.

ENDNOTES

1. D'Ann Campbell, "Servicewomen and the American Military Experience" in *A Woman's War Too: US Women in the Military in World War II*. ed. Paula Nassen Poulos. (Washington, DC: National Archives and Records Administration, 1996), 19.

2. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, "Women in the War" in *American Women in a World at War: Contemporary Accounts from World War II*. ed. Judy Barrett Litoff and David C.

Smith, (Wilmington: A Scholarly Resources Inc., Imprint, 1997), 13.

3. WAAC, WAC, Corps, and Corp are used at different times by different authors. WAAC refers to the Women's Army Auxiliary Corp; WAC, the Women's Army Corp, and applies after 1943. Wherever possible the contemporary authors' choice has been used.

4. Newspaper Clipping, nd. [1942], Lelia Cocke Bagbey Collection. George C. Marshall Library; Lexington, VA. Hereinafter the Marshall Library will be cited as GCM.

5. Donald J. Kingsley, "The Battle for Manpower." *Current History* 3 (September 1942): 26-34.

6. Ibid 29.

7. D'Ann Campbell, "Servicewomen," 20.

8. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, "Women in War," 13.

9. Sherna Berger Gluck, *Rosie the Riveter Revisisted.* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987), 10.

10. Judy Barrett Litoff and David C. Smith, "The Wartime History of the Waves, SPARS, Women Marines, Army and Navy Nurses, and WASP's" In *A Women's War Too: US Women in the Military in World War II.* ed. Paula Nassen Poulos. (Washington, DC: National Archives and Records Administration, 1996), 49, 56.

11. Janet Sims-Wood, "Service Life in the Women's Army Corps and Afro-American Wacs" in *A Woman's War Too: US Women in the Military in World War II.* ed. Paula Nassen Poulos. (Washington, DC: National Archives and Records Administration, 1996), 135.

12. Litoff and Smith, "The Wartime History of the Waves"

13. Doris Weatherford, *American Women and World War II,* (New York: Facts on File, 1990), 30.

14. Ibid.

15. Tania Long, "Women of Three Armies," *New York Times Magazine*, September 2, 1945, 12.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

18. Mary P. Lord., *New York Times Magazine*, June 8, 1942, 18-19.

19. D'Ann Campbell, "Servicewomen," 18.

20. "Biennial Report," June 3, 1945, *Infantry Journal*, Vol. 63:6, (December 1948), 29. GCM.

21. Weatherford, "American Women," 30.

22. Leisa D. Meyer "Creating a Women's Corps: Public Response to the WAAC/WAC and Questions of Citizenship," In *A Women's War Too* ed. Poulos, 31.

23. Ibid.

24. Newspaper Clipping, nd., "Army, How Firm a Foundation," Bagbey Collection, GCM.

25. Ibid.

26. Newspaper clipping, nd., "WAAC Uniform Tops all in Services," Bagbey Collection. GCM.

27. Newspaper clipping, nd., "WAACs Menu Seems Tasty, Plenty of It," Bagbey Collection. GCM.

28. Newspaper clipping, nd., "Observant Citizen," Bagbey Collection. GCM.

29. Ibid.

30. Newspaper Clipping, nd., "The WAACs Drill Sergeant Speaks a Sissy Tongue," Bagbey Collection. GCM.

31. Mary P. Lord, "WAAC US Women Troop to Enlist Army's First All-Female Force" *New York Times Magazine*, June 8, 1942.

32. Newspaper Clipping, December 25, 1942, Susanna P. Turner Collections. GCM.

33. Rebecca Brockenbrough to [her sister], nd., [January 1945]. GCM.

34. Susanna P. Turner to Fweese [her mother], August 1, 1942. Turner Collection. GCM.

35. Elizabeth R. Pollock, "Yes Ma'am! The Personal Papers of a WAAC Private" in *American Women in a World at War*, ed. Litoff and Smith, (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, Inc), 43.

36. Ibid.

37. Turner to Fweese, Turner Collection. GCM.

38. Brockenbrough to [her sister], nd., January 1945, Brockenbrough Collection. GCM.

39. Ibid.

40. Kay Somersby Morgan, *Past Forgetting: My Love Affair with Dwight D. Eisenhower*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1973), 29.

41. Brockenbrough to [her sister], nd., January 1945, Brockenbrough Collection. GCM.

42. Ibid.

43. Charity Adams Earley. *One Woman's Army: A Black Officer Remembers the WAC.* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1989), 45.

44. Meyer, "Creating A Women's Corps," 31.

45. Sims-Wood. "Service Life," 32.

46. Ibid., 130.

47. Earley, *One Woman's Army*, 14.

48. Ibid, 16.

49. Sims-Wood. "Service Life," 131.

50. Gluck, *Rosie Revisited*, 20.

51. Ibid., 16.

52. Ibid.

53. Virginia Pasley, "First Lady to the Common Man." *American Mercury*, March, 1944, 275.