

Re: Nose art on US warplanes

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.military.moderated/2004-12/0022.html>

From: Abrigon Gusiq (abrigon_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 11/22/04

Date: Mon, 22 Nov 2004 02:49:57 -0900

To: sci-military-moderated@moderators.isc.org

Depends on when you are talking about it.

US Army Air Force was near the end of the war? While Army Air Corp was early war, as well as after WW2, after c.1947?

Mike

David Wilma wrote:

- >
- > >Q1) *The US Army Air Corp (the US didn't have an Air Force during WW2)*
- >
- > *Proper name of the service was U.S. Army Air Forces. The branch of the Army was*
- > *the Air Corps.*
- >
- > >*a lot of their planes with nose art. But it didn't seem like the US*
- > >*Naval aviation planes had as much.*
- >
- > *Nose art was a function of the sense of possession that air crews and ground*
- > *crews had for their aircraft, command policy, and the room available. Command*
- > *policy was the biggest factor.*
- >
- > *In many units, crews did not fly the same airplanes every day. In the 8th Air*
- > *Force in England, two or three air crews of ten men each used the same*
- > *airplane, so they had a lot to say about nose art.*
- >
- > *In the Pacific, B-29 crews followed the 8th Air Force example and liberally*
- > *decorated aircraft, but a Congressional delegation became offended and nose art*
- > *was banned by the command, much to the annoyance of the air and ground crews.*
- > *The famous Bock's Car and Enola Gay only had names and no artwork.*
- >
- > >*Nowadays, you don't see any nose art on US military planes*
- >
- > *Again, a function of command and the fact that no single pilot/crew gets to fly*
- > *the same plane every day. The sense of possession is just not the same.*
- >
- > *David Wilma*
- > *www.HistoryLink.org*

sci.military.moderated: Re: Nose art on US warplanes

> *The online encyclopedia of Washington state history.*