

## **Women in Love (with the Enemy): Forgotten Battles of the Second World War**

Christine de Matos

The archives are full of love stories. Especially in cases of migration or war, or both entangled together, not unlike a pair of calamitous lovers. When the Prime Minister of Australia, Ben Chifley, wrote to Tasman Hudson Eastwood Heyes, the Secretary of the Department of Immigration, in 1949 about the case of two English women who wished to join their fiancés in postwar Australia, he said it seemed “an opportunity for your Department to make love’s path smooth”.<sup>1</sup> But smooth not was the route taken by other women who happened to fall for men deemed by the state to be enemies. This essay commemorates some of these British and Australian women and the battles they fought for love and family.

We often hear about heterosexual Allied men who fell in love with and married (former) enemy women, especially in the wake of the Second World War. British men marrying German women, Australian men with Japanese wives. Women, along with children, even of the designated enemy state, are often framed as victims of war, victims of circumstances, victims of the extreme patriarchy of their own men. Women are not generally blamed for warfare, are not seen as having the power to make war. Marrying an enemy ‘she’ is thus marginally acceptable. Not so for Allied women loving an enemy ‘he’.

Colleen Cantrill was 18 years old and living in Orange, NSW, when she fell for an Italian Prisoner of War (POW), Domenico Camarda. During the Second World War in Australia, some 15,000 approved Italian POWs were allocated to rural work as the local men were given over to the war effort.<sup>2</sup> According to a book based on Colleen’s memories, her father and his neighbours “harboured a deep-seated resentment toward the Italians, a feeling which pre-dated the war. To them, the Italians were dishonest, womanising fiends who could not be trusted”, a feeling only exacerbated by the war.<sup>3</sup>

This hostile environment did not deter women like Colleen from pursuing relationships with POWs. In 1948, after war’s end, Colleen contacted the Chifley government to appeal against the impending deportation of Domenico, or Mick as he was known, who was by then her husband and father to one child with another on the way.<sup>4</sup> Australian postwar policy was to deport all POWs, in line with Article 68 in the Geneva Convention,<sup>5</sup> and Camarda had the added black mark of being an escaped one.

But the Geneva Convention did not account for POWs who fell in love with a member of the captor nation. Colleen Camarda requested that her husband either be allowed to stay in Australia or return after his repatriation to Italy and discharge from the army. While the Immigration Minister, Arthur Calwell, “deeply sympathize[d]” with the situation, there was no question for him that Australian policy must be adhered to. He relayed to Chifley the facts of Camarda’s escape from the Glenfield camp in November 1946 prior to his planned repatriation, and his recapture on 17 July 1948.<sup>6</sup> For two years the Camardas had lived hidden amongst the Italian community in Griffith, supported by many but eventually betrayed by one.<sup>7</sup> Calwell’s

sympathies were limited, however. In late 1947 he had “invited all escaped prisoners-of-war to surrender themselves voluntarily by November 15<sup>th</sup>”, giving assurances they would be eligible for re-entry once immigration from former enemy nations had resumed. Those who did not, would not. As Camarda “did not respond to my invitation to surrender ... we cannot very well allow him to remain in Australia when other recaptured prisoners-of-war, some of whose cases were in every way similar to his, were deported recently”.<sup>8</sup> The Melbourne *Herald* reported a “modest farewell party with the wives ... on the prisoners’ troop deck” before *HMAS Kanimbla* departed from Port Melbourne with surrendered or captured POWs aboard in mid-1948.<sup>9</sup> These Australian wives included Mrs Musco and Mrs Iori, both of Victoria, who also had young children.<sup>10</sup> The Camardas’ story was, therefore, not a unique one.

While it is difficult to ascertain a finite number, there were many Italian POWs who married, became engaged to, or otherwise had relationships with Australian women. Nicola was engaged to an Australian and hoped to return to his fiancée in the future. Asked how many Italians were engaged to Australians, he responded “ ‘[p]lenty’ .”<sup>11</sup> Some POWs, like Francesco, were prosecuted for “fraternising” with the local women, especially when they became pregnant.<sup>12</sup> In desperation, one POW, who signed his appeal TRUE LOVE, wrote to a popular help page in the rural-oriented *Weekly Times*:

Dear Miranda,

I’m in Australia since 1941, and I have been in farm work for nearly three years.  
On farm I meet an Australian girl, and we felt both in strong love on the first look.

We are engaged more than two years, in that times we arrange everything to get married soon as I was getting free in Australia.

Now I am in camp waiting to sail for my country. Both sides are unhappy.

Could you tell me, what we can do to get the happiness in life? [sic]<sup>13</sup>

Particularly perturbing is the story of another Francesco, who lived with an unnamed 21-year-old Indigenous woman working on the same farm in Western Australia. Unbeknownst to the Italian POW-the Native Administration Act prohibited cohabitation between non-Indigenous and Indigenous persons.<sup>14</sup> A *Daily Telegraph* article on the case appears sympathetic to the couple, but is couched in the language and ideology of the times, referring to the woman as a “pretty half-caste”. The solicitor for the male party said that Francesco “is an outcast in this country. The girl is an outcast in her own country. What can you expect when two such people get together?”<sup>15</sup> The situation of each was described as “lonely”, until Francesco “sang her love songs”. Francesco risked imprisonment – “a prison within a prison” – or a fine which “he cannot pay because he gets only fourpence a day”. He was fined £5 for cohabitating “with a native girl” and repatriated in 1946.<sup>16</sup> There is no indication of what happened to the woman – other news articles refer to telling “him of her condition in November of last year”,<sup>17</sup> suggesting a pregnancy during a time when the removal of children of mixed descent was commonplace.

While the POWs could not stay, white Australian wives were free to leave. Calwell gave his permission for the Australian wives of deported POWs to follow their husbands to Italy “at Commonwealth expense.”<sup>18</sup> June and Irene left with their Italian husbands, Francesco and Leonardo, from Fremantle aboard *USS General Stuart Heintzelman* in December 1947, the former’s father describing the trip as their “honeymoon”.<sup>19</sup> The Red Cross helped Irene, and another wife of a German POW, with clothing and necessities before they boarded.<sup>20</sup> Joy, who, like Colleen Camarda, married an escaped Italian POW, was so dissatisfied with the Australian government’s response to their dilemma that she planned to leave the country and meet her deported husband, Pietro, in the United States. The couple had appealed to “the Governor-General, Minister for the Army, [and] the Minister for Immigration” but to no avail. Joy’s mother declared that it “was all right for the girls to chase American soldiers who had lots of money and then go off to the USA after them. But what about my daughter?”<sup>21</sup> She pleaded with Major Wyndham of the Victoria Barracks in Sydney to allow “these two young people ... to live normal Christian lives.”<sup>22</sup> In the case of the Camardas, Calwell was “prepared to make similar arrangements [for her to go to Italy], when she and her children are in a condition to undertake the voyage.”<sup>23</sup> Calwell was also prepared to consider an eventual return to Australia for Camarda “but only after we have arranged for the return of those other Italian prisoners-of-war who complied with the conditions laid down.”<sup>24</sup> Domenico Camarda was deported on *SS Napoli* on 30 October 1948.<sup>25</sup>

I wonder how “sympathetic” Calwell would have been should the husband have been a Japanese POW.

It was not only in Australia that women loved and married enemy men, sometimes following them into their devastated, defeated nations. The Imperial War Museum in London houses copies of the *British Zone Review*, a news magazine from the British zone in occupied Germany. A 1949 issue of the *Review* contains the story of one of these women, known only by her initials, SL.

“I hope that our small family,” wrote SL, “will be one modest emblem of [a] better international relationship and of the preservation of certain European traditions.”<sup>26</sup> The English writer arrived in occupied Germany in late 1948, three months before the published article, along with her young daughter. There she joined her already repatriated German husband, whom she had met and married while he was held as a POW in England. SL’s words and actions, a union between the Isles and the Continent, are a poignant reminder of the hope that a new Europe could emerge from the wounds wrought by that brutal conflict; that families such as hers could build connections between victor and defeated as part of the postwar healing.

SL was not the only British woman who married a German during a time of strong anti-German sentiment. While Italian soldiers had fought Australian ones in North Africa, Italy had not directly attacked Australia, thus tempering public resentment towards the POWs, quite unlike the situation of Germans in Britain.<sup>27</sup> In 1946, the year after the end of hostilities, more than 400,000 German POWs remained in the United Kingdom and the last of these were repatriated to

Germany by the end of 1948.<sup>28</sup> Similar to the Italians in Australia, these POWs were often billeted on farms to help with the shortage of agricultural workers and in other types of work. It was thus that British women encountered these German men, and Australians the Italians, and sometimes engaged in illicit relationships with them.

As stated earlier, much better known are the German women who married British (or other Allied) men, the result of so-called “fraternisation” between British occupation troops and civilians in divided and occupied Germany. There were around 10,000 such unions between 1947 and 1950. The anti-fraternisation ban in Germany was retired by September 1945, and British men were permitted to apply to marry German women from August 1946.<sup>29</sup> While these men and women had to face many challenges in both Germany and Britain, especially prejudice, the British man did not lose his status as an occupier or its associated privileges. After marriage in occupied Germany, he could apply for married family housing and his wife, now considered British, could access British rations. Once his duty in Germany was done, he could take his wife and any children back to Britain with him.

Unlike the fraternisation visible on the destroyed streets of a Berlin or Hamburg, British women who formed liaisons with German POWs in Britain did so secretly until 1947. This was partly due to attitudes – women have long been cast in the role of society’s moral barometers, a role intensified by and entangled with patriotism during times of war. Women could be chastised as traitors for their liaisons with other *Allied* men, so to be seen with a former enemy national was to court danger and be framed as both unpatriotic and immoral.<sup>30</sup> As a writer to a British newspaper railed, in response to a story about a group of women appealing the 12-month sentence of a German POW for having a relationship with a British woman and fathering her child:

Do [they] realise that this handsome man and all his POW comrades were not so long ago trying to destroy this island of ours, as their fathers tried before them during 1914-18 ... Before those girls make such appeals, let them appeal on behalf of some of the maimed, blinded and stricken heroes, who saved them from a fate compared with which Belsen would have been a pleasure camp.<sup>31</sup>

SL reflected on her own experience:

I’d had sufficient time to clarify every possible reaction during long arguments with friends and family who opposed my plan to come here and live as a German. This I can understand from a personal point of view; my beloved father and cousin were killed in a war fought with Germany. But on the other hand, I was expecting to be welcomed by a German mother-in-law whose only daughter had been killed in a British raid on Kiel two weeks before the war ended.<sup>32</sup>

One 1947 news article about another British woman declared: “She hated every German – now weds one”.<sup>33</sup> I do not know how SL or others reconciled their relationships and new home with the horrors and legacies of the Holocaust, Nazism, forced labour and concentration camps. But unlike SL, not all moved to Germany – distinct from the Australian situation, many couples

received permission to remain in Britain, thus had more distance between them and the tangible legacies of war and defeat.

Secrecy in these early relationships was mostly necessary, however, simply because to liaise with German POWs was illegal. The 12-month sentence referred to above, to Werner Vetter for his relationship with Olive Reynolds, is famously credited with helping to change the law. Many Britons came out in support for the couple, noting the inequity that existed between British men who could marry German women, and British women who were forbidden to “fraternise” with or marry German men.<sup>34</sup> One woman informant in Mary Ingham’s PhD research on the topic related a comment made by her German boyfriend to explain the double standard: for the victor a German woman was a “trophy of war”, but “the ones who lost aren’t allowed to have the victor’s women”.<sup>35</sup>

The shift in the public and government mood was discernible by August 1947, one year after British men were permitted to marry German women. The POWs were not only given more freedom of movement in Britain – like shopping, travelling on public transport, or going to the cinema – they could now apply to marry British women.<sup>36</sup> Hundreds of applications followed, including some in the British zone of occupation in Germany, where, if approved, the British woman would usually have to relinquish her job with the occupation forces after marriage. In all, 796 British women married German POWs.<sup>37</sup>

The women were warned by the authorities to think very carefully about their decision to marry. Unlike men, British women, up until the 1949 citizenship changes, lost their British nationality upon marriage to a foreigner.<sup>38</sup> SL relinquished her “nationality to be without status or any privileges granted to British people here [in occupied Germany], and I wondered as I looked at the pale, listless faces of the waiting people in Bremen, with their background of bombed destruction, what our future life in Kiel would hold.”<sup>39</sup> SL had been separated from her husband for two years after he was repatriated to Germany, and she had to face “every possible obstacle” before she could join him there. Whereas German women followed British husbands into a relatively better life, the British women who followed their husbands had quite a different experience. Once in Germany, SL wondered no longer: “conditions are far, far worse than I ever imagined, but I know, too, that here we intend to remain.”<sup>40</sup>

Kiel, where SL lived, had been a major German naval base during the war. It was thus a target of Allied bombing, which destroyed around 80% of the city.<sup>41</sup> On top of this there were food and fuel shortages. In the early years of the occupation many Germans attempted to survive on between 1000 and 1250 calories a day.<sup>42</sup>

SL arrived long after the very worst of the hunger years, yet still struggled. While she found it difficult “to realize how grave the food situation must then have been,” SL said :  
[e]ven now I find it impossible to give my family anything resembling a balanced diet on the existing rations. It is not only my lack of experience in this direction, the food is not obtainable. We have at the most two meat meals a month, no bacon whatsoever; the fat ration is far too small; fish is poor; eggs are unobtainable;

barley, macaroni [sic], bread and potatoes are the staple diet and with exception of potatoes all, of course, are rationed.<sup>43</sup>

She worried about the effects on her daughter, but noted she was comparatively healthy “in contrast to the many of the small people one sees here with facial expressions beyond their years.”<sup>44</sup> One British woman, who found the life too tough and returned to Britain with her German husband, lost “over a stone” (six kilograms) in the six months she lived in occupied Germany.<sup>45</sup>

While British occupiers were accused of living lavish lives in large houses requisitioned from wealthier Germans and with large numbers of servants, “[a]s a German family,” SL wrote, “we must, of course, live under the present severe housing restrictions. We have less than the very small allotted space [sic], but I hope that a severely tried but not too helpful housing office will obtain another room in our own house in the near future.”<sup>46</sup> At that time, many German families had to share congested spaces, kitchens and other facilities with a number of other families.

Yet SL writes only of the generosity she received after her arrival: “the numerous other people I have met here have shown great kindness and charm, their hospitality and sharing of meagre rations, their simplicity, unaffected grace and courtesy and the help and advice they have given me.”<sup>47</sup> This was not always the case. Other British wives of Germans wrote of quite different experiences, as relayed in news articles and in Ingham’s research. In Britain they were spat upon, received hate mail, and were called “Eva Braun”;<sup>48</sup> in Germany, some found it difficult to live up to the high domestic expectations of the *hausfrau*, or felt accused of stealing the few remaining German men<sup>49</sup> – in 1946, due the death or continued incarceration of the men, women comprised the majority of the population in the so-called *Frauenüberschuss* or excess of women.<sup>50</sup> SL said she learned “how great can be the [resilience] of the human mind and body to all possible degrees of mental and physical suffering.”<sup>51</sup>

While the British wives of Germans had greater difficulties than British occupation wives, they still had more power and mobility than the German women with whom they shared those tough times – and their German husbands. Many of the now former POWs found it hard to find work in a devastated Germany; sometimes the wives were able to find work with the occupation forces. The women could also receive food parcels from family back in Britain, and access to food in occupied Germany was a form of social power. And in the end, even though she had lost her British nationality, she could still apply to return to Britain – with or without her husband.

I do not know if SL stayed in Germany, or, like some of the other wives, returned to Britain, finding life in the defeated nation too hard. I do not know if her family managed to stay together, or ended in separation or divorce, as some did. Information on the fate of Australian women and families is even more scarce, though it appears that Calwell and the Australian government did keep the doors open for a return to some.

While time in her husband’s land “[p]roved to be very [d]ifficult”, in later days June said “[s]ome of the happiest days of my life were spent in Italy”. After leaving Fremantle, she

arrived in her husband's family's town of Brescia with only a temporary Document of Identity as she had lost her Australian citizenship. Her husband found it difficult to get work, so in a year they applied to return to Australia, sponsored by June's parents.<sup>52</sup> The couple moved between the two countries for the remainder of their lives. Other POWs also returned to Australia. Joy ended up staying in Australia rather than moving to the United States and sponsored her husband's return in 1949 on *SS Napoli*. He became an Australian citizen on 18 December 1956.<sup>53</sup>

Colleen Camarda, like Joy, decided not to take the government's offer to follow her deported husband to his homeland. Instead, she remained in Australia and continued to fight for his return. Colleen feared, based on warnings from others, that if she also left Australia they may never be able to return as a family. Prior to his deportation, Camarda pleaded that he could not take as good care of his family in Italy: "In my home ... there live three families – a total of ten people in a three-room house, and with my wife and family there will be 14. Another thing, where can I get a job in Italy that will earn me enough to give my wife and family the comfort they have enjoyed here in Australia?"<sup>54</sup> While Domenico was in Italy, Colleen continued to lobby lawyers, priests and politicians for her husband's return;<sup>55</sup> he finally did so aboard *SS Cyrenia*, landing in Melbourne in September 1949.<sup>56</sup>

We should continue to remember the women like Colleen Camarda and SL, one who fought to get her husband back and the other who followed him to his destroyed homeland, along with the many and unnamed others. SL's words transmit a level of optimism in between the detailed hardships: "I still retain my belief in the fundamental goodness of the human character and a belief and hope that in spite of the sceptical and pessimistic utterances I hear, Europe will not plan her own destruction but will benefit and be purged by the suffering she has undergone."<sup>57</sup> These women found humanity amongst so much residual hatred and destruction, and sacrificed and risked much, from their identity, to family and friends, to long periods of separation from partners, to their wellbeing and a more comfortable life, to create new postwar lives and build bridges across shattered nations.

And note that nestled amidst the records of routine policy debates and meeting minutes and official documents, the archives contain personal journeys of sacrifice, struggle, heartbreak and, ultimately, resilience; of women who chose and conquered the rough road to love.

Christine de Matos' primary research interest is the Australian role in the Allied Occupation of Japan (1946-1952), in particular using gender, race and class to elucidate the power dynamics of the occupier-occupied relationship. Her other research interests include Australian history, Japanese history, Australia-Asia relations, gender and history, and digital history. She has previously been a Japan Foundation Fellow (2004) and in 1999 was awarded the J.G. Crawford Award from the Australian-Japan Research Centre at the Australian National University.

Christine has published widely on Australia and the Allied Occupation, including her book *Imposing Peace and Prosperity: Australia, Social Justice and Labour Reform in Occupied Japan 1945-1949* (ASP, 2008). Her most recent book publication is *Japan as the Occupier and the Occupied*, coedited with Mark E. Caprio and published by Palgrave Macmillan in 2015, and most

recent article ‘Forgotten Forced Migrants of War: Civilian internment of Japanese in British India, 1941–1946’, in the *Journal of Contemporary History* (2021) with Rowena Ward.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Archives of Australia (NAA): M1455, 446, Personal Papers of Prime Minister Chifley Correspondence ‘V’, 22 Sept 1948–18 Nov 1949. Chifley to Heyes, 9 November 1948.

<sup>2</sup> SBS, “Italian POWs Helped Grow Australia”, 26 August 2013, <https://www.sbs.com.au/news/article/italian-pows-helped-grow-australia/94fkclfee>; John Hall, “Private Memories, Public Perceptions: Italian Prisoners of War in Northern New South Wales” *Limina: A Journal of Historical and Cultural Studies* 5 (June 1999): 42.

<sup>3</sup> Michelle Hoctor and Colleen Camarda, *I Loved an Italian Prisoner of War: A True Story* (Jamberoo: Camarda Publications, 2000), 1.

<sup>4</sup> NAA: M1455, 295, Personal Papers of Prime Minister Chifley Correspondence ‘C’, 8 Nov 1947–27 Aug 1948.

Calwell to Chifley, 5 August 1948, 1.

<sup>5</sup> See “Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War 1929”, International Humanitarian Law Databases, <https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/gc-pow-1929>.

<sup>6</sup> NAA: M1455, 295, Calwell to Chifley, 5 August 1948, 1; NAA: MP1103/1, PWI55944, Prisoner of War/Internee: Camarda, Domenico; Date of birth - 19 April 1917; Nationality – Italian, 2.

<sup>7</sup> SBS, “Italian POWs Helped Grow Australia”.

<sup>8</sup> NAA: M1455, 295, Calwell to Chifley, 5 August 1948, 1; “POW’s [sic] Must Return to Italy”, *National Advocate*, 7 August 1947, 3.

<sup>9</sup> “Deportee Leaves in Handcuffs”, *The Herald*, 23 June 1948, 2.

<sup>10</sup> Hoctor and Camarda, *I Loved an Italian Prisoner of War*, preface.

<sup>11</sup> “POWs Fed, Guards Go Hungry”, *The Sun* 23 December 1946, 7.

<sup>12</sup> “3 Italian POW’s [sic] Were in Trouble”, *The Daily Telegraph*, 1 July 1945, 23.

<sup>13</sup> “Italian POW’s Romance”, *Weekly Times*, 15 January 1947, 25.

<sup>14</sup> See Western Australia Native Administration No. 14 of 1905 (As amended by No. 42 of 1911, No. 8 of 1931, and No. 43 of 1936), Clause 46, 1(b). <https://nla.gov.au/nla.obj-55208730/view?sectionId=nla.obj-507973199&partId=nla.obj-507433360#page/n18/mode/1up>.

<sup>15</sup> “3 Italian POW’s [sic] Were in Trouble”, 23.

<sup>16</sup> “3 Italian POW’s [sic] Were in Trouble”, 23; NAA: MP1103/1, PWI46069, Prisoner of War/Internee: Mariotti, Francesco; Date of birth - 24 January 1919; Nationality - Italian.

<sup>17</sup> “Italian POW Ignorance of the Law”, *Manjimup and Warren Times*, 27 June 1945, 1.

<sup>18</sup> NAA: M1455, 295, Calwell to Chifley, 5 August 1948, 1.

<sup>19</sup> “POW Wives Leave”, *The Age*, 2 December 1947, 3; “Melbourne Girl Sails with POW Husband”, *Daily Telegraph*, 30 November 1947, 7.

<sup>20</sup> “Clothes for Wives”, *Daily News*, 29 November 1947, 1.

<sup>21</sup> “Girl Will Follow Italian Husband”, *The Sun*, 13 January 1947, 3. See NAA: SP196/2, 489/3/5116, PWI 55622 Pietro Gargano [escape and surrender of POW] [Box 6].

<sup>22</sup> NAA: SP196/2, 489/3/5116, E.C. Slocombe to Major Wyndham, 17 December 1946.

<sup>23</sup> NAA: M1455, 295, Calwell to Chifley, 5 August 1948, 1-2.

<sup>24</sup> NAA: M1455, 295, Personal Papers of Prime Minister Chifley Correspondence ‘C’, 8 Nov 1947–27 Aug 1948. Calwell to Chifley, 6 August 1948.

<sup>25</sup> NAA: MP1103/1, PWI55944, Prisoner of War/Internee: Camarda, Domenico, 2.

<sup>26</sup> SL, “I Have Married a German”, *British Zone Review* 2, no. 20 (1949): 4.

<sup>27</sup> While British women also married Italian POWs under similar circumstances to those in Australia, “they were never taken entirely seriously as ‘the enemy’ by large sections of the public”. See Bob Moore, “Illicit Encounters: Female Civilian Fraternalization with Axis Prisoners of War in Second World War Britain”, *Journal of Contemporary History* 48, No. 4 (2013), 752 and *passim*. While there were far fewer German POWs in Australia than Italian (around 1500), there were cases of relationships between German men and Australian women. See for example “POW Hid Identity to Marry”, *Daily Telegraph*, 26 September 1949, 5 and “Girl’s Love Letters to POW Bring £5 Fine”, *The Herald*, 5 December 1946, 3.

- 
- <sup>28</sup> Mary Ingham, “‘Improperly and Amorously Consorting’: Post-1945 Relationships between British Women and German Prisoners of War Held in the UK”, PhD thesis, Goldsmiths University of London, 2019, 7-8.
- <sup>29</sup> Wendy Webster, “‘Fit to Fight, Fit to Mix’: Sexual Patriotism in Second World War Britain”, *Women’s History Review* 22, no. 4 (2013): 617.
- <sup>30</sup> Ingham, “‘Improperly and Amorously Consorting’”, 12; Moore, “Illicit Encounters”, 759.
- <sup>31</sup> E. Wilkinson, Letter to the Editor, *Daily Herald*, 8 July 1947, 4.
- <sup>32</sup> SL, “I Have Married a German”, 4.
- <sup>33</sup> “She Hated Every German – Now Weds One”, *The People*, 10 August 1947, 3.
- <sup>34</sup> See Ingham, “‘Improperly and Amorously Consorting’”, 254-258.
- <sup>35</sup> Ingham, “‘Improperly and Amorously Consorting’”, 15.
- <sup>36</sup> Ingham, “‘Improperly and Amorously Consorting’”, 257-258; “Free to Shop and Travel: German POWs Enjoy Their New Privileges”, *The Illustrated London News*, 16 August 1947, 185.
- <sup>37</sup> Christopher Knowles, “Group Captives, by Henry Faulk: The Re-education of German Prisoners of War (POWs) in Britain after the Second World War”, *How it Really Was* [blog], 31 December 2006. [https://howitreallywas.typepad.com/how\\_it\\_really\\_was/2006/12/group\\_captives.html](https://howitreallywas.typepad.com/how_it_really_was/2006/12/group_captives.html).
- <sup>38</sup> “POWs Free to Marry British Women”, *The Citizen*, 9 July 1947, 4. In Australia, adjustments were made in 1946 for women who married ‘aliens’ to minimise loss of citizenship, and the automatic loss of citizenship removed entirely in the Nationality and Citizenship Act 1948. See Nationality and Citizenship Act <https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C1948A00083>.
- <sup>39</sup> SL, “I Have Married a German”, 4.
- <sup>40</sup> SL, “I Have Married a German”, 4.
- <sup>41</sup> Tim Bouquet, “World War II’s Ticking Timebombs: How the RAF is Helping to Find and Destroy Unexploded Wartime Bombs – in Germany”, *Daily Mail*, 2 April 2013. <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/home/moslive/article-2300139/World-War-II-How-RAF-helping-destroy-unexploded-wartime-bombs--Germany.html>.
- <sup>42</sup> Atina Grossmann, “Grams, Calories, and Food: Languages of Victimization, Entitlement, and Human Rights in Occupied Germany, 1945–1949”, *Central European History* 44 (2011): 122.
- <sup>43</sup> SL, “I Have Married a German”, 4.
- <sup>44</sup> SL, “I Have Married a German”, 4.
- <sup>45</sup> “Girl Who Married German Comes Back with Her Husband”, *Norwood News*, 17 September 1948, 1.
- <sup>46</sup> SL, “I Have Married a German”, 4.
- <sup>47</sup> SL, “I Have Married a German”, 4.
- <sup>48</sup> Ingham, “‘Improperly and Amorously Consorting’”, 184-185; Helen Weathers, “Sleeping with the Enemy: The British Women Who Fell for German POWs”, *Daily Mail*, 17 August 2007. <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/femail/article-476097/Sleeping-enemy-The-British-women-fell-German-PoWs.html>.
- <sup>49</sup> Ingham, “‘Improperly and Amorously Consorting’”, 260, 305.
- <sup>50</sup> Elizabeth Heinemann, “The Hour of the Woman: Memories of Germany’s ‘Crisis Years’ and West German National Identity”, *The American Historical Review* 101, no. 2 (1996): 374.
- <sup>51</sup> SL, “I Have Married a German”, 4.
- <sup>52</sup> Darren Arnott, “Military Camp”, *Rowville-Lysterfield Community News*, October 2001. <https://rlcnews.com.au/articles/military-camp/>.
- <sup>53</sup> NAA: A261, 1947/884, Applicant - GARGANO Joy Marie; Nominee - GARGANO Pietro; nationality Italian; NAA: B78, 1956/GARGANO P; NAA: A446, 1956/11052 Pietro Gargano - naturalisation.
- <sup>54</sup> Hcctor and Camarda, *I Loved an Italian Prisoner of War*, preface.
- <sup>55</sup> See Hcctor and Camarda, *I Loved an Italian Prisoner of War*, 373-400.
- <sup>56</sup> NAA: SP1121/1, CAMARDA, DOMENICO, Domenico Camarda [Italian - arrived Melbourne per CYRENIA, 17 September 1949] [Box 162]; Hcctor and Camarda, *I Loved an Italian Prisoner of War*, 409.
- <sup>57</sup> SL, “I Have Married a German”, 4.