Love, Valor, and Endurance

World War II War Brides Making a Home in Montana

by Seena B. Kohl
Not quite fifteen when World War II began, Joyce Butler of Hampshire, England, went to work for a transistor and battery firm—her contribution to the British war effort. At a canteen run by the U.S. Army, Joyce met a GI from Somers, Montana, Russell DeLong, who would later become her husband and a whirlwind courtship followed. The pair received the army’s permission to marry just before the Normandy invasion and when the war was over made plans to move to Montana. As Joyce recalled: “Most people had not heard of Montana... They said, ‘If you are going to Montana they will have cowboys and Indians there... and they don’t have any water in the house, and you will have to go outside to the toilet.’”

Undeterred, Joyce left for the United States with a nine-month-old baby in February 1945. The trip took two weeks in high seas due to bad weather. The next step was the train trip west, held up for eighteen hours in a blizzard at Wolf Point, Montana. At the Kalispell train station Joyce was met by her husband, “who said I was the sorriest looking lady he ever saw... It was some experience... When I first came over I cried myself to sleep every night. I thought, ‘Why did I do this?’ Now I think I didn’t make a mistake... I go back to England and I wouldn’t want to live there anymore.”

Joyce’s story is representative of those told by many women who married GIs during World War II and moved to Montana. For most of these women, Montana was a truly alien place. They had to adapt to the state’s open spaces, sparse population, and harsh climate as well as to new families, communities, ways of speaking, and customs. Doing so in the absence of their families and often while dependent upon a single person, their husband, who also faced a period of readjustment, called for uncommon abilities to deal with hardship. All managed, albeit not without tears. Heroic on a personal level, the narratives are success stories.

But these individual histories do more than offer stories about building satisfying lives: they illustrate the connections between a person’s life decisions and the social context in which they are made. For all of these women, their understanding of gender roles, expectations for marriage, and acclimation to hardship underlay the successful transitions to new lives.

More than any other factor, World War II shaped the lives and outlooks of the war brides who came to Montana. To understand their lives, it is necessary to remember how young these women were when the war began. They were, for the most part, twelve to sixteen years old in 1939 and most had graduated at age fourteen from eighth grade. Prior to the war, they would have entered the workforce, continued in technical programs, or continued their formal educations. All that changed with the onset of war. By 1941, the British government was recruiting young women into female service organizations such as the Civil Defense Women’s Volunteer Service, Women’s Auxiliary Air Force, and the Women’s Land Army and directing them to areas with labor shortages.

*See notes beginning on page 94.*
The Montana Historical Society

War Bride Project

An oral history project sponsored by the Montana Historical Society and carried out between 2000 and 2003 captured the stories of Montana war brides. The project sought to give voice to a unique group of immigrants and to explore not only the impact of World War II but also the process of becoming a Montanan.

The British women interviewed came from London, Liverpool, and Edinburgh as well as smaller towns—Cheshire, Diehi, Hampshire, West Bromwich, and Great Bloodworth. Three respondents grew up near Rockhampton, Australia, near the training site for the U.S Army Forty-first Division, which included many National Guardsmen from the Kalispell area. Two women lived in small towns near Paris, and two women met their husbands in occupied Germany. One respondent fell in love with her husband while he was stationed in Seoul during the Korean War; despite the fact that she immigrated during a different period than the other women interviewed, her experience illustrates an important exception to the welcome most war brides received. After coming to Montana, the women lived in towns throughout the state: Conrad, Whitefish, Kalispell, Great Falls, Helena, Billings, Geraldine, Grass Range, Butte, and Fort Benton.

Like all oral histories, these interviews raise methodological issues, for example, that of self-selection. Not all women contacted were willing to be interviewed, and those who returned to their countries of origin were unavailable even to contact. Those who agreed to be interviewed were the survivors.

Participants told their stories not for self-satisfaction, but for their families, particularly their children. Yet no life can ever be recorded in totality, and any recollection contains omissions and revisions of what "really" happened. Self-censorship is unavoidable, but what is censored changes over time and with cultural distance.
When the war started, Evelyn “Chub” Tuss was fourteen years old, living with her family in Diehl, a town on the English Channel twenty-one miles from France. She recalled: “You could see France on a clear day. We were called Hellfire Corner. We were bombed, we were shelled, we were machine-gunned. We had warships coming and shooting shells on the beaches. . . . Dad was in the ambulance [service] and mom was too. . . . But when you were fourteen, everybody had to do a job. . . . We were Civil Defense workers. We all had to wear the. . . . tin hats. The fourteen-year-olds used the fire hydrants to [put out the] incendiary bombs. We used to climb the roof and put them out—that was our job.”

War experiences differed, of course, but there are commonalities among all the participants: scarcity of food, scarcity of clothes, scarcity of recreational opportunities. Scarcity is a relative concept, but all talked about how they and their families learned to “make do.” A comment from Ruth Batchen, who grew up on the outskirts of Liverpool, illustrates: “We were living pretty much as we were living before except for the air raids, the shortage of food. For instance, two ounces of butter a week per person and two ounces of meat per person to eat, so that was hard on my mother trying to, you know, eke out the meals for four of us. And it was difficult, but, you know, you think you can’t get by, but you can.”

Elvia Stockton, who grew up in a village outside of Paris, was seventeen when Hitler invaded France. Under German occupation, young girls returned to school and she recalled: “We went because we were allowed some biscuits—a kind of dog-biscuit-shaped thing with vitamins. We went for that. . . . and of course, there was a little, how do you say, indoctrination. We were supposed to really obey the law and stuff—no food, no way to open your mouth. I mean you just knew that you were under very strong pressure. You had to be very, very careful [about offending the Germans].”

In general, the respondents did not elaborate on their memories of hardship. As Doreen Richard, who lived in West Bromage just outside of Birmingham, said of the air raids: It was “just unbelievable if you think back. . . . that you lived through that. More unbelievable to think that you could accept it and cope. You’d go to work one morning and you would see your friends’ houses down. You’d see them digging bodies out. It was just unreal. It was like it was a nightmare. . . . But I was a teenager and I got kind of brave. Well, most people did.”

Perhaps part of “getting brave” was accepting these horrific childhood experiences as normal. The respondents presented their experiences of wartime hardship as just one part of growing up, which, if not forgotten, was not viewed as a primary factor in who they were.
For the women interviewed, meeting one’s husband, marriage, leaving one’s family, and coming to the U.S. defined their lives. Their narratives are love stories, framed around gender and a set of expectations of love and marriage. The war years were a time of far-reaching changes in sexual behavior: there was an increase in venereal disease, illegitimate births, and an increase in rates of divorce as well as marriage. In England, there was also the breakdown of a relatively rigid class system since everyone worked in the war effort. Further, the arrival of U.S. and Canadian servicemen, sometimes called the “peaceful invasion,” accelerated these changes.

Initially American soldiers were, for many, virtually mythological creatures, seen as symbols of hope for an end to the war. They were Santa Claus who had so much when compared with French populations living under German occupation or with the British armed forces. People made comparisons regarding their better uniforms, their food, and their apparent wealth and generosity toward the families of the girls they dated. (Servicemen learned quickly that the best way to a girl’s family’s heart was to bring food to dinner.) Marie Houtz, originally from London, remembered that one Christmas, “We were sitting in the dark. We couldn’t get any coal. It was cold and all of a sudden there was a knock on the door and it was Earl and he had all these brightly wrapped gifts. We didn’t have a Christmas tree or a gift in the house because everything was rationed and my family just fell in love with him. My mother dearly loved Earl.”

In fact, A Short Guide to Great Britain, a pamphlet filled with practical advice given to servicemen prior to their arrival, warned that “if you are invited into a British home, and the host exhorts you to ‘eat up, there’s plenty on the table,’ go easy. It may be the family’s rations for a whole week, spread out to show their hospitality.” Commanding officers began to encourage their men to take official “hospitality rations when they went visiting. . . . Fathers received cigarettes; mothers tinned fruit, ham, chocolate and candies.”

Yanks laughed and were fun and for young women, greatly attractive, particularly in a setting where most of the young men had been called off to war. As Irene Owen, from Cheshire, explained: “I think some people would think, ‘Why don’t you marry someone from your own country.’ But I never went out with anyone from my own country. I was only nineteen and I was wanting to go out.”

Besides the excitement expected from teenage girls at the arrival of a large number of handsome young men into their communities, the GIs were seen as symbols of hope, or as in Australia, defenders. Beatrice “Pete” Berrenger, from Rockhampton, Australia, recalled: “We welcomed them because Australia was left to fend [for itself]. Britain just kind of wiped us off. Until America came into the war . . . the Japanese were getting mighty close. Americans were very welcome there.”

Although all of the respondents noted how fun, attractive, polite, and considerate their future husbands were, not everyone had such positive views of GIs. Peggy Floechinger remembered: “Oh, there was some animosity with certain people . . . against the American soldier. . . . They came over at a time when we were in dire straits. . . . We had been going without for a long time, and the American servicemen were paid a lot more than the British servicemen. Consequently they were looked upon as show-offs. You know, they’ve got all this money and especially if a British girl went out with an American, they were stealing British girls.”

Such ambivalence toward the Americans was common, and GIs were seen alternately as generous or spendthrifts, friendly or pushy, frank or boastful, slovenly or casual. As Elsie Persicke, originally from London, recalled: “Well, most Englishmen didn’t appreciate the Americans being over there because
they took the women and then they had more money than our soldiers. . . . And they always had candy and fruit, which we couldn’t get.”

Less frequently mentioned by war brides was the general feeling that “nice girls” did not go out with U.S. Army men. The common saying in both Britain and Australia was that the “Yanks were over-sexed, over-paid, and over here.” Along these lines, Joyce DeLong recalled her mother’s response to her future husband: “I almost gave my mother a heart attack. She heard through her sisters . . . that ‘Joyce is dating a Yank.’ . . . They didn’t have a very good opinion because of some of the GIs . . . . They had a very bad reputation. I just went ahead and he seemed to be a very nice guy. Fell in love.”

In Norma Duff’s case, it was her father who objected to her dating an American. The town of Rockhampton, Australia, where Norma lived, had a population of about thirty thousand, and there were about sixty thousand servicemen (this was the Forty-first Division, which included members of the Montana National Guard). Norma’s husband, Roy Duff, explained: “He [her father] worked for the U.S. Army, . . . and he worked with the GIs, and all they talked about in the daytime was the girls they had out the night before and that kind of stuff. So he prohibited his daughters from having to do anything with the Yankees.”

Norma’s mother, on the other hand, was supportive. Norma remembered, “I used to go out with him, and then when I’d come home at night, so my dad wouldn’t know who I was with, my mom would stand at the window and move the window up and down to tell me it was time to come inside.” Perhaps her mother recognized that for Norma, as for all of the war brides, the desire to date—to have some semblance of a normal life—trumped any familial or community objection.

For Joyce and the other war brides, falling in love was the easy part. Parental desires, age of consent, and army regulations complicated the decision to marry for all of the respondents. Marie Houtz recalled that although Earl Houtz was twenty-three, he nevertheless had to get permission from his father, who initially opposed their marriage.

In addition to parental permission to marry, army regulations required an appearance before a committee. Marie recalled: “We had to have an interview I think with about six officers, very high-ranking officers, and a chaplain, and they called Earl in and questioned him. Then they called me in and questioned me. Then they called us both in and this is kind of a funny part here—they asked my husband, ‘Do you have to marry this girl?’ And he said, ‘No, sir!’ [laughs]. Then the chaplain kept smiling at me. Everyone else was very sober faced and they . . . denied our request to be married.” Only after a second letter from Earl’s father did they receive permission.

Joyce DeLong recalled a similar experience:

You had to get permission from your commanding officer. Colonel Bell said, “I don’t believe in foreign marriages.” He said, “If you want to marry her, you go back to the States and get your discharge and come back and marry her.” Russell [her husband] “didn’t like that answer at all. . . . He found out that some of the GIs were getting married to English girls . . . . He went to Colonel Bell and said, “How
come you are giving permission to some of these GIs to get married?” “Well, they are expecting a baby, so they have to get married. . . . [T]hey need a marriage license on the birth certificate.” Russell said, “Colonel Bell, I think that . . . is discriminating to the girls that don’t have to get married.” So, [Bell] thought about it. He said, “Soldier, you’re right. I will sign the papers.” . . . Then, the chaplain came down to see me, to see what kind of girl I was, the house I lived in and everything. He talked to my mother. Finally it did go through that we could get married.20

Delong’s colonel was not the only one opposed to foreign marriages. Elizabeth Goff, a refugee from Poland and working for the U.S. Army in Germany when she met her husband, recalled: “He wrote home and told his mom that he met me. And her comeback was ‘Of all the beautiful American girls, why in God’s name would you want to bring a foreigner home?’ And I never forgot that. When I reminded her, she said, ‘Oh my, honey, why do you have such a good memory?’ Many thought they [the girls] just wanted to get to America.”21

In retrospect, the respondents expressed few regrets about marrying. The regrets they did express dealt with leaving their families and enduring some very difficult times. All of the women viewed marriage as an inevitable and hoped-for step. For the most part, however, all of the respondents emphasized that they did not know what they were getting into. All explained that they were young, in love, and could not be assured of a future. As Marie Houtz noted: “You know, it was strange. We didn’t think we would live very long because, when we were married, there were still the V-2 rockets coming over and we just didn’t think we’d survive. So we didn’t think of the future. . . . We just thought we were lucky to be alive that day and maybe by the end of the day we wouldn’t be.”22

Being young and in love also meant that most of the respondents did not think about the difficulties of separating from their families until it was too late. However, when recalling their feelings about leaving their families and country, for the most part, despair was paired with love. The recollection of Chub Tuss illustrates a common feeling: “I knew he lived in Montana. He said, ‘Now, love, there are going to be lots of open spaces, but don’t worry about it. It’s going to be okay. . . . He didn’t have a clue. . . . [I] didn’t really know. I just was in love, I guess. I just thought it would be all right no matter where we were.”23

Elvia Stockton recalled how upset her family was. Leaving the family was “very very difficult. . . . [It was] terrible, terrible, but I was really too full of Bill. . . . We never talked about money or anything. Absolutely none. I guess I was awfully naive. I just didn’t expect anything. But then too we loved each other.”24

Elfriede Johnsen was living in Karlsruhe, Germany, under the U.S. occupation when she met her husband. Her memory of leaving was slightly different: “I didn’t feel bad [about leaving my parents]. . . . But I was young and in love and adventurous, so you leave and a new life starts. Only for them [her parents] it was probably very sad, you know. And every time I went back to visit it was very sad on both parts to leave.”25

For the most part, the respondents were well received by their husband’s families and the particular community. Further, for the most part, they felt they had been “told the truth” about Montana. Nevertheless, few imagined the reality of Montana’s spaces, mountains, weather, and small population. Chub Tuss recalled the trip west to join her husband in Lewistown in central Montana. She was on a train alone for four days and three nights before she arrived at the station in Harlowton where her husband met her.

[It] was just me. . . . I was so scared [whisper]. Just me, that’s all. I tried to make friends with people and everybody was nice . . . . They were really kind and I got off at Harlowton, and I say, “Oh, my Lord!” . . . All I saw was nothing, nothing, nothing! [In the 1940s, Harlowton had a population of 1,897.] I mean land, land, land. . . . You know in England it’s so crowded—shoulder to shoulder.
Roy Duff and other members of the Montana National Guard were among the sixty thousand U.S. troops stationed in Australia and New Guinea during the Second World War. Duff, pictured right (back row, far right), and his fellow soldiers courted young women whose desire for normalcy in the midst of war often trumped any parental concerns.

Norma Duff's father disapproved of her dating Roy; however, her mother helped Norma escape his watchful eye. Roy and Norma are pictured here on their wedding day, November 8, 1944, in Rockhampton, Australia.
The vast open space came as a surprise to many war brides arriving in Montana. Chub Tuss recalled, "All I saw was nothing, nothing, nothing!" when she stepped off the train in Harlowton, a community of about 1,900 people in the 1940s. Compared to the crowds in England, Montana loomed empty and isolated, similar to the feel of this photograph of the state's sparsely populated, albeit grand, landscape.

on the pavement. . . . It was really a shock. It was February and bare. . . . I remember they were all waiting for me. I'd only been in a car once, we rode bikes . . . and buses. So going in the car was quite something and then seeing all that land.26

Doreen Richard's husband told her about Montana and her husband's family's farm, but she remembered wondering:

What is it going to be like? But everyone said to me, "Oh, they have cars and it doesn't take long to get from one place to another." Hello! I arrived here . . . in Great Falls about December the sixteenth and I thought that Great Falls was such a small town. This was so small, and everything. . . . But anyhow we went to the farm and I thought it all looked alike. . . . It was barren. Snow. And we'd go along and we would turn the corner, it was the same. No change. Absolutely none. . . . It went on and on for such a long time. I said to my husband, "Don't we ever come to a town?" "Oh yes, we will be coming into Loma very soon." So I waited and I said to him, "When will we be coming into Loma?" "Oh, we did" [laughs]. That was it. I hadn't even noticed it. So, that was my first experience.27

Peggy Floerchinger and her husband, Tom, whose family farmed outside of Conrad, came on the same ship to the United States and then took a bus to Montana. She remembered: "I didn't see an awful lot until we got to Montana, which is so wide open. . . . I got to see the majesty of the state. It was overpowering. It was a little daunting because I'm a person that needs to have trees and things around me. When I get out in the open spaces, I'm not at all happy. I'm not very good out in a wheat field with nothing around me, and I marry a farmer who is."28

There were problems of housing, family relationships, language, prejudice, loneliness, homesickness, and of learning the ins and outs of a new culture, from the currency to appropriate behavior. Most of the new marriages started in the groom's family home, due in part to the severe housing shortage and to the financial situation of the new couples. Some, however, were able to find their own place. Elfriede Johnsen remembered her first apartment in Billings: "The housing situation was terrible, so we ended up in a one-room apartment. We had to go through the furnace room that had a coal furnace to get to this one room, and there was a hot plate in the closet that we cooked on. There was a table and a bed. We had to share the bathroom upstairs. It was terrible, but believe me, I didn't mind it because I was in love."29

Many of the women had corresponded with their future in-laws and exchanged pictures and presents. However, even where families welcomed the new brides, problems arose. Peggy Floerchinger recalled: "I wasn't thrown into a den of lions, so to speak, so that was good, because I was terribly homesick. . . . Tom's family was wonderful. They enveloped me, but
there were so many changes that I had to make. I was very conscious of the way I spoke... or the way I, for instance, laid the table.  

The first time Chub Tuss met her husband’s family was a shock:

I was an only child and we had a nice house—not fancy but a nice house and I came to one with eleven in it and it wasn’t clean... They were Yugoslavian... [T]hey could speak English, but Grandpa couldn’t very much. It was such a small place and... you had to give him [her father-in-law] money because that was what was expected... We lived there six months and then I went and got a place... They were kind to me, but it was just a shock to come into a house like that, with all those people, after being an only child and spoiled rotten.

Most of the war brides’ husbands met their new wives on their arrival; however, in several instances,

the women arrived before the men. Both Elizabeth Goff and Marie Houtz arrived in the United States while their husbands were still in Europe. In both cases, the family met them, and they had a place to stay. And even in cases where husbands met their wives, in some instances, circumstances forced them to spend a great deal of time away from home. Joyce Vashro’s husband was a railroad employee, and Joyce found herself left alone with her in-laws. She recalled:

Dick had to leave the second day after I got there [Minneapolis] because he had a job back in Montana. So he had to leave, and I stayed there for three months with the in-laws. I tried to make the best of it, but I did feel terribly lonesome for my folks and for the things I was used to... He finally found a place for us to live in Butte... I got to Butte; I thought, ‘Oh, my Lord, what have I [done]?’ So, I thought, ‘Well, Dick will be here. Everything will be fine now and we’ll have a good life.’ Well, he found a room up on the third floor of this hotel and there was just two rooms and he went out and got some

Sometimes war brides arrived in Montana ahead of their husbands, leaving them to meet their new in-laws, settle into new living arrangements, and begin the often difficult adjustments alone. Dick Vashro met his bride upon her arrival, but for two years Joyce Vashro and her young daughter Mary Ann spent six days each week alone, rooming in a Butte hotel, while Dick worked out of town for a railroad. The Vashro family posed for this portrait in 1945.
Joyce lived in the hotel with her baby for two years.

For many of the women, a generally positive welcome eased the transition to life in America. Often, the arrival of a war bride was, as in the case of Ruth Batchen’s arrival in Great Falls, front-page news. For some of the other women, the entire family would be at the railroad station to meet them. Elfriede Johnsen recalled: “Everyone welcomed me in Broadus, . . . a very small town of maybe three hundred population. Everybody was very nice, very interested. Nobody made any remarks because I came from Germany. They were just awed by seeing probably the first war bride that they’d ever had in that town.”

Jung Van Dam, from Korea, who moved to her husband’s hometown of Conrad after the Korean War, received a different reception:

“Well, this is a small community here, so when you go to church, they all look at you, you know, like head to toe. Examine you, you know, to see if she’s fit enough to belong in our church and things like that. . . . My husband belongs to this church. He went to church ever since he was young. . . . so when I came, I thought everybody going to accept me and give me a nice wedding shower and gifts and all that. Nothing like that! . . . Just his sister and his mom and dad was nice to me. . . . I took a lot of criticism, and . . . people would call me, you know, naggar, Jap, Chinaman. And squaw. . . . They are not like that now. Not now, no. This is forty-three years ago. . . . It was real hard, because, you know, people come to my house and . . . we’d be eating . . . having supper and they go around the table to see what kind of food you are serving. Well, you know, oh, yeah, she put a lot of fruit, vegetable, a lot of vegetable and rice and things like that, and fish. Everybody used to like potato and gravy and all that, but now everybody likes Oriental food. And people like to come to my house and eat my Oriental dishes now, and I have a good many friends now. It took many, many years for people to accept me. I used to cry a lot. A lot. The first five years is horrible.”

Women interviewed remembered their surprise about food as well as differences in everyday behaviors, dress, manners, and language. Odette Saylor had worked as a cook in France and also held strong feelings about American eating habits: “I was a cook. I loved to cook and I couldn’t find everything. In those days, the only cheese you could find . . . it was all that yellow . . . processed cheese, yuck . . . I didn’t like corn, I didn’t like peanut butter, I didn’t like potato salad. The first time I had potato salad . . . ah, I could have thrown up . . . Sweet potato salad! Sweet tomato sauce.”

In contrast, the dominant response to the availability of food was amazement. Doreen Richard recalled:

“We went and had a meal and I shall never forget that, because we had been on rations. And I hadn’t had pork in so many years, and I had pork chops . . . When it came, I had two pork chops. I couldn’t believe it. I thought to myself, ‘Well, I think that I am supposed to pass it to him and he will take his part.’ . . . Then, a piece of pie . . . Oh, my gosh. I thought that the Americans were the greediest people I had ever seen. Honestly, I’d walk around and see these people. They’d have half a pie and sometimes even ice cream on it. . . . Even after we were married when I would go shopping, it took me a long time before I could remember that I didn’t have to ask, ‘May I have two loaves of bread?’ Two, because I was so used to only being able to have one for so many years.”

Whereas the abundance came as a pleasant surprise, other cultural differences were less welcome. Janet Mohn, who moved from Rockhampton, Australia, to Kalispell, recalled: “When Bill [her husband] took me to a matinee or to a movie, I was so appalled to see these girls in their jeans and dirty saddle shoes and sweaters. I’d say, ‘Are they going to the show like that?’ He would say, ‘You are in America now, love.’”
Janet also remembered a difference in manners: “‘Please’ and ‘thank you’ just automatically came out of our mouths, and when somebody said, ‘Pass the bread,’ I got to the point where I didn’t until they said ‘please.’”

Peggy Floerchinger also was surprised at some of the behavior she encountered. The English, she explained, are “very reserved, extremely reserved. . . . When I first came over here, I was invited to coffee, and they said, ‘Well, I’m glad to have met you, you’ll have to come to my house for coffee.’ Well, I waited for the invitation . . . and it never came. . . . In England you didn’t do that. . . . I was raised in a very strict family. . . . Consequently, I saw a lot of difference in children and the way they were raised. There were a little freer and they were extremely verbal, whereas I was not allowed to talk unless I was asked to speak . . . so I . . . raised my children pretty strict. And manners were extremely important to me.”

Other war brides also found Americans lax when it came to childrearing. Joyce Barry, who came from Great Bloodworth to Kalispell, recalled: “I sort of went along with everything here, but I had my own ideas with raising children. The things that they couldn’t touch and we could take them anywhere.

They were good. Raising your kids with manners. And toilet training that I thought that they let go too long. I was careful about that.”

Odette Saylor recalled her sister-in-law’s response when Odette “popped” her daughter “one on the butt”:

Those people I met that had children, they raised their babies by what was then called “by the book”—no spanking. . . . One day I went with one of his sisters to town and I kind of hit my little girl. By that time, she was three years old and she had got lost in the store. I popped her one on the butt, and my sister [in-law] said, “Oh, you can’t do that in public. You know you could be arrested.” I said, “What! To give a tap to my child?” And she said, “Yeah, you can’t do that here.” . . . Well, of course, over there people spank their children. . . . They didn’t beat them up. Everybody had a . . . wooden handle with several straps and lots of people spanked their kids when they were unruly. They’d slap them on the legs. . . . That was just a reminder.”

Publications tried to bridge the cultural gap—but without much success. The sheer number of war brides moving from Britain to the United States led the British Good Housekeeping Magazine to prepare A Bride’s Guide to the U.S.A. in conjunction with the U.S. Office of War Information. Filled with advice about how to make the transition, the Guide encouraged women to “smile, use your British habit of thanking people for everything, ask questions, and you will make people feel that you want to be friendly.” Other parts warned the reader about

The abundance of food in the United States amazed most war brides. This promotional photo taken in a well-stocked Butte grocery store shows product availability they had not experienced for years.
U.S. behaviors such as the use of first names and the informal style of making friends. Much of the Guide emphasized homemaking, noting: “In America practically every housewife does her own work . . . Your main job, therefore, will be running the house.” In the interviews all the respondents talked about differences in language and manners and food, but housekeeping went unmentioned. Such emphasis was taken for granted, part of the generally accepted ideas about women in terms of wifehood, motherhood, and family building.43

One thing that eased the transition to American life for many of the women was the presence of other war brides. Elvia Stockton found a group of war brides from France in Billings, where she and her husband lived before moving back to his family’s ranch in Grass Range, about seventy miles away. Joyce Vashro, alone for a large part of the time in Butte, took the initiative in creating a community. She would read about the arrival of women in the paper and call them: “These English girls were coming over at the time . . . I met about ten of them altogether. When I’d see in the paper that so and so arrived from England, I’d call them up and say, ‘I’m English, too,’ and we’d get together for tea, or something, you know. I got to meet an awful lot of nice people. They saved my sanity—they really did.”44

There were formal organizations concerned with the adjustment of war brides such as the American Red Cross and the YWCA, but the most important organizations were war bride clubs.45 In some communities, the YWCA or the Red Cross sponsored these clubs. However, most of the clubs were unaffiliated, organized when a war bride took the initiative, as Joyce Vashro did. In the absence of family support networks, membership in these clubs provided the opportunity to share some of their trials and tribulations as well as to laugh.

The Overseas Wives Club of Kalispell and Whitefish is illustrative.46 Sheila Buck and Janet Mohn were two of the original members. The club, formed in 1951, grew from nine to twenty members by 1966. “We just took turns entertaining,” Sheila Buck explained. “We went from one house to the other. We met once a month and we would exchange magazines, letters, and information. People were hearing from home. And then when we had visitors from overseas we would have an extra special party because somebody’s mother came or some other family member came. We had a nice social evening. It was a night out for most of us.”47 As Joyce DeLong put it, the Overseas War Bride Club “was very important. You felt that you were with kinfolk when you were with someone from your own country.”48
Neighbors could also take the place of kin, as Chub Tuss recalled of her first years in Lewistown: “The lady upstairs really took care of me . . . and she taught me. . . . She was like my mom.” Church also provided a social network. Chub remembered, “church members taught me how to play bridge and then I had a lot of friends. . . . Later on [I met people through] women’s clubs.”

Similarly, when Muriel Morse’s merchant marine husband Herb had to ship out the day after she came home from giving birth to her oldest son, neighbors provided social support. Muriel noted, “You are brought up very reserved in England. . . . You just didn’t ask people. I just managed. . . . It happened that the lady in back of me . . . she saw me one day with Bruce [Morse’s son]. She had her baby at the same time . . . same age and all. She came around. . . . We got to be friends then. In fact we kept in touch for quite a while until she passed away.”

Of course where there was prejudice, there was no help: “See, I had to learn everything myself. Through TV. . . . and I had to be so careful what I would say because, you know, in broken English, and maybe I would say something you don’t understand what I mean, I might hurt your feelings. You know. Things like that.”

In spite of the difficulties, war brides learned to accommodate. Depending upon finances, there were transatlantic visits, although in some instances parting again was even more difficult than leaving the first time. Doreen Richard visited her parents in West Bromage before her children were born. Her first years of farm life had been extraordinarily difficult: the house she came to had no electricity and no running water and the expectations were that she would cook for hired hands without help. She recalled: “I can remember I was due to come back [from England] and I shall never forget. . . . [Returning to Montana] was worse than when I had left home, because I knew what it would be like, [but] I [had] made a promise.”

Richards had a particularly difficult situation, not only because of the lack of amenities on the farm, but also because of her isolation. Where Richards worked hard on the farm, that work did not provide her with a social network outside the family. Other war brides, on the other hand, took jobs outside the home. Such paying work was useful, not only as a means to supplement the family’s income, but as a way of meeting people other than one’s immediate family. Work relationships also helped in an “Americanizing” process, a factor commonly ignored in the advice given to war brides. In fact, the British advice book, A Bride’s Guide to the U.S.A., reflecting a traditional view regarding women’s work, suggested that taking a job would not be useful: “You may wish to take a job so as to increase your family income. If so, you will not be considered queer, nor will people look down on you. But do not waste your time. . . . Since your husband’s prospects of promotion may be improved by an attractive home, you may add more to the family budget by homemaking than by working for pay, unless you can get a really good job at a good salary.”

World War II, however, changed some of the generally accepted ideas, both for American-born women and war brides. All of the respondents, for example, eventually entered the labor market. Of course, all the respondents had prior work experience either associated with the war effort or as part of a family effort. As adult women in the U.S., a return to work was, for the most part, an economic necessity. In the case of the Goffs, of Great Falls, Elizabeth took a job to help earn money to buy a house, a fact her husband noted proudly in the interview.

Elfriede Johnsen, who went to work after her divorce, described her various jobs with pride: “I worked in a grocery store as a meat wrapper for several years. I worked as a waitress. I worked in a diner as a cook, dishwasher, waitress. . . . I worked at a motel and I worked at the hospital in housekeeping for seventeen years. And I had actually never worked in Germany before.”

Peggy Floerchinger and Sheila Buck returned to school for further education. Both had been in college before the war interrupted their studies. Peggy recalled one of the precipitating events in her return to school:

My mother called me and she couldn’t get hold of me and [when she did] she said, “Where have you been?” . . . I said, “Well I was out on the tractor!” She literally came unglued over the phone and she said, “I didn’t raise you to be a tractor driver.” . . . I didn’t do it very often. . . . I think that was one of the reasons that through the years I decided to do something . . . to make me feel that I wasn’t
something to be used out in the field. . . . I applied for the job at the library. Through the years I went through a lot of different workshops and became a certified librarian. That fulfilled that emptiness that I had. . . . I didn’t like farming. I make a joke of it now. I say, “Well, when I return in the next life, if a farmer comes towards me and asks me for a date, I going to run like you-know-what . . . in the opposite direction.”

Peggy’s dislike of farming was not a rejection of her choice to marry the farmer around whom she built her adult life. However, like all of the women interviewed, her embrace of her new life in America was not without contradictory feelings.

The interviews ended with the question, “Would you do it again?” and most of the women had a hard time answering. They mostly answered “yes,” but the “yes” was infused with hesitancy. The women weighed pluses and minuses connected to the loss of leaving family behind against the fact that they had made new lives—their children were here and they loved their husbands and life in Montana. In addition, their memories of their past struggles had inevitably faded over time.

Doreen Richard, who faced one of the most extreme transitions—to a farm without electricity or running water—at first answered “no,” she would not do it again. However, as she considered the question, she added: “The strange thing is that I love America and I think this is a wonderful country. And of course my children are all here. I would not like to go back to England to live. . . . For many years I would have [returned to England] but not now because things have changed.”

For some, there were mixed feelings about national identity. Peggy Floerchinger’s response illuminates the dilemma: “I took my citizenship out very early because . . . this is where I was going to live. . . . I have always kept them [my children] aware of English heritage. . . . I want to be in England. . . . and I love the United States. . . . I wrote a story one time about . . . my trip over here and what I did and how I felt and at the end of it I said simply, ‘Losing one’s country is like losing a child.’ You never lose the love that you had for that child. I still have my love for the country I was born in, but I also have a love for this country.”

Chub Tuss, who also got her U.S. citizenship after four years, said, “I’m glad I came to Montana. . . . Deep down, I’m still British. I’m so proud of being British for some reason. I don’t know why but it’s still home. . . . I’ve got my little wall there [filled with cups and pictures of the royal family]. I don’t push it because I don’t want people to think I’m being disrespectful. Look what I’ve got from being an American . . . my lovely kids, my grandkids, and so I’m blessed. I’ve had a good life. I love Montana. I love the U.S.”

Elvia Stockton perhaps phrased this dual identity most clearly, distinguishing between being an American and being a Montanan: “I would say if somebody asked me if I feel very much like an American . . . well, I would say no, I feel like a Montanan. I don’t know how to explain it, but that’s the way I feel. I really love Montana and the people.”

Autobiography, as Eric Hobsbawm writes, should demonstrate the interconnections between a person’s life and the larger social context in which they find themselves. The time and place offer “a shifting but always limited set of choices from which lives are made.” People “do not make [choices] just as they please, they do not make [them] under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past.”

Most of the women answered “yes” when their interview ended with the question, “Would you do it again?” They loved their husbands, their children, and life in Montana. Time had faded past troubles. Above, Elsie Persicke poses in her Whitefish home in 2002 with her wedding photograph and English keepsakes.
Certainly, the narratives of these twenty Montana women show the intertwining of personal choice and the circumstances in which these remarkable individuals found themselves. Coming of age in the 1930s and 1940s, these women were shaped by the traditional view that marriage, children, and family should define a woman’s life. All of the Montana respondents shared these expectations for their own lives in the face of an almost complete absence of local eligible men. They also shared ideas about love and romance and a youthful exuberance, which fed upon the presence of new attractive men who expanded the potential marriage pool and who brought excitement into a setting of privation. And so they fell in love with foreign soldiers and chose to marry.

The consequences of deciding to marry American GIs were varied, but all of the women had to deal with homesickness, loneliness, and the difficulties of adapting to life in a foreign land. They encountered Montana’s wide-open spaces, limited population, and cultural differences. They also faced all of the ordinary challenges newlyweds confront in learning how to live with one another. And they met these challenges without the support of their natal family or long-term friends. Yet these women exhibited high levels of resilience that helped them survive their transition to life in Montana. Perhaps their early experiences with privation, death, and living with uncertainty had, perversely, provided them with the resiliency to lead successful lives despite difficult circumstances.

Seena B. Kohl is a professor of anthropology at Webster University, St. Louis, Missouri, and coauthor of Settling the Canadian-American West (1995).
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