

Jet Age Feminism: Emilio Pucci, Mary Wells, and the Braniff Airways Stewardess of the 1960s[†]

By PHIL TIEMEYER*

This article considers the bold redesign of stewardess uniforms that designer Emilio Pucci undertook at Braniff Airways in 1965. As part of a larger marketing campaign to alleviate customer fears about the generic nature of jet travel, Braniff promised “The End of the Plain Plane” through injections of color, high-end style, and the objectification of stewardesses. The adoption of jet technology thereby significantly impacted women, at a time when the United States was experiencing the rise of a new feminist wave. What this article terms “Jet Age feminism” is quite different from the radical feminism that not only sought parity with men in careers but also demanded an end to the physical objectification of women, contesting the stringent beauty norms placed on women even at work. In contrast, “Jet Age feminism” was inspired by people like ad executive Mary Wells, who masterminded the Braniff campaign, and *Cosmopolitan* magazine editor Helen Gurley Brown. Braniff’s newly outfitted stewardesses embodied much of these women’s feminist vision: promoting greater public mobility for women without dismantling beauty culture. The end result was a compromised feminism that benefitted wealthy career women like Wells, without freeing Braniff’s stewardesses to attain the same access to life-long careers.

Whether for christening new routes or unveiling new aircraft, airport runways have sometimes supplemented their utilitarian purpose with something more festive. But in July 1965 aviation history marked a revolutionary moment on a different kind of runway: a fashion runway assembled in a lavish ballroom of the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, Italy. There, the famed designer Emilio Pucci, who attired celebrities such as Sophia Loren and Jacqueline Kennedy, introduced his Fall *haute couture* collection. As part of the show, he also debuted the fruition of his months-long collaboration with Texas’ Braniff Airways: a completely new ensemble of stewardess uniforms. Exceptionally colorful and formal-yet-casual, they were a sharp divergence from the monochromatic, military-inspired uniforms of elite carriers like Pan Am, British Overseas Airways, and Japan Air Lines.

The result, in the words of *Vogue* magazine, embodied the geographical fluidity and extraterrestrial yearning of the Jet Age: ‘In look, a combination of Texas, Florence, and

[†] An earlier version of this paper was presented to the Research Institute for the History of Global Arms Transfer in November 2018. The author is grateful to the members of the institute for their feedback, especially Professors Katsuhiko Yokoi and Kaori Takada.

* Author affiliations: Associate Professor of History, Kansas State University, United States.

Mars, the clothes [Pucci] has worked out are meant to meet every possible exigency—including the future’.¹ Braniff’s public relations materials added a similar point about Pucci: ‘As a decorated Italian pilot, he is blazing a new space-age trail for erstwhile earth-bound fashions. His concept for in-flight hostess attire is completely new, completely contemporary, and completely in accord with his credo: “When I design, I think of a woman in motion”’.²

Of course, this ornate presentation was motivated to generate publicity for the airline. However, this fact does not diminish the importance of Braniff’s innovations, which further exacerbated 1960s America’s cultural fault-lines of women’s liberation and sexual revolution.³ As Pucci and Braniff outfitted their stewardesses for a Jet Age future that could as easily involve Mars as it could Texas (in *Vogue*’s words), women at Braniff were rendered at once more empoweringly mobile, but also more restricted than before by male sexual privilege.

This essay’s first part examines how and why Braniff’s creative team, including Pucci, refashioned stewardessing as part of its larger marketing campaign, aptly entitled the ‘End of the Plain Plane’.⁴ The numerous changes responded to a deeper fear among airline executives: that the jet, with its expanded capacity that made air travel less exclusive, was spoiling customers’ sense of awe. Flying risked becoming ‘plain’ for customers, so Braniff’s marketers sought to manufacture renewed excitement, including through the dramatic refashioning of its stewardesses. This overhaul was financially vital for Braniff, since its Board committed in 1965 to shift very rapidly to an expensive all-jet fleet.

Some of this essay’s narrative on the ‘End of the Plain Plane’ campaign has already been chronicled by accomplished historians and journalists. Readers interested in a fuller consideration of the subject should consult Victoria Vantoch’s *The Jet Set: Airline Stewardesses and the Making of an American Icon*, which places the Braniff campaign in the context of other US airlines’ efforts in the late 1960s to sexualize stewardesses as a means to grow their customer base.⁵ In addition, William Stadiem’s *Jet Set: The People, the Planes, the Glamour, and the Romance in Aviation’s Glory Years* offers the most detailed study to date of Braniff’s decisions that culminated in the ‘End of the Plain Plane’ campaign.⁶ Finally, Kathleen Barry’s *Femininity in Flight: A History of Flight Attendants*, chronicles stewardesses’ multi-pronged fight against sexism in the workplace, which became all the more intense due to the Braniff campaign and the various copycats that followed in the US aviation sector.⁷ Overall, my work shares a common basis with these preceding contributions, while offering particular novelty in the analysis put forward in the second and third parts of this essay.

The essay’s second part examines Pucci’s and Braniff’s refashioning of stewardesses in relation to American notions of feminism in the mid 1960s, rendering what I call ‘Jet Age feminism.’ This term is firstly a chronological designation, referring to the status of

¹ McCarty, J, ‘Beauty Checkout’ in *Vogue*, 15 Sept 1965, p. 62.

² Vitra Design Museum, Alexander Girard Archives (hereafter AGA), Box ‘MAR 00105 D-4’, Folder ‘Girard Press - 01/1964-12/1965’, Press release, ‘Emilio Pucci: Fashion Innovator’, 19 July 1965.

³ Works that chronicle the feminism and the sexual revolution in the 1960s include: Allyn, *Make Love, Not War*; Bradley, *Mass Media and Feminism*; Cott, *Grounding of Feminism*; Ehrenreich, Hess, and Jacobs, *Re-Making Love*; Hill, *Peacock Revolution*; Kessler-Harris, *Out to Work*; Meyerowitz, ed., *Not June Cleaver*; Rosen, *World Split Open*; Scanlon, *Bad Girls Go Everywhere*.

⁴ AGA, Box ‘MAR 00105 D-4’, Folder ‘Girard Press - 01/1964 - 12/1965’, Press release, ‘Announcing the End of the Plain Plane’, November 1965.

⁵ Vantoch, *The Jet Sex*, pp. 153-85.

⁶ Stadiem, *Jet Set*, pp. 242-75.

⁷ Barry, *Femininity in Flight*, pp. 174-84.

feminism in the United States in the first decade of civil aviation's adoption of jet technology (1959-69). Yet, it also more specifically refers to how notions of feminism intersected with civil aviation culture during these years. Women could not serve as pilots on US airlines throughout this first decade of jet travel, nor could they enter America's space program. Thus, stewardessing was the most a woman could aspire to, and Braniff's iteration was the first intentional effort by an airline to reshape womanhood in the Jet Age. When Pucci and the person who commissioned him for Braniff, advertising executive Mary Wells, offered women the mixed bag of greater mobility but also greater subservience to men, they indicated that women's 'Right Stuff' would be quite different from astronauts'.⁸ These women endured the erasure of risk as a valued workplace trait, and training for the job became less tied to safety and more tied to personal grooming.

The essay's final part contrasts the Jet Age feminism of stewardesses and that of Mary Wells, the ad executive who masterminded Braniff's 1965 campaign. While both encountered sexism in their work, the class difference between these women rendered divergent fates. Wells successfully blended the competing pulls on Jet Age women towards career, sexiness, and marriage. Ultimately, she and her new husband, Braniff's President Harding Lawrence, met at work and soon thereafter became one of America's first dual-career 'power couples', with husband and wife competing to take home the larger salary. Meanwhile, Braniff offered a more limited version of Jet Age feminism to working-class women: marriage wasn't for them an opportunity to advance their careers, but rather was cause for being fired. As such, even though both Wells and Braniff's stewardesses became paragons of a boldly modern way of being a woman in the Jet Age, neither was a true model for the more radical feminism that was gaining currency at the time. Jet Age feminism, over time, gave way to something more inclusive.

I Democratizing the Jet Set:

Braniff and its Stewardesses Enter the Jet Age

1965 was a momentous year for Braniff International Airways, then a medium-sized carrier based in the medium-sized, but growing city of Dallas, Texas. From its first flight in 1928, Braniff subsisted as a regional carrier in the heavily regulated United States aviation market, granted routes in Texas, eastwards towards New Orleans, and northwards towards Kansas City. The years after World War II offered Braniff a first foothold outside the midsection of the US. A merger in 1952 expanded the route network to Chicago, while its first flights between Dallas and the East Coast came a few years later. Finally, Braniff had become an international carrier already in 1948. With the award of routes to Latin America, Braniff became the Western Hemisphere's equivalent of Trans World Airlines on European routes: it served as the US's second flag-carrier, alongside the much stronger Pan American Airways, on routes as far south as Buenos Aires.⁹

Even so, Braniff had very little brand visibility in the US's biggest cities or in Latin America's metropolises. Only three percent of potential customers in the New York area had heard of the airline, putting it at a significant disadvantage in the largest consumer market.¹⁰ Moreover, Braniff was falling behind major airlines in the rush to transition to an all-jet

⁸ On the application of the term 'Right Stuff' to US astronauts, see Wolfe, *Right Stuff*.

⁹ For a history of Braniff, see Cass, *Braniff Airways*.

¹⁰ History of Aviation Collection, Braniff Collection (hereafter BC), Box 18, Folder 4, 'Harding Lawrence Markets an Airline' in *Media Decisions*, Jul 1968.

fleet. It had secured ten Boeing 707-720 jets between the plane's debut in 1959 and 1964, enough to cover routes to Chicago, New York, and Washington, but its other routes depended on a fleet of piston-engine planes. This lack was particularly glaring on Braniff's Latin American routes.

When Harding Lawrence took over as Braniff's new President in March 1965, the new executive team already was tasked to fully transition Braniff to the jet era. He therefore unveiled a business plan that included purchasing dozens of new jets valued together at \$160 million, of which \$120 million was borrowed. Included were 14 new regional jets (BAC-111s) and 17 new Boeing 727s for longer routes. By mid-1967, Lawrence promised, all of Braniff's non-jets would be retired.¹¹ Overall, Braniff was set to expand its seating capacity by 57 per cent by January 1966, with another 27.5 per cent increase by July 1966.

Executives then faced the daunting challenge of increasing ticket sales, in order to make this investment pay off. Central to this strategy was a new marketing and advertising campaign, for which Lawrence had already identified his chosen partner: advertising executive Mary Wells of Jack Tinker and Partners. Wells details in her autobiography Lawrence's urgent plea, 'Listen, Mary, I need a very big idea for this airline, something so big it will make Braniff important news, overnight'. Behind this need for attention lay the upcoming jet purchases, 'I'm going to buy a large fleet of jets and they'll cost plenty ... I don't want to fly a lot of empty seats around'. Lawrence reinforced his plea for a total makeover, 'I want to hire you people at Tinker to help me reintroduce Braniff to America. Actually, I want you to introduce Braniff to the world'.¹² He then agreed to double the airline's advertising budget, to \$6 million, in the first year.¹³

Bold ideas started taking shape during Wells' research into the state of air travel. In mid-1965, her team spent time in airports, on planes, and at ticket offices, where they interviewed air travelers. The main finding was at once obvious and insightful: 'All planes looked alike; all terminals looked alike; all stewardesses looked alike. There was a great prevalence of gray, a military hang-over'.¹⁴ Wells rightly perceived that many civil aviation resources had direct ties to America's military mobilizations in World War II and the Cold War. Many airfields and terminals were hastily built during the early 1940s, and most pilots were trained either in World War II or Korea.

The militarized stewardess uniforms, however, took root in the 1930s. Their dark colors, stripes on sleeves, and lapels decorated with stylized wings were inspired by the US Navy, which America's first major airline, Pan Am, mimicked for its crew aboard the 'flying boats' that navigated the skies at the time.¹⁵ Early air travel was also bumpy, cold, and fraught with the potential danger of crash landings; thus, a drab, heavyweight uniform that conveyed authority in times of danger was appropriate. That such uniforms persisted through the 1950s is partly a consequence of the accretion of tradition, but it also reflects the resurgent connections between aviation and militarization during the early Cold War. After all, the great innovations of Cold War-era civil aviation—pressurized air cabins, improved radar navigation, and, most importantly, the jet aircraft—were all byproducts of military research and development begun during World War II and enhanced during the

¹¹ AGA, Box 'MAR 00110 D-5', Folder 'Girard Press - 01/1966- 12/1966', Press Release (no title), 16 Jun 1965.

¹² As quoted in: Wells Lawrence, *Big Life in Advertising*, p. 33.

¹³ BC, Box 34, Folder 2, Memo from Rex Brack to All Employees, 24 Nov 1965.

¹⁴ Mary Wells, as quoted in: Black, C., 'Meet America's Top Woman Exec' in *Honolulu Advertiser*, 25 Mar 1975.

¹⁵ The history of the first flight attendants at Pan Am, who happened to be all-male, is described in: Tiemeyer, *Plane Queer*, pp. 14-41.

first decades of the Cold War.¹⁶

In expressing her concerns about a ‘military hang-over’, Wells could have also noted that her work for Braniff was happening in the middle of the US military’s mobilization in Vietnam. In March 1965, right as Wells won the Braniff contract, US Marines made their first landing at Da Nang, and the US Air Force and Navy commenced Operation Rolling Thunder, President Johnson’s gruesome aerial bombing campaign of North Vietnam comparable in size to the raids over Japan and Germany during World War II. As such, the decisions to “feminize” Braniff’s stewardess uniforms by adding lush colors, foregoing stripes on the cuffs, and replacing the lapel’s streamlined wings with a curvaceous golden dove—the symbol of peace—were quite timely. As historian Victoria Vantoch notes, American society at the time had an entrenched masculine-feminine dichotomy that also impacted Cold War notions of technology: the aviation industry ‘relied on polarized descriptions of “cold” and “efficient” (read: masculine) aircraft technology versus “warm” and “friendly” (read: feminine) service in ways that tapped larger Cold War discourse about gender and technology.’¹⁷ As such, the ‘Right Stuff’ of Braniff stewardesses had to be diametrically opposed to the cold, hard, technical exploits of America’s men at war in Vietnam if it was to succeed in elevating Braniff into the jet age via the expansion of its customer base.

The initial inspiration for Braniff’s new campaign was color. Throughout her team’s research, Wells was most struck by its stark absence in airports and on planes: ‘[T]here was no color. This was the sixties, mind you, when color was a hot marketing tool ... [Harding Lawrence] liked thinking about color; he reminded me that Braniff would be flying to places associated with brilliant color, Mexico and South America’.¹⁸ Indeed, color also had deeper importance in the 1960s as a widespread design fad. As fashion historian Shirley Kennedy notes,

One could not help but notice color everywhere. Colors vibrated and seemed to explode on the Pucci silks, as they did on the Pop Art canvases of Lichtenstein, Warhol, Wesselman, and Rosenquist ... psychedelic rock concert posters, and the Beatles’ cartoon movie, *The Yellow Submarine*.¹⁹

Color was playful, young, and, as Lawrence noted, it recalled the alleged simplicity of the pre-modern cultures. Mary Wells conceded, ‘Color was my idea, but not really. There’s no magic talent in advertising. Too many people don’t do their homework and find the obvious need’.²⁰ The need, as she saw it, was to wed the ultra-modern jet with the primordial wonder of color.

Color ultimately infused everything that Braniff remade under Wells’ direction: ticket counters, airport lounges, stewardess uniforms, and ad materials. But the original burst that started this colorful makeover involved the planes themselves. As Wells notes, she first considered having a fleet all in yellow, or orange, or indigo. Her art director drew renderings of planes in these colors, then placed them on the floor for the staff to critique. ‘Then I asked him to do one with all different-colored planes’, recalls Wells. ‘When that sketch hit the floor of the reception it was a thunderbolt, there wasn’t a doubt in my mind

¹⁶ Tiemeyer, *Plane Queer*, p. 58.

¹⁷ Vantoch, *The Jet Sex*, p. 175.

¹⁸ Wells Lawrence, *Big Life in Advertising*, p. 34.

¹⁹ Kennedy, *Pucci*, p. 98.

²⁰ Black, ‘Meet America’s Top Woman Exec’.

... Seven colors looked like a big idea and wow and friendly and it would be big news'. Sharing the concept with Lawrence was also a surprisingly easy success: 'When he studied the sketches of his planes in seven different solid colors he was quiet for a minute. I don't think I breathed. Then he laughed. He said, and I will never ever forget it, 'That will do it!'"²¹

Wells then made a second vital decision, one which tied the universally accessible inclination to embrace color to more exclusivist impulses from high society. After all, she did not employ a child-like adoption of color as one might find in a nursery school, or even the notionally 'primitive' collage of color that one would find in Mexican textiles. Instead, she delegated the implementation of Braniff's color infusion to two of America's and Europe's top-name designers, both of whom were famous for their use of color: Emilio Pucci from the fashion world and Alexander Girard from the interior design realm. By effectively purchasing their aesthetic for use at the airline, Wells assured that Braniff's colors had a patina of elitism.

Pucci's explosively colorful cocktail dresses were famous primarily because of the celebrities who wore them. He had a coterie of rich patrons who would buy directly from his boutiques in Italy. By the mid-1960s, he was also exporting to department stores in the US. But, as the accomplished author and *Cosmopolitan* editor Helen Gurley Brown recalls, Pucci's price point was prohibitive: 'I remember seeing my first Pucci dress in Burdine's department store in Miami in 1963 when I was on a book promotion. "How long has *this* been going on?" I asked myself and, though I didn't think I could afford one—\$190 for one little skimp of a dress—I tried on four in fifteen minutes for sheer pleasure'.²² That Brown, a best-selling author, ruminated about whether she could afford Pucci's creations speaks to his exclusivity.

Ironically, this deployment of an elitist aesthetic was Braniff's tool for democratizing air travel. Braniff's new customers would be drawn from two divergent income groups. The first was comprised of those wealthy enough to partake in Girard's and Pucci's worlds as consumers. Since this group, mainly consisting of business executives and their spouses, likely was already accustomed to flying by plane, Braniff's embrace of Jet Set glitz may have been enough to lure them away from their competitors.²³ Yet, more numerous were customers with considerably less spending power, many of whom were first-time flyers in the 1960s. In their case, too, there was an allure to the Braniff aesthetic. In an aviation market strictly regulated both domestically and internationally, customers found each airline offering the same fares to any desired destination. The only difference was the type of aircraft flown—hence Braniff's desire to catch up to competitors with more jets in service—and the quality of service.

As advertising executives for Braniff's competitor Pan Am researched the habits of travelers with limited budgets, they found the following: 'Once they [are committed to] pay full fare, they are prepared to shop among competitive airlines on the basis of the comfort, service, and enjoyment aspects of the trip'.²⁴ With its new jets and Wells' stylish overhaul, Braniff seemingly offered these customers more for their money. They lounged in Girard-

²¹ Wells Lawrence, *Big Life in Advertising*, p. 35.

²² As quoted in: Kennedy, *Pucci*, p. 7.

²³ On the usage of the term 'Jet Set' to refer to an elite class of celebrities in the 1960s, see Stadiem, *Jet Set*.

²⁴ J Walter Thompson Company Collections, 'J. Walter Thompson Company Account Files, 1885-2008 and undated', Box PA10, Folder 'Research Reports 1969', 'Preliminary Exploration of Consumer Perceptions of the 747 Plane in England, France and Germany', November 1969, p. 18.

styled airports, boarded planes decorated with bold fabrics and Latin American artwork chosen by Girard, and they were served by hostesses who sported the same sort of Pucci-designed outfits as movie stars. These middle-class and working-class customers were thereby offered an opportunity to partake in the ambiance they saw in movies and read about on celebrity pages.

Braniff's Pucci-clad hostesses also addressed—or at least diverted attention away from—a growing personnel crisis tied to the democratization of the jet era. With larger and faster aircraft, customers were beginning to fear that air travel would become like mass transit: utilitarian rather than exclusive, crowded and impersonal rather than enjoyable. In the parlance of Mary Wells' ad campaign, air travel increasingly occurred on a 'plain plane'. A report commissioned by Pan Am just a few years later, in 1969, concluded that middle-income consumers were disappointed by increasingly large jets: 'The impression of mass travel ... underlines their basic concern about de-humanization. They feel the individual passenger will be one of a mob and will not have the kind of personal attention they seek'.²⁵ Jumbo jets with upwards of 400 seats would soon exacerbate these concerns. Yet, already the first models of jets, including the 727s Braniff purchased in 1965, stirred misgivings. While Braniff's largest pre-jet plane, the DC-7C, seated 75 passengers, the new 727s could accommodate 154. Inevitably, passengers desiring a personal touch would more frequently be disappointed.

As such, stewardesses faced increasingly unattainable expectations. As the Pan Am report summarized, '[C]onsumers ... desire to be treated as individuals. Some of them are even sensitive to 'cookie cutter' pleasantness on the part of the stewardesses ... They want to really feel that some one cares about them as individuals'.²⁶ However, flight attendants in the Jet Age cared for more people and undertook the same work in a reduced amount of flying time. In a way, Braniff's stewardess outfits offered a potential remedy. By turning the aisle into a fashion runway, passengers might think of themselves more as spectators than guests deserving high-quality service. They could participate in Jet Set sophistication, but in an impersonal way attuned to the Jet Age reality of mass transportation.

II Jet Age Feminism Takes Off

A new wave of feminism hit the United States in the early 1960s. As activist Betty Friedan's 1963 best-selling book *Feminine Mystique* described, many middle-class and working-class housewives were awakening to a sense of depression, even as their families prospered:

Each suburban wife struggles with it alone. As she made the beds, shopped for groceries, matched slipcover material, ate peanut butter sandwiches with her children, chauffeured Cub Scouts and Brownies, lay beside her husband at night—she was afraid to ask even of herself the silent question—'Is this all?'²⁷

The 1964 Civil Rights Act, which protected women from discrimination in hiring and firing for the first time, allowed feminists to increasingly seek equality in the workplace. Financial independence through a lifetime of work could create more opportunities for

²⁵ Ibid., p. 16.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 18.

²⁷ Friedan, *Feminine Mystique*, p. 57.

women, not only outside the home, but even potentially outside of marriage and childrearing altogether.

Braniff's flight attendant corps did not fit this more radical iteration of feminism. The airline kept rules in place so that stewardessing could not serve as a life-long career, primarily by firing women when they married or became pregnant. As a result, the average duration of a stewardess' career totaled 18 months, a reality which continued for several years beyond passage of the Civil Rights Act. Managers also maintained beauty-based hiring standards, the same as they were before 1964. In 1962, Braniff hired only those women who were no larger than '5'7" and 130 pounds' and possessed 'an attractive, wholesome, well-groomed appearance'. It also openly promoted its no-marriage policy as virtuous for stewardesses: 'the wealth of knowledge and experience gained from their enriching and challenging career as a Braniff hostess contributed immeasurably to their later success as a homemaker'.²⁸

By 1968, these standards had changed only slightly, with women two inches taller and five pounds heavier allowed to apply. Also, in sync with the nation's growing divorce rate, the no-marriage policy was loosened, but only slightly:

[A] young lady is qualified for employment as a Braniff hostess if she is 20 to 27 years old; from 5 feet, 2 inches to 5 feet, 9 inches tall with weight in proportion to her height and not over 135 pounds; single, or a childless widow or divorcee unmarried for one year or more; has 20/50 vision in each eye without glasses; has at least a high school education and good character, and is blessed with sound judgement, an attractive appearance with a clear complexion and an attractive smile, a pleasant disposition, even temperament and a pleasant sounding voice.

With such a focus on cultivating rigid notions of beauty, mention of a flight attendant's most important work seemed almost nonsensical: 'While very few hostesses will ever encounter any type of emergency situation ... passenger safety is their primary function'.²⁹

Not surprisingly given their focus on beauty, Braniff's marketers also openly mocked the more radical feminism of Betty Friedan and others. For example, when the airline opened a new training academy for flight attendants in 1967, it was heralded as an 'ultra-modern and beautiful edifice [that] has been artfully designed with the feminine mystique in mind'. This use of Friedan's own term 'feminine mystique'—which in her book referred to women's degradation via cultural expectations to be conventionally beautiful—was highly ironic, with the airline professing to promote exactly what Friedan fought against.

And while radical feminists fought for women to proceed from university educations into life-long careers, Braniff again sought the opposite. Its new training facility was sarcastically christened the 'Hostess College', but contained only five classrooms. There were instead more extensive facilities for beautifying the stewardesses-to-be. Highlights included the 'Powder Puff Room ... where girls learn the secrets of makeup and flawless complexions'. And in place of a library, studying at the 'college' took place at the 'the rows of electric hair dryers where she may do some homework on jet aircraft passenger configurations while her hair dries'.³⁰

While clearly opposed to radical feminism, there was another iteration of a more limited

²⁸ BC, Box 26, Folder 1, Press release, 'Exactng Qualifications Remain Unchanged as Braniff Hostesses Hold Silver Anniversary Party', June 1962.

²⁹ BC, Box 26, Folder 1, Press release, 'A Braniff International Hostess Is...', undated.

³⁰ Ibid.

feminism in 1960s America that Braniff's flight attendants did embody, at least to a certain extent. This rival to Friedan's *Feminine Mystique* also was introduced by a best-selling book: Helen Gurley Brown's *Sex and the Single Girl* from 1962.³¹ Brown's book had a core message that, like Friedan's, supported women who entered careers and strove for financial independence. The two parted ways, however, with Brown's more open stance towards the sexual revolution, especially as it impacted women at work. For Brown, it was a positive that some workplaces were 'sexier than Turkish harems, fraternity house weekends ... or the *Playboy* centerfold'.³² Accepting male sexual advances in the workplace as inevitable, Brown counseled women to utilize these moments to advance their careers. A successful woman would develop the skill of playfully dismissing certain advances and accepting others in exchange for career assistance.

Brown wrote *Sex and the Single Girl* mainly as a how-to guide to assist the growing numbers of unmarried women, primarily younger women, who entered the workforce and intended to stay until retirement. As historian Patricia Bradley notes, 'When Brown published her book, women between ages twenty-five and fifty-four were on the cusp of exploding into the workforce, a group that increased 45 per cent from 1962 to 1975'.³³ Thus, Braniff's stewardesses were typical of a wave of 'single girls' (Brown's term) entering the workforce, even if they couldn't aspire to a life-long career due to airlines' marriage bans and other restrictions.

Brown stayed in the public eye and promoted her version of feminism well after her book was published in 1962 and Friedan's a year later. She was again making waves in 1965, when she became editor of *Cosmopolitan* magazine and revamped it to be a standard-bearer for single women. From her editorial role, she developed the notion of the 'Cosmo girl' or 'single girl' (synonymous terms Brown employed) to designate a woman who was financially independent, while also comfortable being sexy, dressing in conventionally feminine ways, and being sexually active in ways the woman herself saw fit. As long as they overlooked the temporary nature of Braniff stewardesses' jobs, Brown and her devotees could look to Emilio Pucci, Mary Wells, and Braniff stewardesses as innovators of the single girl lifestyle, as practitioners of Jet Age feminism.

Brown treated Emilio Pucci as an important liberator for women. She saw an almost political ferment in his fashions, likening Pucci's impact on women to the Flapper fashions of the 1920s. As Brown writes, 'I think Emilio, some thirty years later, had somewhat the same effect on American women. No, we weren't exactly constricted or restrained by fashion or society like those twenties women, but he did help us express ourselves ... experience a new freedom, a sensuousness we hadn't felt or shown before. The dresses were spare, sexy, and liberating!'³⁴ These same traits were true of Pucci's Braniff uniforms: they allowed stewardesses to negotiate their workplace and other spaces of modern life with agility and grace and were the envy of many women who flew on Braniff in the ensuing years.

Pucci heavily focused on sportswear throughout his career. Inspired by his passion for aviation, which culminated in his service as a pilot in the Italian Air Force during World War II, he thrived when designing fashion for bodies in motion. After all, pilots of Pucci's generation commonly flew in cockpits exposed to the elements, which in turn forced pilots

³¹ The most authoritative account of Brown as a messenger of a rival form of feminism is found in: Scanlon, *Bad Girls Go Everywhere*.

³² Brown, *Sex and the Office*, p. 183ff.

³³ Bradley, *Mass Media and Feminism*, p. 11.

³⁴ As quoted in: Kennedy, *Pucci*, p. 8.

to modify their clothing choices to adapt to this harsh environment. Most prized in the cockpit was a combination of warmth and mobility: leather jackets that were sturdy and warm, yet form-fitting to keep one's arms free, and equally tight leather caps and goggles that mitigated the harshness of the wind while still allowing maximal head movement. With his piloting career cut short by injury, Pucci after the war applied his aerial fashion knowledge to the next-best thing: the ski slopes, which also demanded the same combination of warmth and dexterity in harsh conditions. As his new career as a designer was taking off, Pucci opened one of his first studios in the ritzy village of Gstaad in the Swiss Alps, a haven for the younger, more active elite among the Jet Set, who helped alpine skiing take root as a stylish and increasingly popular postwar leisure activity. Pucci's outfits became *de rigueur* in these exclusive hide-outs, as they mixed the durability and casualness of leisure fashion with a luster more reminiscent of high fashion.

More broadly, this ideal of promoting mobility had long been standard for male fashions, as with the embrace over the 19th and 20th centuries of fitted slacks, tighter suits, and fewer frills. However, Pucci brought to women this same emphasis on streamlined, form-fitting clothing that maximized flexibility. As fashion historian Shirley Kennedy summarizes, 'Emilio Pucci created clothing with the idea of the body always moving: clothes must move comfortably with the wearer, as though she were perpetually on the ski slopes, and, off the rack, they must fit as if custom made'.³⁵ By the time of his collaboration with Braniff, Pucci had updated his aesthetic for active women, employing miniskirts, tights, or both in combination: 'Motion and movement are very important in our lives. A woman can run to get a taxi in a short skirt and still look elegant, but if she runs in a long skirt, she looks gauche'.³⁶ When author Marilyn Bender summarized Pucci's importance, she focused on jet technology. Noting that the early 1960s was 'the threshold of the Jet Age', she claimed: 'the Pucci dress was both symbol and passport of the new era. Fragile-looking but indestructible, chic and sexy, it was the capsule wardrobe for the mobile woman glorying in the body beautiful'.³⁷

For Pucci, the embrace of psychedelic color also stemmed from his passion for aviation. In his World War II piloting missions, he would fly at low altitudes to avoid enemy radar. 'Pucci clearly recalled the constant movement and the kaleidoscope of colors that spread out before him on these long missions'. For the women who were wealthy enough to buy his dresses, however, there was a different impulse tied to this color rush. The vibrancy—still sophisticated, thanks to Pucci's following among the Euro-American Jet Set—was also risqué. It made some women feel uninhibited: 'How did women dare go around city streets in the 1960s', asks Kennedy rhetorically, 'wearing very bright, short, sexy, tight, clingy, wildly printed clothes?'.³⁸

Yet, Pucci's personal ambivalence about feminism belied a multivalence regarding his fashion innovations: they could indeed be perceived as liberatory, but they could also reinforce male dominance. Pucci himself strongly disavowed any advocacy of a more radical feminism. When interviewed in 1964, he started with a sentiment that radical feminists might applaud, advocating a subtler form of feminine beauty: 'America has been left with the idea that a woman is sexy if her bust sticks out or if she has a thin waist'. Holding up the petite and androgynous Audrey Hepburn, Pucci instead insisted, 'It's not the inches of bust that make the difference, but what is inside'. As for Hepburn, Pucci

³⁵ Ibid., p. 46.

³⁶ As quoted in: Ibid., p. 139.

³⁷ As quoted in: Ibid., p. 46.

³⁸ Kennedy, *Pucci*, p. 9.

insisted, 'Everything she has is fire inside'.

At the same time, however, Pucci attacked women's aspiring to equality, especially through work. He continued, 'What is natural to the American woman is to compete with the man in all fields. I think this makes her unhappy. If the end of man is work and creation, the end of woman is home, children, friends, and culture, things that man hasn't time to pursue'. He admitted that 'American women won't accept' his views, steeped in the traditional ideology of separate spheres. But, it was women's naïve efforts to enter men's spheres and vacate their own, in Pucci's view, that prevented certain American women from attaining happiness.

Pucci then added a short sentence to the interview that warrants closer analysis. In detailing the undesirability of mixing spheres, he theorized about an unhappy woman: 'This girl becomes a secretary, goes to dinner with the boss, gets married, gets pregnant, lives in suburbia and joins women's clubs'. Clear in this account is Pucci's scorn for women who refuse to accept the incompatibility of a career with women's happiness found in family life. The inferiority a woman experiences at work—her diminished role as secretary—leads her to desire the power and wealth of her boss and allow the work relationship to become something erotic. The man and woman—boss and secretary—then go through the ostensible steps leading to a woman's fulfillment: dinner, dating, marriage, pregnancy, and settling down in the suburbs. Yet, Pucci's concern is that this domestic life fails to content some women; they end up 'join[ing] women's clubs' in search of fulfillment, involving themselves in the world of feminist activism. While Friedan encouraged housewives to pursue their yearning for something more, Pucci sees this discontent as absurd: 'Something has been missed over there [in America]'.³⁹

Stewardesses were much like the secretaries Pucci attacked. Each struggled to be treated as career professionals and instead was expected to find a wealthier man to marry and then quit work. For stewardesses, these men typically came from the pilot corps, airline management, or the airplane's First Class section. To facilitate such, Pucci, in his designs for Braniff, adapted the cuts and colors of social clothing—the cocktail dress—worn to accentuate roles like hosting, socializing, and sparking attraction in men. Of course, these roles undercut women's aspirations to be treated as professionals, while instead enhancing their desirability as future spouses.

Meanwhile, Pucci's commitment to separate spheres for men and women led him to erase the military elements that marked stewardess attire from the beginning. Gone were the drab colors and androgynous fits, as well as the decorative stripes and wings shared with pilots. In justifying this overhaul, Pucci suggested merely that the uniforms were outdated, 'Most airplane stewardesses are dressed as if they are traveling by bus in the year 1925'.⁴⁰ Yet, Braniff's copy writers elaborated more fully. They claimed the airline's first stewardess in 1937 was attired inappropriately, 'looking as if she probably could fly the plane herself', and then credited Pucci with replacing 'the severe, mannish uniforms' with the feminine touches of color and 'culottes, leotards, wraparound skirts, scarf hats, derbies, serving dresses'.⁴¹ Pucci added to this sentiment by jettisoning the term 'uniform' and instead calling his Braniff creations a 'couture collection'.

This 'collection' allowed stewardesses to sport four distinct looks on the same flight: an exterior layer anchored by a winter coat, a full suit with a wraparound skirt and zippable blazer, then a lighter layer of culottes and a turtle-neck blouse. The fourth item, nicknamed

³⁹ As quoted in: 'Hero, scholar, jet-age Renaissance man, Italian style-setter: Pucci' in *Life*, 16 Oct 1964, p. 70.

⁴⁰ As quoted in: Kennedy, *Pucci*, p. 154.

⁴¹ BC, Box 27, Folder 3, Press release, 'A Braniff International Hostess Is...', undated.

the 'Puccino', was a colorful smock worn when serving food. Each item embodied the combination of elegance, casualness, and sophistication that made Pucci's designs so desirable among celebrities and the 'single girl' set: form-fitting, above-the-knee styles that made women attractive while in motion.

Pucci intended for his layered creation to express the wonder of jet travel. The way he saw it, Braniff's jets would enable a surprisingly quick half-day transition from the icy climate of Chicago to the balmy beaches of Rio de Janeiro. The stewardess, trying to work hard and still look glamorous through these drastic climactic changes, would benefit from layering. She could embark with a thick coat, gloves, and even a space-age plastic bubble helmet (inspired by astronaut gear) to protect her hair from rain or snow, and slowly transition her outfit while in flight. When she landed a few hours and several costume shifts later, she would be clad in culottes and a lighter blouse, ready to say farewell to her passengers on a sweltering tarmac.

By employing form-fitting but breathable and easily washable fabrics, Pucci scrupulously considered the demands of stewardesses' nomadic lives. He was also particularly proud that the entire ensemble fit into an overnight bag. 'In the future', he noted, 'all an international traveler would need add to such an ensemble would be a dress or two and accessories for evening occasions'.⁴² As women identifying with Helen Gurley Brown's 'single girl' became more prosperous, Pucci offered a way for both designers and consumers to enable women's Jet Age mobility. After all, by 1964, there were thirteen million single women in the US and another 23 million married women working outside the home.⁴³ Air travel would inevitably increase, even for women unchaperoned by men. In sum, Pucci's layered 'couture collection' was an innovation closely aligned with women's Jet Age yearnings to move well beyond the home.

That said, when Pucci passed along his designs to Braniff's lead ad executive Mary Wells, she saw major potential for an alternative use for the layered collection, one that was more perniciously sexist than Pucci himself envisioned. Braniff's most frequent fliers, who typically paid for full-fare First Class tickets, were unaccompanied men flying on business. These men also experienced the most fatigue with flying, so if the 'End of the Plain Plane' campaign was to succeed, they needed to shift their travel to Braniff. To this end, Wells decided that stewardesses discarding layers of clothing as they flew southward should do so in the aisles, in full view of passengers. She christened this attraction the 'Air Strip', and made sure that it would be heavily promoted in Braniff ads.

Business Week, one of the most-read publications among well-heeled men, offered a strong endorsement of the 'Air Strip'. After first quoting Harding Lawrence, who noted that Braniff was 'adding sheer pleasure to the experience of flight', the author then added his own perceptions: 'Indeed, a passenger might easily feel that he's attending an airborne striptease show when, right after takeoff, the hostesses peel off their pink uniforms to reveal the blue ones underneath'.⁴⁴ A correspondent with London's *Sunday Mirror* went one step further, linking the 'Air Strip' with the recently released hit movie 'Boeing Boeing', in which actor Tony Curtis secretly dated three flight attendants at the same time. 'The things they get up to in the air these days!' begins the article, 'There was I, minding my own business, 32,000 feet up on a flight from New York to Mexico when ... Boeing-Boeing. She did it'. He continues, 'The air hostess. She started to undress. Bang in the

⁴² AGA, Box 'MAR 00105 D-4', Folder 'Girard Press - 01/1964 - 12/1965', 'World Fashion Press Acclaims Pucci-Braniff Flight Fashions' in *The Braniff B-Liner*, July 1965, p. 4.

⁴³ Scanlon, *Bad Girls Go Everywhere*, p. 144.

⁴⁴ 'Braniff refuels on razzle-dazzle' in *Business Week*, 20 Nov 1965, p. 110-11.

middle of the aisle. Fasten your seat belts. There's more to this than meets the eye. Because four other hostesses were doing a similar air strip in other parts of the giant Boeing 720 jet'. Adding to his analysis, the author quotes a stewardess: 'Said Carol: "It's zip zip zip all the way. The passengers seem to love it, and we think many fly Braniff just to see our act"'. The author then concludes, 'You could be right, Carol. You could be right'.⁴⁵

Mary Wells made sure the 'Air Strip' received prominent play in the 'End of the Plain Plane' campaign. She devised a media plan that involved a two-step placement in newspapers: on the first weekend, color ads boasting the 'End of the Plain Plane' would run in 41 newspapers in 33 cities. Then, 'A week later our second color newspaper ad will run in the same 41 newspapers headlined, 'Introducing the Air Strip'.' To maximize Braniff's exposure to businessmen for the 'Air Strip', Wells followed up with TV ads during American football broadcasts.⁴⁶ The 'Air Strip' television ad begins with whistling music common to striptease acts and then focuses on a stewardess, suggestively smiling at the camera, in the process of disrobing through her various layers of colorful minis. It concludes with a male voice-over—in the deep, slow tone of an emcee at a strip club—exclaiming, 'The Air Strip is brought to you by Braniff International, who believes that even an airline hostess should look like a girl'.⁴⁷

The debut of the 'Air Strip' found no serious opposition in the mainstream media. Instead, it played a key role in fulfilling Harding Lawrence's goal of filling seats on Braniff's new jets. By June 1966, the airline's passenger traffic was up 48.7 per cent over the previous year. Its revenue in the first full year of the campaign similarly rose by 42 per cent.⁴⁸ Meanwhile, the media's only consideration of the 'Air Strip' from the perspective of Braniff's stewardesses fit the mold of Helen Gurley Brown's 'single girl'. The stewardess stressed a new-found freedom in Pucci's clothes: 'We love the new outfit. It makes you feel like a real female and not a busboy'.⁴⁹

III Mary Wells Lawrence and the Classist Legacy of 'Jet Age Feminism'

In a passage reminiscent of Helen Gurley Brown's *Sex and the Single Girl*, Mary Wells confessed in her autobiography that her work with Braniff inspired romance. She traced the spark to the very moment in mid-1965 that Harding Lawrence agreed to her plans to paint Braniff's jets in a rainbow of colors. 'That had to be the moment I fell in love with him'.

Married at the time to other people, Harding Lawrence and Mary Wells started one of America's most high-profile office romances. As they worked their way through divorces, they also worked together to mold Braniff into one of America's fastest growing airlines. When they wed in November 1967, Harding and Mary Wells Lawrence became one of America's most high-profile 'power couples', each keeping their careers and pulling in salaries of over \$100,000 per year, near the peak of executive pay scales at the time.

Mary Wells Lawrence thereby served as a corporate-class expression of Jet Age feminism, which is both similar to and different from the working-class variety embodied,

⁴⁵ 'The Air Strip' in *Sunday Mirror*, 20 Mar 1966, p. 21.

⁴⁶ BC, Box 34, Folder 2, Memo from Rex Brack to All Employees, 24 Nov 1965.

⁴⁷ 'Braniff International Presents the Air Strip', Television Ad, December 1965. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7TZXRyuhSMg>

⁴⁸ On passenger traffic see Newman, C., 'Color It Colorless: Black and White Gain in Fashions and Homes' in *Wall Street Journal*, 08 Jun 1966, p. 1. On revenue see Loomis, C., 'As the World Turns—On Madison Avenue' in *Fortune*, December 1968, p. 114.

⁴⁹ 'Wild Hue Yonder' in *Life*, 03 Dec 1965.

though imperfectly, by Braniff's stewardesses. She wasn't exactly a 'single girl' when she met Lawrence, but she was still relatively young (aged 37) and very much a working woman. In fact, she succeeded quite spectacularly in the otherwise male-dominated field of advertising. She also exercised a sexual agency that would endear her to Brown, managing the minefield of come-ons from powerful men in the office, and striving with both her first and second husbands to make marriage work in a dual-career household.

Wells Lawrence was a polarizing figure in women's liberation circles. She was at once praised for her successful career in a male-dominated world and her bold reworking of marriage to accommodate her professional aspirations, while also scorned for building her own success by promoting sexism in her various marketing campaigns. Amongst more radical feminists, even her egalitarian marriage to Harding Lawrence constituted grounds for attack. The famous author and activist Gloria Steinem quipped, 'Oh, well, Mary Wells Uncle Tommed it to the top', attributing Wells Lawrence's formidable career successes to her cozy relationship with men like Lawrence.⁵⁰ Furthermore, in her assessment of Wells Lawrence's career, media historian Patricia Bradley finds that she, 'took no position on feminism, took no particular interest (judging by her memoir) in promoting professional women's careers at her agency, and was not involved in the push to change women's images in advertising'.⁵¹

Despite enjoying far more class privilege, Wells Lawrence still shared elements in common with her working-class counterparts. She too experienced unwelcome come-ons from men while at work. Indeed, one of her bosses hired her based in part on his attraction to her, thereby copying a formula for success that Helen Gurley Brown introduced in *Sex and the Single Girl*. This sort of wagering about the risks and benefits of her boss's attractions was all too familiar to Wells Lawrence's working-class counterparts in the stewardess corps. Those who were savviest could artfully negotiate flirtations from pilots and customers. But, if the man's unreciprocated interest escalated, stewardesses and women executives alike were forced to manage an unwelcome and potentially dangerous workplace distraction.⁵²

Mary Wells Lawrence stayed on as Braniff's account executive for about a year after her marriage to Harding Lawrence. During this time, the couple moved Mary's children to Dallas to live with Harding, while Mary maintained her home and office in New York. She flew back to Dallas most Fridays, often meeting the family at the airport, so they could all continue further southward on Braniff's evening flight to Acapulco. Between homes in Dallas, New York, Acapulco, Arizona, and the Cote d'Azur, the family led a decidedly non-traditional life: 'Harding and I are both naturally nomadic and our timing was good', commented Wells Lawrence. 'The jet was cutting the world in half, in fact the world was fast becoming small'.⁵³ As such, the Jet Age was stimulating the social forces that unleashed not only new iterations of feminism, but new constellations of marriage and family.

At the end of the first year of marriage, however, Braniff's board of directors determined that the Wells-Lawrence marriage constituted a conflict of interest. Thus, somewhat similarly to stewardesses, marriage led to an end of Mary Wells' work for Braniff. In her

⁵⁰ Raine, G., 'Creative fizz: Mary Wells' memorable ad campaigns for such clients as Braniff and Alka-Seltzer helped make her the first woman to run a publicly traded company' in *San Francisco Chronicle*, 30 May 2002.

⁵¹ Bradley, *Mass Media and Feminism*, p. 213.

⁵² For accounts of sexual harassment and other forms of abuse against stewardesses, see Panter Nielsen, *From Sky Girl to Flight Attendant* and Barry, *Femininity in Flight*.

⁵³ Wells Lawrence, *A Big Life in Advertising*, p. 59.

case, however, the exit was quite lucrative. She was resourceful enough to lure a rival airline, TWA, to sign on with her ad agency. As TWA was a larger airline, the payout for this exchange was impressive: 'In economic terms, [Wells'] agency would give up about \$7.5 million in billings...and take on \$22 million'.⁵⁴ The day the deal was announced, writes Wells Lawrence, 'was the day some of Madison Avenue's old guard decided women were dangerous to the advertising community and that I was not only an arriviste but the queen of black widow spiders'.⁵⁵

For Wells Lawrence, marriage was, thus, an effective business tool, enhancing her hand in the aviation industry by combining her impressive connections with those of her husband. Rather than an off-ramp into a life as wife and mother, as was the expectation for stewardesses, Wells Lawrence's marriage propelled her career ever higher. She also maintained her financial and personal independence. As Wells Lawrence explains, 'In 1967 when Harding and I married it never entered his mind or mine that I would leave [my firm], that we would have a traditional marriage living and working in the same town'. This reality, for her, was vitally important to feminism, even to the radical feminists with whom she often clashed:

Betty Friedan established NOW in 1966 and ... the psychological shift that the women's movement brought to society had not yet changed it. Long-distance marriage was major news, and we were forever being interviewed about the details of ours. There was just enough awareness about what Betty Friedan called 'the problem that has no name', the growing sense that motherhood and housework were not enough for some women, that our marriage was examined with respect, if not awe.⁵⁶

What is missing from Wells Lawrence's assessment is a sense of cross-class solidarity. She was proud that both her trailblazing career and her unconventional marriage opened new pathways for women. Yet, her work for Braniff, especially the 'Air Strip' campaign, only reinforced an already sexist culture in aviation. Working-class women at Braniff thereby found no opportunity to emulate Wells Lawrence's successes, whether on the job or in her marriage. As such, Jet Age feminism disproportionately favored women in the corporate class.

Support for stewardesses ultimately came from radical feminists, including the National Organization for Women. Already in 1965, as Wells was masterminding the 'End of the Plain Plane' and the 'Air Strip', NOW and other groups began to support stewardesses' grievances from across the airline industry. Their fight boiled down to one central claim, which even Braniff admitted but refused to fully accept: that flight attendants were first and foremost safety professionals. Over the next decade, this vision prevailed, as courts ultimately ordered that flight attendants be endowed with fuller authority.⁵⁷ Braniff and other airlines which had imitated them then jettisoned the colorful, sexy uniforms of the Jet Age feminist era and replaced them with more professional attire. These activists also forced airlines, including Braniff, to end bans on marriage or pregnancy and to refrain from using stewardesses' bodies as marketing material. As such, Pucci's and Wells' efforts in 1965 to stimulate profit by deploying sexual arousal would ultimately be superseded by a more profound commitment to women workers' equality. But for the better part of a

⁵⁴ Loomis, 'As the World Turns', p. 194.

⁵⁵ Wells Lawrence, *A Big Life in Advertising*, p. 101.

⁵⁶ Wells Lawrence, *A Big Life in Advertising*, p. 59.

⁵⁷ See Barry, *Femininity in Flight*, pp. 144-73, and Tiemeyer, *Plane Queer*, 80-108.

decade, their creations comprised one of the hottest trends in American and global aviation, spreading the deeply compromised notion of Jet Age feminism widely.

References

- Allyn, D., *Make Love, Not War: The Sexual Revolution, An Unfettered History* (New York, 2000).
- Barry, K., *Femininity in Flight: A History of Flight Attendants* (Durham NC, 2007).
- Bradley, P., *Mass Media and the Shaping of American Feminism, 1963-1975* (Oxford MS, 2004).
- Cass, R.B., *Braniff Airways: Flying Colors* (Mt. Pleasant SC, 2015).
- Cott, N., *The Grounding of Modern Feminism* (New Haven CT, 1987).
- Ehrenreich, B., Hess, E., and Jacobs, G., *Re-Making Love: The Feminization of Sex* (New York, 1986).
- Friedan, B., *The Feminine Mystique* (New York, 50th Anniv. Edn., 2013).
- Delis Hill, D., *Peacock Revolution: American Masculine Identity and Dress in the Sixties and Seventies* (2018).
- Gurley Brown, H. *Sex and the Single Girl* (New York, 1962).
- Gurley Brown, *Sex and the Office* (New York, 1964).
- Kennedy, S., *Pucci: A Renaissance in Fashion* (New York, 1991).
- Kessler-Harris, A., *Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in America* (New York, 2003).
- Meyerowitz, J., ed., *Not June Cleaver: Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1960* (Philadelphia, 1994).
- Panter Nielsen, G., *From Sky Girl to Flight Attendant: Women and the Making of a Union* (Cornell NY, 1982).
- Rosen, R., *The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America* (New York, 2006).
- Scanlon, J., *Bad Girls Go Everywhere: The Life of Helen Gurley Brown* (New York, 2010).
- Stadiem, W., *Jet Set: The People, the Planes, the Glamour, and the Romance in Aviation's Glory Years* (New York, 2014).
- Tiemeyer, P., *Plane Queer: Labor, Sexuality, and AIDS in the History of Male Flight Attendants* (Berkeley CA, 2013).
- Vantoch, V., *The Jet Sex: Airline Stewardesses and the Making of an American Icon* (Philadelphia PA, 2013).
- Wells Lawrence, M., *A Big Life in Advertising* (New York, 2002).
- Wolfe, T., *The Right Stuff* (New York, 1979).