# Changing Images: The G.I. Bill, the Colleges, and American Ideology

*by William Adkins*
*Winner of the GAH-Federal Archives Undergraduate Essay Contest*

During the decade following World War II, over two million ex-soldiers flooded America's colleges and universities, taking advantage of financial assistance provided by the federal government. Popularly known as the G.I. Bill, the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 was conceived as an instrument of national policy designed to manage the return to society of millions of veterans after the war. It was intended to be a temporary measure and, in this and other respects, was shaped by American political and social ideologies. What no one at the time foresaw was that the bill's provisions for educational assistance would result in profound and permanent changes in those same ideologies and in the structure of American society as well. Benefits to veterans returning from war were not new; pensions had been awarded to disabled veterans since the Revolutionary War. Indeed, pensions and other forms of privilege for ex-soldiers are common throughout history. In ancient Rome, veterans exerted political power sufficient to make and unmake emperors. In Elizabethan England, the soldier's right to special treatment was written into law.[1]

Prior to World War II, the United States government was not so generous. Although care for disabled veterans was generally accepted, and mustering-out bonuses were common, most Americans believed that a citizen called to war was doing

This attitude is reflected in the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt in a speech to the American Legion Convention on October 2, 1933: "No person, because he wore a uniform, must be placed in a special class of beneficiaries."[2] However, fears of a second economic depression and possible social unrest after the war set the stage for radical changes in the treatment veterans received, including the innovation of providing financial assistance for education. These changes fundamentally altered the way Americans thought of higher education. Before 1944, college was a realistic option for only an elite minority in the United States, despite the limited growth of women's colleges and of a network of small Negro colleges. Today, higher education is open to anyone who is qualified (at least in theory). The original G.I. Bill evolved into an institutionalized system of benefits that makes military service a common route to financing post-secondary school education. These developments also led to impressive growth in the number and size of colleges during the post-war years. In Georgia, for example, public colleges in 1943 had a combined total of 13,937 students.[3] Today a single institution, Georgia State University (then a small extension of the University of Georgia with about one thousand students) alone boasts an annual student enrollment of over 30,000.

The G.I. Bill was not the sole cause of these changes, of course. As will be seen, other factors, such as rising social awareness on the part of women and black Americans, were at work. An increasingly sophisticated technology required trained workers, and the Great Depression had demonstrated the vital role government could play in the economic arena. But it was the G.I. Bill's educational features that drew millions of ex-soldiers to the nation's colleges, stimulated changes in widely accepted beliefs about who should attend college, and opened the door to new ideas about equality, diversity, and public support for higher education. These changed ideas are today reflected in national

policies that view wide participation in higher education as vital to national economic well-being and aid to veterans and other groups not as a granting of privilege but as a sound economic investment that also serves egalitarian ideals.

The original impetus for a comprehensive program of benefits for veterans of World War II was generated by concerns about the economic and political consequences of the demobilization of millions of servicemen following the war. National leaders had good reasons to be concerned. Following World War I, sharp reductions in the production of war materials, combined with the return to civilian life of some four million soldiers, caused a severe economic downturn. Furthermore, officials were also aware of the danger dissatisfied veterans could pose to the social and political fabric of the United States. In the 1930s they were witness to the part played by just such dissatisfied veterans in the rise of fascist regimes in Europe during the Great Depression. In addition, the world-wide depression of the 1930s was still fresh in the minds of Americans, creating a political climate favorable to action in Washington.[4]

The situation that Washington faced was potentially much worse. When peace came, a wartime industrial economy that combined with the military to employ some thirty million Americans would have to convert to peacetime production--and some eight or nine million servicemen would be discharged into a job market which would then have to absorb them.[5] Clearly, the policies of the past would no longer serve. Eleanor Roosevelt put the crisis into perspective, saying that the government had to: "adjust our economic system so that opportunity is open to them on their return, or we may reap the whirlwind."[6] In short, a specter of economic disaster and social unrest forced a major change in national policy.

However, if visions of another depression and the politically frightening prospect of millions of unemployed and angry ex-

soldiers forced officials into unprecedented action, the legislative package that emerged was largely shaped by a conservative philosophy that looked with suspicion on active federal involvement in the economy or other aspects of society, such as higher education, that were traditionally regarded as private concerns. Given this approach, it is not surprising that FDR insisted that early studies be conducted without publicity. But seeing "no harm" in some advance planning, he appointed his uncle, Frederick A. Delano, to initiate an unpublicized study.[7]

The progress of the war soon made the need for more planning evident. In addition, proposals to extend the draft to 18- and 19-year-olds in 1941 raised concerns about an "education gap" that would affect large numbers of the nation's youth. In response, veterans' organizations began to urge that education benefits be extended to veterans. In early 1942, the American Legion recommended a program of aid to Congress.[8] In July, 1942, the president appointed the Armed Services Committee on Post-War Educational Opportunities, chaired by General Frederick H. Osborne.[9] Known as the Osborne Committee, this study group reported back to the White House one year later with the following recommendations:

1) All veterans entering the service after the draft was instituted (September 16, 1940) and who served at least six months should be entitled to one year of subsidized training.

2) For those veterans who showed superior academic performance, the educational benefits should be extended for up to three additional years.

3) An in-service training program should be instituted to inform and guide servicemen concerning these benefits.[10]

The rationale for these recommendations is expressed in this

excerpt from the Osborne Committee Report:

> The president endorsed the Osborne Report in November, adding his support to the many organizations proposing that post-war veterans' programs include educational benefits. These organizations included the American Council on Education and the National Education Association.[11]

The support of these organizations, as well as veteran's groups like the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, points out that the broad support was not entirely motivated by the potential economic and political crisis. Many of these groups believed that the country owed a special debt to the citizen who risked his life in the defense of the nation; this was, for those not concerned with matters of national policy, often a primary consideration. To some, the looming crisis offered promise as well as problems, an idea expressed by John R. Emens, president of Harvard University:

> The demobilization of our armed forces is a God-given moment for reintroducing the American concept of a fluid society. If it is handled properly we can insure a healthy body politic for at least a generation. Handle it improperly, and we may well sow the seeds of a civil war, within a decade.[12]

Support for the G.I. Bill thus came from several different directions. Conservatives saw it as a preventative for social disorder, liberals viewed it as a vehicle for social progress, and veterans' groups welcomed a bill that advanced their interests.

The G.I. Bill served the convergent interests of all these groups. This fact sheds additional light on the remarks of Eleanor Roosevelt quoted above. Despite her liberal reputation, she endorsed the idea of the G.I. Bill as a means of maintaining the social order--not the first time reformers had used conservative fears to push for social change on the grounds that the alternative was worse.

However, while such sentiments illustrate the reasons for the widespread support the G.I. Bill received, the record shows that they were not an important influence in the evolution of the legislation. The driving force behind the bill was national interest:

> The primary purpose of any educational arrangements which we may recommend should be to meet a national need. . . .We have regarded any benefits which may be extended to individuals in the process as incidental.[13]

By the end of 1943, the inclusion of an educational assistance package in the legislation was certain. President Roosevelt signed Public Law 346--the original G.I. Bill--into law on June 22, 1944.[14]

At the time, this educational assistance was not considered a major component of the bill. The issue of education was controversial, however. As previously noted, service in the defense of the United States was considered to be a citizen's duty, and did not confer an obligation on the part of the government to provide special benefits. Also, conservative fears of "socialist" programs that would intervene in matters historically regarded as private (such as education) influenced the final form of the G.I. Bill. It was for this reason that it was specifically enacted as a temporary measure, as was a later "Korean G.I. Bill" passed in 1952.[15]

Another concern addressed in the legislation was fear that such a federal program would amount to a "foot in the door" leading to federal interference in the affairs of colleges and universities. To allay such fears, the bill specifically prohibited federal control over any aspect of higher education, including curriculum, admission standards, and faculty hiring.[16] Another concern of educators received less attention. College, they generally believed, should be restricted to those who could benefit from higher education; that is, to a relatively small elite.[17] One Harvard professor commented that "the G.I. Bill carried the principle of democracy too far."[18] However, such concerns were mitigated by surveys indicating that returning servicemen were unlikely to avail themselves of the opportunity for college education in any great numbers (These estimates proved spectacularly wrong.). Most of the veterans were expected to use the benefits to get high school diplomas or vocational training, if they used them at all.[19] But the main reason that this concern was ignored had to do with the nature of the bill itself. To the creators of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act, the colleges of America were one of many resources which could be used to address a looming crisis, and the consequences to the colleges, or any benefits to the individual veteran, were not major issues.

Clearly, the original terms of the G.I. Bill had the secondary purpose of allowing those whose educations had been interrupted to complete their studies. Those terms were, as one writer described them in 1947, "very straightforward."[20] They were also more generous than earlier proposals, such as those made by the Osborne Committee. All members of the Armed Services who served honorably during World War II were eligible (including black and female veterans). Tuition and fees would be paid up to $500 per academic year, along with a

subsistence payment of $50 per month. For married men (but not women) an additional $25 per month was allotted, and $10 per month for dependent children. Veterans were eligible for a minimum of one year of educational assistance, but could be entitled to up to four years, depending on length of service. The bill was later amended to increase the subsistence allotments and to eliminate a provision that restricted benefits to those under 25 years of age.[21]

Little thought, if any, was given to the effects the G.I. Bill might have on disadvantaged groups such as women and African-Americans.[22] The benefits were targeted at the vast majority of soldiers who were white males. Women comprised only 350,000 of the 10 to 12 million members of the Armed Forces.[23] The number of blacks was higher, but they still were a relatively small part of the Armed Forces.[24] It is not surprising that an educational ideology that viewed even most white males as unlikely candidates for a college education would not consider it likely that offering such an option to Negroes and women would have a significant impact. However, long-term trends were at work. Increasing self-awareness on the part of these groups, the experiences they had during World War II, and the G.I. Bill were to combine to bring some unexpected results.

Some servicemen and veterans attended college even before the G.I. Bill went into effect. As early as 1943, about 10,000 veterans had availed themselves of state and other assistance programs.[25] In addition, many servicemen attended classes through in-service training programs. Figures for the University System of Georgia show that more than 7,000 servicemen were enrolled in 1943.[26] At the Evening College of Georgia[27] special courses were offered, including "Military Mathematics," "Problems in Trigonometry for Defense," "Diplomacy and Propaganda," and "Nautical Astronomy."[28] As the war

continued, so did preparations for the expected influx of veteran students. Within the Armed Services, information sessions were conducted to explain the rights soldiers had under the new legislation. Colleges and universities began to prepare as well. Responding to studies indicating that veterans' needs were somewhat different than those of the traditional student, changes in the curriculum were instituted at many schools. Following the recommendations of the National Education Association, these included refresher courses for those long out of school.[29] Many colleges also developed new schedules that included evening courses.

Those concerned with these preparations had little hint of what was coming, however. Studies reported only limited interest among servicemen in the opportunity for a college education at Uncle Sam's expense. One report cited the desire of veterans to "get on with their lives" and predicted that at no time would the total number of veterans enrolled in America's institutions of higher learning exceed 150,000. Other studies concluded that participation would be limited to somewhere around 700,000 over the life of the G.I. Bill.[30] Officials and educators generally believed that most of the educational benefits would go toward vocational job training and the completion of high school.

The reality was far different. An early hint is contained in the description of an information session for enlisted men sent to George Sparks, Director of the University System Center (now Georgia State University). It describes the "enthusiastic response" of soldiers to the opportunities described.[31] It was soon apparent that veterans' interest in higher education was not only enthusiastic, it vastly exceeded all predictions. A brief look at the experience of Georgia's University System of public colleges is a good illustration.

As a result of the departure of many military personnel bound for other duties, enrollment in Georgia public colleges fell to less than 11,000 in 1944. These figures were typical of colleges and universities across the nation, both public and private. The loss of students was so severe that some small liberal arts colleges closed down and never re-opened.[32] By contrast, in 1946 the State Department of Veterans' Affairs reported that over 20,000 veterans were enrolled under the G.I. Bill.[33] In 1953, the figures were still in excess of 8,000.[34] These massive increases are reflected in an article in the Georgia State University *Signal* reporting on the construction of new facilities already underway in 1945 to handle the increasing student load.[35] The volume of students was so large that , as the war drew to a close, George M. Sparks, now Director of the Atlanta Division of the University of Georgia, obtained an old parking garage for the school and had it remodeled using war surplus and partial federal funding to provide space.[36] The additional facility quickly filled up after its opening in March of 1947. During the 1947 fall quarter, more than 5,000 students enrolled.[37] During the 1948-49 school year, the total jumped to 6019, of whom 3097 were veterans.[38] This growth in enrollment caused a comparable expansion in the size of the faculty. The number of instructors grew from 67 in 1940-41 to 132 in 1948-49 and to 335 during the 1953-54 academic year.[39]

Georgia's experience was typical. Nationally, 2,232,000 World War Two veterans eventually attended college under the G.I. Bill, and their numbers were further increased by soldiers returning from Korea in the 1950s.[40] In some years, the total number of veterans came close to being a majority of students nationwide. By the end of the assistance provided by the original G.I. Bill in 1956, college enrollment stood at 2,918,000 compared to just 1,365,000 in 1940.[41] To accommodate these

students, colleges had expanded on every front: buildings, dormitories, classroom space, and faculty. The situation of the Negro colleges was similar in many respects, although these institutions faced additional problems. In 1940 these colleges numbered 112 in the South, where they were primarily located. They formed a virtually isolated network of higher education by and for the black community.[42] The total enrollment in that year was just 43,000. By the time the benefits of the G.I. Bill terminated, that enrollment stood at 76,000.[43] However, some 20,000 prospective students had been turned away for lack of facilities. This occurred despite the fact that, even in this era of segregation, the Negro colleges received a disproportionately large share of federal funds provided to assist colleges in coping with the vast numbers of veterans. Black veterans seeking college educations were 8.6 percent of the national total, but their schools received some 14 percent of the assistance.[44] It was still not enough to handle the load, but it was enough to provide for tens of thousands of newly educated African-Americans who would have been denied the opportunity in earlier years.[45] Furthermore, by paying for new classrooms, dormitories, and other buildings, the federal aid resulted in long-term improvements at these schools.

Women in the Armed Forces did not fare so well. While in theory they were as entitled as male veterans to educational assistance, a number of factors operated against them. First, the bill did not provide entirely equal subsistence allowances, as noted earlier. Second, much less effort was made to inform women in the Armed Services of their rights under the bill.[46] As a result, many did not take advantage of the opportunity. Finally, many women served in support branches such as the WAACS (Army) and the WASPS (Navy). However, when Congress first authorized these units, they were classed as

"auxiliary services" and were in a legal limbo where veteran status was concerned. This resulted in denial of benefits to many women veterans. The WASPs, in particular, never benefitted at all.[47]

Coping with the massive numbers of new students was a major problem. Faced with such huge increases in student populations, colleges and universities nationally found themselves short of classroom space, dormitory space, faculty, and virtually everything else. At the University of Wisconsin, Quonset huts were erected to provide temporary classroom space and trailers were parked on athletic practice fields as makeshift dormitories.[48] The fact that many of the veterans were married presented a new problem for these institutions. In the past, students were expected to be students only. Those who attended were supposed to be able to concentrate on their studies, undistracted by concerns such as a family. Indeed, many institutions that were admitting married veterans had earlier prohibited married students entirely. To deal with the changes, many universities undertook large-scale building programs.[49] The federal government provided considerable assistance to strained college budgets with another innovation. Many of these buildings were built with one-half the cost borne by Uncle Sam. This again raised fears of federal authority intruding itself into the nation's colleges. Again, the authorizing legislation contained specific prohibitions to safeguard against this possibility, as was emphasized in bulletins issued by the American Council of Education that describes "Federal grants, not to exceed the cost of construction. . . The bills prohibit the federal government from exercising any supervision or control over any educational institution."[50]

Given the overcrowded conditions, the question arises: was the education received by the veterans during this period adequate? The evidence indicates that the answer is yes. A

survey conducted by the American Council on Education in 1950 of both disabled and able-bodied veterans in college showed that they did not feel short-changed. A majority of 56 percent rated their education as good to excellent.[51] The opinions of the veterans were supported by the record. On the average, the veteran had better grades than the younger, non-veteran students.[52]While the huge influx of students caused problems, it did not prevent them from obtaining a good education.

In large part this was probably due to the veterans themselves. For, if quantitatively they were a problem, their quality as students was, as one writer termed it, a "pleasant surprise." Far from turning America's campuses into "hobo jungles" the ex-soldiers consistently outperformed traditional students, and were notable for their dominance of Dean's lists and honor rolls.[53] Furthermore, both faculty and outside observers repeatedly noted the greater maturity and commitment of the veteran student, as this comment illustrates: "Their grades quickly climbed past those of their younger classmates and changed forever the perception of the older student."[54] The end results were also impressive. Under the G.I. Bill the colleges and universities produced 450,000 engineers, 233,000 teachers, 79,000 doctors and dentists, and tens of thousands of other professionals.[55]

By the mid-1950s the educational provisions of the G.I. Bill had proved to be a resounding success by any measure. Those provisions had been written into the bill primarily as part of a national policy designed to ward off unemployment, economic chaos, and possibly social and political unrest. By the time the last G.I. left school in 1956, over two million ex-servicemen and women had received college-level training, and they were only a part of the total. Millions more had earned high school

diplomas or completed vocational training programs. A secondary purpose of the G.I. Bill was to close the "education gap" created by the demands of the war, which prevented many from completing their educations. Here, too, it was more than successful; by the mid-fifties, a broad range of Americans were better educated than ever before.[56]

But much more had happened than just the successful implementation of a legislative package of veterans' benefits. The numbers, performance, and diversity of the veteran-students had wrought permanent changes both on and off the campuses of America.

The most obvious of these changes was the size of the college student population in the United States. At the height of the G.I. Bill, ex-servicemen swelled enrollment by 75 percent. It had been anticipated that the numbers would fall after the veterans were gone, but the opposite occurred. After a temporary decline in the mid-fifties, college enrollment began to climb, reaching 3.9 million by 1960, and it continued to grow for decades thereafter.[57] Among the reasons for this growth were population increases and the demand for trained people in an era of Cold War competition and advancing technology.[58] But the G.I. Bill played a major role by changing ideas about who should attend college. The ex-servicemen left in their wake the realization that higher education was for anyone with the ability to do the work. Moreover, the new student diversity was now seen as an asset. These changed attitudes made the academic environment a different place in many ways. Responding to the needs of the veterans, colleges and universities introduced innovations, such as summer sessions and night classes. The immediate reasons can be seen in a memo issued by George Sparks, Director of the Georgia University System Center:

> Those of us who realize the value of formal education must do our part in urging on them [veterans] their obligation to themselves and to the social and political program for which they have been fighting. Colleges are rearranging their programs to make them administratively flexible for the soldier's immediate preparation.[59]

The subsequent evolution of Georgia State University provides a good example of the long run effects of the G.I. Bill. Today, it is a major urban university which serves not only the traditional student but a wide variety of married, part-time, working, and night students--all innovations that originated in response to the needs of the World War II veteran.

The G.I. Bill thus did much to equalize educational opportunities for the American (white) male. It also had similar, though more indirect, consequences for African-Americans and for women, despite the discrimination experienced by the women veterans.

For the black veteran, the most obvious consequence was the increased opportunity to attend college. Furthermore, the experiences of World War II combined with this opportunity to provide much of the impetus for the civil rights movement. Prior to the war, the black community was a world apart from white America. It was isolated, a society within a society.[60] However, black men in large numbers, as part of the Armed Services, had seen and interacted with the outside world. The experience helped to not only broaden their horizons, but to raise questions about the traditional narrowness of those horizons.[61] Following the war, more than 70,000 received college educations, and, thanks to the many buildings and

improved facilities provided for them, emerged from a Negro college system that had a much improved capacity to serve the black community. These veterans were, in a word, a cohort of activists whose experience and education made them less willing to accept the inferior status accorded them by white society. They became a major force in the civil rights struggle that lay ahead. A prime example is William Hastie, the first African-American to sit as a Federal Appeals Court judge. Like many of the leaders of the black community in the fifties and sixties, Judge Hastie owed his education to the G.I. Bill.[62]

As noted earlier, women in general received only limited benefits from the provisions of the G.I. Bill, although some 60,000 were able to take advantage of the educational assistance.[63] Nevertheless, the effects of the bill worked to their advantage in some ways. Traditionally, relatively few women attended college. For example, in 1940 only about 40 percent of the student population were women. During World War II, the numbers increased to between 700 and 750 thousand as many young women took advantage of the places left open by men gone to war. Women's enrollment languished at that level for more than a decade while the nation's colleges coped with the flood of male veterans.[64] But greater participation in the work force during the war and the need to manage on their own while the men were away spurred the aspirations of many women. A college newspaper editorial makes the point: "This is the Age of the Woman. . . It is far past the time when we should have begun the evolution from rugged to subtle femininity. . . [the year] 2000--where will women stand in that year?"[65] By the late fifties, circumstances were more favorable for change. With the departure of the veterans, the nation's colleges faced the danger of declining enrollments and the threat of layoffs of recently hired faculty members. At the same time, thanks to those same

veterans, they now possessed greatly expanded facilities at a time when many women were becoming more conscious of themselves as a group. The results were predictable. By 1960 women's enrollment reached 1 million and continued to grow in subsequent years.[66]

The Serviceman's Readjustment Act, and in particular its educational provisions, was extraordinarily successful in achieving its original objectives. Those objectives had little to do with education per se; they were purely nationalistic in the sense that the G.I. Bill was created by the federal government as a means to maintain economic and social order. The nation's schools at all levels were simply means to that end. Yet, in the long run, the many unforeseen consequences of the bill are of more note. The bill's successes, intended and otherwise, had other effects as well. As Senator Ralph Yarborough, a long-time supporter of a "permanent" G.I. Bill noted, it was "by far the most far-sighted veterans' program in our history."[67] This perception helped to change the federal government's role, both with regard to the veteran and to higher education in the United States.

For example, war brought a new emphasis on the need for continued technological progress. In a report to Roosevelt in 1944, Bernard M. Baruch stated: "Trained people are an inestimable asset to every community."[68] This realization was reinforced in the late 1940s by the advent of the Cold War. The United States now was part of a dangerous, competitive, and increasingly technical world that demanded large numbers of highly trained people simply to maintain national defense.[69] It was also evident that the government had a vested interest, if not an obligation, to support and encourage the institutions of higher learning that could provide those trained people in large numbers. This situation combined with the success of the G.I.

Bill to change ideas about the role of the state in the educational process. Government expenditures were now seen to be an effective, indeed vital, investment in developing national resources.

The G.I. Bill itself proved to be the forerunner of change. In 1966, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law a third G.I. Bill directed toward the servicemen then serving in Vietnam.[70] It was this descendant of the original act that became the basis for the educational benefits that are today an integral part of the compensation (and often motivation) for military service. Such programs are now viewed more as job benefits than as government largess. Furthermore, the availability of these benefits to the wide range of minorities that form a large proportion of the members of the Armed Forces is seen as an equalizing force in society.[71]

In 1940 American ideas about education, veterans, and the role of the federal government were far different than they are today. For most citizens, a high school diploma was sufficient. College was largely reserved for those who were "prepared" and so could benefit from higher education; that is, upper-middle class and upper class white men. Women had a limited role, and a scattering of small Negro colleges existed to train some blacks (mostly men) to perform needed services for their race and so function to maintain the separation of the races. The federal government's role in higher education was virtually non-existent, and such a role was considered undesirable as an inappropriate use of government money and as a potential threat to academic freedom. Nor did citizens believe the government was obligated to provide any special services to veterans who had done their patriotic duty. It was also viewed as undemocratic to institute programs that made these veterans a "privileged class."

The Serviceman's Readjustment Act was crucial in bringing

about both changes in society and changes in the ideologies noted above. Certainly, the act was not the sole cause of change, rather it was part of the vast events and social changes engendered by World War II, and the developments that followed that conflict. But there is no question that the G.I. Bill played a central role in shaping the modern American identity. Educational benefits are now considered an investment that enhances the nation's well-being. The college campus is a more diverse place peopled by students of various ethnic groups and backgrounds. Equal access to higher education, with ability as the sole requirement, is an ideal which, if not always realized, is at least pursued.

## Notes

1. Theodore R. Mosch, *The G.I. Bill: A Breakthrough in Educational and Social Policy in the United States* (Hicksville, 1975), 107-8.

2. Franklin D. Roosevelt, quoted in Mosch, 19.

3. University System of Georgia Enrollment, September 27, 1943, GSU President File Box 42, File 519, Georgia State University Special Collections.

4. Keith W. Olson, *The G.I. Bill, the Veterans, and the Colleges* (Lexington, 1974), 1-2.

5. J. M. Stephen Peeps, "A B.A. for the G.I.," *History of Education Quarterly* 24 (Winter, 1984): 515.

6. Eleanor Roosevelt, quoted in Olson, 21.

7. Olson, 5.

8. Olson, 15.

9. Mosch, 27.

10. Mosch, 28-9.

11. Mosch, 27.

12. John R. Emens, quoted in Mosch, 23.

13. Report of the Armed Forces Committee on Post-War Educational Opportunities for Service Personnel, July, 1943, quoted in Olson, 1.

14. Mosch, 14.

15. Mosch, 14.

16. Mosch, 44.

17. Thomas M. Bonner, "The Unintended Revolution" *Change*, 18 (September/October, 1986): 45.

18. Semmour E. Harris, 1947, quoted in Olson, 99.

[19]. National Education Association, *Educational Programs for Veterans: Report of the Work Conference* (Washington, 1945), 1-2.

20. Charles Hurd, *The Veterans' Program: A Complete Guide to Its Benefits, Rights, and Options* (New York, 1947), 89.

21. Hurd, 89-99).

22. Much of the controversy that the G.I. Bill caused revolved around conservative fears of Federal encroachment on private matters and state's rights. Given the association between these and opposition to civil rights, it is possible to speculate that some of the opposition may have been motivated by the inclusion of the Negro colleges. However, I found no evidence to support this. It appears that the part played by black Americans was simply ignored.

23. June A. Willenz, *Women Veterans* (New York, 1983), 152.

24. National Education Association, 18-19.

25. Bulletin of the American Council on Education, November

14, 1944, GSU President File Box 42, File 519, Georgia State University Special Collections.

26. "University System of Georgia Enrollment, September 27, 1944", GSU President File Box 42, File 519, Georgia State University Special Collections.

27. Georgia State University was originally named the Evening College of Georgia. As it grew, it underwent several name changes. At different times it was also known as the Atlanta Division of the University of Georgia and the University System Center.

28. Bertram Holland Flanders, *A New Frontier in Education: The Story of the Atlanta Division of the University of Georgia* (Atlanta, 1955), 37.

29. National Education Association, 3-5.

30. Mosch, 3-6.

31.Captain Robert M. McGraw, Air Corps, Letter Addressed to Dr. George Sparks, November 14, 1944, GSU President, File Box 42, File 519, Georgia State University Special Collections.

32. Flanders, 39.

33. Georgia State Department of Veterans' Services, *Annual Report 1946*, 19.

34. Georgia State Department of Veterans' Services, *Annual Report 1953*, 19.

35. "New Building," *Signal* (October 11, 1945), 3.

36. Holland, 39-44. This building, named Kell Hall, is still in use today - author's note.

37. Flanders, 39.

38. Flanders, 145.

39. Flanders, 146.

40. Olson, 43.

41. Olson, 44.

42. Henry Allen Bullock, "Education: Parallel Inequality" in *The Segregation Era: 1863-1954*, ed. Allen Weinstein and Frank Otto Catell (London, 1970), 262-5.

43. Olson, 74.

44. Olson, 75.

45. The Negro colleges were relatively small and lacking in funds, resulting in a greater need for federal aid for new facilities. However, the greater assistance they received does not appear to be the result of a conscious effort to address the needs of this minority, although the program (which did not discriminate against these schools) did have that effect.

46. Willenz, 199-200.

47. Willenz, 179.

48. Olson, 90-92.

49. Bonner, 46.

50. Bulletin of the American Council on Education, April 23, 1947, GSU President, File Box 42, File 520, Georgia State University Special Collections.

51. American Council on Education, *The Disabled College Veteran* (Washington, 1950), 11.

52. Bonner, 47.

53. Bonner, 46.

54. Bonner, 47.

55. Edwin Kiester, "The G.I. Bill May Be the Best Deal Ever Made by Uncle Sam," *Smithsonian* 25 (November, 1994): 129.

56. Peeps, 520-1.

57. Olson, 44.

58. Peeps, 518.

59. George Sparks, Memo, 1944, GSU President, File Box 42, File 519, Georgia State University Special Collections.

60. Bullock, 262-65.

61. Bonner, 130.

62. Bonner, 130.

63. Bonner, 130.

64. Olson, 44.

65. "Women: Have They Become Supreme While the Men Were Away at War?" *Signal* (October 11, 1945), 3.

66. Olson, 46.

67. Ralph Yarborough, quoted in Olson, 99.

68. Bernard M. Baruch, quoted in Peeps, 518.

69. Peeps, 518.

70. Bonner, 48-9.

71. Kiester, 129, 132.