

Drew University

College of Liberal Arts

Coeducation at Brother's College,

1942-1950

A Thesis in History

by

Elsa Nygard

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Bachelor in Arts

With Specialized Honors in History

May 2021

Abstract

I studied coeducation at Brother's College from 1942-1950. Brother's College became coeducational for the duration of World War II due to declining male enrollment, and then voted to keep coeducation in place for the duration of the school's existence. I argue that Brother's College's implementation and reaction to coeducation was a reflection of the national issues around women's roles during and after World War II. This conversation was primarily dealing with female inclusion in traditionally male spaces, the changing role of marriage, the importance of social organizing and power, and the backlash that women faced postwar. To study this, I looked at the national context of World War II and changing gender roles, as well as the Drew student newspaper, *The Acorn*, the yearbook, *Oak Leaves*, and the postwar coeducation hearing.

What's Going On Here?

In 1942, due to economic pressures and low enrollment stemming from World War II, Brother's College at Drew University became coeducational for the duration of the war. In 1943, shortly after the first female students started, the Navy also announced that Drew would be a training site for the V-12 program, where Navy volunteers would get their bachelor's degrees while training so they could go on to become officers.

My argument is that Brother's College's implementation and reaction to coeducation was a reflection of the national issues around women's roles during and after World War II. This conversation was mainly dealing with female inclusion in traditionally male spaces, the changing role of marriage, the importance of social organizing and power, and the backlash that women faced postwar.

Nationally, female inclusion in traditionally male spaces was in growing numbers of women working, especially in manufacturing, due to the wartime labor shortage. At Drew, it was in the implementation of coeducation, as it was previously an all-male school.

The family was the traditional building block of society, and also the basis of traditionalism and patriarchal order. The war and the societal changes that it brought around threatened the family and the institution of marriage by breaking up families, allowing and encouraging greater numbers of women (including mothers) to work, and sparking social changes towards younger marriage. After the war, marriage was relied on as a civic institution to create stability and social control, especially as a place to legitimately gratify sexual urges. At Drew, immediately after the war, there was an interest in married couples in the *Oak Leaves*, which then disappeared, but there was still coverage in *The Acorn*, with special focus on how fast engagements and marriages were taking place.

In the national context, social organizing was seen in volunteer efforts and women joining the workforce and sometimes unions. On campus, there were the Drew-eds and the Women's Athletic Association, which created and advocated for women's space on campus. There were also women in *The Acorn* and the *Oak Leaves* recording experiences that were exclusive to the female students. Lastly, there was the more literal side of social organizing, with women predominantly holding the student government seat of social chair, female students planning social events, and the significance of what events are being held.

Nationally, after the war women were forced out of the workforce so that returning veterans could be hired, and there was a strong push towards female domesticity. On campus, there is a 1946 trustee-faculty hearing on Coeducation in the Postwar Period. At this hearing, male students (and some faculty) pushed for the end of coeducation at Drew. The Drew-Eds were also dissolved after the war, and there was a campus-wide move away from female inclusion in major clubs, such as student government, *The Acorn*, and the *Oak Leaves*. This change in representation is possibly linked to the major change in the makeup of the student body, which in turn was linked to preferential acceptance of veterans.

I further argue that the growing inclusion and subsequent backlash was sped up by college turnover, as there would be an entirely new student body every four years. Turnover was also sped up by the war. There was a major break between the prewar and wartime university, as most of the male student body left and were replaced with female students and V-12s, who had never been at the school before. After the war, all of the V-12s left and many of the wartime/first female students were graduating, so there was a second generation of female students beginning around 1946. This new generation coincided with a massive influx of male students, especially veterans, some of whom had attended Drew before the war and were returning. The male

veterans were apparently enrolled at the expense of female students (hinted at in the Trustee Faculty Coeducation Hearing and in *The Acorn*). The returning veterans were also shocked at the changes and preferred the prewar Drew, including ending coeducation, contributing to the on-campus backlash.

This turnover impacted the way the students interact, especially in regards to gender. During the war there was a female majority and some anti-coeducation talk, but women had means to fight back against it (for instance, through the Drew-Eds and *The Acorn*). However, after the war, there was much more outright anti-coeducation sentiment, and women also lost much of their ability to fight against it.

I plan to discuss Drew University and the sources where I see coeducation and gender battles, in the yearbook, *Oak Leaves*, the student newspaper, *The Acorn*, and in the Trustee-Faculty hearing on coeducation in the post-war period. The *Oak Leaves* was intended as a record of the university and the student body and their culture and values at the time. *The Acorn* was student-led and recorded student news and opinions, on a more short term (week-by-week) basis. From both of these, I put special focus on student government, as they were representatives of the classes, especially with whom the student body accepted being in power. The coeducation hearing recorded views on whether or not the university should keep coeducation in the postwar period and the arguments for and against that, which function within the larger context of the university, as well as demobilization and backlash to working women, as well as hinting at university policy not otherwise recorded. I also discuss World War II, the homefront, the economy, the Navy V-12 program, and the G. I. Bill, as well as the history of American coeducation.

Brother's College, Drew University

The Methodist seminary at Drew University, in Madison, New Jersey, was founded in 1867. In 1928, Brother's College was established as an undergraduate companion. The university was all-male until 1942, despite local women and educators asking that the university be coeducational. World War II heavily impacted the male student body and enrollment rate. There were 125 men enrolled at Brothers College on 12 March 1942, as 84 had left to join the armed services.¹ By September 1942, 116 Brother's College men had joined, leaving around 93 men enrolled if the numbers of enrolled otherwise stayed the same from the spring.²

The faculty wrote several memos pushing the trustees to allow women to attend, arguing that doing so would be in conformity with educational standards. They likely also wanted to keep the university solvent so they could keep their jobs. In November 1942, the trustees voted to allow women to study at Brother's College for the duration of the war. The first female student started in February 1943.³ The trustees as a whole allowed coeducation for the duration of the war for financial reasons, like many other colleges at the time. However, several trustees and alumni threatened to withdraw their donations to the university, especially when discussions turned to permanent coeducation.

However, on 7 June 1943, the Navy Board approved Drew to be a V-12 training site, and by 1 July 1943, 192 Navy V-12 trainees arrived on campus to be housed in the USS Hoyt-Bowne, a former theological college dorm rebranded, in V-12 style, as a naval ship. Therefore, while women were moving into the traditionally-male university for the first time, a

¹ "Armed Services Call 84 BC Men; 125 Men Remain," *The Acorn*, 12 March 1942.

² "116 B.C. Men Join World's Armed Forces: 45 to Army; Navy Trains 15; 2 With RCAF," *The Acorn*, 24 September 1942.

³ "Nora Mielke First Woman Pupil at BC," *The Acorn*, 12 February 1943.

large group of men were coming onto campus as well, leading to the highest enrollment Brother's College had ever had.⁴

When the war ended in 1945, the trustees were faced with an issue of what would be done about the female students. In November 1946, the trustees held a hearing on coeducation in the postwar period, hearing from faculty, male and female students, local secondary educators, alumni, and parents. The male students, the alumni, and some of the professors who testified argued against coeducation in the postwar period; the rest were in favor of keeping it. The trustees voted at their midwinter meeting to allow coeducation to continue for the duration of the university being open, mirroring the original coeducation decision.

During the war, in large part because of the lack of civilian men, women stepped into leadership roles on campus, matching a national trend of women at coeducational institutions having greater opportunities for leadership.⁵ Women students were in elected positions of many major clubs on campus, including student government, the student newspaper (*The Acorn*), and the yearbook (*Oak Leaves*). The yearbook was typically the domain of female students, because they were on campus long enough to see it through to its completion versus the V-12s.⁶ They also founded their own club, the Drew-Eds. The group began as a B.C. Fellowship, for male students, female students, and V-12 trainees, but that club appears not to have lasted long, possibly longer than one meeting. The Drew-Eds were primarily a social group, but they became an important part of campus, evidenced by their board members (president and social chair) testifying at the trustee hearing on coeducation and their prominence in the *Oak Leaves*.

⁴ James G. Schneider. *The Navy V-12 Program: Leadership for a Lifetime*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987, p. 385.

⁵ Susan M. Hartmann. *The Homefront and Beyond: American Women in the 1940s*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982, p. 104.

⁶ Schneider, *The Navy V-12 Program*, p. 250.

World War II

The United States was not involved in the war until 1941, but they began preparing for war with the Selective Training and Service Act, passed 16 September 1940, which instituted a peacetime draft. It called upon 900,000 twenty-one to thirty-six year old men to serve in the US for one year with 10 years of reserve duty. They had picked the 900,000 men through a draft lottery and shipped them to training by December 1941, but then Japan attacked the American naval base, Pearl Harbor, on December 7, 1941, leading the United States to declare war against Japan. The Axis powers then declared war against the United States because they were allied with Japan, so America joined the Allies (the UK and the Soviet Union), and the US fully joined the world war.

After Pearl Harbor, thousands of men volunteered for the armed services. Within a week, Congress removed the draft restriction on serving overseas, lowered the minimum age to twenty years old, and changed the duration of service to as long as the war lasted plus six months. On 13 November 1942, fearing the Army was too old (the average age of drafted soldiers was twenty-eight years and two months), the draft age was lowered to include eighteen and nineteen year olds.

On 1 January 1943, in part due to the widespread need for men both in the military but also in war plants and agricultural production, Congress ended volunteering for the armed services, so all men had to be drafted in. They also raised the maximum draft age to thirty-seven years old. Over the course of the war, 403,000 American servicemen were killed on the battlefield or in the line of duty, and an additional 670,000 were wounded.

The armed services tried to keep fathers out of the war, so they sent bachelors first. Men who were fathers before 1941 had a good chance of avoiding the first rounds. However, by October 1943, draft boards began to fall short of their quotas due to this exemption, and so fathers began to be drafted in large numbers. In October 1943, fathers made up six percent of the draft quota. By April 1944, they made up forty percent.

The draft was a great equalizer for class, education, and social status, with college men being drafted as much as those who were not, but the armed services were still segregated for race. The army did not have the time or resources to build segregated facilities for black regiments, so the draft was race-specific. Also, over the course of the war, as the need for men went up, standards went down, in terms of requirements for health, criminal records, and literacy.⁷

Economy

From 1939-1941, the United States was strictly non-interventionist due to the Depression and World War I debts not being paid, including not selling or transporting arms. President Roosevelt wanted more flexibility to contain the Axis while still not entering the war, so he proposed a cash and carry program, which failed until Germany invaded Poland and the war actually began. Cash and carry meant that the United States could sell war material if the buyers paid cash and transported them on non-American ships. Britain was the main buyer, and paid in gold (as stipulated), but eventually could no longer afford to pay.

When France fell in 1940, Roosevelt transferred surplus war material to the British, and allowed the British to place orders for American munitions without guarantee of payment. Prime

⁷ Edward Oxford. "The Draft." *American History* 29, no. 4. October 1994, p. 30-44.

Minister Churchill suggested a lend-lease program, where the US would provide war material, food, and clothing to the Allies, especially the UK. Roosevelt agreed and a bill was enacted on March 11, 1941, allowing the president to transfer “defense materials, services, and information to any foreign government whose defense he deemed vital to that of the United States, but also left to his discretion what he should ask in return.”⁸ Congress appropriated almost \$13 billion for the program by November 1941.

Going into the 1940s, the main economic concern was the Great Depression. Though through the worst of it, the 1940 average real earnings were below those in 1929 and more than eight million Americans were still unemployed. When World War II broke out, the economic situation turned from widespread unemployment to a labor shortage, because of the simultaneous move from a depression economy to wartime mobilization with large parts of the male population joining or being drafted into the war effort.

The needs of the military meant that the government had to maximize production in order to equip all the Allies fighting forces and to sustain their civilian populations, and to finance the businesses producing these goods. The federal government now had a major role in the daily lives of individual Americans, with rationing and limitations on choices about where to live and what work to do. The War Production Board had general responsibility over the economy, beginning with converting factories to military production, and then allocating materials, coordinating production schedules, and controlling what civilian goods could be produced. The War Manpower Commission allocated labor among the different fields that were producing or

⁸ Royde-Smith and Hughes, “The Beginning of Lend-Lease.” In *World War II*, Encyclopaedia Britannica Online.

manufacturing goods, including military, industry, agriculture, and essential civilian labor production.⁹

The wartime economy focused on expanded manufacturing, and was dependent on federal spending, which increased federal authority over economic development. When the war ended, there was deep concern over the economic insecurity of peace. Would the economy continue to prosper with no wartime imperatives, which would produce unprecedented social mobility for millions, or would dismantling the war machine cause major unemployment and destroy the standard of living? The postwar economy was defined by the backlog of demand for consumer goods and services and the accumulation of liquid assets (bank accounts, government bonds)--meaning that a lot of people had a lot of money to spend, and were anxious to do so. Additionally, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, also known as the G.I. Bill cushioned against a postwar economic crisis as veterans were entitled to one year of unemployment benefits, low-interest loans to purchase homes, farms, and small businesses, and assistance for job-training and education.

Women and the Homefront

Wartime mobilization opened labor markets to women. Previously, working women were primarily in domestic work, but as the war shrank the available male labor force, women moved into industrial, military, and government fields, as well as journalism/communications, arts, and finance. The main field that opened up for women was manufacturing, because they were almost entirely closed out of it before and it was the site of the greatest of the wartime growth. Also important were women's volunteer efforts. Women contributed labor through paid work, but also

⁹ Hartmann. *The Homefront and Beyond*, p. 1-3; Karen Anderson. *Wartime Women: Sex Roles, Family Relations, and the Status of Women During World War II*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1981.

through volunteering for government agencies, hospitals, childcare, and other services. Their providing unpaid labor helped ease the labor shortage.¹⁰

World War II was a retreat from prewar notions of women's capabilities and roles, but it was only temporary. The war required women to take over traditionally male economic roles to provide necessary war materials (especially meeting the needs of lend-lease and mobilization) as well as meeting civilian needs. Women also were primarily responsible for organizing and participating in community efforts. William Chafe, as discussed in Anderson, argues that Americans were willing to accept women in the workforce as long as the changes would not threaten traditional sex role divisions.¹¹

By 1944, 37 percent of adult women were in the workforce. Almost 50 percent of all women were employed at some point during 1944, and women constituted 36 percent of the civilian workforce.¹² Additionally, married women began working, and constituted 72.2 percent of new female employees. Traditionally, working women were single, young women, but now older, married women outnumbered the single female labor force.

The labor shortage in the US was caused by men leaving the civilian workforce for military service, coupled with greater demand for production. In the beginning of the war, from 1941 to 1943, there was tension between employer's prejudice and the cultural bias in favor of white male workers versus the need for more workers. Even as the economy functioned more equally, employers maintained discriminatory hiring policies, including not hiring women until all unemployed men were hired. Employers refused to change their traditional hiring practices

¹⁰ Anderson, *Wartime Women*, p. 90.

¹¹ Anderson, *Wartime Women*, p. 8.

¹² Allan Winkler. *Home Front U. S. A.: America During World War II*. Somerset: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2012. ProQuest Ebook Central, p. 58.

because they did not believe that the shortage would be so great (that is, that the demand would be so great as to outpace the available white male labor) to exhaust the current labor force, and also did not believe that women could do physical or mechanical work. Additionally, they did not want to foot the bill for providing facilities for women workers or reengineering equipment for women's use.

The highest labor shortage was in manufacturing, especially for trained positions. Women were at a disadvantage as they were mainly trained in domestic or retail work. The federally sponsored vocational training program was not open to women at the beginning of the war. Because defense contractors were not employing women, the defense spending was not going to train women to work. However, as men became more vulnerable to the draft, women were prioritized for wartime production related courses. Women with college degrees in math, engineering, or other science and technology fields had the opportunity for wartime work that would otherwise have been closed to them, such as becoming engineers or chemists, but it was rare in the grand scheme of wartime work.

One major problem of the war was a housing shortage around defense centers. Employers preferred to rely on migrating white male workers rather than on local populations (including women). Employers would have to house these workers, but the housing was often unsatisfactory, so the migrant workers would leave. The lack of available workforce forced employers to end their discriminatory hiring practices around early 1943.

There were notable disincentives that kept women from working, including high male wages and the declining availability of consumer goods, which meant that there were fewer economic pressures on the family if the man was working. Additionally, young women (the preferred employees) were marrying and having kids, therefore having greater family

responsibilities and less availability for employment. There was also bias and stigma against factory women and working wives and mothers, as well as the fear that working wives would affect their husband's draft status.

The incentives to work were often closely linked to propaganda arguing that working was a woman's patriotic duty. However, women also worked out of economic necessity or the desire to improve their socio-economic status, because they were excited to work or looking for a challenge, especially if they were disaffected with housework, out of loneliness or to fill their days if they were anxious about family fighting, or to gain social and economic independence.

There were also problems with balancing home life with working. Wartime shortages and rationing made maintaining the home harder, and women were usually in charge of and responsible for volunteer work which took up considerable time (like maintaining a victory garden or knitting sweaters for soldiers). Additionally, women's gains in manufacturing came at the expense of work in trade and service fields, as the pay was better and manufacturing had higher patriotic appeal. Women therefore often left the service industry before first-time women workers joined the labor force, so first-time workers had no one to rely on to do domestic work.

Wartime gains did not last. When the war ended, demobilization meant that many women were let go to open jobs for returning male soldiers. Factories let women go at nearly double the rate of men. There were concerns during the war about working women upsetting the traditional social sexual order, where men worked outside the home, and women did the domestic work. There were also concerns from men and women about children's welfare, because their mothers (the primary caregiver) were not caring for them during work hours, and there was very little childcare.¹³

¹³ Winkler, *Home Front U.S.A.*, p. 57-65.

Wartime work meant that women had an unprecedented degree of choice around their economic roles. War work fostered independence and self-expression, though women were still limited by conventional attitudes around women's roles, and their household responsibilities were not lightened. Their postwar roles would depend on the economy. If there was widespread unemployment, they would be the first fired and last hired. If there were jobs, they would still likely be limited to women's work. As men returned, women picked up deferred marriages and childbearing, increasing their domestic responsibilities, which also would interfere with employment.

I have dedicated a lot of space to manufacturing because the female students had very good opportunities outside of college for wartime activities--they could work and get better money than they ever had, or they could volunteer and do their patriotic duty. One possible reason the female students at Drew may have forgone manufacturing opportunities could be that coeducation at Drew was also a wartime opportunity, as it would not continue after. The other possibility is that wartime work was not going to continue postwar. Employers were very clear about not wanting to hire women until they were desperate, and while questioning what the postwar economy would be, it was clear that women would not be prioritized in the labor market. However, before the war there were white-collar jobs for women, especially college-educated women, and these jobs would still exist after the war, and there might be expanded opportunities for college educated women as well. Therefore, it is possible that the female students were clever and setting themselves up for better prospects. Additionally, there were men on college campuses, especially at colleges like Drew, as it was not previously coeducational and it had a V-12 contingent. Marriage was a central aspiration for young women, especially during wartime

uncertainty. This was in evidence on campus, with records of engagements and weddings in *The Acorn* and *Oak Leaves*, so marriage prospects also may have been a contributing factor.

After the war, the social change around sex, sexuality, and gender caused fear that the entire gender role system would break down, because of the breakdown of traditional gender arrangements with women working outside the home. There was some evidence of this happening--the number and percentage of women working increased throughout the 1950s and early 1960s, causing instability in the cultural understanding of traditional gender roles. Anderson notes, "For many Americans the war seemed to presage rapid changes that threatened the integrity of conventional family patterns and values."¹⁴ However, only 26 percent of American wives worked for pay during the war, mainly those with lessened home responsibilities, such as serviceman husbands, or with older or no children. Still, the wartime changes were considerable enough to cause widespread anxiety about women's roles and their neglect of the family. Reumann notes that in the postwar period, there was concern that men had lost their dominance in the family and in American culture. During the war, many men left their wives and children, and the family did not fall apart. More than that, the role of the wife and mother became more important during the war. Wartime inconveniences (with housing or deprivation) sparked family conflicts. Wives' and mothers' role as the peacemaker was central to maintaining the home. Additionally, war boom communities had overcrowded schools, so more children stayed home with their mothers. Postwar, this awareness that the family would not be stable, or indeed stay together, without the wife, meant that women had much more control over the family than the husband.

¹⁴ Anderson, *Wartime Women*, 75.

Anderson argues that simultaneously, “the war reinforced and perpetuated existing role divisions and their ideological underpinnings.”¹⁵ On the list of changes, the marriage, birth, and divorce rates all skyrocketed. Additionally, greater numbers of women were working, including mothers, which was linked to the rising divorce rate due to women’s rising economic and social independence. Staying the same, or even gaining more significance, was the emphasis on the male role of the warrior and protector, the experiential gap between men and women, the reaffirmed value on male activities (especially work, and the types of work, with the importance of manufacturing over service), the numbers of women who did not work, and the way that wartime anxiety led to the restoration of “institutions of social control to manage individual conduct served on contain the forces for change.”¹⁶ The main such institution was marriage, especially young marriage. Americans married faster and younger due to the uncertainty of the war, and especially uncertainty of the length of the war. They wanted to marry and have children as soon as possible. The possibility of a drawn out conflict led the women to marry so that they would not be competing with younger women at the end, or otherwise to marry before their partners were drafted. Marriage therefore became an important aspiration for young women. While only 8 percent of American wives were married to servicemen, young wives were more likely to be separated from husbands, either from joining or being drafted into the armed services or if they migrate to defense centers to work, as the housing shortages meant their family could not join them.

Reumann argues that postwar Americans were embracing marriage as the cornerstone of personal fulfilment, but it was also viewed as an institution in crisis. A lot of the national

¹⁵ Anderson, *Wartime Women*, 75.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

conversation was whether marriage was actually in crisis or if it was being updated to be more equal, with the husband and wife finding mutual growth and fulfilment. Marriage as a civic relationship meant that marriage could either undermine or reinforce national stability, especially when planning for a possible postwar crisis. The war had led to many hasty marriages and premarital sex, which lead the public to predict postwar familial chaos.

Anderson notes that juvenile crime rates were down for males, attributed to them working or in the armed forces, but were up for females. These crimes were primarily running away or sexual offenses. The fear of wartime and postwar sexual immorality was centered on women's sexuality. During wartime, female sexuality was feared in society, and was viewed as a threat to the war effort by the military and public health experts, as women might carry secrets to the enemy or venereal disease to the troops. Younger women were the center of the changing sexuality morality, but, "despite the temporary changes of the war period, the war did not promote a long-term revision of sexual values or conduct."¹⁷

Linking back to young marriage, marriage was the only sanctioned site for sex, and, postwar, there was also more sex in marriage. Experts urged "parents and the state to accept [teens and young adults'] sexual maturation and aid young Americans in legitimately gratifying their sexual needs...."¹⁸ This was their attempt at forcing the younger generation into sanctioned and therefore moral social and sexual arrangements.¹⁹

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

¹⁷ Anderson, *Wartime Women*, p. 110.

¹⁸ Reumann, "I'm a Much Better Citizen Than If I Were Single: Remaking Postwar Marriage and Reconfiguring Marital Sexuality." In *American Sexual Character*, p. 133.

¹⁹ Anderson, *Wartime Women*; Reumann, *American Sexual Character*.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, more commonly known as the G.I. Bill, provided unemployment insurance, low interest loans for home ownership, and educational assistance. If a person completed 90 days of service, they were eligible for one year of educational support, plus a day of schooling per day of service, up to 48 months, max \$500 for tuition fees books plus a monthly stipend. The program ended in 1954, sending approximately 2.2 million veterans to college, many returning to finish their prewar college plans.

Eligible women used the G.I. Bill at lower rates than men, with 35 percent of women taking advantage of the benefits versus 41 percent of men. This difference was likely because there was little outreach to women about benefits. Additionally, women felt that they did not need or did not deserve the benefits offered by the bill. Women were often seen as auxiliary to male veterans, contributing to this feeling. This feeling continued for women who did use the GI Bill for their education--in colleges/universities, women were often portrayed as wives of college veterans rather than students themselves.²⁰

In terms of Drew, postwar there was a massive influx of veterans, who were portrayed in the coeducation hearing as anti-coeducation, though no other record really survives of these attitudes. The reason there were so many veterans is in large part because of the G.I. Bill.

Coeducation

Arguments for women's education, including coeducation, in the United States started in the colonial period. However, because institutionalized education was not a necessity in people's lives, this conversation did not gain much traction. As women moved into the labor force in the late 1700s-1800s, they especially moved into teaching positions, in large part because they would

²⁰ Linda Eisenmann. *Higher Education for Women in Postwar America, 1945-1965*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006, p. 49.

be paid a quarter to a half of the male salary. They did need higher education, and women's seminaries were founded in response to the need for teachers.

In the late 1700s, women were able to enroll in women's academies, which were similar to present day high schools in terms of curriculum. In the early 1800s, female seminaries were founded on the East Coast. These were more academically rigorous, as they were designed to be on par with men's colleges. They were also intended to make wealthy young women more graceful and socially talented to attract husbands.

The first institution of higher education in the United States to become coeducational was Oberlin in 1837. They wanted to make education with a theological emphasis available to all students who could not afford Eastern seminaries and colleges. They also wanted women students to do domestic work, and male students to do harder labor. By 1861, the start of the American Civil War, there were only five coeducational institutions--Oberlin, Antioch, Hillsdale, the University of Iowa, and today's University of Utah. The Civil War caused male enrollments to decline, and colleges in the American west became coeducational. Mainly western colleges became coeducational because those areas were too poor to support two colleges or universities, and lacked benefactors to give money for coeducation. In New England, there were no financial issues because of the college's endowments from their founders and benefactors, so they often opted to have separate women's colleges.

Kleszunski, May, and Alderman, in studying influences on coeducation, argue that coeducation was impacted by industrialization because it took over for domestic production, giving women, especially younger women, more free time to attend school. Beginning in the 1800s, industrialization and the changes it brought about contributed to the growth of the public school system and of formal schooling for youth. Additionally, westward expansion meant that

schools were being founded and expanded, and the curricula around the country was being diversified. The school system grew more with the end of slavery and increasing immigration to the United States. The expanded school system needed more teachers, and taxpayers preferred cheaper ones, so women were allowed into, and then dominated, the profession. Women needed higher education to become teachers, so they were then allowed into colleges/universities.

A major factor contributing to coeducational higher education in the United States was the Morrill Act of 1862. The first act, the Morrill Act of 1857, was vetoed by President Buchanan. The bill was reintroduced in 1862, which created land grant opportunities to create new colleges across the United States. The bill's passage was influenced by the pressures of the Civil War, as the new colleges could be used as training grounds for officers. The bill also encouraged higher education to be aimed at agriculture and other practical studies, which unintentionally led farmers and their families to demand women be allowed to attend public institutions along with men. The colleges agreed, as they faced financial difficulties due to the lack of male students (not fighting in the war) and admitting women would be financially beneficial. Thus, by 1870, 29 percent of the 528 colleges and universities in the United States were coeducational.

By 1910, there were 1,083 institutions, and 58 percent were coeducational. However, many were beginning to reconsider their policies, sometimes segregating female students into separate classes, programs, and even buildings, if they had them available, or placing quotas on women's enrollment. The backlash against coeducation was originally that women were not academically capable enough and would undermine the value of the colleges. By the turn of the century, women proved they were academically capable, so the debate turned to the social effects

of women's enrollment, such as the lowered birth rate. In general, male students did not directly fight against coeducation where it already existed.²¹

World War I created the need for educated, female, white-collar workers for complex industrial production, distribution, and sales promotion. Work for women was mostly clerical work, but coincided with a 11.5 percent jump in bachelor's degrees awarded to women between 1910 and 1920. After the war, students preferred coeducation, and colleges profited from it, even though, or perhaps enhanced by, female enrollments were down, so the policies stayed in place.

By the 1920s, almost half of all college students were female. Women also made up one-third of all college presidents, professors, and instructors combined. They made up 45 percent of the professional workforce, as fields other than teaching were opening to women workers. The Depression imposed a return to traditional roles for women due to the lack of employment for men. However, during this time and World War II, many traditionally male colleges admitted women due to declines in male enrollment. As during the Civil War, women were a financial asset that colleges could not afford to exclude. So going into the period of the case study, there was a resurgence of traditional gender roles in education but also the need for coeducation for economic reasons.

During the war, both girls and boys dropped out of high school to respond to new opportunities (war work and military service). During the 1940s, the percentage of boys who finished high school grew from 48 percent to 54 percent, and the percentage of girls grew from 54 percent to 61 percent. However, in the early 1950s, 78 percent of fully qualified boys planned

²¹ Patricia Dougher Shay. "The Founding of the New Jersey College for Women: The Struggle for Women's Access during the Progressive Era (1870–1930)," Ph.D. diss., (University of Massachusetts Boston, 2010), p. 25-35; Pamela Roby. "Women and American Higher Education." In *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 404, American Higher Education: Prospects and Choices (Nov 1972); Margaret A. Kleszynski, Mildred May, and Patricia S. Alderman, "Cultural, Economic and Social Influences on Coeducation in the United States and Implications for Student Services." Education Resources Information Center, 1994.

to go to college after high school, but only 62 percent of girls did. High school girls were more likely to take commercial classes to learn employable skills (like typing or shorthand) rather than taking academic or general education classes, which would prepare them for college. High school girls had the added expectation of marriage which would likely hinder their pursuit of higher education.²² “Societal and family messages were that professional preparation was not necessary for women. Patricia Graham (1978) claims that society’s ideals for women were youth, appearance, acquiescence, and domesticity during the first half of this century. These ideals were not directly in conflict with a college education, but rather higher education seemed irrelevant to these ideals.”²³

As mentioned previously, after the war there were fears of a glutted labor market because of the returning soldiers, so women were pressured to leave their wartime jobs for domesticity and full-time motherhood. This social change corresponded to a large drop in women in higher education. “The percentage of university acceptances and bachelor’s, master’s, and doctor’s degrees going to women, which had peaked during the war, plunged to levels well below those in 1930. Women students declined from 50 to 30 percent of the resident college enrollment between 1944 and 1950.”²⁴

During the war, women’s contributions to college campuses were on par with their contributions to the labor force, and both were influenced by depleted human resources. However, the influx of veterans supported by the G.I. Bill, combined with societal indifference to women’s education, led the proportion of women in college and graduate school to decline to

²² Hartmann. *The Homefront and Beyond*, p. 101-102.

²³ Kleszynski, May, and Alderman. “Cultural, Economic and Social Influences on Coeducation in the United States and Implications for Student Services,” p. 9-10.

²⁴ Roby. “Women and American Higher Education,” p. 130.

barely one-third. However, though the proportion of women students decreased with the influx of men, the actual numbers of women students grew steadily postwar.²⁵

Most of the research on the topic of coeducation focuses on either the first waves of coeducation in the 19th century, or the 1960s and 1970s. Scholars point to the 1940s as an era of failed potential for female education because the percentage of women to all students enrolled in higher education dropped from 40.2 percent in 1940 to 30.2 percent in 1950. However, this decline can most likely be attributed to the G.I. Bill, which hindered women's access to higher education and diluted the numbers of women as a percentage of all students due to the influx of male veterans. Additionally, the percentage of all women ages 18-21 enrolled in institutions of higher learning grew from 12.2 percent in 1940 to 17.9 percent in 1950, making it a valuable time period for further study.²⁶

After the war, there were major shifts in the relationship between institutions of higher education and the federal government, especially with government research and funding. These shifts subsequently led to the growth of higher education, in terms of enrollments, size, and spending, and the curriculum changed in response to perceived educational needs.

There were three major changes. As mentioned, colleges and universities got bigger. This was very much seen at Brother's College. At the end of the war, in December 1945, there were 239 total students. By September 1946, there were 429 total students. Additionally, war research money, in terms of grants and contracts, meant that higher education, especially universities, gave greater importance to research. Lastly, colleges had to balance liberal arts with

²⁵ Eisenmann, *Higher Education for Women in Postwar America, 1945-1965*, p. 4.

²⁶ Mabel Newcomer. *A Century of Higher Education for American Women*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1959, p. 46; Barbara Miller Solomon. *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985, p. 189.

market-oriented specialization. During the war, there was a focus on practical studies, but this had to be reassessed after the war.²⁷ The focus on practical studies often meant focus on STEM fields, which even then were dominated by men.

Navy V-12 Program

The Navy V-12 program was an accelerated degree program for Navy volunteers to get a Bachelor's Degrees in three years and go on to advanced STEM training to become naval officers. Colleges and universities readily welcomed these programs, out of the desire to maintain solvency and retain their faculty with the desirable contracts, but also out of patriotic duty. The selection process was largely based on suitable housing and messing facilities. The selection ran from February to March, 1943. 131 colleges and universities were chosen. The schools adopted an accelerated term schedule for the V-12s, with three terms of four months. Terms began on July 1, November 1, and March 1.

As the war ended, Navy V-12s had the option to leave service early. Often a factor in their decision was the G.I. Bill. As previously mentioned, the benefits were only for those with 90 days of active service. If trainees joined the V-12 from civilian life, they would have to drop out, go to boot camp and then general duty to be eligible for G.I. benefits.²⁸ Included below is a table of Navy V-12 enrollments at Drew over the course of the program.

Navy V-12s at Drew University

Date	Number of trainees
------	--------------------

²⁷ Eisenmann. *Higher Education for Women in Postwar America, 1945-1965*.

²⁸ Schneider. *The Navy V-12 Program*.

1 July 1943	192
1 November 1943	190
1 March 1944	185
1 July 1944	196
1 November 1944	190
1 March 1945	125
1 July 1945	116

Source: Schneider. *The Navy V-12 Program*, p. 385.

Oak Leaves

Oak Leaves Staff by Gender

Year	Male	Female
1942-1943	15	0
1943-1944	8	4
1944-1945*	2?	8?
1945-1946	8	4
1946-1947	7	4
1947-1948	9	6
1948-1949	9	4
1949-1950	8	0

* There is no full club picture for the *Oak Leaves*, so this is the best guess from the partial images shown.

Source: Drew University, *Oak Leaves*. New York/Madison, New York/New Jersey: 1943-1950.

Drew University Library/Archives.

I have included this table of the gender breakdown of the *Oak Leaves*' staff for the period. As you can see, there was a high point of female participation in 1945 (though this cannot be certain due to the lack of a whole-club picture in the *Oak Leaves*. Female students never get over forty percent of the club except for this year, and by the end of the time period, are not represented at all.

The *Oak Leaves* functions as a record of women's space on campus, especially with social organization, in the *Oak Leaves*, the Drew-Eds, and the Women's Athletic Association. I argue that power is given based on assigned space in the yearbook as well as the content, seen with the treatment of the V-12s and the Women's Athletic Association. The *Oak Leaves* also deals with the changing role of marriage due the 1946 edition's focus on married couples. It introduces the idea of turnover with the ideas of "Old Drew" and "New Drew," beginning in 1944. It also deals with the significance of events, such as the All-College Capers in the 1947 edition.

The 1942-1943 *Oak Leaves*, the year of the vote for coeducation for the duration of the war, and when the first female student, Nora Mielke, began at Brothers College, does not mention coeducation except in a photo caption at the start of the advertisements section. The photo is of a man and a woman, their heads cut off, standing side-by-side, and the man has his arm around the woman. The caption is "The Shape of Things to Come." The yearbook was mostly geared towards seniors, and they would not be impacted by coeducation, so it was likely not included even though it was a hot topic of conversation on campus.²⁹

In 1944, the *Oak Leaves* began to show women students, as it was the first year with a class with female students, but there was no dedicated section in the yearbook for coeducation. The V-12s, by comparison, had a full two pages, with nine pictures. There were a maximum of

²⁹ *Oak Leaves*, 1943.

192 V-12 students on campus during the year (during the summer term), which was a very large percentage of the college population. The space can also possibly be attributed to how much money the V-12s brought into the college, or wartime patriotism. The text in the section notes that when it was announced Drew would have V-12 trainees, the university cancelled the summer program and began planning for their arrival.

The 1944 *Oak Leaves* says that, “In the past, the idea of Drew becoming a coeducational institution has been ridiculed, and the V-12 was not yet to be.... [This] did not seem abnormal for this class had not known intimately the Drew of the past... With the ‘Old Drew’s’ being eclipsed through inevitable change, the form which the New Drew is to take will be up to them.

Adjustments to revolutionary changes are not easy, but with confidence and with the example of the past as their guide, the class of ‘46 looks forward to a promising future.”³⁰ Clearly, there is some chafing around the introduction of women, especially with the “Old Drew’s.” The mention of the V-12, in comparison with the idea of coeducation being ridiculed, foreshadows the 1946 Coeducation Hearing, where Stanley Oppenheim, President of the Student Council, would argue that if the Navy V-12 board had approved Drew earlier, Drew would never have become coeducational, and therefore coeducation should not be continued after the war ended.³¹ The *Oak Leaves* does try to put a positive spin on the discomfort, and “revolutionary” does not mean catastrophic.

This *Oak Leaves* touches again on the idea of Old Drew: ”Many an alumnus returning to Drew Forest must have stared in astonishment at the unfamiliar sights... scores of men in Navy blue marching over the campus..., coeds taking lecture notes in those classrooms never before

³⁰ *Oak Leaves*, 1944, p. 14.

³¹ *Drew University Trustee-Faculty Hearing on Co-Education*. 20 November 1946. Drew University Archives, Madison NJ p. 2.

witness to feminine presence.... [T]here was a realization of the transition which Brothers College was experiencing coupled with a vital and refreshing spirit of optimism and hope for the future replacing the profound depression which had settled over the remnants of the student body after the loss of so many of its members to the armed forces. Yes, the Drew of the past was gone, perhaps irrevocably....”³² This certainly is a more positive view on coeducation and one that also appears to accept the possibility of coeducation in the post-war period in the last sentence. It also defines the V-12s as outsiders as much as the female students, though they are both necessary for the rebirth of Drew, and for carrying it through the war years.

The final words of the 1944 edition also drive the point home: “[T]hrough the sweltering summer months, these men bled about the Drew that was slipping slowly away, until they realized they were living in the past and that their beloved ‘Old Drew’ was gone. But what they failed to realize was that a ‘New Drew,’ more in tune with the times, was taking its place....” The piece goes on to extol the virtues and values of the New Drew. While these do not explicitly mention coeducation, the yearbook is clearly in support of the wartime policies, and the idea of the lasting change and being “in tune with the times,” suggests that the support for these policies would last beyond the war.³³

The most important note about the “Old Drew” is how minimal of a population they would really be. When originally reporting on the majority of the male population leaving, *The Acorn* reported that the projected September 1942 enrollment would be “110 to 125 [students] with no more than 25 to 35 of the present student body returning due to the draft and the calling to service of the marine and naval reserves.”³⁴ While this was just a projection and not the actual

³² *Oak Leaves*, 1944, p. 42.

³³ *Oak Leaves*, 1944, p. 54.

³⁴ “Armed Services Call 84 BC Men; 125 Men Remain,” *The Acorn*, 12 March 1942.

student body makeup, it comes before even more of the “Old Drew” male student body left, leading me to believe that it would be on the lower side of what was predicted, though I am not sure about the actual numbers. Additionally, the V-12s were 192 men, almost two times the population of “Old Drew.”

The Drew-Eds were founded in December 1943. An article in *The Acorn* reports on the organization of the Women’s League to organize all coed activities, and provide a “unity and fellowship hitherto absent among the co-eds!”³⁵ The Drew-Eds were primarily a social organization, but also found and kept a place on Drew’s campus for women, both in terms of organizing events for themselves and also arguing at the 1946 Trustee-Faculty hearing on coeducation that they deserved to stay. The Women’s Athletic Association, a branch of the Drew-Eds, is mentioned in the yearbook, but only in two sentences and no picture.³⁶ In *The Acorn*, women’s athletics is one of the first things mentioned--with the first freshman female students being interviewed for *The Acorn* while interviewing for acceptance with Dean Lankard planning on a girl’s basketball team, to the Athletic Association predating the Drew-Eds, and becoming part of the organization when it is founded.³⁷

The *Oak Leaves* staff for 1943-1944 was a male majority, and it was the year the Drew-Eds were founded, admittedly later in the year than others. The only mention of the club is in campus pictures in the advertisements section. One is captioned “Drew-Eds leading lights,” therefore likely showing their officers.

³⁵ “Co-eds Organize Women’s League,” *The Acorn*, December 31, 1943.

³⁶ *Oak Leaves*, 1944, p. 49.

³⁷ “Dean Sees Girls of Class of ‘47,” *The Acorn*, 18 December 1942; “Co-eds Organize Women’s League,” *Acorn*, 31 December 1943.

In 1945, the *Oak Leaves* “commemorates the graduation of the first women students from Brothers College. We congratulate the B.C. co-ed on her outstanding contributions to our college community.”³⁸ The *Oak Leaves* also points out the lack of a student commons and how that has transformed the library into a social place, a point that the men testifying against coeducation also pointed out, calling the library “a dating bureau.” Unlike the testimonies from the coeducation, the *Oak Leaves* tempers it a bit more than the men, saying “The social function of the library is almost equal to its scholastic function.”³⁹

1945 is the first time the Drew-Eds are listed as a club, “to promote harmony and unity among the women of Brothers College,” even though they would be a year old at that point (the picture used even shows the organization’s birthday--possibly a choice to show that they were not included at their founding). They share the page with the Student Council, possibly showing they were seen as important to the function of the college.⁴⁰ There is also a dedicated page, front and back, for coed sports. The section seems to critique the college, saying, “Despite the almost complete lack of any accommodations for women’s athletics, the coed sport program showed signs of great improvement this year. The program resulted directly from the efforts of the women themselves, who, through the Drew-Eds, organized and conducted a program of interclass and individual competition.”⁴¹ The section also holds the college to a promise of improved facilities and equipment in the near future and planning for the program’s expansion.

³⁸ *Oak Leaves*, 1945, p. 3.

³⁹ *Drew University Trustee-Faculty Hearing on Co-Education*. 20 November 1946, p. 1, 3; *Oak Leaves*, 1945, p. 13.

⁴⁰ *Oak Leaves*, 1945, p. 28.

⁴¹ *Oak Leaves*, 1945, p. 41.

Simply put, the 1945 edition showed many more women than the previous editions--both in the dedicated pages for coed life but also in the general photos of women around campus. This makes sense, given the female majority in the student body. Both coeditors were male, though the rest of the board was most likely female (J. McLuckie, H. Miliun, and A. Wenarsky almost certainly are Jean McLuckie, Helen Miliun, and Alice Wenarsky, and the next M. Williams to be listed in the yearbook was Mary Williams, C'48, making her a freshman for the 1945 edition). The picture above the text thanking the *Oak Leaves* advertising staff features eight women, who therefore can be assumed were the staff, putting the full *Oak Leaves* as potentially being all female, except for the two male editors. If this was the case, it is notable that the highest positions were male. However, it is not clear how the editor(s) were decided. For *The Acorn*, they were appointed by the student government, and it is possible, but not certain, this was the case for the *Oak Leaves* as well. The student council was eight men to two women.⁴²

This edition was published before the end of the war, but very close to it. Therefore, the female students might have been beginning to think about how to secure their place at the college post-war, as they were only admitted for the duration. This might have led them to highlight their accomplishments, especially how they carved out an important space for themselves in the college where they could organize and excel. Also at this point, there are so many of them--they are integral in *Oak Leaves*, but then they are gone a couple years later.

In the 1944-1945 *Oak Leaves*, the V-12 have another two full pages, again with nine pictures. It is titled "Anchors Aweigh!" as the Navy announced the V-12 program would withdraw from smaller colleges. They also appear in the 1945-1946 *Oak Leaves*, despite only being on campus during the July-November term. The section is again titled "Anchors

⁴² *Oak Leaves*, 1945.

Aweigh!!,” saying, “During these two years, we at Brothers College were largely dependent upon the Navy for the continuation of much of our college life during the trying war years... We of B.C. have much to thank the Navy for; its contribution to our life here will not soon be forgotten.”⁴³

The most notable section in 1945 is that the Navy helped plan several social events, which “helped to create more favorable Navy-civilian relations.”⁴⁴ This obviously suggests that the Navy-civilian relationships were less than favorable before. One point in *The Acorn*, from November 1943, a year after they arrived, is that the athletic teams, though mostly made up of Navy V-12 men, were still Drew teams, not Navy teams, and that the Brother’s College students should give them their full support.⁴⁵ This note suggests that they were seen as separate. Additionally, the V-12s were often noted unfavorably in *The Acorn* due to their routines (especially the morning wakeup call).

One explanation for their unpopularity is that the Navy sailors were more attractive to the female students. In *The Acorn*, the Femmes de Faulkner (women living in Faulkner House) wrote about a freshman spending a lot of time in the library, “It must be one of those ‘able’ seamen. Out of more than one hundred and fifty men on our campus, a girl should have an average of two and a half apiece!!!”⁴⁶ Another article on bookstore salesgirls talks of the Navy boys “affaires,” suggesting a romantic angle. In the 1945 *Oak Leaves*, the pictures from the Fall Weekend dance, hosted by the Navy, shows two couples, the men in Navy uniforms. In the B.C. Social picture, five of the eleven dancing couples are Navy.

⁴³ *Oak Leaves*, 1946, p. 11.

⁴⁴ *Oak Leaves*, 1945, p. 25.

⁴⁵ Gordon Bushell. “Riding the Circuit,” *The Acorn*, 26 November 1943.

⁴⁶ “Femmes de Faulkner,” *The Acorn*, August 25, 1945.

Articles in *The Acorn* might threaten the men, especially suggesting the Navy men were more attractive to the female students. In the 1946 coeducation hearing, Mr. Morris, a trustee, asked the female students testifying if the women feel that “a large proportion of the male student body are socially unattractive.” Joy Werner, the social chairman of the Drew-Eds, answered that they seem to want to mix, but the age difference with the returning veterans makes it slightly difficult, but that as peacetime grows and normalcy returns, it would be easier. However, they are testifying to protect the place of female students at Drew, and therefore her answer might reflect that end rather than the truth.⁴⁷

The *Oak Leaves* staff was a male majority for the 1945-1946 edition, with four women to eight men, though the editors were the female students Helen Millium and Jeanne Van Camp.⁴⁸ It was the first full academic year that was postwar, which officially meant that female students would be facing the end of their time at Drew (as coeducation was only instituted for the duration of the war). In practice, however, this was not happening. In December 1945, the student body was 239 students, with 139 female students, making up almost 60 percent of the student body.⁴⁹ However, in March 1946, the student body was 275 students, with 143 male students to 125 female, and 9 special students, or approximately 53 percent male to 47 percent female. The new student population consisted of more than 50 new veterans, and around 30 of those were former Drew students (presumably all male).⁵⁰

⁴⁷ *Drew University Trustee-Faculty Hearing on Co-Education*. 20 November 1946, p. 5.

⁴⁸ “Editors Announce Oak Leaves Theme,” *The Acorn*, 1 February 1946, “Drew-eds Elect Officers; Schlatter New President,” *The Acorn*, 15 March 1946.

⁴⁹ “48 Vets, 139 Coeds Lift Enrollment to New High,” *The Acorn*, 7 December 1945.

⁵⁰ “BC Spring Term Records Student Enrollment High,” *The Acorn*, 15 March 1946; “30-Odd Former Students Back to Complete Studies: Familiar Faces Return to Drew Campus Again To Fill Old Places in Scholarship and Ball Club,” *Acorn*, 15 March 1946.

The 1946 edition also has “married couples” as a designated housing option--the only time this appears. While it is unclear if both the husband and wife of these married couples are students, there were other married students whose spouse did not appear in the yearbook. Of the four couples it says, “Also rooming in town were several veterans who shared their college experiences with their lovely wives. These couples entered into the activities of B.C. with enthusiasm and became a welcome addition to all campus functions.”⁵¹ The idea that the men are sharing “their” college experiences with their wives gives an interesting understanding of the post-war college. It may be simply because they are returning veterans finishing their college degrees, and therefore feel that they do in fact have the prior claim, or it could be an insight into the precarious position of the female students postwar--the veterans were painted as being anti-coeducation anyways.

Already being married would give women a better capacity to go to college (where normally higher education is seen as irrelevant to the goal of marriage, but women who are already married have an easier time pursuing higher education, especially if their husbands are also students as they then cannot yet provide for children, and so wives are not yet expected to be having them).⁵² Married women also made up the majority of working women during the war, so it was already culturally understandable for them to be going to college (not in the home).⁵³

The fact that this is the only time this housing designation appears is significant. This is also the first fully postwar academic year. As I discussed in the introduction, there was considerable fear in postwar America about marriage and gender roles, with marriage being

⁵¹ *Oak Leaves*, 1946.

⁵² Hartmann. *The Homefront and Beyond*, p. 101-102; Kleszynski, May, and Alderman, “Cultural, Economic and Social Influences on Coeducation in the United States and Implications for Student Services,” p. 9-10.

⁵³ Winkler. *Home Front U. S. A.*

relied on as a civic institution for the stability of the country and the rapid wartime changes threatening traditional family patterns. There was also the fear that wartime marriages would not work out, especially as the divorce rate was already heightened during wartime. The inclusion here of married couples might be one way that that fear was acted out in the public consciousness.

Most specifically, college women were to some extent more free than women without college educations. There were white collar jobs for college-educated women before the war that would almost certainly not go away the way manufacturing and wartime jobs would, no matter what the postwar economy brought. Also, while in college, they were not necessarily married and not necessarily living at home, while also being in close contact with men, inside and outside the classroom. Aiming a message of the importance of marriage at this demographic and making it common even for college women is notable. So, while women who worked in manufacturing were a considerable percentage of the population, as seen in the introduction, they were a population that would be more easily pushed back into the domestic role through discriminatory hiring practices and social pressure, even if their deviance from traditional gender roles was greater. College women, on the other hand, potentially posed a greater threat to traditional gender roles. They had a socially sanctioned, independent, and mostly unsupervised space to interact, especially with men, before marriage. They were also preparing for careers, whether or not they would pursue them, and those careers usually accepted women, so they would continue to have independence outside the home after college, and potentially (though it would be unlikely) able to support themselves. This whole argument presumes that the marriage page was aimed at women as opposed to men. There was also a concern postwar that men, especially veterans, would either be hyper-sexual or emmasculated due to the wartime experience, and therefore,

society would want to aim them into marriage as well, to give them an obligation to keeping sex within marriage. Therefore, the inclusion of young married couples as a sanctioned housing assignment might be one way that the fear of women abandoning traditional gender roles was acted out in the public consciousness.

The 1945-1946 edition specifically points out the Drew-Eds in one of the few text blocks around clubs, calling them a “new and vigorous organization,” which is not strictly true as they had been around since 1943. It might have been new to the returning male students, and trying to accommodate them at the expense of the female students (which was not uncommon after the war). The Drew-Eds sponsored a number of dances on campus this year, including the Valentine’s Dance, and a Picnic Dance (featured in the *Oak Leaves*). Just before the Trustee-Faculty Hearing, accusing them of being separate and distinct, they are really showing up with full campus activities. The Student Council also converted the coed lounge into a commuter lounge, as the majority of female students now lived on campus (as opposed to 90% of them commuting in 1943, when it was designated as the coed lounge).⁵⁴ This edition is from the post-war period, and from the female students fighting for and winning their place at Drew after the war.

The 1946-1947 *Oak Leaves* staff pictured was four women to seven men (one co-ed in the write-up appears not to be pictured, as her name is not listed in the caption). Described as “lending a much needed feminine touch,” clearly reinforcing gender roles though probably intended as a compliment, a co-ed held the role of Assistant Editor, though she did write-ups and covered “strictly co-ed activities”.⁵⁵ I would argue that this comment is a reflection of the

⁵⁴ “Student Council Asks Use of BC Co-ed Lounge,” *The Acorn*, 1 February 1946; “Drew-eds Sponsor Valentine Dance,” *The Acorn*, 1 February 1946; *Oak Leaves*, 1946.

⁵⁵ *Oak Leaves*, 1947, p. 76.

growing movement in demobilization around women to stay in their own sphere, which would contribute to the movement around women not being in leadership positions.

The *Oak Leaves* dedicated a page to the All-College Capers, a continuation of the pre-war (and therefore pre-coeducation) All-College Stag. Stag was an event for the students, faculty, and staff with dinner, a musical program, and skits from the students. Apparently, the All-College Capers toned down the skits for a mixed-gender audience. Notably, at this point, male students made up two-thirds of the student body, and three-quarters of the male students were veterans. Therefore, around half the student body were male veterans, many of whom were returning “Old Drew” students. In the coeducation hearing, returning veterans were portrayed as against coeducation as they were nostalgic for the prewar college. The return of the Capers may have been a way to return parts of the prewar college, placating returning veterans, while maintaining coeducation.

In 1947, the Drew-Eds are not pictured, but the *Oak Leaves* list the new officers. They are then not mentioned again.⁵⁶ In January 1947, the Women’s Athletic Association was separated from the Drew-Eds because the Drew-Eds activities were being cut back. In September 1947, the Women’s Athletic Association “made plans to hold one social event each month. In addition, playdays with other schools and intramural athletics will be a part of the year’s program.”⁵⁷ This suggests that they may have taken over the normal social activities that the Drew-Eds would normally host. In the online database for *The Acorn*, the term “Drew-Eds” continues to appear consistently until 1970. The last mention (January 27, 1971) was the first semester resolutions for “No money for Drew-Eds,” suggesting that they are still a group, but not an active one.

⁵⁶ *Oak Leaves*, 1947; 1948; 1949; 1950.

⁵⁷ “WAA Holds Pup Roast,” *The Acorn*, 26 September 1947.

However, the *Oak Leaves* titles the women's athletics page as "Women's Activities,". The label of "activities" serves to devalue the Women's Athletics Association, a very different tack from the 1944-1945 *Oak Leaves*. It is also the first year that they are playing intercollegiate, devaluing the group further, as rather than extolling their accomplishment in creating the group and relating their record, it merely notes that they existed.⁵⁸ However, this was the year that the Women's Athletic Association was separated from the Drew-Eds, as the activities of the Drew-Eds had been "cut down," so it might be more inclusive and accurate as they took over hosting the Drew-Ed social events.⁵⁹

Instead, the coverage in *The Acorn* was primarily dedicated to their social events rather than their athletic achievements. The 30 September 1949 *Acorn* reports on the WAA officers first meeting, and how they planned to hold a Splash Party, the Hallowe'en Masquerade, and the Thanksgiving Dance, and that socials would be held in the women's dormitories after varsity basketball games, with no other mention of the women's varsity sports. They also plan to host playdays with women from other colleges.⁶⁰ This is likely a by-product of the Women's Athletic Association taking over the Drew-Eds--they are not treated as equal to male athletes, despite their athletic endeavors being an original goal of several of the original female students at Brother's College. The social events, which were central to the coed experience, especially planning and hosting, are the primary focus of all coed organizations. This is not necessarily a bad thing--at many other colleges, the women were dependent on the men for their social lives, and so they held power in their ability to plan social events.⁶¹

⁵⁸ *Oak Leaves*, 1947, p.82.

⁵⁹ "Joy Werner Elected President of Women's Athletic Ass'n", *The Acorn*, 17 January 1947.

⁶⁰ "Richard, Board Plan Women's Athletics Fall Season," *The Acorn*, 30 September 1949.

⁶¹ Schneider, "Campus Life." In *The Navy V-12 Program*.

Notably there is no mention or reference to the Trustee-Faculty Hearing on Coeducation, held 20 November 1946, where women won the right to stay at Brothers College for the duration of the college being open, intentionally reusing of the language of the wartime coeducation decision.

The 1948 *Oak Leaves* staff was nine men to six women. There was a male editor, male head of advertising with an unnamed though competent staff, a male photographer et al (plural?--likely also male, as the photography club is all male), a male lay-out director, and a coed to schedule senior photo appointments. The “Women’s Activities” page again devalues their athletic achievements, and has no text. The Drew-Eds are not featured in the book as they no longer formally exist, but they are listed with the clubs that seniors were involved in. This edition is devaluing athletics versus acknowledging their expanded role in hosting social events as they are in the Athletics section of the book rather than the Social Life section.⁶²

By 1949, only four out of fifteen of the *Oak Leaves* staff were female, and they were either literary editors and secretaries, if they were titled at all. All of the important positions were filled by men. The definition of important is found in the *Oak Leaves* blurb, where they dedicate two text blocks, accounting for half the text, to the editor-in-chief, the business manager and his assistants, the photography editors, and the photographers.⁶³ The same trend is found in *The Acorn*’s blurb. Despite a bigger and more equal staff (seven women out of nineteen total), the women are all “untitled members of staff,” listed for being especially helpful in that role.⁶⁴ The women’s sport page is given the title of “Women’s Athletics,” and includes text about them and the schools they competed against. Notably, they do not mention any social events hosted by the

⁶² *Oak Leaves*, 1948.

⁶³ *Oak Leaves*, 1949, p. 71.

⁶⁴ *Oak Leaves*, 1949, p. 70.

group. This might mean that even the Women's Athletics Association, as the last piece of the Drew-Eds, loses social organizing power on campus.

Lastly, the staff for the 1949-1950 *Oak Leaves* was all male. The page for the "Women's Athletic Association" gets two full pages, but again, the Drew-Eds dropped off in their activities, with the Women's Athletic Association taking over and holding new ones. The text mentions that they still struggle with lack of facilities, and the many athletic events that they held through the semester, culminating in an Awards Banquet. Again, there is no mention of independent social events. However, they did form house teams and a "well-organized intra-mural schedule" for basketball, bowling, and tennis. Even the *Oak Leaves* acknowledges the creation of successful companionship "which was even more successful than previous years."⁶⁵ This could be a more limited social power--still organizing spaces and activities for female students, but now limited in the athletics that the association is limited to.

Conclusions on *Oak Leaves*

There is little coverage of female students in the yearbook in the early years, when the *Oak Leaves* board was more male dominant. When women got onto the board and made up the majority in the club, they, their clubs, like the Drew-Eds, and women's sports got dedicated space in the yearbook. When the war ended, possibly because of the greater male student population, the dissolution of the Drew-Eds, or the criticism they received at the trustee hearing, they again faded out of the yearbook.

Coeducation was especially an overarching theme in 1944, though the book does not mention it directly. The book talks excessively about Old and New Drew. The book is clearly in

⁶⁵ *Oak Leaves*, 1950, p. 94.

support of the wartime policies, and the idea of the lasting change and being “in tune with the times,” suggests that the support for these policies would last beyond the war.⁶⁶ However, the reason this support may not have continued is because of the postwar turnover of the student body, especially returning veterans who embody the “Old Drew,” which was closely tied to the backlash to the female students having too strong of a role on campus.

These editions from around the end of the war are interesting as they might be records of female students who wanted to highlight their accomplishments, especially how they carved out an important space for themselves in the college where they could organize and excel, to secure their place at the college post-war, as they were only admitted for the duration. Then, the move away from highlighting coed achievements and away from women working on the *Oak Leaves* (it was an all-male process by the 1949-1950 school year) is just as notable. This again I believe is caused by the postwar turnover of the student body, especially with the massive influx of male veterans.

I think a big part of the relationship between student body turnover with the backlash is that the veterans were removed from the homefront during the war, and therefore did not partake or even witness almost all of the notable changes in women’s status. Therefore, when they returned, it was to a distinctly different society than the one they left to defend. This is more notable in the environment of the college, especially one like Drew that was not coeducational when they left but was when they returned. The main division of students in the *Oak Leaves* are by class and then by the housing they live in. I talk later about *The Acorn*’s coverage of when traditionally male housing becomes coed housing and how it comes across as hostile to it. For the veterans, especially prewar male students returning to finish their education, this stark

⁶⁶ *Oak Leaves*, 1944, p. 54.

disconnect between the pre- and postwar society is their entire experience. I don't want to seem like I am defending the attempted re-exclusion of women from the public sphere, but it was a major societal change from the Depression to World War II to the postwar period and there was considerable backlash against it.

The changing coverage of the Women's Athletics Association is also very interesting. It is first mentioned in passing in the 1944 edition. The 1945 gives them a full page, and recognition for the hard work they put into creating the program, especially with how little aid they got from the university. The 1946 gives them two pages, and draws attention to how they are still waiting to compete on the intercollegiate level. These two years also make up when women were the majority or a significant portion of the student body. The 1947 devalued women's athletics to "activities," even though they are finally competing intercollegiate. The same is true in 1948. In 1949 and 1950, they were restored to "Women's Athletics," and have text about their record, their board, and their awards. In the turnover idea, when we understand the Women's Athletics Association as the last holdout of social organizing for the female students, this devaluation immediately postwar might be hinting at the backlash nationally to women's involvement in the public sphere.

In the 1940s, some coeducational colleges and universities adhered to the "separate spheres ideology," so they created separate, women-only student government and clubs. Their leadership opportunities were limited to all-female activities. Across many colleges, women founded their own organizations in order to have parties and events. However, women's organizations were secondary to men's groups, which were the only university organizations.⁶⁷

This is seen with the Women's Athletic Association--it was almost never covered in *The Acorn*,

⁶⁷ Shay. "The Founding of the New Jersey College for Women: The Struggle for Women's Access during the Progressive Era (1870–1930)," p. 25-35.

and struggled with the available accommodations. The only time the WAA is recognized for their athletics is in 1948 when the WAA had their “annual awards”--these awards were never mentioned before or again in *The Acorn*.⁶⁸

Lastly, the dedicated space in the yearbook to the Navy V-12 program is notable, especially as it continues for a year after they leave. They get full and two page spreads in the yearbook, and paragraphs about the honor of the Navy Board picking Drew as a training site, where women got a paragraph. This may be because of the fierce patriotism of the time period, especially tied to military services, or maybe how much money the Navy paid the college, or maybe that female students were simply not as important to the college or the male students--especially in the early and war years, as they were only expected to be there for the duration of the war and not permanently. Also, male students might have begun as V-12 then after the war be alumni donors, like the trustee hearing suggests.

The Acorn

The Acorn Staff by Gender⁶⁹

Year	Male	Female
1942-1943	20	0
1943-1944	10	8
1944-1945	2	16
1945-1946	11	13
1946-1947	12	6
1947-1948	12	7

⁶⁸ “Gals Rewarded for Athletic Prowess,” *The Acorn*, 14 May 1948.

⁶⁹ *Oak Leaves*, 1943-1950.

1948-1949	12	7
1949-1950	9	11

Looking at the club makeup throughout the period, you see in 1944-1945 that a disproportionate share of women make up the staff, even versus the student body (which was not yet at the high point of being 60% female in December 1945). I argue that this is because women were comfortable in their space at the college, and it was accepted that they could be in positions of power. There is then a stark difference at the end of the war, from thirteen women and eleven men to six women and twelve men. This change is really where my turnover idea comes in, because it is so stark and sudden. However, it does rebound at the end of the time period, but it is notable that at this time the other major publication on campus, the *Oak Leaves*, was all-male, so it is possible that it was the only place for female students who wanted to be involved.

The Acorn was entirely student-run, so the articles directly reveal the attitudes of the students. It is another outlet of social organizing, of events and with the treatment of housing. It also provides one of the best records of the backlash against coeducation, seen in the articles around housing and the All-College Capers. It also deals more in-depth with marriage on campus.

The first opinion coverage of coeducation in *The Acorn* is from November 1942, soon after the coeducation vote. It was an unsigned article titled, “BC Men Not Sure They Like Coeducation (But They Like Coeds).” The article makes fun of both pro- and anti-coeducation arguments, though is harsher with the anti group, calling them “women haters.” Clear from the title, the article focuses on the male students' attraction to the women and maybe potential social relationships, rather than their potential academic ability. It also calls the past female activists for coeducation at Drew “a few forceful females,” reinforcing the fact that coeducation was only at

Drew because of the war.⁷⁰ The 1942-1943 *Acorn* staff was all male as women did not start at Drew until 1943.

This culture makes it more notable that the 1943-1944 *Acorn* staff was as equal as it was, and that Jean McLuckie was co-editor in the spring term. Under this staff (though before McLuckie was coeditor), there was a poll in *The Acorn*, “Should Drew Have or Keep Coeducation in the Post-War Period?”, which was responded to by two male students. One of the respondents, John Dexheimer, despite being the chairman of the B.C. Fellowship (a club for “Brothers College, Coeds, Navy, ???”) at the first meeting in July 1943, was strongly against coeducation. He leads off the argument that will be made in the Trustee hearings: that women have ruined the academic excellence of BC, making it less distinctive among American colleges. The other respondent, John Heagney, takes a less extreme view. He says that Drew is not actually coeducational because it was just instituted for the duration of the war, and that true coeducation should be tested after the war.⁷¹ It is still early in the national project of accepting women working outside the home, or even being involved in the public sphere, which may explain the hesitancy toward coeducation.

This poll was followed by articles about formerly male housing (like Faulkner and Rogers Houses) being used for female students. A major problem in the coeducation debate (on campus at this point, as well as nationally at this point and in the past) and in America at large during the war (especially with available housing around production centers), was about available and equal facilities. The stories on campus are written like stories of hostile takeovers. Most of them are written towards the end of the war period, which coincided with the growing

⁷⁰ “BC Men Are Not Sure They Like Coeducations (But They Like Co-eds),” *The Acorn*, November 20, 1942.

⁷¹ “Question of the Week: Should Drew Have or Keep Coeducation in the Post-War Period?” *The Acorn*, 3 September 1943; “Organization of B.C. Fellowship,” *The Acorn*, 30 July 1943.

female population at Drew, and also the move of more female students living on campus. The final lines of one article are, “But there is no joy in Drew, boys--Rogers men have been thrown out.”⁷² At the start of the discussions about whether co-education would continue at Drew, this article sheds light on *The Acorn*'s seemingly anti-coeducation bent. However, *The Acorn* staff was nearly all female in this period (sixteen women to two men). There was still a male editor, possibly accounting for anti-coeducation tone, or reflecting the male student opinion at large. Additionally, it could be a joke, as the articles are written in a dramatic enough tone to suggest it.⁷³ Also possible is the permeation of the idea of the “Old Drew” from the *Oak Leaves* from the same year. Though likely making up a small percentage of the student body, the “Old Drew” may have been ingrained and outspoken enough to take to *The Acorn* to express their grievances about the female students. This also connects to the idea of turnover and advocacy power--in periods of high female population, there is more coed housing and well-documented backlash to that. When there was a high male population, there was no mention of the change in housing that undoubtedly took place, and no backlash.

In 1945-1946, several female-driven pieces, like “Femmes de Faulkner,” and “Gilbert House Want-Ads,” were published, possibly reflecting the female-majority staff's experiences. These are a shift from the takeover pieces from the previous year, especially with Femmes de Faulkner, one of the houses that was flipped from male to female. The takeover pieces continue into this year, with an article about Rogers House becoming a women's dorm was also published. The author of the piece was Dixon McGrath, who went on to argue against coeducation at the

⁷² “Rogers Effeminated,” *The Acorn*, 22 September 1944.

⁷³ “Rogers Effeminated,” *The Acorn*, 22 September 1944; “Faulkner Goes Feminine,” *The Acorn*, 8 December 1944; *Oak Leaves*, 1945.

Trustee hearing.⁷⁴ These pieces also seem to tie into the turnover idea. The high female population led to female participation in *The Acorn* and records of women's lives on campus, as well as male discontent with the high female population. The record and the discontent disappears during the high male population.

In 1946, a coed, Jean Elmore was editor of *The Acorn*. Her role was prominent, as she testified at the 1946 coeducation hearing alongside the president and social chairman of the Drew-Eds. One of the headlines published under Elmore, on September 20, 1946, was "Brothers College Opens Nineteenth Year; Largest Civilian Enrollment in History: Male Students are Two-thirds of Student Body." This is also one of the articles accompanying *The Acorn* staff page in the yearbook. Three quarters of the male students were veterans, which sets the stage for the 1946 coeducation hearing, as they are portrayed as being anti-coeducation, though only one of the three male students testifying was a veteran (Stanley Oppenheim entered with the class of 1945 but left to fight in Europe).⁷⁵ The article says, "Male dominance, lost for terms last year but regained with a three-to-one lead in the summer session.... The general intention of the college, expressed by faculty vote in October 1944, is to keep the two groups in balance, but this is not held as a hard and fast rule. Admission priority given to returning Brothers College veterans accounts for the disproportionate number of men this year."⁷⁶ This article provides a lot of insight into both the college policies and attitudes toward coeducation in the post-war period. Specifically, the writer caters to the returning B.C. veterans, who, as mentioned before, were

⁷⁴ "Femmes de Faulkner," *The Acorn*, August 25, 1945; "Gilbert House Want-Ads," *The Acorn*, October 18, 1945; "Tid-Bits," *The Acorn*, October 18, 1945; McGrath, Dixon. "Asbury Visits Rogers En Masse to Shed a Few Nostalgic Tears," *The Acorn*, December 21, 1945.

⁷⁵ *Oak Leaves*, 1947, p. 16; "30-Odd Former Students Back to Complete Studies: Familiar Faces Return to Drew Campus Again To Fill Old Places in Scholarship and Ball Club," *The Acorn*, 15 March 1946.

⁷⁶ "Brothers College Opens Nineteenth Year; Largest Civilian Enrollment in History: Male Students are Two-Thirds of Student Body," *The Acorn*, September 20, 1946.

against coeducation. The article goes on after the included quote to say that demobilization slow-downs holding back returning B.C. veterans account for some freshmen (likely female students) admitted last-minute.⁷⁷ In the turnover narrative, the new female students were fill-ins for absent men, suggesting a bit of a second-class status for them, setting the tone for the new postwar student body. The 1946-1947 *Acorn* staff was twelve men to six women. The 1947-1948 staff was twelve men to seven women. All of the titled positions were held by men.

On 10 October 1947, *The Acorn* published a Letter to the Editor by the Faulkner Girls, about a “Come-As-You-Are” party that they held the previous Wednesday that was such a great success “that we think it is about time for some congratulations on paper.”⁷⁸ They say that there has been a lot of complaining about “our” lost college spirit--either from the female students or the whole college. It is important to note that it is published just under a year after the coeducation hearing, where one charge leveled against the female students is lack of integration and school spirit. The Faulkner Girls say that “for the last year we have been groping in the dark for something which we were not sure of. Everyone was looking for it, but it never came... Last Wednesday night we finally found the beginning of the true Drew spirit... feeling at last the close bond of mutual interest with our fellow students.”⁷⁹ This article should be understood as relating something that has been missing from the full college, but it specifically points to the lack of school spirit stemming from a lack of oneness. One perception at the school at the time (seen in the coeducation hearing) was that female students were the problem and that they did not have proper school spirit. The women’s perspective, as the lack of school spirit the lack of oneness, may come from the attempted exclusion of women, and now that the college and

⁷⁷ “Brothers College Opens Nineteenth Year,” *The Acorn*, September 20, 1946.

⁷⁸ The Faulkner Girls. “Letter to the Editor,” *The Acorn*, 10 October 1947.

⁷⁹ The Faulkner Girls. “Letter to the Editor,” *The Acorn*, 10 October 1947.

perhaps the student body has accepted women permanently and they have begun to form a fellowship (the same word used when women first came to Drew in the BC Fellowship) the college can heal and develop their spirit again.

The Acorn ran an article, “Mamie Mushroom and the College Capers,” before the All-College Capers, to answer questions about the event as it had not been held at Drew since 1943. As I have mentioned before, there was a large veteran population, several of whom were returning “Old Drew” men. In the article, Mamie Mushroom asks junior L. “Bobo” Newsom about the Capers. He explains ““The college capers is one of the favorite traditions of Brothers College. It is the censored version of the old time College Stag which had to be discontinued after women came to Drew.’ ... ‘But don’t you like having women here at Drew?’ she asked. ‘It does sort of cramp our style,’ answered Artie. ‘But we’ll accommodate them....’”⁸⁰ Jean Elmore was the *Acorn* editor the year before and testified at the Coeducation Hearing that the veterans had idealized Drew and were shocked at the changes when returning, especially coeducation. Therefore, the return of the capers and the tone of Artie in the article may have been an effort to make peace between the female students and anti-coeducation men, as it would be returning pre-war events, and framing the men as tolerating the women, but nothing more.

This is another hint at the postwar student body’s view of female students--they are unwelcome but tolerated by the men, who have the power to be the deciders of college matters. Of course women become underrepresented in student government, *The Acorn* and *Oak Leaves* boards in the postwar period--they are barely welcome as students now, much less in positions of power, as seen in the *Oak Leaves* section.

⁸⁰ Joe Slung, *The Midget*. “Mamie Mushroom and the College Capers,” *The Acorn*, November 21, 1947.

Marriage in The Acorn

As I discussed in the introduction, there was pressure and motivations for women to marry. They wanted to marry before men got drafted, because they did not know how long the war would be or if their partners would return.

On 5 December 1942, a profile about student Carl Robert Moodey begins with, "Graduation, the army, defense work, and marriage have removed the majority of the "characters" from the Hill to such an extent that there is a definite shortage this year." This was before coeducation, but still pressures of marriage took men not away from the college but away from being "characters".⁸¹ This was just under a year after the United States joined the war, leading to plenty of quick, war marriages.

On 14 January 1944, *The Acorn's* gossip column, Trivia, published, "Gloom looms and Senior Martinez-Etc.-Etc. retires to the comfort of his Faulkner House cubby hole. Trudy the fair, Trudy the lovable, Trudy of the high school ring and the Guomi, has been wed. And who was it who kissed the bride. We expected it from Jack... Infanger, but YOU MR. Benedict!!! Really now--well--oh--my--" Far from a typical wedding announcement. It hints at some tangled romantic relationships before

On 7 December 1945, there was a story in the paper dedicated to a marriage announcement, not just in the gossip columns. The article, "Gregory, Warshaw Wed in Secret," includes details of wedding/elopement, which took place in October. The story stood out in that it was "unknown to parents, friends and fellow students," apparently for almost two months, and that they were nearly discovered when they picked up a fellow Drew student, Dixon McGrath (called "Dixon McWrath") who was hitchhiking.⁸²

⁸¹ "Local Boy Makes Good (?) at WMC." *The Acorn*, 5 December 1942.

⁸² "Gregory, Warshaw Wed in Secret." *The Acorn*, 7 December 1945.

The edition of *The Acorn* from 28 March 1947 is rife with notes about marriage. One note in the Trivia column says, “Spring is here and Sam Bowne isn’t putting up much of a fight. Why else would they be placing the ring on the third finger, left hand of so many of the young innocent coeds. Even bigamy.” Sam Bowne was a nickname for Samuel W. Bowne Hall, which had the refectory on the upper floor and housing on the lower, this year for male students (it frequently changed). Like most of the gossip entries, it is not certain what it is exactly referring to, as it is based on intimate knowledge of the student body, but it seems clear that many of the male students living in SWBowne were proposing to female students on campus. The bigamy comment is interesting and troubling--in context it suggests that someone proposed to someone while already being married or engaged. The 28 March 1947 also notes the frequency of engagements between freshmen men and women. In one case, one freshman was engaged to his roommate’s sister. On one hand, the quick postwar marriages are likely related to the postwar morality crisis, and the continuing push for young people to get married which led to a major drop in the marriage age, as discussed in the introduction. Also, as mentioned before, college women were also more independent, and marriage was the only sanctioned site for sex, and it was encouraged for young people to marry to “legitimately gratify” sexual needs.⁸³

On 11 February 1949, *The Acorn* reported that, “Well, Patty's gone and done it. Note that sparkle on her third finger left hand and the one in her eye.” Marriage is portrayed as something women pursue and achieve, while her fiance is not mentioned. It is possible that he was not a Drew student, and it would not be notable to give him name, but it is still notable that it is centered on her. The section also says, “Have you noticed the speed demons in the angel factory? Only have to know the girl two or three weeks and you can get engaged, married, etc. But good!” Again, it is not clear what they are referring to without knowledge of the college gossip, but it is

⁸³ Reumann, *American Sexual Character*, 133.

clear that there have been some very quick relationships and engagements on campus. Like the 1947 comments on early engagements, this might be tied to legitimate gratification of sexual needs.⁸⁴

The Acorn also reports on the marriages of Betty Grable in 1944 and Thomas F. Manville Jr in 1945. These were high-profile marriages of celebrities/asbestos heirs. Grable was mentioned in an article about the music of her husband Harry James. The Manville story is instead in the gossip column, *Honi Soit Qui Mal y Pense* (“shame on anyone who thinks evil of it”). It reports on Manville’s eighth marriage. The punchline of the marriage is the justice of the peace had never officiated over a marriage that would be broken, and hoped Manville would ruin that record. Manville responded, “I won’t make any rash promises.” *The Acorn* commented, “Nothing rash about that marriage vow, is there, Tom?”⁸⁵ So, in this case, it shows marriage (at least for men) as something less than serious. Notably, in December 1945, the college was 60% female and *The Acorn* staff was thirteen women to eleven men.

Student Government

Student Government by Gender (w meaning women, m meaning men)

Year	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Council
1942-1943	0 w/ 5 m	0 w/ 6 m	0 w/ 5 m	0 w/ 6 m	12 m
1943-1944	1 w/ 5 m	0 w/ 6 m	2 w/ 3 m	At least 2 m	1 w/ 11 m
1944-1945**					2 w/ 8 m
1945-1946	2 w/ 3 m	2 w/ 3 m	4 w/ 1 m	1 w/ 4 m	4 w/ 8 m
1946-1947	3 w/ 2 m	1 w/ 4 m	1 w/ 4 m	At least 1 w/	1 w/ 10 m

⁸⁴ “Trivia.” *The Acorn*, 11 February 1949.

⁸⁵ “Honi Soit Qui Mal y Pense.” *The Acorn*, 21 December 1945.

				2 m*	
1947-1948	1 w/ 5 m	1 w/ 5 m	1 w/ 5 m	At least 1 w/ at least 2 m*	1 w/ 10 m
1948-1949	1 w/ 6 m	2 w/ 5 m	1 w/ 6 m	At least 1 w/ at least 2 m*	1 w/ 12 m
1949-1950	1 w/ 6 m	1 w/ 5 m	2 w/ 5 m	At least 2 w/ at least 2 m*	5 w/ 6 m

* No full picture of the class officers, so this is drawn from the *Oak Leaves*' record of seniors'

club involvement

** No record of the classes' student government officers

Source: *Oak Leaves*, 1943-1950.

The *Oak Leaves* recorded, for the most part, on the makeup of the student government. As I mentioned in the introduction, the student government were representatives of the school and a reflection of who was allowed to have power. It is another site to look at social organizing, more of the literal side, with event planning. It is also another site to look at club makeup and backlash. In 1945-1946, there was a high point for female representation, but it is still very low, reflecting the national negative view of women in positions of power. What is notable is that at the end of the time period, there is a very balanced student council.

The Acorn also reported on the student government elections. In November 1943, they reported that, "The co-eds of the second semester Freshman Class stormed the ballot boxes on Wednesday, November 17th, and captured two of the six offices of the class [Vice President and Social Chair].... However, the male contingent of the class, although a minority group, is represented in the offices of President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Student Council

Representative....”⁸⁶ Again, the language is reminiscent of hostile takeovers of on-campus housing. This was a year after the coeducation vote, and most women were only on campus for around a month at the time of this printing. In the *Oak Leaves*, the only female freshman class officer was Anne Di Marco, Social Chairman. Joseph Blessing was vice president.⁸⁷

On the 1946 *Oak Leaves*’ Class Officer page, it says, “With the fall term of 1946, Brothers College went back to the pre-war class system, another step in moving from wartime into a peacetime era. In March 1946, class elections were held again, and the council was reorganized to fit it for its work in the year ahead.”⁸⁸ It might seem the emphasis on return to pre-war norms might suggest the move towards women leaving the workforce nationally, and in the college the push for coeducation to be discontinued, or at least for women to be out of leadership positions. However, there were women among the officers--they held the majority of the offices for the junior class and almost half of the freshman, sophomore, and student council seats.

Stanley Oppenheim testified in November 1946 that “the high offices in this college are and were maintained by men even when men were in the minority. [The co-eds] have no interest in campus life and hold themselves aloof.”⁸⁹ They were obviously involved in the *Acorn* and student government, but even this oversimplifies the issue. The female students may not have found it possible to get elected to campus-wide office. They did in several cases, but they also had the Drew-Eds, where they could gain leadership experience and shape their college experience to their best advantage.

⁸⁶ “Frosh Class Elects Leaders,” *The Acorn*, November 26, 1943.

⁸⁷ *Oak Leaves*, 1944, p. 15.

⁸⁸ *Oak Leaves*, 1946.

⁸⁹ *Drew University Trustee-Faculty Hearing on Co-Education*. 20 November 1946, p. 2.

I have taken the tone here that women holding the position of social chair was upholding gender roles and keeping them from real power in student government. This may still be true, but a 1942 article of *The Acorn*, before women were admitted, asks the Drew students to fight for the freedom to self governance of social affairs free from faculty intervention.⁹⁰ Therefore, the prevention of faculty involvement in social planning and maintenance of the student's power and self governance makes the social chair a more powerful role. Again though, this discussion was before women were admitted.

A possible similarity between the on-campus and national narrative is the importance of volunteer versus paid work during the war. Working women are the focus of a lot of study due to the tangible economic impacts of their labor, but volunteer labor was much more widespread and impactful across many fields--government administration, hospitals, military, childcare (allowing women to work), maintaining the home and the family, especially through the war despite wartime shortages, and all-over helping the war effort.⁹¹ Social events are similarly less appreciated work, versus student government positions, due to the seeming importance of governance. But social chairs organized volunteers to set up events, which they held more often than the other government members. They provided a service to the student body.

Nationally, V-12s frequently dominated campus politics--in large part because of how much of the student population they made up. However, they did not seem to do this at Drew. One possible explanation was that Drew academically switched to a three term system but may not have for the terms of office, so the V-12s would not be on campus during traditional office holding periods. Additionally, V-12s were very busy with an accelerated academic schedule and

⁹⁰ "Fight For Your Rights!" *The Acorn*, 5 March 1942.

⁹¹ Anderson, *Wartime Women*, p. 90.

their V-12 commitments, and also their widespread presence in athletics, making holding office difficult.⁹²

Trustee-Faculty Hearing

The November 1946 Trustee hearing heard from a wide variety of speakers on coeducation, from faculty, to male and female students, local secondary educators, alumni, and parents. The female students were Jean Elmore, the editor of *The Acorn*, Jeanne VanCamp, the president of the Drew-Eds, and Joy Werner, the social chair of the Drew-Eds. The male students who testified were Stanley Raub, senior class president, Stanley Oppenheimer, the student council president, and Dixon McGrath, the junior class president. The male students (who nationally, in the pre-war period, tended to prefer coeducation), the alumni, and some professors who testified were the only ones opposed to coeducation in the post-war period.

The hearing started with Professor Jones, who argued that there was no conclusive proof the coeducation would help or hinder education, but that allowing coeducation would mean that the college could maintain a larger student body of better quality than if they allowed only men. Additionally, they would better serve the needs of the community with a coeducational institution. However, coeducation is also more expensive, as they would need new facilities for female students.

Senior Class President Stanley Raub argued that Drew could either be a mediocre coeducational institution, or return to being an outstanding men's college. He argues that Brother's College was founded for men and, because there was no longer an economic need for coeducation, they should return to the pre-war norms. He argues that the female students have

⁹² Schneider, "Campus Life."

not made any contributions to the college, but have made impediments--that the library had become a dating bureau. He also says that he is speaking for many students who attended college before coeducation, both returning students and alumni, and that these students will be helping finance the college in the future, so the relationship between the college and these alums should be cultivated. Additionally, women go to college to “gain polish and finesse,”⁹³ while men come to prepare for a career, and coeducation has changed classes and they no longer receive the same rewards for attendance they used to.

The Dean of Women, Dean Morris, argued for coeducation, and that the female students have upheld standards of excellence, both academically and socially. She also says that the dorms are well-enough equipped to be used for several more years.

Stanley Oppenheim, the President of the Student Council, argues that if the Navy had decided to contract Drew earlier, the college would not have allowed coeducation, and that female students have added nothing to the college educationally. He repeats Raub’s points about how the college could be outstanding if it were male-only and that the library has become a dating bureau. He builds on that and says coeducation is supposed to develop social balance and poise, but that the social functions have been disappointing, that former students did not find themselves socially inept around women, and that they are not necessary for their social development. He additionally questions the economic need to keep coeducation as the college survived the Great Depression. Dr. Lambdin, a trustee, asked, because Oppenheim was not aware of any contributions from the women, what would he ask them to do? Oppenheim responded that they are separate and distinct as a group, that the high offices have always been maintained by men, and that they have no interest in campus life.

⁹³ *Drew University Trustee-Faculty Hearing on Co-Education*. 20 November 1946, p. 2.

Dixon McGrath, Junior Class President, argues that the men built up Brothers College's reputation, and that large colleges and universities are male. He argues that coeducation was instituted for economic purposes only and that was why men were forced into abnormal dormitory conditions. McGrath wrote an article in December 1945 about visiting Rogers to shed tears over it becoming a female dorm, a year and three months after the decision.⁹⁴ He also argues that women go to college to get married ("a M.R.S. degree"), that they have no intention of going into a profession, that they are trying to turn the college into a glorified country club, and that if they left, seriousness would return to the college. He notes the additional expenses of coeducation and that the housing and facilities differences may scare off prospective students. He again argues that they have not made any specific contributions, especially in leadership, and that they are socially exclusive. Specifically, they monopolize Saturday nights for the social calendar and charge admission.

The treasurer of the alumni association, Johnston Stewart, class of 1932, argues that coeducation has some positives--that it is presently existing, that it provides an extra financial cushion for the college, that it permits male-female relations, and that it will help the local female population get a college education. However, he then argues that the facilities are not sufficient to expand coeducation, that men's place at the college would have to be sacrificed for women, that relationships are a distraction and will change the approach of professors, that it violates the purpose Brothers College was founded. He also argues that permanent coeducation will mean the college has to compete with all other coeducational institutions and that, long-term, the college will seem less attractive. Also, it will impair the standard of work in the college and men will restrain themselves in class. Lastly, he argues that "men should have an

⁹⁴ Dixon McGrath. "Asbury Visits Rogers En Masse to Shed a Few Nostalgic Tears," *The Acorn*, December 21, 1945.

intangible stamp placed on them; an [sic] uniqueness of character,” which cannot exist with coeducation.⁹⁵ Trustee Baldwin asks if this is the opinion of the alumni, which Stewart says that a considerable proportion of alumni who graduated before 1942 are against coeducation.

Jeanne VanCamp, the President of the Drew-Eds argued next. She acknowledges that coeducation was supposed to be temporary, and that therefore it would be unfair to judge the female students based on the last three years. They have tried to become organized, especially with the Drew-Eds, and a longer trial will show that they deserve to be at college. VanCamp also notes the age difference between veterans and the young women--the men are older and more mature. They have more time for school spirit, while the female students have less time with scholarship work, and the return of class organization will give them more time to develop better school spirit.

Joy Werner, the Social Chairman of the Drew-Eds argued that the women added to the refinement of the college, as men are no longer wearing sloppy clothes and vulgarity has been limited. She also argues against the social development argument, saying that coeducation allows for a more realistic environment.

Jean Elmore, the editor of *The Acorn*, says that coeducation offers a greater future for the college as they will have a broader base to pick students from and coeducation will make the college more attractive. She also argues that the needs of women at the college are not so different from the mens, as additional dormitories will be necessary whether coeducation continues or not, and that the female students will not require any change to the curriculum. Lastly, she reaffirms that the female students want to be in college, especially as most of them are working or on scholarships, while the veterans are on the GI Bill. Dean Lankard asks if the

⁹⁵ *Drew University Trustee-Faculty Hearing on Co-Education*. 20 November 1946, p. 4.

female students are cooperative, and Elmore says they are and that they will step into leadership roles and be part of school traditions. Lankard then asks about the Drew-Eds, and Elmore says that they are primarily for women but provide a social function for everyone. Trustee Morris asks if the women find the men socially unattractive, to which Werner replies that they want to mix, even with the age differences. Faculty member Dr. McClintock asks if women are at home on campus, which VanCamp says they are but they are not familiar with some traditions. Trustee Baldwin asks if veterans are more resentful of coeducation than other men, which Elmore says that they idealized pre-war Drew and that coeducation has been a shock. Dean Lankard asked if the female students would resent if the curriculum changed for women, which Elmore says they would, and that in the business world there is intermingling, so the college should keep the system as is to prepare them.

The supervising principal of Madison schools, Dr. Robert Parker, argued for coeducation because young people should not be separated in the crucial years so they can learn how to cooperate. He argues that women take greater interest in human relationships, which causes men to think better. Also, women are at least academically equal to men, and coeducation has raised the moral conditions of the college. Lastly, only one-third of New Jersey women can get a college education in the state, and the college could help alleviate that issue. Lankard asked if the differences between men and women meant they should be separated for college, to which Parker replied that mixed groups are better. Dr. Brown, a BC administrator, asked about an analysis of the local community and the college, and if coeducation had anything to do with the attitude on campus. Parker replied that the community is proud of Drew and approved of coeducation.

Dr. Ralph Perry, the principal of the Morristown High School said that local parents were very happy about coeducation. Baldwin asked if he knew any Drew students from the 1930s, and if he observed their sincerity of purpose. Perry said that the students from the 1930s did not notice a difference with coeducation. Faculty member Dr. Schultz asked what the reaction would be if Brother's College gave up coeducation. Perry responded that it would be negative, and some women would even have to give up their plans for higher education.

Dr. David Fulcomer, a Brothers College professor, testified in favor of coeducation. He argued that the atmosphere on campus is better now, in the classrooms and in terms of wholesomeness. Baldwin asked if female students resent "the masculine show-off" in classrooms.⁹⁶ Fulcomer says there is not a lot of that behavior, and that the female students do influence campus behavior. Baldwin then asks if the men resent the women for being on campus because the college is not the same as it used to be. Fulcomer says that many do, but mainly resent the loss of housing, so proper housing would lessen the resentment. Brown asked if the male students before were correct in saying that the women have unfavorably affected the social life. Fulcomer said the women have been supportive of school activities, and that men are misremembering the past on campus. Schultz interjects that Professor Simester (the professor of physical education) said that women have been more loyal to athletics than male students (Simester submitted a letter to the committee about the athletic facilities). McClintock asks if coeducation has affected the intellectual caliber of students. Fulcomer says there has been no lowering of academic standards. Lankard asks if he has needed to change his teaching for coeducational classrooms. Fulcomer said that there is no difference in teaching approach, and he

⁹⁶ *Drew University Trustee-Faculty Hearing on Co-Education*. 20 November 1946, p. 7.

prefers a mixed group. Morris asked what the average age of the GIs is. Fulcomer said that the average GI has been away from college three years, and is around 22 or 23.

This is all the in-person testimony. Also attached to the hearing is a letter from a father of two coed students, a letter from a junior coed [who is physically handicapped], the letter from Professor Simester on athletic facility capacity (which concluded that the male student body alone has outgrown the facilities, and unless they can provide better ones the college should discontinue coeducation), a letter from Professor Whitney (who argues that the college does not have the resources to be a coeducational institution), one from Professor Kimpel (in favor of coeducation for social maturity), and a memorandum to the committee from Dean Lankard about the postwar college (the GI Bill and the new relationships between the government and colleges).

The anti-coeducation arguments focused on the academic reputation of Brothers College, which they feel has been ruined by coeducation, the strain on resources, and the belief that it will distract the students from their studies and make them behave differently in class. This was a common argument against coeducation (the strain on resources and their academic reputation), made possibly more poignant due to the war and postwar economic fears--on one hand, if the economy sours it would be prudent to keep coeducation to help the college weather it; on the other, female college grads would have less opportunity for employment in a bad economy due to discriminatory hiring practices. Stanley Oppenheimer, a representative of the Old Drew, testified that veterans were anti-coeducation, most likely how I discussed previously--that they were not returning to the same society that they left before the war. As around half the student body was male veterans, this was not an insignificant claim. Additionally the male students accuse the female students of being “distinct, separate, and as a group within themselves.”⁹⁷

⁹⁷ *Drew University Trustee-Faculty Hearing on Co-Education*. 20 November 1946, p. 3.

Most likely in response to this criticism, the Drew-Eds dissolved and the Women's Athletic Association took over on holding social events.

The female students had to organize themselves to testify against the students who may have had the most credibility in front of the administration, as they were in powerful elected positions, as class and student body presidents, therefore serving as representatives for the student body. This is lost after the coeducation hearing, with the Drew-Eds dissolution and the Women's Athletic Association taking over the social events, but losing the leadership of being the coed group on campus. This is probably one of the major shifts in postwar college gender relations--as mentioned in my intro, women lost their ability to fight for coeducation after they gain the right to stay at college, and in doing so they lose most of their ability to advocate for themselves and take up space at the college (in student government and in *The Acorn and Oak Leaves*).

At the beginning of the conversation around coeducation, faculty were a driving force in support. This was continued postwar, when the college was more solvent, and therefore they were not just out to save their own jobs, though again there was widespread postwar economic fear. Two faculty members were opposed to coeducation, mainly arguing that there were not sufficient facilities (housing and athletics being the two main concerns) on campus at the time for co-education, as already they were insufficient facilities for the male student body. This is a fair criticism, as the facilities were insufficient, especially as more and more men returned from the war with the GI Bill to fund their college education.

The faculty in favor testified that coeducation was necessary for social maturity, that the atmosphere of campus and in the classroom had improved with the female students, and that having a larger pool of prospective students to pick from through coeducation would ensure the

academic excellence of the college. The social maturity argument, especially from the perspective that men and women would need to be able to interact professionally, was a new concern, as wartime mobilization was the driving force around intergroup contact. Additionally the hearing was so soon after the war that they did not know this would not be a problem as women were pushed out of male dominated jobs through demobilization.⁹⁸ However, these were college educated women who may still be able to find employment in the white collar workforce, as they did through the 1920s and 1930s, though the jobs were clerical and often understimulating for college women.

The sociology professor, Dr. Fulcomer, was extensively questioned by the trustees, and he testified that the male students resented the female students' presence, but mainly because they idealize the past and resent the loss of housing. Specifically, Dr. Fulcomer said that, "Girls have been good in supporting school activities. Men forget what the spirit on campus used to be."⁹⁹ This alludes to their organization on campus and their involvement in many different clubs, such as *The Acorn* and the *Oak Leaves*. Again, he is responding to the idea of the Old Drew and having a distinct prewar, war, and postwar student bodies. In his testimony he presents the Old Drew (the veterans) as wanting to return to the prewar college, and as I said earlier, the prewar society.

Conclusion

Much like the rest of the United States and indeed the world, the end of World War II caused a huge culture change at Drew. One major change was that in December 1945, women

⁹⁸ Rosalind Rosenberg. *Divided Lives: American Women in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1992; D'Ann Campbell. *Women at War with America: Private Lives in a Patriotic Era*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984, p. 236.

⁹⁹ *Drew University Trustee-Faculty Hearing on Co-Education*. 20 November 1946, p. 8.

made up 60 percent of the student body, but by March 1946, it was 53 percent male to 47 percent female. The influx of male students continued, making it 66 percent male by September 1946, and 50 percent of the entire student body was male veterans. Women dominated clubs in the 1944-1945 school year, in a way that they never really did again. From 1942-1950, only two female students were *Acorn* editors, in 1943 and 1946. The Drew-Eds disbanded after the coeducation hearing, but they were folded into the Women's Athletic Association. Women students went from holding numerous student government offices--in the 1946 elections, they held thirteen out of thirty-two offices, including four out of twelve student council seats, but in 1947, they held one out of eleven council seats. In the 1950 elections, the freshmen class elected one woman out of eight offices, sophomores one out of seven, and juniors two out of seven. The student council was more equal, with six men to five women. *The Acorn* editor does not buck the trend, but it is clearer to see when women were in power. Jean McLuckie became coeditor over a staff of 8 women to 10 men in 1943-1944, one year after coeducation was allowed and barely a semester after the first female students started. The next female editor was in 1946-1947, with Jean Elmore, over 12 men and 6 women. *The Acorn* editor was appointed by the student council. McLuckie would have been appointed by a student council with likely no female students (the freshman class apparently had the only coed representation with a female vice president and social chair). The March 1946 election had eight men to four women on the student council, but in 1947 the student council was ten men to one woman.

The first coed graduated in 1945 (presumably a transfer as coeducation was instituted for the 1943-1944 school year). That was also the high point of female participation in *The Acorn* and *Oak Leaves* (16 women to 12 men on *The Acorn* and a female majority *Oak Leaves*), and also when the student body was a female majority. In 1945-1946, *The Acorn* was still a female

majority with 13 women to 11 men, and the student body was female majority in December, but by March it was a male majority. The *Oak Leaves* was a male majority, though there were coeditors.

The turnaround after this high point was swift, especially in the *Oak Leaves* and in student government. As early as 1947, the student council was 10 men to one woman. There was also a new focus on gender roles in the description of club roles in the *Oak Leaves* in 1947 under the club's male majority. Also in 1947, there were surprisingly strong anti-coeducation pieces in *The Acorn*, especially shown in Mamie Mushroom, which presents the idea that women were cramping the male students' style and they were merely tolerated. The end of the Drew-Eds in 1946 marked a change in the role of women on campus--while they held onto event organizing power, they lost a lot of their more political organizing power.

Nationally, the backlash to women in traditionally male spaces was institutional--hiring practices were that they would be let go in favor of returning veterans, and socially forced back into the home. Post-war United States did not need to rebuild or repopulate, so there were few to no social welfare programs aimed at supporting working women and mothers.¹⁰⁰ At Drew, there were few changes at the college when women attended. The curriculum was not changed, as it was nationally, often to favor domesticity. New rules for women were written and revised several times and some new staff were hired, but there was no institutional overhaul--in fact, there was less done than there probably should have been, especially in regards to women's facilities on campus. There was more done for the V-12s coming onto campus temporarily than for the female students.

¹⁰⁰ Rosenberg. *Divided Lives*.

As a whole, the faculty had supported coeducation since the beginning of the war, had pushed for it originally, and several testified in favor of it to the trustees. However, some did testify against it as well, but mainly argued that there were not adequate facilities, rather than questioning the quality of women as students or the value they brought to Drew.

In D'Ann Campbell's *Women at War with America: Private Lives in a Patriotic Era*, she argues that women responded to World War II "on the basis of their identities as women, as members of families and communities, that had been forged before the war and would persist after." This does not apply to the female students at Drew, because while they were clearly still women, they were not a community before the war. They responded to the war and the backlash against them on campus by organizing and forming new communities. This was especially important as the 1940s marked the beginning of youth culture and the growing importance of peer groups, putting the organization of the Drew women into broader context.

They may not have had "a permanent break with their past commitments, sense of themselves, and expectations," as many of them still married while in college, but they did "seize opportunities for new occupations that the war proffered..."¹⁰¹ Additionally, I feel that the point in this case study is not that the war profoundly shaped college women, but the Drew female students during the war shaped the college. However, the postwar issue complicates the matter. First off is that the wartime changes did not last in the postwar period, beyond continuing coeducation (which is still a major victory). However, the change seems to be starker between the college women's experience and the national women's experience. Of course working women lost their jobs and were pushed towards the home during demobilization, but for many women this was a welcome return. College women at Drew fought against attempts to force

¹⁰¹ Campbell. *Women at War with America*, p. 236.

them out, as it was not just undoing wartime gains but going against the general standards of education, not universally, but wide-spread.

Society allows people to build on themselves and others more than on a college campus with an entirely new student body every four years because they can continue doing their work longer than four years. In the case of the Drew-Eds, the organization was dissolved and the social aspect carried on in the Women's Athletic Association, but it lost a lot of its activist role. Even by the end of the period, the Women's Athletic Association was doing their best to engage with female students, but no longer organizing outside athletics. This may have been because women are more integrated into the college, and all-college organizations also represent women. However, women were also losing representation in student government, *The Acorn*, and *Oak Leaves*.

The struggle of studying college women during World War II is that they usually did not participate in the war effort, and most studies of women during the war deal with how they contributed to the war effort, in the WAC or the WAVES, or in factories, or at home with victory gardens, rationing, and war bonds. A big reason these programs were allowed was that equality assumed equal moral value between men and women, but equal sacrifice was universally appealing as it did not mean that men and women were actually equal. Therefore, their service with the armed forces, or in factories, or at home was sacrifice, and comparable to men's service without being equal. Coeducational colleges did not have that reasoning. Some colleges changed their curriculum when they became coeducational--Drew did not. Therefore, male and female students were taking the same classes and were active in the same community, creating equal value, though the female students were still limited by gender roles.¹⁰²

¹⁰² Campbell. *Women at War with America*.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Karen. *Wartime Women: Sex Roles, Family Relations, and the Status of Women During World War II*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1981.
- Campbell, D'Ann. *Women at War with America: Private Lives in a Patriotic Era*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Dougher Shay, Patricia. "The Founding of the New Jersey College for Women: The Struggle for Women's Access during the Progressive Era (1870–1930)," Ph.D. diss., University of Massachusetts Boston, 2010.
- Eisenmann, Linda. *Higher Education for Women in Postwar America, 1945-1965*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.
- Hartmann, Susan M. *The Homefront and Beyond: American Women in the 1940s*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982.
- Kleszynski, Margaret A., May, Mildred, and Alderman Patricia S. "Cultural, Economic and Social Influences on Coeducation in the United States and Implications for Student Services." Education Resources Information Center, 1994.
- Miller Solomon, Barbara. *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Newcomer, Mabel. *A Century of Higher Education for American Women*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1959.
- Reumann, Miriam G. *American Sexual Character: Sex, Gender, and National Identity in the Kinsey Reports*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Roby, Pamela. "Women and American Higher Education." In *The Annals of the American*

Academy of Political and Social Science 404, American Higher Education: Prospects and Choices, Nov 1972.

Rosenberg, Rosalind. *Divided Lives: American Women in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1992.

Royde-Smith, John Graham and Hughes Thomas A. *World War II*. Encyclopaedia Britannica Online. Last Updated 10 September 2020.

<https://www.britannica.com/event/World-War-II>.

Schneider, James G. *The Navy V-12 Program: Leadership for a Lifetime*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987.

Winkler, Allan. *Home Front U. S. A.: America During World War II*. Somerset: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2012. ProQuest Ebook Central.

The Acorn, Drew University, Madison NJ, 1942-1949.

Drew University Trustee-Faculty Hearing on Co-Education. 20 November 1946. Drew University Archives, Madison NJ.

Drew University, *Oak Leaves* (New York/Madison, New York/New Jersey: 1942-1950). Drew University Library/Archives.