www.janus.umd.edu

Janus

The Undergraduate History Journal
University of Maryland
Spring 2009

Spring 2009
Janus: The Undergraduate History Journal
University of Maryland: Department of History
www.janus.umd.edu

Produced and Edited by:

Rachel Rosen (Class of 2010)
Chiara Tanzi (Class of 2012)
Emica Mehrer (Class of 2009)

Faculty Advisor: David Sartorius

Director of Undergraduate Studies: Elsa Barkley Brown

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Owen Andrews *Honorable Mention*

"Weaving Political Protest and Economic Necessity: Scenes of Resistance to Pinochet's Dictatorship in Chilean Arpilleras"..... **(4)**

Scott Golden

"Causes of the English Civil War as Reflected in the Artwork of Anthony van Dyck and the Court Culture of King Charles I"**.....(14)**

Kate Kennedy

"You're going out in *that?!*": A Study of the Fashionable "Mothers" and "Daughters" of the Women's Rights Movements in Twentieth-Century United States"**.....(22)**

Julie Rapoport

"Wissenschaft des Judentums and the Orthodox Movement"**.....(35)**

Khalid Rosenbaum *Honorable Mention*

"The League of Women Shoppers: How and Why the Anti-Communists Destroyed Them"**.....(40)**

Joe Siev

"The Bolsheviks' Failed Campaign Against Religion"**.....(55)**

Weaving Political Protest and Economic Necessity:

Scenes of Resistance to Pinochet's Dictatorship in Chilean Arpilleras

Owen Silverman Andrews

Introduction

The resistance of Chilean women to the repressive Pinochet regime (1973-1990) assumed numerous forms. *Chilenas* (Chilean women) performed the *cueca*, a romantic dance usually performed with a male partner, *sola* (alone) to indicate the absence of detained-disappeared loved ones. Others participated in hunger strikes, chained themselves to the gates of Congress, or banged pots and pans in street demonstrations. The activism of Chilenas responded not only to the political repression and human rights violations of the dictatorship, but arose as a reaction to a scarcity of basic human needs in poor urban neighborhoods, a result of the arduous implementation of neo-liberal reforms by the junta. Collective soup kitchens and economic workshops on clothes laundering, rabbit breeding, sewing, and broom and bread making sprung up in these neighborhoods. But it was the arpilleras, tapestries of scrap material depicting gendered scenes woven by female relatives of the disappeared that fused practical needs with political protest by creating a salable protest commodity that spoke to the abuses of Pinochet's government. This amalgamation of the need to resist the abuses of the military government with the need to put food on the table proved to be a powerful combination. The dual motivation of the arpilleras, practical and political, is what made these bits of cloth potent weapons with which Chilean women confronted the generals who had torn their lives and their country asunder.

While the neo-liberal economic reforms of the Pinochet government are sometimes retrospectively referred to as the "Chilean Miracle," the miracle was nothing more than a mirage for a great many Chileans. This economic crisis which struck the *poblaciones* (poor urban neighborhoods) the hardest, catalyzed the growth of *talleres productivos* (productive workshops), *ollas communes* (collective kitchens), and *comprando juntas* (purchasing collectives), especially during the early years of the dictatorship when conditions were worst.[1] The arpillera workshops, in which women banded together to translate their misery into salable commodities, also developed around 1974-5 [2] and this proximity is no coincidence. All of these groups were subsistence organizations, whose members organized in order to achieve basic human needs. Elsewhere, women entered wage labor positions such as those on newly profitable fruit farms, eroding the dominance of male breadwinner headed household.[3]

The craft of the arpilleristas represented a direct and forceful rejection of the dictatorship's political repression, and not merely the economic fallout related to the neo-liberal reforms of the junta. This is because: 1) the arpilleras were sold by women working within the newly emerged entities described above-- entities that were themselves reactions against the regime; 2) the content of the artwork was highly politicized; and 3) these 'revolutionary' products were distributed for sale throughout the country and exported to paying sympathizers around the world.

Just as the economic turmoil during the early years of the junta forced poor urban women into both formal and informal economies often for the first time, it was the impact of direct state violence that led many of the arpilleristas into political resistance and consciousness. In the words of one arpilleristas: "I looked closely at everything. I believed I learned how to see."[4] The medium of the arpillera required open eyes and active observation, a process necessary for capturing a bleak world in woven images. This awakening, related by numerous women in personal accounts and interviews[5] translated itself into greater political activism among poor urban women. The arpillera workshops were not a loose confederacy of like-minded citizens, but rather a structure which included job specialization (i.e. treasurers, reviewers), message control, and systems of distribution that ordered the arpillera workshops into instruments of resistance to the regime.[6] While outside organizations, particularly the Catholic Church's Vicariate of Solidarity were associated with the workshops, offering patronage, support, and protection, the arpilleristas acted as independent political and economic entities.

---

[1] Susan Franceschet, *Women and Politics in Chile* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005), 65.

[2] Eliana Moya-Raggio, "'Arpilleras': Chilean Culture of Resistance," *Feminist Studies 10 (*Summer 1984): 280.

[3] Heidi Tinsman, "Reviving Feminist Materialism: Gender and Neoliberalism in Pinochet's Chile," *Signs 26* (Autumn 2000): 145-188.

[4] Marjorie Agosín, *Tapestries of Hope, the Arpillera Movement in Chile 1974-1994: Threads of Love*. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996), 22.

[5] Ibid.; Jacqueline Adams, "Movement Socialization in Art Workshops: A Case from Pinochet's Chile," *The Sociological Quarterly 41* (Autumn 2000): 615-638.

[6] Eliana Moya-Raggio, "'Arpilleras': Chilean Culture of Resistance," 280.

The synthesis of practical and political need that manifested itself in the activism of the arpilleristas is best expressed in the arpilleras themselves and in the personal accounts of the women who wove them. Because the arpilleras are often untitled, anonymous pieces of visual art, labeling the weavings that will substantiate the arguments made in this paper becomes a creative enterprise. Therefore, the following titles will be used to reference the three primary works cited throughout: *Gathering*, *Labor Day*, and *Olla Comun*, which appear on pages 51, 54, and 45 respectively of Marjorie Agosín's *Tapestries of Hope, Threads of Love*. *Gathering* depicts a scene of women congregated in what may be a church, mourning, consoling, and sewing. *Labor Day* portrays women demonstrating in a park and calling for "bread, justice, liberty, work." *Olla Comun* renders women gathered in front of a church and a soup kitchen, two pillars of resistance during the dictatorship.[7] Of all the arpilleras, these three most succinctly represent the fusion of practical needs and political protest. A picture of *Gathering* appears on the cover of this journal issue. In addition, the personal accounts of various arpilleristas, as well as period newspaper articles, will be used to contextualize the repressive conditions which gave birth to the arpilleras and the empowerment of a women's movement based in poor urban neighborhoods.

Framing the Arpilleras: A Gendered History of Chile under Pinochet

In order to decode the arpilleras as the significant historical artifacts they truly are, it is necessary to contextualize these primary sources by sketching the world of the women who wove them. Women, having formally gained the franchise only a few decades prior in 1949 were participants in the events which led up to and followed the military coup d'etat that brought General Augusto Pinochet to power on September 11, 1973.[8] Rather than offer an in-depth history of Chile during this crucial time period, this section will focus on three concepts crucial to the process of framing the arpilleras historically. First, it is necessary to provide a picture of working-class urban Chilenas pre-coup, in order to understand the enormous transition these women made during the dictatorship. Second, the economic hardship of the dictatorship era will be drawn upon as it is a force which pushed the arpilleristas toward social activism. Thirdly, touching on the depoliticization, at least at the official level (national parties) that took place in Chile under Pinochet provides another rationale for the grass-roots organization of the arpillera workshops. With this dynamic background in place, the stage will be set to investigate the personal testimonies of arpilleristas, and images of the arpilleras, that will constitute the following two sections respectively.

It is of great significance to note the gender schism evident in the 1970 election, in which a slim 36% plurality supported Salvador Allende. In total, only 31% of women voted for Allende, who represented the left-wing Popular Unity party, compared to 42% of men.[9] As Margaret Power relates in *Right-Wing Women in Chile*, this gender gap was evident even in the working class neighborhoods of Santiago that later produced the arpilleristas. However, female support for Allende, a socialist, was higher in these neighborhoods than among Chilenas as a whole. The deviation by gender in many working-class Santiago districts was between 9 and 12%.[10]

Keeping in mind that the arpilleras that would later be produced were a powerful synthesis of the economic and political needs of working-class women in Santiago, this gender divide in the 1970 election is noteworthy for three reasons. In the first place, Allende's socialist vision for Chile and its redistributionist economic polices were aimed specifically at improving the lives of the poor across Chile.[11] Therefore, that the very women who had the most to gain from his policies opposed Allende more frequently than did their working-class husbands, brothers, fathers, and sons speaks to the social isolation and limited political worldview of these Chilenas. A traditional patriarchic society which "kept women at home looking after the children and discouraged intimacy with non-family members," diminished opportunities for poor women to learn about and discuss politics—activities enjoyed by male counterparts in union meetings, the workplace, and in public places and political parties.[12] A second convincing rationale for the gender gap was the media blitz of anti-Allende propaganda directed at women, financed by Chilean conservatives and the United States Central Intelligence Agency.[13]

The second and third important conclusions to be drawn from the gendered divergent voting behavior of working-class residents of Santiago are the gender-specific rationales for opposing the military government that ousted Allende in 1973. On the one hand, women were less likely to be openly supportive of, or active in, the Allende government. Those who were became the first round of disappeared persons. Lastly, the ardent anti-dictatorship activism of women's groups

---

[7] Marjorie Agosín, *Tapestries of Hope, the Arpillera Movement in Chile 1974-1994: Threads of Love*, 45.
[8] Margaret Power, *Right-Wing Women in Chile: Feminine Power and the Struggle Against Allende 1964-1973* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), 46.
[9] Margaret Power, *Right-Wing Women in Chile*, 138.
[10] Ibid., 140.
[11] Richard Muir and Alan Angell, "Commentary: Salvador Allende: His Role in Chilean Politics," *International Journal of Epidemiology* 34 (2005): 737.

[12] Jacqueline Adams, "Movement Socialization in Art Workshops," 623; Margaret Power, *Right-Wing Women in Chile*, 135.
[13] Margaret Power, *Right-Wing Women in Chile*, 132 and 135.

such as the arpilleristas cannot be relegated to merely being a response to the demise of Allende, since his support among these women was shaky at best. The responses, as voiced in the arpilleras, did much more than bemoan the loss of a leader that many had not supported, but rather should be understood as a synthesis of the practical and political feminist needs that were born out of the tumult of the coup and the ensuing dictatorship.

After coming to power and consolidating his role at the head of the military junta, one of General and "Supreme Chief of the Nation" Pinochet's first actions was to outlaw the Popular Unity party, force all other parties into "recess," and shut the doors of the Chilean Congress.[14] In the past, "political institutions were stronger than social organizations, and even if social movements arose, they were mobilized and sustained by the political parties."[15] Women had been backseat passengers in Chile's primary political vehicles, the traditional parties. With the parties disbanded or underground, "the traditional dichotomy between formal and informal politics was blurred as the informal arena in which women's activism predominated became the main site for oppositional politics."[16] Differences in scholarly opinion exist, but the consensus strongly supports the theory that the vacuum created by Pinochet's banning of political parties, along with dictatorial repression and the economic crises that followed created an environment where grassroots "movement socialization" and the fostering of a collective identity among women was both possible and necessary.[17]

The space emptied by the forced exit of the political parties may have created room for social movement organizations such as the arpillera workshops, but it was the combination of the economic turmoil and violent state oppression that pushed women towards new forms of activism. The worst years were the first years of the dictatorship, in the mid 1970's, and during the economic collapse of 1982-3, when real unemployment reached as high as 20.3% and 35% respectively.[18] The first economic rupture for poor Chileans[19] occurred during the harshest period of political repression and human rights violations; the second is credited as having hurried the eventual softening of the regime.[20] Thus, the interweaving of politics and economics so evident in the work of the arpilleristas manifested itself on a national scale.

The gender-specific nature of the brutal repression in the 1970's is apparent in the evidence revealed in the Report of the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation. Although the total number of killed-disappeared offered by the Commission, some 2,279, is very low (Steve Stern estimates 3,500-4,500 as "reasonable"), statistics elsewhere in the report are extremely telling.[21] Of the over 2,000 disappeared persons confirmed by the Commission, 94.5% were male.[22] Married individuals made up 51.5% of the total disappeared.[23] The occupations of the disappeared trend toward jobs held by lower- and middle-class Chileans as well.[24] The Commission's numbers, erring on the conservative side (another indicator of the primary source status of the 1990 Commission), offer clues in cold statistics as to who the fatal casualties of the Pinochet regime's repression were.

Absent from an analysis of these numbers however, are the lived experiences of economic hardship and political repression that motivated the arpilleristas. Although a majority of families were antagonized in varying degrees and forms by the repression of the Pinochet dictatorship,[25] poor, urban women, already living on the cusp of Chilean society were a group most dramatically harmed. With many male breadwinners disappeared or unemployed, Chilenas responded by

---

[14] Alexandra Barahona de Brito, *Human Rights and Democratization in Latin America: Uruguay and Chile*, (Oxford University Press, 1997), 34-5.
[15] Annie G. Dandavati, *Engendering Democracy in Chile*, (New York: Peter Lang, 2005), 4-5.
[16] Susan Franceschet, *Women and Politics in Chile*, 58.
[17] Jacqueline Adams, "Movement Socialization in Art Workshops," 623; Susan Franceschet, *Women and Politics in Chile*, 58; Annie G. Dandavati, *Engendering Democracy in Chile*, 5; Helen Icken Safa, "Women's Social Movements in Latin America," *Gender and Society 4 (September 1990):* 359.
[18] Fernando Ignacio Leiva and James Petras, "Chile's Poor and the Struggle for Democracy." Grinor Rojo and John J. Hassett, *Chile: Dictatorship and the Struggle for Democracy*, (Gaithersburg: Ediciones Hispamerica, 1988), 82-3.
[19] It is important to note here that the privatization that occurred during these years proved very lucrative for the top 20% of Chileans. when terms like economic crisis, downturn, or rupture are used in this paper, it is to denote periods of increased hardship for poor Chileans specifically, although these years, especially 1982-3, do coincide with general nationwide economic turbulence. Rosa M. Canadell and John F. Uggen, "Chilean Women's Organizations: Their Potential for Change," *Latin American Perspectives 20 (Autumn 1993): 43-60.*
[20] Pamela Constable and Arturo Valenzuela, *A Nation of Enemies: Chile Under Pinochet*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1991), 242.
[21] Steve Stern, *Remembering Pinochet's Chile: On the Eve of London 1998*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), xxi; Truth Commissions Digital Collection: Reports: Chile. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993, Appendix II.
[22] Truth Commissions Digital Collection: Reports: Chile. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993, Appendix II Table 4.
[23] Ibid., Appendix II Table 3.
[24] Ibid., Appendix II, Table 9.
[25] Steve Stern, *Remembering Pinochet's Chile*, xxi.

entering the economic and political marketplaces more forcefully than ever before. The arpilleras are powerful evidence of this political and economic emergence.

In Their Own Words

This section will characterize the arpilleristas in their own words. Personal testimonies will be taken from Marjorie Agosín's *Tapestries of Hope, Threads of Love: The Arpillera Movement in Chile 1974-1994*. Supplementing an interpretation of these personal accounts, interviews and block quotes found in the secondary literature on the topic will be woven into the discussion. Furthermore, an important disagreement among the scholars of the arpillera social organization will be addressed: were the arpilleristas participants in a top down structure where the content of their work was censored and directed by the Vicariate of Solidarity? Or were these women socialized within a structure influenced—but not dictated by—Vicariate employees? Analyzing this disparity in the literature will bring to life the struggles of the arpilleristas, elucidating their motivations and clarifying their intentions. After considering the analysis of several scholars, an original analysis of the personal testimonies of the arpilleristas will be proffered.

Months after the coup, in response to the rash of disappearances and other human rights abuses that were sweeping the nation, Cardinal Raúl Silva Henriquez[26] founded the Pro-Paz (For Peace) Committee—an "ecumenical group of religious leaders with the immediate objective of lending support to those whose human rights had been violated."[27] Pressured by the regime, the Pro-Paz was shuttered and reconstituted within the Church's internal structure, insulated from the junta's control. The new organization, known as the Vicaria de la Solidaridad (Vicariate of Solidarity), would become one of the chief benefactors and protectors of the arpilleristas.[28]

While the consensus concurs with the above account, a subtle yet significant schism exists concerning the relationship between the Vicariate of Solidarity and the arpillera workshops it sponsored. Jacqueline Adams, in her article "*Movement Socialization in Art Workshops: A Case from Pinochet's Chile*, specifically argues that the Vicariate enforced a "quality control" on the production and sale of arpilleras created in "shantytown" church workshops.[29] She goes on to theorize that it was the specific directions of Vicariate employees that moved women toward the themes they took up in their arpilleras and that the poor Chilenas were ideologically and politically a *tabla rasa* on which leftist Church employees imprinted a rigid set of guidelines for arpillera production. According to one Vicariate employee interviewed by Adams:

> In the arpilleras we would try… again, I go back to this idea that the women, that they came [to the workshops], and they had no political consciousness whatsoever. They were not interested in overthrowing Pinochet. They didn't know anything about what was happening. I mean, they knew what they experienced, when they [the military] had conducted a shantytown raid, when they knew a neighbor… yes, but the women were not, I mean, they were women of another kind, you could have considered them almost "lumpen," you see?[30]

Although her methodology is rich in primary source material, Adams seems to accept this version of the oral history too readily. Other authors, including Marjorie Agosín and Eliana Moya-Raggio, while acknowledging the pivotal role of the Vicariate, award more credit to the arpilleristas themselves for their bravery, imagination, and perseverance.

Scholars such as Marjorie Agosín and Eliana Moya-Raggio understand the Vicariate as a guiding force in the creation of the arpillera movement, rather than a dictator of the artistic-political content produced in the workshops. Firstly, Moya-Raggio's article suggests that the arpilleristas themselves filled roles within the organization structure becoming treasurers and more notably, "reviewers" of the thematic message of the arpilleras.[31] Likewise, although Agosín astutely confirms the central organizational role of the Church, her analysis of the relationship between the arpilleristas and the Vicariate is more closely aligned with Moya-Raggio's than with Adams's.[32] Enlisting the personal testimonies of the arpilleristas themselves, an interpretation more similar to the Moya-Raggio-Agosín camp will be confirmed. At the same time, the case for arpilleras as feminist protest commodities empowered by a synthesis of political and economic needs will be crystallized.

---

[26] In his full page obituary in the New York Times, his role in organizing networks of resistance to the Pinochet regime is explicitly noted, and the Pro-Paz and Vicariate are alluded to.

[27] Marjorie Agosín, *Tapestries of Hope, the Arpillera Movement in Chile 1974-1994*, 7.

[28] Alexandra Barahona de Brito, *Human Rights and Democratization in Latin America*, 113.

[29] Jacqueline Adams, "Movement Socialization in Art Workshops," 622-3.

[30] Ibid., 623.

[31] "The reviewers take care of the finishing of each piece as well as making sure the theme is significant as well as realistic (a piece showing a settlement without children, for example, would be rejected as unreal)."
Eliana Moya-Raggio, "'Arpilleras': Chilean Culture of Resistance," 280.

[32] "A Church official, Valentina Bonne, gave the women remnants of clothing and they, already familiar with the art of sewing, *spontaneously* made the first arpilleras." Italics added.
Marjorie Agosín, *Tapestries of Hope, the Arpillera Movement in Chile 1974-1994*, 12.

Over and over again in their personal accounts, arpilleristas relate how intimately they suffered direct political repression and economic desperation during the Pinochet years.[33] Understanding these women as "lumpen,"[34] Adams and the Vicariate employee who used the word disregard the seismic shift that occurred among the worldviews of poor Chilenas, starting just hours after September 11, 1973. Before the coup, poor Chilenas were largely under-politicized, socially and ideologically isolated, and relegated to the home. After the coup, all this changed. One need not be a political scientist to understand the political implications of a disappeared relative, nor an economist to understand the economic implications of an unemployed former breadwinner. When Violeta Morales's brother Newton was disappeared, she went looking for him. When the sons of Anita Rojas and Irma Muller were disappeared, they went looking for them.[35] These first defiant searches for justice were tentative first steps out of a "lumpen" class,[36] and into a new activist class of working-class women in Chile. It was however, only after these women formed congregations of arpillera workshops that they developed the collective identity necessary for full political awakening.[37]

This enlightenment is narrated by Violeta Morales in one of the most telling of the arpillerista testimonies. Before the coup:

> We had no help, we were very isolated in those years. At times it seemed as if the whole world had turned its back on us. There were not politicians, union leaders, or anyone on this earth who could help us organize and give us ideas about how to survive the tragedy [of the dictatorship].[38]

Specifically mentioning politicians and union leaders, who for Chilean men were representative of integration into national public life largely denied to poor Chilenas, Morales' words reflect the peripheral economic and political space occupied by Chilenas pre-coup. Writing of her years of activism, Morales relates an empowered feminine identity that springs from a new economic and political perspective:

> It was the women comrades who managed to end the military nightmare in our country; they had the strength that the men lacked or lost along the way. Women, *who were always housewives*, woke up and didn't submit until freedom returned to their country and its citizens. One must remember that we were the ones who organized the first protests.[39] (Italics added)

Her emphasis on the no longer singular identity of the housewife denotes the dual awakening manifested in the arpilleras: a greater degree of economic independence (an economic identity indeed worthy of pride), and a newfound political activism. Morales's memory depicts the arpilleristas as independent actors, not as pawns of the Vicariate or any other organization.

Anita Rojas, another arpillerista from Santiago, lived through the Pinochet years on a meager pension and the money from the sale of the arpilleras.[40] Typical arpilleras, according to period newspaper articles from the New York Times sold for around $50, smaller ones for $12-20, and larger wall-size tapestries bought by U.S. universities and a Senator, could sell in North America and Western Europe for considerably more.[41] Rojas offers a succinct set of motives for weaving arpilleras:

> We also denounced other problems, not just our own: unemployment, the massacre of Lonquén, the shantytowns, how people live there, the soup kitchens, the closed factories, children begging. We wanted people living outside Chile to see how we live here. We are also concerned about the problems of other people, with all that we see and feel and show in the arpilleras.

---

[33] Personal Accounts found in "Testimonies" chapter of Marjorie Agosín, *Tapestries of Hope, the Arpillera Movement in Chile 1974-1994*, 98-136.
[34] Mirriam-Webster definition of lumpen: of or relating to dispossessed and uprooted individuals cut off from the economic and social class with which they might normally be identified.
[35] Marjorie Agosín, *Tapestries of Hope, the Arpillera Movement in Chile 1974-1994*, 102, 120, 124.
[36] One need also be careful in applying this term to pre-coup Chilenas as well.
[37] Jacqueline Adams, "Movement Socialization in Art Workshops," 626.
[38] Marjorie Agosín, *Tapestries of Hope, the Arpillera Movement in Chile 1974-1994*, 109.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid., 122.
[41] Figures are for U.S. dollars. The University of Connecticut purchased and displayed a wall-sized tapestry in 1989, as did Connecticut Senator Christopher Dodd (D-Conn.) who is the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on Western Hemisphere affairs. This exposure is representative of the wide reach of the arpilleras as a medium of protest.
Ruth Robinson, "Needlework Stories Tell of Chilean Life," *New York Times*, October 29, 1989.
Ruth Robinson, "Subtle Protests You Can Hang on the Wall," *New York Times*, August, 24, 1989.

The personal testimony of women like Anita Rojas, Violeta Morales, and other arpilleristas repeatedly return to this crucial confluence of economic and political needs. In the arpilleras, the need to denounce the dictatorship and the need to put food on the table became inexorably interwoven.

The Arpilleras: Weaving Together Practical and Political Feminist Needs

Even after casual examination, it is clear that the arpilleras represent a synthesis of political and economic need. With money scarce, materials were not readily available. "So," as Violeta Morales stated, "we got the idea of cutting up our own clothes and unraveling our sweaters to make the first arpilleras."[42] Thus, not only the scenes depicted, but the entire process—materials, motivation, and environmental conditions—are evidence of the linkage between survival and protest, the two inspirations for the arpillera movement.

The first arpillera to be discussed here, *Gathering*,[43] portrays a group of twelve women in an arpillera workshop. An average workshop consisted of about twenty women.[44] While the group shown is slightly smaller, it is not abnormal. Three empty chairs in the back of the room may indicate that more women are coming, or, the empty chairs may suggest the absence of disappeared loved ones, a common motif. A cross hangs in the center of the far wall, suggesting that the workshop may have been held in a church. In the upper left corner, stitching reads, "¿Donde estan los detenidos desparecidos?" (Where are the detained-disappeared?). A single word "Paz" (Peace), appears in the upper left and upper right corners, beneath which a woman mourns apart from the group seated at wooden tables. Without these captions, the scene might indicate a non-political sewing circle. With them, the piece connotes a direct and forceful message. The brightly colored or patterned cloth used for the women's clothing appears to have been taken from scraps of the artist's own wardrobe. The message and method used in this arpillera clearly represents the parallel expression of political and economic needs.

A second arpillera, *Labor Day*, displays women protesting in a public park.[45] A banner in the center of the cloth spells the letters "CNT." The strike organized by the *Comando Nacional de Trabajadores* (National Workers' Command) in May 1983,[46] bringing skyrocketing unemployment and other economic woes to the public's attention was a significant turning point in the sixteen year life of the dictatorship.[47] The Pinochet regime "had founded its legitimacy on two elements: the success of the economic model, and the maintenance of internal order. The collapse of the first element in 1982 resulted in the destruction of the second element."[48] Just as the strike broke the silence of political repression in 1983, the arpilleras performed the same task throughout the dictatorship's reign. Other banners held by women read "*Basta de Hambre*" (Enough of hunger), "*Todos Unidos en el Parque*" (Everyone Unite in the Park), and "*Pan Trabajo Justicia y Libertad*" (Bread Justice Liberty and Work). This arpillera, in sync with then current political events, demonstrates the sophistication and political awareness of its artist, and once again, is a reminder of the confluence of political and economic demands made in the arpilleras.

The final arpillera, *Olla Comun* (literally Common Pot, or soup kitchen), depicts women gathered in front of two sites of resistance during the dictatorship, a church and soup kitchen. Like the arpilleras, the *olla comun* was more than the sum of its parts. Cooking, like sewing, had traditionally been the work of housewives, but during the hard times of the dictatorship these roles took on new meaning. While in some respects Chilenas were "simply extending domestic roles into the public realm, at the same time their work significantly represented collectivization of those roles."[49] The scene expressed in this arpillera is hopeful, especially in comparison with others revealing torture, exile, and despair. Above the Andes, an orange sun shines over the "*San Roque*" church and birds fly above the *olla comun*. The relative tranquility of this arpillera suggests the comfort Chilenas took from these two institutions during otherwise turbulent years. However, the depiction of the *olla comun* also denotes the economic hardship of the period—a subtle undertone of political dissonance is threaded through this arpillera.

---

[42] Marjorie Agosín, *Tapestries of Hope, the Arpillera Movement in Chile 1974-1994*, 105.
[43] Arpilleras are anonymous and untitled. Therefore, all titles used here are given by the author.
Ibid., 51.
[44] Jacqueline Adams, "Movement Socialization in Art Workshops," 621.
[45] Marjorie Agosín, *Tapestries of Hope, the Arpillera Movement in Chile 1974-1994*, 54.
[46] May 1st is Chilean labor day.
[47] Pamela Constable and Arturo Valenzuela, *A Nation of Enemies*, 242.
[48] Silvia Borutzky, "The Pinochet Regime: Crisis and Consolidation," in *Authoritarians and Democrats: Regime Transition in Latin America*, ed. by James M. Malloy and Mitchell A. Seligson, (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1987).
[49] Patricia M. Chuchryk, "From Dictatorship to Democracy: The Women's Movement in Chile," in *The Women's Movement in Latin America: Participation and Democracy*, ed. Jane S. Jaquette, (San Francisco: Westview Press, 1994).

These three arpilleras, and the medium of protest tapestries in general, embody a fusion of feminist "practical" and "strategic interests."[50] The materials used, the process of production, and the themes woven all synergize these two sets of needs. The sale of the arpilleras spread seeds of dissent domestically, shed light on the human rights abuses of the Pinochet regime for international audiences, and put food on the tables of the arpilleristas.

Arpilleras Abroad: the Export-Oriented Commodification of Protest

So often, the power of protest is underestimated because it is intangible. The scenes of communal resistance and feminist awakening previously described were of tremendous importance to those involved, as well as to the political environment of Chile at the time. However, without the physical medium of the arpillera to capture these crucial moments, press censorship and the dictatorship's firm grip on the daily lives of Chileans would have isolated the effects of these powerful forms of resistance. The medium of the arpillera operated as an export-oriented protest commodity, capable of revealing to the world what was transpiring behind the military's curtain of silence.

Art shows of the arpilleras were held in Anne Harbor, Michigan in 1980[51] and throughout New England in 1989. In Connecticut, the William Benton Museum of Art of the University of Connecticut at Storrs displayed seventy-one arpilleras. The arpilleras for this collection were obtained in 1987 through the Vicariate of Solidarity. The collection was then loaned to public schools and colleges throughout Connecticut.[52] Marjorie Agosín, author of one of the monographs used in this paper, contributed her collection of forty-one arpilleras to a traveling exhibition sponsored by the New England Foundation for the Arts in Cambridge, Massachusetts, reaching audiences across the North-East United States.[53] Thus the arpilleras, because they represented an exportable protest commodity, were able to politically impact North Americans much more forcefully than local street demonstration and other domestic forms of resistance.

Indeed, a special order wall-sized arpillera was commissioned by United States Senator and Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on Western Hemisphere affairs, Christopher Dodd. His arpillera, prominently displayed in his East Haddam, Connecticut home, belies more than the Senator's appreciation for art. On at least one official trip to Chile, Sen. Dodd visited the Vicariate to order his arpilleras, an act of solidarity with the arpilleristas and a snub to the Pinochet regime. [54]

The above information is garnered from period newspapers, such as the New York Times, with broad and far-reaching circulation. Although described in one article as "primitive,"[55] these articles were sympathetic to the plight of the arpilleristas, enlightening a far-removed readership to the abuses of the Pinochet regime. Most importantly, these articles reveal the two-fold power of the arpilleras. As an economic means for hard-pressed Chilean women, the international market provided eager buyers willing to pay $50 for standard arpilleras and even more for custom installations.[56] As a political end, the internationalization of the arpillera movement brought the abuses of the Pinochet regime into the light, reaching large audiences and even U.S. Senators. This international dimension is yet another demonstration of the influence of the arpilleras to simultaneously decry the abuses being perpetrated by the dictatorship and address practical economic interests in one medium.

Conclusion

The Chilean arpillera movement provided working-class urban Chilenas with a source of much needed economic income and an outlet for political protest. Domestically, arpilleras were considered a subversive contraband. Both the production and consumption of the weavings maintained a space for political protest where elsewhere this spirit was being crushed under the heel of the regime. Abroad, arpilleras exposed the brutality of Pinochet's dictatorship to audiences in North America and Western Europe. Abroad and at home, arpilleras became a symbol of protest and perseverance.

In the second section of this paper, *Framing the Arpilleras, a Gendered History of Chile under Pinochet*, the historical background contextualizes the rise of the arpillera movement in the mid 1970's. Isolation of housebound women was the rule pre-coup. The shock of the coup began a domino effect that created the space and the catalysts for the activation of poor urban Chilenas as full political and economic actors. Traditional political parties were banned, male breadwinners were disappeared or laid-off, and the repressive presence of a violent military government with strong patriarchic overtones all factored into the social calculus that mobilized the arpilleristas.

---

[50] Julie D. Shayne, *The Revolution Question: Feminisms in El Salvador, Chile, and Cuba*, (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2004).
[51] Eliana Moya-Raggio, "'Arpilleras: Chilean Culture of Resistance," 278.
[52] Ruth Robinson, "Subtle Protests You Can Hang on the Wall," *New York Times*, August, 24, 1989.
[53] Ibid.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Ruth Robinson, Needlework Stories Tell of Chilean Life," *New York Times*, October 29, 1989.
[56] Ibid.

Section three, *In Their Own Words*, spoke to a schism in the scholarly interpretation of Chilean history. The personal testimonies of arpilleristas were enlisted to side with the scholarly camp that depicts these women as having acted of their own volition, with the Vicariate as a guiding, rather than dictatorial presence in the workshop socialization that took place. Furthermore, these personal accounts solidified the assertion that the strength of the arpillera medium came from the synthesis of practical economic and strategic political interests woven together in a commodified protest art form.

The fourth section analyzed the arpilleras themselves, denoting the clear presence of convergent economic and political motifs. The materials used, the themes expressed, and the environment in which they were produced all confirms the simple artistic beauty and undeniable political awakening caused by military repression and economic depression. As prisms of Chilean life during the Pinochet era, the arpilleras are a rich primary source.

The final section details the internationalization of the arpillera movement. Audiences in the United States became aware of the abuses of the Chilean dictatorship as they visited museum instillations or read articles in newspapers. International sales expanded the market for arpilleras, bringing additional desperately needed resources back to the arpilleristas. Furthermore, while other forms of protest reached a limited audience due to tightly controlled local media, the arpillera—as a protest commodity with export potential—were well positioned to advance the political interests of their creators.

On Thursday, January 13, 1977, the Paulina Waugh Art Gallery in Santiago was firebombed by agents of DINA (Dirección de Inteligencia Nacional, the military government's secret police).[57] Among the exhibits targeted was *Christmas, 20th Century*, a collection of arpilleras depicting the hardships of the normally joyous holiday season. Marisa T., one of the arpilleristas with featured work in the exhibition, explained: "When they killed a youngster and his mother picked him up from the floor, I gave expression to it in an arpillera; when we lived Christmases so poor, well I also captured it in the arpillera."[58] Once again, the words of an arpillerista sum up the convergence of economic and political needs that were then infused into the arpilleras. The targeting of a gallery displaying arpilleras confirms just how dangerous this synthesized expression was to the legitimacy of Pinochet's regime.

[57] Steve Stern, *Battling for Hearts and Minds: Memory Struggles in Pinochet's Chile, 1973-1988*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 83.
[58] Ibid., 84.

Bibliography

Adams, Jacqueline. "Movement Socialization in Art Workshops: A Case from Pinochet's Chile." *The Sociological Quarterly 41* (Autumn 2000): 615-638.

Agosín, Marjorie. *Tapestries of Hope, the Arpillera Movement in Chile 1974-1994: Threads of Love*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996.

Barahona de Brito, Alexandra. *Human Rights and Democratization in Latin America: Uruguay and Chile*. Oxford University Press, 1997.

Borutzky, Silvia T. "The Pinochet Regime: Crisis and Consolidation." In *Authoritarians and Democrats: Regime Transition in Latin America*, edited by Malloy, James M., and Seligson, Mitchell A. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1987.

Chuchryk, Patricia M. "From Dictatorship to Democracy: The Women's Movement in Chile." In *The Women's Movement in Latin America: Participation and Democracy*, edited by Jaquette, Jane S. San Francisco: Westview Press, 1994.

Canadell, Rosa M., and Uggen, John F. "Chilean Women's Organizations: Their Potential for Change." *Latin American Perspectives 20 (Autumn 1993): 43-60.*

Constable, Pamela, and Valenzuela, Arturo. *A Nation of Enemies: Chile Under Pinochet*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1991.

Corradi, Juan E., and Fagen, Patricia Weiss, and Garreton, Manuel Antonio, eds. *Fear at the Edge: State Terror and Resistance in Latin America*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992.

Dandavati, Annie G. *Engendering Democracy in Chile*. New York: Peter Lang, 2005.

Ensalaco, Mark. *Chile Under Pinochet: Uncovering the Truth*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

Franceschet, Susan. *Women and Politics in Chile*. Boulder (CO): Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005.

Howe, Marvin. "Chile's Women Ew a Protest Message in Folk Art Hangings." *New York Times*, November 14, 1984.

Jelin, Elizabeth. *State Repression and Labors of Memory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Leiva, Fernando Ignacio, and Petras, James. "Chile's Poor and the Struggle for Democracy." In *Chile: Dictatorship and the Struggle for Democracy*, edited by Rojo, Grinor, and Hassett, John J. Gaithersburg: Ediciones Hispamerica, 1988.

Moya-Raggio, Eliana. "'Arpilleras': Chilean Culture of Resistance." *Feminist Studies 10 (*Summer 1984): 277-290.

Muir, Richard, and Angell, Alan. "Commentary: Salvador Allende: His Role in Chilean Politics." *International Journal of Epidemiology* 34 (2005): 737-739.

Munoz, Betilde V. "Where are the Women?: The Case of Chilean Women: 1973-1989." *International Social Science Review* 74 (1999): 3.

Noonan, Rita K. "Women against the State: Political Opportunities and Collective Action Frames in Chile's Transition to Democracy." *Sociological Forum 10* (March 1995): 81-111.

Pace, Eric. "Raul Silva Henriquez, 91, Chile Cardinal, Dies." *New York Times*, April 12, 1999.

Power, Margaret. *Right-Wing Women in Chile: Feminine Power and the Struggle Against Allende 1964-1973*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.

Richards, Patricia. *Pobladoras, Indigenas, and the State: Conflicts over Women's Rights in Chile*. New Brunswick (NJ): Rutgers University Press, 2004.

Robinson, Ruth. "Needlework Stories Tell of Chilean Life." *New York Times*, October 29, 1989.

Robinson, Ruth. "Subtle Protests You Can Hang on the Wall." *New York Times*, August, 24, 1989.

Safa, Helen Icken. "Women's Social Movements in Latin America." *Gender and Society 4 (September 1990):* 354-369.

Sepulveda, Emma. *We, Chile: Personal Testimonies of the Chilean Arpilleristas*. Falls Church (VA): Azul, 1996.

Shayne, Julie D. *The Revolution Question: Feminisms in El Salvador, Chile, and Cuba*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2004.

Stern, Steve. *Battling for Hearts and Minds: Memory Struggles in Pinochet's Chile, 1973-1988*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

Stern, Steve. *Remembering Pinochet's Chile: On the Eve of London 1998*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.

Tinsman, Heidi. "Reviving Feminist Materialism: Gender and Neoliberalism in Pinochet's Chile." *Signs 26* (Autumn 2000): 145-188.

Van Dijk, Janie A. "Testimony Therapy: Treatment Method for Traumatized Victims of Organized Violence." *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 57 (2003): 361-373

Truth Commissions Digital Collection: Reports: Chile. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.

Causes of the English Civil War as Reflected in the Artwork of Anthony van Dyck and the Court Culture of King Charles I

Scott Golden

During his tumultuous reign throughout the first half of the seventeenth century, King Charles I and the members of his court attempted to craft a favorable public image for the monarchy of England, Scotland, and Ireland, in the process shaping a distinctive and recognizable court culture. This effort was largely manifested in the patronage of artwork from artists such as Inigo Jones, Gerard van Honthorst, and, most famously, Anthony van Dyck. In establishing their court culture, the king, his family, and his courtiers created an enormously manipulated common perception of themselves and their interactions within the royal circle. This fabricated perception, though related to the actual culture of the court, was largely meant to countervail the strife caused by the realities of Charles's reign, including the multi-faceted conflict over religion, constant royal financial difficulties, and highly visible power struggles among the royal family, the aristocracy, and the English Parliament. Despite efforts to create a positive image of conditions within the three kingdoms, through careful examination of artifacts of the court culture of Charles I, most prominently the art of Anthony van Dyck, one may discover signs of the major short term and long term causes of the English Civil War that broke out under Charles's reign.

In examining how the court culture of Charles I reflected the turmoil within the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, one must review the iconography in the works of those artists who helped create the images of the court. The paintings of Anthony van Dyck provide an invaluable reference for studying this time period. They compose a large portion of the court culture being scrutinized. Moreover, they contain much information that goes beyond the simple propaganda and aesthetic purposes for which they were commissioned. These paintings, therefore, constitute potent examples of the mythology that Charles and his circle wished to propagate, while also serving as sources of factual information that may be understood through proper examination of the symbolism and images within them. While other artists certainly produced many works of note during the time period, consulting the paintings of van Dyck would be most fruitful, as he was court painter for Charles I during the 1630s, a time period when court culture expanded greatly and new problems developed as Charles embarked on a policy of personal rule. Furthermore, the study of Parliamentary documents and published writings from the time period is necessary to fully understand the context in which the art was created. Finally, much historical literature has been written regarding the reign of Charles I and the artwork of his court. All of these sources provide a rich base from which to discover how representations of the court culture of Charles I such as the paintings of van Dyck reflect the building strife in the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland that eventually erupted into the English Civil War.

First, a major source of public and parliamentary antipathy toward King Charles I was his intense use of royal prerogative and reliance on the divine right theory of kingship to justify his actions on the throne. Charles's personal attitude toward rule is quite evident within the art of Anthony van Dyck and is in fact promoted by the paintings in order to establish the validity of King Charles's decrees among the people of the kingdom. A striking example of Charles's use of art to enhance this notion of divine royal power is Anthony van Dyck's famous portrait, *Charles I on Horseback*. Here Charles is depicted in shining armor astride an incredibly muscular white horse. The horse stands regally with one leg lifted off the ground, as if paying deference to its rider. Charles's posture and facial expression suggest he guides the great horse with ease, as a servant behind him holds his helmet.[59] These details are clearly present within the painting to make Charles seem extremely powerful and noble, so it is unmistakably clear that he is in a position of power. Furthermore, Charles is painted surveying a sprawling landscape, implying he is master of all he sees before him, the physical land of England. To make this suggestion even more explicit, van Dyck includes a sign hanging from a tree with the Latin inscription, "Carolus I Rex Magnae Britaniae," or King Charles of Great Britain.[60] Charles is deliberately presented in this painting as one who should not be questioned, or, as historian Roy Strong comments, "…not only as 'The Lord's Anointed' but as 'Imperator'"[61] Indeed, this image persists in other van Dyck portraits of Charles I. In *Charles I Riding through a Triumphal Arch*, symbols of the king's supremacy abound. Charles is again dressed in ornate armor and positioned upon a magnificent white horse, this time holding a scepter, a perennial symbol of power.[62] Van Dyck paints the king under an imperialistic "triumphal arch"

---

[59] Anthony van Dyck, *Charles I on Horseback*, oil on canvas, c.1635-40, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., in *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography,* Vol. 3, *Jacobean and Caroline,* by Roy Strong (Woodbridge, U.K.: Boydell Press, 1998), plate 138.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Roy Strong, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography,* Vol. 3, *Jacobean and Caroline* (Woodbridge, U.K.: Boydell Press, 1998), 173.

[62] Anthony van Dyck, *Charles I Riding through a Triumphal Arch*, oil on canvas, 1633, The Royal Collection, Buckingham Palace, in *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography,* Vol. 3, *Jacobean and Caroline,* by Roy Strong (Woodbridge, U.K.: Boydell Press, 1998), plate 142.

with clouds behind his head and an accompanying man looking up at him as if in awe. Each of these details serves to make the king appear taller, more powerful, and divine in nature. Meanwhile, Charles regally looks out upon the viewer of the painting with a facial expression suggestive of both haughty disinterest and deep wisdom.[63] This painting, like many van Dyck works, is obviously meant to glorify the king as a divine and powerful ruler, one who knows what is best for the kingdom and must be given unwavering respect. However, the public as well as the English Parliament began to question this sentiment quite frequently in written form leading up to the English Civil War and subsequent execution of the king.[64] It is clear though that the divine ruler image Charles wished to propagate through van Dyck's art permeated English society to a significant extent. For instance, a 1642 pamphlet distributed in England is entitled, "Christus dei, the Lords annoynted, or, A theologicall discourse wherein is proved, that the regall or monarchicall power of our soveraigne Lord King Charles is not of humane, but of divine right, and that God is the sole efficient cause thereof, and not the people: also that every monarch is above the whole common-wealth, and is not onely major singulis, but major vniversis."[65] Therefore, it is obvious that the message the paintings of van Dyck were used to impart was present in other forms throughout the period of Charles's reign. Charles clearly relied heavily on the notion of royal supremacy and divine right kingship in ruling, seemingly to the extent that it was the only justification he believed he needed to support all of his endeavors, a notion many did not agree with.

Next, one must examine the actions Charles felt were justified by his royal prerogative that so incensed the English Parliament and members of the public and how these tensions were reflected in the art of Charles's court. Charles became quite unpopular due to his handling of national finances, as he involved England in expensive foreign wars—many of which led to humiliating losses—and took extreme measures to increase royal revenue during his period of personal rule in the 1630s, when he refused to meet with Parliament and could not ask for grants.[66] These issues are evident within the art of the court of Charles I as well as several documents from the period. Early in Charles's reign, he embarked on expensive foreign wars, placing command of the army with court favorite George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham. However, constant losses in battle were a source of dismay, as evidenced by a contemporary journal of the war effort, which reads, "Yet there are some malevolent spirits who are luke-warme in affection, either to the Duke, or to the cause, have maintained with an opinionative obstinacy, that the taking of the Fort is not feazable…"[67] Indeed, it seems there was palpable opposition to Charles's "cause" and doubt about the possibility of victory. Parliament, meanwhile, commented on the burdensome cost of these conflicts abroad, noting that "…his [Charles's] great occasions of State did require more Money then at this time was given."[68] Clearly, support for Charles's foreign policy was tentative among both the public and Parliament. The court culture of Charles I reflects the issues associated with the expenses Charles accrued as a result of such endeavors. The paintings of van Dyck can be viewed in the context of a king attempting to build nationalist support, and subsequently monetary support, for his agenda. As previously examined, Charles is often portrayed in armor as a warrior king. Van Dyck's *Charles I in Armor* is a potent example of this image. Standing for a portrait in armor and military garb, Charles holds a commander's baton in his hands and a sheathed sword at his hip.[69] This image of Charles as a chivalrous knight is a frequent one in the works of van Dyck, and it appears to serve an important purpose. Indeed, paintings like these were often, "…commissioned to be given away to relatives, friends, and loyal supporters."[70] Charles clearly attempted to craft a favorable image of himself in relation to battle among his subjects, both to make himself appear powerful as well as justify his presiding over such expensive foreign engagements. Ironically, this illusion van Dyck helped create was contrary to Charles in reality, as Charles was not a warrior in his youth, but a "sickly adolescent."[71] However, knighthood and battle was clearly a theme throughout van Dyck's paintings in Charles's court, reminding the viewer of Charles's wars, as they were clearly meant to build support for Charles and his financially burdensome foreign policy.

---

[63] Ibid.
[64] C.H. Firth, "The Reign of Charles I," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 3, no. 6 (1912): 46, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3678241?origin=JSTOR-pdf.
[65] John Jones, *Christus dei, the Lords annoynted*, (Oxford: Printed by His Maiesties Command, 1642, 1, http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search.
[66] Firth, "The Reign of Charles I," 320-27.
[67] *A continued iournall of all the proceedings of the Duke of Buckingham his Grace, in the Isle of Ree, since the last of August*, (London: Printed by Augustine Mathewes for Thomas Walkley, 1627), 4, http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search).
[68] The Commons House of Parliament, *Aprill 4. The proceeding of the Parliament being this day related to the King, by the councellors of the Commons House of Parliament*, (London : s.n., 1628), 1, http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search.

[69] Anthony van Dyck, *Charles I in Armor*, oil on canvas, c. 1636, private collection, England, in *Anthony van Dyck*, by Arthur Wheelock (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990), plate 77.
[70] Arthur Wheelock, *Anthony van Dyck* (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990), 294.
[71] R. Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), 31.

In addition to the cost and unpopularity of these wars, Charles's innovations in finance and revival of ancient taxation methods during his period of personal rule drew extreme enmity from nobles and commoners alike. By efusing to call Parliament during the 1630s, Charles was forced to find other means of securing royal revenue, and ruminations of his policies are clearly present within van Dyck's art work in this decade. The most infamous of Charles's financial innovations was the imposition of a tax called "ship money." In acquiring funds to replace those he could no longer secure from Parliament, the king required that coastal towns in England supply ships defend the kingdom from a purported naval threat, and, if they could not provide ships, then they could simply pay with money. He then expanded this tax so that "…not onely the Maritime Counties, but also those that were In-land [were] to finde ships for the defence of the kingdome."[72] These measures appeared to be extremely inflammatory and drew much opposition. English statesman and future solicitor-general Oliver St. John argued passionately against ship money in Parliament, questioning, "…the right whereby this burden may be imposed."[73] The significant issue of ship money, foremost among Charles's reviled financial innovations, expectedly appears within the pieces of court culture produced by Anthony van Dyck. However, it is clear once again that his works are largely used to portray a false reality in justifying the means of the king. In one of van Dyck's most famous works, *Le Roi a la Ciasse*, this technique is extremely evident. In this painting, Charles stands confidently in front of a horse. The horse's head is bowed to him, and Charles stands surveying the land before him, a common depiction tying him to the land of England, as noted in other van Dyck paintings. Yet, in this particular work, van Dyck introduces a body of water in the background, and a ship floats just offshore.[74] Here is a subtle suggestion of England's vulnerability by water, placed with great care in a widespread portrait of the king. Clearly, there is a combined message in this work, justifying the imposition of the ship money tax and repeating once again the divine and commanding power of the king. Charles seems to express in this painting that the money is most certainly necessary for naval protection, and as the divine ruler of England, there is no reason to question that his judgment is sound. Once again, the art of van Dyck reflects the contextual circumstances that led to the English Civil War, in this instance the fiercely-opposed and often illegal financial measures taken by the king during his period of personal rule.

Another source of tension in the three kingdoms and in the public distrust of the monarchy that contributed to the outbreak of war was the king's marriage. In 1625, the same year he took the throne, Charles I married Henrietta Maria, daughter of Maria de Medici and Henry IV of France. From the beginning, this marriage was problematic to the English public, and the works of Anthony van Dyck that relate to this subject may be viewed largely as efforts to make the queen more palatable politically. The new queen was a French Catholic with special permission from the Pope to marry the Protestant Charles, with the conditions that she protect the Catholics of England, raise her children as Catholics, and attempt to convert her husband to Catholicism.[75] Obviously, this disturbed the vast Anglican Christian, Puritan, and Presbyterian populations of the kingdom. One way in which the art of van Dyck addressed this divisive issue was to create a national image of the queen that was both physically and morally attractive to her subjects. In doing so, it is clear once again that court culture was often used to distort reality for the purposes of the monarchy. For example, the simple portrait *Queen Henrietta Maria*, commissioned in order to create a bust of the queen, portrays Henrietta Maria as a pretty woman with a gentle expression on her face, dressed in soft lavender clothes.[76] However, this depiction of the queen is contradictory to actual reports of her appearance. Indeed, van Dyck did such an impressive job of idealizing the queen's features that foreign dignitaries were surprised at her real appearance upon meeting her, having developed severe misconceptions about the physical beauty of both the queen and English women in general from such portraits.[77] Clearly, this art had a role in creating a favorable public image of the queen by making her physically attractive.

Next, in addressing the controversial issues of the nationality and religion of the queen, van Dyck's art presents a moralized image of Henrietta Maria to complement the beauty the artist bestowed upon her. Another portrait of van Dyck's, *King Charles I and Queen Henrietta Maria*, is a perfect example of this agenda. The painting features the king and queen facing one another exchanging gifts, as the queen looks serenely out upon the viewer and the king looks at her

---

[72] The Commons House of Parliament, *Articles of accusation exhibited by the Commons House of Parliament now assembled against St. John Bramston, Knight, Sr. Robert Berkley, Knight justices of His Majesties bench, Sr. Francis Crawley, Knight, one of the justices of the Common-pleas, Sr. Humphrey Davenport, Knight, Sr. Richard Weston, Knight, and Sr. Thomas Trevor, Knight, barons of His Majesties Exchequer* (London: s.n., 1641), 4, http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search

[73] Oliver St. John, *Mr. St.-John's speech to the Lords in the Vpper House of Parliament, Ianuary 7, 1640, concerning ship-money* (England: T. Harper, 1640/1), 5, http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search.

[74] Anthony van Dyck, *Le Roi a la Ciasse*, oil on canvas, 1635, Louvre, Paris, in *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography,* Vol. 3, *Jacobean and Caroline,* by Roy Strong (Woodbridge, U.K.: Boydell Press, 1998), plate 155.

[75] Wheelock, *Anthony van Dyck*, 248.

[76] Anthony van Dyck, *Queen Henrietta Maria*, oil on canvas, 1637, Memphis Brooks Museum of Art, Memphis, in *Anthony van Dyck*, by Arthur Wheelock (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990), plate 82.

[77] Smuts, *Court Culture,* 31.

longingly, suggesting their loving marriage.[78] Not only are their natural positions and tender facial expressions appealing, but to fully understand the power of this complex portrait, one must examine the symbolism in the gifts Charles and Henrietta are seen exchanging. The queen holds an olive sprig in her hand, representing peace, as the king accepts from her a laurel wreath, the ancient Greek symbol of victory awarded to champions. Furthermore, they stand against the backdrop of a vast landscape.[79] Taken in combination, the symbols in this portrait suggest that the union of Charles I and Henrietta Maria will bring peace and victory to the land of England.[80] This notion must be viewed as political propaganda for the royal family, especially in light of the previously discussed problems the public had with the idea of accepting a French Catholic queen. Through the distribution of the art of his court, including paintings like this one, Charles could attempt to combat popular antagonism toward his wife. However, van Dyck produced his most noteworthy depiction of the queen the same year that the most blatant attack on her character occurred. In 1633, London writer William Prynne, in response to the queen's much-discussed participation in and love for a form of play called the masque, called into question the queen's morals and the morality of acting in general.[81] In his *Histriomastix*, Prynne writes that plays, "…are sinfull, heathenish, lewde, ungodly spectacles, and most pernicious corruptions...And that the profession of play-poets, of stage-players; together with the penning, acting, and frequenting of stage-playes, are unlawfull, infamous and misbeseeming Christians."[82] When one considers that the queen was a participant in the activities Prynne condemns here, the gravity of his statements is greatly enhanced. However, van Dyck's *Queen Henrietta Maria with Sir Jeffrey Hudson* addresses both the queen's penchant for the exotic and extravagant, while assuring the viewer of her moral character. In the painting, the queen is seen standing in front of a marble column, creating the illusion of height and gracefulness. At her side is a dwarf named Sir Jeffrey Hudson with a monkey on his arm. The queen rests her hand gently on the monkey, and in the background stands an orange tree.[83] As in many of van Dyck's works, there is clearly a message within this portrait. The queen placing her hand on the monkey is often interpreted as symbolic of her control of passion and sexual desire, and the orange tree is generally associated with the Virgin Mary, a Christian symbol of chastity and moral purity.[84] Therefore, it seems van Dyck acknowledges the queen's love of the exotic in this painting, yet defends her as a paragon of Christian virtue through carefully inserted icons. All the while, he presents her as a beautiful, tall, and graceful woman through his painting technique. Clearly, King Charles's marriage to Henrietta Maria stirred tension that contributed to the English Civil War, and the art of Anthony van Dyck not only reflected this tension, but was used to combat unfavorable sentiment toward the unfamiliar French Catholic woman.

Finally, arguably the most direct cause of the civil war in the three kingdoms was widespread division over religion. This issue manifested itself in the court culture of King Charles I in the form of extravagances of courtiers seemingly unbefitting of Christians, as well as the king's efforts to influence religion in his realm directly through policy. Many of van Dyck's paintings from Charles's court represent an extravagance of show that was, for the mainly Anglican, Puritan English, and the Presbyterian Scottish populations, associated with the traditions of Catholic worship. Improprieties like those pinned to the Catholic queen may be found among other courtiers in the artwork of van Dyck. For example, in addition to his poor record at war for the kingdom and his popularly perceived undue influence over the king, George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham exhibited a "flashy grandeur" that was surely unpopular among moderate and conservative Christians.[85] Early on, he would dress flamboyantly in garish clothing and flaunt his wealth in a way that clearly did not reflect the material restraint valued in this time period by Protestants.[86] This reputation for opulence and glamour appeared quite clearly in the art of van Dyck. The portrait *George Villiers and Lady Katherine Manners as Adonis and Venus* supports this notion. Here, Villiers and his wife, the Lady Katherine Manners, are depicted as the Roman god and goddess Adonis and Venus, respectively. They walk through a lush landscape, a large dog jumping joyously along with them. Villiers is covered only by a flowing, obviously expensive blue cloth. Similarly, Manners's lower body is covered by a

---

[78] Anthony van Dyck, *King Charles I and Queen Henrietta Maria*, oil on canvas, 1632, Statni Zamek, Kromeriz, Czechoslovakia, in *Anthony van Dyck*, by Arthur Wheelock (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990), plate 62.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Wheelock, *Anthony van Dyck*, 249.
[81] David Howarth, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance 1485-1649* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 270.
[82] William Prynne, *Histriomastix: The Player's Scourge, or Actor's Tragedy* (London: Michael Sparke, 1633), 1, http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search
.
[83] Anthony van Dyck, *Queen Henrietta Maria with Sir Jeffrey Hudson*, oil on canvas, 1633, National Gallery of Art, Washington, in *Anthony van Dyck*, by Arthur Wheelock (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990), plate 67.

[84] Wheelock, *Anthony van Dyck*, 262-5.
[85] Smuts, *Court Culture*, 104.
[86] Ibid, 104-5.

complementary red one. However, she is left completely topless.[87] To an increasingly vocal population of conservative Christians in King Charles's realm, this image must have been scandalous. In this instance, not only does van Dyck's art represent the attitude of certain courtiers, but it likely would have helped fuel the intense debate over religion in the kingdom, one that would produce such visceral literature as William Prynne's *Histriomastix*. Another example of courtly impropriety reflected in van Dyck's art is his portrait *Venetia Stanley, Lady Digby, as Prudence*. Here, van Dyck attempts to defend the character of a woman, much as he did for the queen. Lady Digby was apparently rumored to have had romantic relationships with several noblemen, and she consequently developed a reputation of sexual immorality.[88] However, in this painting, she is portrayed as a virtuous woman, the embodiment of prudence. She sits in a white dress, symbolic of chastity, with her foot resting on a seemingly conquered cupid-like figure that is blinded and has clipped wings, likely demonstrating her control over passion. Cowering behind her is a man with two faces, representing deceit, as three angels fly above her to place on her head a laurel wreath of victory.[89] Clearly, van Dyck, at the behest of her husband Sir Kenelm Digby, portrays Stanley as a woman of great Christian virtue. As in the case of the queen, maintaining a reputation of chastity and prudence within the court was important, especially due to heightening fear of Catholicism within the realm. Van Dyck's art was certainly used to further this cause.

Throughout the decades leading up to the English Civil War, a clear anti-Catholic sentiment, already present, was augmented by the actions of the king. Before he even ascended the throne, a proposed marriage to the Catholic Infanta of Spain caused a furor around the young Charles. A man named Thomas Alured even sent a letter to the Duke of Buckingham regarding this marriage, "…discovering what dangers would happen to this state by the Kings marrying with one of a contrary religion."[90] He goes on to suggest that "…this match makes a general feare that it can neither be safe for the kings person, nor good for this Church and Common-wealth, because that thereby may be an in-let to the Romish Locusts…and then what may we all feare but the heate of persecution."[91] Clearly, there was a strong concern over religious differences before Charles even became king. However, Charles's actions on the throne increased these problems, which directly led to the English Civil War. Many signs, including his marriage to Henrietta Maria, suggested he was surreptitiously being converted to Catholicism. Indeed, his study of an innovative form of Protestantism began to worry his subjects. In 1641 one Englishman put his concerns into verse, beseeching the king to reject this form of worship, called Arminianism. His plea reads, "England's petition, to her gratious king, that he Arminius, would to ruine bring who, by his doctrine, privie plotts, and hate to verify, doth ruine Church and State."[92] This new doctrine of Protestantism simply seemed to the English too much like Catholicism with its ceremony and emphasis on paths to salvation.[93] This growing fear of Catholicism infiltrating the monarchy and overtaking the kingdom became focused around the appointment of William Laud as Archbishop of Canterbury. In addition to his attempts to beautify churches, he attempted to help Charles impose upon the staunchly Presbyterian Scotland a more Anglican form of liturgy.[94] These innovations in religion led to war with Scotland and garnered the distrust of many English subjects and parliamentarians. Anthony van Dyck painted Laud in the portrait *William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury*. Here, Laud is seen leaning confidently against a large column. He wears an outfit suggestive of his high position as archbishop, and he stares out authoritatively at the viewer.[95] Van Dyck's portrayal of Laud as a powerful and godly man is obviously meant to invoke immediate respect. It is reflective of Laud's strong will and his attempts to establish uniformity of worship in the three kingdoms that helped cause the English Civil War. Van Dyck was a Catholic and confidant of the queen.[96] Therefore, it is not unreasonable to believe he favored the religious policies of William Laud, who attempted to beautify churches and implement certain elements of worship that to the public seemed like popery. It is clear then that his portrait of Laud was meant to cement the man as a figure to be revered, even as Laud's

---

[87] Anthony van Dyck, *Sir George Villiers and Lady Katherine Manners as Adonis and Venus*, oil on canvas, c.1620-1, Harari & Johns Ltd., London, in *Anthony van Dyck*, by Arthur Wheelock (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990), plate 17.
[88] Wheelock, *Anthony van Dyck*, 254.
[89] Anthony van Dyck, *Venetia Stanley, Lady Digby, as Prudence*, oil on canvas, 1633, National Portrait Gallery, London, in *Anthony van Dyck*, by Arthur Wheelock (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990), plate 64.
[90] Thomas Alured, *The coppie of a letter vvritten to the Duke of Buckingham concerning the match with Spaine: discovering what dangers would happen to this state by the Kings marrying with one of a contrary religion shewed by divers presidents* (London : for George Tomlinson, 1642), 1, http://eebo.chadwyck.com.

[91] Ibid, 2-3.
[92] *Englands petition, to her gratious King, that he Arminius, would to ruine bring, who, by his doctrine, priuie plotts, and hate to verity, doth ruine church and state* (Amsterdam: Hendrick Laurentz, 1641), 1, http://eebo.chadwyck.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu.
[93] Ibid.
[94] Firth, "The Reign of Charles I," 34-40.
[95] Anthony van Dyck, *William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury*, oil on canvas, c. 1636, National Portrait Gallery, London, http://www.npg.org.uk/live/search/portrait.asp?LinkID=mp02641&rNo=0&role=sit.
[96] Wheelock, *Anthony van Dyck,* 248.

policies infuriated the anti-Catholic subjects of King Charles. Both the improprieties within the court of King Charles and the policies on religion he implemented through William Laud led to tension and conflict, and van Dyck's paintings addressed these issues.

Through careful analysis of the paintings of Anthony van Dyck, one may discover reflections of the short term and long term issues that caused the English Civil War. The paintings, though clearly intended to create a favorable image of the court and override negative aspects of Charles' rule, reveal, when scrutinized, the conflicts of the time period. In van Dyck's paintings, one may observe strong suggestions of King Charles's royal prerogative and reliance on the divine right theory of kingship to justify his actions as monarch. Also, van Dyck's paintings often seem to justify Charles's poorly executed and expensive foreign policy, as well as his unpopular innovations in finance, such as the ship money tax. Next, van Dyck's paintings of Queen Henrietta Maria serve to defend her from public suspicion as both a Catholic and a foreigner. Indeed, not only does van Dyck maintain her reputation, but he attempts to endear her to the public through his paintings of her physical beauty and virtuous relationship with Charles. Finally, the artwork of Anthony van Dyck addressed the controversies over religion in the kingdom, both directly and indirectly. Through his paintings of the lavish lives of Charles's courtiers van Dyck likely stoked division through fear of Catholicism as much as he attempted to curb it with paintings defending the moral character of certain women. Furthermore, his favorable painting of Archbishop William Laud, who attempted to institute Catholic-leaning policies and interfered with the worship of Presbyterian Scotland, was surely meant to garner respect for this divisive figure.

Through examination of these paintings, it is apparent how members of the aristocracy and royal court hoped to present themselves to the common people. While van Dyck certainly dictated the symbolism within his own works, the messages he created resulted from close cooperation and approval from the subjects of his paintings. Therefore, it is clear that courtiers wanted to present themselves as glorified, noble leaders. It is made abundantly clear in every painting with whom power and wisdom lie. Indeed, the paintings of van Dyck could have been used for simple self-promotion, justification of one's station and actions, or to make complex statements upholding one's character and reputation. However, the manipulations of van Dyck's paintings allow one to logically deduce many realities regarding the aristocratic class presented. It is interesting to note, through contemporary written sources, how the common people actually perceived the aristocracy and royal circle, and how their attitude so often contrasted with the notions the nobles hoped to impart. Whether widespread public fear of religious innovation, distrust of the queen and dislike for her exotic interests, or simple protest of unfair taxes, written documents from the reign of Charles I present a story contrary to many of the messages in van Dyck's paintings, helping to clarify the points of view of both the royal court and the common people. The study of Anthony van Dyck's paintings in comparison with sources from outside the royal court allow for the understanding of court culture and its purposes, while also revealing important short term and long term causes of the English Civil War.

Bibliography

Secondary Sources:

Firth, C.H. "The Reign of Charles I." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 3, no. 6 (1912): 19-64. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3678241?origin=JSTOR-pdf.

Howarth, David, ed. *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts: Essays in Honour of Sir Oliver Millar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Howarth, David. *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance 1485-1649*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Howarth, David. *Lord Arundel and his Circle*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Millar, Oliver. "Charles I, Honthorst, and Van Dyck." *The Burlington Magazine* 96, no. 611 (February 1954): 36-42. http://www.jstor.org/stable/871328?origin=JSTOR-pdf.

Oppe, Paul. "Sir Anthony van Dyck in England." *The Burlington Magazine* 79, no. 465 (December 1941): 186-191. http://www.jstor.org/stable/868431?origin=JSTOR-pdf.

Smuts, R. Malcolm. *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987.

Strong, Roy. *Splendor at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and the Theater of Power*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

Strong, Roy. *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting Iconography*, Vol. 3, *Jacobean and Caroline*. Woodbridge, U.K.: Boydell Press, 1998.

Wheelock, Arthur. *Anthony van Dyck.* Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990.

Primary Sources:

A continued iournall of all the proceedings of the Duke of Buckingham his Grace, in the Isle of Ree, since the last of August. London: Printed by Augustine Mathewes for Thomas Walkley, 1627.
http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=99846853&FILE=../session/1227234742_25338&SEARCHSCREEN=CITATIONS&VID=11847&PAGENO=4&ZOOM=FIT&VIEWPORT=&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=DATE_ASC&HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD=param(HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD).

Alured, Thomas. *The coppie of a letter vvritten to the Duke of Buckingham concerning the match with Spaine: discovering what dangers would happen to this state by the Kings marrying with one of a contrary religion shewed by divers presidents.* London : for George Tomlinson, 1642.

http://eebo.chadwyck.com.proxyum.researchport.umd.edu/search/full_rec?SOURCE=var_spell.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=99871690&ECCO=undefined&FILE=../session/1227664373_28575&SEARCHSCREEN=CITATIONS&DISPLAY=AUTHOR.

Englands petition, to her gratious King, that he Arminius, would to ruine bring, who, by his doctrine, priuie plotts, and hate to verity, doth ruine church and state. Amsterdam: Hendrick Laurentz, 1641.

http://eebo.chadwyck.com.proxyum.researchport.umd.edu/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=99883500&FILE=../session/1227667781_5110&SEARCHSCREEN=CITATIONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&ECCO=undefined&DISPLAY=AUTHOR&HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD=param(HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD).

Jones, John. *Christus dei, the Lords annoynted*. Oxford: Printed by His Maiesties Command, 1642.

http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=20534895&FILE=../session/1227027305_10318&SEARCHSCREEN=CITATIONS&VID=109429&PAGENO=1&ZOOM=FIT&VIEWPORT=&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=DATE_ASC&HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD=undefined.

Prynne, William. *Histriomastix: The Player's Scourge, or Actor's Tragedy*. London: Michael Sparke, 1633. http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/fulltext?ACTION=ByID&ID=D00000998505350000&SOURCE=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=AUTHOR&WARN=N&FILE=../session/1224088245_11766.

St. John, Oliver. *Mr. St.-John's speech to the Lords in the Vpper House of Parliament, Ianuary 7, 1640, concerning ship-money*. England: T. Harper, 1640/1.

http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=25596470&FILE=../session/1227233957_24120&SEARCHSCREEN=CITATIONS&VID=27920&PAGENO=3&ZOOM=100&VIEWPORT=&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=DATE_ASC&HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD=undefined.

The Commons House of Parliament. *Aprill 4. The proceeding of the Parliament being this day related to the King, by the councellors of the Commons House of Parliament*. London : s.n., 1628.

http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/fulltext?SOURCE=var_spell.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=D00000998491440000&WARN=N&SIZE=5&FILE=../session/1227234742_25338&ECCO=undefined.

The Commons House of Parliament. *Articles of accusation exhibited by the Commons House of Parliament now assembled against St. John Bramston, Knight, Sr. Robert Berkley, Knight justices of His Majesties bench, Sr. Francis Crawley, Knight, one of the justices of the Common-pleas, Sr. Humphrey Davenport, Knight, Sr. Richard Weston, Knight, and Sr. Thomas Trevor, Knight, barons of His Majesties Exchequer.* London: s.n., 1641. http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgimages.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=17755755&FILE=../session/1227233957_24120&SEARCHSCREEN=CITATIONS&VID=106569&PAGENO=5&ZOOM=200&VIEWPORT=&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=AUTHOR&HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD=param(HIGHLIGHT_KEYWORD).

Van Dyck, Anthony. *Charles I in Armor*, oil on canvas, c. 1636 (private collection, England). In *Anthony van Dyck*, by Arthur Wheelock. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990, plate 77.

Van Dyck, Anthony. *Charles I on Horseback*, oil on canvas, c.1635-40 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.). In *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography,* Vol. 3, *Jacobean and Caroline,* by Roy Strong. Woodbridge, U.K.: Boydell Press, 1998, plate 138.

Van Dyck, Anthony. *Charles I Riding through a Triumphal Arch*, oil on canvas, 1633 (The Royal Collection, Buckingham Palace). In *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography,* Vol. 3, *Jacobean and Caroline,* by Roy Strong. Woodbridge, U.K.: Boydell Press, 1998, plate 142.

Van Dyck, Anthony. *King Charles I and Queen Henrietta Maria*, oil on canvas, 1632 (Statni Zamek, Kromeriz, Czechoslovakia). In *Anthony van Dyck*, by Arthur Wheelock. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990, plate 62.

Van Dyck, Anthony. *Le Roi a la Ciasse*, oil on canvas, 1635 (Louvre, Paris). In *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography,* Vol. 3, *Jacobean and Caroline,* by Roy Strong. Woodbridge, U.K.: Boydell Press, 1998, plate 155.

Van Dyck, Anthony. *Queen Henrietta Maria*, oil on canvas, 1637 (Memphis Brooks Museum of Art, Memphis). In *Anthony van Dyck*, by Arthur Wheelock. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990, plate 82.

Van Dyck, Anthony. *Queen Henrietta Maria with Sir Jeffrey Hudson*, oil on canvas, 1633 (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.). In *Anthony van Dyck*, by Arthur Wheelock. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990, plate 67.

Van Dyck, Anthony. *Sir George Villiers and Lady Katherine Manners as Adonis and Venus*, oil on canvas, c.1620-1 (Harari & Johns Ltd., London). In *Anthony van Dyck*, by Arthur Wheelock. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990, plate 17.

Van Dyck, Anthony. *Venetia Stanley, Lady Digby, as Prudence*, oil on canvas, 1633 (National Portrait Gallery, London). In *Anthony van Dyck*, by Arthur Wheelock. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1990, plate 64.

Van Dyck, Anthony. *William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury*, oil on canvas, c. 1636 (National Portrait Gallery, London). http://www.npg.org.uk/live/search/portrait.asp?LinkID=mp02641&rNo=0&role=sit.

"You're going out in *that?!*":

A Study of the Fashionable "Mothers" and "Daughters" of the Women's Rights Movements in the Twentieth-Century United States

Kate Kennedy

"In general, people have always worn what they wanted to wear; fashion exists to keep fulfilling that desire."[97] Wearing precisely what one wanted to wear, however, has often come at a price, if it came at all. Throughout the twentieth century, women in the United States took seriously the possibility that perhaps they actually *could* "always [wear] what they wanted to wear" and that fashion could fulfill their desires for social and sexual freedom. Traditionally, daughters followed in the fashion footsteps of their mothers, where propriety was key and to challenge social regulations was to challenge divine law. But the end of the nineteenth century and the flush of war and social revolution in the twentieth century brought forth generations that were clearly defying those patterns. From unlaced bodies to pants to Birkenstocks, feminist generations of "daughters" took on fashion challenges that their "mothers" had never thought proper – or even possible. Some have theorized reasons why these changes took place and others still have merely dipped into the possibility that fashion is just a useful *tool* for understanding the past. This paper seeks to prove, however, that fashion, in itself, has actually snuck into the American political landscape as a quiet force that pushed for change, inspired change, and answered change, which is reflected in a generational study of the women's rights movements – and the societal and psychological bases behind them – throughout the century.

It is impossible and nonsensical to define feminism as a movement that occurred within the confines of the 20th century in the United States. It is similarly impossible to confine feminism to the fledgling United States. As a matter of course, Abigail Adams is arguably the earliest documented feminist in the United States. A decade after the American Revolution, the Madame Defarges of France would address loudly in their revolution a "demand [for] liberté and égalité for themselves"[98] in uprisings where a main enemy was a young, foreign queen. Abigail Adams and a few respected peers, however, fell in with the social conduct rules of the mid-1770s and addressed only privately their "[acute awareness] of the inequities imposed by one sex upon the other,"[99] even in the as-yet established United States. It has been thought that in general, "by providing a definition of women's stake in the world outside the traditional, private homeplace, feminism should increase the relevance of political action to the life of the individual and, thus, increase her participation."[100] Thus, this essay will neither attempt to define feminism nor confine it to the twentieth century. Rather, it will use approximately those margins in order to highlight one such definition that provided women (and feminism) a way out of that relegation to the "homeplace."

Fashion is as difficult as feminism – if not more difficult– to set within parameters of time or space. So much of the scholarship on the subject spends great amounts of time explaining how difficult fashion is to define, while simultaneously defining it based on the author's particular approach. The most prominent and constant definition seems to be based on the consensus that there is in fact *no* constant in fashion, but rather that fashion's best laid plans are based on the concept that "changes in dress *are* social changes,"[101] that "clothing is a mechanism by which the social order is experienced, communicated, and reproduced."[102] Essentially, fashion can be agreed upon as a series of changes and "upheavals." It has gone back and forth throughout the century as a form somewhere between fad and function. 1930s American designer Elizabeth Hawes argues also, in an effort to keep the American public from taking fashion too seriously, that "by the time you've taken off fashion's bright cellophane wrapper, you usually find not only that fashion is no fun at all, but that even the utility of your purpose has been sacrificed."[103] This paper will discuss the possibility that, at the beginning of the century, fashion was created by or within a male-centered ideal that would force women into traditional roles of subjugation. From that ideal rose many debates over the role of clothing, which showed themselves in the form of strikes, protests, and shifts in feminine doctrine. There existed also, at a time when fashion was generally acknowledged as a very real and dynamic presence in American society, a notion that "if one could understand why styles changed so rapidly, then one might grasp modernity itself."[104] Modernity, then, would be the concept that would push women to not only push the boundaries of

---

[97] Anne Hollander, *Sex and Suits* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994), 141.
[98] Elaine Forman Crane, "Political Dialogue and the Spring of Abigail's Discontent," *William and Mary Quarterly* (October 1999): 745.
[99] *Ibid.*
[100] Susan Ann Kay, "Feminist Ideology, Race, and Political Participation: A Second Look," *The Western Political Quarterly* (September 1985): 476.
[101] Hollander, 4.
[102] Deirdre Clemente, "Striking Ensembles: The Importance of Clothing on the Picket Line," *Labor Studies Journal* (Winter 2006): 1-2.
[103] Elizabeth Hawes, *Fashion is Spinach* (New York: Random House, 1938), 11.
[104] Daniel Leonhard Purdy, ed., *The Rise of Fashion: A Reader* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004).

fashion but also, consequently, social boundaries that had been previously established. Another view of fashion is that it is "merely a stylized display of oneself; yet even if it is just a façade, fashion organizes who we are and what others take us to be. If the two concepts could be combined, then, fashion would be a key player in society in that its "social effects were beneficial in reconciling potentially antagonistic claims for individualism and social cohesion."[105] What is proved in this paper, then, is that this is hardly what fashion did for society at all. Instead of creating the more beneficial kind of homogeneity some believed it would, this paper will address the possibility that, instead, fashion actually created a greater rift between those who believed that fashion would help cure social ills and those who continued to be oppressed. Still, that rift created some of the greatest women's rights movements in the history of the nation, with one generation following another. It is also important to realize that sometimes the rifts were present in the very inner workings of the movement itself. This makes for a different analysis of history that explains each one in reference to each other. This paper seeks to prove, then, that clothing does not provide merely "a powerful lens for examining American history,"[106] but again, that it was fashion that actually helped propel social change in the United States – and thereby helped to propel the women's rights movement.

It must also be discussed within this study, as it seems to be much the basis for rebellion, the perceptions of who exactly controls the fashion industry. It has been offered that a group of men, or the male population on the whole, was designing the majority of clothes available on the market in the period of study as well as in the current period. It made sense to suggest such a theory: if men were designing clothes, they would be completely in control of the roles women played – and would therefore be able to "keep" women in their homemaker roles and roles as tragic, fragile creatures. If it were women designing clothes for other women, on the other hand, it would only be right to assume that perhaps women would design clothing that instead catered to a woman's needs and would give where women needed it to give.[107] Women, if they were designing clothes, would be more likely to sympathize with the feminine struggle to accomplish motherly deeds while maintaining proper health in the meantime. Women had always been dressmakers, but only rarely had the opportunity to *design* the clothes they were making. This gave them little control over the ratio of fashion to function and comfort.[108] A seemingly common perception of fashion dictates that men had created fashion to suppress, oppress, and even protect women, as they were "delicate, submissive, of inferior intellect, and prone to nervousness and hysteria."[109] Certainly if women were prone to hysteria, a more tightly wound wardrobe, a more neatly kept figure would prevent the lapses in "good taste" that women were said to undergo inherently.[110] It had started in fashion and remained there that by design, women were in mind and body the weaker sex, and so their clothing reflected that mentality. In addition, the "general" male opinion that they "[admired] exceedingly not only a small, but well-laced-in-waist in a lady,"[111] implied that their preferences lay solely in the aesthetic. However, it was clear and commonly thought, as will be expounded upon later, that a well-laced-in lady would also prevent a usurpation of gender roles, being that such clothing would mean that "society ensured that women would not pose any challenge to men's position or authority."[112]

Despite common opinion *today* among designers that "they expect women to create their own styles of dress from a variety of options available to them,"[113] designers then and still some now believe that "you mold a woman into what you perceive her as being… [as a] product of…admiration…in an idyllic state… whether she exists or not."[114] Though perceptions of fashion and perceptions of gender today vary greatly from what they were are the turn of the century, it seems that men have for a long time, and (through at least the foreseeable future) will vastly populate, if not entirely dominate, the fashion design realm. A study by historian Robert Radford suggests that the main reasons for men's oppressive designs for women rose out of a variety of fears of the opposite gender. Among other things, it is proposed that "fashion is a male problem, deriving from the need for reassurance as to masculinity and from men's unconscious, masochistic fear of women's bodies."[115] One such fear comes from men being "universally so afraid of women's menstruation" that they subsequently proceeded to "[demand] that women were suitably covered to avoid the sight and smell of menstrual blood."[116] Referencing Edmund Bergler, psychological analyst of the first of half of the 20th century, a

---

[105] Robert Radford, "'Women's Bitterest Enemy': The Uses of the Psychology of Fashion," *Journal of Design History* (1993): 116.
[106] Clemente, 2.
[107] Radford, Nelson, Crane, in particular, seem to agree that the gender of the designer does denote the kind of fashion one designer created as a man to the kinds of fashions available that were designed by women.
[108] Diana Crane, "Fashion Design and Social Change: Women Designers and Stylistic Innovation," *Journal of American Culture* (Spring 1999): 61
[109] Jennifer Ladd Nelson. "Dress Reform and the Bloomer," *Journal of American & Comparative Cultures*. (Winter 1999): 22.
[110] *Ibid*.
[111] *Ibid*.
[112] *Ibid*.
[113] D. Crane, 62
[114] *Ibid*.
[115] Radford, 116
[116] *Ibid*., 117

man first experiences this fear of women at his mother's breast. There, she apparently has the power, or even the desire, to "starve, devour, poison, choke, drain, or castrate"[117] her son. Radford cites that Bergler believes that this fear follow them throughout life, to the extent that grown men may "sometimes or even frequently suppress the thought that his wife is a sponging parasite, for whom he is working himself to death."[118] Even more interestingly, Radford brings forth another of Bergler's beliefs that it was not simply men but homosexual men who looked specifically to oppress women through fashion. It was thought that "'women are dressed by their bitterest enemy, the male homosexual,' with the result that 'unsuspecting women are the victims of a fashion hoax.'"[119] Based on the notion that homosexual men are instilled with an even greater fear of women from a hate "originally directed against their mother,"[120] which was later projected on to women as well as through homosexual men's fear of heterosexual men. The fact that "the majority of the really creative people in the field are male…homosexuals" made all the more sense, then that the women's fashions of the 1920s were boyish at best and therefore "attractive to boyish young men."[121] This implies, then, that homosexual men not only wanted to punish women to quell some apparent underlying fear, but that homosexual men also wanted to somehow create for themselves a pleasurable situation. The study continues to express that not only was fashion a "male problem" but also that it was magnified as such because the fashions that men were designing were oppressing both male and female sexual appetites; the women were too masculine and the men did not feel masculine enough. This resulted in a strange male confusion over his masculinity and the feminine capability and desire to "take control of [her life]."[122] While the psychology and philosophy behind this theory is questionable, especially when noting the mentalities of the time period of the original writings, it does add to the argument. Historian Anne Hollander argues that, in addition, "the most important change for women thus occurred when fashion began to demonstrate female sexuality in direct bodily terms, instead of referring to it indirectly."[123] If a woman was supposedly being punished for her biological capabilities of giving birth, it seems, then, more than mildly obvious why a woman would want to take control over what she wore.

Perhaps one of the most recognizable movements in women's rights progress is that which was set forth by some of the most recognizable women's rights leaders. Since the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848, Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton had been recognized as some of the first leaders of the modern women's rights movement. As was the tradition in the 1850s, women had been relegated to the home. The home as a realm was "increasingly… segregated from what was seen as the capitalistic, base world of the workplace, recognized as the domain of men."[124] This was quite the contrast to what Anthony, Stanton, and their contemporaries were willing to concede as their only place in society. It was certainly not the first time that women would step forward to claim their rights, but it *was* the first time that women "integrated dress reform into a larger political agenda of women's emancipation."[125] Anthony and Stanton joined forces with a woman named Amelia Bloomer who, only months after Seneca Falls, started a publication called *The Lily*. The writings from feminist activists across the nation focused on the progress of the newly-united feminist effort. One of their main concerns regarding not only the health of women but also the health of the movement lay with the clothing of the era. It was expressed that such "binding clothes were both a metaphor for the constricted position of women in society as well as a prime instrument in the control of women's lives."[126] It was thus proclaimed in the same way that "such clothes, and other domestic arrangements, hampered women's potential."[127] There was, of course, plenty of statistical evidence that argued against the corset and explained the inability of women to function with it, even in the motherly and homebound realms to which they were assigned. Garments were certainly considered part of this realm; along with a woman's duty to be a caretaker and source of moral rightness, it was also her duty to maintain a proper and fragile physique. Clothing also helped denote the rank and pleasure that the man had so diligently earned for his home. Because women were charged as "keepers of religion and morality" and because men were charged with "having a more sensual nature than women,"[128] it was all the more necessary that women's clothing reflect that chaste, fragile role. One famous point in history, the details of which are available to every fifth-grade girl in the education system, is the moment when *The Lily* promoted women wearing pants, or, as they were called for their staunchest supporter and first committed wearer, Bloomers. *The Lily* published in 1851 a resounding series of articles where Amelia Bloomer "noted the control men exerted over women's

[117] *Ibid*., 116
[118] *Ibid*., 117
[119] *Ibid*., 116
[120] *Ibid*., 117
[121] *Ibid*.
[122] *Ibid*., 119
[123] Hollander, 131.
[124] Nelson, 21.
[125] Purdy, 110.
[126] *Ibid*., 109.
[127] *Ibid*.
[128] *Ibid*., 22.

dress and the tendency for women to acquiesce to the tastes of men."[129] Soon after, with inspiration from a friend's outfit,[130] Bloomer launched an offensive supporting the wearing of shorter skirts – for a variety of reasons – with trousers underneath. What came from a "frustration with the 'shackle' of fashionable dress" and the adoption of "full Turkish trousers"[131] were the beginnings of a kind of revolution. It was a revolution that "forced… Victorian society… to engage in consideration of women's rights, including their right to choose their own style of dress, even one that facilitated their movement into the public realm."[132]

However, it wasn't as though the change was easy to make for even the most active feminists. Societal norms in clothing made up a wall that was hard to hit, especially with such force as to go against gender assignments and relationships that were no less than "ordained by God."[133] Bloomer herself conceded that she "[disliked] innovation," and was "constitutionally disposed to look with distrust upon any striking departure from our old ways, 'our good old ways,' as many kindly call them."[134] She perhaps wanted to relate, in that sense, to the woman who would be battling her husband and battling jeers on the street for wearing such an abhorrent display, in rejection of society's gender expectations. Bloomer prepared an argument that would stave off the objections of male and female opposition alike, though her female opposition was probably not great due to the need for change in comfort and practicality. The new style, which boasted a comparable expense to the old style, simultaneously improved weight of skirts, convenience, and health for the wearer. Certainly no woman, and no man on top of that, could argue against the benefits. A man could never want for his wife the old ways, which were "affections which seem to make half our women prematurely aged, and entail on many an existence to which death would be preferable."[135] Such advantages seem, even in the context of present society, all but unreasonable. Bloomer poses arguments for indelicacy, brought about at the idea of raising the skirts a few inches off the ground, where if the women are to pick up their skirts to "prevent their [skirts'] draggling in the mud of the street," then certainly "the charge of indelicacy" on the display of mud on their skirts would certainly be a much worse fate than the indelicacy of a shorter skirt.[136] The specific reforms Bloomer called for were merely compromises to the too-constricting manner of dress. She wanted that the "portion above the waist" be left largely as it was with a minor loosening so that that arms may move more freely; that the skirt be "not made quite so full as is the present fashion" and that its length be moved up to "between the knee and ankle;" that "trowsers" could be worn under the skirt, down to the ankle in more temperate weather and tucked into a boot in colder weather; and that such "trowsers" and boots be made out of comfortable yet attractive or "fancifully embroidered, according to the taste of the wearer."[137] Finally, in true form, she remained a lady of her time by keeping a certain consciousness of the judgments of society. She implored readers at the end of her piece that "those of our female friends who entertain the intention of being pioneers in this reform to be deliberate and not to injure what is good, and prejudice many against their cause, by carelessness of taste, or by going to unnecessary extremes."[138] Finally, *The Lily* and its writers provided a further call for understanding regarding this first drastic step in dress reform, stating that "all unnecessary violation of public opinion is censurable, for to it we look for protection; but we should never allow it to enslave our bodies or our spirits."[139]

Women had always been in the public realm as members and indicators of high society. But "into" is the operative word in the explanation of the dress reform movement, where "into" involves more than being simply pieces of artwork or carriers-on of idle conversation. They had a cause to support and a change to make, and they had, at least so far, for all intents and purposes, succeeded. Women were "accused of immodesty, 'aping men,' and of usurping what was rightfully man's" for themselves, but they had ultimately created "a garment that emphasized both beauty and comfort" that allowed them the freedom "of going out in inclement weather and…[staying] warm in winter, as well as their newly found independence."[140] So it was true, and it was tangible. They had not *simply* created just a garment nor a more clear sense of "beauty and comfort," but a real and new tangible sense of their new place in society. The Dress Reform, at least in its earliest days, holds a grand part in this proposed understanding of the role of fashion in the feminist movements. It is perhaps because it is the first or the most obvious, but it is also because, with those characteristics, it is the most moving.

---

[129] Nelson 23.
[130] *Ibid.*
[131] *Ibid.*
[132] *Ibid.*
[133] *Ibid*.
[134] Amelia Bloomer, "The New Costume for the Ladies," *The Lily* (1851). Purdy, ed., 110.
[135] *Ibid*., 112.
[136] *Ibid*., 111.
[137] *Ibid*.,
[138] *Ibid*., 113.
[139] Mrs. R.B. Gleason, "The New Dress," *The Water Cure Journal*, as published in *The Lily* (1851). Purdy, ed., 116.
[140] Nelson 24.

Historian Deirdre Clemente provides an enlightening argument regarding dress reform and the women's labor movement. Women at the turn of the century, working particularly in the textile mills, were no strangers to the dress reform movements. The press, their major opposition, focused not on their message but instead on their clothing.[141] Unknowingly, this may have helped the picketers more than it hurt them. With the press a rising force in the political realm and with jazz culture on the rise, as well as with the stirrings of political unrest overseas in the era that preceded the Great War, the press helped make the strike into a scene where "the message of their clothing was as relevant as the text on the picket signs they carried."[142] The first strike in 1909, Clemente notes, featured women in the traditional dress of the time, with remarkably traditional roles still in place. Women, though they made up the majority of the workforce in the textile mills, were often neglected and disorganized when it came to any kind of labor union.[143] Exposed to the trends of the time and fully aware of the current styles because of their line of work, women in 1909 in the Shirtwaist Strike in New York City "adorned themselves in feathered hats, fur muffs, and French heels,"[144] as was the suitable, Parisian-inspired design of the early part of the century. Clemente also notes that such a large-scale organization had never really been see before, especially from women, given the seasonality of girls' employment for such factories. "Seasonality" not only references the ebb and flow of the seasons of the fashion industry, but also includes the fact that "to a large degree, women considered work in the garment shops to be an intermediary phase between childhood and marriage."[145] In addition, such traditional roles – the same ones that dictated the kinds of clothing women wore for both work and play – also dictated "women's involvement with organized labor, and her decision to participate in public protest was never an easy one."[146] It was thought also, then, that if femininity was supposed to reign, it was "incomprehensible" for women to be "actively picketing on street corners."[147] And so their feminine identities reigned – at least in the *clothing* they wore on the picket lines. Clemente writes that because most of the workers in these factories were immigrants working to make ends meet at home, they did their best, in terms of dress, to "[show] their knowledge of American culture… rejecting their traditional ethnic culture, and…expressing their own identities."[148] In the process, they "created a style that was uniquely their own"[149] out of a mix of a number of current fads. The innocently outlandish ensembles of bright colors and big embellishments "enraged the suffragettes and labor leaders who thought the colors were garish and distracting to the cause,"[150] but garnered the attention of the press and public alike. The young workers seemed to be more focused on remembering to be ladies and proving that they were nobler than their meager wages would have indicated; the labor leaders, meanwhile, had originally "sought to portray the workers as frail and downtrodden."[151]

The Dress Reform cannot possibly be discussed without at least briefly addressing the movement against corsets. As was expressed by the textile mill workers in the aforementioned strikes and in later ones, corsets were seen as constricting and binding pieces of clothing that added to the oppression of Victorian-era women. It was as much a step against the ties that bound women symbolically as it was literally, but it was also a movement toward the "modernity" that everyone so desired to achieve.[152] A spark of fear from the corset industry that they would lose control over – and consequently lose altogether – their consumers actually set in motion a series of corset reforms. Before corsets were vastly abandoned, the reforms gave women a huge variety of fabrics and forms in corsets that gave them *more*, if not total, freedom of movement. Such movement was quite liberating, and since "the corset significantly restricted her movement" and therefore "[reinforced] her ornamental presence in the home,"[153] the loosening of corsets meant the loosening of such binds in classic gender roles. On the other hand, women feared the problems that would arise from *not* wearing the corsets, the wearing of which their mothers so diligently practiced. And it was not just their metaphorical mothers-of-feminism-past who wore corsets. It was common belief that "mothers would have been considered negligent had they not provided such garments, as [mothers] were responsible for preparing their daughters to enter fashionable society."[154] Women feared "ill health…sagging bodies…lost figure… shiftless appearance in the nicest of clothing…sallow

---

[141] Clemente, 2.
[142] *Ibid.*
[143] *Ibid.*, 3.
[144] *Ibid.*
[145] *Ibid.*, 4.
[146] *Ibid.*
[147] *Ibid.*, 5.
[148] *Ibid.*, 6.
[149] *Ibid.*
[150] *Ibid.*
[151] *Ibid.*
[152] Jill Fields, "'Fighting the Corsetless Evil': Shaping Corsets and Culture, 1900-1930," *Journal of Social History* (Winter 1999): 355.
[153] Nelson, 23.
[154] *Ibid.*, 22.

complexion."[155] With the threat of economic depression looming in the late 1920s and the dress industry as a whole heading into a slump, the corset industry fought hard in the 1910s and early 1920s to reclaim their consumer territory. Claims even that women were less inclined to be able to follow evolutionary patterns to upright walking – that "the evolution from 'horizontally to vertically' was more difficult for females than for males"[156] – appeared as legitimate reasons for wearing corsets. Still, such claims could not suppress the rumblings from "the margins of feminist dress reform," which had begun in the nineteenth century.[157] So much of the feminist doctrine behind abandoning corsets and classic Victorian dress has already been explained, but will later be further explained in another example of a textile mill strike. However, it was certainly the corset movement that garnered the attention of the press – who flip-flopped between supporting and opposing corsetlessness – as well as the nation's socio-political skepticism of the women's movement. It was nothing new to the "subcultures" of the nation, which had already adopted the corsetless trend in the 1910s. In highly educated, cultured, and politicized areas, such as Greenwich Village in New York, women had adopted the trend as an extension of their already-set beliefs in Freudianism, socialism, and feminism. They had rejected traditional social and sexual roles, including in the marriage relationship, and the clothing that accompanied those beliefs.[158] There and elsewhere, medicine still prevailed as the default reason for rejecting corsets, but it was clear that women sought, in the same moment, freedom from societal binds and pressures. It was clear also that once women had headed into the fray of corsetlessness, they would not easily be pushed back in.[159] Interestingly, the fight against corsets from the pro-corset side of the argument would later become a racial and "patriotic" issue,[160] the bases of which would actually be echoed in the earlier days of the Second Wave. Magazines from the 1920s "identified corsetlessness as a dangerous and evil fad."[161] It wasn't simply evil to the body or evil to the corset industry, either. The fight against corsets turned into an argument motivated by the very deepest post- and pre-war fears of radicalism in United States citizens. Not only would a corsetless woman suffer "dissipation of muscular strength" or "injury to internal organs," but corsetlessness would also lead to "corruption of standards of beauty, damage to moral fiber, contamination of race pride and purity, and destruction of American sovereignty."[162] The magazine press began to use to its advantage a rising belief in eugenics when it published articles about Indian girls, where their traditional corsetless youths led them to "grow and develop wildly."[163] Magazines proceeded to write about how corsets would help raise the "firmly-muscled women" that were "vital, charming, full of that potential race force which must be coined into American supremacy among men tomorrow."[164] Trade journals and magazines were again assigning roles to American women, where a "corsetless girl has naturally to fall into one class or the other," that is, into the class of American women or the class of "Amazons… or… a race of Oriental dancers"[165] that would certainly develop if women did not wear corsets. Truthfully, in that era or any other, no one wanted to be accused of being unpatriotic, or, for that matter, unfeminine. "Bodily submission" kept the figure that would insure a women to keep from turning into, God forbid, the English – where "the number of biological mistakes among women [were] [sic] increasing"[166] – nor did women want to turn into the "woman who would imitate men" who were "not the kind that Nature selects to mother the next generation."[167] It was notably the younger generation that was willing to take their chances at risking the welfare of the nation by not wearing corsets, and it showed in their dress and the dress of the textile mill strikers of the 1920s and 30s.

All the same, the labor leaders didn't know what would come a decade and a half after the 1909 strikes. As the price of the war took its toll across the globe, textile mills were hit harder, even than many other industries. Necessities for living took priority over the glamorous lifestyle of the jazz-era 1920s.[168] Women still reigned as the majority of workers in the mills, and they were willing to demonstrate their need for equal working rights again. Now, however, the were riding on the heels of perhaps the greatest victory in women's rights history, the passing of the Nineteenth Amendment through Congress, which granted women the right to vote. Suffragettes had created a kind of "newly emergent alliance among elite, middle-class, and working-class women," which guaranteed the Nineteenth Amendment "triumph over fractious internal

---

[155] Fields, 355.
[156] *Ibid*., 358.
[157] *Ibid.*
[158] Deborah Saville, "Freud, Flappers and Bohemians: The Influence of Modern Psychological Though and Social Ideology on Dress, 1910-1923," *Dress* (2003): 64-65.
[159] Fields, 362.
[160] *Ibid.,* 363.
[161] *Ibid.*
[162] *Ibid.*
[163] *Ibid.,* 367.
[164] *Ibid.*
[165] *Ibid.*
[166] *Ibid*
[167] *Ibid.,* 369.
[168] Clemente, 8.

discord, dissension over gender roles, and even a world war."[169] Women, especially the mill workers, had found in their suffragette mothers a group that had made "their roles as shoppers into arguments for granting women the ballot."[170] And so, reflecting the picketing style of her mother, "the textile mill girl of the late 1920s used her clothing, as well as her picket signs, to further her cause. She, too, cobbled together a unique and telling wardrobe that merged her identity as a worker and a woman."[171] She donned "the overall," a workingman's uniform, and draped herself in "red, white, and blue regalia."[172] This stepped even further beyond the rejection of corsets and into the realm of pants, traditionally a man's clothing, which clearly declared that mindset of "worker" before "woman." Clemente notes that this picketer identified herself not as a lady in particular, but rather "as an American… she was a consumer…[which] spoke clearly to specific changes in the social, economic, and political role of workingwomen in the United States."[173] She wore her "latest lipstick" alongside her "hair barrettes, necklaces, and blouses" and continued to be "thrilled… laugh… [and] flirt."[174] They expected, in tandem with their "assumed ladylike dignity" that donning their overalls and the colors that they would soon "do a man's work and receive a man's wages." [175] Clemente's article expresses almost exactly the aim of this essay, to show that by creating their own sense of style or fashion, by combining and adjusting definitions and social norms of "femininity," the women workers "both simultaneously adhered to and rejected society's image of womanhood."[176] Her study has a slightly different focus, that fashion can aid the understanding of history, while she also proves the goal of this essay, that fashion actually *is* history and doesn't merely help it along or stand as a coincidence. The 1920s generation, whether they were aware or not, took notes from a motherly generation that passed on the ideals of using femininity to emphasize, rather than distract from, the cause. She – the striker of either generation – changed the American landscape by changing what she wore.

Where did this leave the feminists who would succeed their foremothers? What would she have gained in addition to a corsetless body and the right to vote? What had developed was new perceptions of gender, of who feminists were, and of what their role was in America. Literally, generationally speaking, it would be a generation of granddaughters – and grandnieces – who took over the next quiet series of feminist movements. Susan B. Anthony II was one such woman. She echoed the long-resounding themes of generations before her, proclaiming before anyone else in her time that "just as the white race likes to raise its own prestige by detracting and minimizing the abilities of the Negro race, so men in general like to build up their superiority by minimizing all women."[177] Echoing the themes that race would destroy America and the American Way, the movement in the1940s forward became entrenched in a political climate that was a mixture of not only the feminist movements but also the civil rights battles and the underlying attitudes given by being at home while the boys were at war, whichever war it happened to be. Susan B. Anthony II struggled her way through an era where it wasn't actually fashion that was the immediate oppressor but politics; it is important to address this era as one that preceded a fashion-heavy Second Wave. The decade surrounding World War II was an era in which feminists, fascinatingly, were accused of Communist plots. Ironically, at least until later in the 1950s, Communism was known for doing its best to ignore the "woman problem" and group it instead with the problems that would be solved once class was destroyed.[178]

Communist publications served as a forum where women would declare their need for "special help"[179] from the Communist Party because they still held the roles that served as "double oppression under capitalism" as wife/mother and political participant. Women at the time freely referenced their feminist predecessors, citing that even for Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony (I), "emancipation by no means took place automatically."[180] Feminists in the Communist era, even the Communist sympathizers and active supporters, suggested that solving the class conflict would *not* solve the "woman problem" that had been previously deftly ignored. The "problem," as it were, stemmed from the culture around them, including the "day-to-day attacks in books, films, radio shows, and magazine articles" that, when combined with the lack of acknowledgement of female successes, "[sapped] their confidence, and [convinced] them that they were really inferior to men."[181] It continued on from doctrine of old that the home was still the man's – or the husband's – haven and

---

[169] Margaret Finnegan, *Selling Suffrage: Consumer Culture and Votes for Women* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 5.
[170] *Ibid., 2.*
[171] *Clemente*, 9.
[172] *Ibid.*
[173] *Ibid.*
[174] *Ibid.*,10.
[175] *Ibid.* 11.
[176] *Ibid.* 12.
[177] Kate Weigand, *Red Feminism: American Communism and the Making of Women's Liberation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 1.
[178] *Ibid.*, 7.
[179] *Ibid.*, 67.
[180] *Ibid.*, 76.
[181] *Ibid.*, 77.

that especially there the fruits of his labor were displayed by and on his wife. Betty Millard, feminist progressive writer of the era, expressed how "women's attempt to achieve equality with men…involves an especially difficult, concealed and subtle struggle because women are not isolated in ghettos, but live in intimate daily relationships with the 'superior sex,' a relationship infinitely complex and entangled with biological, economic, and social factors."[182] It was that intertwining of the personal and political that had plagued – and would continue to plague – generations of feminists.

While it was a quieter movement among the others, the work of women in the 1940s, if even just for social rights in 1940s political parties, led to works in the 1950s and 1960s that would develop into feminism's Second Wave. French Feminist Simone de Beauvoir helped set the wheels in motion with *The Second Sex*. Far from the United States, she expressed disdain for a seemingly universal and ever-present era of a woman's duty to be a wife to display her husband's wealth. Society, as was the same for generations before her, pressured her generation still to be the sexual object. It was a role that forced previous generations to submit to the current fads or risk being called masculine, Communist, or a revolutionary. Beauvoir writes that among her other duties in her home, a woman took great care in dressing for each occasion, particularly for formal ones, because "by means of it the woman who is deprived of doing anything feels that she expresses what she is."[183] "Social custom," Beauvoir says, "furthers this tendency to identify herself with her appearance."[184] It was so important that a woman be properly attired for societal reasons, but it was necessary, too, to keep her sanity and sense of self. But it is interesting, then, that the social acceptance of such a possibly varied appearance is very cut-and-dry. It appears simple:

> "…a woman who appeals too obviously to male desire is in bad taste;
> but one who seems to reject it is no more commendable. People think
> that she wants to be mannish and is probably a lesbian, or that she
> wants to render herself conspicuous and is doubtless an eccentric.
> In refusing her role as object, she is defying society; she is perhaps
> an anarchist. If she simply wants to be inconspicuous,
> she must remain feminine."[185]

Clothing at the time was a social need – to indicate status or rank – as well as, more importantly, also a help to women in allowing them to express themselves as more than just what others expected them to be. Beauvoir writes that the "social significance of the toilette allows woman to express, by her way of dressing, her attitude toward society."[186] Fashion became a means of deciding whether or not she would be "submissive to the order" wherein if she was, "she can present herself as fragile, childlike, mysterious, frank, austere, gay, sedate, rather bold, demure." If, "on the contrary, she scorns the conventions, she will make it evident by her originality."[187] Fashion served women in the second half of the twentieth century as the same freedom from social norms as their foremothers – if they so chose. Still in a delicate balance between causing one's husband to be jealous and causing society to judge one's dress and personality,[188] women were again on the cusp of learning that their clothing could help them establish a place, for better and for worse, in society.

American fashion designer Elizabeth Hawes made no bones about fashion and its worth in society. She was known for calling fashion "spinach," which stressed that it was best if the subject was not taken too seriously; or, "to hell with it."[189] She openly discussed the state of fashion and how the current fashions – in 1954 – seemed to be spinach still, at best. Her writing does carry a tone, however, that it is not fashion itself that is spinach, but rather the attitudes of seriousness and even pretension that surround fashion. Evidently, homosexuality – or the fear of it and the associated terms of gender identity therein – was a rising topic, at least in the more taboo discussions in the 1950s. Simone de Beauvoir mentioned it freely regarding feminism and feminist expression, which said one thing; Hawes, discussing it in the realm of fashion, says still another. Hawes even addressed it so frankly that she accused – or pointed out, perhaps – that "it is perfectly possible you are afraid, way deep down inside, of your own homosexual tendencies," if the "you" involved happens to be against the possibility that the sexes may soon dress more alike.[190] This may even be a good point to reference the Bergler studies, where he claimed that the cruelest fashion rose not from heterosexual men but from homosexual men. Perhaps it was merely out of fear that society placed blame on the homosexual population. Hawes, though, put to question something that obviously lingered on through the generations, that "there's no practical necessity in the U.S.A. for one sex wearing trousers

---

[182] *Ibid*.
[183] Simone de Beauvoir, "Social Life," *The Second Sex* (1953). Purdy, ed., 128.
[184] *Ibid*.
[185] *Ibid*., 130.
[186] *Ibid*.
[187] *Ibid*.
[188] *Ibid*., 134. Beauvoir explains that personality, as in, whether or not a woman could be considered a "streetwalker," was also determined by the degree to which she displayed her assets.
[189] Elizabeth Hawes, *It's Still Spinach* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1954), 45.
[190] *Ibid*., 29-30.

and the other skirts"[191] other than the previously mentioned and psychologically-based need for specific distinction between the sexes. There is no need, she said, for a man to wear trousers or a woman a skirt for if asked, "it is extremely doubtful that the answer would ever be: Because I am deeply concerned with pointing out that I have a penis, or a vagina, as the case may be."[192] She proceeded to echo the wishes of her foremothers, hoping that "surely 'free' women are of greater social and moral value to a world in which they take an active part than those who live a proscribed 'womanly' life."[193] She explained the contrast, present in the Victorian era and apparently still in the 1950s, between women and men and the "proscribed" uses of their bodies. Where women were to "display their bodies and clothe them beautifully," men are in the opposite way "supposed to have no bodies at all. A man's body is regarded merely as a useful instrument."[194] She continues on to address accessories in particular, but her philosophy would clearly apply to all means of dress:

> "It should serve to underline the fact that you have to determine your own course of action all along the line in the matter of dressing Social demands may be so important you can't achieve that personal peace we're after without social compromise."

As it had been for so many years, a magazine could determine – and not report on – fashion, which became a point of contention a decade later in the Second Wave. Hawes, perhaps ahead of her time, believed that if women (and men, even) were to be able to live on their own terms, it was of the utmost importance that "fashion editors should start reporting to the American people what exists and stop handing out edicts on how to dress based on theories unrelated to practices."[195] Somehow, at some point in the 1950s, it had become glaringly apparent and as significantly important that people were able to make these decisions on their own, about how their bodies would be dressed and how their bodies would be used. Where Anthony and Stanton and the women in the textile mills fought for working and voting rights, in addition to a kind of right to clothing, women of the 1950s fought to *retain* all three.

And so rose, either at once or gradually at different times, the varying doctrines that created the Second Wave of feminism. Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* brought not only to light but also very much into the most public realm a hard-and-fast declaration of womanhood. She gave an actual definition of, or at least a reason for, the "woman problem" that had previously been seen as a result of women being in some way unsatisfiable and perpetually disgruntled. "Experts" had been telling women, Friedan said, "how to catch a man and keep him… how to dress, look, and act more feminine and make marriage more exciting."[196] For so long there had been nothing greater than to go "to college to get a husband" or the desire of a ten-year-old girl to "Join the Man-Trap Set."[197] And if this was the case, it was surprising and disconcerting to men that woman would be so "disgruntled," despite the sheer joy women should have found in the positively womanly roles of wife and mother. Her role as housewife was "rewarding and satisfying," and men were confused, thinking, "doesn't she know yet how lucky she is to be a woman?"[198] The American woman had not found the happiness or fulfillment she sought, which she was at that point not allowed to seek in work, further education, or pursuits beyond her kitchen walls. The Second Wave began, fueled by a population of women who sought more than their mothers had been satisfied in finding. Friedan served as "the mother of women's liberation" to the generation previous. The younger, hipper feminists saw Beauvoir as their "revolutionary mother."[199] History seems to concede that though this newer generation knew what their mothers had done for them and though "they acted out of sympathy for their mothers' 'Feminine Mystique' experience," the new voices of the new generation "were determined not to be like the previous generation in any way." In that sense, "their politics involved a *rejection of the mother* as well as *retribution on her behalf*."[200] Despite the fact that their inspiration came from a united root, their front was less than united. It was not their front – their outward political movement – to the press that was the problem. The press and the public were under the impression that the movement was cohesive. But the internal workings and beliefs in the factions of the movement varied. Particularly, interestingly, they were divided on the topic of fashion. Friedan herself was "bossy, unkempt, and emotionally volatile."[201] Friedan was

---

[191] *Ibid*., 27.
[192] *Ibid.*
[193] *Ibid*., 31.
[194] *Ibid*., 36.
[195] *Ibid*., 89.
[196] Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (originally published1963; republished New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001), 15.
[197] *Ibid*., 16.
[198] *Ibid*., 24.
[199] Linda M. Scott, *Fresh Lipstick: Redressing Fashion and Feminism* (New York: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN, 2005), 290.
[200] *Ibid.*
[201] *Ibid*., 284.

named leader of the movement, at least initially, because of her already-public identity. Again, however, it was not an entirely united front behind her.[202] The anecdote of the 1970 sit-in at the offices of *Ladies' Home Journal* magazine – where the initial protest was staged by a neatly dressed, even "jittery" group of feminine feminists who were followed into the fray, unintentionally, by a group of feminists who "smoked the editor's cigars and openly discussed throwing him out the window"[203] – clearly demonstrates the divide over practice, if not also over doctrine. It was a divide in philosophy – especially in the agreed-upon (by whichever group) terms of manners and dress. It was vaguely reminiscent of the First Wave, when in 1869 Lucy Stone, apparently frustrated by "cliques" and the members themselves, split from Anthony and Stanton's organization and formed her own.[204] Much of the Second Wave was young and stylish, where most involved magazines had females as editors (*Ladies' Home Journal* was one exception),[205] and *Vogue* and other fashion magazines "were even more vocally feminist."[206] The bra-burning feminists of the 60s (who "stress that no one burned anything"[207]) of the era existed as a sect of that young movement. The "New Feminists" cut their hair and ceremoniously threw away "grooming products and clothing" that held them back. Some "hated the fact that the movement could be represented by these women"[208] while others embraced it. It was a narrow path, however, as "butches" and other lesbians were pushed out of the movement by radicals, who believed that "male-identified" women did too little to help the cause; "after three decades of struggling for the right to express their sexual orientation in their appearance, lesbians were once again in disguise."[209] Women like Gloria Steinem marked the fashionable side of the movement, while others preached that makeup and the beauty culture were part of a "demented quest for transmutation"[210] that women sought out of vanity and desire to appeal to men. Afterward, "after the defeat of the ERA[211],"[212] women went back to fighting the good fight, for feminism, in private sectors. They took up the full-bodied professions that they had fought so hard to win, and they started families. It was the dawn of a new era, but one without an extreme amount of definition. It seemed that "children were raised differently, boardrooms were opened, and fields of research were cast… but the old divisions continued and so, too, the dress habits that marked them."[213]

So what is a generation to do? Today, societal "norms" are so skewed by politics and clouded by ongoing debates regarding race, education, and economy that a daughter may not recognize the feminist movements of her mother. She may not even recognize that her mother is, or was, a feminist. There are now so many different definitions of "feminist" that it may be hard to find – or to relate to – just one. If such a range of feminists remained at the end of the second wave, the current generation would quite possibly find it difficult to relate to either extreme or to that which, to a layperson, may be an unrecognizable middle ground. If the word "feminist" carries the stigma of a "butch," where a woman has, in the extreme, her hair fixed in a crew-cut, and her features and clothing untraditionally masculine and clearly lacking femininity, and a woman does not see herself as such, she would likely steer away from identifying herself as a feminist. If "feminist" carries the stigma of a woman, clad in an all-over floral, waist-cinching dress, who agrees to confinement to her home for the purpose of making it a haven for her husband and to fulfill her life's work as a wife and mother – and a woman does not seek fulfillment in that manner, then she would certainly not want to identify herself with such a culture. Fashion obviously plays a large part in defining either of these extremes, as they provide an illustration of and insight into the kinds of people one could expect them to be. Each can be considered a feminist, based on her beliefs regarding the proper roles for women. So where does that leave the middle ground? How does a girl or woman in the twenty-first century really know? Studies have been conducted in recent years that examine just those questions. It has been found that "women will begin statements in support of a feminist position with the phrase 'I'm not a feminist, but…'" which is an interesting result of the separation of definition from identity.[214] The studies suggest that perhaps it is not the mix of identities that is

---

[202] *Ibid.*
[203] *Ibid.*, 282.
[204] Robert E. Riegel, "The Split of the Feminist Movement in 1869," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (December 1962): 487-488
[205] Scott, 282.
[206] *Ibid.*, 288.
[207] *Ibid.*, 290.
[208] *Ibid.*
[209] *Ibid.*, 293.
[210] *Ibid.*, 291.
[211] The Equal Rights Amendment, or the ERA, was authored by Alice Paul in 1921 and had been introduced in every session of Congress since 1923. It called on the government to stop discrimination based on sex; it also called for the government's enforcement. It passed through Congress in 1972, but did not meet the 38-state ratification deadline in 1982; it had been ratified by only 35 states. (http://www.now.org/issues/economic/eratext.html)
[212] Scott., 312.
[213] *Ibid.*
[214] Jason Schnittker, Jeremy Freese, and Brian Powell, "Who are Feminists and What do they Believe? The Role of Generations," *American Sociological Review* (August 2003): 607.

confusing but rather the meshing of all of the identities into one that causes problems with women wanting to identify with the movement. It was decided in one such study that the definition, or meaning, of feminism is different and has "different aggregate effects on identification for those whose political coming-of-age has occurred at different times."[215] At the same time, it is well established that, "because 'feminist' is premised on heterogeneous understandings of what 'feminism' is, the identity can be connected to manifold political agendas, serving potentially opposing political ends."[216] Such changes can only be accompanied by changes in that generation's attitudes of the movement's beliefs and the accompanying stigma.

Fashion has also changed. What used to be a dictated-by-high-society rule became, at some point in recent years, a mix of the haute and the avant-garde into designs that are "influenced [by] the street."[217] Designs or real clothing, rather, have remained a series of "phenomena that are new but we have been rapidly and widely accepted."[218] At the same time, it is still, as it seems to have started to do in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, "responding to changes that [are] taking place in women's lives."[219] Clearly, this essay strives to prove that fashion is a vital and dynamic part of history. This essay also recognizes that such a study can only be proven when it has been agreed that the subsequent movement must be forward, when it is realized that "we must break away from conventional forms of dress for the new woman of today. We need a strong new image, not to revisit the past."[220]

Today, new fronts are on the horizon. While feminist doctrine of days past remains justifiably at the forefront, the recent generations are beginning to, as they always have in the past, claim bits of fashion as their own and therefore bits of declarations and reclamations of the definitions of feminism. It has even been argued that the oppressive ousting and cliquing of certain groups of people is wrong because each group, each clique, each woman, has her own set of morals, beliefs, and education that put her in whatever realm of feminism she claims as her own. It is emerging that, as this essay has hoped to prove, fashion and beauty are things to be embraced as a part – as a very distinctive root – of feminism. Historian and women's studies writer Linda M. Scott's take on feminism expresses this:

> "By ignoring the way that self-decoration expresses
> the human force of creative expression – the song of the
> self to come into being – and by denying the strength these
> practices can bring at moments of depression, dislocation,
> and even death, the anti-beauty critique engages
> in cultural cruelty."[221]

Women in the discussed eras have taken not only the ideas of dress and modernity and adapted them to their own times and attitudes, but they also brought to the forefront the changing views of gender identity. With their dress and their strikes in tandem, women were able to bring attention to their desires for enfranchisement and to the horrible working conditions in the textile mills in the first decades of the 20th century. Their rejection of old styles and adoption – for however temporary a time – of newer, more comfortable ones told society that they would no longer be bound by stays or layers upon layers of uncomfortable and constricting skirts, and even wore pants. Their call for – and victory in winning – rights shook society into rethinking gender roles, what they had become, and what they would develop into in later years. Generations of feminists led and followed their respective movements, adapting doctrines to their own times and tastes. But one theme seemed to remain clear: a woman would rather choose her own clothing from a limited palette, even clothing that is not in the current fashion, than be forced by society to wear constricting, demeaning, or label-defining clothing. So perhaps it is fashion that has helped to forge new paths in women's rights history. Perhaps the gender ideals and identity that emerged as women changed their clothing was exactly what the movement needed to propel it forward. At times, the movement stood on its own. And, at times, fashion stood on its own as well. But neither existed fully without the other, and so it is impossible for one to be understood without understanding the other. So perhaps, then, the next time a daughter gets ready to leave the house and her mother turns to say goodbye, it will take all of the mother's willpower to realize that her daughter, like her mother and grandmother before her, might just be forging her own path in the feminist movement. Perhaps the mother will refrain from asking, "You're going out in *that?!*"

---

[215] *Ibid*., 608
[216] *Ibid*.
[217] D. Crane, 66.
[218] *Ibid*., 63.
[219] *Ibid*., 67.
[220] *Ibid., 64*.
[221] Scott, 329.

Bibliography

de Beauvoir, Simone. "Social Life," *The Second Sex* (1953). In *The Rise of Fashion: A Reader*, edited by Daniel Leonhard Purdy, 128. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.

Bloomer, Amelia. "The New Costume for the Ladies." *The Lily* (1851). In *The Rise of Fashion: A Reader*, edited by Daniel Leonhard Purdy, 110. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.

Clemente, Deirdre. "Striking Ensembles: The Importance of Clothing on the Picket Line." *Labor Studies Journal* (Winter 2006), http://www.jstor.org/.

Crane, Diana. "Fashion Design and Social Change: Women Designers and Stylistic Innovation." *Journal of American Culture* (Spring 1999), http://www.jstor.org/.

Crane, Elaine Forman. "Political Dialogue and the Spring of Abigail's Discontent," *William and Mary Quarterly* (October 1999), http://www.jstor.org/.

Fields, Jill. "'Fighting the Corsetless Evil': Shaping Corsets and Culture, 1900-1930." *Journal of Social History* (Winter 1999), http://www.jstor.org/.

Finnegan, Margaret. *Selling Suffrage: Consumer Culture and Votes for Women*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. Originally published1963; republished New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001.

Gleason, Mrs. R.B. "The New Dress." *The Water Cure Journal*, as published in *The Lily* (1851). In *The Rise of Fashion: A Reader*, edited by Daniel Leonhard Purdy, 116. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.

Hawes, Elizabeth. *Fashion is Spinach*. New York: Random House, 1938.

Hawes, Elizabeth. *It's Still Spinach*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1954.

Hollander, Anne. *Sex and Suits*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994.

Kay, Susan Ann. "Feminist Ideology, Race, and Political Participation: A Second Look." *The Western Political Quarterly* (September 1985), http://www.jstor.org/.

Nelson, Jennifer Ladd. "Dress Reform and the Bloomer." *Journal of American & Comparative Cultures* (Winter 1999), http://www.jstor.org/.

Paul, Alice. "Equal Rights Amendment." National Organization for Women. http://www.now.org/issues/economic/eratext.html (accessed July 17, 2007).

Purdy, Daniel Leonhard, ed. *The Rise of Fashion: A Reader*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.

Radford, Robert. "'Women's Bitterest Enemy': The Uses of the Psychology of Fashion." *Journal of Design History* (1993), http://www.jstor.org/.

Riegel, Robert E. "The Split of the Feminist Movement in 1869." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (December 1962), http://www.jstor.org/.

Saville, Deborah. "Freud, Flappers and Bohemians: The Influence of Modern Psychological Though and Social Ideology on Dress, 1910-1923." *Dress* (2003), http://www.jstor.org/.

Schnittker, Jason, Jeremy Freese, and Brian Powell. "Who are Feminists and What do they Believe? The Role of Generations." *American Sociological Review* (August 2003), http://www.jstor.org/.

Scott, Linda M. *Fresh Lipstick: Redressing Fashion and Feminism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Weigand, Kate. *Red Feminism: American Communism and the Making of Women's Liberation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Wissenschaft des Judentums and the Orthodox Movement

Julie Rapoport

The term *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, or the "Science of Judaism," entered the German vocabulary as early as the second decade of the nineteenth century, but the concept was formalized by the development of a society dedicated to the Wissenschaft, *Der Verein fur Cultur und Wissenschaft der Juden.* The Wissenschaft des Judentums was devoted to the development of the study Judaism as a legitimate academic discipline. Its proponents sought to achieve that goal through the critical, scientific analysis of Judaism in its various aspects. The organization published a periodical called the *Zeitshrift fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentums* to generate an interest spread their ideals to others and generate interest among them.[222] This truly revolutionary conception of Judaism terrified traditional Orthodox Jews as well as many others concerned for the dwindling spirituality of European Jewry. To champions of Orthodoxy in particular, the Wissenschaft des Judentums symbolized the essence of the heretical "other," the radical movements of Conservative and Reform Judaism, by providing an intellectual justification for the concept of religious reform.

The forerunner to the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* was the *Haskalah*, the eighteenth-century Jewish Enlightenment. Characterized by a philosophy that emphasized the reconciliation of rationalism with the Jewish religion, the *Haskalah* is best personified by scholar Moses Mendelssohn. Mendelssohn advocated for an Enlightened Judaism in response to the conflict of German Jews between their desire to assimilate into German society and their need to maintain Jewish identities. He believed that the Enlightenment ideals of reason and the philosophy of Judaism were not necessarily opposed and that it was possible to reconcile Judaism with the intellectual ideals of secular culture. The *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, a new attempt at the reconciliation of Judaism with secular culture, was founded by the second generation of *Maskilim,* the proponents of *Haskalah*.[223]

While the goal of the *Haskalah* was the merging of the ideals of Judaism and reason, the *Wissenschaft* responded to a new intellectual ideal in Germany, that of scientific critical analysis. Leopold Zunz distinguished the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* from the *Haskalah,* explaining that while the latter served a normative purpose, the former was dedicated to the objective, or scientific, study of texts without a goal of practical application.[224] The text-study of the *Wissenschaft* must also be distinguished from the classical study of Jewish texts. Though both methodologies of study require the application of a certain logic to comprehend texts, traditional Jewish institutions of learning were centered on the analysis of Jewish legal texts through specifically identified methods and were directed towards the derivation of Jewish law. The new *Wissenschaft* method of textual analysis, on the other hand, utilized the critical analysis of German academia and had no plans for Jewish legal implications.[225]

The *Wissenschaft des Judentums* originated in Germany in the beginning of the nineteenth century in response to a variety of factors. German literature of the period spread anti-Semitic propaganda that claimed that the Talmud was corrupt and that post-Jesus Judaism was invalid. Students in Southern Germany demonstrated against the Jews there in the *"Hep! Hep!"* riots, destroying Jewish-owned businesses and homes. At the same time, greater numbers of Jews were entering universities and gaining exposure to new attitudes towards scholarship and higher intellectual standards. These Jewish youth began to acculturate and adapt those ideals to their own lives, striving for academic achievement in German universities and acceptance in German secular society. In their attempt to integrate into German society, however, many young German Jews became estranged from traditional Jewish society. In the hopes of drawing this generation back into Judaism, Jewish intellectuals redefined Judaism as a challenging academic discipline.[226] This social and historical context clarifies three essential components of the Wissenschaft identified by scholars. First, the Wissenschaft was an expression of the self-consciousness of the Jewish community in the context of a secular, often unfriendly world. Second, it served as "propaganda for internal consumption," to effect change within the Jewish community. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, many scholars of the Wissenschaft intended to earn validation and status in the academic world by convincing non-Jews of the intellectual nature of Judaism.[227]

Scholar Leopold Zunz described a detailed methodology for the application of the principles of the Science of Judaism in his 1818 *Etwas ueber die rabbinische Literatur*. According to Zunz, Jewish scholars had created a significant body of literature on the analysis of Biblical texts, but that "such an appreciation was never granted to the later productions of

[222] Sigal 197
[223] Meyer (book) 129
[224] Meyer (book) 52
[225] Schorsch 181
[226] Dinur 106
[227] Dinur 106

the Hebrew nation."[228] In his efforts to develop Judaism as an academic discipline, Zunz incorporated a variety of texts and approaches to fully study Judaism in its various manifestations, past and present. The category of Jewish literature defined by Zunz included religious legal texts such as the Bible and Talmud, theological texts, Jewish history and any kind of Hebrew literature. He also called for the study of the sciences, history, and sociology as they each related to Judaism. Zunz clarified research methods that allowed for the exploration of and extraction of data from previously unapproached historical sources like Jewish legal responsa and inscriptions of tombstones.[229] It is interesting to note that Zunz approached his study with the belief that he was "rendering a final accounting for a literature that had reached the end of its history."[230]

The proponents of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* followed the example of Zunz; many scholars used his ideas as a basis for their own versions of scientific studies of Judaism. In particular, the ideals of the *Wissenschaft* inspired the compilation of histories of the Jewish nation. Until this point in history, Jewish history had mainly consisted of Josephus's *Antiquities of the Jews*, Biblical and other religious sources, and some chronologies. In traditional Judaism, history was simply integrated into everyday practice; it was commemorated cyclically instead of simply taught in a linear, straightforward fashion. Historical events such as the Exodus from Egypt were commemorated in daily prayers, while others, such as the Maccabean Revolt, were commemorated annually during holidays. Jews traditionally interpreted their history through the lens of exile in the Diaspora and the hope for redemption and return to the Land of Israel.[231] However, to fit the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* into the mold of an academic discipline, scholars required an uncritical, comprehensive history from the perspective of historicism, the conception of history as a succession of developments influenced by particular conditions. The originality of the Jewish historicism of the *Wissenschaft* stemmed not from the subject matter itself, but rather from the ideals through which the subject matter was perceived.[232]

In 1820, Isaac Marcus Jost published the first of nine volumes of his *History of the Israelites.* Encouraged by historian Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, Jost wrote with the goal of creating an honest portrayal of Jewish history for the benefit of both Jewish and non-Jewish audiences. Hoping for the eventual emancipation of German Jewry, he made a concerted effort to prove to government officials the historically good nature of the Jews, beginning with the period of the Maccabees and ending in the year 1815. The tone of Jost's *History of the Israelites* is apologetic and he cautiously refrained from using certain terms or perspectives to avoid concerning Gentiles. He chose to use the word Israelites instead of Jews, emphasized stories that presented Jews as loyal subjects to their rulers, and deemphasized the extent of the global network of Jews. Regarding the 1492 expulsion from Spain, he wrote that the Jews, "whose number and influence could have easily ignited a civil war…nonetheless refrained from any agitation or stirring up of emotions…Such a decision surely wipes out all the hostile feelings that one harbored against Judaism and opens the way for high regard and admiration."[233] Although Jost believed his work to present a *theologically* unprejudiced account of Jewish history, he geared his writing towards a favorable portrayal of the Jewish people.[234]

Abraham Geiger, another scholar of the *Wissenschaft,* understood Jewish history rather differently than Jost. He believed that one could organize the history of the Jews as Jost did, by piecing together the histories of cultures in which Jews lived, but he also believed that Jewish history was more than that simple compilation of stories. To Geiger, the term Jewish history referred to the history of the Jewish faith, an aspect of Judaism that has survived for generation *in spite of* the influences of other cultures, not *as part of* them.[235] To reinterpret history from the Jewish perspective, Geiger portrayed Judaism as the source of both the powerful forces of Christianity and Islam. He drew comparisons between Jesus and the other Pharisaic[236] rabbis of the time period, presenting Christianity as an offshoot of the liberal, free-thinking religion of Judaism. Geiger's analyses earned the sharp criticisms of Christian theologians as well as the Orthodox Jewish leadership.[237]

A third scholar, Heinrich Graetz, took an historical approach that combined the two philosophies of Jewish history. Graetz believed that Jewish history comprised two essential components: the political and the spiritual. Although Jost had already completed an objective and thorough compilation of Jewish history, Graetz's eleven-volume *History of the Jews* incorporated an additional element of religious historical analysis to create a more integrated whole. He drew a different conclusion from his research than Zunz about the relationship between modernity and Judaism; Graetz argued that

---

[228] Reinharz, Mendes-Flohr 221
[229] Dinur 107
[230] Meyer (book) 55
[231] Meyer (book) 46-51
[232] Schorsch 178
[233] Jost, Isaac Marcus. *History of the Israelites* (as quoted by Meyer (book) 56)
[234] Meyer (book) 55-57
[235] Meyer (book) 57

[237] Heschel 65

modern scholarship marked a revival of the Jewish people, not the beginning of their end.[238] The concept of a *Wissenschaft* that strengthened religiosity arose again in the context of Zacharias Frankel and Positive Historical Judaism.

Traditional Rabbis disliked the *Wissenschaft* approach of historicism because they believed Jewish history to be influenced by God and beyond such surface analyses. There exists a concept in the Jewish tradition that "*ein mukdam u'meuchar batorah,"* essentially, that chronology is insignificant to the traditional Jewish understanding of history.[239] To reduce the history of the Jewish nation to a simple chronology was to disregard a significant concept of Jewish philosophy. The actual historicist accounts of Jewish history were less significant than the philosophies that the methodology motivated. The analysis of Jewish texts from an historicist perspective opened the possibility for the critical study of traditional claims regarding religious texts. Scholars began to question the origins of texts such as the Five Books of Moses, classically attributed to the divine revelation of Moses at Sinai.

The push for the modernization of traditional Jewish thought and methodology appealed to many of the secularized Jews in Germany, but it repulsed the Orthodox German Jews, whose leadership viewed the application of the principles of *Wissenschaft* to traditional texts as utterly sacrilegious. They feared the challenge presented by the *Wissenschaft*, that "it gave a new elite the right to interpret texts, sometimes radically, on the basis of external historical knowledge."[240] By definition, the Orthodox movement believed in the divine authority of the "straight teaching" of both the oral and written traditions as well as the authority of the Rabbinic tradition stemming from that. Any sort of innovation that questioned that foundation was considered heretical and outside of the realm of Judaism; this innovation was more threatening because it wished it to enact change based on insider knowledge.

Zacharias Frankel, the founder of the Positive Historical Jewish movement in Germany, advocated for the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* so long as it strengthened Judaism. He believed that Judaism required scholarship and faith in conjunction with one another, and that the methods of *Wissenschaft* would identify the essence of Judaism vital to the survival of the Jewish people. Frankel applied the principles of the *Wissenschaft* to all varieties of Jewish literature, excepting the Five Books of Moses. He introduced the *Wissenschaft* to his Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau with teachers like Heinrich Graetz, for he argued that Judaism "decays when the love of its scholarly study disappears."[241] In the eyes of the Orthodox rabbis, however, Frankel's dissemination of the ideals of the *Wissenschaft* to his seminary students only served to further taint German Jewry. Of more concern to the Orthodox, perhaps, were the ideas Frankel suggested in his *Darkhei Hamishna,* published in 1859. In this work on the ancient rabbis, Frankel questions the revelational status of the Oral Tradition, implying that the rabbis of the Talmud *created* the tradition instead of simply *relating* the tradition God gave to Moses at Sinai. Frankel's ideas of the origins of rabbinic literature fundamentally opposed the Orthodox belief system and shook the foundations of Rabbinic Judaism.[242]

As scholars applied the critical approach of the Science of Judaism to more texts of greater religious significance, the impact of the *Wissenschaft* on religious belief intensified. Though some scholars advocated for the scientific studies on religious grounds, many questions that arose from the critical study of ancient religious texts grew into deep theological questions that altogether distanced many intellectuals from traditional Judaism.

Abraham Geiger took the application of *Wissenschaft* one step further than Frankel when he welcomed the criticism of the Five Books of Moses.[243] Traditional Judaism required the exegetical study of the Bible and other sources, but the analysis of those texts was limited to the application of particular concepts. Geiger's method of analysis, on the other hand, abstracted concepts further than Traditional Judaism permitted, and he applied analytical methods foreign to Judaism.[244] Opening the Bible to human critique effectively denied the divinity of the most essential of Jewish texts. Geiger wished to utilize the *Wissenschaft* approach in the study of the Bible in order to prove the creativity and flexibility of the Jewish people, and to justify religious reforms. He declared that he "was always concerned to study thoroughly the kernel [of Judaism] and to draw results from it for reform."[245] The ramifications of his radicalism were tremendous: If the Bible had no absolute authority, then the Jewish legal system had no authority, and traditional Jewish practices could be reformed according to the desires of individual societies. Historian Gershom Scholem, a staunch opponent of the principles of the *Wissenschaft,* attacked Geiger as hypocritical and destructive to the core of Judaism. Rather than liberate the

[238] Meyer (book) 58-59
[239] Dr. Rachel Manekin, personal communication. Oct. 20 2008
[240] Meyer (article) 110
[241] Meyer (book) 133
[242] Meyer (book) 132
[243] Meyer (book) 133
[244] Schorsch 186-187
[245] Meyer (book) 133

authentic essence of Judaism from the unnecessary and antiquated practices that surrounded it, Scholem argues, Geiger destroyed the essence of Judaism by molding it to the standards of secular Germany.[246]

Geiger's willingness to apply a critical methodology to every kind of Jewish text lent legitimacy to the most radical of religious reforms. Though he was less concerned with particular reforms than a reformation of Jewish ideology, Geiger did view himself as a religious figure more than an academic one.[247] He did a great deal of research and analysis into the question of the origins of rabbinic literature. Tracing Jewish history and legal literature from the *Mishnah* to the *Talmud*, Geiger determined that the foundations of Jewish law were arbitrary and affected by historical ignorance. He felt that the inflexibility of Jewish law came from internal corruption: the intention of the rabbis to "ground every post-Biblical *halakhic* innovation in Scripture with a rigidity impervious to time." His work paved the way for the ultimate rejection of Jewish legal authority by the Reform movement.[248] As Geiger once wrote, one of the essential goals of the *Wissenschaft* approach to history was "to prove that everything that presently exists at some point came into being and [therefore] possesses no binding force."[249]

Some of the most vocal and extreme Orthodox opposition came from a former friend of Geiger's, a scholar named Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch. The founder of neo-Orthodoxy, an Orthodox movement that called for secession from the general Jewish community as a response to the Reformers, Hirsch was strongly opposed to anything related to the *Wissenschaft*. He believed that the philosophy of historicism did not strengthen the Jewish tradition as Frankel argued, but rather that it achieved quite the opposite—the weakening and destruction of the essence of the Jewish experience. Though he and Abraham Geiger had been close friends at the University of Bonn, the two fundamentally disagreed on the nature of Jewish ideology. Those same changes that Geiger viewed as progressive reforms directed towards the establishment of a modernized Judaism were the manipulations of tradition Hirsch viewed as destructive to the core of the Jewish religion.[250]

In a sermon on the Science of Judaism he gave in 1855, Hirsch mockingly portrayed a proponent of the *Wissenschaft* in order to demonstrate its absurdity and deride its goals. "With our feelings "refined" by a cool reality, and with our unbiased scientific insights, we understand and evaluate all [Jewish practices and traditions] very differently."[251] While the "old Jews" prayed and mourned the destruction of the Holy Temple in Jerusalem, he said, the "refined", "modern" Jews of the *Wissenschaft* knew much better. Instead of actually practicing the religion of antiquity, the Jews of the *Wissenschaft* ensured that "its memory is kept alive in histories of literature" while "the old Judaism is carried to the grave."[252] He clearly found no reason to reconcile the traditions of Judaism with any modern intellectual ideal.[253]

Not unlike the way he responded to the *Wissenschaft*, Hirsch disparaged the Reform movement supported by its principles of critical study. A movement that called for the abandonment of traditional practices of circumcision and laws of marriage and denied the divinity of oral law and written Torah, all in the name of modernization, could not be tolerated.[254] He opposed the progressiveness the Reformers advocated and the disregard for tradition it produced. In his 1854 essay "Religion Allied to Progress," Hirsch writes that "Judaism never remained aloof from true civilization and progress; in almost every era its adherents were fully abreast of contemporary learning and very often excelled their contemporaries."[255] He argued that Judaism has always been progressive, but that Reformers' conception of progress was a foreign one and so irreconcilable with Jewish law. Hirsch felt that Jews *should* desire progress, so long as he remains in the context of his religion, because "any step which takes him away from Judaism is not for him a step forward, is not progress."[256]

The concerns voiced by Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch regarding the negative impact of the Wissenschaft on Judaism were not unfounded. The redefinition of Jewish history and principles of the Wissenschaft demolished many foundations of Orthodox Jewish belief, creating a rationalization for the reform of traditional practices and the rejection of the authority of Jewish law. The Wissenschaft des Judentums was ultimately responsible for the overthrow of Rabbinic authority and the controversial reforms which ensued.

---

[246] Heschel 67-68
[247] Meyer (book) 133
[248] Schorsch 187
[249] Meyer (book) 51
[250] Liberles 113-116
[251] Reinharz, Mendels-Flohr 234
[252] Reinharz, Mendels-Flohr 235
[253] Sigal 207
[254] Ellenson 740-741
[255] Reinharz, Mendels-Flohr 200
[256] Reinharz, Mendels-Flohr 201

Works Cited

Dinur, Benzion. "Wissenschaft Des Judentums." Encyclopaedia Judaica. 2nd ed. Vol. 21. New York: Thomson-Gale Macmillan Reference USA, 2006.

Ellenson, David. "Traditional Reactions to modern Jewish Reform: the paradigm of German Orthodoxy." Routledge History of World Philosophies: History of Jewish Philosophy. Ed. Daniel H. Frank and Oliver Leaman. Vol. 2. London: Routledge, 1993. 732-58.

Heschel, Susannah. "Revolt of the Colonized: Abraham Geiger's Wissenschaft Des Judentums as a Challenge to Christian Hegemony in the Academy." New German Critique (1999): 61-85. JSTOR. University of Maryland, College Park. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/488522?seq=17>.

Liberles, Robert. Religious Conflict in Social Context: The Resurgence of Orthodox Judaism in Frankfurt Am Main, 1838-1877. Westport, CT: Greenwood P, 1985.

Meyer, Michael A. Judaism Within Modernity : Essays on Jewish Historiography and Religion. New York: Wayne State UP, 2001.

Meyer, Michael A. "Two Persistent Tensions Within Wissenschaft Des Judentums." Modern Judaism 24 (2004): 105-19. Project MUSE. University of Maryland, College Park. <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/modern_judaism/v024/24.2meyer.html>.

Reinharz, Jehuda, and Paul R. Mendes-Flohr, eds. The Jew in the Modern World : A Documentary History. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford UP, Incorporated, 1995.

Schorsch, Ismar. From Text to Context: The Turn to History in Modern Judaism. London: Brandeis UP, 1994.

Sigal, Phillip. Judaism: The Evolution of a Faith. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Company, 1986.

The League of Women Shoppers:

How and Why the Anti-Communists Destroyed Them

Khalid Rosenbaum

The League of Women Shoppers (LWS) was consistently accused of being a Communist threat and was eventually forced to disband. News articles and Congressional hearing testimonies at the time shows the league was not controlled by Moscow, although they did make enemies of powerful business interests in America, such as the meat industry, textile manufacturers, media moguls, Hollywood magnates, automobile manufacturers, and powerful market capitalists. After the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, various U.S. politicians and activists were accused of having loyalties to Moscow. Some Americans capitalized on "red" fears to implement their own economic and political agendas. The LWS activities mainly involved protecting workers' rights, preserving unions, and maintaining living standards for the lower classes. There is only scattered research on this consumers' organization although it is one of the early victims of McCarthyism. Despite being accused by business executives, media sources and Federal officials of being part of a Communist plot, no such evidence has been disclosed.

The 1930s Great Depression greatly affected the political landscape across America. Many blamed commercial monopolies and excessive capitalism for the new hardships of workers across the country. Diverse political ideas once deemed unnecessary became a growing part of mainstream discussion.[257] There were new calls for strong unions, and radical political parties like the Communist Party had growing influence in America.[258] New ideas were being proposed by Congress and the White House. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, elected in 1932, had enacted popular New Deal legislation, and began new social welfare programs, like Social Security. Senator Huey Long backed up FDR's tax proposals targeting millionaires.[259]

Anti-Communists feared these social changes, and perceived any welfare and social legislation as a Moscow directed plot to overthrow the United States. One 1938 letter to the editor published in the *Washington Post* said the New Deal was the Communist Party's plan to replace our system with a totalitarian system.[260] Another letter later that year praised the anti-Communist investigations for uncovering the New Deal Communist conspiracy running through the government chain of command.[261] Even President Roosevelt was considered by many to be part of a Communist plot. In the 1944 Presidential campaign, FDR's Republican opponent Thomas Dewey said that Roosevelt received his orders from the Communists, and that the New Deal was part of the Communist plan.[262] Dewey's Vice Presidential running mate John Bricker argued FDR's ties to subversives "conclusively prove that Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal are in the hands of the radicals and the communists." [263]

This political atmosphere spawned the League of Women Shoppers (LWS) in 1935 in New York. Chapters of LWS then sprang up in cities around the nation, totaling thirteen by 1939, and claimed twenty-five thousand members by then. This organization was based on the premise that women had a hidden power as consumers, and if they worked in concert, they could affect political change. Their literature often claimed, "Women Do 85% of the Buying," to emphasize the hidden power women held in a sexist era, in which women were delegated to housewife activities.[264] The LWS had roots in other consumer groups and worked in conjunction with groups like the National Consumers' League.[265] A chapter of LWS in Atlanta, Georgia was launched in the late 1930s. They claimed in one pamphlet that, "Your buying power can be used for justice." [266] On another pamphlet, their objectives were stated as "To better the quality of goods sold; To eliminate the sweatshops; To raise the living standards of workers; To make the whole community a better place to live." Claiming

---

[257] Merrill, Dennis, "The Truman Doctrine: Containing Communism and Modernity," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 36 (March 2006), 15.
[258] Merrill, "Truman," 30.
[259] Merrill, "Truman," 25.
[260] "Letters to the Editor: From an Ex-Communist," *The Washington Post*, 2 July 1938, X6.
[261] "Letters to the Editor: Dies And Roosevelt," *The Washington Post*, 17 November 1938, 10.
[262] "Democratic Party Is 'For Sale,' Dewey Says," *The Washington Post*, 2 November 1944, 1.
[263] "Communists Run New Deal, Bricker Says," *The Washington Post*, 31 October 1944, 7.
[264] Storrs, Landon. "Red Scare Politics and the Suppression of Popular Front Feminism: The Loyalty Investigation of Mary Dublin Keyserling." *Journal of American History* 90 (2003), 512-3.
[265] Storrs, "Red Scare," 515.
[266] Board of Directors of Atlanta League of Women Shoppers, "The League of Women Shoppers cordially invites you," Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, Online Manuscript Resources in Southern Women's History (0528-079), http://marbl.library.emory.edu/DigProjects/swh/images/Barker%20528/0528-079.htm (accessed October 20, 2006).

nationwide growth, the pamphlet stated: "The Atlanta League of Women Shoppers has recently been organized, following the lead of similar successful organizations in New York, Washington DC, Newark, N.J., and elsewhere." [267]

The activities of the League of Women Shoppers mainly centered around helping labor unions fight for fair working conditions and pay and keeping prices low for consumers. Although some would argue these two goals were in conflict, the LWS felt they were both possible if profiteering and middleman revenue were kept to a minimum for the benefit of the worker and the consumer. An example of advocating this balance was expressed in a *New York Times* article from 1937. It states:

> A determined step toward raising milk prices for the farmers and lowering them for consumers was taken yesterday by representatives of organizations of producers and consumers. They established a joint committee with the purpose of forming a cooperative to eliminate the big distributors and act as the middleman in the distribution of milk.

The LWS was represented in this joint committee, which argued that the distributors were cooking the books to hide their profit taking.[268]

Amid accusations of subversion, LWS grew in strength and popularity. Wives of prominent government officials in the New Deal administration were LWS leaders. The daughter-in-law of the Interior Secretary during the late 1930s "told the women next to her at a luncheon that 'the League of Women Shoppers is the fashionable thing to belong to in Washington now.' " [269] The wife of the Undersecretary of the United States Treasury, Mrs. Acheson, hosted a LWS "membership tea" at her home in January 1938.[270] Dean Acheson was later appointed Secretary of State. In 1944, First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt claimed she was once a member.[271] In 1936, she spoke to a LWS meeting in New York City. Although she criticized the promotion of labor strikes as a technique to advocate their cause, she also praised their efforts to improve standards of living,.[272] In 1938, a delegation of consumer advocates, including the executive secretary of the LWS spoke to President Roosevelt advocating price controls, and the "creation of a central service agency for consumers in the Federal Government." [273]

Most of the League of Women Shoppers activities centered on improving living conditions and lowering prices, and often they worked jointly with other consumer organizations and labor groups. In September 1935, the LWS met with other groups to discuss preserving the 40-hour work week.[274] In 1936, LWS met with other groups to discuss a minimum wage law for women as a relevant case was to be heard in the Supreme Court.[275] In May 1936, they were concerned over tactics used by the police during a seaman strike on the New York pier.[276] In January 1937 the president of the LWS wrote to General Motors concerning its actions during an auto workers union strike "so that we may be guided in recommending purchase of cars." She continued her threat: "I happen to be in the market personally this week to replace a Buick and do not wish to buy one as long as Sloan refuses to recognize the necessity of a national trade union in the automobile industry." [277] The Washington DC chapter of LWS, which was established in 1937, joined other "New Deal wives" in a protest in March of 1937 against the conditions of National Pants Co., a textile manufacturer. According to the *Washington Post* "Three women were arrested on assault charges in front of one plant yesterday." [278] Picketing with the LWS was the "wife of the economic advisor to Secretary of Agriculture Wallace." [279]

---

[267] Board of Directors of Atlanta League of Women Shoppers, "The Atlanta League of Women Shoppers is a member of the national League of Women Shoppers Inc.," Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, Online Manuscript Resources in Southern Women's History (0548-011), http://marbl.library.emory.edu/DigProjects/swh/images/Raoul%20548/0548-011.htm (accessed October 20, 2006).
[268] "Consumers Begin Cheap-Milk Fight," *The New York Times*, 23 November 1937, 1.
[269] Storrs, Landon. "Left-Feminism, the Consumer Movement, and Red Scare Politics in the United States, 1935-1960," *Journal of Women's History* 18 (2006), 40.
[270] "Shoppers Plan Fashion Show: 'Life Without Silk' Theme of Women's League Planned Exhibit," *The Washington Post*, 19 January 1938, X13.
[271] Storrs, "Left," 45.
[272] "Living Rise Asked by Mrs. Roosevelt: President's Wife Urges Use of Spending Power to Improve Standards of Country," *The New York Times*, 9 December 1936, 34.
[273] "Consumer Group to See Roosevelt," *The New York Times*, 24 February 1938, 8.
[274] "Stores are Assailed on Code Work Week," *The New York Times*, 17 September 1935, 6.
[275] "Parley is Planned on Minimum Wage," *The New York Times*, 19 April 1936, N6.
[276] "150 Ship Strikers Protest on Police," *The New York Times*, 13 May 1936, 20.
[277] "Both Sides Offer Conference Terms to End Auto Strike," *The New York Times*, 7 January 1937, 1.
[278] "New Dealers' Wives Picket in Pants Strike," *The Washington Post*, 18 March 1937, 5.
[279] "Wife of Adviser to Wallace in Picketing Line," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 18 March 1937, 2.

The League of Women Shoppers was not delicate in their methods, and the media often portrayed them as a rambunctious crew. In April of 1936, a *New York Times* article was headlined "Borden Labor Policy Attacked by Women." LWS unsuccessfully "invaded" a Borden Company shareholders meeting in order to pressure the milk distributor to continue working with a milk drivers' union.[280] In August 1936, the LWS complained to the mayor of New York that young women arrested for protesting at a department store were unlawfully receiving physical examinations.[281] In February 1937, a New York court heard eight members of the LWS who were arrested picketing a beauty shop. The demonstrating women wore Turkish towels on their head and most likely were advocating labor issues. The court magistrate told the women, "You should be home knitting." [282] In December 1937, the LWS participated with other groups in an anti-fascism rally in New York to support a boycott against Japanese goods, mainly silk. "More than 500 persons, mostly women who wore cotton, lisle or rayon stockings, participated," according to the *New York Times*.[283] In Washington DC, the LWS planned a "Life Without Silk" fashion show. In addition to protests, social events such as dances at hotels and tea parties on roofs were often planned by the Washington DC chapter.[284]

The activities of LWS had attracted many allies, while also creating enemies. In August 1938, the League of Women Shoppers was accused of being a Communist front by a witness in the Special House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities in the United States, then also known as the Dies Committee. The witness, James B. Matthews, claimed that Communists controlled by Moscow were using tactics like the promotion of job security to recruit unsuspecting Americans, but in actuality they had no interest in helping Americans. The main goal of these organizations was allegedly to weaken America in the event of a war with the Soviet Union. Claims of red baiting, a term used by liberal organizations who felt they were unjustly accused of being Communist, were just tricks, according to the witness. According to Matthews, accusations of red baiting by the accused were a technique "for making short work of anybody who dares to object to Communist theories or practices. . . A twentieth century American 'liberal' would rather face the charge of slapping his grandmother than to be accused of red baiting." James Matthews claimed first hand knowledge, as a member of LWS, that they and other consumer organizations were Communist fronts.[285]

The claims of James Matthews before the Un-American Activities Committee were quickly refuted, and Matthews was accused of having a conflict of interest in his accusations. James Matthews was vice president of a consumers' advocacy company called Consumers' Research. The popular magazine Consumers' Report is an off-shoot of Consumers' Research. This company was a staunch conservative organization, and remained committed supporters of anti-Communist efforts throughout the Cold War. In September 1935, there was a labor strike at Consumers' Research. One of the demands by workers and supporting organizations was a minimum pay of $16 a week. Also, they demanded that the vice president, James Matthews, be dismissed from the company because of his bias against unions.[286] The League of Women Shoppers supported the strike against Consumers' Research, and in August 1938 they denied that Matthews was ever a member of LWS as he claimed. They also asserted that Matthews' hostility towards organized labor would prevent him from being considered as a member. The national president of LWS volunteered to speak before the House investigating committee to refute the charges.[287]

The year following the Matthews' accusations, the LWS was attacked again for being a Communist front organization. In 1939 the attacks were instigated by the *Chicago Tribune*, a paper owned by newspaper magnate Randolph Hearst.[288] Hearst's media tycoon tactics were Orson Welles' basis for his famous movie *Citizen Kane*. Hearst smeared Welles as a Communist threat, and prompted an FBI investigation. To protect the image of Hearst and other media moguls, Mayer of MGM offered RKO $800,000 to destroy all copies of the movie.[289] In January 1939, a court held that Hearst had violated the Wagner Labor Act by interfering with union organizing in Chicago. The C.I.O. Chicago Newspaper Guild had been on strike for over a month at two small Chicago Hearst owned newspapers.[290] The League of Women Shoppers had

---

[280] "Borden Labor Policy Attacked by Women," *The New York Times*, 16 April 1936, 15.
[281] "Mayor Repeats Order: Warns Prison Head on Physical Examinations for Women," *The New York Times*, 15 August 1936, 17.
[282] "Court Scolds Pickets," *The New York Times*, 12 February 1937, 6.
[283] "500 in Parade Back Boycott on Japan," *The New York Times*, 12 December 1937, 3.
[284] "Shoppers Plan Fashion Show: 'Life Without Silk' Theme of Women's League Planned Exhibit," *The Washington Post*, 19 January 1938, X13.
[285] "Red Growth Swift, Matthew Asserts: 'United Front' Gain in Nation in Last Few Years Has Far Outrun Hopes, He Says," *The New York Times*, 23 August 1938, 2.
[286] "Research Strikers Meet," *The New York Times*, 8 September 1935, 35.
[287] "Tead Defends College, Shoppers Leader Hits Matthews," *The New York Times*, 24 August 1938, 7.
[288] "Hearst Drops Chicago Newspaper In Merged; Guild Strike Continues," *The New York Times*, 27 August 1939, 1.
[289] Linden, Sheri, "The Battle Over Citizen Kane," Variety Magazine, January 29, 1996, http://www.variety.com/index.asp?layout=print_review&reviewid=VE1117910708&categoryid=31 (accessed December 11, 2006).
[290] "Hearst Verdict Divided," *The New York Times*, 12 January1939, 4.

been working in support of the newspaper Guild, with "housewives" boycotting "the products of companies which are hostile to the act or the board." [291]

In May of 1939, Hearst's Chicago flagship paper, the *Chicago Daily Tribune*, published an article attacking the League of Women Shoppers' "ingenious campaign of intimidation to restrain criticism and even coerce" support for the Wagner Labor Act in relation to the Chicago Guild. The article quoted Matthews' Dies Committee testimony a year earlier, and labeled the LWS a Communist front organization. The article stated: "The League of Women Shoppers includes the wives of many prominent New Dealers, present and former government officials, in its membership." Five women's portraits were portrayed in a lineup in the article as being sponsors of the LWS. As if accused of a crime, the article stated each woman's affiliation with the LWS and their affiliation with the Federal Government. First example listed was "Mrs. Mordecal Ezekiel, wife of the economic advisor to Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace, is president of the Washington League of Women Shoppers." Also listed was Congresswoman "Representative Caroline O'Day [D., N.Y.], great friend of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt." [292] Randolph Hearst, not a fan of Roosevelt, had once referred to the President as "Stalin Delano Roosevelt." [293]

Hearst Magazines, Inc. was also in a battle against consumers' organizations at the same time. Historian Landon Storrs explains:

> In the spring of 1939, the Consumers' National Federation and one of its member groups, the League of Women Shoppers, did several things that antagonized powerful conservatives. The CNF filed a complaint against *Good Housekeeping* magazine that led the Federal Trade Commission to cite its owner, Hearst Magazines, for guaranteeing fraudulent advertising.[294]

Executive vice president of Hearst Magazines responded on August 17, 1939 with a statement claiming:

> Certain subversive elements, pretending to serve the consuming public but actually motivated by communistic theories, have persistently been attacking the institution of advertising and Good Housekeeping in particular as a leading medium in the advertising field…. We have information that the sources of many complaints against Good Housekeeping and other publications and advertisers are certain radical and communistic groups in and out of the government service who are waging a vigorous fight to eliminate all advertising from magazines and newspapers. We believe the underlying motive of these attacks on advertising is to destroy the freedom of the American press by first destroying its principal source of revenues—advertising. We believe this subversive movement must now be publicly exposed.[295]

Later in 1939, Matthews, again working with the House Committee Investigating Un-American Activities, laid attacks against various groups, including the LWS, and echoed the statements made by Hearst spokesmen. Matthews said that advertising was essential to the capitalist system, and the goal of discrediting advertising was to weaken free enterprise. Matthews claimed the plot to foment revolution was directed by Moscow. He said in his report, "the communist party does not stop at the utilization and exaggeration of real weakness in the capitalist system; it deliberately invents false ones and imputes them to the capitalist system for the purpose of overthrowing it." [296]

The Matthews report asserts that the investigation of *Good Housekeeping* is evidence of a Communist plot. As mentioned in the May 1939 *Chicago Tribune* article, Communist ties allegedly came through the Department of Agriculture under Henry Wallace. The Matthews report stated there was no direct evidence, but he was suspicious of the connections between an investigation by the Department of Agriculture and the attacks on Good Housekeeping. The Matthews report states: "While there is no record of the findings of the investigation being used as a basis for action against that magazine, it may be assumed that such was the intention. This is evidenced by the close affiliation of the government official in question with the heads of the Consumers' Union and Consumers' National Federation." He also used group affiliations of LWS members and the American Communist Party as evidence of a Moscow directed plot. Those who were not direct Communist agents were "fellow-travelers," activists who unknowingly follow the Communist agenda.[297]

The Matthews accusations were discredited very quickly, although the bad publicity was still affecting the consumers' movement. The president of the National League of Women Shoppers, Sophia Boyer, claimed in a statement:

---

[291] "Bare Campaign of Intimidation on Wagner Act," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 7 May 1939, 14.
[292] Ibid.
[293] Manley, John, "Marx in America: The New Deal," *Science & Society* 67 (Spring 2003), 25.
[294] Storrs, "Left," 44.
[295] "Hearst Magazines Accused by F.T.C.," *The New York Times*, 21 August 1939, 22.
[296] "Dies Investigator Says Reds Utilize Consumer Groups," *The New York Times*, 11 December 1939, 1.
[297] Ibid.

"The only knowledge that Mr. Matthews has of the League of Women Shoppers dates back from 1935, when the New York League supported his striking employes [sic] at Consumers Research." Ms. Boyer claimed that she was not a Communist or a "fellow-traveler" and that the House committee had never asked LWS representatives to testify before the committee. She further claimed,

> We consider this statement as untrue and inaccurate as the testimony given by Matthews about the League of Women Shoppers previously. At an earlier session he stated that he, J. B. Matthews, was a member and active in the formation of the League of Women Shoppers and had access to our files. We showed in the press that this statement was absurdly untrue, as we had never until our convention in May, 1938, accepted male members into the organization, and he never was in our office at any time.

Other accused groups, such as the Consumers Union, also made similar statements defending themselves against the allegations.[298]

Again in 1940, another accusation of guilt based on association with the Communist Party was laid against the League of Women Shoppers. A Hollywood writer, Rena Marie Vale, claimed she was a member of the Communist Party and helped organize the League of Women Shoppers. She testified before the Dies Committee about various Communist activities she observed, including a play based on John Steinbeck's "Grapes of Wrath." She claimed she willingly joined the Communist Party, and left after being "bitterly disillusioned," because she found "the party was interested solely in promoting Stalin's foreign policies and not the principles of trade unionism." [299]

The goal of the anti-Communist investigation was twofold. First was to prove that the Communist Party in the U.S. was controlled by Moscow, and therefore could be considered a threat to national security. Second, anti-Communists wished to prove that the Communist Party in the U.S. controlled Communist fronts as part of the plot. By making these two connections, the anti-Communists could reveal an elaborate plot from Moscow to conquer America. An attempt to construct this scenario is evident during hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee in the August of 1950 questioning of witnesses concerning activities in 1941. The witness, an undercover agent, was asked by committee member Mr. Velde, "Mr. Edmiston, I believe you by your testimony have shown that you believe, as I do, that the Communist Party line of the United States is originated in Moscow." Mr. Edmiston answers, "That is my belief." Mr. Velde asked, "Do you have any personal knowledge as to how that party line is transmitted to the party members in the United States?" The witness answered, "No; I do not." [300]

Mr. Edmiston testified that his best evidence of a Moscow directed plot was the American Communist Party's change in attitude towards American foreign policy the day Hitler invaded the Soviet Union. Before the invasion, "We had been for world peace. We had been against aid to imperialistic Britain." He stated in his testimony concerning a Communist Party meeting July 1, 1941, "Now we were on the side of the Soviet Union, and we were going to work very hard as Allies, and we were going to bolster everything that America did to make this country the storehouse of democracy." [301]

This change in policy served as proof for many anti-Communists. Mr. Edmiston said antiwar signs such as, "The Yanks Are Not Coming" were ordered destroyed. Committee member Mr. Velde asked: "Do you feel that that change in policy of the Communist Party then showed once and for all at that time that the American Communist Party was definitely connected and controlled by the Communist Party of Russia, Moscow?" Mr. Edmiston answered: "That was my inference, and I'm still with it." [302] Further, he claimed that the Communist Party changed their domestic agenda for America. Now the American Communist Party "recognized that America is not ready for socialism but is ready to fight Hitlerism, so that from now on that will be our slogan." [303]

Mrs. Edmiston, the wife of the undercover witness, was also allegedly working as an undercover agent. She had joined the League of Women Shoppers in Columbus, Ohio in 1940. She claimed the LWS was Moscow controlled, and she insinuated the reason was because the Columbus chapter had a peace agenda. "It was fronted by respectable clubwomen in Columbus, but within the organization were Communist Party members," she testified. "They were engaged primarily, at the time I joined, in the Yanks Are Not Coming program, the peace program. They had in mind, too, certain Government

---

[298] "Matthews Meets Denials, Attacks," *The New York Times*, 11 December 1939, 14.
[299] "Says Reds Formed Women Shoppers," *The New York Times*, 23 July 1940, 10.
[300] Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives. *Hearings Regarding Communist Activities in the Cincinnati, Ohio, Area, Part I*. John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter, Richard M. Nixon, Burr P. Harrison, Francis Case, John McSweeney, Harold H. Velde, Morgan M. Moulder, and Bernard W. Kearney, members. Washington, DC: U.S. House of Representatives, 1950, 2701.
[301] Committee, *Cincinnati*, 2700.
[302] Committee, *Cincinnati*, 2702.
[303] Committee, *Cincinnati*, 2703.

reforms, and bigger relief appropriations, and that sort of thing. Their slogans were generally those of the Communist Party." [304]

In this 1950 testimony, there was no clear evidence implicating the League of Women Shoppers as a Communist front group. Committee member Mr. Velde asked Mrs. Edmiston, "Was the League of Women Shoppers established by the Communist Party, or infiltrated by the Communist Party?" Mrs. Edmiston answered: "I don't know it on a national level. I only know it from the Columbus angle." Committee member Mr. Velde attempted to confirm what he knew about the organization and asked, "The ostensible purpose of the League of Women Shoppers was to get the best bargains that they possibly could, was it not?" The witness answered reiterating her most condemning evidence, "Yes it was. Of course they took up the peace cry louder, I believe, than any other group." [305] Yet a study of the *Washington Post* and *New York Times* articles on LWS shows that there was very little reference to activities concerning world peace.

Although there was no clear evidence condemning the LWS, the accusations of 1939 began affecting membership. February 29, 1940, the Atlanta, Georgia chapter of the LWS closed. Their letter to their members read, "At its meeting on February twentieth, the Board of Directors of the Atlanta League of Women Shoppers voted to dissolve the organization, because of the apparent impossibility of obtaining the cooperation necessary to keep it functioning efficiently." [306] Members of the Communist Party who were active in the LWS were the members most likely to remain during the accusations. According to Landon Storrs, "The Matthews report became a self-fulfilling prophecy because many early LWS backers began to withdraw, increasing the influence of the Communist members; in 1944 the Dies Committee officially labeled the LWS a Communist front organization." [307] Other groups, like the National Consumers' League, began to distance themselves from the Communist accusations and exclude LWS from their activities.[308] The LWS was heavily defended in the face of these accusations. Historian Landon Storrs explains:

> Consumer movement leaders did not deny that Communists participated, but they emphatically denied that Communists controlled their organizations. Eleanor Roosevelt announced at a press conference that she had been a member of the League of Women Shoppers, and President Roosevelt scolded Martin Dies, and angry letters from distinguished citizens poured in to the Dies committee.[309]

Smear tactics, combined with Federal job loyalty programs, were used against those accused of being Communists because there was no evidence to bring individuals to trial. Commissioner Arthur S. Flemming of the Civil Service Commission had been running employee loyalty investigations since 1940 before the Department of Justice was officially assigned to the task.[310] In a 1946 hearing before the House Special Subcommittee on Loyalty, Flemming explained their policy of not asserting Communist affiliations of progressive groups, including the League of Women Shoppers.[311] He listed these groups as being "made up of genuine progressives and liberals, some conservatives, and also followers of the Communist party line," according to the Investigators Manual of Instructions. The policy was to ensure liberals and progressives don't feel under attack by loyalty investigations.[312] Otherwise, the manual argues, we are "playing into the hands of those who desire to sabotage our work by leading the American people to believe that we are engaged in the business of persecuting genuine liberals and progressives." [313]

Flemming named the League of Women Shoppers as one of the organizations "which cannot be classed as Communist or Communist 'front' " but is "infiltrated to various degrees by Communists." [314] Mr. Flemming also read into the record an article from a 1944 *Saturday Evening Post*. This article states the Bill of Rights has been ignored in the case of Federal workers, "because the worker is not being prosecuted and is accused of no crime." The article furthers states:

---

[304] Committee, *Cincinnati*, 2714.
[305] Committee, *Cincinnati*, 2721.
[306] Board of Directors of Atlanta League of Women Shoppers, "February 29, 1940," Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, Online Manuscript Resources in Southern Women's History (0528-063), http://marbl.library.emory.edu/DigProjects/swh/images/Barker%20528/0528-063.htm (accessed October 20, 2006).
[307] Storrs, "Red," 513.
[308] Storrs, Landon, *Civilizing Capitalism*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000, 237.
[309] Storrs, "Left," 45.
[310] Committee on Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives, House Special Subcommittee on Loyalty. *Personnel Practices Concerning Loyalty of Government Employees [Part 4]*. Hon. J. M. Combs, Hon. George H. Fallon, and Hon. Edward H. Rees, members. Washington, DC: U.S. House of Representatives, 1946, 421.
[311] Committee, *Personnel*, 447.
[312] Committee, *Personnel*, 450.
[313] Committee, *Personnel*, 452.
[314] Committee, *Personnel*, 456.

> He is merely in danger of being ruled unfit for Federal employment because of the most terrible offense of all, disloyalty to his country….The employee is blackened for life by traducers he has never seen and whose testimony, possibly motivated by the basest of malice, he can refute with the greatest difficulty.[315]

Despite these setbacks, the LWS continued with its agenda of workers rights and fair consumer prices. In March of 1941, the LWS helped organize a symposium on a plan to set household worker standards across New Jersey.[316] In July 1941, the Washington DC chapter of the LWS protested a laundry chain that refused to recognize the union.[317] Also in 1941, the LWS participated in a Disney studio labor strike.[318]

After the U.S. entered the war, the LWS did participate in what their accusers alleged was the Communist policy of supporting the U.S. war effort. In February 1942, they helped in a campaign to stop Americans from excessive buying in order to help conserve materials for the war effort.[319] In September of 1942, the Office of Price Administration (OPA) fought energy price hikes in Washington DC. The Washington LWS endorsed the OPA's action, and a letter of their support was read into the record at the hearing.[320] Days later, the Dies Committee named government employees who supposedly had links to Communist front organizations. An OPA employee was named.[321] The relationship between the LWS and the OPA grew dramatically as WWII continued.

The activities of the LWS continued to resemble the same activities as before the accusations began. In October 1942, the Washington DC chapter worked to unionize female domestic help.[322] In November 1942, the DC LWS defended black workers looking for employment at the Capital Transit Company.[323] Later in March 1943, the LWS helped organize a protest in Franklin Park to assail "the Capital Transit Co. for its failure to hire Negro bus and trolley drivers." [324] In December 1942, the New York LWS began to distribute shopping price guides determined by the OPA. Miss Katherine Armatage, the national chairman said, "American housewives have been urged by OPA Director Leon Henderson to help make the price-control law work by watching for price ceiling violators." [325] April 1943, the LWS began a campaign to improve product labeling because companies were beating price controls by lowering the quality of their goods. In a letter to President Roosevelt, the LWS and other organizations warned of the effects of weak labeling enforcement, saying: "It would expose the dependents of our fighting men, and all other whose incomes are fixed, to the burden of price rises they cannot bear. It would break a hole in the price control dike we have sought to build and expose the country to the very inflationary forces Congress directed your agency to combat."[326]

As the relationship grew between the LWS and OPA, so did their enemies among businesses. One employee of OPA in opposition to its policies assured the business community that the "Gestapo of volunteer housewives" would not be empowered to control prices. Congressional conservatives were cutting the budget of the OPA, which only increased the usage of volunteers, such as those in the LWS. According to Historian Storrs, "Tight budgets and escalating prices forced the OPA to concede the necessity of volunteer participation, and by 1944 a massive volunteer program was in operation." [327] The problem of low grade goods continued to be an issue in price ceiling enforcement, and in November 1943 organizations including the LWS again asked for labeling requirements. "They said that 'if low-grade products are passed off as high grade,' price ceilings could be violated by as much as 27 per cent on canned peas, 23 per cent on canned tomatoes and 33 per cent on eggs." [328] In May of 1944, the OPA named 13 women as OPA advisors in New York, one being a leading member of the LWS New York chapter.[329]

In December 1944, the meat industry began to fight the OPA. In protest of price controls, the meat industry planned a meat holiday for New York and New Jersey, affecting 10,000 retail markets. Councilman Michael Quill had accused the "Big Four meat packers" of trying to "destroy the OPA and the whole price stabilization structure." The four

---

[315] Committee, *Personnel*, 464-465.
[316] "Household Jobs Parley," *The New York Times*, 9 March 1941, D4.
[317] "30 Employes [sic] Hold Stoppage In Laundry," *The Washington Post*, 23 July 1941, 17.
[318] "Disney Corrects Testimony," *The New York Times*, 11 November 1947, 3.
[319] "Anti-Hoarding Campaign Gets Fresh Impetus," *The New York Times*, 1 February 1942, D4.
[320] "OPA Gains Time in Gas Rate Fight," *The Washington Post*, 15 September 1942, B1.
[321] "Rep. Dies Names Government Employes [sic] He Links to Communist Front Organizations," *The Washington Post*, 25 September 1942, 5.
[322] "D.C. League to Organize Domestic Help," *The Washington Post*, 11 October 1942, 8.
[323] "Women's Unit Indorses Fair Employment Plan," *The Washington Post*, 4 November 1942, 8.
[324] "Protest, Parade Mark Transit Work Request," *The Washington Post*, 8 May 1943, B1.
[325] "Ceiling Booklet Issued," *The New York Times*, 19 December 1942, 24.
[326] "Grade Labeling Urged by Women," *The New York Times*, 26 April 1943, 16.
[327] Storrs, "Left," 52.
[328] "Grade Labeling Asked on Eggs, Canned Goods," *The Washington Post*, 15 November 1943, 9.
[329] "13 Women Named as OPA Advisors," *The New York Times*, 12 May 1944, 16.

companies denied orchestrating the meat holiday. Mayor La Guardia of New York City promised that the meat holiday was an empty threat. He said, "We'll see to it that those who stay open will get the meat of those who do not." The mayor said the price ceilings system would work fine if the retail markets would cease to buy meat at black market prices when meat becomes scarce. The League of Women Shoppers pointed out that labor has made a no-strike pledge as part of their war effort. "The retail butchers had 'the same responsibility toward the Government and the war effort as labor.' " [330]

The LWS lost a friend in the White House when President Franklin D. Roosevelt died in April 1945, and the OPA began to disintegrate. In July of 1945, an executive OPA employee on suspension, Paul L. Ross, charged that the OPA regional head, Daniel P. Woolley, was "hampering the effectiveness of price control by going counter to the national enforcement policy—in some cases to serve his own political ambitions, according to Mr. Ross." Mr. Ross cited many examples where Woolley worked counter to OPA efforts, including obstructing cigarette and dairy price ceilings, and providing leniency towards black marketers. National president of the LWS, Katharine Armatage, sent a telegram to the National Administrator requesting that Woolley be dismissed because, " 'his recent activities have convinced us that his true interests lie outside the [OPA] agency.' " [331]

When World War II ended in August 1945, discussions about eliminating price controls increased. OPA head Chester Bowles had written a letter in appreciation to the volunteers who had been indispensable in price controls. A group of eleven consumer organizations, including the LWS, responded, " 'your recognition of the work done by volunteers has been received with gratification.' " In addition, consumer groups urged Bowles to retain rent control and price and rationing controls " 'to dispel public fear' that restrictions will be too hastily removed and that 'dangerous inflation will greet returning veterans.' " [332] The head of the National Meat Council requested an end to the meat rationing by October 1, 1945. Katharine Armatage sent a telegram to the Secretary of Agriculture "for an indefinite continuance of meat rationing, to assure fair supplies to housewives while permitting the nation to fulfill its commitments to Europe." [333]

Many of the LWS pre-war activities continued, as the no-strike pledge was no longer in effect. In November 1945, the LWS requested General Motors cooperate with its striking workers.[334] In December 1945, the LWS, along with the American Association of University Women (AAUW), attacked a proposed Senate Bill, which "authorizes a manufacturer to set a minimum price on his product." Head of the AAUW said this bill threatens free market enterprise, and the LWS "defended their right to go bargain-hunting. 'Price competition is the best guarantee of getting our money's worth,' Mrs. Sylvia Wubnig of the League of Women Shoppers said." [335] Soon after meat rationing ended, the LWS sent a telegram to President Truman in December 1945 requesting the program be re-instated. The LWS complained that housewives could rarely get choice meat at legal prices, while hotels and restaurants received 50 percent more since rationing ended.[336]

Post-war inflation became a growing issue, and the LWS stuck to their position on price controls being the solution. A debate aired on a New York radio station had four participants, one being the vice president of the LWS. One participant, a member of the New York Times Editorial board, claimed that the cause of inflation was "overissuance of money and bank credit." Somewhat agreeing along those lines was a Professor of Economics at Harvard School of Business Administration, who said price controls caused inflation by not allowing excess money to be siphoned out of the money supply. The fourth participant, a Professor Lonigan of Economics at Brooklyn College, agreed with the LWS participant on retaining price controls, but also mentioned there were issues with the money supply. Only the two female participants advocated price controls.[337]

LWS remained part of the intense debate on price controls until the last days of the OPA.[338] After three weeks of unrestricted prices, President Truman signed a compromise version of the bill to extend the OPA.[339] Meat instantly became scarce on the shelves of retail markets. The markets that received meat were mobbed. One Senator requested an investigation into the causes of the shortages of meat so as to find "if evidence discloses a conspiracy to keep meat off the

---

[330] "Mayor to Combat Meat Shut-Down; Dealers Divided," *The New York Times*, 12 December 1944, 1.
[331] "Suspended OPA Man Accuses Woolley of Interference," *The New York Times*, 27 July 1945, 1.
[332] "Consumers Urge Bowles to Keep OPA Curbs 'To Dispel Public Fear' of Inflation Peril," *The New York Times*, 6 September 1945, 21.
[333] "Women Want Ration of Meat to Remain," *The New York Times*, 13 September 1945, 17.
[334] "Women Shoppers Sent Message," *The New York Times*, 27 November 1945, 26.
[335] "D.C. Fair Trade Bill Opposed As Booster of Living Costs," *The Washington Post*, 11 December 1945, 11.
[336] "Best Beef Scarce, But Hotels Get It," *The New York Times*, 14 December 1945, 25.
[337] "Curb on Inflation Debated at Forum," *The New York Times*, 6 February 1946, 20.
[338] "Save OPA Caravan is Going to Capitol," *The New York Times*, 24 June 1946, 34.
[339] "New OPA," *The New York Times*, 28 July 1946, E1.

market to the detriment of the American people." The Senator and the LWS both backed the New York mayor's plan to open meat imports from South America.[340]

There were accusations by many that meat depletion was a plot both to eliminate the OPA and to help Republicans in the coming elections. One Democratic State campaign manager charged that,

> The present meat famine is the direct result of a deliberate, malicious conspiracy to starve the voters into submission…The only way the reactionary Republican leadership and the controlling financial interests of this country can return to the robber baron period of the twenties is to create dissatisfaction among the people.[341]

The meat packing labor union agreed, and "asserted today that ample supplies of beef cattle were available and accused chain store operators and large packers of damming normal supply channels for political as well as economic purposes." [342] Truman agreed with other Democrats' accusations of a meat conspiracy, yet eliminated the price controls. He blamed the shortage on "selfish men…who, in order to fatten their profits, are endangering the health of our people by holding back vital foods." [343]

Meat suddenly became plentiful and prices skyrocketed, and the LWS transitioned from their focus on price controls back to boycotts and protests. According to the *New York Times*: "A veteran buyer for a major packing plant, surveying the flood of cattle and hogs coming into the Omaha stockyards this week on the second day of free trading, commented: 'They sure fed a lot of cattle and raised a lot of hogs overnight.' " A cartoon in a *New York Times* article depicted the powerful meat industry as a bull dressed as a bull fighter killing a man representing the OPA.[344] Prices stayed high without price controls and some meat rotted on the shelves in New York markets. The National LWS "urged housewives to refrain from buying meat until prices became 'reasonable.' " In addition, the LWS protested improper labeling of meat grade.[345] The DC chapter worked with other groups to encourage shoppers to sign a pledge: "I pledge I will pay no more than 60 cents a pound for any cut of meat. I will help bring prices down by buying only what I need." [346]

Continued inflationary prices led the LWS to other projects. In January 1947, the LWS and other groups campaigned for an increase in minimum wages for service employees, in part because they were receiving smaller gratuities. Harry Reich of the New York Joint Executive Board of Hotel and Restaurant Employees claimed that higher prices affected the tips workers received. According to the *Washington Post*, " 'Tips don't rise with the increase in menu prices.' Mr. Reich declared before the restaurant board. 'As a matter of fact, tipping has declined greatly since the end of OPA. The customers are taking out their resentment against the higher price of food on the employes [sic].' " [347] In May of 1947, the DC LWS again took issue with the Capital Transit Co., this time for raising its fares to the detriment of the Washingtonians. In a letter they said that the company "can and has operated successfully and profitably with out any fare increases." [348] In New York, the LWS helped cut meat prices in July by helping to promote a "Buy No Meat Week." [349]

---

340 "Shops With Meat Stormed; Buyers Wait in Line 6 Hours," *The New York Times*, 6 October 1946, 1.
341 "Meat Crisis Called Republican 'Plot'," *The New York Times*, 6 October 1946, 9.
342 "Union Says Meat is Political Pawn," *The New York Times*, 11 October 1946, 14.
343 "Talks to Country," *The New York Times*, 15 October 1946, 1.
344 "Sudden Action on Meat Starts a Dizzy Cycle," *The New York Times*, 20 October 1946, E9.
345 "Meat Goes Begging, Prices Stay Up; Buyers Canny and Receipts Mount," *The New York Times*, 24 October 1946, 1.
346 "Spokesmen of 260,000 Pledge Not to Buy Meat Above 60c Lb.," *The Washington Post*, 31 October 1946, 1.
347 "Sharp Drop in Tips Laid to End of OPA," *The New York Times*, 4 January 1947, 12.
348 "Women Shoppers 'Disappointed' at Transit Fare Rise," *The Washington Post*, 18 May 1947, M10.
349 "Market Prices Drop in Boycott on Meat," *The New York Times*, 19 July 1947, 16.

In September 1947, almost a year after price controls were lifted by President Truman, organizations such as the LWS and the Congress of American Women (CAW) testified in a Congressional committee investigating the high cost of living. These groups supported the reinstitution of price controls. The representative of the LWS used shopping baskets to demonstrate the loss of consumer buying power. Many groups blamed profiteering "monopolists" for increased costs.[350] After President Truman issued a statement hostile to reinstituting price controls, the National League of Women Shoppers issued Truman a telegram:

> Deeply shocked at your statement that price control, rationing and rent control are police state methods. The signature of thousands of democratic citizens to petitions asking for such control are complete repudiation of the statement. Is boom and bust better than price control because that's what your statement means.[351]

In early 1947, the American political landscape shifted when President Truman became the architect of U.S. Cold War policy. In February 1947, the British pressured Truman to protect its ex-colonies from the Soviet Union.[352] Truman attempted to frighten Americans in order to gain support for the Truman Doctrine. While Roosevelt told Americans that they had nothing to fear but fear itself, Truman told Americans that they were in danger and that their country was insecure. This had a major impact on American foreign and domestic policy.[353] Addressing Congress in March of 1947, Truman stated, "It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." [354] One critical senator asked why we should be "pulling British chestnuts out of the fire." [355] Despite such objections, Truman was successful in selling his doctrine, and began an expansive foreign policy which included NATO and the Marshall Plan.[356] Truman signed a bill in 1947 that changed the domestic landscape of security. It created the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency. The Army, Navy, and Air Force were now relocated under a new Department of Defense.[357] Soon after, Truman began to involve the U.S. in Korea and Vietnam. Truman even dropped government actions against oil monopolies and staunchly backed Saudi Arabia under the name of national security.[358] In a 1947 move that many labeled "thought control," Truman ordered the Justice Department to release lists of subversive organizations as part of the government worker loyalty program he began in the Justice Department in July 1947.[359]

In October 1947, the Justice Department released a list of subversive organizations that included the League of Women Shoppers. These organizations were accused of having the goal of overthrowing the government of the United States, and members were to be purged from federal jobs. According to Hearst's paper, "Persons holding membership in the organizations listed will be regarded as Communists, fellow travelers, parlor pinks, Fascists, or exponents of totalitarianism and unworthy of holding positions of trust under the federal government." [360] Affiliation with the LWS, even if only through marriage, jeopardized the careers of many people.[361] Later that month, Walt Disney testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on a world-wide Communist plot to harm his company, pertaining to the 1941 workers strike at Disney.[362] He named the League of Women Voters, but later corrected his testimony to declare the League of Women Shoppers as one of the subversive groups.[363]

The LWS continued to function as long is it could. In January 1948, a LWS representative addressed a Senate committee requesting reinstatement of price controls to combat inflation.[364] Again in July the LWS issued a statement to Congress urging the reemployment of price controls.[365] In November, the LWS used a mass petition campaign to urge President Truman to strengthen rent control laws.[366] As the LWS attempted to continue its activities, the U.S. loyalty

---

350 "Price Witnesses Demand New OPA," *The New York Times*, 23 September 1947, 9.
351 "Women Rebuff Truman," *The New York Times*, 17 October 1947, 4.
352 Merrill, "Truman," 31.
353 Merrill, "Truman," 37.
354 Merrill, "Truman," 27.
355 Merrill, "Truman," 32.
356 Merrill, "Truman," 28.
357 "Unification Bill Sent to President," *The Washington Post*, 26 July 1947, 1.
358 Merrill, "Truman," 36.
359 "U.S. Official 'Subversive' List Blasted On All Sides," *The Washington Post*, 6 December 1947, 1.
360 "List Subversive Groups for U.S. Loyalty Tests," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 12 October 1947, 5.
361 Storrs, "Left," 55.
362 "Reds Tried to Ruin Him, Disney Says," *The Washington Post*, 25 October 1947, 1.
363 "Disney Corrects Testimony," *The New York Times*, 11 November 1947, 3.
364 "Senate Extends Distilling Curbs," *The New York Times*, 24 January 1948, 3.
365 "Women Shoppers Urge Reimposing of Price Controls," *The Washington Post*, 26 July 1948, B1.
366 "Shopper Unit Asks Rent, Price Curbs," *The New York Times*, 7 November 1948, 42.

employment screenings were hurting the organization. A well-known progressive investigative journalist of the time, I. F. Stone, spoke to the group in October 1948, stating: "The loyalty purges not only violate the basic ideas of our democracy but they are corrupting the thinking of America." [367] By 1949, the LWS disbanded completely. The remnants merged with the Congress of American Women (CAW), an organization which was also labeled subversive and ruined in 1950.[368] In January 1950, members of the CAW were ordered to register with the Justice Department as "foreign agents." [369]

Attacks on those affiliated with the LWS continued after the organization ended. Secretary of State Dean Acheson's loyalty was brought into question when Senator McCarthy named his wife a subversive Communist agent. Ironically, Dean Acheson was an architect of Truman's foreign Cold War policy. McCarthy claimed that his wife had been a member of CAW. Mrs. Acheson denied any knowledge of the organization, then "learned that this was a merger of the League of Women Shoppers and other groups." Defending against the accusations at a press conference, the Secretary of State claimed his wife's affiliation was 10 years earlier, and consisted of a $2 donation. He told a story at the conference to describe the current anti-Communist atmosphere in the country:

> There was once a disturbance at a political meeting; someone telephoned the police to say that Communists were trying to break the meeting up. The police arrived and began to break heads right and left. They even went onto the stage and cracked the chairman over the head. The chairman protested that he was an anti-Communist. The police answered: We don't give a damn whether you're a Communist or an anti-Communist or what kind of Communist you are.[370]

Twelve years after the campaign against Communism destroyed the LWS, another women's group helped bring the decline of HUAC. The Women Strike for Peace (WSP) humiliated HUAC and dispelled their accusations of being part of a Moscow driven plot. They succeeded partly by relating their global peace activism to their maternal roles as peace advocates.[371] The LWS also did not challenge stereotypes of a woman's domestic role, and, in fact, emphasized their role as shoppers. Ultimately, other factors played a role in this turn of events a decade later. WSP was created in 1961, and did not have the stigma of Communist Party members who were prominent activists in the 1930s. Another main difference between the two groups were their objectives. The LWS was accused of being an advocate for peace, but their main task was directly confronting profiteering by big business. The LWS made powerful enemies like the meat industry, media moguls, automobile manufacturers, and energy companies. The Cold War ended with free market allegedly winning, yet media and corporate consolidation is far worse than in the days of Randolph Hearst. During the eleven years LWS was attacked, no reasonable evidence was ever disclosed of a Communist conspiracy directed by Moscow. Yet, without evidence, and sometimes with flawed evidence, corporate executives like James Matthews, Randolph Hearst, and Walt Disney, backed by government officials, successfully destroyed the League of Women Shoppers.

---

[367] "Loyalty Purges Decried by Speaker at Shoppers League," *The Washington Post*, 20 October 1948, B7.
[368] Glickman, Lawrence, "The Strike in the Temple of Consumption: Consumer Activism and Twentieth-Century American Political Culture," *The Journal of American History* 88 (Jun 2001), http://www.historycooperative.org.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu//journals/jah/88.1/glickman.html (accessed October 21, 2006), 14.
[369] "Women's Groups Accused," *The New York Times*, 7 January 1950, 12.
[370] "Mrs. Acheson Once Paid $2 to Shoppers Unit," *The Washington Post*, 9 March 1950, 1.
[371] Laville, Helen, *Cold War Women: The International Activities of American Women's Organisations*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002, 137.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

"13 Women Named as OPA Advisors." *The New York Times*, 12 May 1944, 16.

"150 Ship Strikers Protest on Police." *The New York Times*, 13 May 1936, 20.

"30 Employes [sic] Hold Stoppage In Laundry." *The Washington Post*, 23 July 1941, 17.

"500 in Parade Back Boycott on Japan." *The New York Times*, 12 December 1937, 3.

"Anti-Hoarding Campaign Gets Fresh Impetus." *The New York Times*, 1 February 1942, D4.

"Bare Campaign of Intimidation on Wagner Act." *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 7 May 1939, 14.

"Best Beef Scarce, But Hotels Get It." *The New York Times*, 14 December 1945, 25.

Board of Directors of Atlanta League of Women Shoppers, "February 29, 1940," Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, Online Manuscript Resources in Southern Women's History (0528-063), http://marbl.library.emory.edu/DigProjects/swh/images/Barker%20528/0528-063.htm (accessed October 20, 2006).

Board of Directors of Atlanta League of Women Shoppers, "The Atlanta League of Women Shoppers is a member of the national League of Women Shoppers Inc.," Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, Online Manuscript Resources in Southern Women's History (0548-011), http://marbl.library.emory.edu/DigProjects/swh/images/Raoul%20548/0548-011.htm (accessed October 20, 2006).

Board of Directors of Atlanta League of Women Shoppers, "The League of Women Shoppers cordially invites you," Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, Online Manuscript Resources in Southern Women's History (0528-079), http://marbl.library.emory.edu/DigProjects/swh/images/Barker%20528/0528-079.htm (accessed October 20, 2006).

"Borden Labor Policy Attacked by Women." *The New York Times*, 16 April 1936, 15.

"Both Sides Offer Conference Terms to End Auto Strike." *The New York Times*, 7 January 1937, 1.

"Business Men Here Pledge Fight to Prevent Increases." *The New York Times*, 2 July 1946, 1.

"Ceiling Booklet Issued." *The New York Times*, 19 December 1942, 24.

"Curb on Inflation Debated at Forum." *The New York Times*, 6 February 1946, 20.

Committee on Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives, House Special Subcommittee on Loyalty. *Personnel Practices Concerning Loyalty of Government Employees [Part 4]*. Hon. J. M. Combs, Hon. George H. Fallon, and Hon. Edward H. Rees, members. Washington, DC: U.S. House of Representatives, 1946.

Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives. *Hearings Regarding Communist Activities in the Cincinnati, Ohio, Area, Part I*. John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter, Richard M. Nixon, Burr P. Harrison, Francis Case, John McSweeney, Harold H. Velde, Morgan M. Moulder, and Bernard W. Kearney, members. Washington, DC: U.S. House of Representatives, 1950.

"Communists Run New Deal, Bricker Says." *The Washington Post*, 31 October 1944, 7.

"Consumer Group to See Roosevelt." *The New York Times*, 24 February 1938, 8.

"Consumers Begin Cheap-Milk Fight." *The New York Times*, 23 November 1937, 1.

"Consumers Urge Bowles to Keep OPA Curbs 'To Dispel Public Fear' of Inflation Peril." *The New York Times*, 6 September 1945, 21.

"Continuance Of OPA Urged By 30 Groups." *The Washington Post*, 10 February 1946, M5.

"Court Scolds Pickets." *The New York Times*, 12 February 1937, 6.

"D.C. Fair Trade Bill Opposed As Booster of Living Costs." *The Washington Post*, 11 December 1945, 11.

"D.C. League to Organize Domestic Help." *The Washington Post*, 11 October 1942, 8.

"Demand Extension of Price Control." *The New York Times*, 9 February 1946, 16.

"Democratic Party Is 'For Sale,' Dewey Says." *The Washington Post*, 2 November 1944, 1.

"Dies Investigator Says Reds Utilize Consumer Groups." *The New York Times*, 11 December 1939, 1.

"Disney Corrects Testimony." *The New York Times*, 11 November 1947, 3.

"Grade Labeling Asked on Eggs, Canned Goods." *The Washington Post*, 15 November 1943, 9.

"Grade Labeling Urged by Women." *The New York Times*, 26 April 1943, 16.

"Hearst Drops Chicago Newspaper In Merged; Guild Strike Continues." *The New York Times*, 27 August 1939, 1.

"Hearst Magazines Accused by F.T.C." *The New York Times*, 21 August 1939, 22.

"Hearst Verdict Divided." *The New York Times*, 12 January 1939, 4.

"Household Jobs Parley." *The New York Times*, 9 March 1941, D4.

"Labor and Women Back OPA Control." *The New York Times*, 30 April 1946, 24.

"Letters to the Editor: From an Ex-Communist." *The Washington Post*, 2 July 1938, X6.

"Letters to the Editor: Dies and Roosevelt." *The Washington Post*, 17 November 1938, 10.

"List Subversive Groups for U.S. Loyalty Tests." *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 12 October 1947, 5.

"Living Rise Asked by Mrs. Roosevelt: President's Wife Urges Use of Spending Power to Improve Standards of Country." *The New York Times*, 9 December 1936, 34.

"Loyalty Purges Decried by Speaker at Shoppers League." *The Washington Post*, 20 October 1948, B7.

"Margarine, Shortening Put on Food Decontrol List; Meat Supply Up in Chicago." *The New York Times*, 17 October 1946, 17.

"Market Prices Drop in Boycott on Meat." *The New York Times*, 19 July 1947, 16.

"Matthews Meets Denials, Attacks." *The New York Times*, 11 December 1939, 14.

"Mayor Repeats Order: Warns Prison Head on Physical Examinations for Women." *The New York Times*, 15 August 1936, 17.

"Mayor to Combat Meat Shut-Down; Dealers Divided." *The New York Times*, 12 December 1944, 1.

"Meat Crisis Called Republican 'Plot'." *The New York Times*, 6 October 1946, 9.

"Meat Goes Begging, Prices Stay Up; Buyers Canny and Receipts Mount." *The New York Times*, 24 October 1946, 1.

"Mrs. Acheson Once Paid $2 to Shoppers Unit." *The Washington Post*, 9 March 1950, 1.

"New Dealers' Wives Picket in Pants Strike." *The Washington Post*, 18 March 1937, 5.

"New OPA." *The New York Times*, 28 July 1946, E1.

"OPA Gains Time in Gas Rate Fight." *The Washington Post*, 15 September 1942, B1.

"Parley is Planned on Minimum Wage." *The New York Times*, 19 April 1936, N6.

"Pre-Opening of Play to Further Welfare: League of Women Shoppers Takes Over 'Johnny Johnson' for Nov. 16 Performance." *The New York Times*, 8 November 1936, D4.

"Price Witnesses Demand New OPA." *The New York Times*, 23 September 1947, 9.

"Protest, Parade Mark Transit Work Request." *The Washington Post*, 8 May 1943, B1.

"Red Growth Swift, Matthew Asserts: 'United Front' Gain in Nation in Last Few Years Has Far Outrun Hopes, He Says." *The New York Times*, 23 August 1938, 2.

"Reds Tried to Ruin Him, Disney Says." *The Washington Post*, 25 October 1947, 1.

"Rep. Dies Names Government Employes [sic] He Links to Communist Front Organizations." *The Washington Post*, 25 September 1942, 5.

"Research Strikers Meet." *The New York Times*, 8 September 1935, 35.

"Save OPA Caravan is Going to Capitol." *The New York Times*, 24 June 1946, 34.

"Says Reds Formed Women Shoppers." *The New York Times*, 23 July 1940, 10.

"Senate Extends Distilling Curbs." *The New York Times*, 24 January 1948, 3.

"Sharp Drop in Tips Laid to End of OPA." *The New York Times*, 4 January 1947, 12.

"Shoppers Plan Fashion Show: 'Life Without Silk' Theme of Women's League Planned Exhibit." *The Washington Post*, 19 January 1938, X13.

"Shopper Unit Asks Rent, Price Curbs." *The New York Times*, 7 November 1948, 42.

"Shops With Meat Stormed; Buyers Wait in Line 6 Hours." *The New York Times*, 6 October 1946, 1.

"Spokesmen of 260,000 Pledge Not to Buy Meat Above 60c Lb." *The Washington Post*, 31 October 1946, 1.

"Stores are Assailed on Code Work Week." *The New York Times*, 17 September 1935, 6.

"Sudden Action on Meat Starts a Dizzy Cycle." *The New York Times*, 20 October 1946, E9.

"Suspended OPA Man Accuses Woolley of Interference." *The New York Times*, 27 July 1945, 1.

"Talks to Country." *The New York Times*, 15 October 1946, 1.

"Tead Defends College, Shoppers Leader Hits Matthews." *The New York Times*, 24 August 1938, 7.

"Unification Bill Sent to President." *The Washington Post*, 26 July 1947, 1.

"Union Says Meat is Political Pawn." *The New York Times*, 11 October 1946, 14.

"U.S. Official 'Subversive' List Blasted On All Sides." *The Washington Post*, 6 December 1947, 1.

"Wherry Questions Truman's Veracity." *The New York Times*, 17 October 1946, 17.

"Women Rebuff Truman." *The New York Times*, 17 October 1947, 4.

"Women's Groups Accused." *The New York Times*, 7 January 1950, 12.

"Women Shoppers 'Disappointed' at Transit Fare Rise." *The Washington Post*, 18 May 1947, M10.

"Women Shoppers Sent Message." *The New York Times*, 27 November 1945, 26.

"Women Shoppers Urge Reimposing of Price Controls." *The Washington Post*, 26 July 1948, B1.

"Women's Unit Indorses Fair Employment Plan." *The Washington Post*, 4 November 1942, 8.

"Women Want Ration of Meat to Remain." *The New York Times*, 13 September 1945, 17.

"Wife of Adviser to Wallace in Picketing Line." *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 18 March 1937, 2.

Secondary Sources

Glickman, Lawrence. "The Strike in the Temple of Consumption: Consumer Activism and Twentieth-Century American Political Culture." *The Journal of American History* 88 (Jun 2001), http://www.historycooperative.org.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu//journals/jah/88.1/glickman.html (accessed October 21, 2006).

Laville, Helen. *Cold War Women: The International Activities of American Women's Organisations*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Linden, Sheri. "The Battle Over Citizen Kane." Variety Magazine, January 29, 1996, http://www.variety.com/index.asp?layout=print_review&reviewid=VE1117910708&categoryid=31 (accessed December 11, 2006).

Manley, John. "Marx in America: The New Deal." *Science & Society* 67 (Spring 2003): 9-38.

Merrill, Dennis. "The Truman Doctrine: Containing Communism and Modernity." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 36 (March 2006): 27-37.

Nutter, Kathleen Banks. "JESSIE LLOYD O'CONNOR AND MARY METLAY KAUFMAN: Professional Women Fighting for Social Justice." *Journal of Women's History* 14 (Summer 2002):132-135.

Orleck, Annelise. " `We are that mythical thing called the public': Militant housewives during the great depression." *Feminist Studies* 19, Issue 1 (Spring 1993), http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy-

um.researchport.umd.edu/login.aspx? direct=true&db=aph&AN=9307095047&site=ehost-live (accessed October 4, 2006).

Storrs, Landon. *Civilizing Capitalism*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Storrs, Landon. "Left-Feminism, the Consumer Movement, and Red Scare Politics in the United States, 1935-1960." *Journal of Women's History* 18 (2006): 40-67.

Storrs, Landon. "Red Scare Politics and the Suppression of Popular Front Feminism: The Loyalty Investigation of Mary Dublin Keyserling." *Journal of American History* 90 (2003): 491-524.

The Bolsheviks' Failed Campaign Against Religion

Joe Siev

Even before the Bolsheviks seized power in October 1917, their attitude toward religion was no secret. Indeed, every socialist revolutionary party, regardless of the particulars of their interpretations of Marxist philosophy, shared a strong contempt for religion and hoped to abolish it as part of the eventual transition into communism. For this reason, it is not surprising that the Bolsheviks, almost immediately upon coming to power, began to implement various repressive measures against Russia's religious institutions. The combination of hostile, often violent, anti-religious policies and an aggressive campaign of atheist propaganda left many religious institutions, most notably the Orthodox Church, in shambles. Yet somehow, despite the Soviet government's best efforts, faith in God and participation in religious rituals and ceremonies persisted in Russia. Historians unanimously acknowledge the remarkable nature of this phenomenon, but differ in their explanations of its causes, both political and socio-cultural.

This study will focus on the period beginning with the Bolshevik coup in 1917 and will continue only until the outbreak of World War II. The reason for this is that the demands of the war forced the Soviet leaders to relax their anti-religious policies so that they could benefit from the contributions of religious organizations to the war effort, financial and otherwise. In fact, many historians have credited the outbreak of the war with the salvation of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Soviets were compelled to act with restraint in the post-war period as well, since the geo-political climate of the Cold War was such that it was in their best interests to project an image of allowing more individual freedom than did their capitalist rivals.[372] It was only during the 1920s and 1930s, therefore, that they were able to implement their most militant anti-religious tactics, free from both international scrutiny and war.

In order to understand the extent to which atheism was intrinsic to Soviet policy a brief overview of the attitude Marxist philosophy displays toward religion, particularly as it was interpreted by the Bolshevik leader Vladimir Lenin, is necessary. Before even establishing a political program, Marx was unequivocal regarding his opposition to religion. "To abolish religion as the illusory happiness of the people," wrote Marx, "is to demand their real happiness."[373] Marx sought to free mankind from its self-alienation –its socially constructed misunderstandings of human nature and of the nature of society – much of which he attributed to the false happiness provided by religion.

As his philosophy matured, Marx made explicit the practical application of this concept. "When the political state as political state comes violently into being," he declared, "…the state can and must proceed to the abolition of religion, to the destruction of religion."[374] This was also a cornerstone of Lenin's political philosophy. He saw religion as the most important ideological tool used by those at the top of society to maintain their dominance over the exploited masses.[375] Religion, in Lenin's eyes, is inherently resistant to change, and therefore a natural enemy to those engaging in class struggle. Given this interpretation of Marx, it is not hard to understand why the Bolshevik platform was far less tolerant of religion than the other Russian revolutionary parties who preached a less militant brand of atheism.

Some historians, as Dimitry Pospeilovksy points out, have mistakenly assumed that only the Communist Part (CPSU) was active in its repression of religion, while the Soviet government itself maintained a neutral stance.[376] This is not true. Perhaps they have been misled by their readings of Article 52 of the USSR Constitution, which states, "Citizens of the USSR are guaranteed… the right to profess or not to profess any religion." But this is to overlook the fact that, as Article 6 reads, "The leading and guiding force of Soviet society and the nucleus of its political system, of all state organizations and public organizations, is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."[377] In other words, the Communist Party and the Soviet government were essentially one and the same; the government can even be seen as the brawn to the CPSU's brains, the latter serving as the de facto dictator of the Soviet state.

It is within this context that the Bolsheviks commenced their war on religion immediately upon seizing power. Their first action, in November 1917, was to establish the People's Commissariat of Enlightenment, the task of which was essentially to design and disseminate atheistic propaganda. However, the centerpiece of Lenin's strategy was implemented shortly thereafter, on 23 January 1918. The Decree on the Separation of Church and State declared that the Church no longer had the status of a legal entity, that it did not have the right to own property, and that it could not teach religion in public or private schools, or to any groups of minors. The main motivation for this decree was Lenin's belief in the Marxist

---

[372] Jane Ellis, *The Russian Orthodox Church: A Contemporary History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 254.
[373] Dimitry Pospielovsky, *A History of Marxist-Leninist Atheism and Soviet Anti-Religious Policies* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987), 14.
[374] Pospielovsky, *Marxist-Leninist Atheism*, 14.
[375] Pospielovsky, *Marxist-Leninist Atheism*, 18.
[376] Pospielovsky, *Marxist-Leninist Atheism*, 1.
[377] Pospielovsky, *Marxist-Leninist Atheism*, 2.

concept of 'materialistic determinism,' which seemed to imply that the Church, having been deprived of its material (i.e. financial and popular) support, would collapse on its own.[378]

The Soviets leaders hoped that by weakening the Church and bombarding the population with anti-religious propaganda they would transform believers into non-believers and witness the death of religion in Russia. To expedite the process, they began to close churches across the country. The Bolsheviks also capitalized on the population's strong antagonism toward anyone labeled "counter-revolutionary" by printing articles and fliers depicting the clergy as plotting the restoration of the monarchy. As a result, the jails filled with churchmen.[379]

A prominent feature of the propaganda during this period was its portrayal of communism as a new religion to replace faith in God. This strategy was pushed, for the most part against Lenin's will, by Anatoli Lunacharsky, the Commissar of Enlightenment.[380] During the inter-revolutionary years of 1905-1917 Lunacharsky had helped to found the concept of "Godbuilding," which argued that while faith in God must be obliterated, faith itself is not without utility – religion, according to this theory, fosters an important spiritual bond between men which could be maintained even without God.[381] Lenin was extremely opposed to this idea, but Lunacharsky managed to make use of it in a modified version as part of his propaganda assault on religion.

With this strategy in mind, the Bolsheviks instituted national holidays to parallel and replace Christian ones. These events, steeped in pseudo-religious symbolism, were given their own set of rituals. Even events related to the life cycle were Bolshevized. Baptisms were replaced by "Octobrisms;" marriages and funerals were made "Red" as vows of allegiance and tributes to the state were incorporated into them.[382]

Non-institutionalized violence toward religious practitioners was endemic to the Bolshevik attitude as well, and it was often more extreme than even the government's attacks. Numerous disturbing accounts tell of Red soldiers attacking monasteries, churches, and synagogues and torturing, humiliating, and murdering abbots, priests, rabbis, and anyone else with a religious appearance. One Red army detachment completely scalped a 75 year old abbot before chopping off his head.[383] "I also shot a priest," a soldier wrote to his family in 1918, "We are continuing to chase these devils and killing them like dogs."[384] Isaac Babel's fictionalized journalistic accounts made the fact of these atrocities well known. Cheka police (the Cheka was the predecessor to the KGB) also targeted religious figures with unspeakable acts of violence.[385] But these acts originated with the perpetrators themselves, rather than with the Bolshevik leadership, who were more heavily invested in their aggressive propaganda campaign. To be sure, they should be condemned for doing nothing to put an end to the slaughter; however, the topic at hand is Soviet policy, not Soviet apathy.

At the 10th Party Congress in 1921, Lenin and his Bolsheviks enacted the New Economic Policy (NEP). It was designed to stimulate economic recovery from the devastation that the civil war and the policies of War Communism had left in their wake. NEP is usually remembered for halting the grain requisitioning that had caused severe famine across the countryside and brought with it peasant revolts against the state, and for its legalization of petty trade, which, in the minds of many of the Bolshevik rank and file, resurrected the capitalist corruption from which they thought the Revolution had freed them. Many party members therefore saw it not simply as the ultimate ideological retreat, but an outright betrayal of the ideals of the Revolution – they called it the "New Exploitation of the Proletariat."[386]

The NEP also rolled back anti-religious policies, while a Central Committee Resolution of the same year made explicit the new official policy of the regime toward religion: "To replace religious understanding of the world with a rigorous communist scientific system."[387] This strategy was called "scientific atheism." Atheist organizations, such as the Union of the Militant Godless, were formed to carry out the task. Debates between scientific atheists and members of the clergy were held in order to disprove the superstitions and religious beliefs of the peasants; anti-religious agitators performed public "experiments" to determine whether fertilizer or holy water was more effective in producing a bountiful harvest.[388]

---

[378] Pospielovsky, *Marxist-Leninist Atheism*, 27.
[379] Orlando Figes, *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution, 1891*-1924 (New York: Penguin Books, 1996), 745.
[380] Pospielovsky, *Marxist-Leninist Atheism*, 20.
[381] Richard Stites, *Revolutionary Dreams: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 102.
[382] Figes, 748.
[383] Dimitry Pospielovsky, *Soviet Antireligious Campaigns and Persecutions* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988), 10.
[384] Pospielovsky, *Soviet Antireligious Campaigns and Persecutions*. 10.
[385] Pospielovsky, *Soviet Antireligious Campaigns and Persecutions*. 11.
[386] Figes, 771.
[387] Stites, 105.
[388] Figes, 746.

Historians have tended to see the NEP period as the most liberal in Soviet history. It certainly did mark a relaxation of their policies. Lenin himself argued at the 10th Party Congress that War Communism had been nothing more than a utopian dream; socialism, he now said, could not be achieved by a simple restructuring of law.[389] However, despite having a more tolerant exterior than both its War Communist predecessor and the Stalinist period that would replace it, the introduction of NEP actually commenced a far more brutal series of attacks on religion than revolutionary Russia had yet to suffer at the hands of its new government.

The Bolsheviks' concessions were insincere; they were meant merely to resolve the post-civil war crisis and to soothe the increasingly militant peasantry. If they could present a moderate exterior and thereby maintain the security of their power while working to achieve socialism, they would certainly do it. The NEP period contradictions between official Soviet policy toward religion (or at least the aspects of it that were made public) and their actions reflect this fact.

The post-civil war famine of 1921-1922 had been building for several years with help from the Bolsheviks' War Communist policy of grain requisitioning, and finally hit in full force almost simultaneously with the introduction of the NEP. An official relief effort was organized under intense scrutiny from Lenin; the Church, too, in the limited capacity it still existed and with the limited funds it could still accrue, contributed to the cause. But the real aid came when President Herbert Hoover agreed to dispatch the American Relief Administration (ARA) to Russia in response to a plea for help from the prominent Russian author and political activist Maxim Gorky. This made Lenin furious; he was concerned merely with the preservation of his party's dictatorship, and not with the rampant human suffering. But his hands were tied, and the ARA arrived and began to feed millions of people every day.[390]

However well intentioned the relief efforts were, they were not enough to end the crisis. As millions continued to starve, Lenin, being the clever and ruthless leader that he was, saw the pretext he needed to escalate his attack on institutionalized religion and on the Church specifically. He demanded that the Church surrender its consecrated valuables to support the famine relief, and when they predictably refused to do so, he sent an order to the local Soviets ordering them to take the holy items by force. In a top-secret memo sent to high-ranking party members, Lenin explained his strategy:

> "It is precisely now and only now, when there is cannibalism in the famine stricken areas and hundreds if not thousands of corpses are lying along the roads, that we can (and therefore must) carry out the confiscation of valuables with fanatical and merciless energy and not hesitate to suppress any form of resistance."

Later in the document, he makes clear his object in perpetrating this act of repression:

> "…it is precisely now that we must wage a merciless battle against the reactionary clergy and suppress its resistance with such cruelty that it may remember it for several decades… the more members of the reactionary bourgeoisie we manage to shoot, the better."[391]

Lenin's true intention, it is plain to see, was to ruthlessly attack the Church, and institutionalized religion as a whole. From this point on, the Bolsheviks' assault on institutionalized religion was relentless – they closed churches, monasteries, and synagogues, and murdered as many of leaders and participants from these institutions as possible. Simultaneously, they intensified their atheistic propaganda efforts. The state continually enhanced these efforts throughout the NEP and Stalinist periods, without letting up in any significant way until its entry into WWII.

In order to fully appreciate the extent to which the survival of religion in Soviet Russia was challenged, it is important to distinguish between the Bolsheviks' attacks on institutionalized religion and those on religious faith. The multiple avenues they pursued in the hopes of achieving their dream of an atheistic Russia make the persistence of religion there all the more remarkable. Indeed, many historians of the era have sorted through a multitude of factors, assigning relative importance to each, in an attempt to adequately explain the phenomenon.

As determined as the Soviet war against religion was, there were factors that limited the state's ability, or even its desire to act. William Fletcher argues that the existence of underground religious organizations was the primary factor preventing the Soviet state from eliminating the Church entirely.[392] Jane Ellis corroborates this claim, arguing that the state

[389] Figes, 766.
[390] Figes, 779.
[391] Pospielovsky, *Marxist-Leninist Atheism*, 36.
[392] William C. Fletcher, *The Russian Orthodox Church Underground* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), 3.

leaders knew that they could not completely destroy religious activity, and preferred whatever activity that did exist to be out in the open so they could monitor and control it.[393]

The significance of this explanation is mainly its implication that religious life managed to survive in Russia only because the government, to some small degree, allowed it to. However, while it may be true that the government was forced to exercise some restraint, it is well established that overall, their policies were aggressive, and their application of them relentless. On its own, this notion ignores the strong evidence for other factors, both political and socio-cultural, having contributed to religion's resilience. Hence this factor is insufficient as a complete explanation for the survival of religion in Russia.

Lenin's belief that by introducing communist policies and cutting off the Church from its material base he would precipitate the disappearance of religion suggests that the Bolshevik leadership underestimated the importance of religious life in Russian society. One could point to this as symptomatic of a generally ineffective approach to the eradication of religion. But, as Dimitry Pospielovsky points out, Lenin and the rest of the Bolshevik leaders did not take long to realize that religion was a more complex and enduring phenomenon than they had previously suspected.[394] They began to look for alternatives to the traditionally accepted Bolshevik view that religion was nothing more than a set of inherited superstitions perpetuated by ignorance.[395] Even Trotsky, who was among the last Bolshevik party elites to abandon this simplistic, patronizing attitude toward belief, acknowledged by 1924 that religious life was actually a very powerful feature of Russian culture, and that the battle against it was to be long and difficult.[396]

The Soviet leadership, upon recognition of the misguided nature of its early assaults on religion, modified its strategy. They had earlier considered religion to be merely symptomatic of class exploitation, and therefore something that did not require more than peripheral treatment. But a lack of results convinced them that it was in fact one of the main causes, rather than an effect, of the social evils they sought to destroy.[397] This ideological development spurred a dramatic increase in the militancy of their anti-religious policies, which renews the question – how did religion survive the Soviet campaign against it?

Daniel Peris argues that the regime, even once it understood the importance of incorporating religious themes into its own propaganda, failed to design a substitute religion that appealed to the people.[398] Orlando Figes echoes this point, stating that traditional religious rituals were simply more fun than their communist counterparts.[399] Peris also points to the Bolshevik neglect of religion's emotional appeal.[400] The blandness of Soviet rituals could be considered the product of simple carelessness, as even some party intellectuals acknowledged that a main attraction to religion is the search for beauty and emotional fulfillment.[401] Richard Stites explains that the peasantry, which made up a large percentage of the population, had no desire to adopt the Soviet set of rituals in place of what he calls "the mysteries, beauties, joys, and ebullience of country-style ritual."[402]

Some historians have emphasized the counter-productivity of the regime's various militant anti-religious policies. Figes argues that the Bolsheviks' tactics actually served to rally believers in support of their faith.[403] Fletcher takes this a step further, stating that many otherwise politically neutral religious activists were turned against the government, leaving the Bolsheviks to face an even more resistant, and in some cases combative, religious population than before.[404]

Their practice of closing churches in particular, some have argued, harmed the anti-religious cause more than it helped. They would have been better served, Fletcher argues, to have acted with more restraint in the early years of their regime because forcing the Church underground helped to create a tradition of clergymen wandering from place to place, serving different purposes in different communities.[405] This made monitoring and manipulating the religious climate in Russia much more difficult than it would have been had churches been allowed to function openly. Figes further argues that the closing of churches led to a self-supporting, grassroots-based parish, not unlike what some 19th century Church

---

[393] Ellis, 254.
[394] Pospielovsky, *Marxist-Leninist Atheism*, 26.
[395] Dimitry Pospielovsky, *Soviet Studies on the Church and the Believer's Response to Atheism* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988), 179.
[396] Pospielovsky, *Marxist-Leninist Atheism*, 31.
[397] Pospielovsky, *Marxist-Leninist Atheism*, 26.
[398] Daniel Peris, *Storming the Heavens: The Soviet League of the Militant Godless* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 92.
[399] Figes, 751.
[400] Peris, 97.
[401] Pospielovksy, *Soviet Studies on the Church*, 180.
[402] Stites, 114.
[403] Figes, 750.
[404] Fletcher, 280.
[405] Fletcher, 41.

leaders dreamed of.[406] Moreover, the harsh methods employed by the Bolsheviks forced members of different religious movements who previously had no affiliation to strategically ally themselves with one another in the interests of self-preservation.[407]

Both Stites and William B. Husband present intra-party conflicts over anti-religious strategy as a major factor in the Bolsheviks' failure. Stites emphasizes the debate over whether religion should be replaced by a communist pseudo-religion.[408] Husband posits that this and other contentious subjects damaged Soviet efforts not only in the war against religion, but regarding the economy, education, and other issues of great political importance.[409]

In spite of all of the Bolsheviks' mistakes, a number of socio-cultural factors give the impression that their campaign was doomed to fail no matter how well it was orchestrated. Among the most important is the heroism of Patriarch Tikhon. His staunch resistance to the Bolsheviks in the early years of their regime, writes Fletcher, made him the patron saint of the religious opposition to the Soviets and, more importantly, rallied believers to action.[410] Patriarch Tikhon inspired both a sense of confidence and one of defiance in the hearts of many of the Russian people. The importance of this fact cannot be stressed enough – the simple way that much of the peasantry understood the Revolution and its ideology was such that they were probably at a loss as to why their most basic beliefs and institutions were under attack, and his leadership by example was crucial to their determined resistance.

Some historians emphasize the psychological tendencies of the population – the peasantry in particular – as a major reason for the endurance of their religious beliefs and activities. Peasant culture, explains Stites, had built into it a system of what he calls "dual faith."[411] By this he means that many peasants were able to accept certain aspects of the Bolsheviks' atheistic propaganda while simultaneously and somewhat paradoxically maintaining the strength of their belief in God. Their understanding of the world, according to this argument, was not sophisticated enough to recognize the seeming contradictions in their attitudes. Most peasants, however affected they were by atheistic propaganda, continued to regard religious faith as the primary force guiding their behavior. Pospielovsky attributes this to the moral failings of Soviet communism – "you say that under communism," he quotes a female worker as saying, "man will turn into a model of morality. Well, in our [Christian] community many members could already be such models."[412] The moral system under Bolshevism was vague; it merely required a subordination of the individual to the goals of class struggle and the promotion of socialism – highly subjective guidelines.[413] This kind of system was not compelling enough to reach its objective of replacing religion.

At this point there can be no doubt that there is a great deal of compelling evidence pointing to the fact that the Bolshevik anti-religious campaign was, by and large, unsuccessful. One problem, however, remains – given the multitude of reasons presented in this paper, how can one account for the fact that religious activity did in fact decline in the early years of Bolshevik rule? This phenomenon has not gone unnoticed by historians, and they have put forth very different arguments in explaining it.

William Husband and Orlando Figes take opposite stances on the issue. Despite their many failings, Husband argues, Lenin's Bolsheviks managed to reduce the prominence of religion in Russia by forcing people to reevaluate their faith and indeed to compare it to their faith in revolutionary ideals.[414] Even if the anti-religious campaign was ultimately doomed to fail, it was also destined to have a significant impact.

Figes, on the other hand, argues just the opposite – that the heavy handed methods employed by the Bolsheviks in their assault on religion had the opposite of their desired effect, and the religious decline had an entirely unrelated cause. Many Russians, he writes, became more resolute in their commitment to religious faith in the face of the Bolsheviks' attacks, but the powerful modernizing forces of the time inevitably caused an overall decline in religiosity.[415] There is no simple way to conclusively determine which of these arguments is more correct; however, while Figes does have a point, one must at least acknowledge the possibility that he may exaggerate the Bolsheviks' failure to impact the religious attitudes of the population. After all, Lenin was always ready to adjust his political program if it was not working; he must have felt that his campaign was having some effect.

---

[406] Figes, 750.
[407] Fletcher, 8.
[408] Stites, 120.
[409] William B. Husband, *Godless Communists* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2000), 159.
[410] Fletcher, 42.
[411] Stites, 122.
[412] Pospielovsky, *Soviet Studies on the Church*, 182.
[413] Peris, 95.
[414] Husband, 162.
[415] Figes, 750.

All of the aforementioned theories can be divided into two general categories. First, there are those which emphasize the Bolsheviks' ineffective or even counterproductive methodology – they failed to present a viable alternative to religion; their aggression turned neutral citizens into enemies; the bureaucracy was divided and inefficient. On the other hand, there are those explanations which emphasize socio-cultural factors – the success of underground organizations; the emergence of Patriarch Tikhon as a leader; the peasantry's acceptance of conflicting ideas. The main reason the Bolsheviks failed to obliterate religion in Russia, however, is overlooked by each of these explanations. In fact, it is much simpler: they were facing an impossible task. Pospielovsky points to the futility of using "scientific atheism" as a weapon against religion. Religious belief, he argues, is spawned in the human psyche, and cannot be confirmed or debunked by science.[416] The supporters of religion, whether led by Patriarch Tikhon or not, were thus destined to emerge victorious from their war with the Bolsheviks. After all, as Figes concludes, human nature cannot be so easily shaped by any ruling ideology.[417]

[416] Pospielovsky, *Soviet Studies on the Church*, 81.
[417] Figes, 751.

Works Cited

Babel, Isaac. *Red Cavalry*. New York: Norton and Co., 2003.

Ellis, Jane. *The Russian Orthodox Church: A Contemporary History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Figes, Orlando. *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution, 1891*-1924. New York: Penguin Books, 1996.

Fletcher, William C. *The Russian Orthodox Church Underground*. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Husband, William B. *Godless Communists*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2000.

Peris, Daniel. *Storming the Heavens: The Soviet League of the Militant Godless*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Pospielovsky, Dimitry. *A History of Marxist-Leninist Atheism and Soviet Anti-Religious Policies*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.

Pospielovsky, Dimitry. *Soviet Antireligious Campaigns and Persecutions*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.

Pospielovsky, Dimitry. *Soviet Studies on the Church and the Believer's Response to Atheism*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.

Stites, Richard. *Revolutionary Dreams: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.