MAKING UP FOR WAR:
SEXUALITY AND CITIZENSHIP IN
WARTIME CULTURE

PAGE DOUGHERTY DELANO

"Too much lipstick."
—Ann Petry, "In Darkness and Confusion," Cross Section, 1947

"A fresh application of makeup, my helmet at a jaunty angle, and I was ready for anything."
—Nurse Ruth Haskell, Helmets and Lipstick, 1944

This article explores makeup in American cultural practices during World War II. Wearing makeup during World War II sometimes indicated overly sexualized, manipulated women—echoed in the words of the uncle in Ann Petry's short story. For others, makeup suggested a woman intimately bound to sex, prostitution, and rape, for whom lipstick signified their regrettable victimization, or an iconic woman who was more advertisement for a well-wrought nation than real, vocal flesh and spirit. But there was, I contend, another woman in this wartime picture, evoked in the words of army nurse Ruth Haskell. Makeup could be a sign of female agency that included sexual power and citizenship and as such was disruptive of wartime's masculine codes of power. Certainly, as Kaja Silverman writes, "oppositional gestures are never absolute." This entanglement makes scanning makeup complex and exciting.¹

That women's adornment evokes varied images of public women, including those whose virtue arises in being assertive, and even assertively sexual, suggests critical disruptions of a masculinist imagination of war and nation. I use the terms "public women" and "virtue" with their rich registers—incorporating a public's earlier disdain and sexualization of the "public woman" and its insistence that a woman's virtue lay in her domestic confinement. Women overthrow and reinvent both concepts through active, often critical participation in wartime mobilization, con-
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tributing to numerous cultural refigurations. Building on provoc-
tative work about gender and the horrendous forms of violence
which characterize this century, my research shows that makeup
both intimates that which is to keep woman from full citizenship
and that which empowers her. 2 My probe aims less for chrono-
logical assessment than for a description of an opening in representa-
tion—or in imagining—which allows for and anticipates a far
wider, less rigid idea of the citizen. Surely war mobilization
undermines the sense of citizen as a uniformly singular and undif-
ferentiated—male, white—member of the nation at the same time
that it challenges the "restraining moral force of neighborhood
opinion," as a contemporary observer wrote. 3 The extent to which
these changes enlarge and complicate the collective imagination
needs further exploration, but in this project, because war "over-
turns—politicizes—everything," I look for a more demanding citi-
zen who does not validate the "identity-thinking inculcated by
mass media." 4

Jane Gaines's work on the wartime discourse of makeup in
Hollywood magazines links images of the glamorous woman
with exhortations about patriotic duty. Gaines finds that the
"national version of correct female sexual behavior" was as unsta-
able as the notion of women's place in wartime. "Make-up could
signify sexual laxity to community moral arbiters, while images
of prettified factory workers could symbolize women's sacrifice to
the nation." 5 I have unearthed narratives of makeup in numerous
texts of the period, primarily by American women, in particular
those less tied to advertising or outright manipulation. Fiction,
film, and memoirs often present the ambiguous import of cosmet-
ics, and with less investment in "correct female behavior," they
more frequently link makeup to agency or resistance. These
sources have drawn me to explore a larger frame of meaning for
makeup that imagines it as a politically meaningful practice of
women in World War II and allows me, in closing, to dissect some
feminist discussions of adornment.

Iris Marion Young, Genevieve Lloyd, and Joan Landes have
illuminated various signs of women's exclusion from the public
sphere, arguing women's practices must be validated in a radical-
ly democratic community. 6 And, as Hélène Cixous and Luce
Irigaray have argued with play and insight, the differences which
women draw from their experiences, a refusal to be known

---
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through phallocentric tropes, allows for different, at times subversive, narratives of power. Certainly, the familiar narratives of war, with their rigid gender codes and their overvaluation of masculinity, are ripe for redress. In recasting one thread of critical involvement and assertiveness, I expand our understanding of the complexity of this terrible, liminal period.

Throughout the war, makeup helped inscribe what Elizabeth Arden advertised as a "war face" for American women on the home front as well as in the theaters of battle. Indeed, hardly an American text, poster, advertisement, or film of the era depicts a woman without including her makeup—or connoting its meaningful absence. The government decree permitting production of cosmetics arose from an array of concerns and cannot simply be read as a means to maintain the icon of the beautiful dame. We might, for instance, counter Simone de Beauvoir's reticence to embrace adornment in The Second Sex with the experience of French résistante Jeanne Bohec, who bicycled across Brittany instructing maquis units in explosives, "somehow [finding] time to have a suit and a dress made: 'Dressing, sleeping, and eating properly are also elements of clandestine life.'" The American "war face" could also evade the "limits of ideological production" and denote instead the visage of the assertive American woman active in all spheres of the nation's mobilization. Some feminists have argued such engagement forms the postmodern frame of women's individuality.

Undoubtedly, as Karen Anderson writes, "the war . . . strengthened male socialization for aggressiveness, violence, and physical strength" and increased the "coercive" attention paid to "perceived sexual misconduct on the part of young girls and women." Susan Hartmann contends that the "war generated needs whose fulfillment strengthened traditional sex roles." Susan Gubar's foray into World War II literature reveals a "hostility" and an "intense hatred of women." I am uneasy about such austere assessments of women's lack of agency, in their public practice as well as in sexual encounters, in literary representations as well as in other texts of the period. Indeed, it is not difficult to find views that stress the alternative aspect of women's participation. Even the preeminent defender of women's "civilizing" role, Emily Post, addressed such new freedoms.
[P]rompted by her "admiration for the way women have rallied to the war effort," [Post] sent the OWI [Office of War Information] her new ruling on travel etiquette. It is both proper and patriotic for young women defense workers to thumb rides to and from work, she declared—though they should confine their talk strictly to the weather. It would be better, however, she suggested, if girls displayed their defense plant identification tags instead of the usual thumb.19

According to Elaine Tyler May, within the broader context of the nation's upheaval, "[n]ew possibilities for work, play, and sexual adventure were everywhere."16 Listening for the "double voice"17 in wartime representations, I suggest terms for reading what we have tended to dismiss. Through makeup, the markings and traces, we see women's presence intimately linked to their social and political agency.

RADICAL CITIZENSHIP

The citizen I invoke is ideally a radical democrat "committed . . . to the principle that every citizen should participate as fully as possible in the debates that shape his or her society or culture,"18 an image evident in many wartime representations. Sexual agency, I argue, is a crucial component, a "prerequisite for civic agency."9 In my fusion, then, "luminous sexuality"20 and a public, political, or critical presence constitute citizenship for women. A "good citizen" is one in whom juridical rights are ground for "authentic" public performance, as Hannah Arendt suggests, where deed and action are joined, where spontaneity, and thus differences, are affirmed in defiance of the numbing conformity which modern society condones and enables. "Good" in this sense entails not obedience but resistance, where women are accorded "status as political actors in their own right," in which "plurivocal" discourse and performance are affirmed. Iris Young argues that matters of the private sphere associated with women's desires and practices—"affectivity, affiliation, need, and the body," or as she writes elsewhere, "particularities"—have been routinely dismissed in the name of an "objective" public sphere, an idea in my mind linked to Lloyd's critique of a masculinist, Hegelian belittling of women's secondary role as "mere nature."21 These writers both offer more expansive views of citizenship. Finally, the formerly dismissed citizen can be considered instead what Woolf calls a citizen of the world.22

Contemporary observers of the American home front under-
stood that wartime's limitations on autonomy helped form an "enlarged and exalted self." But the reference generally was to men, for whom "[n]o experience is comparable to war in producing this sense of solidarity and unity." Agnes E. Meyer, Margaret Culkin Banning, and other writers championed women's role in mobilization and challenged women to be publicly involved. There was much contemporary interest in expanded definitions of citizenship, in texts ranging from Mary McCarthy's 1942 collection *The Company She Keeps* to Martha Gellhorn's prescient *A Stricken Field* (1940), Chester Hines's novel *If He Hollers Let Him Go* (1945), Gertrude Stein's *Brewsie and Willie* (1945), and Kay Boyle's 1951 collection of short stories, *The Smoking Mountain*. Women war workers demonstrated their understandable concerns with actively possessing citizenship, for example, in Josephine von Miklos's *I Took a War Job* (1943) and Elizabeth Hawes's witty *Why Women Cry, or Wrenches with Wrenches* (1943). And African American newspapers regularly linked equal rights with wartime citizenship.

Other writers downplayed this new agency: Margaret Mead wrote toward war's end that women experienced the war not in a collective sense, but rather as individuals, through the absence or the loss of the men they loved. . . . They have been asked to go on living pretty much as they did before. . . . [facing] a thousand little irritations and no big ones. Nothing has happened on the home front to mobilize all of their strength and to put petty details in their places. Because there were no big difficulties, little ones have loomed large.

The absence of bobby pins became emblematic of women's experience, serving to mollify fears about assertive women by depoliticizing them. In *The Naked and the Dead* (1947), Norman Mailer's women, who exist only in the combat soldiers' recollections, are caught in what one character decries as their "labial interpretation" of the world. Although such a term might be a bold assertion from a postmodern feminist, Mailer means no such celebration but rather that women fail to see from the worldly, and phallocentric, perspective of men. Lacking the masculinizing civic practice of going to war as soldiers, they are doomed to petty deeds and sexual manipulation, forever outside the pale of Mailer's existential vision of critical citizenship or meaning making.

Still others point to additional obstructions which served to undermine women's citizenship. We should note in particular
Miné Okubo’s memoir of internment, Citizen 13660 (1945). In addition to the strictures of race, women faced bias in other venues. Working in a California shipyard which opened its doors to women for the first time, sociologist Katherine Archibald claimed that

the ancient doctrine was never wholly abandoned. . . . I remember another captious old codger whose principal concern was the uselessness of the women and their continued preoccupation with mirror and lipstick. "Lazy and good-for-nothing, that’s what these women are," he pronounced in final judgment. "If I had had a say-so in this place, I’d fire every last one of them."27

In spite of such aversions, Leila Rupp finds that many observers acknowledged a "new woman" who exuded a "strong sense of citizenship. . . . She wore simple clothes and sensible shoes, used lipstick, powder and fixed her hair in a short, smooth, neat style, and did not indulge as much as she had before the war in coffee drinking, smoking or gossiping."28

WARTIME POLITICS OF MAKEUP

Lipstick, marking on a face's lips, the border of the mouth, suggests a visceral stamp, a trace which lasts in time. Lipstick connotes the material surfaces and lived practices of female embodiment, in this instance interacting with and echoing the physical intensity of warfare itself as well as the intricacies of wartime erotic desire. It is worn for looking good, it is worn for going out and being seen, it is worn for parties, it is worn for work; it is put on privately, at the bathroom mirror, or it is applied publicly, in restaurants and in subway cars. It disguises. Or it amplifies. It is worn for kissing, to seduce. Sometimes it is used as a writing instrument. Sometimes it gets all over things, as we find when Lee Miller writes to her Vogue editor from liberated Paris: "One film in the envelope is soaked in melted lip rouge. Be careful in handling as the grease base will make finger prints."29

Cosmetics' ties to sexual openness, to disguise, and to the politics of consumption make its history engagingly complex, especially as it crosses over between private and public activities or enhances an artificial—what we can call cosmetic—or performative mode. Murray Wax, a sociologist of the 1950s, suggests that making up is a gesture of "sociability, not of sexuality. . . . Cosmetics serve to transmute the attraction between the sexes from a raw
physical response into a civilized game." Self-creation or a dulling mimicry of what a woman is supposed to be—what lipstick signifies is far from agreed upon. Around 1915, lipstick in the United States began to be sold in cartridge containers. One historian of makeup claims the tubes' phallic shape appealed to women, but it was its relative cheapness that assured that lipstick "sold and sold." Cosmetics were not only a widespread practice of American women but also of use in displaying the "modern" woman internationally.

In the United States, it is difficult to extract a discussion of cosmetics from color and class. For example, dyes and oils were used to conceal flaws on Africans up for auction as slaves and, in this instance, to deny subjectivity to humans defined narrowly as property. Zora Neale Hurston in Color Struck (1925) and Wallace Thurman in The Blacker the Berry (1929) explore the self-destructive practices used by some African American women to meet the preference for lighter skin. To "'remove this unwelcome black mask from her face,'" Thurman's character Emma Lou "eats arsenic wafers and uses a peroxide solution, . . . [a] routine which underscores her self-hatred." As Kathy Peiss has pointed out in her pioneering study, "the cosmetics industry has historically taken discourses of class, ethnicity, race and gender . . . and displaced them onto safe rhetorical fields [including] a language of 'color' and 'type,' a rhetoric of 'naturalness,' 'expressiveness,' and 'individuality.'" She emphasizes advertisements for skin bleaches to disguise labor (that is, working women's exposure to the sun) which set Anglo-Saxon women at "the top of [a] racial hierarchy." Yet, as Peiss notes, beauty culture also provided the first opportunity for African American women to enter large-scale entrepreneurial life, involving a range of products and venues, from beauty parlors to door-to-door sales; the desire for hair products created the first Black millionaire, Madame C.J. Walker. Moreover, "the dominant culture's ascription of promiscuity to black women led them to stress the importance of looking respectable" by wearing cosmetics.

At the same time, the use of makeup complemented women's newly won rights in the United States, Germany, England, and the Soviet Union at the end of World War I. Women "bobbed their hair, donned short skirts, smoked in public, and wore heavy makeup that had formerly been the attribute of the harlot." No
doubt the incitement to cosmetics was orchestrated as "mass-mar-
ket circulation pulp journals full of Avon, Pond's, and Woodbury
ads created home markets for the products that sold feminine
attractiveness." But it is inadequate to cite only the manipulative
advertisers because women joined in creating such practices. "I
think it is important," Atina Grossmann writes, "that we begin to
look at the New Woman as a producer and not only a consumer,
as an agent constructing a new identity which was then marketed
in mass culture, even as mass culture helped to form identity." For
all its complexity, by the 1930s, makeup promised the fulfill-
ment of consumerism, modernity, and a female youthfulness
which bespoke desires for economic, social, and sexual indepen-
dence, however much these were unattainable for most women.

A national concern for makeup was announced dramatically in
December 1941, when *New York Times* fashion writer Kiley Taylor
urged women to respond to Pearl Harbor by choosing "the right
lipstick":

> Not every girl, by any means, can be a Helen of Troy, but you can never aim
too high. American women are almost the only women on earth who still have
on their dressing tables all of the little props and aides to loveliness. . . . This
Christmas of all Christmases you will want to look your prettiest. Your mouth
will be a bright inviting flash of color if you choose the right lipstick. Experts
tell you to choose one that is strong and red."

Taylor's suggestion plays to a discourse of the trivial, the absurd
persistence of practices which, as Beauvoir writes, like "fashions
to which she is enslaved[,] . . . cut [woman] off from her trans-
cendence." Yet the very "props" which sexualized and limited women
also offer as well the possibilities of visibility and assertiveness.
*Visibility* alone does not insure agency. Nevertheless, brazenness,
impudence, and courage require embodiment, and the evidence of
such agency in memoirs and fiction indicates that makeup was
a sign of an intensified sense of self during World War II.

It is not surprising, then, that the War Production Board (WPB)
chose to keep cosmetics from the list of restricted wartime indus-
tries. "The beauty industry rushed to the defense of glamour,"
aware of the $16.00 per capita spent by the average woman (com-
pared with expenditures of $21.44 for gasoline). But the question
was also one of morale. Although rubber-made girdles, silk stock-
ings, and hairpins were scarce, the manufacture of face powder,
lipstick, rouge, and deodorants continued. The WPB operated by
These Women - 1944's best dressers choose favorite Cutex Shade.

women choose Cutex than any other nail polish in the w

Advertisement for Cutex nail polish, Ladies Home Journal, August 1944.
strict enforceable restrictions and quotas, and the agency understood that good morale and interest in the war were necessary to achieve the vastly increased production needed for the American military and the Allies. As it did with many items, the WPB established controls over materials of adornment. For men, a "victory suit" was promulgated. For women, a "no fabric over fabric" rule meant "no pleats, patch pockets or full skirts, with limited use of embroidery." Military needs for rubber and nylon also restricted the manufacturing of girdles and stockings. But cosmetics, relatively cheap items available widely, were reckoned essential for women's well being and thus were not added to the list of rationed items, even though made from petrochemicals and dyes. Ways were found to maintain makeup production even when metal packaging had to be redirected to war service. Revlon's lipstick, for example, was bound in plastic and finally in paper. Advertisers such as Hold-Pin Bobs assured the public: "Beauty is her badge of courage. . . . It's a tonic to the war-torn nerves of those around her." The results [of surveys] indicated that women would practically collapse," Mercedes Rosebery writes, "if deprived of face powder; that they could be brave only if allowed, in addition, their lipstick, rouge, face creams, and deodorants. The negro women (another survey revealed) could be brave only if they were permitted hair straightener and bleach cream." A WPB spokesman offered a telling rationale for continued production: cosmetics enabled American woman's "resultant vivacious spirit, self-confidence and geniality, [which] being infectious, to be transmitted directly to the male members of the family." This odd language draws a fine line between infectious sexuality and sexual infection, a tension which persists through the war: while the assertive and sexually evocative woman is required in wartime, her sister, the sexually independent woman, is maligned for being an enemy who transmits venereal disease to the male member.

The promotion of "war paint" in its nonmilitary sense was common across race and class lines. For example, advertisements for face creams, skin lighteners, hair straighteners, and face powders clutter the weekly Pittsburgh Courier in 1943. "Life Is Brighter When Skin Is Lighter!" claims Nadinola Bleaching Cream. Sweet Georgia Brown offered Hair Dressing Pomade for women and men, and Be-Smart Products advertised a product which "Lightens Dark Outer Skin." These joined sundry other ads directed at a
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race audience—notices for hotels, a sprinkling of help wanted and clothing ads. While giving consistent attention to the Jim Crow army, such as quoting a British woman who noted that the American "military encouraged racism in Europe," the Pittsburgh Courier at the same time showed a people unhesitatingly part of the war effort—respectable, attractive, and modern as any Americans.

Still it was the "woman in the factory" who dominated the public media, testifying to the nation's need for women workers. In February 1942, Life's Picture of the Week featured thirty widows of American sailors killed at Pearl Harbor "piling on a bus [to] report for work at a West Coast aircraft factory." Such news linked bereaved women to a great collective sacrifice. Numerous other images suggested that underneath that rough welding mask lay a carefully coiffed woman whose femininity remained intact despite the national upheaval. Filmmaker Connie Field and others have documented the alignment of formerly feminine, domestic tasks with rigorous albeit temporary factory work. To this extent, makeup, like the gesture of actress Veronica Lake who cut her bangs to promote factory safety, ratified a qualified, conditional citizenship for the duration, with the props of prewar femininity kept intact.

Tangee Lipstick's "War, Women, and Lipstick" ad wove the "right to be feminine and lovely" into commercial propaganda, but such ads obviously reflected women's sense of independence and require us to understand that power does not have a single originary source. Although some images glamorized industrial work in this way, the efforts of women to work in factories and shipyards created what Melissa Dabakis calls an "uneasy space for women." Glowing accounts existed alongside rumors of loose women in the factories and "coexisted . . . with pin-ups," replaying the virgin/whore dichotomy that has informed women's exclusion from public life. At times women's new independence attracted open hostility. Katherine Archibald reported that nail polish and lipstick were forcibly removed.

One . . . minor potentate, whose wife, it was said, complained about the temptations to which he was subjected in the dissolute shipyards, went about among the girls of his jurisdiction with a bottle of acetone and a handkerchief, and forced them to remove their nail polish and lipstick, under penalty of his displeasure.
The Moore Shipyard management decided to address the underlying concern about female sexuality, finding compliant women to enforce the standards.

The management issued strict rules to govern the dress of shipyard women—rules based fully as much on the principles of concealment and sexless propriety as on the purported aims of safety. Women guards stalked vigilantly through the warehouses, the workshops, and the rest rooms, looking for the coy curl unconfined by a bandana, the bejeweled hand, and the revealing sweater.46

Karen Anderson documents arrests of single women as fears mushroomed about mannish and promiscuous WACs (members of the Women's Army Corps), and rumors flew about "Eleanor Clubs" through which Black domestics were said to organize against their white employers.47 Social workers and others were alarmed about the "victory girl," alarmed about her blatant role in the "sex epidemic . . . which infects the whole community."48 Office of War Information recommendations to magazine editors indicated an unease about women's sexual or otherwise nontraditional mobilization: sexual encounters in fictional portrayals of middle-class women were discouraged although encouraged, or at least allowed, as murky plot entanglements for working-class women.49

In spite of the complex tensions, images of the made-up and well-coiffed woman persisted. Posters addressing women at work—for example, ordinance workers, the women behind the men with the guns—are hardly distinguishable in their representations from the more "classless" images used for luring women into the WACs, nursing corps, or Red Cross. Although there may have been some intent to soothe the fears of a public concerned about women's expanding roles, such images also spoke to women's empowered sense of themselves. Furthermore, the posters countered images of the male body as the "arena of public authority," empowering women engaged in mobilization, whether it was flying an airplane or traveling to unknown parts with two small children in search of work and housing.50

The mass emphasis on masculinity, whether in soldiering or soldering, was often at odds with women's practical experience. In a great many homes the swarthy protector was gone, and numerous images and texts expanded the vocabulary of virtue for women, such as the production worker or the take-charge
woman who confronts difficulties in the absence of a man. As Elizabeth Hawes advised her readers:

Just wear anything you have on hand which is comfortable and in which you can most efficiently get your work done. . . . If your long fingernails break, cut them off. If high heels make you unhealthy (which they do), don't wear them. . . . You will probably wear slacks to make sure your stockings don't get snagged by the tin cans.  

There was, undoubtedly, conflation of state-directed propaganda, advertising interests, and women's own assertiveness. My interest is not so much in extricating these complex locations of femininity/gender as in showing that the cultural moment is itself complex. In such details one reads the ideological effects of gendered practices, yet the validity of seeing "morale" through such details—women's access to pleasure, to self-fashioning, and how they imagined themselves in the cause they were engaged in—should not be overlooked.

The national luster of cosmetics may have increased in contrast to the National Socialists' severe prejudices against such artifice. Both the United States and Germany upheld conventional views about women's primary importance as mothers and housewives. But while national identity in the United States permitted a more independent woman, the Nazis made the mother/wife image central to their vision, a woman stripped of as much overt sexuality as possible. The composite of a natural/national woman was embodied in a Germanic type, dredged up from a mythic past, beautiful and fecund, celebrated within the confines of a nearly asexual nationalist respectability. The cosmopolitan Hollywood-influenced woman set an independent course; her explicit refusal to be mastered by a man portended her refusal to submit to the will of the state.

The New Woman of Weimar Germany and of the West—with shorter skirt and cosmetics—was singled out as particularly detrimental to national morality and well-being. As for clothing, the Nazis "condemned the foreign influences—of Paris and the United States—which, they claimed, had encouraged German women to adopt a style of dressing that was either frivolous or else an imitation of men's clothes, and was in any case decadent and not conducive to a healthy rate of population growth." Smoking too was discouraged, as champions of the nation and racial purity blamed that "German women do not smoke." The National Socialists
chose to downplay images that too closely linked German women to other Europeans. "[E]dics were issued castigating and ridiculing women who 'shave their eyebrows, use rouge, dye their hair' in an altogether foreign manner. . . . 'For good health the javelin or the pole-vault are of more value than lipstick.' This attitude was vociferously enforced; zealous Nazis accosted women in the street and wiped their cosmetics away. A Jewish woman in Hamburg wrote in her diary that she was told to remove her makeup because 'German women do not wear lipstick.' She replied, bravely mocking the new category of "German women" from which she was now brutally excluded: 'I am not German, I'm Jewish.' Another woman recounted how racialized policies were linked to women:

"Women under Hitler, that was something completely dreadful. A German woman does not wear makeup, she may not smoke, she should have a thousand children. . . . [sic] Ach, that still brings a chill to my spine'. . . . And everything having "a tone of physical desire," she said with increasing anger, "was called 'Jewish piggishness'. . . . It was dreadful." In contrast, the U.S. press offered one-dimensional praise of American cosmetics in the fashion pages, harping on the Allies' resilience. British women were said to respond inventively to bombing raids, finding in them the opportunity to ratify their femininity: a chemist for Dorothy Grey Cosmetics Ltd. bragged in January 1942 that "London members of the Women's Auxiliary Forces take time out after bombing raids to reapply their lipstick and remove the shine from their noses before they tackle their other tasks." Such romanticized images reflected a genuine desire but also signified a national concern. "The worst shortage for most women was of good brands of lipstick. . . . 'One needed that lipstick to show one's flag was flying,'" recalled one woman. The Soviets, too, were deemed makeup fans. Eager to show that the Soviet Union embraced morale building tied to femininity, screenwriter Howard Koch added a cosmetics store to his script Mission to Moscow (1943). Even before the United States joined the war, the New York Times reported Axis fashion shortages with zeal. In March 1941, they announced "Vichy Has Lip-Stick Rush as Women Fear Rationing." In this case, unfulfilled desire could only indict the bankruptcy of the Vichy regime. Note the reversal as well: where the traditional conventions about a woman's appetite for cosmet-
ics had been linked to an unruly and unreasoning behavior held tenuously in check, it was now suggested that lipstick unrufulness can usher in resistance to the "reasonable"—read ruthless—control of the pro-Nazi Vichy government.

In June 1942, United Press correspondents Eleanor Packard and Jack Fleischer, recently returned from Europe, reported on the dour beauty scene in Italy and Germany: "Italy Aids Women to Keep Looks While Nazis Impose Dowdiness." The first dispatch noted that "women in Italy are encouraged to keep themselves attractive to the menfolk—though the means at their disposal is limited." At the same time, a "more babies" campaign included special allotments of linen to newlyweds: "sheets for twin beds are not permitted." That the Italian state penetrated and enforced the bridal bed was insinuated, as was the state's rigid regulation of dress codes, which extended to a ban on the wearing of mourning clothes. Thus we see a rearrangement of personal symbols and rituals in the interests of the fascist state. Efforts to maintain "the maximum of chic" were pursued within conventional gender rules which had loosened in the United States: "slacks . . . are strictly forbidden. Pants are the exclusive prerogative of the male. Through all this," the article continued, "lipstick of bad quality is plentiful." By its immediate vicinity to slacks, lipstick was made the exclusive prerogative of the female, which the Italian Fascist state could supply only badly.

"Almost no cosmetics can be bought in Germany," the second dispatch announced. Indeed, Germans existed "without Beauty." Their wartime environment was "unrelieved by even the simple pleasure of dancing or having a few friends in for tea." Statistics showed vast numbers of German women moving into the work force, a figure capped with the statement that "[p]leasure is virtually unknown to the German woman." It was argued that women themselves had lost their glow. To a reader sensitive to the link between a woman's vanity and male morale, such a description is in fact telling of the German home front's despair, bleak news meant to warm the American audience. "The clothing ration and an almost complete absence of cosmetics and toilet articles make it impossible for her to look attractive," the writer continued. "She can still buy face powder, but lipstick, fingernail polish, perfumes have virtually disappeared, now that the loot from France and the Low Countries is exhausted." I emphasize words meant to impress
upon the reader the totality of this situation, and the superior strength of the United States in everything from makeup to beautiful women to material goods.

The article perches above another "woman's article" on "The Beauty Quest," on a page which gloats over the goods available for the unchecked bent for adornment.\textsuperscript{59} I do not want to underplay the ordeal women faced in being counted fully as citizens, nor can we substitute these articles for full and meaningful accounts about wartime contributions; newspapers still generally ghettoized women's activities. Makeup tips, formulas for leg cosmetics to substitute for silk stockings, and new hats ran alongside articles about menu planning, room decorating, and the like, as if this constituted legitimate news of women's wartime participation. Furthermore, the line between advertising and analysis could be annoyingly thin. For example, a July 1944\textit{New York Times} article "Women of Britain Facing a Long Wait for Adequate Supplies of Cosmetics," turns to an executive of Yardley Ltd. to honor the "ingenuity of English women in stretching those cosmetics available." Another "news" article was also a shill for cosmetic manufacturers: "Women Overseas to Get Cosmetics," Martha Parker reports. The article, however, merely announced suggestions "by cosmetic houses" that cosmetics can and should be sent to supplement PX (Post Exchange) supplies for women in theaters of war.\textsuperscript{60} But more complex signs of women's independence and assertiveness lay embedded in this triviality.

**Narratives of Makeup**

As writers from Virginia Woolf to Robert J. Lifton have accurately decried, women in wartime have often served only to reflect men's glory and military might.\textsuperscript{61} This sentiment may have been what drove Pvt. Paul Fierros to write the Army's \textit{Yank}, objecting to the photograph of a woman munitions tester which had appeared in a previous issue. He seemed more concerned that this "super-gal stuff" in \textit{Yank}'s "Gals behind the Guns" was a sign that the U.S. Army newspaper was trying to "pull a Hitler on us." \textit{Yank} took such criticism seriously and stopped portraying "gun molls" in favor of more sexualized images. A January 1945 edition for men in the Pacific, for example, devoted its front cover to a WAVE (Women Accepted for Voluntary Emergency Service) applying
makeup, her nail-polished fingers holding her compact, her mouth open yet silent. This image restored "proper" gender rules, diminishing makeup to its sexualizing powers, and echoing anxiety about the abilities of female members of the service. In a House of Representatives debate over the formation of a woman's naval auxiliary, Representative Beverly M. Vincent of Kentucky announced that "the whole thing is ridiculous." Women, he insisted, were more experienced at "putting on lipstick and looking in mirrors."

A look at representations in fiction, film, and memoirs, however, reveals that putting on lipstick did not insure that women longed to submit to prewar behavior. Two brief lipstick events suggest its role in marking agency internationally. In her July 1942 diary, Russian poet Vera Imber records her flight to the city of Christopol on a tiny "U.z." Conscious of her privileges as a member of the Leningrad Writers Union, she writes: "I tried to give my pilot cigarettes, but it seemed she didn't smoke. I offered half a bottle of good red wine, but no, she didn't drink, either. Then after a short hesitation I pulled out a new lipstick, and this my pilot could not resist. Smiling and embarrassed, she took it." The exchange evokes not only female competency but also female appetite, both of which complement women's vital participation.

In 1944, at the liberation of Paris, elated women covered American soldiers with lipsticked kisses, wearing their precious remainders of cosmetics for this day. Women, in so marking soldiers, became "meaning makers," joining in the "writing" of liberation.

In _Helmetes and Lipstick_ (1944), Ruth Haskell, a lieutenant in the Army Nursing Corps, offers an account of overseas nursing which she hoped might attract women to the military. At first, one might think she proposed an unproblematic place for women in the public arena. Yet, while hardly a "volcanic" text in Cixous's sense, Haskell evokes an affiliation to the nation that displaces the concept of republican motherhood, where women's service to the nation consists of instructing their children in patriotic practices. Indeed, a divorcée, Haskell leaves her young son behind to join Uncle Sam.

The somewhat oxymoronic title implies an intrusion into what John Costello has called the "the world of ritualized masculinity" where soldiers "regard their weapons as extensions of their virility." Both words are needed in the fashioning of this military nurse, the helmet crucial to protection, and the lipstick to particu-
"8:30 A.M. Dinner is served for the night shift." Advertisement for Libbey Safedge Glassware, with women defense workers wearing nail polish and lipstick, *Ladies Home Journal*, August 1944.
larize, to lessen her loss of autonomy, and to enable a self-awareness in her daily existence in the theater of war. In this sense lipstick is not only the widely addressed morale booster but also a sign of the writing woman, writing herself. That "split subjectivity" which Mary Ann Doane finds when the wartime factory woman faces being both the "masculinized worker and the embodiment of femininity" recurs in this context. But lipstick might also help to redress what Doane identifies as a woman's problematic access to the signifier/phallus, where "she finds herself in a kind of signifying limbo." The fact that lipstick goes on the lips, and that lips also denote labia, suggests a devaluation of the phallic signifier.

Christmas in Arzeu, Algeria, in 1942 finds the nurses exhausted and lonely, shaken by bombardments and grisly battles nearby. When the folks back home send seemingly impractical gifts of cosmetics and perfume, and little else, the nurses are unmoved until they realize the value of such packages. With plain honesty Haskell insists "if I should ever stop using make-up there would be nothing left of my morale. A fresh application of lipstick, my helmet at a jaunty angle, and I was ready for anything." Her sister nurses concur.

The military attempted to enforce contradictory rules regarding makeup for women volunteers. Eager to dispel images of the soft, self-absorbed woman and to counter derisive apppellations such as "Fort Lipstick," U.S. Army officials insisted that the Women's Army Corps was "no picnic for glamour girls." Although both the army and navy encouraged women to wear light makeup, red nail polish or too-bright a lipstick could earn an infraction. Yet makeup might help establish a sense of identity in the face of army-issued girdles, stockings, slips, and bras—all, at least initially, khaki colored. The WAC uniform, designed by Dorothy Shaver of Lord and Taylor, was aimed at enticing women into service, to create identity within the organization, and to convey as well an ideological position of Woman as demure and attentive to her appearance. It was hoped that these efforts might also quell the public's fears of "loose" or "mannish" female soldiers.

A significant amount of Haskell's text addresses dancing, preparations for dating, and so forth. Haskell does not emphasize the hard work attending bloody wounds, dismembered bodies, or screaming G.I.'s, but rather shares experiences of a more benign
military culture where a sexual life is thinly implied. Thus she undermines presuppositions about women's behavior, newly ratified by lipstick. Nurse Millie's perfume, "Indiscreet," for example, evokes the new permissibility of indiscretions. Haskell's dating discourse offers a genteel parallel to men's wartime texts where carousing and whoring help constitute the soldiers' narrative and inform their identity. Yet we must assume that military women were less free to gain this experience, if not averse to painting it openly in autobiography, in the face of steep hostility. In 1943, a "nationwide underground slander campaign, tainting all women soldiers as promiscuous," was deemed serious enough for the FBI to investigate. The FBI attributed the rumors to service men in particular.

In the face of such hostility, the nurses' sense of themselves, informed by shared concerns, increasingly gives license to differences which constructed the "individualities" Cixous honors. Even during their training in England, Haskell marked the rupture by noting changes in the collective sense of corporeal propriety as well as a change in her sense of her own body:

Gone were the days when a gal went modestly into the shower in a robe and pulled a curtain protectingly across while she scrubbed herself. After the supper meal those of us who were going to the party tore across the road and undressed in the cold of that unheated building, piled clothes on the floor, and ducked under the shower at once.

Here, as they "stood around and washed each others' backs," the women talked. Eager to be naked together, conscious of having embarked on new practices, they shared the pleasure of the shower, of touching and talking--practices which have since become central in the feminist vision of openness, intimacy, and engagement. However one reads this scene, as a sign of same-sex affection or as preparation for heterosexual pleasures, it is outside the frame of marriage. "I don't cotton to married men," one nurse insisted. "What the heck,' picked up Ginny Ayers. 'We aren't planning on marrying any of them"' Ginny had adopted the attitude of pleasure commonly associated with the sexual rites of the masculine soldier.

"All of them had been good soldiers," Haskell notes of her comrades, although "[c]urls popped out from under helmets, [and] lips shone with lipstick of various hues." The nurses thus evade the helmet's power to define them as citizen soldiers for whom gender is transcended. Gender was in fact crucial in their consid-
eration of citizenship and national identity. Stepping forward as "Americans," as Uncle Sam's nieces (as Haskell claims in her dedication) in the sororal/fraternal state, they have the quality of anonymity which Cixous has noted but embody "individualities" as well in the variety of their colors and scents. The voices the women adopt are their own, frequently in contrast to masculine expectations. As the nurse Louise summarizes, "'Africa has done much for me. My boy friend won't know me!'" Louise recognizes her revised self as no longer tied to her boyfriend's earlier view. She now evokes Mary McCarthy's sexually and politically inquisitive Margaret Sargent, who borrows the words of Chaucer's Criseyde, "'I am myn owene woman, wel at ese.'"81

One reads of American women on the home front who mourned the loss of their girdles to rubber rationing and stormed department stores for silk stockings, actions which seem myopically disconnected to the agony of women from Nanking to Vilna.82 However, many texts honor this aspect of self-attention as a part of the war effort, a factor in the complicated construction of independence and agency. Such women anticipate, in part, Cixous's woman who "must put herself into the text—as into the world and into history—by her own movement."83 She is sexual, rather than being sexualized, anticipating Luce Irigaray's call for a constant "luminous sexuality," where makeup may or may not play a role as long as it does not "make us disappear." Her celebration of self-involvement in lips—highlighted by lipstick—and their dynamic motion honors and indulges the female body.84

Two wartime films present the radical lipsticked women—one situated in Europe before the United States entered the war, one on the home front after the U.S. entry. Arise, My Love (1940), with its witty screenplay by Berlin émigré Billy Wilder and his collaborator Charles Brackett, and Saboteur (1942), directed by Alfred Hitchcock,85 bring forth critical citizens. Each film features a dashing and contrary male character whose willful independence is wielded in the service of antifascism and the war effort, but the female characters in this hypermasculine moment also deserve attention. Both reporter Augusta Nash (Claudette Colbert) and the fashion model Patricia (Priscilla Lane) represent resistant women claiming civic involvement and independence as women, sexually as well as socially. Neither abandons those "tools" of femininity, such as lipstick, but rather asserts their significance as signifiers of sexuality and voice.
Arise, My Love mixes love and politics in Europ as war breaks. Reporter Augusta/Gusto tries to stop herself from falling in love with American flier Tom Martin (Ray Milland). At first, Nash finds that love interferes with the career she eagerly seeks. "I want my mind free," she insists. Yet the freedom of Europe and the world is at stake, and even as she falls in love with Tom, which draws her toward the buzz of domesticity, it becomes clear that she cannot evade her role as a critical witness to Nazi brutalities. At the opening, Gusto reveals her guts by rescuing Tom from his executioners at the end of the Spanish Civil War by pretending she is his wife. In flight from Franco's soldiers, she shows Tom the ring worn for the performance: "This is all the makeup I need." It becomes clear later that this has been a dress rehearsal for a more defiant moment of makeup, in the penultimate scene with Hitler's adjutant at France's surrender in June 1939. "You will have to remove your lip rouge," the officer insists. "Don't worry," she snaps, "my lips will be as white as chalk." This self-conscious and defiant transformation, from red to white lips, both signifies and informs her fearless resolve. The narcissistic "career woman" becomes resilient actor against the ongoing horrors of war—an actor now not in the sense of performing but in urging preparation for the inevitable, and politically necessary war. "Arise, my love," Gusto says, echoing Tom during their flight from Spain. This phrase from Song of Solomon introduces the Hebrew Scripture's celebration of male and female corporeal passion. At film's end, Gusto has taken up the discourses of freedom and eros.

Although Wilder and Brackett's film could handle a distant war with humor and panache, Saboteur tells a tale more threatening to a home front audience, that of an airplane factory worker whose friend has been killed in a saboteur's explosion. The tension between anonymity and recognition is played out in a number of ways in this patriotic but politically critical film. Barry Kane (Robert Cummings), mistakenly thought to be the saboteur, goes underground in a thrilling pursuit of justice, seeking to clear his name and expose a Fascist fifth column inside the United States. In his pursuit, Kane is forced to unite with a woman who for a good part of the movie hardly believes him. When at last convinced that a Nazi ring is victimizing Barry, Patricia adopts his cause and helps catch the saboteurs. In a low-key but exhilarating moment, she uses her lipstick as a pen, writing a note to be dropped out a
skyscraper window to free herself from their imprisonment. Liberated with the aid of lipstick, she then tails fifth columnist Fry (Norman Lloyd) to the Statue of Liberty, a prelude to the dramatic climax where he drops to his death from the statue’s arm.

Consistently, Hitchcock’s narratives subvert the viewers’ expectations of seemingly conventional scenes. The seeds of his critical vision are evident in Saboteur’s opening image where a counter girl at the airplane factory holds compact and lipstick. The shot seems to yield the conventional perspective on women. Yet as Saboteur unfolds, Hitchcock reveals an adept woman, whose lipstick is instrumental both in her own liberation and in the contested political realm. "You look like a saboteur," Pat tells Kane in an early encounter, one of numerous signals to the audience that appearances are not to be trusted. A professional model, single and enterprising, Patricia enters the film as the corporate version of the New Woman, representing the sex/gender system’s semi-disguised discipline of femininity. Initially, she is obedient to the fraternal state and its instruments of power—the radio and police—behaving as a "model citizen"; yet the interrogation of this term lies at the heart of the film. Her ensuing experiences undermine this obedient stance and illuminate the value of a critical citizen. Both Pat and Augusta not only forge trust with their male counterparts but, more crucially, engage in self-transformation as well. Lipstick in each film highlights inventive self-awareness, joining personal identity with an anti-Fascist defiance and, for Hitchcock, an anti-authoritarianism necessary in the United States as well.

In her fiction, Ann Petry also determinedly counters authoritarianism, depicting not only the rampant discrimination endured by the Black community but also the sordid power men wield over women. In both zones, she imagines resistance. Having developed the trope of lipstick in her earlier wartime story, "Like a Winding Sheet," where lipstick becomes the focal point of a brutal wifebeating, Petry uses it again in "In Darkness and Confusion." Here, young Annie May embodies the contradictory signs of cosmetics for African American women in a community where violence is not confined to the war zones.

The central male character, her uncle, William Jones, is a porter in a drugstore where he observes teen life:

A little after eleven o'clock three young girls came in. "Cokes," they said, and climbed up on the stools in front of the fountain. William was placing new
stock on the shelves and he studied them from the top of the ladder. As far as he could see, they looked exactly alike. All three of them. And like Annie May. Too thin. Too much lipstick. Their dresses were too short and too tight.

William’s fear about his soldier son’s long silence is juxtaposed to his growing alarm about his niece, who seems as sexually carefree as these girls. At the story’s end however, Petry suggests that “too much lipstick” challenges one’s exclusion from the world. At first, the traces of her lipstick and perfume seem to seal the communal powerlessness of African Americans, as if the fate of the race is tied to women’s virtue, an idea common in masculinist visions of national formation and identity. The scene at the soda fountain only adds to William’s unease:

He knew, too, that she didn’t earn enough money to pay for all the cheap, bright colored dresses she was forever buying. . . . Her girl friends looked just like her and just like all these girls. He’d seen her coming out of the movie houses on 125th Street with two or three of them. They were all chewing gum and they nudged each other and talked too loud and laughed too loud. They stared hard at every man who went past them.90

William’s fears reflect those felt throughout Black communities that young women were “vulnerable to moral perils” which soldiers might offer.91 Gretchen Lemke-Santangelo reports, however, that Black women saw things differently as they gained an "enhanced sense of self-sufficiency and independence" in the boom of mobilization. For them, "traditional gender roles could feel stifling." The war gave Black women greater "social permission" to work and to play. Yet for Annie May, the effects of the "state-sanctioned importance of women’s labor" are dim, as she moves between marginal jobs.92

To an extent, the drugstore girls’ dresses and lipstick blare their membership in the national community, celebrated in wartime advertising. Robin Kelley focuses on the role of zoot suits, but surely these teenage girls, too, "reinforce a sense of collectivity as well as individuality."93 They exhibit their own performance of a patriotic stance, a "patriotism" otherwise so uniform that it disavows or attempts to contain deviation. Their attire, to borrow Kelley’s phrase, "collapse[s] status distinctions between themselves and their oppressors." Their lipstick also marks an unstable/unruly female identity, suggesting public, sexual young women, for the drugstore was the oft-cited site to pick up victory girls. The girls' "staring" at men shows their active presence, their re-
fusal to accept the passive roles assigned them by Black men and white society.

Labeling Annie May a "Jezebel," William is at first blind to any merits in this kind of unruliness. Then the Harlem riot of July 1943 breaks out, drawing in William, his wife, Pink, and their niece. As Annie May breaks a plate glass window and dismembers a white dummy, her fiery stance reveals that she is not what either Black men or white nation has supposed. Even as she wears lipstick and short dresses, she revises the concept of "public woman." She challenges a symbol of universal and passive female beauty in the shape of the window dummy, literally rupturing the dummy's silenced/passive/racialized version of the "model citizen." Like oppositional zoot suiters, Annie May emerges as a disorderly woman whose disturbing appearance must now be read as disturbing the pillars of racism and the sex/gender system.

DIFFERENCES IN FEMINISM

My argument is specific to World War II, for after the war make-up absorbed and transmitted different connotations as images of sexualized women coexisted with an increased domesticity and a new premium on femininity and maternity. But this postwar meaning too has evolved; new claims to self-presentation and sexual assertiveness arose, not accidentally, in the wake of two decades of feminism. My sense of this shape shifting makes it even more necessary to understand a more complex World War II woman who has been painted over. Instructed in the troubling connection between subjugation and carnal lust, feminism grapples still with how to read women's agencies and desires. The extent to which makeup itself is an aspect of modernity's hostility toward female desire should be weighed. An ambivalence toward modernity—and even about our own agency—among those of us coming of age in the 1960s as well as postmodern quarrels over the very possibility of a singular or self-willed subject should not be discounted. Quite dramatically, we see the fear of modern women's presence magnified by perfume or cosmetics throughout the century. In one of high modernism's most canonical texts, The Waste Land (1922), T. S. Eliot bemoans the oppressive "strange synthetic perfumes, / Unguent, powdered, or liquid—troubled, confused" which illustrate both social and gender disorders.
Annie May's working-class uncle shares such anxiety, pained by her "lips . . . heavily coated with lipstick." But in Petry's radical vision, lipstick denotes a Black woman who comes and goes with a sense of her own presence, who will relinquish her ambivalent and ambiguous national position neither in the name of an ineffective or destructive patriotism nor in the name of a submissive Black nationalism. Ruth Haskell, Saboteur's Patricia, and Arise My Love's Augusta Nash anticipate Iris Marion Young's heterogeneous public, a public which can accept differences enacted when "desire, affectivity and the body" are incorporated into the realm of reason. Desire, registered in Annie May's lipstick and riotous presence, is not denigrated in the name of "impartiality" but rather helps incorporate even incongruous partialities.

Sandra Bartky cautions that a "fashion-beauty complex" systematically organizes women's self-adornment through a "vast system of corporations . . . of emblematic public personages and sets of techniques and procedures" with the effect that women are both limited and limit themselves to an infantile, alienated self-involvement preventing self-conscious subjectivity. Bartky effectively challenges Foucault's failure to address gender, but her view that makeup is linked solely to the limiting and trivial "production of docile bodies" leaves little room for women's agency in arousing or performing various kinds of roles. Rather, women are only "fooled and taken in by such practices." Certainly, much of World War II reveals the drastic effects of power, and by war's end, Americans confronted a radically strengthened apparatus of manipulation and surveillance. But to consider women's assertion of sexuality and to counter the idea of a female "lack" indicates a different terrain. Irigaray's celebration of female anatomy/sexuality offers such an approach. Jane Gaines argues that critiques such as Bartky's are overly moralistic and antipleasure. It is possible, instead, to reclaim female "indulgences" and turn them into powers. Similarly, Elizabeth Wilson seeks to rescue feminism from a "refusal of the body," and Carol Ascher argues that "self-decoration" may provide "women a sense of potency to act in the world."

In this light, Ascher and Wilson offer a means to reexamine the United States in wartime: made-up women may have imagined themselves as potent and sexual beings. Irigaray also emphasizes the performativity of such gestures, suggesting self-invention through makeup: "One must assume the feminine role deliberate-
ly. Which means already to convert a form of subordination into an affirmation." While Irigaray is referring to the "feminine in the language," her emphasis on play and visibility are crucial to my argument. Even in wartime, this play and visibility are necessary moments to embrace, when women assert themselves, critically and as sexual beings, into the body politic. Although makeup may have been intended by government officials to be a morale booster evoking a time before the intrusion of war, it nevertheless endorsed women's self-fashioned presence and inscribed them, however fragmentarily or provocatively, into a historical moment where public passion and individual deeds came together. Fascist ideology directed women to cling to supposedly timeless practices of femininity which endorsed another kind of public passion aimed at their own political silencing. American culture for this brief period permitted and/or had to accept practices associated with modernity and independence, encouraging the complexity of cosmetics as a component of this vital public woman. Marks of desire, like marks of political presence, are extremely important, for they are, as Doane notes, "crucial in the assumption of the position of speaking subject," in many incarnations.101

I do not wish to suggest the neat equation that lipstick for women is the equivalent to the uniform for men during World War II. Numerous texts referred to here point to contradictory registers. Furthermore, women are not "equal" to men with their "parallel" equipment, for the state and other apparatuses of power limit and contain woman's meaning and value. Lipstick does not solve the problem of a single-sex army, of the hypermasculinization of World War II culture, or of misogyny— but, like Pat's markings on a scrap of cardboard, it shows us that women have been enacting and writing vibrant, sometimes different, narratives.

Let us reconsider the woman's mouth which "will be a bright inviting flash of color," Kiley Taylor's December 1941 entreaty. It indicates in effect not a transcendence, Beauvoir's problematic urge in The Second Sex, but a female embodiment and virtue which may differ from a man's but similarly helps to mark her position in the nation as an existential risk taker. Certainly, such a cosmetic image alone cannot herald this citizen of the world. But, as I have shown, a radical revision of instrumentality, a different concept of self-fashioning with a vocal and at times openly sexual presence enables new configurations. This is especially true at a
time when not only the bloodbath of war but also the threat to "democracy . . . within our own personal attitudes and within our own institutions" both magnified and numbed the human imagination. Women were not so easily enslaved or contained. Numerous representations of women in this gulf affirmed presence and agency, voice and assertion, aspects of a more radical civic virtue and visibility.

NOTES

This article is part of a larger project entitled "Loose Lips Sink Ships: Women, Citizenship, and Sexuality in Wartime Culture." I am indebted to the editors of Feminist Studies for their insight and encouragement concerning earlier drafts. I am thankful for the warm support of colleagues and friends who have read earlier versions or offered vital suggestions and answers to my questions: John Brenkman, Jane Marcus, Blanche Wiesen Cook, Marion Kaplan, Nancy Berke, Barbara Bowen, Jody Bresnanah, Cheryl Fish, and Shuang Shen, as well as to the antiwar warrior I shared half my life with, Skip, and to my unquestionably insightful/inciteful children, Molly and Joe Delano.


7. See, for example, selections from Hélène Cixous and Luce Irigaray’s essays in *New French Feminisms*, ed. Elaine Marks and Isabelle de Courtivron (New York: Schocken, 1981).


9. See, for example, "More Nurses Needed: U.S. Army Nurses Corps," National Archives Still Pictures 44-PA-205, National Archives, Washington, D.C.


15. Mercedes Rosebery, *This Day’s Madness, A Story of the American People against the Background of the War Effort* (New York: Macmillan, 1944), 199.


18. Berube, 79.
22. ”As a women, as an outsider,” writes Virginia Woolf on the verge of the Second World War, ”I have no country. As a woman I want no country. As a woman, my country is the whole world” (Three Guineas, 108, 109).
27. ”March on Washington Committee Sends Odd Card,” Pittsburgh Courier, 6 Mar. 1943, 16. Artist Miné Okubo’s is the first of an important group of women’s memoirs from the Japanese American internment camps. See Katherine Archibald, Wartime Shipyard: A Study in Social Disunity (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1947), 26-7; Costello, 175.
32. Kathy Peiss, ”Making Faces: The Cosmetics Industry and the Cultural Construction of Gender, 1890-1930,” Genders 7 (March 1990): 164 (with reference to Gwendolyn Robinson’s work). The references to Hurston and Thurman are found in Trudier Harris,
34. Atina Grossmann, "Girlkultur," in When Biology Became Destiny, 64.
81. Wartime business was good for cosmetics companies. Coty and Estée Lauder got their start.
38. Rosebery, 90, 86-87. The War Production Board spokesman is quoted in Renov, 19, and Richard Lingeman, Don't You Know There's a War On? (New York: Putnam, 1965), 122-23. The WPB's Chicago representative was addressing an association of hairdressers and cosmetologists, fall 1942, when he heralded the "vivacious" powers of women (Rosebery, 87).
40. Rupp, 143.
42. Lingeman, 158; Hartmann, The Home Front and Beyond, 195.
43. This is Anne McClintock's view in Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Context (New York: Routledge, 1995), 15.
45. See Archibald's chapter on women shipyard workers in Wartime Diary. See also "Sex in the Factory," Time, 12 Sept. 1943, 21, Business Week's findings that a high percentage of women workers were prostitutes, 9 Jan. 1943, in Rupp, 152 n.30, 34; Kesselman, 148 n.88.
47. Anderson, 106. Hartmann, The Home Front and Beyond, 39-40. Doris Kearns Goodwin, No Ordinary Time: Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt: The Home Front in World War II (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 370-71. See also Lingeman, 165; Lee Kennett. For the Duration, America at War, 1941-1943 (New York: Scribners, 1985), 198. Factories were the cite of frequent, and complex, race and gender antagonism. See, for example, "Ford Strike Stops Output of B-52s" on a walkout in protest of the disciplining of a white worker who hung a noose over a Black worker's station after he talked with a white woman (New York Times, 16 July 1944, 25). Such a conflict, between Bob Jones and Madge, is central to the twisted plot of Hine's If He Hollers Let Him Go.
49. Honey, 137, 154.
51. Elizabeth Hawes, "Let's Ration the Clothes Problem," Independent Woman 21
57. Quoted in Norman Longmate, "Best Face Forward," in How We Lived Then: A History of Everyday Life during World War II (London: Hutchinson, 1974), 287. In some texts of the period, lipstick became a code word for gendered ingenuity and perseverance, even if makeup itself was not discussed. See, for example, Elsie Danenberg, Blood, Sweat, and Lipstick (New York: Greenberg, 1945), with no mention of lipstick.
63. Beverly M. Vincent, quoted in Rosebery, 82. President Roosevelt signed a bill creating the WAVES in July 1942.
66. Ruth Haskell, Helmets and Lipstick (New York: Putnam, 1944). Haskell's memoir is one of relatively few autobiographical accounts of American women's military service. Mary Lee Settle's brilliant account of her service in the British military, All the Brave Promises (New York: Ballantine Books, 1966), also deserves more attention. See D'Ann


68. Costello, 77.

69. Doane, 29, 10.

70. Haskell, 131.

71. Quoted in Costello, 44.


73. Rosenthal, 72. See Meyer, *Creating G.I. Jane*, 154-55. Costello discusses the creation of uniforms, 43-44. See also Rosebery's discussion of uniform designs, 94.


75. See James Jones's *WwII* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1975), for example, with his accounts of sexually hungry women factory workers whom G.I.s on leave encountered: "Love among the Riveters," 151-52.

76. Campbell, 37.


78. Haskell, 62.

79. Leisa Meyer notes that the army's rules, preventing nurses from dating privates, often directed women into the arms of married men because they were officers (*Creating G.I. Jane*, 133). Haskell makes no reference to nonfraternization rules.

80. Haskell, 159, 180.

81. McCarthy, 104.


84. Luce Irigaray, "When Our Lips Speak Together," 75, 69.

85. *Arise, My Love*, dir. Michael Leisen (Paramount, 1940); *Saboteur*, dir. Alfred Hitchcock; screenplay by Peter Viertel, Joan Harrison, and Dorothy Parker, 1942.


91. The views of a Black Army chaplain in Baltimore are found in Anderson, 40.
96. Young, "Impartiality and the Civic Public," 66-67, 56-76. See also Young, "Women Recovering Our Clothes," in On Fashion, 197-210, for a gloss on Irigaray's concept of lips and assertiveness.
101. Doane, 10-11.
102. See Beauvoir, 529 n.1, for some equivocation on clothing and transcendence. Beauvoir anticipates Robin Kelley's argument that the zoot suit was a gesture of resistance for men. See John Dewey, Freedom and Culture (1939), quoted in Posnock, 50.