379
N81d
No.1890

THE ATTITUDES OF EDWARD BOK AND THE *LADIES' HOME JOURNAL* TOWARD WOMAN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY, 1889-1919

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By
Michael D. Hummel, M.A.
Denton, Texas
August, 1982

Hummel, Michael D., The Attitudes of Edward Bok and the 'Ladies' Home Journal' Toward Woman's Role in Society, 1889-1919. Doctor of Philosophy (History), August, 1982, 311 pp., bibliography, 352 titles.

Edward William Bok, the Ladies' Home Journal's editor from 1889 to 1919, remained a confirmed proponent of Victorian womanhood. Yet, dramatic changes in American society made his perceptions increasingly anachronistic and, recognizing this, he reluctantly permitted his magazine's portrayal of woman to change with the times.

The first part of the dissertation examines Edward Bok's Victorian attitudes toward woman's role in society. According to him, woman's intellectual, emotional, and physical inferiority and her moral and intuitional superiority harmonize perfectly to define a special sphere for her--the home--where she fulfills her roles as wife, mother, and homemaker. Outside the home, Bok permitted only a narrow range of activity for woman--church and club activities and even employment outside the home if finances required it.

The second part of the dissertation illustrates how the Journal's image of woman changed during Bok's tenure, especially during the second decade of the twentieth century. At the outset, all departments of the Journal reinforced the editor's concept of woman, but by the time

Edward Bok retired, in 1919, the magazine's image of woman contrasted sharply with Bok's personal views.

By 1919, therefore, the *Ladies' Home Journal* had accepted the fundamental features of twentieth century American thought on woman's role in society. The changes in the *Journal*'s image of woman, occurring as they did under Edward Bok's conservative guidance, reinforce Henry May's assertion that America lost its innocence in the years prior to American entry into World War I.

© Copyright by

Michael D. Hummel

1982

PREFACE

Founded in 1883, with Mrs. Louisa Knapp (Mrs. Cyrus H. K. Curtis) as editor, the *Ladies' Home Journal* soon became the leading women's magazine in America. During Edward William Bok's term as editor, from 1889 to 1919, the *Journal*'s circulation surpassed that of all other American magazines of every type.

In this same period, roughly coinciding with the Progressive Era, the organized feminist movement vigorously agitated for equal rights. And women in general, whether part of the organized feminist movement or not, made significant inroads into previously all-male bailiwicks. Naturally, the issue of women's rights found expression in the pages of the revered *Ladies' Home Journal* which, save perhaps for the Bible, exerted more influence over the attitudes of American women than any other single literary source. Yet, there has been no careful analysis of the attitude which this most popular magazine had toward woman's role in society. This dissertation, therefore, describes the *Ladies' Home Journal*'s view of woman's place in society, from the magazine's inception until Bok's retirement in 1919, the same year the woman's suffrage amendment was passed by Congress.

Editors Knapp and Bok strongly subscribed to the traditional Victorian impression that God placed woman on earth to serve in three interdependent, perhaps inseparable, capacities--mother, wife, and homemaker. And, of course, this image of woman permeated the editorials, fiction, advice columns, and other departments of the Journal. The magazine's raison d'etre was not to stave off success of the new woman. Rather, the basic purpose behind the Journal was the obvious one, to make money for its owners and to do so by appealing to a largely female clientele. Initially Bok portrayed woman in the traditional fashion because he believed deeply that it was the role God intended woman to play and, concomitantly, because he was convinced that it was the role most of his subscribers and potential subscribers envisioned for women.

As the popularity of the new woman grew, however, Bok wrote fewer editorials concerning the role of woman and at the same time began permitting more favorable views of the new woman to appear in other departments of the magazine. In other words, when Bok realized that his genteel view of woman was becoming ever less in touch with the attitudes of American women, he played the role of the expedient and successful editor by permitting the magazine to change with the times.

Recent literature on the woman's movement has been arguing that the big shift away from Victorian concepts

of woman's accepted place in society occurred before the end of World War I, rather than during the 1920s as earlier historians had contended. This study supports the more recent interpretations, finding that the *Journal*'s stand on woman's role in society changed substantially just after the turn of the century, especially between 1905 and 1919. Interestingly, this dramatic change occurred under the aegis of the very conservative, antifeminist, Edward William Bok.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE iv

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I
EDWARD BOK'S ATTITUDE
TOWARD WOMAN'S ROLE
IN SOCIETY

Chapter

I. IN THE HOME 13

II. BEYOND THE HEARTH 49

PART II
THE _LADIES' HOME JOURNAL_'S
CHANGING VIEW OF WOMAN'S
ROLE IN SOCIETY

III. FEMININE TRAITS 101

IV. MARRIAGE 126

V. DIVORCE 148

VI. MOTHERHOOD 169

VII. HOUSEKEEPER 206

VIII. THE NEW WOMAN 230

IX. WOMAN SUFFRAGE 258

X. IN THE MARKETPLACE 281

CONCLUSION 307

BIBLIOGRAPHY 312

INTRODUCTION

In 1879, Cyrus Hermann Kotzschmar Curtis and a partner founded the *Tribune and Farmer* (1879-1885), a farm family paper published monthly at a subscription cost of fifty cents a year. Along with horticultural and other articles, publisher Curtis included a women's department, "Women and the Home," edited by his wife, Louisa Knapp. The department was successful enough that after several years Curtis began issuing it without his partner's assistance as an eight-page monthly supplement to the *Tribune and Farmer*, selling it separately for fifty cents per year's subscription. This "unpretentious, cheaply printed" folio, as Frank Luther Mott described it, was named the *Ladies' Home Journal and Practical Housekeeper*, a title which appropriately reflected its contents of household hints, fashions, "fancywork," and short fiction. Considering its size and cost, the *Journal* was well-edited; and it was immediately popular, reaching 100,000 circulation by the end of 1884, when Curtis, as a result of some strong disagreements, severed his ties with his partner, allowing his partner to keep the *Tribune and Farmer* while keeping for himself the *Ladies' Home Journal and Practical Housekeeper*.[1]

---

[1] Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines, 1885-1905* (Cambridge, 1957), IV, pp. 536-538.

Under Louisa Knapp's editorial skill, the quality of the *Journal* improved rapidly. Not only did the magazine take a more finished, up-to-date look, but the publisher and editor printed articles from better-known writers including Louisa M. Alcott, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps and Will Carleton. Still, most of the literary material in the magazine abounded in plebian humor and soupy romance clearly directed toward readers without extensive education. Within four years, this literature along with the fashion and household departments attracted 440,000 subscribers and probably hundreds of thousands of other readers.[2]

In October of 1889, Mrs. Curtis, convinced that her daughter needed her attention more than the *Journal* did, relinquished the editorial chair to Edward William Bok, a twenty-six-year-old Dutch immigrant who had already proven his entrepreneural skills by syndicating a woman's department in many newspapers across the country. An epitome of the Horatio Alger archetype, Edward William Bok's life story provides very helpful background material for appraising his attitude toward woman's role in society. In 1870, when Edward William was six years old, the Bok family immigrated to the United States from the Netherlands. The activities of his first years in the new country centered around learning a new language and

---

[2]Edward William Bok, *The Americanization of Edward Bok* (New York, 1932), p. 166.

gaining, sometimes through fisticuffs, the approval and respect of his nativistic American schoolmates. Although the elder Bok had apparently fared moderately well in the old world, he experienced financial reverses in the United States and, as a result, Mrs. Bok was forced to begin doing her own housework. Edward felt obliged to help his mother in the home because he saw that she was having difficulty in adapting to the strenuous exertions which housework required. Writing characteristically in the third person, much later, Bok stated: "It was a curious coincidence that it should fall upon Edward Bok thus to get a firsthand knowledge of woman's housework which was to stand him in such practical stead in later years."[3]

After attending school six years, Bok sought work to improve his family's finances. This early demise of his formal education and his later business successes profoundly affected his view of the world. Indeed, throughout his autobiographies and editorials Bok displayed a strong anti-intellectual bias, preferring bright men and women who were capable of putting their intellect to practical use. After he dropped out of school in his early teens, two major traits of Edward Bok began to take definite form.

---

[3]Edward Bok, A Dutch Boy Fifty Years After (New York, 1921), pp. 1-14.

First, he demonstrated a marked propensity toward and skill at beginning small business enterprises which, although they did not provide a great amount of revenue for the family, proved that Bok had unusual imagination and ability in the art of making money without capital expenditure. Seeing how hot and thirsty passengers on the trolleys became on warm days, he began selling ice water at a penny a glass on the trolleys, especially to women who were too afraid or staid to get off the trolleys at stops just to get a drink of water at public fountains. On another occasion he wrote an account of a party he had attended, making certain he included everyone's name. Then he took this story to the local newspaper and pointed out to the editor that each of the names represented additional buyers and that the editor should have an entire column of such articles to help boost his circulation, whereupon the editor offered Edward three dollars for one column each week. Edward began getting his friends to report to him all the parties they attended and the names of each guest present and he would pay them a fee. By the mid-teens Edward had been engaged in numerous such adventures, all the while holding full-time jobs. At different times he was employed by a bakery, the telegraph office, and a newspaper.

During these same years, Bok demonstrated an inordinate desire to meet and begin correspondence with prominent

individuals. He visited and communicated with scores of nationally and internationally known people including General and Mrs. Ulysses Grant, President and Mrs. Rutherford B. Hayes, Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr., Henry Ward Beecher, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and Jefferson Davis, to name only a smattering. Indeed, he developed such an impressive assortment of autographs and letters that his collection received wide coverage in American newspapers.[4]

When Edward was eighteen years old his father died leaving Edward's nineteen-year-old brother and himself responsible for their mother. Bok and his brother "determined to have but one goal: to put their mother back to that life of comfort to which she had been brought up and was formerly accustomed."[5] Since their current incomes precluded this goal, they sought evening employment. At that time Edward worked for The Brooklyn Eagle and, on the side, a friend and he were publishing the Brooklyn Magazine (later becomes Cosmopolitan) which they were able to sell for a profit. Meanwhile, the two men persuaded, perhaps one should say finagled, Henry Ward Beecher, the famous minister and one of Bok's boyhood

---

[4]Edward Bok, The Americanization of Edward Bok (New York, 1932), pp. 17-60.

[5]Edward Bok, The Americanization of Edward Bok (New York, 1932), p. 61.

correspondents, to write articles which they would in turn sell across the nation as a syndicated column. Within a short time they were syndicating several other features.

Despite success in these and several other ventures, Bok was not content. He resigned his position at The Brooklyn Eagle to become a stenographer for Western Union Telegraph Company, where he subsequently gained the respect and confidence of the company's owner, Jay Gould. After making money playing the stock market, using confidential information he acquired while a personal stenographer for Gould, he decided, against Gould's wishes, to change jobs. Bok implied in his autobiography that he felt guilty about getting money in this manner and that he did not like the way Gould manipulated the market and mistreated many of his employees.

Bok then went to work for Henry Holt and Company and later for the larger and more well-known Scribner's and Sons, where he rose rapidly in the ranks. During this time he gained invaluable knowledge of the publishing industry and of techniques in advertising. Yet he still was able to use his spare time for other entrepreneural efforts. For instance, he realized that newspapers could increase their circulations if they included items which appealed to women. Consequently, he added to his syndicate the first "Woman's Page," which, becoming highly respected and

acclaimed, proved financially profitable to Bok and opened the door to his next venture.[6]

In 1889, Bok gave up a notably promising career with Scribner's to accept an offer from Cyrus H. K. Curtis to become editor of the Ladies' Home Journal. Bok's trusted friends advised him against taking the position. When he asked his mother's advice, as he usually did on important matters, she likewise urged him not to accept the job. Contrary to the unanimous opinions of his advisors, Bok "followed where his instinct so strongly led" and accepted the editorship. In commenting on this decision, Bok later recorded that his mother said: "I am sorry you are going to take this position. It will cost you the high ideal you have always held of your mother's sex." Regarding his new position as editor of the Ladies' Home Journal, Bok stated that no man could have had "a less intimate knowledge of women" then he did since he had no sister, wife, nor other women confidantes. His mother was the only woman he knew or who knew him. But, he did not take the job because of a need to know women; he simply saw the offer as an excellent opportunity to move up in his chosen profession of journalism and to test his executive skills.[7]

---

[6] Edward Bok, The Americanization of Edward Bok (New York, 1932), pp. 61-159.

[7] Edward Bok, A Dutch Boy Fifty Years After (New York, 1921), pp. 103-107; and The Americanization of Edward Bok (New York, 1932), p. 339. In explaining his reasons for

In 1896, Bok married the daughter of Cyrus Curtis, Mary Louise, who bore him two sons. It is interesting to note that Bok scarcely mentioned his wife or children in his lengthy autobiography although he very often made endearing references to his mother, repeatedly revealing his considerable pride in being able to care for her after his father died.[8]

---

accepting the editorship of the Ladies' Home Journal, Bok provided valuable insight into his feeling toward his mother as well as his feeling toward women in general. "No man, perhaps, could have been chosen for the position who had a less intimate knowledge of women. Bok had no sister, no women confidantes: he had lived with and for his mother. She was the only woman he really knew or who really knew him. His boyhood days had been too full of poverty and struggle to permit him to mingle with the opposite sex. And it is a curious fact that Edward Bok's instinctive attitude toward women was that of avoidance. He did not dislike women, but it could not be said that he liked them. They had never interested him. Of women, therefore, he knew little; of their needs less. Nor had he the slightest desire, even as an editor, to know them better, or to seek to understand them. Even at that age, he knew that, as a man, he could not, no matter what effort he might make, and he let it go at that." Edward Bok, The Americanization of Edward Bok (New York, 1932), p. 168.

[8]The following quotation is the only account Bok offers in his autobiography regarding his decision to get married. Notice the relative importance he placed upon his mother and his wife. "He was now realizing the dream of his life for which he had worked: his means were sufficient to give his mother every comfort; to install her in the most comfortable surroundings wherever she chose to live; to make it possible for her to spend the winters in the United States and the summers in the Netherlands, and thus to keep in touch with her family and friends in both countries. He had for years toiled unceasingly to reach that point; he felt he had now achieved at least one goal.

Edward Bok demonstrated a supreme confidence in himself and his ideas. He believed, as he said in his autobiography, that although he was certainly more "intellectual, artistic, and aspiring" than his readers, he was still able to accurately discern their simpler, less refined tastes and to give them what they wanted in a magazine. Those who might have been miffed by this rather condescending view of his readers may have been mollified somewhat by his insistence that the contents of the magazine were directed "to the intelligent American woman rather than to the intellectual type."[9] As shall be noted later, this statement is indicative of his deprecating opinion of female intellectuals. (Bok would never have said feminine intellectuals because the two words would have been mutually exclusive.)

Notwithstanding Bok's rather high opinion of his own perspicacity, Frank Luther Mott correctly asserts that "intellectually, esthetically, and sentimentally" Bok was "near enough to the level of his audience--which is

---

"He now turned instinctively to the making of a home for himself. After an engagement of four years he had been married, on October 22, 1896, to Mary Louise Curtis, the only child of Mr. and Mrs. Cyrus H. K. Curtis: two sons had been born to them; he had built and was occupying a house at Merion, Pennsylvania. . . ." Edward Bok, _The Americanization of Edward Bok_ (New York, 1932), p. 268.

[9]Edward Bok, _The Americanization of Edward Bok_ (New York, 1932), p. 268.

commonly the case of a great editor." And Edward Bok was a great editor, clearly successful in capturing a huge reading audience of middle class readers. Under his direction the Journal's circulation rapidly jumped from 440,000 in 1889, to the unprecedented one million mark by 1903, and, just before Bok's retirement, to the theretofore unbelievable level of two million copies per month. The phenomenal rise of the magazine testified to Bok's administrative and marketing genius and verified that the magazine at once mirrored and helped mold the attitudes of the great American middle class toward woman's proper place in society.[10]

In his three decades as editor, Bok periodically succumbed to his reformist impulses and directed the magazine's forces toward an assortment of reforms: combating the evils of the patent medicine industry; beautifying American cities and towns; providing more extensive and honest sex education for children by their parents; and creating a cleaner, neater environment in the nation's schools.

During the course of Bok's tenure as mentor of the Journal, the magazine's portrayal of women underwent substantial alteration although Bok himself does not appear

---

[10]Frank Luther Mott, A History of American Magazines, 1885-1905 (Cambridge, 1957), IV, p. 542; and Edward Bok, The Americanization of Edward Bok (New York, 1932), p. 421.

to have changed his personal opinions. In his editorials, the changes that occurred were not in content nor attitude but rather in emphasis. During his first decade's editorials, Bok defined his Victorian impressions of the nature and role of the American woman; in the second decade he appears to have been defending his traditional view of woman against the onslaught of the "new woman"; and in the third decade he became very quiet on the question of woman's role in society. In contrast, in its fiction, non-fiction, and advice columns, the *Journal* moved from antipathy toward the new woman in the 1890s, to grudging tolerance of her in the first decade of the twentieth century, to mild endorsement of her in the teens.

In short, this paper will demonstrate that the *Journal*, the nation's most read magazine, switched its position on woman's role in society dramatically between the years 1889 and 1919, even under the very traditional, conservative mentor Edward Bok. The obvious place to begin this study is with an explication of its editor's personal views on woman's role in society.

PART I

EDWARD BOK'S ATTITUDE TOWARD WOMAN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY

CHAPTER I

IN THE HOME

Ever meticulous and cautious, Edward William Bok prided himself for always exhaustively studying an issue, whether a business proposition or an editorial point of view. Before taking a firm position, he was invariably convinced of the correctness of his stands and the thoroughness of his rationale. Despite his supreme self-confidence, Bok's editorials were often marred by inconsistency, superficiality, and imprecise wording, all of which significantly complicate attempts at systematizing his editorial philosophy concerning woman's position in society. Some of these weaknesses in his commentaries may simply reflect lack of polish resulting from the abortive end to his formal education but most of them obviously grew out of the fact that he was not a philosopher but an editor. His primary responsibility was managing a huge publishing enterprise and his writing, which spanned three decades, was never intended to be systematic nor comprehensive. Understandably, there was no order in his selection of topics: many of his editorials were aimed specifically at the question of woman's role in society, some touched the question only tangentially, and others not at all.

The discussion of the following pages is not intended primarily to criticize Bok's ideas by dissecting and displaying Bok's editorial contradictions and myopic arguments but instead to sift through the contradictions and inconsistencies in order to describe as accurately as possible Bok's opinions on woman's role in society, opinions which take on considerable significance since they were read by more individuals than were the views of any other magazine editor, indeed of most any writer, of his day.

Bok assigned clearly defined roles or spheres for both men and women. And, these precise spheres emanated naturally from the relative strengths and weaknesses God imposed on man and woman at creation. Edward Bok asserted in one of his editorials that the best interests of man and woman are too closely aligned and interdependent to make discussion of their respective claims of superiority over the other either "useful or profitable." Nevertheless, in the process of partitioning all human activities into two distinct realms--man's sphere and woman's sphere--he openly admitted that "men are superior to women in some things, just as women are by far the superior of men in other things."[1] While never simply listing the sexes' relative strengths and weaknesses, Bok's comments, explicit and implicit, revealed his conviction that woman is morally

[1]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (February, 1893), 12.

superior to man but intellectually and physically inferior to him. In many respects the editor's conclusions reflect that point of view which H. Carleton Marlow and Harrison M. Davis identify as "innatism" in their carefully reasoned volume The American Search for Woman.[2]

"Any thinking mind" will agree, Bok declared in 1895, in his sometimes condescending style, that in moral character "woman is the superior of man"; and not by mere happenstance but because God never intended her to be morally equal. "He created her last, showing plainly, by that act, that He wished she might improve on what had gone before." Consequently, God imbued woman with moral strength "to uplift man from moral degradation and intemperate principles" and point him toward the higher road. Powerful though her moral suasion might be, it is not inviolable, it will not always reign victoriously over man's degeneracy and woman should never allow herself to be lured into the misconception that it will. Woman must always be vigilant of evil and endeavor to avoid it while simultaneously being prepared to resist evil when it cannot be avoided. That is not to say, however, that woman should remain apart from man; such an assertion would be foolish. Rather, when she does associate with man it must be under proper circumstances and with utmost propriety, or else

---

[2]H. Carleton Marlow and Harrison M. Davis, The American Search for Woman (Santa Barbara, 1976), pp. 253-358.

man's intemperate and impolite behavior might "soil" her "truest self-respect."[3]

Significantly, while Bok argued that woman possesses a much stronger moral constitution than man, he also renounced the prevailing moral double standard which imposed upon woman "all the responsibility for purity and all the penalty for wrong-doing." He believed "absolutely in an equal standard of morals for men and women." Bok particularly expressed dissatisfaction with the "false and misleading physiological" myth purporting that unless man were permitted to "sow his oats" (Bok's euphemism for premarital sexual relations) he would suffer debilitating physiological repercussions. Bok did not specify what repercussions he had in mind.[4]

In one editorial Bok discussed a report by a Social Purity organization which had stamped "the 'wild-oats' fallacy as one of 'the most dangerous errors to be counteracted.'" The study proved that sowing wild oats was not a "physical necessity," it was not essential to the young man's health. So, Bok lent the support of his editorial page to the task of persuading his readers to reject "the wretched sophistry" which strips the guilt from masculine

---

[3]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (March, 1895), 12.

[4]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XI (June, 1894), 14; and "Problems of Young Men," LHJ, XIV (March, 1897), 35.

immorality and makes it a "pardonable pastime." He insisted that whatever "is morally right and physically well for a woman is equally right and well for a man."[5]

Of course, just because Bok was anxious for society to cast away these specious assumptions and to erase the moral and legal double standards did not mean that he wanted woman and man to have the same moral freedom. On the contrary, he wanted man on the same high moral plane society already required of woman; woman was his model for proper behavior. Bok's position, therefore, put him in league with the active Social Purity movement of the day.

Since woman's predisposition toward morality is much greater than man's, it is not surprising that Bok envisioned woman as the "most potent factor" in fighting the double standard. Perhaps the quickest way to eradicate the double standard and to elevate American morals overall is for woman to extend the "same sternness" in judging man's behavior that she exercises toward her sisters'. A woman's typically strict judgment of another woman's moral behavior pleased Bok, but such strict standards become a travesty, he insisted, when woman exonerates the "man for the same offenses against morals and society which she condemns in the woman." In a recent scandal, Bok pointed out, many women had defended the man involved,

---

[5]Edward Bok, "In an Editorial Way," LHJ, XXV (June, 1908), 5-6.

characterizing him as "'a victim of a smooth-tongued woman'" and the woman as brazen and unsavory. Certainly, Bok insisted, the man deserved condemnation as much as she and the entire episode demonstrated how willingly men and women alike accept the weak excuse "of the base coward who whines that 'the woman tempted me and I was led astray.'"[6]

At one point Bok uncharacteristically encouraged women to "find open fault with the law--which at present they, in all too many cases, openly indorse and accept--which punishes a woman and allows the man to escape." For a moment it appeared that Bok was actually going to encourage women to take political action but he did not; he never even specified what law he was referring to nor what he meant by finding "open fault." Definitely, as will be demonstrated later, any political activity by women themselves to eliminate unjust laws would have been repugnant to him since politics is man's sphere. Besides, legislative or political action would not have a salutary effect anyway since "morality is not a question that can find its solution in legislative halls, it is a matter of the principle of the people." Hence, his desire for women to find "open fault" with a bad law apparently meant only that they should openly display disapproval of man's immoral behavior and support the non-political activities

---

[6]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XI (June, 1894), 14.

of the "various Social Purity Leagues." For example, women should not receive "into their homes men whose lives they know are a constant defiance of the highest moral laws." Further, women should immediately begin giving boys "as careful training as our girls," indicating incidentally his recognition that morality is not entirely an inherited trait of females.[7]

Parenthetically, Bok also assigned men two tasks in the campaign against the moral double standard. First, if woman must elevate her conception of men's moral standards, then "it is for the young men of today to adjust themselves to that higher measure." Further, it is incumbent upon the father to teach his son moral lessons, Bok said, realizing that fathers object to discussing sexual matters with their sons for fear that it will unnecessarily turn the boys' thoughts in directions which "are best ignored." Bok rejected this notion out of hand as "nothing but mock modesty." How can boys avoid the dangers of immorality if they are not warned of them ahead of time? "If we teach our daughters to protect their womanhood we should likewise teach our sons to respect it." In his major editorial on this subject, Bok specifically renounced the idea that woman should be held responsible for maintaining a high national moral standard, but the essence of his proposal

---

[7]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XI (June, 1894), 14.

demanded that very thing--he was prodding women to accept their divinely ordained responsibility to maintain a high national moral standard through the home although, as noted, he did expect man to assist her.[8]

In this connection, Bok addressed the charge made by some feminists that the existing moral and legal double standards resulted simply from man being "his own arbitrator of morality." As one might expect, Bok would have none of that thesis. Man was not the cause of the double standard, society was and had been since biblical times. Bok never gave his readers a hint, however, as to how he blamed society for accepting a dual moral standard and simultaneously exonerated man from being his own arbitrator of morality. Certainly he did not lay the blame on woman. One can only speculate upon the possible explanation Bok might have given had he been called upon to resolve this flagrant inconsistency.[9]

While he viewed female morality higher than man's, Edward Bok ranked woman inferior to man intellectually, although on some occasions Bok seemed to profess woman intellectually equal to man. For instance, he claimed that God did not give man "all the wisdom He had for

---

[8]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XI (June, 1894), 14.

[9]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XI (June, 1894), 14.

distribution" and that "man hasn't a 'corner' on intelligence. Women managed to get a little just as well." And elsewhere Bok deigned that it had been acknowledged for centuries that "women, in hundreds of cases, were the intellectual equals of man and had always been so regarded."[10] These comments certainly do not add up to a ringing affirmation of the intellectual equality of man and woman: even allowing for possible sarcasm, they were at best left-handed compliments.

Ironically, perhaps Bok's most damning observation of women's intellectual inferiority occurred when he was attempting to defend woman from her detractors. He quoted one of woman's critics as saying that while woman's heart may be in the right place "'she acts from impulse, and not on the clear, logical lines'" which characterize man's deliberative processes. Bok then quipped in response: "Not impulse, my friend; instinct is better." And he further insisted that if given a choice between the instinct of woman and the "clear, deliberate judgment of man" he would choose woman's instincts in "nine cases out of ten." True, woman jumps to conclusions and can rarely explain her reasons for them but she still will come closer to the truth than a man will after extensive

---

[10]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (February, 1893), 14; and XII (June, 1895), 14.

deliberation.[11] In other words, Bok was convinced that in making decisions and drawing conclusions woman displays superior ability to man's. The catch in his argument, however, was that he was not defending her intelligence at all, though that was his ostensible purpose; he was praising woman's intuition. Woman reaches her conclusions not by utilizing her intellectual faculties but by applying her God-given intuitive powers as compensation for her inferior ability to reason and articulate her reasoning.

Bok's apparent inconsistency in his views of woman's intellectual abilities lies, as the above example indicates, in his confusion of the terms wisdom, intellect, instinct, and intuition. Once one realizes that, it is relatively easy then to discern his intended meaning. In short, Bok viewed woman inferior to man in intellect but superior to him in intuition (which he often construed synonymously with instinct) and wisdom. And, of course, woman's powers of intuition and wisdom are, like her moral strength, more closely associated with her spiritual than her intellectual nature.

Not once did Bok specifically address the relative physical attributes of the sexes but there is throughout his editorials an undercurrent of inferences to woman's physical inferiority. Bok often commented to the effect

---

[11]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (February, 1893), 12.

that woman is clearly "not physically constituted" to bear the intense physical demands of the business world, a point which will be examined more fully later, and that even domestic work can strain the limits of feminine physical endurance.[12] Conversely, he never alluded to man's inability to withstand the physical demands of the business world or the home. And, though a firm advocate of athletics and outside activities for girls, Bok typically cautioned girls not to overdo their physical exercise. Despite the want of extensive comment on it, this underlying current of feminine physical inferiority was a major integrant in Bok's allocation of spheres.

Parenthetically, Bok noted with pleasure, in 1894, a recent medical report attesting that the health and vigor of American girls were increasing as a result of the expansion of feminine participation in sports and other outside activities. In the outdoors more than ever, American girls were becoming less nervous and were living much longer. Twenty-three years later Bok repeated his endorsement of athletics for girls by advising parents to encourage their daughters to participate in such sports as tennis, croquet, and golf. Bok mentioned one man who happily permitted his daughter to play sports even when boys were playing and, ever ready to make a moral point, applauded the man's

---

[12] Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (December, 1894), 16.

wisdom in recognizing that "when a girl's mind and body were healthfully employed she had not too much thought for her boy companions." It was much better, Bok affirmed, for the man's daughter to be playing sports in mixed company than for her to be by herself, "a prey to thoughts that have no place in the life of a fourteen-year-old girl."[13]

Bok used the differing capabilities of the sexes as the matrix for defining special spheres of activity for the sexes. Because woman is morally superior but intellectually and physically inferior to man, woman is "instinctively drawn" to the home; it is her "natural sphere," for only there can she simultaneously exercise her divinely ordained dual roles as wife and mother.[14]

That being the case, then, it is certainly not surprising that Bok allotted considerable editorial space to the consideration of marriage, "the ideal state for man or woman." To him, marriage entails commitments before two authorities, one before God and another before the law. In an editorial in 1900, Bok registered deep annoyance at the growing ease with which marriage could take place: in

---

[13]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (December, 1894), 16; and "Editorial," LHJ, XXXIV (October, 1917), 36.

[14]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XV (June, 1898), 14.

some places in the United States a man merely had to introduce a woman as his wife in the presence of a third party and in other locales a couple needed only to live together under the same name for a short time in order to be considered legally united. These laws were legal and spiritual travesties. They encouraged elopment and other forms of "foolish wedlock" and thereby contributed to the growing number of bad marriages and ultimately to greater numbers of divorces.[15]

Although he considered the union of two hearts a sacred institution, Bok was practical enough to recognize the advisability of divorce in certain cases, as long as the divorce procedures were strict enough to prevent divorce on the spur of the moment. In fact, Bok bore little patience for those who, in "perfect hemorrhages of righteous indignation," advocated the virtual eradication of divorce statutes. The idea of making divorce more difficult overlooked the obvious fact that the cause for the alarming increase in the divorce rate was not lax divorce laws but rather lack of stiff requirements for marriage. "We are horrified at the thought of free love; we go into spasms of virtuous indignation over free divorce; we frown down mightily upon Mormonism," Bok observed. "And yet we

---

[15]Edward Bok, "The Unmarried," LHJ, XIX (November, 1902), 16; and "The Ease with Which We Marry," LHJ, (April, 1900), 18.

sanction free marriage--absolutely free, with everything eliminated: minister, magistrate and license. There's where our sublime inconsistency comes in."[16]

To Bok, it was wholly illogical and unmerciful to allow immature young women, and men too for that matter, to enter into this legal and divine commitment with total ease and then make it terribly difficult for them to get out of the agreement when they found that in frivolity and childlishness they had made a grievous error. If anything, stricter marriage laws would reduce impulsive wedlock. Bok looked with approbation at certain European countries that allegedly required public proclamation of intent to marry a fortnight before marriage took place and, even more so, at early American marriage laws that had required notice of marriage to be announced from the pulpit and posted in public places thirty days prior to marriage. Marriage licenses should be required for all marriages and the license must be "procured in the presence of and with the consent of the father, mother or guardian of the girl to be married."[17]

Although Bok professed opposition to a double standard, it is interesting that he did not recommend that the

---

[16]Edward Bok, "The Ease with Which We Marry," LHJ, XVII (April, 1900), 18.

[17]Edward Bok, "The Ease with Which We Marry," LHJ, XVII (April, 1900), 18.

young man should be accompanied by a parent or guardian. And he never gave serious consideration to the legal implications of divorce with regard to such subjects as community property. At any rate, with these safeguards against impetuous marriage, the divorce rate would soon begin to decline, he claimed, with a concomitantly salubrious effect both on society and on those who otherwise would have been participants in ill-advised marriages. And to those who might object to his plan on the grounds that it subverted individual freedom, Bok retorted with apparently no pun intended that "freedom is not license." American constitutional guarantees of freedom of thought and action were "never intended to be construed into license."[18]

Although marriage is the "ideal state for man or woman" there are many of both sexes who never marry. In some cases a man does not get married because he does not think it proper "to ask a girl to accept less at his hands than she receives from her father's," a sad situation in Bok's sight. "Other young men remain single, lavishing money upon themselves while an army of girls are forced to work for the necessities of life." A girl, on the other hand, occasionally avoids marriage so that she can maintain her independence or misses marriage because no one

---

[18]Edward Bok, "The Ease with Which We Marry," LHJ, XVII (April, 1900), 18.

asks for her hand. But all these instances are the exceptions rather than the rule, according to Bok. Normally the celibate's decision to not marry represents "magnificent self-sacrifice, self-effacement" and he or she deserves everyone's "deepest respect." Only in extraordinary cases does a woman reach years of maturity without an opportunity to get married.[19]

By 1915, Bok noted with pleasure that the unmarried woman no longer felt so stigmatized nor so compelled to "enter a loveless marriage for fear of being branded an old maid."[20] Regardless of any praiseworthy reason for celibacy, the fact remained that being unmarried is unnatural. It is not consistent with the instincts of womanhood.

The normal girl should marry and her marriage should be permanent; therefore, she should be very careful to marry that particular man meant just for her and she should do so at the propitious time. Because the process of selecting a husband is fraught with innumerable pitfalls, Bok tendered fatherly advice to young women.

Incumbent upon the young woman is the selection of a groom who possesses high moral standards and a good

---

[19]Edward Bok, "The Unmarried," LHJ, XIX (November, 1902), 16; "Editorial," LHJ, XXXI (March, 1914), 5-6; and "Editorial," LHJ, XV (June, 1898), 14. See also "Problems of Young Men," LHJ, XIII (January, 1896), 14; and "Editorial," LHJ, XXXII (September, 1915), 5-6.

[20]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XXXII (March, 1915), 3-4.

reputation. Bok observed with anxiety, however, that more and more girls seemed to be attracted to men who were considered "fast." Indeed, when word got around that a young man had "seen the world" he suddenly acquired a "singular glamour" in the eyes of many girls, including "girls as good and pure as were ever created." Clearly, the girls' attraction to the "scent of danger about such a man" was predicated on their total misunderstanding of what the term "fast" means, Bok said. Naively, the typical girl construed a "fast" man as one who did nothing more than indulge "in a few choice oaths, an hilarious time at the club, maybe an occasional overindulgence, and perhaps a 'fling', as it is called, at the poker table or a horse race." If that were all that "fast" means then it "would not be so fraught with grave danger." But Bok knew that the reputation for a fast life could "hardly be earned on such lines" and that American girls were especially vulnerable to these bad characters because they had been reared in a society which, because of "certain fancied sensibilities," had hesitated "to call a spade by its right name."[21]

Notwithstanding this criticism, after detailing what fast did not mean, the editor himself steadfastly refused to define what the word did mean, insisting that it was "not the function of any public writer to open the eyes of

---

[21]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIV (March, 1897), 14.

the young to the truthful definition of a questionable term." The responsibility to tell the girls "plainly and directly" what it meant rightly belonged to the girls' parents, guardians, or brothers although, Bok admitted, most of those people would fail to carry out this responsibility, ostensibly because they were protecting the girls from unwarrantable knowledge of "certain phases of life." Usually the true characters of fast men were not readily discernible; they were "clever, handsome of carriage, skilled in compliment, or graceful in deportment," just the ingredients to hide their evil nature and to entice many girls into marriage. Parenthetically, one might wonder who was most naive about what. Were the girls as naive about "fast" men as Bok was about the girls? Obviously, his view of their naiveté was built on his concept of woman's moral superiority and, implicitly, on the idea that woman's sexual drive is much weaker than man's.[22]

In the event that a woman married a man of "unclean reputation," however, it would not take her long to comprehend "that no arts nor graces can counterbalance a stained character," and Bok warned girls to avoid such a "calamity" by marrying a man only whose reputation meets

---

[22]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIV (March, 1897), 14; and "Problems of Young Men," LHJ, XIII (January, 1896), 14.

the approval of her parents and brothers.[23] Though a woman has tremendous powers of moral suasion, she should never deceive herself in the belief that she will be able to convert a "fast" man of unclean reputation into a husband of virtue and fidelity.

In an editorial in April, 1898, Bok directed his attention to the question of betrothal, observing as noted earlier that the modern American girl was the subject of considerable criticism for so capriciously breaking her engagements. But he claimed that, to a very large degree, such criticism was unfair. Indeed, the fact that she severed her marriage engagement actually demonstrated that she was fully aware of its importance and her responsibilities and that she intended to avoid the catastrophe of marrying the wrong man. The crux of the problem, Bok said, was that she did not always understand the "true gravity of a promise of marriage" before she was betrothed. Yet the girl should not have borne the brunt of the blame for this ignorance nor should her parents, because the real culprits were "the changing conditions of society" (an argument which Bok inconsistently but steadfastly refused to accept as an excuse for the growing independence of young girls, as will be noted later). Hence, parents should have made

---

[23]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIV (March, 1897), 14; and "Problems of Young Men," LHJ, XIII (January, 1896), 14.

renewed efforts to advise America's young women of the far-reaching consequences of betrothal to convince them that "betrothal should be just as sacred as the marriage. It is the gravest of the two steps which bind two people together because it is the initiative."[24]

In analyzing this compact between two young adults, Bok was "inclined to lay special emphasis upon the girl's responsibility," because while it is man's prerogative to ask, "it is for woman to answer, and the reply is infinitely more important than the question." The young woman must be cognizant that a girl who has broken a betrothal two or three times will never again command the same respect from young men. Furthermore, he explained, by avoiding long engagements young couples can reduce the chance of broken engagements. A long acquaintanceship before betrothal is very good but once that firm commitment is made the time until marriage should be rather brief.[25]

Editor Bok also held firmly the conviction that a woman should not marry until she and her intended were sufficiently old. For the girl, twenty-three was a good age but for the man the ideal age for marriage was between

---

[24]Edward Bok, "The First Flowers," LHJ, XV (April 1898), 18.

[25]Edward Bok, "The First Flowers," LHJ, XV (April 1898), 18; and "Problems of Young Men," LHJ, XII (January, 1895), 12.

twenty-five and thirty, or even thirty-five. Although the average age for marriage for both men and women was rising --seventy percent of men married between twenty-five and thirty in 1893--Bok still was distressed over statistics testifying to excessive teenage marriages. It is bad enough for a female under twenty to marry but it is disastrous for a male because he is just a "boy" who "doesn't know himself, let alone know a woman," and who does not yet possess those manly attributes of "guidance and confidence" which a man must be able to offer his wife. As a matter of fact, until he reaches a minimum age of twenty-five he is "absolutely incapable" of caring for and supporting a wife. So, Bok advised his readers, in selecting a mate the least a young woman can do "is to marry a man, and not a boy."[26]

Assuming that a wholesome marriage has been made, Bok wrote, the husband will exhibit definite positive attributes. And an examination of those traits can help shed further light on his view of woman. Of course, the ideal husband will manifest the realization that he has departed the "world of self" and entered a world of cooperation where the "husband and wife are equal: the one not inferior to the other: the wife not a slave: not a housekeeper--

---

[26]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (March, 1893), 12; "Editorial," LHJ, XVII (May, 1900), 14; and "Problems of Young Men," LHJ, XIV (March, 1897), 35.

but an equal: a companion." He will demonstrate the equality of the partners and the mutuality of the marriage relationship by having "absolute confidence" in his wife and sharing with her the duties and benefits of marriage.[27]

Secondly, the sterling husband will observe his wife's "great need of consideration," a need "felt by so many wives and so little understood by husbands." Next to love itself, Bok believed, women appreciate consideration--in fact, in tandem, love and consideration complete "a combination that raises a man to the highest pinnacle of a woman's love and respect." Bok offered several examples of the type of consideration he had in mind. For instance, the husband should remain sensitive to his wife's need for a periodic evening out of the home at a party, the theater, a lecture, or an opera. Too few men realize that such diversions from her normal household activities serve as a tonic of considerable efficacy for the wife. Of such moment was it for a man to help restore his wife's vigor by relinquishing an occasional evening at home by the fire with a good book and fine cigar that Bok allotted an entire editorial to that subject. The husband can also manifest consideration for his spouse by avoiding undue discussion of his business affairs at home. True, the wife will act interested and may even be interested in some aspects of

---

[27]Edward Bok, "To a Young Man About to Marry," LHJ, XVIII (October, 1901), 16.

his business, but for the most part any interest she has comes only from the fact he is interested. "She has no inherent love" for business because it is not her sphere.[28]

Thirdly, a new husband must learn to treat his wife's mother with utmost respect. Regardless of the depth of love between man and wife, the husband is not "all-sufficient to his wife." His wife's love for her mother and vice versa did not cease when she married him.[29]

In addition to these "subtle" earmarks of an ideal husband, Bok outlined several distinguishing traits of a more material nature. First, he insisted that the husband provide the couple "a home of their own" because the home is "the most important place in the world." The home is not simply where the heart is, as the adage goes, it actually possesses material characteristics. Not just any residence, for example, is a home. "Permanent happiness is impossible for a newly-wed couple in a boarding house or hotel" because in such a dwelling they do not have their own possessions, only rented furnishings, and consequently cannot express themselves in their surroundings. The wife does not prepare meals or make curtains or otherwise create

---

[28]Edward Bok, "To a Young Man About to Marry," LHJ, XVIII (October, 1901), 16; "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (May, 1893), 12; and "Editorial," LHJ, XIII (October, 1896), 14.

[29]Edward Bok, "To a Young Man About to Marry," LHJ, XVIII (October, 1901), 16.

her own home, and without these duties of home she occupies her time shopping, visiting friends, reading, or whatever. Hence, she is a wife in "mere name." The only way for her to become a wife in the fullest sense of the term is "through her wise direction of a home"--with "home" meaning a single family dwelling.[30]

Fortunately God in His wisdom has placed in "every American man" a strong attachment to the woman who yearns for "the joy and pleasure of her own home, no matter how small and insignificant." The wife must not necessarily do the housework herself. It is certainly permissible to employ servants when the couple can afford it, especially when they have children. But the wife must at least manage the housecleaning, food preparation, and, with her husband's assistance, the decoration and furnishing of the home. The material environment influences mankind "mightily" and, therefore, unless the couple puts its "own expression" into the home, then it cannot be called by that name; it is only a residence.[31]

Incidentally, Bok believed that a man would be doing a good service to his family and himself if he moved his

---

[30]Edward Bok, "The Beginning of Married Life," LHJ, XVIII (November, 1901), 16; "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (March, 1895), 12; and "Editorial," LHJ, XIV (November, 1897), 14.

[31]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIV (November, 1897), 14.

family to the suburbs away from the "close unventilated city quarters . . . in the polluted atmosphere of the crowded centers." His family would thrive in the sunshine and space of the suburbs and he would find the train ride to and from town "infinitely more comfortable" than his trips on the overcrowded urban trolleys and elevated railways.[32]

Moreover, Bok preached, an exemplary husband must from the very beginning of marriage keep his wife "thoroughly posted as to his income," not only because it helps cement the mutuality of the marriage but because the wife should assist in determining the most efficient allocation of the money. Indeed, Bok personally believed that in most instances the wife is the "wisest custodian of the family income" because she does not, as popularly claimed, spend money extravagantly. Man, on the other hand, "is either penurious or he is extravagant;" he seems never to take the middle ground. Most of the numerous marriages wrecked by family indebtedness could probably be salvaged if the wives were given full custody of family finances.[33]

Short of that, however, the husband should at least keep the wife informed of his income and recognize the

---

[32]Edward Bok, "The American Man and the Country," LHJ, XVII (July, 1900), 14.

[33]Edward Bok, "To a Young Man About to Marry," LHJ, XVIII (October, 1901), 16.

wife's "right" to an ample allowance for her own personal needs, an amount apart from that used for family expenses. The wife should never have to ask her husband for money to buy a new dress, bonnet, or other personal items. Such "humiliating dependence" upon her husband for every trifle she needs makes "thousands of women restless and anxious for outside careers." And on top of all these considerations, Bok urged each married man to insure his life for the benefit of his wife, potentially the "wisest" of all his acts.[34]

While Bok advised husbands to share responsibilities with their wives and to nurture mutual understanding and respect, he still managed to keep her on her pedestal. "The men of our land can, therefore, scarcely withhold their choicest gifts from the women of their hearts and homes," Bok wrote. "Their comfort must come first; their pleasure must give man pleasure; their happiness must precede ours; their safety above all. Woman first; then man!"[35]

The Journal's editor, of course, more than balanced his advice for husbands with advice for married women. It

---

[34]Edward Bok, "To a Young Man About to Marry," LHJ, XVIII (October, 1901), 16; and "The Editorial Page," LHJ, XVIII (March, 1901), 16.

[35]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (May, 1893), 12.

is preeminently important, he said, for a wife to realize that "a home is no better than the woman in it" because she is the one who establishes the family's moral criteria. Woman's moral superiority to man offers her an unparalleled opportunity in her role as wife to accomplish her divine imperative to "point men to good deeds," and she should steadfastly resist lowering "that standard of refinement instinctive to her."[36]

Another cardinal principle for the wife to follow in nurturing a healthy relationship with her husband is to maintain a youthful heart. She should avoid the "myriad of unnecessary cares" and the numerous encumbrances upon her time and energy which cause her to grow old in spirit before her days, thereby effecting a deterioration in her relationship with her husband. Accordingly, the key to remaining youthful is the "great gospel of simplicity," a matter Bok discussed at greater length in his editorials than any other subject save woman's moral responsibilities. Expressing much apprehension and frustration about women making much to-do out of housekeeping and home decorating, in 1893, Edward Bok traced modern woman's "weaker nerves" to the "unhappy modern tendency toward excessive house-

---

[36]Edward Bok, "What Should a Young Wife Stand For?" <u>LHJ</u>, XIX (July, 1902), 18; and "At Home with the Editor," <u>LHJ</u>, XII (March, 1895), 12.

keeping" in homes built too large and decorated too elaborately.[37]

In the past, "housekeeping was a pleasure rather than a burden," he asserted. And why? Because in those halcyon days the "kitchen was a study in simplicity"; rooms were furnished for comfort, not for show; and halls were halls, not rooms. True, "science and mechanism" had lightened certain aspects of domestic work but on the whole they had not eased woman's work, for while they had eliminated some manual labor they also brought on additional mental strain. A chief effect of these devices was to deceive women into thinking they could do more than they could.[38]

Furthermore, even servants did not help relieve woman's nerves appreciably because, like appliances, servants reduced the manual labor while simultaneously increasing the mistress's responsibilities. As a solution to the growing incidence of weak nerves due to excessive housekeeping, Bok proposed returning to the simpler life of earlier days, not by eliminating the new technology and firing servants but by returning to smaller, less

---

[37]Edward Bok, "What Should a Young Wife Stand For?" LHJ, XIX (July, 1902), 18; Bok noted the following year that medical authorities were convinced women were becoming healthier and more vigorous. Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (December, 1894), 16.

[38]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (August, 1893), 14.

ostentatious, more livable homes. Unless women were able to make housekeeping a pleasure again, Bok believed, they risked moving from "over-tired nerves to discouragement, a complaining tongue, an irritable disposition, too great strain upon the brain and a final collapse." But the wise woman avoids frustration and nervous breakdown by implementing in the home the techniques a man uses in business: simplifying household furnishings, systematizing her work, and using new devices when they actually save work. Following this scheme, the woman will find that housework is no longer a drudgery and that her relationship with her husband will remain warm because she will have retained that youthful verve which husbands find so satisfying. Housework can and should be a pleasure for woman--after all, it is all part of God's scheme for the universe.[39]

Another facet of wifehood which Bok brought to the attention of his readers was woman's intellectual development. A man, because of his constant touch with the outer world, continually absorbs new ideas and information and will eventually broaden his horizons well beyond his wife's unless she makes a determined effort to keep pace with him. She will have time for personal enrichment if she follows

---

[39]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," _LHJ_, X (August, 1893), 14; "The American Woman and Her Home," _LHJ_, XXXIII (September, 1916), 34; "The Beginning of Married Life," _LHJ_, XVIII (November, 1901), 16; "Is It Worthwhile?" _LHJ_, XVII (November, 1900), 18; and "The Editorial Page," _LHJ_, XVIII (March, 1901), 16.

the gospel of simplicity. Estrangement often occurs, Bok cautioned, when the wife's intellectual development is not commensurate with her husband's because she no longer offers him intelligent companionship.[40]

The wife should also endeavor to be neat and clean. In 1916, Bok cited an incident where a man filed for divorce because his wife was never "fresh and neat and clean" around the house. Each morning the same sorry spectacle occurred as she appeared wearing "a slouchy kimono slipped on over almost nothing," messy slippers, and one of her "detestable boudoir caps." Sundays were worst: she traipsed around the house in unsightly disarray until late afternoon or early evening and then she underwent "a transformation into false hair, paint, and powder." The man asked the judge how anyone could respect a woman like that; the children were too embarrassed to bring friends home because of it. Although a divorce could not be granted on those grounds, the judge ordered a separation and Bok left the distinct impression that he concurred with the judge's decision.[41]

Notwithstanding the importance of the foregoing advice Bok gave American wives, Bok felt that in the final

---

[40]Edward Bok, "What Should a Young Wife Stand For?" LHJ, XIX (July, 1902), 18.

[41]Edward Bok, "The American Woman and Her Home," LHJ, XXXIII (October, 1916), 42.

analysis the success of a wife depends "purely and mainly" on her ability to give her husband "love and sympathy." If she manifests love and sympathy, the couple can resolve almost any of the problems which normally crop up in marriage.[42]

Woman's responsibilities in the home obviously are not restricted to her role as wife. She is also a mother, and the future moral standards of society rest on the effectiveness of her moral ministrations to her children. "The time which a boy spends at his mother's knee is never forgotten by the man," Edward Bok proclaimed. "Our morality is learned there. Our characters are formed there." Understandably, the realization that a growing number of mothers were relinquishing care of their children to nurses or were sending their children to kindergarten at very early ages ostensibly to provide them with better training and education was disturbing to Bok. The child suffers from this practice because rudimentary moral instruction from a mother is worth its weight in gold and is indisputably more important than "grammatical excellence" and "correct phrasing." Besides, the lessons learned from the nurse or kindergarten teacher are soon forgotten.[43]

---

[42]Edward Bok, "What Should a Young Wife Stand For?" LHJ, XIX (July, 1902), 18.

[43]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIII (November, 1896), 14.

If however the woman's abdication of her motherly responsibilities is due to "physical or mental necessity," Bok the pragmatist could accept it. Indeed, in 1915, anxious to alleviate some of the burdens of motherhood, Bok not only strongly endorsed the current agitation for day nurseries for children of working mothers but he was further convinced that the campaign should be expanded. Governmentally financed nurseries should be established in virtually every neighborhood across the nation to aid working mothers as well as those women who, although not employed outside the home, need some time away from their children from time to time in order to be "free in heart and nerve." Such occasional free time rejuvenates the mothers' sagging spirits and permits them to complete their shopping or whatever with fewer frustrations and infinitely greater efficiency. Besides, it is unhealthy for the children, especially young ones, to be subjected to congested streets, crowded aisles and stifling trolleys. The only women who would not benefit from these nurseries are those from the one percent of Americans who are sufficiently wealthy to afford servants in their homes.[44]

That Bok would support government financing of day nurseries when he was normally loath toward such government programs is an index both of his desire to ease strains on

---

[44]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XXXII (May, 1915), 4.

American mothers and his grudging acquiescence to female employment. But even in making concessions by advocating such reforms, Bok did not abjure his beliefs that the child learns best when taught by the "spirit of the mother-heart" and that no newfangled education "system, however improved by modern skill," can do as well as mother.[45]

Bok also perceived paternal responsibility for teaching children moral and academic lessons, but he relegated it to a position secondary to woman's. He bemoaned the fact that men are not "greater factors" than they are in rearing children; the American father sees too little of his children and "he knows even less about them." Until that situation is corrected the mother will have to compensate by carrying part of his weight. Yet, no matter how active a father might become in rearing his children, the mother's influence will ever remain dominant because "a woman has a power for influence in her training that a man can never exert. That instinct is God-given; it is hers and hers alone."[46]

Obviously, not all mothers prove themselves capable mothers. In 1904, in an editorial entitled "The Ratio of Real Mothers," Bok registered consternation at a

---

[45] Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIII (November, 1896), 14.

[46] Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (March, 1895), 12.

contemporaneous study showing that eight hundred and thirty-five children under five years old had died in one American city in one year's time and a children's doctor in that community had remarked that to him the real surprise of the study was that no more than that had died. His forty-three years of practice had convinced the physician that the ratio of "real mothers" who knew the proper care of their children was ten percent. Mothers' lack of knowledge of proper diet and care of children was almost beyond belief, he said; it was "criminal ignorance."[47]

Edward Bok commented that Americans are taught to believe that the "normal woman has the instinct of motherhood within her," but these facts and observations raised in his mind substantial doubt "whether that instinct is always accompanied by either the average intelligence or the simplest common sense." Whatever the cause, there is no excuse for lack of proper care of children. And, although Bok was by no means an advocate of small families and did not want "to deprive the poor of the pleasurable companionship of children," he resolutely believed that unless a family could afford domestic help for the mother the family should be kept small enough that the mother had time and energy enough to cope with all her responsibilities. Indeed, Bok's sensibilities were highly offended by the man

---

[47]Edward Bok, "The Ratio of Real Mothers," LHJ, XXI (January, 1904), 16.

who expected his wife to rear "five to eight children regardless of her strength or irrespective of his ability to provide suitable help for her."[48] This was the closest Edward Bok came to espousing birth control.

In summary, woman's sphere is the home, "the most important place in the world," and there she fulfills her roles as wife and mother. Evidently, the editor was not sure which role was more important. On one occasion Bok asserted that woman's "first duty in the home is to her children" and on another he insisted that the call of the child is second only to the call of the husband and the home.[49] Such inconsistencies however can be explained by the distance in time between these comments and by the fact that in each case Bok was attempting to reinforce his arguments for motherhood and wifehood respectively.

Whatever the reasons for these inconsistencies, Bok believed that women belong in the home where they wield "the power of the world"; men play only a secondary role. "Men may have consummated" the world's greatest achievements, "but women have shaped them" in the home. So profound is woman's impact that Bok suggested constructing

---

[48]Edward Bok, "The Ratio of Real Mothers," _LHJ_, XXI (January, 1904), 16.

[49]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," _LHJ_, XII (March, 1895), 12; "Editorial," _LHJ_, XIII (November, 1896), 14; and "The Ratio of Real Mothers," _LHJ_, XXI (January, 1904), 16.

monuments not only to heroes but to their mothers as well.[50] The editor apparently intended to place woman on a pedestal both figuratively and literally.

Given Edward Bok's views on woman's roles in the home, did he cordon off the remainder of the world and mark it for men only? No, Bok was willing to let woman venture beyond the hearth, but only in carefully prescribed directions and a specifically defined radius. The limits Bok imposed on woman's activities outside the home are the subjects of the next chapter.

---

[50]Edward Bok, "Problems of Young Men," LHJ, XII (May, 1895), 14; and "The Editorial Page," LHJ, XX (September, 1903), 16.

CHAPTER II

BEYOND THE HEARTH

Edward Bok admitted that "a complete absorption of domestic affairs, to the exclusion of all other things, is as dwarfing to a woman as a complete absorption of business affairs is detrimental to a man."[1] He also conceded that certain exigencies might make permissible for women a number of activities that under normal conditions would not be acceptable. The aim of this chapter is to further clarify Edward Bok's view of woman's role in society by explicating tenets regarding woman's involvement in the marketplace, domestic service, college, women's clubs, and the feminist movement.

The *Journal*'s editor matter-of-factly assumed that women are not suited for the marketplace. True, women had for years attempted to move into the business world, but their incompetency had become so notorious, Bok declared in the mid-1890s, that it was already producing a marked constriction in female employment. The girls failed to perform satisfactorily under pressure and had too great a propensity to quit their jobs to get married. For a while,

---

[1]Edward Bok, "The Wisdom of New York," *LHJ*, XIX (June, 1902), 16.

employers had "overlooked" women's incompetency because women worked for lower wages than men, but gradually "there came the inevitable weeding process" when businessmen, realizing that hiring female employees even at lower wages was not profitable in the long run, resumed the practice of hiring men. Bok was convinced that the alleged decline in female employment was based not upon male prejudice against women but upon facts. And, the facts pointed to one thing--"the unnatural position of woman in business." Having made her a woman, God "never intended her for the rougher life planned out for man. . . . It was not man that stood in her path: it was herself."[2]

Because the marketplace is outside woman's sphere, Bok registered deep anxiety over its debilitating effect upon women who flouted nature by entering it. And in his estimation there was plenty of reason for concern. Unable to cope with the demands of their employment, women in large numbers were leaving their positions in business and filling "rest cures, sanitariums and hospitals to the doors." Even relatively light jobs took their toll on women. Bok noted that "oculists and specialists in nervous diseases are entering into the question by declaring that the typewriter is ruinous to the eyesight and back-nerves of girls and women." And even if women still "in the formative

---

[2]Edward Bok, "The Return of the Business Woman," LHJ, XVII (March, 1900), 16.

period of their life" were to immediately exit the marketplace, Bok was convinced that they would continue for a lifetime to feel the enervating effects of that unnatural arena.[3]

Physical harm was not the only evil impact of business upon woman. Bok feared the effect such work would have on her femininity. Most women in business lose their "gentleness and womanliness," he said, reflecting his idyllic view of woman. To work in the predominantly male bailiwick has never done one woman any good, but it has injured thousands. Though the effect may be only in her speech, or "in an unconsciously-assumed manner that belongs to men rather than to women," or in a new, "broader" way of "looking at things," it is still harmful. Following these observations, Bok made a statement which nowadays may seem rather innocuous but which likely packed a powerful punch for Bok's Victorian readers. "I should like to be plainer on this subject if I could, for the benefit of those girls to whom a business career is so attractive. But there are some things better left unsaid." Whatever those unsaid things were, Bok pointedly reassured his readers that in making this comment he did not mean to imply any disrespect for working girls in general. Indeed, they knew what he

---

[3]Edward Bok, "The Return of the Business Woman," LHJ, XVII (March, 1900), 16; and "Editorial," LHJ, XIII (December, 1895), 20.

was referring to, he said, because it was those unspoken considerations that made working girls so loath to see their younger sisters enter the marketplace. Bok argued emphatically that no other single factor in contemporary America was contributing to the degeneration of young womanhood as girls' "mad race" from domestic life into the business world.[4]

Illustrative of this point was an editorial Bok wrote in response to a large number of inquiries from readers interested in becoming journalists. The editorial consisted essentially of quotations from reputable newspaper men and women to whom Bok had put the question, "Is the newspaper office the place for a girl?" A large majority said no, emphatically. Among their reasons for negative responses were that such work is "an appalling moral eye-opener"; that the freedom of the job "deteriorates into all sorts of license of language and behavior" characteristic of "Bohemians"; and that a woman reporter is vulnerable to improper advances. The few whom he quoted who approved of girls working in press rooms did so with the reservation that the girl should possess tremendous strength of character, good health, and clearness of thought.[5]

---

[4]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIII (February, 1896), 14.

[5]Edward Bok, "Is the Newspaper Office the Place for a Girl?" LHJ, XVIII (February, 1901), 18.

Because woman is unfit for business, it did not necessarily follow in Bok's scheme that she is unfit for all employment. If a woman actually needs her own source of income she should seek a job in domestic service, where she is "safe from danger" and where her "surroundings might be elevating and congenial." In the marketplace woman "is on foreign soil: in the other she is in her natural sphere." And, domestic opportunities were abundant. Throughout the United States tens of thousands of "refined and cultured homes" were in great need of "intelligent, competent service," he said.[6] Incidentally, it was reflective of Bok's idealistic vision of the home that he never warned his sweet young readers that they should be as wary in selecting a position in a home as in selecting one in business.

Despite the innumerable openings for women in household work in 1896, Bok still witnessed a disturbingly large number of women leaving domestic service to go to the marketplace. One reason so many were moving into the business world was that they believed a job in business was more "respectable." Women were not receiving adequate recognition "in their natural work," so they searched for unnatural employment, hoping to find more satisfaction. Secondly, Bok noted that women were leaving domestic service because they did not like the idea of being called

---

[6]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIII (February, 1896), 14.

servants. Yet, in business establishments that was exactly what they were, servants. There could be no doubt that businessmen demonstrated much less leniency toward their employees than women in American homes offered their domestic servants.[7]

Bok also claimed that many women sought employment in business on the mistaken assumption that it gave them a much higher degree of independence. Compared to the business woman (employee or employer), the poor, hard-working woman in a home was "a queen of independence." And, compared to a business career, domestic work was a "perfect Elysium of leisure." No one denied that a domestic employee may have had to take orders, but the orders were given by her loving mother or a compassionate mistress, not a stranger who had no interest in her except the amount of work she could produce. The young girl must remember, Bok counseled, that business is designed not to take care of young women but solely to make money.[8]

A major ingredient in the young woman's quest for independence was her desire to "have her evenings to herself." If she worked in a home as a domestic she could count on only one full evening each week, the girls

---

[7]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIII (February, 1896), 14; and "What Women Find To Do All Day," LHJ, XVI (April, 1899), 20.

[8]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (April, 1893), 18.

contended, but in the marketplace she could have every evening to herself. Bok disagreed with that assertion, conceding that "nominally it is true, but only nominally." Actually, she had "not a whit more leisure" because, as a rule, she arrived home in the evening exhausted from her day behind a counter or at a desk or machine. If she were truly interested in performing her job as well as possible, she would retire just as early as her sister in domestic service. Besides, during the day a maid at least had a little free time for personal sewing or to rest or whatever. Reiterating his concern for woman's physical well-being, Bok said that the girl in domestic service worked in much healthier conditions because she did not have to, as a business girl must, brave the elements to get to work. And, usually the maid had the opportunity to go with the family for whom she worked to the seashore or mountains for the entire summer for relief from the stifling heat of the city. The business girl may have gotten two weeks' vacation but she could not have taken them in the summer. "And all this the average girl endures because she can have her evenings to herself," Bok commented sarcastically.[9]

Bok likewise found it distressing that so many young girls who were seeking independence by getting jobs in business were doing so for utterly ridiculous reasons.

---

[9]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XV (February, 1898), 14.

Some sought jobs because disagreement with their parents prompted them to exercise some "rights" they thought they were "old enough to have"; or after a lover's quarrel they wanted to prove to their lovers that they could be independent of man if they chose to be; or they wanted to escape the stultifying effects of home so they could earn more money to buy better clothes and have more fun.[10]

These are exactly the wrong reasons to seek employment. In getting a job for such senseless reasons, Bok remonstrated, a girl "usurps the place" which a much needier person should have. Accordingly, she keeps "numberless young men" from marriage because they cannot afford to care for a wife since they do not have a job or else do not get paid enough. In Bok's estimation, this was one of the "chief evils" attendant to women's participation in business. When one of Bok's male readers quizzed him about the degree to which the salary question influenced businessmen in hiring young women in preference to young men, Bok contradictorily responded that it would affect the young man only at the beginning of his career when he may, for example, have to temporarily work for a lower salary. Once in a position, however, the "young women are then his

---

[10]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (April, 1893), 18.

equals--alas, that it should be so!--and if he can, with his ability, push ahead of her he may," and will.[11]

Bok refused, however, to place upon these young women all the blame for their misguided desire to work in the marketplace, for much of the blame should have been fixed upon the poor training they received at home from their parents, especially their mothers. For example, far too many well-to-do parents failed to give their daughters any "household knowledge," leaving the impression with the girls that domesticity is "purely and lowly menial" and therefore below them. Further, the parents perpetually complained of the "ignorant and unreliable element" who sought work as domestics--no wonder young women did not want to go into domestic service. Bok argued weakly that mistresses who complained of the poor quality of domestic help could only blame themselves because they had taught their daughters that this work was "beneath" them. While families that could afford household employees should not have necessarily made their daughters serve as domestics in their own homes, they unquestionably should have taught them that household work "is not 'beneath' the highest-bred girl ever born on this earth." And Bok noted with pleasure that educational institutions were breaking from

---

[11]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (April, 1893), 18; and "Problems of Young Men," LHJ, XII (May, 1895), 14.

the old mold and making strides to help demonstrate to the American people that domestic service is a "science" that can "challenge the most alert intelligence and keenest knowledge of the brightest girl."[12]

Parents who could afford household employees nevertheless should have had their daughters work "side by side" the domestic servants so that the daughters would learn domestic work and its value. By such a practice the parents simultaneously would be raising the servant's position to a level where the mistress could ask for and receive "a higher grade of work" from the servant.[13] In other words, Bok favored an all-out effort to restore to domestic service the prestige it once had and still deserved.

Evidence supports Bok's earlier assertion that women in growing numbers were leaving domestic employment for other jobs. However, the cause of that trend had less to do with the explanations Bok advanced than with urbanization and technological development. Proportionately, far more Americans than ever before were living in urban centers where more jobs were available. Carl Degler has noted that power-driven machinery in factories reduced the need for heavy physical labor, therefore opening more jobs to

---

[12]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIII (February, 1896), 14.

[13]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIII (February, 1896), 14.

women. Further, new household appliances could perform much of the work servants traditionally had done while new domestic services and products, from processed foods to professional laundry services, reduced the volume of work actually performed in the home.[14]

Although in 1896, Bok had bemoaned the growing wave of women moving into business from domestic service, by 1898, he announced major changes in the nature of domestic service: people were attaching more dignity to the position and the mistresses' attitude toward servants was improving. Obviously, the extensive discussion of the "servant problem" in the Journal and other media had proven to the homemaker of America that much of the solution rested with her rather than the maid. The mistress had found she received much better service from her servant by treating her as a "faithful and intelligent girl" and paying her accordingly. At any rate, the menial qualities which domestic service once possessed were disappearing so rapidly, Bok reported, that a girl no longer needed to feel any reluctance in entering that vocation. In fact, domestic service had again come to mean a "position of responsibility and respect" and Bok advised girls promptly to "turn their heads in the right direction" before all the other capable

---

[14]Carl Degler, At Odds (New York, 1980), pp. 373-376.

girls recognized this and began rushing into domestic service.[15]

In an editorial two years later Bok reiterated that the "tide of women rushing pell-mell into all kinds of business had been stemmed" and that it was already perceptibly receding because the women were neither physically nor psychologically suited for most jobs in business. Bok was very pleased that in large numbers business women were returning to domestic service, "a return from a false to a normal condition." Life for domestics and their mistresses was much better than it had ever been because each had a greater respect for the other: never was there a time when the domestic service problem was so close to "its own logical adjustment." Parenthetically, Bok concluded his turn of the century discussion of women in the marketplace playing the role of a prophet. "The twentieth century," Bok said, "will in no other aspect be so marked as in the natural and divine division of the world's labor which America is destined to present to the world: men for business and women for the home."[16] Events have proven Bok suffered from a case of myopia most unbecoming a prophet.

---

[15] Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XV (February, 1898), 14.

[16] Edward Bok, "The Return of the Business Woman," LHJ, XVII (March, 1900), 16.

Bok's later references to the return of girls to domestic service at the turn of the century cannot be substantiated in literature on woman's work outside the home. Since he did not mention particular studies or authorities to corroborate the vaunted return to domestic employment, he may very well have been drawing conclusions from personal observations. It would not have been the first time.

Because relatively large numbers of women were employed as teachers during the years Bok edited the Journal and because teaching, especially in lower grades, appears to require many of the very talents which Bok felt woman inherently possesses, it would seem Bok might have endorsed teaching as a positive option for women. He did not; neither did he condemn it. For all practical purposes he simply ignored it as an option. His silence, to an extent, therefore, illustrates just how strong he saw the interrelationship between womanhood and the physical home environment. Further, Bok so unequivocably opposed physically taxing jobs for women that he did not find it necessary to attack such preposterous notions as female employment in industry, despite the fact that already by the early twentieth century, a significant number of women were so employed.

Bok's basic stance on female employment, therefore, was that if it is necessary for a woman to have a job he would not quarrel with her working, but she should not work

unless it is absolutely necessary. And, if she does work outside her own home, she should make every attempt to work as a domestic so that she can remain in her divinely appointed sphere.[17]

Another facet of the feminine activity outside the home which Bok criticized was woman's pursuit of a traditional college education built around the same curricula

---

[17]In an editorial in 1903, entitled "The Mother of America," Bok made several statements which ran counter to certain generalizations that appear in the preceding paragraphs. In that article his purpose was to show the tremendous impact the Netherlands had on American society, an impact that he thought may have been greater than England's. Among other things he claimed that the Dutch introduced to the world a national educational system that gave females and males equal opportunities. The key point for this discussion was his summary of the effect that the Dutch educational system had on women once they reached adulthood. They were:

". . . not the mere slaves of men, not alone the equals of men, but to the amazement of foreigners they were not absolute autocrats in their homes. Those who had no family cares became the sole managers of family estates, or branched out into agriculture and became farmers, delved into commerce and became merchants or manufacturers, while those of finer tastes became poets and painters. And, centuries after, we see women holding the same positions and enjoying the same freedom in America as did the Dutch woman in those early days. The direct influence of the emancipation of women as a sex--whether we regard the question from the original source of the laws relating to a married woman, her equal education with men, or her absolute sovereignty in the home--came from the Netherlands."

Because these comments are so drastically different from Bok's numerous statements elsewhere, because other parts of the essay abundantly reflected Bok's proclivity toward hyperbole, and because of his intense pride in his Dutch origins, these comments do not weaken the generalizations in the preceding pages. Edward Bok, "The Mother of America," LHJ, XX (October, 1903), 16.

generally prescribed for men. It is considerably more important for woman to be taught the "mysteries of the cooking stove and the plain, practical things of life," Bok said, than for her to live on Parnassus and hold "soulful commune with esoterics and aesthetics." A woman graduating with the usual academic degree may have been proficient in academic subjects but she never seemed able "to keep a simple account of her own expenses." In an article entitled "Women as 'Poor Pay'," Bok observed that women, including college-educated ones, did not understand the significance of the simplest business transaction because they had never received training in that area. They often failed to pay their bills for prolonged periods of time, not realizing the simple obligation to pay a bill as soon as it comes due. "High-sounding knowledge" simply does not ground young women in the "practical lessons of living."[18]

Once married, the college-bred woman becomes frustrated because she finds "nothing practical" in her academic background to apply to the domestic activities which have become her life's work. On the editorial page in one issue of the Journal, Bok printed with his avid endorsement an article by Mrs. Katharine Roich addressed to

---

[18]Edward Bok, "The College and the Stove," LHJ, XX (April, 1903), 16; "Editorial," LHJ, XVII (May, 1900), 16; and "Women as 'Poor Pay'," LHJ, XVIII (June, 1901), 14.

those college-bred women suffering under the oppression of household drudgery and boredom. Mrs. Roich advised the "restless housekeeper" to put more mind in her work; to find in her daily occupations studies interesting and important." In response to those who might have scoffed at housewives for being unintellectual and unimportant, she rhetorically asked whether a woman's life would be more a credit to her college training if she were to "shut herself away with old German, or painting," or if she dedicated it to her home "where body, and soul, and mind are cared for."[19] It is doubtful that her comments were of either help or consolation to the frustrated college-educated women.

A young woman does not have to decide exclusive of the other whether she should pursue a college degree or acquire domestic skill; she can have both. Indeed, for any woman who can afford it, Bok strongly endorsed a college education with a combination of scholarly and domestic science courses. Such an integrated curriculum prepares her not only for cooking, cleaning, and sewing but also for instructing her children in art, literature, and science and for conversing more intelligently with her husband. Bok praised the three thousand "sensible" girls who graduated in May, 1900, from new domestic science courses where "the

---

[19]Katharine Roich, "The College-Bred Woman in Her Home," LHJ, XVI (July, 1899), 14.

college and the stove" were united to employ the greatest knowledge and skills which girls could muster. The domestic science course of study was not a watered-down curriculum, he asserted; it was just as rigorous as any other course of study, challenging "the most alert intelligence and keenest knowledge of the brightest girls."[20]

While Bok could see many possible advantages of a college education for women, especially when they study domestic science, he also foresaw danger. Academic ambition is "in many ways the most deadly foe to a young woman's character" because it attracts her "away from her true place in life" and makes her a "cold, unloved and unhelpful woman, instead of a joyous, affectionate and unselfish blessing to a home and friends." Pursuing a career in academe, therefore operating within the male sphere, is defeminizing. Unsurprisingly, many of Bok's women acquaintances, who had "steeped themselves with the ologies and osophies until their pretty heads fairly reeled," never married. College training for women, when oriented around woman's sphere, Bok endorsed: but the female scholar is an extraneous and abnormal part of society. In 1893, Bok contended that women do not need "higher education" so much as they need "some good, strong doses of lower education" which teaches the fuller

---

[20]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XVII (May, 1900), 16; and XIII (February, 1896), 14.

development of charity for and patience with others' faults.[21]

In this regard, Edward Bok was not altogether at odds with feminists of his day. His staunchly held conviction that education plays a vital role in supplementing woman's intrinsic motherly talents corresponded with what Sheila M. Rothman calls the progressives' "ideology of educated motherhood."[22] Of course, he did not go as far as many progressive advocates of educated motherhood, but he agreed that an educated mother (using his concept of education, of course) would be most likely to produce healthy, well-adjusted, and successful children. Indeed, it was his desire for educated motherhood that spawned Bok's efforts in the Journal to promote sex education for children, combat patent medicines, provide advice from doctors, nurses, and educators, and in general broaden woman's understanding of the home and the world.

Edward Bok also put his pen to a fourth area of feminine endeavor outside the home--woman's participation in club activities. Some of his arguments on this subject coincide with those he advanced against woman's involvement

---

[21]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XI (July, 1894), 14; "Editorial," LHJ, XVII (May, 1900), 16; and "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (October, 1893), 16.

[22]Sheila M. Rothman, Woman's Proper Place (New York, 1978), pp. 97-132.

in the marketplace and to discuss them here would be redundant. Several topics are worth comment.

Bok maintained with dubious historical accuracy that women's clubs "unquestionably sprang from men's clubs" when women, resentful of all-male clubs, attempted to retaliate by organizing societies and clubs exclusively for women. But retaliation failed, and instead of drawing the sexes together as women had hoped, the exercise actually broadened the schism between the sexes, much to Bok's disfavor. For as long as the sexes are "arrayed against each other" rather than intermingled in a healthy fashion, "society will be the worse for it."[23]

Yet, Bok was not on all counts opposed to women's clubs. He admitted that woman benefits from occasional retreat from the routine of domestic activity and from meeting with her friends in different surroundings for social betterment or for personal improvement. It was a sad indictment upon many American women, however, that they were permitting their clubs to become ends in themselves rather than means for personal and social enrichment. Once clubs become ends in themselves, it is only a matter of time before women are putting club

---

[23]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XV (September, 1898), 14.

affairs before their motherly and wifely responsibilities.[24]

Bok printed a letter he had received from a woman who could not find trustworthy domestic servants to help train and care for her son and who, herself, did not have time to do it since she had so many "'duties of a charitable and religious nature.'" Bok rebuked the woman by pointing out that she and so many others of the same ilk confused the word "duty" with the term "claim upon my time." Regardless of the nature or the import of an outside activity, it is never a duty, only a claim on her time. Woman's <u>duty</u> is her home and family, club work is only a claim on her time. He reminded his correspondent further that there is never such a thing as conflicting duties because God never gives a woman more duties than she can effectively handle. Hence, woman must exercise caution before entering upon any club activity because managing a household "is about all the average woman can do well." In 1900, Bok cited Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt as an example of a woman who offered "benefit of her talents and gifts to her husband, her children, and her friends" rather than to club activities. Of course Mrs. Roosevelt may not have been a favorite of the "aggressive clubwoman

---

[24]Edward Bok, "Editorial," <u>LHJ</u>, XV (September, 1898), 14.

or the assertive female publicist," but to Bok's way of thinking that was to her credit.[25]

Furthermore, woman must take heed that her "club keeps within its sphere--that of the social, mental and education improvement of the sex and the children." If it remains true to its purpose the club will perform a "high and mighty" service. Unfortunately, late nineteenth century woman had permitted her club work to venture far afield into the "maelstrom" of politics and other matters, "the conduct of which it is not given women to rightly understand, and in which they can do no good." Engaged in these inappropriate activities, the club benefits neither the woman nor society. Even when a club operates within its proper sphere there is the distinct possibility that its work will be fruitless. For example, many feminine societies were engaged in charitable ventures which, although noble in their intent, reflected a total ignorance of the alleged hardships they purportedly were attempting to alleviate. In such instances the women only further beleaguered the poor. And, Bok complained, when women's clubs were not misdirecting their efforts into political matters or ill-advised charities, they were more than likely "doing nothing," only talking,

---

[25]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIII (November, 1896), 14; "The Rush of American Women," LHJ, XVI (January, 1899), 14; and "Editorial," LHJ, XVII (October, 1900), 16.

partying, or hearing "ill-digested" papers on Egyptian art or some other esoteric subject prepared from encyclopedias.[26]

In 1910, Bok initiated a running duel with the women's clubs of America with an inflammatory editorial entitled, "My Quarrel with Women's Clubs." Basing his arguments on woman's moral responsibilities to society, the editor censured women's clubs for failing to accomplish anything constructive, such as encouraging better sex education for children; searching for the causes and cures of the ponderously high percentage of blind babies; working for stricter marriage laws; attempting to abolish the practice of using public drinking cups; trying to end Fourth of July slaughter by fireworks; and attempting to surmount the problem of indecent advertisements.[27]

Years later in his autobiography, Bok said he had attacked the women's clubs purposely to provoke them into action. Whether that was his motive or not, that was the result because club women across the nation promptly began villifying the Journal. When some of them threatened to boycott the Journal, the editor responded by hiring legal

---

[26]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XV (September, 1898), 14; XXVII (January, 1910), 5-6; and "In an Editorial Way," LHJ, XXV (March, 1908), 5-6.

[27]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XXVII (January, 1910), 5.

counsel to begin antitrust proceedings against them. They quickly backed down and Bok carried the day, he said, because he had the evidence to support the accusations he had made. On the other hand, Bok received volumes of correspondence from women enumerating the numerous social and educational reform programs women's clubs had successfully undertaken.[28] Recognizing a promotional opportunity when he saw it, Bok immediately began running a monthly column, "What Women's Clubs are Doing," which developed into one of the magazine's largest and longest running departments and which the Board of Directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs endorsed.

Bok's provocation of women's clubs and his subsequent promotion of them through the good services of *Ladies' Home Journal* illustrated that Bok's views did not in all respects contravene the precepts of mainstream feminism. William L. O'Neill, in *Everyone Was Brave*, identifies women's club activities as a major ingredient of "social feminism"; and in *Woman's Proper Place*, in the chapter entitled "The Protestant Nun," Sheila M. Rothman advances the same point. Women's clubs nurtured through community projects and informational programs many of the progressive reforms, especially social reforms on the local level, that

---

[28] Edward Bok, *The Americanization of Edward Bok* (New York, 1932), pp. 297-302.

Edward Bok judged to be within the legitimate purview of women's clubs.[29] Just how much weight Bok carried in the advancement of social feminism will never be precisely demonstrable but, in light of the magazine's enormous circulation, it must have been substantial.

In the summer of 1893, Edward Bok trained his guns on a fifth type of female activity outside the home--the "new woman" movement. In an unusually caustic editorial he expressed his irascibility at the "idiotic clamor of certain eccentric and unpicturesque platform women" who denigrate woman's role in the home and advocate the elimination of sexual roles so that woman may enter any type of activity she finds to her liking. Fortunately, Bok said in a relieved tone, "these home-disappointed exhorters" will never be successful in remaking woman's sphere in the image of man's because "God's work was too well done in the original. His colors do not wash out, despite the hard scrubbing which some women give them."[30]

Of course, these types of comments outraged many of the Journal's readers and resulted in a deluge of protest letters. It would be interesting to read a large sampling of those letters but, of course, they have not survived

---

[29]William L. O'Neill, Everyone Was Brave (Chicago, 1971), pp. 77-106; and Sheila M. Rothman, Woman's Proper Place, pp. 61-93.

[30]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (August, 1893), 14.

and, unhappily, Bok did not make a practice of printing representative letters to the editor. Bok did write an editorial retort, in 1895, to the combined complaints of his readers who had inclinations toward or who actively participated in the new woman movement. He composed his rejoinder around a letter from a woman who had asked Bok if she inferred correctly from his editorials that he did not sympathize with the new woman and, if not, why? He replied superciliously that in order to develop any feelings whatsoever about an object one has to acknowledge the existence of the object. And, "there is no 'new woman': hence I can have no feelings for her one way or the other." The alleged new woman has only "two kinds of existence," he claimed; one type is in "the minds of a certain group of women; the other on paper." Beyond this ephemeral existence, the new woman did not and never would exist.[31]

In that same editorial, Bok also outlined a colorful if inaccurate interpretation of the history of the new woman movement. According to him, the movement had four distinct stages of development. The initial stage began with a group of women who protested that marriage as an institution was a failure. This was by no means a new assertion, but since it had not been bandied for some time it bore an air of freshness and, despite its foolishness,

---

[31]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (June, 1895), 14.

remained popular for a brief time among "a certain group of restless women." The feminists who advanced this argument were women who were always unhappy, generally for reasons of a "very personal nature," unless they could cause other women to be as restless and unhappy as some of their experiences had caused them to be. Although not necessarily a Freudian, here and elsewhere Bok pictured the new woman as a maladjusted female trying through her feminist activities to compensate for being born female rather than male. But it was not long, said Bok, before this myth was "exploded and its insulting untruthfulness laid bare," thus marking the demise of the first stage of the new woman movement.[32]

Ever resourceful, this same neurotic minority of women managed to salvage the dwindling movement and concomitantly earn more notoriety and money for themselves by changing their target. The aim of the second stage of the movement was to demonstrate "how devoid of morality" man is and to open the eyes of American girls before they rushed headlong into marriage with "those barbarians and monsters of inequity." This tack quickly proved as ineffectual as the first, according to Bok, because it was glaringly evident that, first, while man is by no means a saint he is certainly not as impure as the feminine activists professed

---

[32]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (June, 1895), 14.

him to be and, second, woman is as much to blame as man for man's moral shortcomings because she has not properly taught man and demanded from him higher moral standards.[33]

No sooner had this second stage begun to wane when a third stage emerged, built on the battle cry of equality of the sexes. The new women began insisting that woman is intellectually equal to man and therefore should be granted equality before the law, indeed in every facet of society. After his superficial description of this phase of the feminist argument Bok gave a simplistic explanation of the reason for its rapid decline. Since people "on every hand" already recognized the intellectual equality of man and woman, the entire question was moot.[34] Typical of a propagandist, Bok never gave a second premise to this syllogism that would have permitted him to logically conclude that universal recognition of woman's intellectual equality with man did not jibe with many of his explicit and implicit observations in other editorials.

At any rate, just when it appeared that the new woman movement had nowhere else to turn for a self-justifying rationale, Bok reasoned, the new woman found a new line of argument. She no longer decried inequality of intellect

---

[33]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (June, 1895), 14.

[34]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (June, 1895), 14.

but "an inequality of sex." The new woman "stopped quarreling with men and earthly institutions, and so far as one can gather from their present maunderings, their quarrel is with their Creator." The feminists were vexed simply "because they were women." Yet their new argument led nowhere because it had no point, Bok insisted. Obviously the feminists did not want to be male because "they have plainly told us that men are immoral and are dominant tyrants" and the new women resented being female because a woman was "a 'subject creature'--whatever that may mean." So, as far as Bok could see there was only one solution to the feminists' problem--the creation of a "third sex."[35]

If Edward Bok's correspondents had had any doubt about his stand on the new woman movement, this narrative on the history of feminism should have alleviated it once and for all. Two years later Bok wrote an editorial about the "recent collapse" of the new woman movement and, in effect, delivered its obituary. By 1897, the editor observed, the feminists "who ascended the platform, proclaimed for women's 'rights,' and made a wild and frantic effort to vote" were no longer in vogue. Sure, there were still some women who belittled others because they refused to wear short skirts and mount a wheel and otherwise were "fearfully 'behind the times,'" but they were in a distinct

---

[35]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (June, 1895), 14.

and declining minority. Those whom the progressive women had earlier dubbed old fashioned were, by 1897, the fashion setters. Why? Because nature is more potent than all the clamour of shrieking sisterhood, Bok remarked. There may have been thousands of women who did ride the wheel, but on the other hand were tens of thousands who did not.[36] During the nineties in his homiletics on feminist history, regretfully, Bok was more anxious to ridicule the new woman than to give an objective appraisal of her. He was guilty of reducing a complex issue to stereotypes and simplicities. Generally, Bok demonstrated better taste and greater understanding.

Although during the next several years Bok made some brief observations about various facets of the new woman movement and allotted much space to the franchise issue, he never again wrote an article so disparaging of the movement. Seldom one to saddle a certain individual or group with full responsibility for a problem, and perhaps trying to mollify some readers or potential subscribers, almost two decades later Bok conceded that men themselves had in the past contributed to the expansion of the feminist movement by failing to treat their wives as companions, but they were currently doing much better. The next year, 1916, he observed that had all women in the preceding

---

[36]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIV (September, 1897), 14; XV (June, 1898), 14.

century married good men and, consequently, satisfied their instinctive desire for usefulness and achievement in "the normal and ideal way," then there would have been no women seeking fulfillment by pounding lecterns and shouting slogans in behalf of the feminist movement. Perhaps, Bok suggested, a "Good Husband Movement" would prove more logical and productive than the woman movement.[37] Of course, even these statements would not have assuaged his feminist critics because they amounted to nothing more or less than a reaffirmation of his concept of spheres.

Because woman suffrage was the paramount issue of the feminist campaign during the Progressive Era, the editor of the world's largest woman's magazine could scarcely evade the subject. In replying to accusations from his readers that the Journal opposed woman's suffrage, Bok stated in an editorial, in 1895, that "the Journal has never opposed 'equal suffrage.'" But he also confessed that neither had the Journal advocated it.[38] Feeling somewhat forced by his readers into taking a position, he decided to study the subject thoroughly before making a public commitment. As he later noted in his autobiography, "he consulted women of every grade of intelligence and in every station

---

[37]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XXXII (March, 1915), 3-4; XXXIII (April, 1916), 12.

[38]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (August, 1895), 12.

in life" and then took a straw vote of a sampling of his subscribers to determine whether a majority favored or opposed female suffrage. The response "was most emphatic and clear." The preponderance of his respondents either opposed or were indifferent to the ballot while those who actually desired it "were negligible in number." As a matter of fact, American women did not even "care to look into the rights or wrongs of the subject" because they were more interested in other matters. What they really preferred was to find out more about the operation of the government, a very healthy sign in Bok's opinion, and consequently he decided to engage someone to write "an intelligent and authoritative" series of articles pertaining to the operations of the government. Sure enough, within a short time he found "the right man" to write the series.[39]

Because his readers showed no interest in reading articles which simply rehashed the pros and cons of the suffrage question, Bok decided to institute a systematic, objective investigation of conditions in several states where women had been voting for years. The study, conducted by journalist Richard Barry, revealed that there had been no outstanding accomplishments in those states

---

[39]Edward Bok, The Americanization of Edward Bok (New York, 1932), pp. 302-308; and "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, XII (August, 1895), 12.

where women had the franchise, certainly nothing approximating the inflated predictions of the suffragists. When Bok published Barry's article, in 1910, he wrote a foreword stating that "although the Ladies' Home Journal is, from policy, opposed to woman suffrage, it stood prepared and ready impartially to print Mr. Barry's investigations no matter which side the investigations favored." As luck would have it, right prevailed. The essentially sound article showed that states which allowed woman suffrage were no more progressive or reform oriented than those which did not, and in some instances even less progressive.[40]

Further, Bok examined the platform of the leading woman's suffrage organization, read speeches of the proponents of woman suffrage, and "talked at length" with such leaders of the movement as Susan B. Anthony, Julia Ward Howe, Anna Howard Shaw, and Jane Addams. Throughout the duration of all his probes and analyses, "Bok kept his mind open."[41] In his autobiography, The Americanization of Edward Bok, the author stated his rationale rather succinctly in his usual third-person style:

> The arguments that woman should not have a vote because she was a woman; that it would interfere with her work in the home; that it would make her more

---

[40]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XXVII (November, 1910), 15; and Richard Barry, "What Women Have Actually Done Where They Vote," LHJ, XXVII (November, 1910), 15.

[41]Edward Bok, The Americanization of Edward Bok (New York, 1932), pp. 302-308.

> masculine; that it would take her out of her home; that it was a blow at domesticity and an actual menace to the home life of America--these did not weigh with him. There was only one question for him to settle: was the ballot something which, in its demonstrated value or in its potentiality, would serve the best interests of American womanhood?
>
> After all his investigations of both sides of the question, Bok decided upon a negative answer. He felt that American women were not ready to exercise the privilege intelligently and that their mental attitude was against it.[42]

When Bok vacated his editorship of the *Journal* in 1919, he still had not given any indication in his editorials that he had changed his mind about woman suffrage nor did his autobiography written several years later indicate any shift in his thinking.

Although the preceding delineation of woman's activities into acceptable and unacceptable spheres goes a long way in describing Edward Bok's attitudes toward woman's role in society, it will still be helpful in the following pages to examine Bok's observations on the dress and deportment of the contemporary "American girl." In this regard, Bok registered alarm at the increasing tendency of American girls with normally good judgment to engage in questionable, if not downright dangerous, pastimes. After nightfall, many girls frequented the five-cent theaters lining the business thoroughfares of American cities and the "picture 'arcades' where a penny in the slot sets

---

[42]Edward Bok, *The Americanization of Edward Bok* (New York, 1932), p. 303.

in motion a series of views whose effect on the young beholder is absolutely degrading." During the day many young girls and boys habitually met and loitered around the music counters of cheap department stores listening to "ragtime pounded out by so-called 'artists'" and making dates for other amusements. And countless unchaperoned girls customarily attended plays which were entirely inappropriate for them, plays which they should not have seen even accompanied by their parents.[43]

All these girls' improprieties were the results of grave miscalculations on their part. Observing the greater freedom and mobility exercised in public by mature women at the turn of the century, young American girls fatuously assumed that they likewise should be permitted the freedom of unchaperoned public activity; they simply chose to ignore the truth, that a "woman's years are her protection, whereas a girl's lack of years is her danger."[44]

And, during World War I, Bok declared that "one of the sorriest sights imaginable" was seeing, into the late night hours in front of picture houses and railroad stations in towns close to naval yards or military camps, hundreds of young girls ostentatiously parading, giggling, flirting,

---

[43]Edward Bok, "In an Editorial Way," LHJ, XXIV (June, 1907), 5-6; and XXV (January, 1908), 5.

[44]Edward Bok, "Breaking Down the Fences," LHJ, XIV (August, 1897), 14.

and otherwise trying to attract the attentions of men in uniform. Bok reaffirmed his opposition to the double moral standard which absolved man and penalized woman for the same acts but, he asked, "is it any fairer to expect our boys to hold fast to their standards when every artifice is used by these girls to break down those standards?" If not with originality at least with forthrightness rather uncommon in his editorials, Bok declared that "an ounce of prevention now is worth pounds of cure, not forgetting that there are some things which cannot be cured," a statement which could have had at least two meanings in those days before the pill and penicillin.[45]

Furthermore, in 1898, Bok expressed indignation at the "spirit of unwise freedom at sports" asserting itself strongly among American girls, especially in the clothing they donned for athletics. One only had to look at many of the "wheelwomen" riding through the streets "with skirts too short for a well-grown child of twelve years" in order to see to "what vulgar extent this abuse has been carried." Granted, in sports women with long skirts were at a "serious disadvantage," Bok conceded, and no reasonable person would have dared deny her permission to make herself more comfortable by wearing shorter skirts while engaged in sports. But that did not give her the prerogative of

---

[45]Edward Bok, "War Editorials," LHJ, XXXV (January, 1918), 26.

making herself appear "ridiculous in the eyes of men" by wearing "a garment so scant as to leave her limbs exposed." Girls were not the only culprits, however, for many married women dressed the same; and to Bok that was "nothing short of disgusting" since they should have been mature enough to know better. Indeed, some girls and women were beginning to wear short skirts during the daytime with no intention whatsoever of engaging in athletics, some going so pitiably far as to visit public dining rooms or to "loll around" verandas.[46]

Bok similarly upbraided American girls and women for immodestly parading on the beach in their dripping-wet bathing dresses and "lying on the beach in unseemly attitudes." Yet, in directing such criticism at them, Bok protested that he was not playing the prude: "Nothing in this world is prettier than a woman in a becoming bathing-dress as she plunges into the surf, and perverted must be that man or woman who sees aught but beauty therein." Once finished swimming, however, she should immediately retire and change into proper clothing or else she will never "impress men that she is a woman meant to uplift mankind."[47]

In dressing and behaving in such a deleterious fashion "women unsex themselves" by removing the veil of mystery

---

[46]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XV (May, 1898), 14.

[47]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XV (May, 1898), 14.

and virtue which separates woman from man. Then, when men, because the veil was removed, displayed more familiarity with women and used freer speech within their hearing, these same women were quick to resent it. But they really had no right to feel resentment, Bok observed in a statement that surely must have curdled the blood of many feminists, "an insult to a woman is generally invited." Since men knew which women they could be careless with and which they could not, surely the wise and decent girl would never, either by her dress or deportment, "forfeit the respect which has always been accorded her sex."[48]

Keeping her clothing dry and her limbs covered did not necessarily guarantee a woman that Bok would be satisfied with her dress. In the mid-eighteen-nineties Bok aimed particularly sharp criticism at dress standards which required American women to cinch their waists down to twenty-two or perhaps twenty inches without regard to serious warnings given by the growing incidence of "stomach, lung, liver and arterial trouble." The editor's protests against the tight corset represented a moderate, practical view. He did not join ranks with the ilk of Thorstein Veblen in interpreting the wasp waist as anti-proletarian nor did he agree with Simone de Beauvoir's assertion that society concocted the tightly cinched corset to entrap woman,

---

[48]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XV (May, 1898), 14.

thereby restricting her from many masculine pursuits. Bok instead echoed the concerns of reputable physicians that the "colossal mismanagement of flesh" injured woman's health.[49]

Eventually women began shifting from the hazardous "wasp waist," Bok asserted, but only when it began to strike squarely at their vanity by causing red noses, flat chests, and other visible symptoms and when Parisian designers began marketing the manifestly more sensible "Greek waist."[50] Bok, however, conveniently failed to mention that the Journal was still depicting the wasp waist in corset advertisements and on fashion pages.

In 1907, complaining of too much uniformity in women's dress, Bok repeated a charge he had made on several occasions--that fashion dictums, issued from Paris, so addled the brains of American women that they lost all sense of the individual lines of their own bodies and of what best suited their own figures. He proposed, in effect, that American women declare independence from French fashion lords and develop their own simple-but-elegant styles.[51]

---

[49]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIII (June, 1896), 14. John S. Haller and Robin M. Haller, The Physician and Sexuality in Victorian America (New York, 1977), pp. 141-187.

[50]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XIII (June, 1896), 14.

[51]Edward Bok, "In an Editorial Way," LHJ, XXIV (July, 1907), 5-6; and "A Woman's Questions," LHJ, XVIII (April, 1901), 16.

The shameless dress and the flirting and loitering so rife among American girls was, from Bok's perspective, ample evidence of the deterioration of parental control. Girls between sixteen and twenty-one years old were not yet of mature enough judgment to act without guidance and yet they were intensely sensitive to the watchfulness of their parents, often responding to supervision and discipline with hostile independence. Unfortunately, many parents, hoping to avoid the tension and discomfort of family conflict were permitting their daughters more license than they deserved and concomitantly were setting the stage for trouble.[52]

If parents intended to rear their children responsibly, Bok admonished, they must be willing to accept the inconvenience of allowing their daughters to invite their friends into their homes to visit in the parlor or on the veranda. This principle applied not only to their girl friends but their male companions as well. Elders should remember their youth, when they courted in the girls' homes and their parents were conspicuously involved in some activity in another part of the house. Under those conditions the young people had the proper balance of supervision and privacy. Parents should never acquiesce in the easier but foolhardy alternative of permitting their daughters to

---

[52]Edward Bok, "Breaking Down the Fences," LHJ, XIV (August, 1897), 14.

gad about unchaperoned. After all, "inconvenience is better than heartbreaks."[53]

Not only should parents be willing to suffer inconvenience in order to offer their children wholesome activities, they must also be willing to discipline their children. Just as some people build fences around their property to keep others from trespassing, so parents should build fences of discipline to discourage "a girl's trespass in deportment." The fence dividing proper from improper behavior is much more difficult for young women than for adults to discern; and consequently a girl's parents, particularly her mother, should exercise the necessary guidance and control to keep her from trespassing. Though the girl may resist the constraints of loving discipline, as long as she remains under the roof of her parents she should expect to follow their restrictions on her actions. Only the parents' knowledge, borne of years of experience and applied through guidance and supervision, can prevent the girl from crossing the barrier and losing "a girl's highest possession: her self-respect."[54]

---

[53]Edward Bok, "In an Editorial Way," LHJ, XXIV (June, 1907), 5-6; and "Editorial," LHJ, XXXIII (April, 1916), 12.

[54]Edward Bok, "Breaking Down the Fences," LHJ, XIV (August, 1897), 14; and "In an Editorial Way," LHJ, XXV (June, 1908), 5.

Many mothers complained that they were losing control of their daughters and blamed it on changing times, but Bok rejected that excuse out of hand. He argued instead that the degree to which the daughter veers from the path of high moral standards actually reflects her parents', especially her mother's, ineffectiveness as parents. If the American girl is out of control, her parents are "on trial: not the times nor the conditions." Much of the reason for mothers' lack of control, Bok editorialized, is that the majority of mothers do not have their daughters' confidence, especially in those matters where each daughter should, "of very necessity and of her very being, be dependent upon her."[55]

To leave the impression that Bok was always critical of the American female would be grossly inaccurate. He reminded his readers that he directed his criticism only at the offenders, not at the majority of American women. Further, in several instances he allotted substantial space in praise of American girls. In his estimation, the American woman, by accenting "her chic and her brightness," set the international standard of beauty and was the most clever and graceful woman in the world. Although the French were setting the world's fashion standards, it took the

---

[55]Edward Bok, "Editorial," LHJ, XXXIII (November, 1916), 87; and "The Blot on Our American Life," LHJ, XII (July, 1895), 15.

American girl to wear the fashions to full effect, he said in 1899. Even the working girl of modest income demonstrated a remarkable knack for a lovely, becoming appearance. And when some readers wrote him that the illustrations of girls featured on the covers and inside the Journal were idealized, he vigorously retorted that was not true, the illustrations offered true representations of the beauty and charm of the American woman.[56]

In one editorial, Bok expressed disturbance at the current proliferation of articles in magazines and newspapers purporting a rapidly growing tide of smoking and drinking women in America; and he came to the defense of his girls by repudiating the purveyors of the moral decline of American woman and insisting that the extent of their indecorous behavior was vastly exaggerated. To prove his point, Bok investigated the facts behind an article in a leading newspaper telling of a luncheon where "champagne flowed like water, where twenty out of the thirty women present smoked with their coffee, and devoted all the rest of the afternoon to playing bridge whist for high stakes." When the Journal's editor inquired into the veracity of the story, the reporter conceded that she had concocted the entire episode because of the pressures of meeting a deadline. This was, for Bok, enough evidence to corroborate his

---

[56]Edward Bok, "Where Are the Pretty Girls?" LHJ, XVI (May, 1899), 20.

suspicion that the incidence of such behavior was not at all as great as the media hoopla led the public to believe. Most American women obeyed the "instincts of womanhood, wifehood and motherhood," avoided making "any noise in the world," and eschewed getting "into print." To be sure, some women did behave in the tasteless manner described in the spurious article, but they generally came from the leisure class where all too few learned to handle idleness and money fittingly and therefore were "going to 'demnition bow-wow.'"[57]

Parenthetically, these comments raise another interesting facet of Bok's thought--that from the great middle class "springs not only the mental, physical and moral bone and sinew" of the United States but also the world's highest order of womanhood. Even if the number of obdurate women were growing, Bok stated, it would only be due to America's increasingly large idle class, confined primarily to New York and Chicago and perhaps a few other large cities, "which in its idleness finds foolish and vulgar things to do." Of course, Bok did not mean to disparage all the idle class because some of his best friends were wealthy and their home lives were pure and elevating. Nevertheless, women and men of the idle class had a tendency to place greater importance on social standing than

---

[57]Edward Bok, "The Editorial Page," LHJ, XXI (February, 1904), 16.

on high moral standards and a true conception of womanhood.[58]

The ideal American girl, therefore, was not the society girl whose life was so often superficial, it was the middle class girl whose family was a tight-knit unit and who believed no woman was "so sweet as her mother; no man so good as her father." It was the American family of average income, he said, which produced "the best American wifehood" and provided "helpmates to the foremost American men of our time." Further, it is the great middle class "which teaches its daughters the true meaning of love; which teaches the manners of the drawing room but the practical life of the kitchen as well; which teaches its girls the responsibilities of wifehood and the greatness of motherhood."[59] Bok could pay no greater tribute to middle class Americans nor could he characterize his ideal female more succinctly.

During the three decades that Edward Bok was editor of the Journal, women in the United States experienced a many-sided revolution. And yet, Bok's attitude toward the role of women in society, as delineated in this chapter,

---

[58]Edward Bok, "In an Editorial Way," LHJ, XXIV (July, 1907), 5-6; "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (March, 1893), 12; and XXIII (July, 1906), 16.

[59]Edward Bok, "At Home with the Editor," LHJ, X (March, 1893), 12; and "In an Editorial Way," LHJ, XXIV (July, 1907), 5-6.

remained essentially unchanged from his initial editorial foray, in 1889, to his valedictory comments in 1919, indeed even into the early 1920s when his autobiography was published. Clearly, Bok was cognizant of the changes underway and in fact, as shall be demonstrated in subsequent chapters, gradually approved the introduction of certain feminist precepts in various departments of the magazine. The growing success of the feminists even effected Bok's editorial comments about woman's position in society. Not that he changed his ideas, for he did not; but he did change his emphasis and approach to the so-called "woman question."

For example, for several years after taking the helm of the Journal Bok confidently proclaimed the genteel Victorian gospel--woman's divinely ordained sphere is the home where she fulfills her providential roles as wife, mother, and housekeeper. The editorials of these years exuded such a positive character and manifested such self-assurance that it appears Bok considered himself an oracle of sorts.

Beginning in the mid-nineties, however, Bok's editorials less frequently exuded that positive spirit as more and more of them took on an air of combativeness. He vitriolically attacked the new woman as only an illusion of addled feminists. That phase of Bok's editorial comment on the woman question had evolved into another by the nineteen teens, with Bok not only soft-pedaling his early positive

portrayal of Victorian morality but also quieting his verbal attacks on the new woman. During the teens he did not castigate the abominable "platform women," as he had done some years earlier, for causing this shift toward the new woman. Rather, Bok grudgingly conceded the success of the new woman movement which he earlier had said did not really exist. Although he tacitly recognized her presence, Bok still did not approve of the new woman and penned several editorials mildly chiding American girls and women for displaying so many of her traits. Their behavior was not so much a manifestation of a fundamental flaw in womanhood, Bok seemed to be saying, as it was a temporary detour from the straight and narrow path of genteel Victorian feminine behavior.

Meanwhile, as the end of Edward Bok's editorial tenure came closer, he less frequently broached the controversial woman question. In several instances when he allotted space to the woman issue he did not write his own material but instead endorsed essays written by others supporting his personal point of view. One gets the impression that he had all but abandoned his personal editorial crusade to defend Victorian womanhood from the new woman.

His autobiography, _The Americanization of Edward Bok_, includes observations about his perception of women which shed light on the point. Bok recounted how several times during his editorial tenure he had become somewhat

perplexed about and even disillusioned with women. In one instance he attempted to persuade American women to break the spell which Parisian designers had over them. He warned his readers that clothes manufacturers hoodwinked American fashion mongers in at least two ways: first, they manufactured by the gross in the United States a large portion of the so-called Paris originals and, second, according to many experts, the women in Paris seldom wore the "grotesque" fashions which American women aped. The Journal's lengthy campaign against the Paris-dominated fashion market was a failure and Bok naturally suffered to the core with the realization that American women had spurned his sound reasoning in favor of personal vanity.[60]

Similarly, Bok attempted to discourage women from wearing aigrette feathers because the mother heron produced the gorgeous aigrette only in maternity and her gruesome murder meant that several infants left in the nest would soon starve to death. Bok gathered and published heart-rending photographs and narratives of the slaughter of the birds, convinced that the "mother-spirit" in American women would be so repelled by such cruelty and violence that they would stop buying the feathers. But, to Bok's utter dismay, his editorials had the opposite effect of reinforcing the idea that such decorations were

---

[60]Edward Bok, The Americanization of Edward Bok (New York, 1932), pp. 327-333.

chic. Because demand for them soared, Bok backed off this approach and devised new strategy. He enlisted the support of the Audubon Society and other interested parties to lobby for legislation prohibiting the importation of the aigrette; and sure enough, Congress and several state legislatures responded with protective legislation. But Bok felt no satisfaction in this hollow victory. The entire episode demonstrated that American women placed their vanity above the vicious, repugnant abuse of the heron. Bok had learned, to his eternal regret, that woman's "love for personal vanity and finery absolutely dominate the mother-instinct."[61]

Bok's unsuccessful campaigns against Paris fashions and the use of aigrette feathers had a profound effect on his view of women. "He was conscious that something had toppled off its pedestal which could never be replaced." His image of woman thus buffeted, Bok recalled his mother's reaction years before when he had informed her of his appointment as editor of Ladies' Home Journal. "I am sorry you are going to take this position," she had said. "It will cost you the high ideal you have always held of your mother's sex. But a nature, as is the feminine nature, wholly swayed inwardly by emotion, and outwardly influenced by an insatiate love for personal adornment, will

---

[61]Edward Bok, The Americanization of Edward Bok (New York, 1932), p. 338.

never stand the analysis you will give it."[62] His mother's prediction, he admitted, had proven correct.

Ironically, Edward Bok himself had contributed to the ultimate demise of the genteel womanhood he so cherished. Years earlier, by insisting with the Social Purists upon a single moral sexual standard, the editor actually helped prepare the way for subsequent feminist victories. The Social Purists' policy of limiting man to sex only with his wife weakened the underpinning of Victorian morality--the moral double standard--by circumscribing man's freedom and simultaneously giving "married women greater control over the family" and over society in general. As Carl Degler says of the Social Purity movement, Edward Bok inadvertently "was part of a larger movement in behalf of women's freedom and autonomy inside and outside the family."[63]

In review, then, throughout his adult years Bok ascribed to woman the "natural" roles of wife and mother, and expressed very clearly his opposition to her participation in activities outside the home, unless, of course, those activities were extensions of her wifely and motherly duties. He believed that, if financially necessary, a woman might justifiably seek employment, though preferably

---

[62] Edward Bok, The Americanization of Edward Bok (New York, 1932), pp. 338-339.

[63] Carl Degler, At Odds (New York, 1980), pp. 280-290.

in domestic service. She could go to college if she pursued a course of study which prepared her for rearing children, maintaining a household, and serving as a bright, intelligent companion to her spouse. Bok consented to club work provided it remained ancillary to woman's domestic responsibilities and addressed problems of moral and physical health through nonpolitical channels. On the other hand, woman should never get involved with other neurotic women in the new woman movement nor participate in woman's suffrage because such activities would draw her outside her divinely ordained sphere. To Bok's way of thinking no woman was more likely to abide within these parameters than one from a middle class American family, precisely the type female to whom Bok could expect to sell the most Journals.

In 1919, these views were anachronistic and Bok knew it. Upon his retirement from the Journal publishers beseiged him with requests to offer his "opinions of women"; but this man who had so freely offered his opinions on American women for so long now refused every publisher's offer. Why? "He did not give his reasons," Bok stated, and "he never will."[64] Nevertheless, there can be little doubt that Bok's disenchantment with woman emanated from matters more fundamental than his unsuccessful campaigns against Paris designs and the use of aigrette feathers.

---

[64]Edward Bok, The Americanization of Edward Bok (New York, 1932), p. 339.

Female employment was up, hems were up, the divorce rate was up, the number of women studying the liberal arts was up--the day of the new woman had arrived and the crest-fallen Bok knew there was nothing he could do about it.

PART II

THE *LADIES' HOME JOURNAL*'S CHANGING VIEW OF WOMAN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY

CHAPTER III

FEMININE TRAITS

While Edward Bok's portrayal of woman's role in society remained essentially unchanged in his thirty years as editor of _Ladies' Home Journal_, the image of woman depicted in other departments of the magazine dramatically changed. Indeed, by the nineteen teens the magazine praised the same new woman that Edward Bok considered anathema. Permitting such heretical precepts to infiltrate his magazine only could have meant that Edward Bok was tacitly conceding victory to the new woman movement. A man of his principles never would have changed his editorial opinion simply to mollify the sentiments of his subscribers; but a man of his business acumen _would_ permit endorsement of the new woman in other parts of his magazine if he felt it was necessary in order to keep the _Ladies' Home Journal_ the most widely circulated magazine in the world. So, he stuck by his principles and followed his best instincts as a businessman.

To understand the evolution of the _Journal_'s view of woman's role in society, it is requisite to first examine carefully the magazine's changing conception of feminine nature. In early volumes, the _Journal_'s views closely

paralleled Edward Bok's version of the Genteel Tradition, assigning to man physical and intellectual superiority and to woman moral and spiritual ascendency. Over the years in many departments, however, the magazine's delineation of sexual differences eroded. Changing times wore down some of woman's superior traits and built up some of her inferior characteristics, leaving less pronounced peaks and valleys distinguishing woman's abilities from man's.

In 1896, the Reverend Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D. enunciated a theoretical framework that can serve as an effective starting point for running the Journal's maze of conflicting and confusing reflections on the sexes' relative abilities. He built his essay on the premise of "woman's intrinsic superiority"--his phrase for the pedestal theory. The "Scriptures regularly put the stamp of Divine preferment" on woman, he insisted, because woman's creation was the "consummating act of the creative week." True, woman may be inferior to man physically but she is superior to him metaphysically. And her physical differences from man only make woman "female"; it is her metaphysical features, such as morality, spirituality, and sensitivity, that actually make her "woman." In other words, the metaphysical strengths of womanhood represent "the supreme distinction" between the sexes.[1]

---

[1]Charles H. Parkhurst, "Andromaniacs," LHJ, XII (February, 1895), 15.

That "women are more courageous, morally," than men are is a theme the Journal hammered home time and again during the 1890s. One commentator noted that "women are the custodians of morality of a nation, and cannot hold themselves too high," while another asked rhetorically, "Is woman not constantly upholding weakness, inspiring morality, stimulating higher motives?" This "intrinsic quality of womanly fiber" which sets woman apart from man is responsible for "nearly all the restraints of the violent impulses that civilization has imposed," according to an article in 1903. Even as late as 1908, a columnist observed that woman is "far higher in the moral scale" than man and "she instinctively and hourly practices the qualities that would make and indeed are making the world a better and happier place."[2]

Comments denigrating man's character reinforced these positive pronouncements of woman's moral strength. For example, in "The Business Girl and Her Employer" in 1898, Ruth Ashmore, a long-time monthly contributor to the Journal, warned the woman in business to beware her married employer if she should ever begin taking her to luncheon,

---

[2]Mrs. Burton Kingsland, "Dangers of a Social Career," LHJ, X (January, 1893), 6; Junius Henri Browne, "Are Women Timid?" LHJ, X (April, 1893), 8; Charles H. Parkhurst, "Andromaniacs," LHJ, XII (February, 1895), 15; "The World and His Wife," LHJ, XX (October, 1903), 18; "As a Bachelor Sees Women: In Which He Frankly Explains Why He Has Never Married," LHJ, XXV (January, 1908), 12.

talking to her about "private affairs," or giving her little gifts or special social recognition. If she is "a brave and a good girl," she will immediately close up her desk and seek another job. Anticipating that some girls might see behavior of this sort by their employer as nothing more or less than friendship and consideration, Ashmore remonstrated such naiveté by commenting: "I do not mean that all men are bad. . . . but masculine nature is weak and when things have gone wrong at home" the average man derives "immense satisfaction" from the sympathy of a charming young woman. He is preying on the girl in an unguarded moment.[3] Similar inferences of man as tempter abounded before the turn of the century, thereby reversing the traditional roles of Adam and Eve.

Apparently, part of the rationale behind the concept of woman's moral superiority to man was anchored in the classic Victorian conviction that man has strong sexual drives which woman does not possess. "Woman might be man's equal in all respects, but when it comes to sex it is all on the man's side."[4] Recent studies by David Pivar, Carl Degler, and others have effectively shown that such notions grew in large part out of woman's concern or even fear of

---

[3]Ruth Ashmore, "The Business Girl and Her Employer," LHJ, XV (February, 1898), 21.

[4]Yvonne Dufour, "As a Woman Sees the After-the-War Woman," LHJ, XXXV (October, 1918), 12.

the grave physical dangers attendant to pregnancy and child-bearing.

By the nineteen teens, however, the _Journal_'s handling of morality had changed in two ways. First, the magazine no longer regularly addressed the question. Of course, this want of comment might have meant that the issue was simply no longer important, which in itself would be significant since woman's morality had been such a keystone issue earlier. More likely it indicated an increasing acceptance of the moral equality of the sexes.

Also by the teens, when the magazine did broach the subject of masculine and feminine morality, its treatment was pronouncedly more balanced than before. The _Journal_ more candidly recognized woman's moral weaknesses, including her sexual ones. Granted, in most of these cases, the writers blamed the environment for woman's fall; but, still, she had fallen, an occurrence scarcely admitted before the mid-1890s, at least not with any expression of compassion for the incontinent woman.

A number of articles went so far as to specifically affirm the moral equality of the sexes. In 1914, the "Country Contributor," one of the most conservative columnists in the magazine, not only acknowledged moral weakness in woman--"few women, however beautiful and good, are above 'stooping to folly' under certain conditions"--but subsequently pressed the case for moral equality. "Men have a

way of depending on women to be good for the whole family. They ask us to keep on our pedestals," she said, which "may be very complimentary to us, but it is also very unfair, very unworthy of the real ideal of manhood." In making man after His own image, God did not establish a double standard of morality. Had He, the model of morality would be man, not woman. But, He established no moral double standard and consequently "there is no scrap of evidence or argument to justify man in the foolish notion that woman must be 'better' than himself."[5]

Interspersed among these comments reinforcing moral equality, man still intermittently reappeared as the moral weakling in both fiction and non-fiction. As late as 1914, in an article about the tribulations of a middle-aged widow, the writer observed that she had stopped dating men because as soon as "they are alone with me they offend me." Her male companions took "it for granted that in some way a widow is on their plane of experience; that she is an animal, not a soul."[6] So common before the turn of the century, these comments were quite rare during the teens, even in the columns of "Aunt Patience" and the "Country Contributor." All told, by 1919, the Journal

---

[5]Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," LHJ, XXXI (February, 1914), 30.

[6]"Why I Have Not Remarried--Yet," LHJ, XXXI (February 1914), 14, 42.

had journeyed far down the road toward moral equality of the sexes.

A second superior feminine characteristic appearing in the *Journal*'s late nineteenth century scheme was woman's conspicuous religious nature, a metaphysical trait closely associated with her moral nature. Until the early twentieth century the magazine was replete with strongly religious articles or, to be more precise, strongly Christian articles in which the writers commonly concurred that "woman's nobility consists in the exercise of a Christian influence."[7] Her spirituality surpasses man's significantly, as one might expect of a creature with far-reaching moral powers and a decidedly emotional bent.

A "Well-Known Pastor" contended that "the best women religiously considered are the most emotional ones; the best men, on the other hand, are usually the ones least so." He encouraged woman to try to harness her emotions a little more so that she might develop a greater degree of consistency, but he felt her emotionalism is the basis of her religious powers.[8]

The *Journal*'s emphasis on woman's ascendant spiritual capacity did not survive as long as its emphasis on woman's

---

[7] T. DeWitt Talmage, "The Curiosity of Eve," *LHJ*, X (February, 1893), 14.

[8] A Well-Known Pastor, "As a Clergyman Sees Women," *LHJ*, XXIV (September, 1907), 24.

moral superiority. As early as 1900, an article appeared which marked a transition from the notion that woman has higher natural religious inclinations. "An American Mother," pointing out that "a man learns . . . his religion from his mother," was deeply disturbed that modern woman was so caught up in politics and club activity that she neglected the religious instruction and encouragement of her children and husband. "If our men have no God in the world it is our women who have robbed them of Him."[9] Still holding to the Victorian idea that woman has primary religious responsibility in the family this writer conceded that modern woman lacked the spiritual edge. As it turned out, this article augured the Journal's shift away from its concept of woman's spiritual superiority because by the teens religiously oriented features appeared less frequently and assertions of woman's conspicuous spiritual talents were rare.

Intuition is a third example of woman's metaphysical powers, according to the Ladies' Home Journal. The various departments in the magazine did not emphasize this particular feminine trait to the extent that Edward Bok did in his editorials, but it was an undercurrent in discussions of woman's intellectual, spiritual, moral, and other talents. Occasionally an author openly avowed this characteristic of

---

[9]An American Mother, "Have Women Robbed Men of Their Religion?" LHJ, XVII (February, 1900), 17.

womanhood. One writer, in 1908, mentioned that he "would generally trust a woman's intuition more confidently than a man's. A man's judgment is often warped by superficial evidence of an immaterial kind, whereas a woman sees far more clearly the spirit and essence of a situation." And in March 1919, speculating on the impending impact of woman's suffrage, David Lawrence concluded that the "power of intuition or discrimination on the part of the women voters has given the political leaders much to worry about. Women seem instinctively to know the value of the candidates--that's the bogy of it." Hence, he anticipated, machine politicians would have greater difficulty maintaining their bases of power and relying on party affiliation.[10]

Because such explicit comments as these were relatively rare, it is difficult to ascertain with a substantial level of confidence if any shift occurred in the Journal's opinion of woman's intuitive powers. It appears, however, that the Journal's opinion was consistent with Bok's editorial philosophy from the Victorian era through the teens.

Woman's metaphysical powers also included certain emotional characteristics. According to Bok's magazine, some emotional traits--charity, love, self-sacrifice, and others--emanate from her metaphysical nature while others--

---

[10]"As a Bachelor Sees Women: In Which He Frankly Explains Why He Never Married," LHJ, XXV (January, 1908), 12; and David Lawrence, "Mrs. New Citizen," LHJ, XXXVI (March, 1919), 13, 103.

nervousness and hypersensitivity--issue from her physiological composition. The immediate focus is on woman's metaphysically-founded emotional habits, but an examination of her physiologically oriented emotions will follow later.

Woman's enduring "love-hunger" is a cornerstone of her metaphysical emotions. Women demonstrate romantic love and demand it from man. In 1896, Lillian Bell wrote a delightful satire on man's ineffectualness as a lovemaker. "Men seldom make good lovers," she said. They are never satisfied to approach any other task in the "slovenly way" they make love. "I deeply regret being obliged to say this, as they are about all we girls have to depend upon in that line, but it's the solemn truth." Indeed, it appears that "many men make love because the girl is convenient and they happen to think about it." Lillian Bell's article described humorously what several other writers examined in a more serious vein, but their conclusions matched hers. As late as 1916, a columnist observed that man apparently loses his romantic love very soon after marriage, while woman demonstrates it to a higher degree after repeating the marriage vows. It is not that man necessarily falls out of love, he simply graduates from "love-passion" to "love-service."[11] To these writers romantic love was essentially sentimentality, not sexuality.

---

[11]Lillian Bell, "From the Girl's Standpoint: Men As Lovers," LHJ, XIII (February, 1896), 6; "Her Brother's Letters," LHJ, XXXIII (April, 1906), 32.

Woman additionally evinces a love that transcends romantic love, the type of love early Christians characterized as agape, a love that continues giving even when it is not reciprocated. Jane Addams recounted several stories of women in slum districts who displayed a profuse capacity to love and serve their loved ones though their love was never returned nor appreciated. And, apparently, few writers would have disagreed with Cornelius Cabot's statement, in 1914: "A woman's affections are more enduring and more loyal than those of a man. A man's affections are more vagrant."[12]

The fictional representations of woman's loving ability did not give her the clear-cut superiority recorded in non-fiction, for there was a host of stories written around the undying love of members of both sexes. Be that as it may, from the earliest editions through the end of Edward Bok's editorial reign, the *Journal* typically gave woman the edge over the man in the power to love. Interestingly, no perceptible evolution took place in the *Journal*'s view on this subject as it had in regard to woman's moral and spiritual nature.

Woman's metaphysically-based emotional nature included an heroic streak as well. Women may be timid when no danger threatens, but as peril approaches, whether it

---

[12]Cornelius Cabot, "How Shall a Young Man Decide?" *LHJ*, XXXI (March, 1914), 17, 79.

be moral or physical, "their daring rises to meet it," observed a clergyman in 1893. "They are not brave to do wrong, to speak evil, to injure humanity, as men so often are; but, in the cause of good, of advancement of pure unselfishness, they parallel Caesar or Lincoln. . . ." Indeed, so conspicuous is woman's courage that the author coined "a new adjective--heroinic, in place of heroic to express the highest courage."[13] Once again, as in the example of woman's capability to love, there was not a major shift even in the teens in the Journal's portrayal of woman's heroic--or heroinic--characteristics.

By the nineteen teens, then, woman's superior Victorian features had eroded substantially in the Journal. Woman still maintained her love, courage, and a number of secondary characteristics, but she was no longer the paragon of morality and spirituality she had once been.

Yet, this is only half the Journal's picture of woman, for it is limited to those traits which, in Parkhurst's

---

[13]Junius Henri Browne, "Are Women Timid?" LHJ, X (April, 1893), 8. The Journal paid homage to several other feminine attributes. Charity, self-sacrifice, hopefulness, truth, faith, honor, loyalty, and other traits, many writers claimed, "are found in a far purer quality among women than among men." But since each of these attributes is essentially a specialized component of one or more of woman's four major metaphysical traits, discussing these points individually would add scant additional light on the Journal's changing views. See especially S. Weir Mitchell, "When the College is Hurtful to a Girl," LHJ, XVII (June, 1900), 14; and "As a Bachelor Sees Women: In Which He Frankly Explains Why He Has Never Married," LHJ, XXV (January, 1908), 12.

estimation, make woman "woman." Parkhurst claimed that the other side of womanhood, her physiological features, only make woman "female" and are therefore not important in evaluating the relative superiority of the sexes. That her physiology prevents her from doing things man can do is a matter of irreversible Divine discretion. Feminist rationale of course disagreed. insisting that the stereotyping of woman as physically, intellectually, and emotionally inferior was contrary to fact and was a subterfuge for justifying sexual discrimination. To a substantial degree, the Journal's view of woman's physiological traits, like its view of her metaphysical nature, gradually shifted from the Victorian standard of genteel womanhood erected by Parkhurst and others to endorsement of new womanhood.

The precept that man is distinctly healthier and more durable than woman permeated the Journal's articles for nearly thirty years. This notion appeared in articles on health and exercise and in advice columns, particularly in the monthly column "Side-Talks with Girls" by Ruth Ashmore. She did "not approve of the extreme in outdoor sports" for women "since they have an inheritance from generations of delicate mothers to fight against before they can obtain good constitutions." A "pleasant walk" might be invigorating, but so profound is woman's inherited delicateness that "an active run" might well prove injurious. Mrs. Ashmore also deemed tennis "too violent" for girls while

the current United States tennis champion, Mabel Esmonde Cahill, endorsed tennis for women; but even she recommended that women should serve the ball underhanded to avoid exhausting or injuring themselves. Ashmore, whose columns ran for many years and covered a wide range of topics, denounced any physical activities for females where "competition begins to reign" because competition, a decidedly masculine attribute, prompts the girls to try to outdo one another and that in turn inevitably pushes them past their physical limits.[14] Women are not men and should not attempt to emulate masculine levels of strenuous physical activity.

The Journal did not assert, as did many physicians and religious leaders of the day, that cycling was evil because it stimulated the woman's genitals.[15] Indeed, while the magazine cautioned women not to pedal too fast or too far, it often depicted cycling as good exercise and on occasion tendered rudimentary instructions on how to ride bicycles. Around the turn of the century, though the Journal carried advertisements for various bicycle

---

[14] Ruth Ashmore, "The Foundation of Physical Beauty," LHJ, XV (November, 1898), 24; Ruth Ashmore, "Side Talks with Girls," LHJ, XVI (December, 1898), 41; Mabel Esmonde Cahill, "The Art of Playing Tennis," LHJ, X (June, 1893), 6.

[15] John S. Haller and Robin M. Haller, The Physician and Sexuality in Victorian America (New York, 1977), pp. 174-187.

seats especially designed for women; some with additional padding, others rigged in two parts so that each side could pivot up and down independently as the woman pedaled, and still others that were concave so that only the buttocks would rest on the seat. The implication of the ads was that women should be very careful not to injure their delicate bodies while riding.

The alleged physical shortcomings that incapacitate women in sports served as pretexts in part to preclude them from politics, business, and other activities requiring even a modicum of strength and stamina. The Journal's fiction in the late nineteenth century usually pictured woman within the strictures of proper Victorian standards for physical activity, but it did not reinforce the notion of woman's physical inferiority to the extent Ruth Ashmore did.

Part of the Journal's picture of woman's physical nature is what John S. Haller and Robin M. Haller term "body religion." That Victorian phenomenon suggested that such things as freckles, red nose, sunburn, "or a 'gymnastic face' not only destroyed the harmony of form but also suggested that the moral character of the woman had undergone a modification for the worse."[16] Through numerous

---

[16]John S. Haller and Robin M. Haller, The Physician and Sexuality in Victorian America (New York, 1977), pp. 141-142.

advertisements as well as fiction and nonfiction the Journal taught body religion, although on the whole it did not go to the extremes that other American converts practiced. Still, the magazine advised women to pay special attention to their appearance because a healthy appearance is part of true womanhood.

Two relatively early signs that the Journal was recanting its belief in body religion were its campaigns against patent medicines and the corset. By attacking patent medicines, even refusing to advertise them in its pages, the magazine struck a blow at one of the sacred elements body religion used to maintain woman's beauty. And rejecting the corset was an attack upon a leading symbol of the Victorian perception of feminine beauty--the wasp waist. The Journal did not couch its campaigns in such terms, of course, but those were nonetheless their implications.

By the end of Bok's tenure, the Journal's image in fiction of woman's physical stature had undergone such thoroughgoing change that the strong athletic woman became a very attractive protagonist. Woman no longer appeared so frequently as a physically inactive or frail person but rather an individual who, though not as powerful, is just as healthy and durable as a man. Many stories depicted the heroine as a good athlete, occasionally talented enough to beat most men in such activities

as swimming and tennis. Female characters also worked in jobs for which they previously had been declared physically unfit. Regardless that the Genteel Tradition would have considered such activity disgustingly "mannish," these protagonists were highly attractive to the opposite sex and were the subjects of jealousy by others of their gender. To be sure, many female characters of the old style still cropped up in the Journal during the teens, but the new woman was rapidly supplanting the older genre.

Isaac F. Marcosson's comment in 1918, though addressed specifically to public opinion in England, typifies the shifting tide of opinion in the Ladies' Home Journal as well. "There was a widespread delusion before the war that woman was the weaker sex," he said, but "like a great many other fetishes, it has gone into the scrapheap. . . ."[17] Woman's employment in so many "men's jobs" during the Great War unquestionably contributed handsomely in convincing the Journal's writers that woman could handle tasks that she had earlier been thought physically incapable of performing. As a matter of fact, the Journal seemed to glory in woman's newfound talents. Yet, it should be noted here that manifestations of this change were distinctly visible before World War I, indeed even before the teens. At any rate, by the end of the teens, the magazine no longer

---

[17]Isaac F. Marcosson, "After-the-War-Women," LHJ, XXXV (June, 1918), 13.

stressed woman's physical limitations and consequently no longer used her physical weakness as a pretext for excluding her from politics, business, or academia.

Another of the fundamental comparisons of man and woman which ran through late nineteenth century Journals was its view of their respective emotional or psychological traits. As noted earlier in this chapter, some emotional traits are apparently based on woman's metaphysical nature while others arise from physiological sources. Since woman is physically inferior to man, it stood to reason that her nervous system is not as sound as man's.

Regular monthly articles, question-and-answer columns, and special features displayed the greatest propensity to expose woman's emotional peccadilloes. In 1893, Junius Henri Browne observed that women shriek at the sight of mice and snakes, start at peals of thunder, and evince agitation at matters so trifling that even the most timorous men ridicule them. "This is largely due to extreme nervousness, in which our women excel, to over-sensibility, to excess of imagination, qualities commonly lacking in masculine nature."[18]

In 1907, a physician asserted that it "is all wrong" to assume that "because woman is physiologically different from man she must suffer from nervousness." In fact, he

---

[18]Junius Henri Browne, "Are Women Timid?" LHJ, X (April, 1893), 8.

continued, "a certain class of men do suffer from hysteria. But they are individuals of an effeminate character" who do not take good care of themselves physically. If woman would just take hold of herself she "should be the healthier of the sexes." And she can do that by replacing "chemically-prepared sweets" and other poor quality food in her diet with more natural foods and by forsaking the use of powder and other cosmetics which clog her pores and thus prevent proper cleansing of the body.[19] The physician refuted the idea that woman's nervousness is physiologically founded. In so doing, however, he admitted that woman, from whatever cause, is more hypersensitive than man and that the few men who suffer from such nervous symptoms are effeminate. So, while the doctor broke from Victorian theory by disassociating woman's nervousness from female physiological origins he nevertheless conceded the Victorian argument that she is more nervous than man.

The next year, 1908, another writer echoed the argument that "man's nervous system is quite as sensitive as woman's" but also tended to blame woman for not harnessing her emotions more effectively. The title of the article was "'Why is My Husband So Irritable?'" The answer was that woman does not muster "a steady and consistent effort to bear her own burdens and to work out her own problems."

---

[19] "As a Physician Sees Women," LHJ, XXIV (March, 1907), 16.

In short, woman's own emotionalism contributes to her husband's and, to a degree, vice versa.[20]

Perusal of the Journal's volumes from 1883 to 1919, offers four generalizations about the sexes' emotional traits. First, unlike shifts in the Journal's views of the relative physical and intellectual abilities of the sexes, there was no corresponding profound change in the Journal's attitude about their emotional traits, at least not in non-fiction. As late as 1916, one of the monthly columns commented that "men, as a rule, take these things as they come, but women fret about them and suffer over them."[21]

Second, in the Journal's fiction the emotional image of heroines, even in the Victorian era, compared quite favorably to man's, for many of the heroines actually possessed emotional stamina commensurate with man's. This is not surprising, of course, since a steady diet of emotionally hypersensitive, weak heroines would not have been attractive even in Victorian America; women displaying their metaphysically-based emotions are more appealing protagonists. The third generalization that comes to the fore is that by the teens there was a noticeable, though

---

[20] Annie Payson Call, "'Why is My Husband So Irritable?'" LHJ, XXV (November, 1908), 30.

[21] Country Contributor, "Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," LHJ, XXXIII (March, 1916), 32.

not a dramatic, increase in female characters who demonstrated unusually high levels of emotional strength and drive. And, finally, the female characters by the teens exhibited more control over their lives.

Female intellectual inferiority was another Victorian physiological characterization. Even in its early years, seldom did the Journal explicitly assert that woman is the mental inferior of man. The Reverend Parkhurst, in 1895, observed "the unlikeness of method" in which the male and female minds operate. Indeed, except in math where the mind "works purely as a machine. . . . the female student is quite a distinct species of intellectual creature from its male counterpart." Although isolated articles stated that woman is the "mental equal" of man, the magazine repeatedly verified, in two ways primarily, that woman is not as suited as man for rigorous intellectual activity. One writer cautioned that in choosing their daughters' courses of study, parents should "remember that their minds are not like the stomachs of ostriches, and will not bear 'cramming.'"[22]

In 1900, S. Weir Mitchell, M.D., LL.D., cautioned girls that in college they must compete with man. "I do

---

[22]Charles H. Parkhurst, "College Training for Young Women," LHJ, XII (May, 1895), 15; "American Girls and Titles," LHJ, X (February, 1893), 8; and Mrs. Hamilton Mott, "Sending a Girl to Boarding-School," LHJ, X (August, 1893), 17.

not like that," he said, because the professors require of woman the same "virile standards of work" they do of man, which consequently creates "an atmosphere of peril." Unless a girl approaches her school work prudently she will suffer "certain regrets" for having chosen to go to college. Unfortunately, he concluded, "the exceptional successes and vigor of the rare few served but to lure the mass of women into the belief that the continuity of work of the man can be imitated with no more risks than are his."[23]

The Journal also implied woman's second-class intellect by its frequent suggestion that a girl should not assume an intellectual mien because "man prefers mental repose rather than mental titillation in the companionship of a woman." Or, as another author put it while explaining how men choose their mates, "to the ordinary man ignorance is always a charming necessity."[24] The impression such articles left was that very bright, well-educated women are unfeminine, if not outright abnormal, and therefore unappealing to men. And, whether male or female, the authors usually sympathized with man for not being attracted to the bright woman rather than with the woman for not

---

[23]S. Weir Mitchell, "When the College is Hurtful to a Girl," LHJ, XVII (June, 1900), 14.

[24]Mrs. Burton Harrison, "The Well-Bred Girl in Society," LHJ, X (February, 1893), 4; and Amelia E. Barr, "Why Do Not Literary Women Marry?" LHJ, X (November, 1893), 10.

attracting admirers. In essence, mental acuity and education are presumably male traits and a woman possessing them, or acting as though she does, is not feminine.

By the early part of the twentieth century this image of woman's intellectual nature was fading as many writers like Alice Preston asserted that "the ideal friendship between a man and a girl is where there is not only trust and faith on both sides, but some intellectual congeniality as well. However lovable a girl may be, if she cannot give a man a certain brain companionship the friendship must be unsatisfactory." Preston, after making this point, reverted to the older point of view by continuing: "A girl need not be especially brainy or clever, but her nature should be so warm and understanding that it will follow sympathetically a man's intellectual tastes." While Alice Preston was not a radical feminist, she and other writers chipped away, if ever so slightly, at the Victorian image of woman's intellect.[25]

The Journal's genteel image of female intellectual inferiority had all but faded, however, by the second decade of the twentieth century, particularly by the time the United States entered World War I. The most convincing manifestation of its demise was the magazine's virtual silence on the subject. During the teens, in discussions of

---

[25]Alice Preston, "The Things of Girls," LHJ, XXI (October, 1904), 24.

woman's suffrage and even in essays on woman's rapidly expanding involvement in the wartime marketplace, the subject was virtually never stressed. But there was an undercurrent, an insinuation, that woman was unquestionably intelligent enough to assume any typically male position or responsibility. And in the relatively few instances in the teens when an article did discuss the subject it generally came down on the side of equality. In 1915, Caroline Hazard, Litt.D., LL.D., addressed the point in an unusually straightforward way. She observed that women's colleges had been founded upon the same academic traditions and standards as men's colleges back in the days when it was "necessary to prove that a girl could conquer them." But, she added, "that stage is gone by. No one whose opinion is of value will now pretend to deny that a girl can master mathematics and the exact sciences."[26] And, sure enough, by this time in the various departments of the Journal, no one did "pretend to deny" that a woman's intellectual capacity was as great as man's.

To recapitulate, in the first two decades of the Journal's publication the image of woman depicted throughout the magazine paralleled closely the genteel image Edward Bok painted in his editorials. By the end of Bok's term in 1919, the image of woman's abilities compared to

---

[26] Caroline Hazard, "Where the College Fails the Girl," LHJ, XXXII (March, 1915), 19.

man's had gone through a metamorphosis. The metaphysical superiorities of woman--moral strength, religious sensitivity, love, courage, and so forth--slipped considerably; woman was no longer so distinctly superior morally and spiritually. Simultaneously she had overcome enough of her physiological inferiorities that she approached par with man in health and intellect, although she was still more nervous than he. To be sure, the image of woman's abilities offered by the _Journal_, in 1919, was not at all satisfactory to feminists of the day, to say nothing of present day feminists, but the fact remains that the magazine's impression of the differences between the sexes had narrowed significantly, even under the editorial direction of the antifeminist Edward Bok. The pedestal had not collapsed by 1919, but the plinth had disintegrated and a good number of chinks marred the pedestal itself.

Predictably, because it was built upon the _Journal_'s view of the relative abilities of the sexes, the magazine's attitude toward woman's role in society changed profoundly between 1883 and 1919. That is the subject of the next several chapters.

CHAPTER IV

MARRIAGE

The title of Edward Bok's magazine fittingly described both its contents and philosophy in its formative years. Indeed, especially in the first two decades, the *Ladies' Home Journal* imposed upon woman a virtually inescapable obligation to get married and make a home. That obligation, however, slowly diminished over the term of thirty-six years as the *Journal* reluctantly acquiesced in the reality that woman was moving ever more rapidly into other areas of society.

In the 1880s and the 1890s, number after number, volume after volume, the *Journal* preached the same sermon. Both Roman Catholic and Protestant spokesmen defended the separate sphere doctrine. Woman's "true business in life" is to be wife and mother; her "most natural duty is at home."[1]

To put into proper perspective the *Journal*'s molds for wife and mother, a brief explication of the magazine's

---

[1]J. Cardinal Gibbons, "The Restless Woman," *LHJ*, XIX (January, 1902), 6; see also T. DeWitt Talmage, "'Male and Female Created He Them'," *LHJ*, X (September, 1893), 14; Anna Robertson Brown, "The Girl Who Goes to College," *LHJ*, X (October, 1893), 24; and An American Mother, "Is a College Education Best for Our Girls?" *LHJ*, XVII (July, 1900), 15.

early concept of the home is essential. The home is the "true unit of society" because God and nature have decreed that man needs woman, woman needs man, and both need children. The bachelor and "his female counterpart" are nothing but "dislocated fragment[s]" because they have not created the finished cell--the home. To convey in a sentence the Journal's intense emotional attachment to the home is probably impossible, but the Reverend T. DeWitt Talmage made a Herculean effort. If "you had only just four letters to spell out the height, and depth, and length, and breadth, and magnitude, and eternity of meaning," the theologian observed, "you would, with streaming eyes, and trembling voice, and agitated hand, write it out in those four living capitals H-O-M-E."[2]

Predicated on the Judeo-Christian tradition which so heavily permeated American society in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Journal's view of the home stood firmly on the base of marriage. One of the Journal's resident theologians witnessed to the truth that "marriage is our normal estate" and argued that the man who treats that divine law of life "either indifferently or contemptuously, does so at his peril,

---

[2]Charles H. Parkhurst, "The Unit of Society," LHJ, XII (March, 1895), 13; and T. DeWitt Talmage, "'Male and Female Created He Them'," LHJ, X (September, 1893), 14.

and comes very close upon the ground of disobedience to Divine requirement."[3]

The Journal exalted wifehood by frequently publishing articles about the wives of prominent men. For the first half of the nineties the Journal ran a series entitled "Unknown Wives of Well-Known Men," highlighting each month the activities of one or perhaps as many as three wives. The series portrayed the wives of such luminaries as Phineas T. Barnum, Thomas A. Edison, 'Uncle Remus,' and Count Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy. Typically the wife was a "valuable and efficient aid to her husband," occasionally offering her famous spouse advice and maybe even serving as financial manager. Almost invariably, however, the articles honed in on the wife's aid and comfort to her husband in their home rather than her own activities outside the home. In the case of Mrs. Barnum, the article illustrated how she provided aid to charitable causes, but "such assistance as she renders being always given anonymously or under cover of Mr. Barnum's name."[4]

When the Journal terminated "Unknown Wives of Well-Known Men" it did not stop giving its readers insights into the lives of this type woman, it just did not present

---

[3]Charles H. Parkhurst, "The Young Man and Marriage," LHJ, VII (November, 1890), 15.

[4]Alice Graham Lanigan, "Unknown Wives of Well-Known Men," LHJ, VIII (February, 1891), 3.

the vignettes so systematically. Still, the readers received a fairly steady diet of articles describing what supportive companions such women as Mrs. Andrew Carnegie and Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt were to their husbands. The print was clear in the vast majority of these articles--even though the wives of famous men were in the public eye and usually were blessed with greater financial resources, they had to perform essentially the same role the *Journal*'s readers had to perform. In short, Bok's magazine made extensive use of prominent wives to shore up the Victorian image of wifehood.

Periodically, the *Journal* addressed the question of unmarried women and its attitude varied according to the motivation or circumstance behind the woman's unmarried state. The magazine issued no indictment of the rare woman who never receives a proposal of marriage, although it occasionally admonished her for never having developed the noble, loving traits that are generally woman's nature. If woman refuses an offer of betrothal on grounds that the man is not a good man the *Journal* did not complain, unless she is the unduly critical type who demands perfection instead of simple high quality. But if a woman foregoes engagement and marriage because she treasures independence and has no intention whatsoever of marrying, the *Journal* took serious exception.

In 1898, the "bachelor girl" troubled Ruth Ashmore. The term, Ashmore said, connoted in her mind an honorable status that was totally lacking in the term "old maid." Yet, despite such window dressing, the woman is still the same. She lives her life without love and marriage and consequently does not fulfill those divine functions set out for her by God. The Country Contributor, a decade later, declared that "woman, without the maternal instinct, is an immoral creature, and I suspect it is this lack, more than anything else, that makes young women grow bitter with disillusion."[5]

The Journal's writers did not speak of one accord, however. Amidst the firm expressions of support for marriage appeared an occasional voice crying in the wilderness. Anne Shannon Monroe stated in 1908: "Let the woman who loves the atmosphere of the commercial world stick to business" and those who love other work assume positions that bring them greatest satisfaction. Certainly, let the woman who finds joy in housework and nursing pursue a career as a mother, but do not force other women into the mold or the world might miss the future Jane Addams, Helen Gould, or Frances Willard.[6]

---

[5]Ruth Ashmore, "The Bachelor Girl," LHJ, XV (April, 1898), 22; Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," LHJ, XXV (May, 1908), 32.

[6]Anne Shannon Monroe, "When a Girl Has No Business to Marry," LHJ, (May, 1908), 14, 72.

Such isolated views notwithstanding, the bulk of the Journal's writers taught that upon recitation of her marital vows, woman immediately assumes the exalted role as wife, at once basking in the light of divine fulfillment while committing herself to a lifelong obligation. A woman can occupy no better position than "that of companion to man," though she must understand before taking that fateful step that marriage is "no frolic under the mistletoe."[7]

What are the attributes of a true wife? In 1893, Octave Thanet outlined them. The good wife is interesting to her husband, because she develops interest in and preferably some knowledge of subjects her husband especially enjoys. She possesses tact, which is "nine parts sympathy and one part shrewdness." Thirdly, a wise wife manifests magnanimity (a trait normally "not considered a property of the feminine mind") by neither nagging nor harping on her husband's small vices and weaknesses. She also possesses "sense." Men care little if their sweethearts have sense, the author said, but they certainly expect their wives to have it. And the true wife admits that sometimes her intuition leads her astray. The good wife has a sense of humor, a trait that is "as charming as grace." And finally, a good wife enjoys cooking and keeping house.

---

[7]Ruth Ashmore, "The Conservative Woman," LHJ, XIII (February, 1896), 16; and Fannie Kilbourne, "'And Forsaking All Others'," LHJ, XXXII (October, 1915), 19, 87.

Indeed, a girl has "no right to marry" if she cannot handle those "duties." Forestalling possible criticism of her essay, Thanet observed that a sound marriage depends not only on a wise wife, but a wise husband as well.[8]

The attributes Octave Thanet and the Journal ascribed to true wifehood were demanding but generally pragmatic. Yet these standards evidently were not stringent enough for one particular subspecie of womanhood--the minister's wife. In the Victorian editions of the magazine, relationships between ministers and their girl friends or wives attracted a disporportionately large amount of attention. The minister was a strong character and a highly attractive "catch" for girls seeking marital bliss. Once married to a man of the cloth, however, a woman generally found she was not just another wife; everyone expected her to manifest a level of circumspection and taste a cut above the wives of laymen. In early Journals the higher standards specified for the wife of a clergyman were a badge of merit of sorts, an opportunity for her to exercise to the utmost woman's God-given spiritual and moral gifts.

By the turn of the century, however, the unique position of the minister's spouse lost its appeal as an opportunity for meritorious service. "A Minister's Wife" wrote an article entitled "The Church Engaged My Husband,

---

[8]Octave Thanet, "That Man: Your Husband," LHJ, X (February, 1893), 8.

Not Me" in 1900, decrying her "lack of privacy and the sacrifice of dignity" and complaining that she could not make close friends for fear of stimulating factionalism in the fold. Whatever service she gives to the church, the author argued, "is given voluntarily, and is something which no church has a right to demand." Elizabeth Wood Scott eight years later added that the minister's wife bears intense scrutiny in such tangential matters as the clothes she wears and what activities she participates in outside the home and church; and she must foreswear any dream of a career of her own.[9] In short, being a minister's wife makes a woman more visible and therefore a much easier target for backbiting and gossip.

Since women must get married, what traits did women "think best fit a man for a husband?" Carolyn Halsted posed that question to one hundred married women and revealed their responses in 1906. To her surprise, none of the hundred mentioned "wealth, good looks, good dressing, social position or indulgence as desirable qualifications for the good husband." Her tally of the responses showed that seventy-five wanted an honest man; fifty, a good provider; thirty-eight, a home-lover; twenty-three, a man

---

[9]A Minister's Wife, "The Church Engaged My Husband, Not Me," LHJ, XVII (August, 1900), 28; Elizabeth Wood Scott, "Problems That Vex Ministers' Wives," LHJ, XXV (January, 1908), 31. See also Alice Freeman Lusk, "The Wife of the Minister: What Has the Church the Right to Ask of Her?" LHJ, XXXII (November, 1915), 27-28.

with self-control; eighteen, a manly man; and fifteen, a patient man.[10]

The Journal seemed to have ambivalent sentiments toward the nature of the relationship between husband and wife. In Victorian editions of the magazine, man appeared as the central figure of authority in the family but not as an all-powerful ruler. The closest the Journal came to depicting man as the unchallenged head of the family was in an occasional short story where the husband subjugated the female protagonist. In 1902, in "The Wisdom of the Dove," for example, the leading female character was a very submissive type who "accepted her husband's suggestions . . . with placidity" and made it "a rule to obey him in everything as literally and quickly as possible." In this instance the husband, a minister, never seemed to abuse his power over his wife, but still she was entirely submissive and as good a wife as one could hope.[11]

Annie Payson Call, author of a number of works on the "power of repose," came closer to the norm, positing the thesis that the wife is chiefly responsible for preventing marital conflict. When the husband is grouchy and irritable, she should diffuse his combativeness by

---

[10]Carolyn Halsted, compiler, "The Best Kind of Husband," LHJ, XVIII (March, 1906), 10.

[11]Lilian Brooks, "The Wisdom of the Dove," LHJ, XIX (January, 1902), 8.

kindness; her husband will eventually reciprocate. Lest someone misinterpret her essay to mean woman must yield to a continual barrage of disagreeable behavior, the author hastily noted "that there is a radical difference between indulging another's selfishness, and waiting, with patient yielding, for him to discover his selfishness himself, and to act unselfishly from his own free will." Call however did not arm her readers with a standby plan in the event that the husband never saw his own unselfishness; she was obviously sold on the "power of repose."[12]

A humorous glance at this question appeared in 1901. The Reverend D. M. Steele related an ostensibly true experience from his ministry, describing how during a wedding ceremony when he reached the point of asking the bride to repeat "love, honor and obey," she refused to utter the repugnant phrase, thus creating an embarrassing scene. The nervous groom tried to humor her by offering to omit the word obey but the minister refused, explaining to the groom that "this household must have a head somewhere." The man of God then said he would proceed with the ceremony if the groom would speak the phrase. Embarrassed, frustrated, and angry, the groom said he would not, and "gathered up his hat and started for the door when, presto! change! she sprang after him, led him

---

[12]Annie Payson Call, "Why Is My Husband So Irritable?" LHJ, XXV (November, 1908), 30.

back by the hand, looked meekly up at him and said it."[13]

A number of other articles addressed the same question. One revealed that almost half the female college graduates surveyed approved the use of "obey" in the marriage ceremony, despite their reputation for opposing marriage in favor of personal independence. As late as 1915, a writer considered it a "constant amusement and amazement to see a skittish girl shy at the word 'obey' in the marriage service, though she's fearlessly willing to promise to 'love, honor and cherish.'"[14]

These sentiments did not go unanswered. In 1906, Dean Hodges stated that he had never seen bitterness erupt over the word "obey" in a marriage service but he still considered it a conventionality that had long since seen any reason for existence. A vestige from a period "when a woman was supposed to have no will, and when it was seriously doubted if she had any soul," this term should be eliminated. In Hodges' estimation, the husband "is not to obey her, nor is she to obey him; both are to be obedient to those high laws of reason and courtesy and love

---

[13]D. M. Steele, "Some People I Have Married," LHJ, XVIII (June, 1901), 2.

[14]Carolyn Halsted, collator, "How to Make Marriage a Success," LHJ, XXII (March, 1905), 10; A Minister's Wife, "Ideas of Two Women," LHJ, XXXII (October, 1915), 28.

which are the laws of God." Such a vow is "impertinent." If the marriage is right, no promise of obedience is necessary; if it is wrong, no promise of subjection can mend it.[15] Still, at that time such vigorous declarations of domestic feminism were rare in the Journal.

Over the decades occurred no particularly dramatic shift in the Journal's portrayal of wifely submission. Indeed, even in 1918, a story appeared strongly affirming man's authority in the marriage relationship. John Armstrong's wife, accustomed to her family's great wealth, continued to purchase extravagant items after they were married, knowing that while John's income could not stand that kind of expenditure her father would gladly foot the bills. John eventually issued an ultimatum, Alice capitulated, and harmony returned. "Don't you see," John said to his penitent wife, "you would despise me sooner or later if I let you have your own way in this?" John was the master of the house; he had her under tow.[16]

Given the Journal's consensus of views on the sanctity of marriage and the husband's principle authority in marriage, it is a little surprising that so much evidence

---

[15] Dean Hodges, "The Business of Being a Wife," LHJ, XXIII (January, 1906), 19.

[16] Harold MacGrath, "Playing the Game: When Alice Didn't Do It and John Blundered," LHJ, XXXV (August, 1918), 23, 74.

of marital dissatisfaction appeared in the pages of the magazine. Regular advice features such as "Side-Talks with Girls" and "Girl's Problems" aired a substantial amount of reader discontentment, and special features venting considerable dissatisfaction implied editorial recognition that many of woman's complaints about her husband were legitimate. In 1908, the magazine ran an article entitled "Why I Would Not Marry My Husband Again" by "A Wife." It was an unusual article in the breadth of its complaints against A Wife's husband and for that matter against husbands in general. A Wife's indictments of her husband serve effectively as an outline for the criticisms leveled against husbands by many other writers.

In her jeremiad, A Wife enumerated a thorough check-list of the endemic inadequacies of husbands, using her husband as a case study. First among her complaints was her husband's ignorance of the nature of domestic life. His mother, A Wife said, had never taught him to cooperate in keeping the house neat and orderly, for she had been "a slave to her boys, allowing them to throw their clothes on the floor for her to pick up and put away, to sit while she was standing, to see her carry burdens and open doors with her arms full." Once married, he expected his wife to treat him as his mother had,

picking up after him and arranging household affairs to his personal specifications.[17]

Similarly, another anonymous writer recalled how, after the children had left home, their servant had quit and she was unable to find another. Rather than share the additional homemaking chores, the husband left her all the additional work, cleaning and fueling the furnace, maintaining the pump, and canning and preserving fruits and vegetables. Why did he not heed the call of duty? "It was not in him to do this. He contented himself by saying that he wasn't built that way."[18]

Closely related to A Wife's grievances against man's lack of understanding about the nature of domestic work was her frustration over financial matters. Indeed, of all the complaints catalogued in the Journal, none elicited as much critical comment or emotion as this. Financial protests consisted of two fundamental problems--insufficient allowance for the wife's personal use and inadequate allocation of income for household expenses.

Woman's allowance was a pernicious problem. Ideally the man should give his wife an allowance for herself in addition to normal household expenses. Wives bitterly

---

[17] A Wife, "Why I Would Not Marry My Husband Again," LHJ, XXV (August, 1908), 4.

[18] Herself, "What Being a Woman Has Meant to Me," LHJ, XXVI (December, 1908), 4.

resented having to wrangle "over every new dress, every winter coat, every hat and pair of shoes and gloves" they purchased. Husbands seemed oblivious to their wives' personal financial needs. Indeed, resentment welled up in one wife to such an extent that at times she "actually hated him." Another woman commented on the humiliation of asking for money and how she "innately rebelled from asking for anything which was mine by right but which was not accorded me unless I asked for it." She confessed that she should have forced a serious discussion of her allowance as soon as they married but she was too afraid of creating an ugly scene. After twenty years she finally threw the gauntlet. Tempers flaired momentarily, but the couple resolved the problem and she encouraged other wives not to delay in addressing the issue.[19]

The Country Contributor concurred that handling money contributes "immeasurably to a woman's self-respect." A husband should understand that the money his wife requests for her personal use is not an allowance. Because "allowance smacks of gratuity or charity," she preferred the terms "share" or "wages" instead. Every good wife "earns" the money she gets. The Country Contributor hoped

---

[19]A Wife, "Why I Would Not Marry My Husband Again," LHJ, XXV (August, 1908), 4; and The Wife, "Twenty Years of Humiliation with My Husband," LHJ, XXIV (September, 1907), 25.

she could inspire each wife "with new confidence in her claim upon the business of life." But inspiring readers was one thing and convincing husbands was quite another, since "the majority of men are 'little' in their money dealings with their wives--that is if their wives allow them to be." The author concluded that "men like to make children of their wives. It is inherent, this patriarchial air, the heritage of centuries, as the dependent air is the heritage of the woman."[20]

To overcome man's "real mistrust of a woman's ability to handle" her allowance "wisely," woman should educate her husband to the reality that, while marriage is certainly "a relation of sentiment," it is also "as much a business contract as any other partnership." The husband earns the capital and the wife distributes it, "and of the two her work is really the more complex and difficult."[21]

In 1902, Margaret Sangster, long-time editor of "Girls' Problems," received a letter noting that the correspondent's husband objected to her working, although she had "plenty of time" to work and to take proper care of the home. Since his income prevented him from proffering as much "for my personal use as I want," what should

---

[20]Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," LHJ, XXIV (August, 1907), 26.

[21]Helen Watterson Moody, "What It Means to be a Wife," LHJ, XVI (March, 1899), 26.

she do? Sangster reminded the young woman that her "home and its happiness must take precedence of everything else, and if your husband gives you all that he can afford you should try to make the amount cover your personal and other expenses." Yet, if the problem caused serious agitation and tension, the author advised, she should "frankly" discuss finances with her spouse to see if some adjustment might be possible. Perhaps he might permit her to do some work at home that would not interfere with her housekeeping chores. If not, she should remember that her husband's notion "that he should be the breadwinner is fundamentally right."[22]

The venerable Ruth Ashmore took a firmer position while replying to a husband's question about an allowance for his wife. She remonstrated him for having insisted that she tell him "exactly how she spent the household money." After all, his wife is "a partner in the purse" and should be treated in that manner.[23]

Even in the teens, the issue of the wife's allowance did not pass away. In fiction and non-fiction alike the Journal kept up the pressure in defense of the wife's right to have her own money. In one short story the wife

---

[22]Margaret Sangster, "Girls' Problems," LHJ, XIX (October, 1902), 31.

[23]Ruth Ashmore, "The Young Husband's First Year," LHJ, XII (February, 1895), 16.

related the storm that erupted in her marriage over her personal funds. "I sprang up fiercely," she said, "and turned loose upon Hartley the pent-up, slow forming wrath of those five years, hurling at him wild-angry sentences, many of which were unjust, I suppose." She made her point and got her allowance.[24]

The second facet of wives' financial dissatisfaction was the shortage of funds for household operations. Most of their complaints paralleled those just mentioned in regard to the wives' personal expenses and to repeat them is unnecessary. However, an article which appeared in 1919, reflects how completely the Journal had adopted the view of the homemaker as an economic factor.

"An American Mother" asked her husband what kind of business he thought the home to be. He responded: "A business quite celestial as a general rule." She objected vigorously to his interpretation on grounds that such idealistic trappings hide the fact that the home is an economic enterprise. In the parley that ensued she contended that "the home produces wealth as well as consumes it," since almost everything brought into the house is "raw material," practically useless in its original state. She insisted that her labor had "a cash value whether I

---

[24]The Wife Herself, "The Purple Hat: Its Share in Solving a Wife's 'Allowance' Problem," LHJ, XXXII (July, 1915), 16, 60.

am canning food, baking bread or only making a bed, and I have come to be as jealous of my time as my husband is of his office hours." Modern labor-saving devices--carpet sweeper, vacuum cleaner, sewing machine, electric iron, washing machine, refrigerator, and others--should not be construed as luxuries. Just as new machinery makes businesses more efficient, these devices permit the wife to produce more goods and services in the same amount of time.[25] By the late teens, then, the belief that homemaking should be analysed from this economic perspective had the upper hand over the Victorian notion that homemaking is a womanly responsibility regardless of economic considerations.

In addition to her complaints that husbands have no comprehension of housework and typically fail to provide satisfactory allowances, A Wife further charged that men "are dreadfully afraid of being sentimental, especially after they are married." The husband's lack of sentimentality tends to leave the impression that he takes his wife for granted, an impression that slowly begins to eat away at her soul, actually causing her to wonder "if she would do it over again." During courtship, A Wife's husband-to-be had never failed to rise and offer her a chair when she entered a room and to wait until she was

---

[25] An American Mother, "A Talk I Had with My Husband and What Came of It," LHJ, XXV (March, 1918), 42.

seated before he returned to his seat. Yet, she said, "he never did it once after we were married." Having won his prize, a man should not cease bestowing these "little courtesies," he should be aware that sentimentality "is so much better than a mere physical passion." Certainly, romance fades but sentiment lives on and on and, she implied, adds deeper dimension to physical passion.[26]

Her husband's lack of consideration was another of A Wife's reasons for arguing that she would not marry him again. For example, he used tobacco inordinately. She easily could have accepted a moderate habit, but she objected to his "absolute lack of consideration for her and the rest of the family. He knew that she kissed him "mechanically," she said, but his lips and mustache "invariably reek" so much from his smoking, "why do I kiss him at all?"[27] Frustration over cigar smoking and, to a lesser degree, pipe and cigarette smoking prompted several writers to suggest that if men are going to smoke, then at least they should be courteous and thoughtful enough to smoke in only one designated room in order to keep the remainder of the home fresh and sweet.

---

[26]A Wife, "Why I Would Not Marry My Husband Again," LHJ, XXV (August, 1908), 4.

[27]A Wife, "Why I Would Not Marry My Husband Again," LHJ, XXV (August, 1908), 4.

The hackneyed complaint of "man's lack of appreciation" for his spouse's labor was another of her husband's major deficiencies. He seemed to think, she said bitterly, that while he is at work "I 'just lie around home.'" And it is precisely this lack of appreciation that prompts many women to shirk their domestic duties. A constant stream of compliments to pump her vanity is unnecessary, but an occasional one is a tremendous morale booster. But, A Wife's husband was so unaccustomed to offering compliments that it is "evident that he doesn't know how."[28]

Finally, A Wife admitted that she would not marry her husband again because he would not ask her. He could summon as many reasons for not marrying her again as she had for him. More than likely he would charge that she was fastidious, beset with ideals far beyond their financial means, and sharp-tongued. Having been married to her, if he could select a spouse again, she said sardonically, he would pick a "girl more like him--a matter-of-fact girl with no taste for fine lines--a girl who would like plated spoons and tapestry Brussels, and who would be proud of her man because he knew more than she did--a better woman than I perhaps."[29]

---

[28]A Wife, "Why I Would Not Marry My Husband Again," LHJ, XXV (August, 1908), 4.

[29]A Wife, "Why I Would Not Marry My Husband Again," LHJ, XXV (August, 1908), 4.

In concluding her essay, A Wife rendered an indictment of her husband that was harsher than most but not too far from the norm. Her husband spoke the first cross, impatient word and was first to stop exhibiting the courtesies and kindnesses that are the core of marital happiness. He "deliberately" demonstrated "the worst side of his nature with utter tactlessness and unconcern as to how it might affect my love." To avoid more serious repercussions, she endeavored to ignore his slights, condone his bad habits, and make allowances for his inadequacies. Consequently, with her doing all the giving, they lived together "in comparative happiness." But, her final statement in the essay was, "I would not marry him again."[30]

These were mighty damning criticisms to appear in the Ladies' Home Journal and they represent the increasing willingness of the Journal to catalogue negative features of marriage. With growing regularity the Journal admitted that, while unquestionably God had ordained that man and woman should be united in marriage, the holy institution was not perfect. In a marriage as unrewarding as A Wife's, or perhaps even worse than hers, what were the wife's options? Should she stand her ground, or accept the grin-and bear-it approach of A Wife, or get a divorce? That is the subject of the next chapter.

---

[30]A Wife, "Why I Would Not Marry My Husband Again," LHJ, XXV (August, 1908), 4.

CHAPTER V

DIVORCE

The *Ladies' Home Journal*'s initial position on the subject of divorce was forthright and firm. Divorce, an unconscionable renunciation of the sanctity and permanence of marriage, is a bane upon mankind. In the face of soaring divorce rates in the United States and the deterioration of Victorian standards on almost all fronts, however, the *Journal*'s initial militant opposition softened gradually to forbearance--never approval, only forbearance. But, since Bok's publication had originally contended that woman has the major responsibility for keeping a home together, its relaxation on the divorce issue was tantamount to both reducing its demands on womanhood and narrowing the gap between the sexes imposed by the old double standard.

The Reverend Charles H. Parkhurst, who wrote about divorce more than any other *Journal* contributor during the Gilded Age, probably best represented the *Journal*'s early attitude on that controversial subject. The sanctity of marriage emanates from its indestructibility, he said, so to permit divorce is to deny the holiness of marriage. Some people who readily denounce bigamy consider divorce permissible when "there is not a great deal of difference

really between having two wives at the same time and having them at different times and changing off at the suggestion of whim or convenience." Therefore, the growing respect being accorded divorcées and the rising tide of divorces are a "menace to the sanctity of marriage" and consequently are "evil omens of social and national destiny," portending possibly the ultimate destruction of civilization.[1]

In early numbers, the *Journal*'s short stories preached the same doctrine. For example, the childhood sweetheart of the Rector of St. Peters returned to her hometown after leaving her husband, a scoundrel who treated her cruelly and gambled away their money. The Rector, whose love for her had never waned, wanted desperately to marry her but could not because, regardless how worthless her husband was, she had no right to violate the vow she had made at the marriage altar. Tragically, their love was never consummated.[2] Characters in other short stories encountered similar dilemmas, with their strict precepts on divorce running counter to their emotions and causing, it seemed, no end to sadness and frustration. But the characters, as the Rector and his lover did, typically assented passively to the realization that there was no alternative to the

---

[1]Charles H. Parkhurst, "Marriage and Its Safeguards," *LHJ*, XII (July, 1918), 15.

[2]Margaret Seymour Hall, "The Rector of St. Peters," *LHJ*, X (July, 1895), 1-2.

high moral road. And this pattern jibed perfectly with the standard Victorian perceptions on the evils of divorce which William L. O'Neill describes in his fine study of divorce in the Progressive Era.[3]

Happy endings with weddings and prospects of a couple living happily ever after are far more appealing to most people than stories, such as the one just mentioned, with a couple deeply in love having to face the future sad, alone, and unfulfilled. The following summary of a serial that appeared in 1893 and 1894, illustrates how some writers managed to depict a love affair between a man and a "married" woman and still produce a happy ending without contravening the Journal's opposition to divorce.

A lawyer named Albert Noel met Mrs. Christine Dallas, a vivacious, intelligent woman, and immediately fell in love with her. After protracted personal deliberation, Noel chose the honorable route of breaking off the relationship and moving to another city rather than challenging Christine's love for her husband, a love that seemed all but gone. Suffering self-recrimination for having followed "this high moral platform" instead of his love, Noel moved back a year and a half later to renew the relationship, cognizant that his actions might lead to her divorce. Upon seeing her he immediately called her by her first name, an

---

[3]William L. O'Neill, Divorce in the Progressive Era (New York, 1973), pp. 57-88.

act which itself flouted contemporary standards expressed elsewhere in the Journal. Mrs. Dallas looked pale and haggard and he was distressed to see her weighed down by "unnatural burdens" of a sick child (which soon died) and an irresponsible husband who left her and moved west.

At the end of the fourth installment of the series, a western law firm employed Noel to investigate locally the background of a man charged with bigamy in a distant state. Coming as no surprise to the reader, the man suspected of bigamy was Christine's husband. Noel was elated and in the next episode, at Noel's insistence, Christine detailed how cruel her husband was to her; but when Noel asked if she had ever considered divorce she replied emphatically, "Divorce? . . . Never! I scarcely know what it is--but marriage seems to me a thing indissoluble and inviolate." Then Noel played his trump, revealing to her that she was not and never had been married to Dallas because the baneful man was already married when he and Christine had exchanged vows. Shocked and distraught, she cried that death would be easier to face than "life with this thing branded on me." She had lived with a man to whom she was not married. But the persistent Noel then asked her to marry him and she asked rhetorically how a woman can be "at once so honored and so shamed?" No, she would not marry him; she could not give any man a ruined life like hers.

But wait! One installment remained. And in that episode Christine at long last confessed her love for Noel, they kissed (for the first time), and she agreed to marry him provided his mother approved. When Christine visited Noel's home to talk things over, Mother Noel asked her if her "honor is free from stain?" Of course it was. "Do you think yourself a fit wife for my son?" she queried. Of course she did. Finally the mother said, "My child, if you had had a mother all this would not have come to you. I rejoice to take you for my daughter," which she did.[4]

What an endorsement of motherhood! And what a vivid demonstration of the towering importance the Journal placed on the technicalities of law pertaining to the institution of marriage! The author interpreted Christine's commitment in good faith to Dallas as evidence of her virtue (although misguided) and therefore as partial justification her ultimate marriage to Noel.

Actually, the opposite is true. Because her intent before God and the world had been to become Dallas' wife and the mother of his children, as far as her virtue was concerned what difference did it make that Dallas was already married? In her heart and mind she was married: mere technicalities or formalities could not salvage her

---

[4]Julia Magruder, "A Beautiful Alien," LHJ, XI (December, 1893), 7-8; (January, 1894), 5-6; (February, 1894), 7-8; (March, 1894), 7-8; (April, 1894), 3-4; (May, 1894), 5-6; and (June, 1894), 7-8.

virtue. Actually, the author was confusing a moral question with a legal one. In the author's opinion it was not that Christine had considered herself married to Dallas, had intercourse with him, and borne his child that determined her virtue, it was the bigamous act of Dallas that determined it. There was no marriage only because Dallas did not make a valid contract. Had the marriage been legal, although Dallas mistreated and abandoned her, divorce would have been out of the question and could not have preserved her virtue. Viewed in this light, then, the author's, and therefore the Journal's, concern in such a situation was actually not with virtue but with formalities.

Had this story been an isolated one it would not have merited this summarization and discussion, but several other stories during this period similarly hinged around the questions of marriage, divorce, and bigamy. And the implication was clear even in stories uncomplicated by the bigamy factor that if the characters had been able to discover similar loopholes they also could have found bliss. The Journal's preoccupation with the technicalities of divorce, therefore, indicated that it was grasping at straws for arguments to shore its uncompromising position on divorce.

As early as 1898, however, a slight, very slight, chink began to appear in the Journal's armor. One author

began her article by staunchly proclaiming the standard fare that "divorce is a canker-worm" that robs "matrimony of its purity and sanctity," and Americans should resist the liberalization of divorce laws which would allow "marital anarchists" not only to satisfy their own whims and pleasures but ultimately threaten society itself. But in a passing comment the essayist equivocated on this hard line stance. Any man who accepts his vows seriously could never ask his wife for a divorce, she said, "unless she were insane or a murderess," and even under those circumstances, "a deeply conscientious man" would feel compelled at least to remain faithful to his vow to "cherish and protect." This is not much of a chink, to be sure, but a chink nonetheless.[5]

Five years later the chink widened ever so slightly. In the monthly column, "Council Chamber," after admonishing wives to work as hard as possible to keep their marriages afloat, the writer admitted that there are some men who cannot be trusted and "in whose company a woman and her little ones are in even bodily danger." To admit that divorce is justifiable under these extreme conditions represented a significant departure from earlier pronouncements in the Journal because it recognized in a very limited manner the woman's right to initiate divorce. To make sure

---

[5]Frances Evans, "About Men," LHJ, XV (November, 1898), 19.

that people did not read too much into that statement, however, the author emphasized that in the vast majority of cases conditions are not that severe. Further, a woman should remain forgiving and patient and keep foremost in her mind the notion that a terribly trying father may still be a good father. To clinch her point, the author noted that nowhere can there be found "heroism higher and nobler than that of a woman effacing herself to save her husband from destruction."[6]

The Journal's representations on the divorce issue took a dramatic stride away from the Victorian pattern in 1906 and 1907, very active years for the divorce question. A number of articles and stories merit close examination because they not only bear upon divorce but upon many other facets of woman's role in society as well.

An excellent example of the new attitude was a serial, "Holly: The Romance of a Southern Girl," in which the young heroine fell deeply in love with the wealthy and dignified Robert Winthrop, who owned the property on which she and her father lived. To her dismay, Holly discovered that in his room he kept a picture of a woman and child and from that she assumed that he either was or had been married. Rather than confront Winthrop directly for an answer, she reluctantly began to cool the relationship. After an

---

[6]Mrs. James Farley Cox, "The Council Chamber," LHJ, XX (May, 1903), 22.

accident, however, she had to nurse him for several days. With plenty of time to talk, he informed her that indeed he had been married, that they had had a son who died at the age of five, and that his grief-stricken wife had required treatment in a sanitarium, where she fell in love with her physician. "Her love for me seemed to have died with our child," he explained. "The man was--worthy of her. There was a divorce: it was the only way out of a wretched muddle. That was four years ago, and I think, I pray that she is very happy." Once convinced that his love for his first wife had gone, she agreed to marry him.[7]

This serial taught a far different message than earlier stories had. The Journal actually approved marriage between a woman and a man she knew was divorced. Winthrop and Holly did not have to forego marriage because he was divorced and the author did not need the contrivance of bigamy to produce a happy ending.

Also illustrative of the Journal's softening toward divorce is an installment of "Her Brother's Letters," which took the form of letters written by Lent Carlson, practicing law in New York, to his younger sister Kittens.

---

[7]Ralph Henry Barbour, "Holly: The Romance of a Southern Girl," LHJ, XXIV (August, 1907), 5-6, 41-42; (September, 1907), 15-16, 67-69; (October, 1907), 14, 87; and (November, 1907), 16, 84.

In a recent letter to him, Kittens had referred to the impending divorce of Joyce Peek from his wife Clara and denounced him as "a beast" for leaving her after she had given him the best years of her life and borne his children. Once Clara's "freshness" had faded, Kittens said impudently, "he's through with her and casts her off, and wants to marry that snip of a Grace Ford! That's manhood!"

Lent hastily corrected her misapprehension of the situation, reminding her that Joyce was a student type, always studying and reading until late at night in his quest for greater knowledge. Probably he was too much a student for his own good, Lent conceded, but Clara had known that when she agreed to marry him. By comparison, Clara was a "butterfly who flits here and there; likes the lights, and the band playing." When Joyce arrived home around six or seven, as he did "nearly every evening," Clara was going out to the opera or for dinner or something. "There was no evening lamp in that house, Kittens, and no hearthstone, and where those two vital elements in a home are lacking--well look out for squalls." If a man like Joyce does not receive sympathy and understanding at home, "where he has a right" to expect it, then "he's going to get it elsewhere." Joyce did, from Grace Ford. And Grace was no "snip," Lent said, but an "all-fired clever girl," ideally suited to talk over Joyce's work with him and offer him support.

Ideally, Joyce should have married Grace Ford "in the first place," admitted Lent, but how could he have done so when he had not known her. The major fault was Clara's for being "foolish enough" to let Joyce find someone more suited to him than she. "And there's where I blame Clara or any other wife," Lent said. If the wife is not as well qualified as another woman "she ought to make herself so." Clara could have done that, she was plenty bright; but she did not try, she was just out for a good time.[8]

Two interesting points emerge from Lent's letter. First, he held tightly to the Victorian notion that woman has the primary responsibility for keeping the relationship on sound footing--the double standard. He only tangentially blamed Joyce for being insensitive to Clara's needs while strongly condemning her for not being sensitive to his. Secondly, he paradoxically deviated from the Victorian view of marriage by implicitly accepting divorce as a viable, though unfortunate, alternative to an unhappy marriage. This marks a profound shift in the Journal's view of marriage and divorce, for Joyce's and Clara's marital problems were not built on violence, insanity, or infidelity. Joyce was not even a bigamist. In this case, simple dissatisfaction, or irreconcilable differences to use a more modern term, was the only excuse for divorce. The

---

[8]"Her Brother's Letters," LHJ, XXIII (May, 1906), 8.

Journal had taken a very big step in publishing this article.

Now and then during this period, the *Journal* published non-fiction accounts of the marital machinations of certain women, some from the ranks of servility and others from nobility, that were also fundamentally different from the *Journal*'s late nineteenth century perception of marriage and divorce. The true stories consisted of sometimes incredible series of mock marriages, divorces and remarriages, unmarried couples living together, and men keeping mistresses. Despite all the conjugal improprieties, the authors, including Jane Addams, never wrote a disparaging word about the individuals.[9]

Interestingly, in the midst of the *Journal*'s changing attitudes about divorce, the monthly advice column, "Good Manners and Good Form," discussed rules of etiquette associated with divorce and separation, such as how to address a woman who is separated or divorced. That the magazine allotted space for this did not necessarily signal approbation of divorce, but it was symbolic of the *Journal*'s acquiescence to the reality of divorce.[10]

---

[9]See Jane Addams, "Why Girls Go Wrong," *LHJ*, XXIV (September, 1907), 13-14; and William Perrine, "The Beautiful Mrs. Fitzherbert," *LHJ*, XXV (January, 1908), 7-8.

[10]Mrs. Burton Kingsland, "Good Manners and Good Form," *LHJ*, XXIV (July, 1907), 32.

In 1916, amid many that reflected the *Journal*'s more liberal view of divorce, there appeared one short story in which a married woman with two children had fallen in love with another man. Viola's husband was kind and considerate, a good husband; but she now loved Norman. As she discussed the situation with Norman's mother she admitted: "I know I am doing wrong: but I *want* to do wrong." Norman's mother was wise and exceedingly perceptive, as most *Journal* mothers were. "There is not a woman in the world that does not understand. . . . But it is not really Norman you love. You love the mystery." Convinced by the older woman's words that she was chasing the will-of-the-wisp, Viola went home to her husband.[11]

This story helps put into perspective the distance the *Journal* had travelled on the divorce issue in a little over three decades. First, neither a victim of cruelty or bigamy, Viola was a happily married woman who had found a lover. Earlier volumes had noted in non-fiction (usually advice columns) that such relationships occur but never had the reaction been so mild. And, this story represents a most outspoken admission that many married women make conscious effort to have affairs, they are not simply hornswoggled by conniving men.

---

[11]Jeannette Lee, "Another Woman: A Unique Story of the Eternal Mystery of Love," *LHJ*, XXXIII (February, 1916), 13-14, 66-69.

Moreover, Viola's decision to stay with her husband and not marry Norman was not based essentially on moral and legal grounds but on the fact that she was probably more intrigued by the mystery of the affair than she was enraptured by love. The author made no effort to convince the reader Viola was an evil woman, she was sympathetic with Viola and her predicament from beginning to end. Finally, while by this time the Journal had been able to accept the divorce and remarriage of individuals who were victims of cruelty or even irreconcilable differences, it was not willing to go the final step of accepting divorce when a person falls in love with someone else.

The same year, the Journal taught essentially the same lessons in "A Widower for a While" by Sinclair Lewis. The delightful story is too complicated to summarize here; suffice it to say that a middle-aged man and woman, both married, met by chance one day, were immediately enamored with one another, and gave serious consideration to running off together and beginning life anew. "There is nothing to prevent us but--nothing but us." Each was willing to do it if the other would only coax a little. Neither did. They were too "horribly, sickeningly respectable." It was not moral convictions but lack of courage that kept them from being "bad."[12]

---

[12]Sinclair Lewis, "A Widower for a While, LHJ, XXXV (July, 1918), 13, 62, 65.

It would be inaccurate to leave the impression that at this time the Journal was totally converted to this liberalized attitude toward divorce. In one of a series of articles airing Theodore Roosevelt's opinions, the author reported the President's traditional view on divorce. In typically picturesque fashion, the Chief Executive observed that, due to lax divorce laws, marriage resembled "an old-fashioned quadrille in which 'change partners' is the ruling direction. There is music; there is gayety; but all the same it is a dance of death." To stem the rising tide of divorce the President advocated "uniform divorce laws" to render absolute divorce "as rare as possible" and permit remarriages only under certain circumstances.[13]

The Reverend Lyman Abbott, in March 1914, asked in his column how the reader could reconcile "the prevailing divorce of persons standing high in church and moral works" with the injunction that a couple God has joined no man should put asunder. Likewise, His Eminence J. Cardinal Gibbons vitriotically attacked "A National Evil So Prevalent That Marriage is Getting to be Little Better Than a System of Free Love."[14]

---

[13]"The President: The President's Views on a Uniform Divorce Law," LHJ, XXIII (September, 1906), 17.

[14]Lyman Abbott, "How Do You Explain These Things?" LHJ, XXXI (March, 1914), 23; J. Cardinal Gibbons, "A National Evil So Prevalent That Marriage is Getting to be Little Better Than a System of Free Love," LHJ, XXX (March, 1913), 10.

Courtney Ryley Cooper of Kansas City, billed as "a man who is casting out divorce," also denounced divorce but, in so doing, interjected the new argument that women are the real culprits when it comes to "trivial divorces." Evidence proved conclusively, he contended, that women were more prone than men to file for divorce because, frankly, wives store up trivialities in their minds until they "become a bug bear to life" while "men have something else to think about." To improve the quality of marriages and concomitantly to reduce the number of divorces based on petty complaints, Cooper proposed strict requirements for procuring marriage licenses, including six month's waiting period, and creation of domestic relations courts.[15]

By 1920, then, while the Journal still registered opposition in principle to divorce, its attacks had become much less virulent. The writers did not share the unanimity of opinion characteristic of the volumes during the Gilded Age and the magazine no longer so fiercely condemned those who failed to live up to its still high standards.

All along, however, the Journal had been cognizant that not all its readers behaved with utmost propriety, that some actually had relationships with the other sex outside marriage. For some readers, general discussions

---

[15]Courtney Ryley Cooper, "A Man Who is Casting Out Divorce," LHJ, XXXI (March, 1914), 20.

of the evils of divorce and fictional portrayals of role models were not sufficient, they needed specific pointers on what a person should and should not do in order to avoid the catastrophe of divorce. In advice columns, especially, and other non-fiction, the Journal tendered more specific advice. Some of the advice consisted of such practical suggestions as how to manage a household efficiently and how to get along better with a spouse, suggestions which are examined elsewhere in this paper and which therefore do not bear repeating. However, the Journal also instructed individuals on how they could avoid getting entangled in relationships that might lead ultimately to divorce.

Ruth Ashmore, for example, in one of her "Side Talks with Girls" in 1894, advised "a devoted reader" that some day she would "bitterly regret" writing to a married man, apparently an old boyfriend, "'in a tenderly reminiscent strain,'" to use the reader's words. In a different volume she told one correspondent it was unwise for any "married woman to carry on correspondence with a young unmarried man" and informed another that it was improper for "a young matron" visiting out of town to dine at a restaurant and then attend an opera with "'a former admirer.'" She admonished Dell to "ask God to help you in your determination to kill your liking, or what you say is a stronger feeling, for this man whose wife is your friend. Do not

say that you cannot do it, because by God's help you certainly can." A married woman should not tolerate a man so untoward as to call her by her first name, and a business girl should maintain a meticulously business relationship with her married employer.[16]

As early as 1898, Frances Evans, author of the series "About Men," approached the question more directly. She warned the young married man about undue familiarity with another woman, especially if he were having some difficulties at home, because "no such thing exists between any man and woman" as platonic love. It is indescribably easy for a man to develop an attachment for an attractive woman who sympathizes with his moods and seems always to look so attractive. Oh, he might try to play down its importance and potential danger by convincing himself that their feelings for one another are platonic, that she is just brighter and more clever than his wife, and that it would be absurd for a man to abstain from admiring clever, attractive women just because he is married. But as the man enunciates these specious arguments, the writer said, the devil is "at his elbow urging him on, erasing from his mind all sense of duty." Platonic relationships cannot last very long, for one day the desire to touch becomes

---

[16]Ruth Ashmore, "Side Talks with Girls," LHJ, XII (December, 1894), 35; XII (July, 1895), 29; XII (February, 1895), 26; and XV (February, 1898), 21.

overpowering, then, "they know how un-Platonic and like every other love theirs is." Before long, "his satanic majesty" will be reminding the man that he can escape his problems at home and find happiness, for all he needs to do is to go to Satan's divorce court and then marry the other woman. At that point, if the man has even a glimmer of honor left in him, he will "remember duty."

Frances Evans, however, did not propose that a married man should abjure speaking to a young woman or finding "her society agreeable occasionally," she was simply warning that for the "peace and safety of all concerned" he must take the precaution of seeing her infrequently, so that no "particular bond of congeniality" develops between them. When a young man asked Frances Evans if "Platonic love is possible between young unmarried men and women," her response was interesting. Platonic relationships, she said, are "more likely between them than between a married man and a young unmarried woman.[17]

So it went, month after month, until the beginning of the twentieth century when the frequency of this type of advice started a decline that continued somewhat irregularly into the teens. This trend adds additional weight to the thesis that the Journal's position on divorce was softening.

---

[17]Frances Evans, "About Men," LHJ, XVI (December, 1898), 24.

Unsurprisingly, the _Journal_'s handling of the divorce question corresponded quite closely with national trends, which William L. O'Neill has so ably described in _Divorce in the Progressive Era_. During Edward Bok's reign over the _Journal_, the divorce rate rose rapidly. The number of divorces per 1000 existing marriages rose from 4.0 in 1900 to 7.7 in 1920, an increase of 92 percent, while the actual number of divorces grew by almost 500 percent, from 33,461 to 167,105.[18] The _Ladies' Home Journal_, whose popularity depended on staying abreast of, or at least not clashing severely with, prevailing trends revised its stand as the rate of divorce increased. True, the magazine remained opposed to divorce throughout the years Bok was editor, but the temper of its articles and stories mellowed over the years, becoming far less contentious. From its original no-divorce-under-any-circumstance position, the magazine acquiesced to divorces motivated not only by consideration of violence and insanity but even for irreconcilable differences. And marrying a divorced person was no longer the anathema it had once been.

Moreover, O'Neill claims that on the national scene there were two periods "when the problem received most attention. The first period lasted from about 1889 to

---

[18]William L. O'Neill, _Divorce in the Progressive Era_, pp. 20, 254-261.

1894, and the second roughly from 1904 to 1914."[19] The Journal's emphasis on the divorce issue closely matched these periods of particularly active debate. The magazine defiantly attacked the devil's instrument from about 1890 to 1895; then after a decade of relative quiet it demonstrated its most pronounced changes in attitude in a burst of articles from 1906 through 1908.

All told, the Journal's relaxed attitude toward divorce amounted to a significant expansion in woman's range of alternatives in an unsatisfactory marriage. It marked a diminution, though by no means eradication, of the old double standard that had imposed upon woman premier responsibility for keeping the family together. Granted, the Journal did not champion elimination of sexual discrimination in the states' divorce laws or even liberalization of divorce statutes; but, considering the conservative, generally antifeminist bent of its editor, the Journal had made substantial strides in adapting to national trends.

---

[19] William L. O'Neill, Divorce in the Progressive Era, pp. 254-266.

CHAPTER VI

MOTHERHOOD

In the *Journal*'s scheme of things, woman's second role in marriage is to be a mother. To be a wife is to fulfill a sacred calling, but unless a woman also becomes a mother she cannot fulfill that penultimate calling for which she is "specifically endowed and ordained."[1]

Indeed, motherhood is not simply a path which woman may take if she chooses, rather it is an undying impulse that wells up from her very being. The Reverend Charles H. Parkhurst explained it in this fashion. "Nature has certain pretty decided opinions" about motherhood and has so strongly imposed these opinions on woman's physical nature "that any feminine attempt to mutiny against wifehood, motherhood and domestic 'limitation' [those quotation marks serving as a not so subtle jab at feminists] is a hopeless and rather imbecile attempt to escape the inevitable." Furthermore, just as He physically constituted her to bear children, His Omnipotence imbued woman with the emotional attributes to rear them as well. No wonder

---

[1]A Famous American Novelist, "When I Was a Man for Awhile: And Why I Would Rather be a Woman," *LHJ*, XXXIII (May, 1916), 34.

being a mother "is the greatest thing a woman can do," said Parkhurst. And, no wonder, said another writer, it is "the supremely important business of humanity."[2]

Throughout the period covered in this study, the Journal's view of motherhood remained soundly constructed on the bases just described, although by the teens the Journal did tend to demonstrate more understanding and compassion toward childless and unmarried women. That notwithstanding, the Journal's promotion of motherhood continued unabated.

Ruth Ashmore, responding in general to questions and comments from her correspondents in 1898, observed that motherhood is "the ideal state" for woman and reassured a reader that it is "right and proper" for her to want to become "some good man's wife and the happy mother of some dear little children." With evangelical fervor, "A Farmer's Wife" a decade later said she would offer a girl only one piece of advice, "and that is--marry! Don't be an old maid if you can help it--I know some lively ones--but no woman ever really lives until she is a mother!" President Theodore Roosevelt praised motherhood from a different perspective--patriotism. To him, a good mother "is a

---

[2]Charles H. Parkhurst, "The True Mission of Woman," LHJ, XII (April, 1895), 15; A Famous Novelist, "When I Was a Man for Awhile: And Why I Would Rather be a Woman," LHJ, XXXIII (May, 1916), 34.

better citizen even than the soldier who fights for his country."[3] Heroic soldiers only have Valhalla; mothers have Heaven.

What can be more satisfying and ennobling for a woman than bearing and rearing a child? To a host of the Journal's contributors the answer was self evident--bearing and rearing more children. Marion Sprague praised the large family and was perplexed as to why some women, for no better reasons than the extra work and expense of a larger family, voluntarily limit themselves to only two or three children. President Charles Eliot of Harvard claimed that the "mother of several children--four, five or six--has better opportunities of developing her own intellectual life than the mother of one child or two children." In a large family there is such variety in the children's dispositions and talents that it offers mental stimulation to the mother just to keep up with them and lead them to stable, productive adulthood.[4] Certainly, many readers must have scratched their heads quizzically over this line of reasoning.

---

[3]Ruth Ashmore, "The Bachelor Girl," LHJ, XV (April, 1898), 22; A Farmer's Wife, "The Letter of a Farmer's Wife," LHJ, (February, 1907), 48; Theodore Roosevelt, "The Successful Mother," LHJ, XXV (June, 1908), 10.

[4]Marion Sprague, "The Letters of Two Mothers," LHJ, XXIII (March, 1906), 28; Charles W. Eliot, "The Normal American Woman," LHJ, XXV (January, 1908), 15.

Further, other writers, like "An American Mother," observing the steadily declining size of white families, wondered if "the race" were going to "become extinct while our women hunt for work higher than that which God gave them." President Theodore Roosevelt despaired at statistics which revealed that family size was decreasing, especially among families best suited educationally and financially to have many children. The Chief Executive, whose views on race suicide appeared several times, feared that if the average family size falls below four population will decline eventually to the point of virtual extinction. The regrettable decline in family size was due at least partially to "side currents" accompanying the otherwise "highly welcome emancipation of woman." A few on the fringe of the new woman movement had "twisted" the meaning of their newfound freedom by employing it as an excuse and opportunity for relieving themselves of the obligations and duties that are woman's estate. And Roosevelt rebuked women of this ilk for placing their own pleasure and comfort above the survival of the race.[5]

The declining size of families in America was largely the result of the growing use of contraception.[6] However,

---

[5]An American Mother, "What of the Woman Herself," LHJ, XVIII (June, 1901), 10; "The President: Mr. Roosevelt's Views on Race Suicide," LHJ, XXIII (February, 1906), 21.

[6]Sheila M. Rothman, Woman's Proper Place (New York, 1978), pp. 198-199.

the ever-circumspectful Journal, despite its concern over the falling birth rate, never attacked contraceptives or any other specific forms of birth control. Such arguments, to have had any effect, would have required some rather detailed references to the human reproductive system, and the Journal with its Victorian standards was not ready for that.

The Journal did not simply admonish its female readers to have children, many of them, and then leave them to their own devices when it came to rearing them. On the contrary, in virtually every issue, in short stories, advice columns, and non-fiction alike, Bok's magazine explored the relationship between mother and child and provided counsel on what it considered the best methods for managing them. Periodically the Journal published articles, occasionally even series, about relationships between prominent individuals and their mothers. For a while, a series entitled "The Woman Who Most Influenced Me" served as an avenue for famous and not-so-famous individuals to remember their loving mothers. In addition, Aunt Patience, Ruth Ashmore, Charles Parkhurst, Lyman Abbott, and other Journal stalwarts repeatedly addressed this important question in their departments and, of course, the magazine often ran stories built around the mother-child relationship.

The hundreds of articles and stories that centered on this question were far from uniform in their portrayals,

although two rather distinct generalizations did emerge. On one plane, especially in fiction, writers depicted the alliance of mother and child in a very sentimental fashion, either as a maudlin emotional dependency of the child for the mother or an ethereal union of souls. On another level, chiefly in non-fiction, that relationship came across in a far more realistic tone.

During the years of Bok's reign atop the Journal empire, there was a rather pronounced movement from the heavily sentimental version of the mother-child relationship to the more practical image. The turnabout was not complete, by any means, but the following paragraphs will illustrate just how evident it was.

Sentimentality over the daughter's dependency on her mother was a staple in the Ladies' Home Journal's fiction and occurred most profusely in circumstances where the girl was agonizing over unrequited love, basking in the bliss of requited love, debating whether or not to accept her beau's offer of betrothal, or experiencing anticipatory anxiety on the eve of her marriage. The girls in these stories seemed totally dependent on their mothers' counsel and the mothers' counsel proved absolutely reassuring.

In one story representative of this sentimental mood the narrator related how she, as a girl of sweet sixteen convinced she had found true love, allowed her boyfriend to kiss her, only to be shocked shortly thereafter at her

brother's announcement that the boy was spreading word of his conquest far and wide. Mortified, heartbroken, and insulted by the revelation, she naturally shared her burdens in a long chat with her mother, who observed consolingly that "at sixteen a girl is simply in love with love." At the end of the protracted conversation, the narrator paid homage to her mother. "'I can bear anything, Mother,' I cried, 'while I have you.'"[7]

But what is a girl to do if she has no mother to whom she can turn? Without her mother, a girl's life is "maimed and incomplete" and the idea of encountering a watershed experience without benefit of motherly comfort was enough to make Mrs. Sangster's heart give "a great throb of pity." Yet even under these extenuating circumstances, the _Journal_'s fiction sometimes found the mother still all-sufficient. In one story, the protagonist, grappling with conflicting advice about backing out of her imminent marriage to a much older man, stood transfixed before a mirror and heard her dead mother's voice reassuring her that she was doing the proper thing.[8]

---

[7]Emily Calvin Blake, "The Six Great Moments in a Woman's Life: The First--Sixteen and in Love," _LHJ_, XXV (January, 1908), 22.

[8]Margaret Sangster, "Mrs. Sangster's Heart to Heart Talks with Girls," _LHJ_, XXI (May, 1904), 26; and Herbert D. Ward, "The Bridal Mirror," _LHJ_, XXI (May, 1904), 7.

Similar fictional portrayals persisted into the teens but with less regularity than in earlier editions. In increasing numbers of short stories, mawkish mother-daughter relationships gave way to ties in which daughters, typically in their teens, practiced more independence and self-reliance and their mothers responded with greater flexibility. Later in this paper, a section dealing with feminism will illustrate this new relationship more fully.

Throughout most of the period of this study, the mother-son relationship played a decidedly secondary role to the mother-daughter relationship. However, when the United States was in the throes of World War I, the number of stories revolving around the mother's relationship with her son increased dramatically. The *Journal* prevailed upon Grace Richmond, probably the magazine's most popular short story writer, to write a serial demonstrating the relationships between American mothers and their sons and husbands, especially the former, who had volunteered to wage war against the evil Germans.

In one story of this genre, the son considered his mother the paragon of strength because when he visited home very briefly just prior to embarking for "somewhere in France" she neither whined nor wept; she instead behaved in her normal manner. She simply said, "You're a brick," as her son departed. That bromide struck a

beautiful chord with him and, with emotion welling up inside, he replied that she was "a whole brickyard." This contrived scene exemplified the total empathy which was the hallmark of the idealistic mother-son relationship.[9]

On those occasions during the war when fictional mothers and sons did not share such a degree of mutual veneration, their roles were usually secondary ones. And even then, most of the less-than-perfect relationships between mother and son were mended by story's end as the mother recognized her foibles and defects and took action to correct them. But on the whole, the Journal idolized the wartime mother. As one writer noted, most sacrifices during wartime "have an undoubted alloy of self-interest about them, as noble as they may be. The mother's sacrifice has none of this. It is pure, real and absolute."[10]

Compared to the romantic fiction in the Journal, the non-fiction profiles of a mother's relationship with her child were from the earliest editions consistently more evenhanded and realistic. To be sure, the sentimental image was not absent from the non-fiction. Mrs. Sangster, as late as 1904, noted that a girl naturally goes to her mother "straight as a homing pigeon to its nest" when she

---

[9]Grace Richmond, "The Whistling Mother," LHJ, XXXIV (August, 1917), 8.

[10]Thomas L. Masson, "The Only Real Sacrifice," LHJ, XXXV (August, 1918), 30.

is troubled. A girl may have secrets from the world, "but to her mother her heart is an open book and if there is a puzzle in that book, mother's fingers, mother's gentle touch, mother's fun that bubbles up so brightly will set it straight."[11] No greater compliment could the Journal bestow upon motherhood than to picture mother as all-sufficient to her daughter's needs.

Even during the first half of Bok's editorial tenure, more reasonable non-fiction versions of that noble calling partially offset these hopelessly romantic images. Many writers readily admitted that a mother's relationship with her pride-and-joy is not always so Elysian, even in the best of families. Often a mother cannot maintain the confidence of her children, Aunt Patience recognized as early as 1891, and sometimes it is the fault neither of the mother nor the child. Rather it is a result of incompatible "temperaments" which "forbid a complete understanding of one another." Nevertheless, a mother should endeavor to obviate such a regrettable experience by nurturing from the child's birth that intimacy which the mother so deeply appreciates and which the daughter so desperately needs during her formative years.[12]

---

[11]Margaret Sangster, "Mrs. Sangster's Heart to Heart Talks with Girls," LHJ, XXI (May, 1904), 26.

[12]Aunt Patience, "Just Among Ourselves," LHJ, VIII (June, 1891), 21.

The *Journal* recognized that tension and conflict between mother and daughter are most common during adolescence, but it never provided a satisfactory explanation of that "peculiar strain." The authors either avoided mentioning or else glossed over the deepseated physiological and psychological impulses which buffet girls during adolescence.[13] It would still be a while before the *Journal* was willing to explain the biological origins of the "peculiar strain."

Despite their deficiencies, articles which admitted problems between mothers and their children served as a countervailing force to the pap prevalent in the bulk of the magazine's fiction. It suggested that the real often falls short of the ideal, even with the best people, and therefore offered aid and comfort to those mothers who, having tried everything in their power, could not attain familial bliss. As years passed, this more realistic portrayal of the mother-child relationship became the predominant image in the *Journal*.

While the world's most successful magazine allotted a substantial amount of space to the broad question of the nature of the mother-child relationship, it assigned even more space to defining the attributes of a fine mother

---

[13]For an example how some writers wrote around the issue, see Helen Watterson Moody, "Amy and I," *LHJ*, XVIII (February, 1901), 21.

and proffering instructions on how to handle particular problems. From the outset, the *Journal* taught that a mother must possess and demonstrate love. True motherhood transcends basic maternal instincts; it is on an entirely separate level of existence. In the opinion of Helen Watterson Moody, while "maternal love" is nothing more than a mother's instinctive animal love for her young, "mother love" is spiritual love consisting of "as much of God's love as the finite human heart can hold." And, unlike maternal love, which a woman directs exclusively toward her own progeny, mother love manifests itself to all children, in fact to all things "that need what little children need." True motherhood is a special grace, a fulfillment of the divine purposes of marriage and the family, an "elevation of the race through the improvement of the individual." Moody reflected the *Journal*'s consensus of opinion when she observed that true motherhood is a "profession" requiring "enlightened knowledge conscientiously acquired and carefully digested."[14]

Unless she demonstrates "mother love," then, a woman is incomplete and cannot discharge her duties effectively regardless how educated and skilled she may be. In fact,

---

[14]Helen Watterson Moody, "The True Meaning of Motherhood," *LHJ*, XVI (May, 1899), 12.

so mighty is a mother's love that it enables her to redeem virtually "all the shortcomings of the household."[15]

The Journal, especially in its short stories, warned mothers of possibly tragic results that might come from the failure to nurture their children in love. For example, in "Anybody Want This Little Boy?" Lester "couldn't remember ever having known his mother's arms around him; she had never really kissed him, even." From this he concluded that his parents had not wanted him in the first place and that he, therefore, should relieve them of the burden of caring for him by finding someone else who would love him. Unbeknownst to his parents he advertised for someone to adopt him. When his parents finally discovered Lester's scheme they were taken aback: "We---we might have been a ---little blind---and---and foolish, and---and given him just cause to think we didn't care; but he's ours." After a moment they stammered, "We---er---find we can answer that advertisement ourselves." There the story ended, but who can doubt that Lester lived happily ever after, having taught his mother a valuable lesson.[16] To love a child is not sufficient, a parent must demonstrate that love as well by caressing, caring, and sharing.

---

[15] "Personal Experiences of Mothers: The Mistake I Made with 'My Little Daughter,'" LHJ, XXXI (February, 1914), 28.

[16] Marie Conway Oemler, "Anybody Want This Little Boy?" LHJ, XXXIII (February, 1916), 16, 57-59.

A mother must also strive to develop her child's character. Because of her spiritual and moral superiority to man and because of the time she has with her children, it is only logical that the mother shoulder primary responsibility for engendering the highest moral and spiritual standards in her offspring. And that obligation has cosmic implications; mothers are both guardians of their own children's moral training and "the custodians of the morality of a nation." A mother is not alone, however. If she lays the foundation of her home "upon the substance of God," He will make provisions for her success.[17]

Emelyn Lincoln Coolidge, M.D., whose articles on developmental child care the Journal ran for several years, believed that the mother who wants to attain optimum results in the moral training of her "little flock" must have "thorough knowledge" of her husband's and her own positive and negative attributes. Only with that knowledge can she "bend her energies" effectively in reinforcing the children's inherited positive traits and "eliminating as early as possible all the evil tendencies to which they may be heir." While the children may not actually inherit personality peculiarities or moral defects, they will

---

[17]"Personal Experiences of Mothers: The Mistake I Made with 'My Little Daughter,'" LHJ, XXXI (February, 1914), 28.

certainly inherit propensities toward them. It is the mother's burden therefore to nip the character flaws in the bud or at least to redirect them in more positive directions. She may not succeed in every case, but the alternatives demand that she make the attempt.[18]

Dr. Coolidge's behavioral convictions received reinforcement from other writers as well. Conceding that social institutions and the laws of nature "are constantly stamping themselves upon the developing character of children," Edward Howard Griggs insisted nevertheless that the parents' influence, and implicitly the mother's influence primarily, hold the potential of negating most of the effects of those exterior determinants.[19]

Yet even a cursory glance at the world testifies to disturbingly high levels of violence and corruption. The Reverend Charles H. Parkhurst, in an essay advocating the use of firm discipline in the moral training of children, noted that the misery and suffering of mankind, particularly prevalent in "working classes," is attributable to "the wife's ignorance of the duties that belong to her.

---

[18]Emelyn Lincoln Coolidge, "The Young Mother's Club," LHJ, XXIII (January, 1906), 38; see also Nellie M.L. Nearing and Scott Nearing, "When a Girl is Asked to Marry: Why it is the Most Important Moment in Her Life," LHJ, XXIX (March, 1912), 7, 69-70.

[19]Edward Howard Griggs, "Edward Howard Griggs' Talks: The Moral Training of a Child," LHJ, XX (February, 1903), 17.

She is ignorant of them because she has never been compelled to learn them." And it should not be surprising, Helen Watterson Moody observed, that many girls of all classes undertake motherhood "with less understanding of its duties than they give to selecting the tailors who make their gowns."[20]

The stakes then are enormous! With the well-being of civilization dependent upon the mothers of the world, could not something be done to rectify the dismal records of so many of them? Edward Bok, a moral reformer at heart, resolved to commit the good services of the *Journal* to making sure American mothers were well equipped and well trained to combat Satan's forces. In the true spirit of progressivism, he mustered an army of the best experts he could find to provide the millions of *Journal* readers with reliable advice and information on the strategy and tactics of rearing children. So, the *Journal* monthly dispensed a seemingly inexhaustible supply of advice from experts in medicine and child care, homilies from famous ministers, and homespun commentaries from regular contributors.

A mother, they sang in unison, must be the arbiter of her child's morality. Yet, to discuss at length those moral values which the *Journal* urged mothers to instill in

---

[20]Charles H. Parkhurst, "The True Mission of Woman," *LHJ*, XII (April, 1895), 15; Helen Watterson Moody, "The True Meaning of Motherhood," *LHJ*, XVI (May, 1899), 12.

their offspring is not necessary here. Suffice it to say that the list included those attributes one would normally expect from a magazine founded so irretrievably in white Anglo-Saxon Protestantism. Besides dedication to God, honesty, industry, frugality, and chastity, the Journal beseeched mothers to imbue their children with a love for beautiful things, a spirit of self-control as the foundation of cooperation, and a desire and respect for learning (although much of the time this goal seemed to be nullified by strong strains of anti-intellectualism throughout the pages of the magazine). Unless her children continue to exemplify these traits into adulthood, then a mother has not completed the mission which God assigned her.

Accompanying the Journal's injunction that mothers provide strong moral guidance for their children were other entreaties which merit closer examination. For example, many writers urged parents in so many words to teach their children stereotypical sexual roles. Only infrequently did writers compose essays specifically arguing the case of sexual stereotyping, but in articles such as those illustrating how to make toys for children or suggesting chores for children to perform around the place the message rang loud and clear. Girls' play and household work should prepare them for wifehood and motherhood. "Little girls should be encouraged in a fondness for dolls,"

said one writer. "In a very few it is undeveloped and requires to be stimulated. The mother instinct is usually strong; when it is weak it needs fostering."[21]

Boys are supposed to play ball, be rough-and-tumble, and develop the art of self-defense along with a strong sense of independence. Too much supervision of a boy might make him a sissy, and that would be a sad predicament.[22] Even illustrations in advertisements for soaps, clothes, and other merchandise carried out the same theme. In rare instances, however, a writer advised that once in a while a boy might want to play with a dollhouse, provided there were no other boys in eyeshot, or some other little girl games, but the _Journal_ never encouraged mothers to try to break down the stereotypical roles.

A modest shift occurred in one area of sexual typing. By the teens, the _Journal_'s writers accepted the new independence of young women living at home. In many short stories and in non-fiction girls traveled more freely, went about without chaperones, behaved more aggressively, participated actively in sports, and sometimes got jobs. In other words, parents permitted their older daughters to do things that previously they allowed only their sons to do.

---

[21]Elizabeth Robinson Scovil, "Playthings for Children," _LHJ_, XII (January, 1895), 24.

[22]Inez Haynes Gilmore, "Sylvia's Sissies," _LHJ_, XXXV (October, 1918), 22, 130-132.

But in the training of younger children the Journal made no significant stride away from sexual stereotyping.

A mother must also maintain a very close watch on her children's physical health, the Journal insisted. Health care hints were a staple in the Journal. In the first decade or so regular contributors who had no medical or related training nonetheless regularly dispensed advice, mostly home remedies, on all kinds of ailments--acne, red nose, fainting, headaches, and other miseries. Sometimes the advice was very poor. In 1912, one writer cautioned readers that innumerable case records "conclusively prove" that if a pregnant woman "experiences the sudden sight or even a mental picture of physical deformity it effects the forming child to the extent of reproducing that deformity in the child." On the whole, however, the Journal's advice was probably no better or no worse than readers would have received from experts.[23]

As the magazine hired more qualified writers, the quality of health care columns in later numbers improved noticeably. The Journal published special features on

---

[23]Sarah Curtis Mott, "The Child That is to Be," LHJ, XXIX (January, 1912), 6, 55. In her excellent study, Sarah Stage contends that even at the end of the nineteenth century, given the state of the medical profession and the propensity of doctors to prescribe the "heroic cure," a person might have been well advised to follow Lydia Pinkham's advice to stay away from doctors. Sarah Stage, Female Complaints: Lydia Pinkham and the Business of Women's Medicine, (New York, 1979), pp. 45-88.

practical health care of children, many teaching preventive measures associated with proper diet and exercise, and produced several longstanding series, including the helpful and by that day's standards medically sound one by Emelyn Lincoln Coolidge, M.D., of the Babies' Hospital of New York City.

By 1916, the Journal's persistent interest in children's health became a dominant theme in the magazine. Dr. Coolidge and others boosted the government's "Children's Year" with articles such as "Uncle Sam and His Babies" and "Won't You Weigh and Measure Your Baby for Uncle Sam?" These articles' purpose, of course, was to help identify the children who were not developing at the proper rate so that the families might receive advice or assistance in correcting the children's health problems. At about the same time, concern over eugenics mounted and implications were that early detection of genetic problems increased the chance of successful treatment. If the child carried a particularly dysgenic trait, medical authorities could counsel him later in life to avoid having children or at least to be extremely cautious in selecting a mate whose genetic make up was most likely to produce a healthy offspring.

At the outset, the Journal indicated that "every right thinking woman wishes to nurse her own children and

considers it no less a privilege than a duty to do so. It should not be foregone except under the advice of a physician." In so many words, a mother who does not nurse her infant, except for overriding medical reasons, is not a true mother.[24] By the teens, however, such encyclicals had all but disappeared and breast-feeding no longer possessed the mystique that had surrounded it in earlier Journals. Perhaps the typical progressive confidence in science played a role in dissolving that mystique. Scientists explained more of life's mysteries by chemical formulas and cell development, thereby prompting many people to view the human body more as a natural organism than as a special creation.

In caring for her family's physical well-being, ideally a mother will teach her children the facts of life. In 1907, however, the Journal indicted American mothers for derelection of this duty and initiated a campaign to correct the problem. Working with juvenile delinquents for many years had persuaded Ben B. Lindsey, nationally-known Judge of the Juvenile Court of Denver, that nine-tenths of the girls go wrong because of the inattention of their parents. Dr. William Lee Howard reinforced this point when he related several instances where girls' mothers had refused, not simply neglected but refused, to discuss sexual

---

[24]Elizabeth Robinson Scovil, "Suggestions for Mothers," LHJ, XII (December, 1894), 37.

matters with their daughters. One adolescent girl told Dr. Howard that when her little brother was born her mother "had the nurse tell me that the doctor brought him in his satchel."[25]

To Bok and his cadre, the effects of sexual ignorance among children and adolescents were often tragic--the ravages of venereal diseases, the stigma of babies out of wedlock, plus attendant psychological complications. Through his editorial page and articles by prominent specialists, Bok felt that the Journal could effectually combat sexual ignorance that nurtured those dreadful problems and, concomitantly, rescue untold numbers of young people from calamity. With classic muckraking rationale, Bok reasoned that by laying the facts before America's mothers and suggesting a strategy, his magazine could motivate them to take up the cudgels. Bok knew that such an intensive campaign as he planned would likely offend many readers and might cost many subscriptions, but he moved ahead confidently. Indeed, his concern over lost subscriptions was warranted, because the Journal lost, by Bok's estimation, 25,000 subscriptions as a result of the campaign.[26]

---

[25]Ben B. Lindsey, "Why Girls Go Wrong," LHJ, XXIV (January, 1907), 13; William Lee Howard, "Why Didn't My Parents Tell Me?" LHJ, XXIV (August, 1907), 32.

[26]Curtis Publishing Co., Minutes of the Tenth Annual Conference, p. 343, cited in Salme Harju Steinberg, Reformer in the Marketplace, (Baton Rouge, 1979), p. 111.

The sex education campaign proposed a decisive change in the still strongly entrenched Victorian policy of silence on sexual matters. One facet of the campaign aimed at venereal disease. The Journal pointed out that "over 70 out of every 100 surgical operations on women are the direct or indirect result of one cause." And in "The Tragedy of the Marriage Altar," Abraham Wolbarst observed that many women became infertile and suffered other debilitating symptoms not long after marriage because their husbands had "sown wild oats" before marriage. But the Journal never graphically described the physical effects of venereal disease; indeed it even shunned the use of that term. What Bok intended, in fact what he stated in one editorial, was that the articles would arouse women's curiosity and they would ask their husbands, "What does Mr. Bok mean?"[27]

The second facet of the campaign was an attack on sexual ignorance. Indeed, some adolescents apparently were not cognizant that intercourse itself was that horrible immoral act which many parents always had refused to discuss and commanded them never to discuss. Margaret Deland, a progressive reformer, cited an example of a fourteen year

---

[27]Edward Bok, "The Editor's Personal Page," LHJ, XXV (September, 1908), 1; Abraham Wolbarst, "The Tragedy of the Marriage Altar," LHJ, XXV (October, 1908), 26; Curtis Publishing Co., Minutes of the Tenth Annual Conference, p. 343, cited in Salme Harju Steinberg, Reformer in the Marketplace (Baton Rouge, 1979), p. 109.

old who had become pregnant. When Deland asked her the circumstances behind her pregnancy, she replied, "I didn't know" what caused babies. Because the girl was so ignorant of the human reproductive system, Mrs. Deland concluded, she and the boy had been victims of their "untrained instinct." And to classify as "wicked" an act "which becomes moral or immoral only when knowledge is added to it" would be "absurd." "No; the children are not to blame. As for the father and mother, that is another story!"[28] Mrs. Deland's progressive assessment of that regrettable episode reflected how far the Journal had moved from the Genteel Tradition.

Other writers came to essentially the same conclusion when discussing the subject of sex. The Country Contributor, after confessing she had "never read a psychological work" in her life, nevertheless demonstrated little reticence in offering advice on child care. She advised that mothers "not look down with contempt upon what we call our animal passions," that they not even call erotic love a weakness since they cannot be sure it is a weakness. Previously a parent could have evaded the question more easily, she noted, but in the modern day even children from respectable homes are met with distorted images of sex painted in "licentious reading material" and described

---

[28]Margaret Deland, "I Didn't Know--," LHJ, XXIV (March, 1907), 9.

distortedly on the playground. Therefore, unless parents, particularly the mother, discuss reproduction frankly and in the context of morality, the child will probably never discover that sex and morality are irrevocably related. By teaching the moral implications of sex, parents can "often save their children from premature development of this part of their nature and inculcate habits of self-control that will influence their morals through life."

Regardless of how devastating the results of premarital sex might be, the Country Contributor continued, the question should be handled gingerly. Reflecting vestiges of the Victorian policy of silence on sexual matters and, perhaps, the influence of John Dewey's educational theories, she cautioned a mother under normal conditions not to initiate discussion of the facts of life with the child. No, it is much better to wait until the child himself broaches the topic, unless the parent has firm evidence that the child is already learning about reproduction from unsavory sources or firsthand experience.[29]

Parents from all social and economic sectors, not just the lower classes, must always be on guard and be prepared to act. The girls who go wrong "do not all land in the red-light district," Judge Lindsey said, but instead move about in society spreading "pollutions" and "filth" and

---

[29]Country Contributor, "Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," LHJ, XXIV (April, 1907), 34.

contributing to the rising tide of divorce, broken homes, desertion, and other social evils.[30]

The Journal's appeal for more candor with children on the topic of sex applied almost exclusively to the home, the natural place for such discussions. To underscore the importance it placed on having the father and, especially, the mother teach the children about sex, the Journal refused to offer instruction on the subject. The pages of a family magazine simply were not the proper place to do it. Its responsibility was to expose the severity of the problems, then the people would take action to conquer them.

Interestingly, Judge Julian W. Mack, formerly of the Juvenile Court of Chicago, offered an isolated endorsement of sex education in schools. In 1902, he observed that "some wise teachers" had incorporated valuable information on sex in their physiology and hygiene courses in high school, treating it as a "normal and natural part of the course without any undue emphasis." But he cautiously admitted that the task is "extremely delicate" and, "except in the hands of the wisest and most experienced, is apt to be full of danger." As Judge Mack saw it, such a program would not relieve parents of their responsibility for sex education at home, it would only supplement their effort,

---

[30]Ben B. Lindsey, "Why Girls Go Wrong," LHJ, XXIV (January, 1907), 13.

for regardless of how well a child has been taught about his sexuality, "knowledge alone, without character, will never save." Still, if a child's moral training at home is wanting, sex education at school might bring salvation, since "fear of consequence will ofttimes brace up a weak girl to resist to the uttermost."[31]

The sex education campaign went beyond warnings about the possible catastrophic effects of sexual relations and addressed possible emotional effects of ignorance of such fundamental matters as menstruation. Prior to the sex education campaign, the Journal's health care columns, when they referred to menstruation at all, alluded to it in only the most circumspect manner. All women should get plenty of rest and avoid carrying heavy objects, but young girls and older women should be especially cautious. Significantly, in the 1880s and 1890s, the Journal made no overt effort to perpetuate the idea that menstruation is the curse of the garden, a concept commonly propounded in popular health and marriage manuals, but that was probably more a result of the Victorian policy of silence than anything.

The sex education campaign lifted the virtual silence on menstruation and recommended that mothers prepare daughters for it. Dr. William Lee Howard, in one of the most

---

[31]Julian W. Mack, "What I Have Learned from Hundreds of Girls," LHJ, XXV (May, 1908), 6.

sensationalized articles in the Journal, pressed firmly for preparing girls for menstruation. He recounted one episode of a girl at school standing "painfully at the blackboard; her back ached, her limbs trembled," and her male teacher, insisting on faster responses from her, "ignorantly harassed and embarrassed her." The girl was already harried when, "all of a sudden, that day, at the blackboard, the shock came. She was carried home screaming with fear and shame. . . . Weeks of delirium followed." Never again would she be able to face the teacher and the boys in the class. "This young girl, if she ever recovers," he said, "will be a nervous wreck." And all because her mother had refused to give her what is the "right of every girl"--the truth about her normal bodily functions.[32] If women were to successfully counter the concept that they are innately inferior, they would have to rear a generation of daughters who understood menstruation as a normal biological occurrence and, unintentionally, the Journal's sex education campaign hastened that day.

Yet, frankly revealing the facts of life is not the mother's sole weapon for attacking children's misconceptions about sex. She also must endeavor to keep from her children any materials or individuals who might distort

---

[32]William Lee Howard, "Why Didn't My Parents Tell Me?" LHJ, XXIV (August, 1907), 32.

the details and true meaning of sex or stimulate premature interest in it. Hence, she must ban newspapers and magazines which print scandalous material, "no matter how able or reputable" the publication might be, and keep from table tops and shelves of the home books "of questionable taste and morality." For instance, while Anna Karenina is a "great story," no one younger than twenty years old should read it. And be careful, a writer advised, that children do not hear adults discussing "in a flippant spirit" any matters related to reproduction.[33]

Of all the concern expressed about the possible physical and emotional ramifications of sexual activity among the naive, the preponderance was directed at the girls. It is certainly understandable that a woman's magazine would place more emphasis on the girls, especially when the magazine was so closely attuned to Victorian morality; but, more importantly, the imbalance was a manifestation of the magazine's realization of the obvious. It is the female who bears the child, encounters the brunt of the stigma associated with premarital sex and illegitimate children, and suffers the most debilitating and critical effects of venereal disease. And, if the worst should happen, parents should never disown the child. For a

---

[33]Hamilton W. Mabie, "Which Novels are Wise for the Young?" LHJ, XXV (September, 1908), 34.

daughter to bear a child out of wedlock "is a great tragedy" but, the Country Contributor urged parents, "do not make it a greater one by refusing her your love and sympathy." Despite the circumstances of conception, parents must remember the lessons of Jesus of Nazareth. "We must grant her prestige: she is a mother!"[34]

The Ladies' Home Journal's campaign against sexual ignorance and its destructive ramifications placed the magazine squarely in the Social Purity movement. Under Edward Bok's guidance, however, the Journal avoided the movement's most controversial elements, such as white slave traffic and the legal age of consent. On the important issue of censorship the magazine took a moderate stand, avoiding what David Pivar terms the "ugly side" of the movement--"the totalitarian implications" of censorship.[35] Instead of clamoring to close theaters and to prohibit publication of certain books, the Journal imposed upon parents the responsibility of protecting their children from noxious influences. And by its studied refusal to discuss sexual matters in any detail in its own pages, the magazine censored itself, probably in deference to the vestiges of the Victorian policy of silence and to

---

[34]Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," LHJ, XXVIII (May 1, 1911), 28.

[35]David Pivar, Purity Crusade: Sexual Morality and Social Control, 1868-1900 (Westport, Connecticut, 1973), p. 261.

some Social Purists' claim that such discussions contribute to licentiousness.

By urging its readers to deal with the details of sex in an objective manner while simultaneously placing human sexuality in a moral context, Bok's magazine helped shatter many of the myths that formed the base of the moral double standard. And that was a significant departure from the notion that women are innately inferior to the concept of domestic feminism which teaches that although the sexes have different strengths and weaknesses, neither is inferior to the other. With its enormous readership, the Journal carried a moderate version of Social Purity to a much larger audience than any of the movement's own publications could hope to do. In that capacity, it facilitated, as David Pivar puts it, the purity reformers' "major role in changing American sex attitudes. Introducing a tabooed subject into general society, they reeducated Americans to a new morality [and] proclaimed a woman's right to her own body, . . ."[36]

Motherhood, the Journal professed, is an intensive, demanding profession which leads some conscientious women to the point of forsaking their own interests for their children's. But a mother must not succumb to that impulse, she must not "submerge" herself entirely in her motherly

---

[36]David Pivar, Purity Crusade: Sexual Morality and Social Control, 1868-1900 (Westport, 1973), p. 255.

duties, for it does both herself and her children a disservice. President Roosevelt, who wholeheartedly believed that a mother's primary accountability lies in rearing her children, nevertheless recommended strongly that a mother should find vent for her other interests as well, in church work, club work, reading, and other activities. And Helen Watterson Moody felt it is far better to be a "just mother than to be an unselfish one." Unselfishness in a mother frequently produces the opposite in her children, she said, because the mother has maintained a monopoly on unselfishness for so long. A mother must remember the Golden Rule and treat her children as she would have them treat her.[37]

For a clearer perception of the foregoing description of the Journal's images of the distaff side, focusing briefly on the spear side will be helpful. The father, separated as he is from his wife and children six days a week, obviously has fewer opportunities and, concomitantly, fewer obligations in rearing the children. And that is probably all for the best because, according to a number of the Journal's writers, "most men do not care much for babies and do not understand little children" anyway. As the children grow older, fathers develop a habit of not working with or trying to understand them and the time

---

[37]"The President: Mr. Roosevelt's Views on Race Suicide," LHJ, XXIII (February, 1906), 21; Helen Watterson Moody, "The True Meaning of Motherhood," LHJ, XVI (May, 1899), 12.

never comes at all when they naturally change and begin to take an "intelligent interest" in the day-to-day care of their children. The result is that many fathers are largely ignorant of their children's activities and interests because they leave their children's care solely in the mother's hands.[38]

Nevertheless, even a father who does not actively work with his children can be a good father and contribute to their development, Marion Sprague stated, if "he stands behind the mother, always ready to support and enforce her decisions." Seeing the parents working in tandem, the father reinforcing the mother's guidance and discipline though perhaps only implicitly or indirectly, has a powerful impact on the children and thereby eases the mother's burden. In essence, observed President Eliot of Harvard, the father's major role in rearing children is to add authority to the mother's efforts.[39]

The ideal father has secondary functions. According to Charles Eliot, the father should also share in household

---

[38]Charles W. Eliot, "The Part of the Man in the Family," LHJ, XXV (March, 1908), 7; Marion Sprague, "The Letters of Two Mothers," LHJ, XXIII (January, 1906), 26; see also Mary Stewart Cutting, "The Suburban Whirl: The Story of a Young Couple in the Suburbs," LHJ, XXIV (January, 1907), 7, 8, 50.

[39]Marion Sprague, "The Letters of Two Mothers," LHJ, XXIII (January, 1906), 26; Charles W. Eliot, "The Part of the Man in the Family," LHJ, XXV (March, 1908), 7.

work, provided he generally sticks with masculine tasks such as bringing in the coal. Several writers issued strong words of caution, however, that the husband not go overboard in helping around the house. "Neither hen-pecked husbands nor housekeeping husbands make dignified fathers," Barnetta Brown remarked, only cooperative ones do. After all, parents cannot be too conscientious about serving as role models for their children. A father should teach his children by example to respect womanhood and motherhood. Ideally, a father is patient and sympathetic with his wife; that is one reason his help around the house is so important for it not only helps her physically but it also demonstrates to the children a level of respect and love that is vital in molding their character. Too frequently a father's attitude toward and treatment of women, especially his wife, signal condescension and lack of respect and leave the children without benefit of a strong role model for motherhood or womanhood.[40]

Father can help mother in other ways. Because of his "wider contacts" with others, the father should lead the way in making family friends and encouraging "helpful relations with neighbors." He should strive to improve the

---

[40]Charles W. Eliot, "The Part of the Man in the Family," LHJ, XXV (March, 1908), 7; Barnetta Brown, "Mothers' Mistakes and Fathers' Failures," LHJ, XVII (December, 1899), 37; (January, 1900), 30; (February, 1900), 32.

level of "family talk" by sharing his knowledge and experience with his wife and children.[41]

A shortcoming typical of many fathers is their "despotic sway"; you-obey-me-because-I-am-your-father is their chant. Authoritarianism "is a very natural outflowing" of man's nature, said one essayist; what else can you expect from members of the sex who have considered themselves "Lords of Creation from time immemorial." Fathers should stop playing that part, for they serve their children far better as guides than as governors. They cannot force a child's soul upon its "upward and onward way," but they can guide it.[42]

In an anonymous article in 1908, a father described how he had cultivated rapport with his daughters. He played with his daughters and frequently went riding with them, taking advantage of the time for long discussions. By providing them with special things, such as a trapeze bar, he encouraged them to remain at home and simultaneously helped strengthen their relations with neighborhood children. Their friends, always welcomed in the home, could come and go freely. And later when the girls began dating he never teased them about their boyfriends and he went out

---

[41] Charles W. Eliot, "The Part of the Man in the Family, LHJ, XXV (March, 1908), 7.

[42] Barnetta Brown, "Mothers' Mistakes and Fathers' Failures," LHJ, XVII (February, 1900), 32.

of his way to make the boys feel comfortable in the home. In short, this father had made his time with his daughters count and, accordingly, their experiences together were a joy to him and an enrichment to them. Significantly, the Journal featured this man as a superfather although it deemed comparable relationships between mother and child as standard fare.[43]

Barnetta Brown summed up the ideal father. He "must be of fine, large quality, strong, sane and loving," she said, "a self-forgetful, pleasant guide, a chum for his boys, a lover for his girls, a comprehending husband, a comfortable man."[44] That is perfection for fatherhood, but it is a supporting role, demanding nothing approaching the amount of time and energy expected of the normal mother.

In conclusion, the Ladies' Home Journal's portrayal of motherhood evolved significantly during Edward Bok's years as editor. When he became editor and for several years thereafter the fictional mother was an all-sufficient mother-hen type whose children loved and admired her intensely and who seemed capable of answering any of her children's needs. The image in non-fiction tended to

---

[43]"What I Did with My Two Daughters: The Experiments of a Father and How They Worked Out," LHJ, (March, 1908), 10, 56.

[44]Barnetta Brown, "Mothers' Mistakes and Fathers' Failures," LHJ, XVII (February, 1900), 32.

admit she had weaknesses and could not always nurture an ideal relationship with her children. By the teens, however, in non-fiction there was a ground swell of criticism of the poor state of motherhood in America, and in fiction (with the exception of accounts of mother-son relations during the war) and non-fiction alike, the mother played a more realistic role. And, mothers seemed far more inclined to accept, if not rejoice in, their daughters' growing self-reliance and independence.

CHAPTER VII

HOUSEKEEPER

During its first three and a half decades, one of the most profound changes in the _Ladies' Home Journal_'s design for womanhood appeared in her role as housekeeper. In the early issues, such household responsibilities as cleaning, cooking, sewing, decorating, and washing possessed an almost mystical attachment to wifehood and motherhood, to the point that for some writers the actual performance of the task seemed to apotheosize womanhood. By the end of Bok's tenure at the helm of the _Journal_, however, not only had that special quality of household chores disappeared but the _Journal_ had begun to accept the notion that many household chores are drudgeries which reasonable women hire done instead of doing themselves.

From the outset, the _Journal_ remained at its core a publication designed for family women upon whose shoulders ultimately rested the responsibility of managing the home, and it continued assiduously to feature departments with advice, information, and hints attuned to the needs of the homemaker. Many of the magazine's most trusted and long-serving contributors produced columns staunchly supporting the cult of domesticity. For example, from the mid-nineties

into the twentieth century, Sarah Tyson Rorer wrote one and sometimes more departments in each issue, covering a broad spectrum of household duties but concentrating on her specialty, cooking. Her advice ranged from special recipes for holidays and other special occasions to instructions on the rudiments of the culinary arts and the fundamentals of nutrition.

Sarah Rorer brought impressive credentials to the Journal, having established her own cooking school that earned "almost world-wide" recognition. She had superintended the "model kitchen" in the woman's building of the Chicago world's fair and for several years had published a magazine called Household News, which the Journal "absorbed." A description of Sarah Rorer which appeared in the Journal to introduce her to readers seemed to personify the magazine's ideal contributor. "Personally, Mrs. Rorer has a strong physique, full figure and glowing health," the article said, and thanks to her careful eating habits she had a "fresh, unwrinkled complexion and fair hair untouched by years." She exemplified "the assured poise of the woman of affairs, while still retaining the gracious presence and engaging reserve which are the charm and attraction of womanhood."[1]

---

[1]Mrs. Talcoll Williams, "The Most Famous Cook in America," LHJ, XIV (February, 1897), 7.

Of course many other contributors served the Journal in a similar capacity for years. Isabel A. Mallon, billed as the Paris Editor of the Journal, tendered helpful hints about sewing and even provided diagrams (not actually patterns) for fashionable creations, and Maria Parloa taught more fundamental skills of sewing. Later, Dr. Emelyn Coolidge recommended numerous prophylactics as well as chemical and natural solutions for creating a healthful physical environment in the home and explained the probable causes of a multitude of ailments such as red noses, splotchy skin, catarrh, and sleeplessness.

The Journal also published essays and pictorials on the design, decoration, and maintenance of houses. There were pictorial series such as "Inside of a Hundred Homes" and others on beautiful exteriors and unique floor plans; and the magazine even offered sizeable prizes for the best house plans and designs.

While the Journal throughout the years consistently allotted considerable copy to articles and departments aimed at the work of homemakers, the nature of the Journal's attitude toward household work was undergoing a pronounced metamorphosis. To trace that metamorphosis it is necessary to begin by examining the Journal's Victorian view of the house, for the house was a vital ingredient in making a home.

Charles H. Parkhurst's postulates on the house, which corresponded closely with the views of Edward Bok, typified the Journal's concept of the house and its relation to family and home. "To be perfect and entire," he observed, a home must consist of not only a family but also "a dwelling place that is fragrant in its own memories, hallowed by its own associations and marked by its own characteristics and distinction of style, manner and environment." The house must be such in its neatness and personality that, along with the family, it is a magnet to and a source of "nutriment" for the children, even after they have become adults.[2]

With the house perched on such a lofty peak, understandably the Journal placed great emphasis on the design, decoration, and maintenance of houses. Hundreds of regular features served the dual purposes of attracting readers and guiding them in the all-important task of developing a structure that would give "nutriment" to the family.

In early issues the Journal veiled household work in correspondingly exalted trappings. Helen Watterson Moody testified "that housewifery is a profession; indeed, it is the sum of all professions," since it requires knowledge of all the trades and most of the arts and sciences as well as an extensive understanding of human nature. The central

---

[2]Charles H. Parkhurst, "The Unit of Society," LHJ, XII (March, 1895), 13.

character in a short story exemplified the good housekeeper because her home was "truly a mathematical demonstration in its orderliness, a scientific treatise in its hygiene and sanitation, a very poem in its artistic beauty, and a living sermon in the peace and love that dwell therein."[3] Even at the turn of the century it appears that such strong affirmations of the virtue of household work emanated not so much from the writers' confidence that readers accepted unquestioningly this point of view but, contrarily, that the idealized perception of the housewife had about seen its last days and the Journal was shoring up its sagging defenses.

Sure enough, before long the Journal openly registered consternation that vestiges of the Victorian perception of the household were rapidly succumbing to a "general revolt." The Country Contributor insisted that women should "return from their foolish 'strike' from housework" and once again assume their proper position in the home. The venerable writer also decried the "mania for 'ladyhood'" that was abroad, in which women deluded themselves into believing they could and should escape the fag of housework. It was no wonder such notions were prevalent since everywhere, in stories, the media, and advertisements, women

---

[3]Helen Watterson Moody, "What It Means to be a Wife," LHJ, XVI (April, 1899), 22; Janet H. M. Swift, "The Contrariness of Francesca," LHJ, XIX (April, 1902), 6.

"are invariably shown in every attitude of uselessness," wearing exquisite clothes and eating dainty meals served by dainty maids. Only when she decides to "renew her acquaintance with flour and meal" by cooking or at least overseeing the preparation of wholesome meals will she "be a real woman" instead of "a silly imitation of the fashionable lady."[4]

Woman must develop "some feeling for the domestic life," take "pride in cookery," possess "some vanity about housekeeping," and insist on pretty rooms, or "she is a deplorable failure as a woman. A woman without the housewife sense fairly verges on the immoral." Or to put it another way, a woman who "prefers to be relieved from all responsibility of homekeeping, she--well, she is not a woman." But, while a true woman is totally committed to homemaking she should not be totally immersed in it. A woman must not "smother in a perpetual atmosphere of household affairs" but must instead set aside time and energy for her own social and intellectual development. Otherwise, she does her family and herself a disservice.[5]

Regardless of household work's nobility, many subscribers' letters expressed dissatisfaction with and even

---

[4]Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," LHJ, XXIII (February, 1906), 28; XXIV (November, 1907), 34.

[5]Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," LHJ, XXIV (July, 1907), 24.

contempt for household work. Typically, while the columnists agreed that housework is difficult and at times monotonous, they did not concur with many subscribers' suggestions that such work is a blight upon womanhood. In those instances where woman speaks deprecatingly of homemaking, the Journal admonished, the problem is the woman, not the work.

The woman who complains about housework, for example, might be unnecessarily complicating and increasing her labor in her desire to emulate others, an interpretation posited at one time or another by many of the Journal's regular contributors. If a woman has carpets, someone has to propel the sweeper; if she has "stuffy curtains and hangings," someone has to combat the invading moth, said Robert J. Burdette. The woman has no room to complain about housework if she makes her "house an art gallery, a museum of modern curios, a furniture warehouse, a china emporium, a toy shop and a World's Fair in miniature." With a mixture of late nineteenth century jargon and biblical-sounding phraseology he added; "She that increaseth bric-a-brac increaseth care, and much bijouterie is a weariness of the flesh." Further, her proclivity toward making "dainties" for her husband's palate instead of simpler, more substantial fare needlessly strains a woman. Moderation is the key to making housekeeping a

manageable, enjoyable exercise instead of an exhausting, tedious blight on womanhood.[6]

A second reason why some women complain about housework is that they possess weak characters. These malcontents, harboring the misconception that a career in the marketplace offers a more exciting and fulfilling life, are the unfortunate products of poor parental training, weak role models, and distorted media images of both homemaking and the marketplace.

Sometimes, when responding to extensive reader criticism of homemaking, the Journal's columnists employed the strategy of counterattack. Usually, however, in replying to specific questions or criticisms they supplied helpful hints and occasionally consolation. But always lurking in the background was the implication that excessive criticism of homemaking came from someone other than a true woman.

Domestic responsibilities do not require that a wife perform her domestic chores personally. On the contrary, many of the magazine's contributors agreed with its editor that, provided finances permit, a family is justified in hiring, and probably should hire, one or more servants. Yet hiring a servant girl or girls is no panacea for the

---

[6] Robert J. Burdette, "The Taskmistress of Woman," LHJ, X (November, 1893), 16.

woman seeking surcease from the toils of home. True, if managed properly, servants will relieve the mistress from most of the heat of the kitchen and the backbreaking labor of cleaning, but she still is the manager and must make sure everything is done, and done properly.

The _Journal_'s initial view of the homemaker, then, was built around the notion that a home consists not only of parents and children but also a physical structure. It decreed that a woman properly attuned to her true responsibilities will perform or at least directly oversee most of the chores attendant to the physical care of the family and the house. Failure in this capacity is tantamount to failure in life.

Over the years, however, especially after the turn of the century, the _Journal_'s key Victorian postulates on the nature and responsibilities of the homemaker deteriorated until by the time Edward Bok stepped down the _Journal_'s view was markedly different. That metamorphosis, it seems, had its origin in three fundamental circumstances: the problems with live-in servants, the impact of technology, and the popularity of the gospel of efficiency.

Between the Civil War and World War I, "the servant problem was the bread and butter of women's magazines," says historian David M. Katzman in _Seven Days a Week_. For

the Ladies' Home Journal that is somewhat an exaggeration, but Bok's magazine did pay considerable attention to the vexatious problem. From almost the beginning, the Journal perceived a serious shortage of qualified, dependable servants and over the years seemed progressively more resigned to the fact that the live-in servant was becoming an anachronism. The shortage was real, because work in factories, offices, and stores attracted increasing numbers of women from domestic service. David Katzman states "that by 1920 servants were available to only about half as many families or individuals as they had been in 1870" and that therefore high turnover was "a basic characteristic of domestic service."[7]

At first, however, the Journal interpreted the servant problem in a much narrower context. It tended to blame the servants, claiming that they lacked reliability, motivation, and pride in their work, and that they made no effort to try to get along well with the mistress of the house. In many stories, such as "The Successors of Mary the First," the Journal satirized the multitudinous problems inherent with live-in servants. Mrs. George (Perley) Hollis, who lost the services of her excellent cook Mary, hired and fired a number of Marys in rapid

---

[7]David M. Katzman, Seven Days a Week (New York, 1978), pp. 55, 138, 223.

succession before finding a satisfactory replacement. It was bad enough that the new Marys did not perform their work well, but they also created other problems. One Mary went to work for them because she was leaving her alcoholic husband, but as soon as she had settled in the job her husband took the pledge and she went back to him. Each successive Mary created her special problems for the Hollis household. One brought in diphtheria, resulting in weeks of quarantine; another had drunken men calling at all hours; and still another took off on all religious holidays, prompting Mrs. Hollis to search for an atheist. And so it went for six installments. When at last they procured another good Mary, Mr. and Mrs. Hollis began getting along better again and Mrs. Hollis' health improved immediately.[8]

Given its ubiquitous class consciousness, it is easy to see how the Journal criticized servants so persistently. But early in the twentieth century many writers, following Bok's lead, also reprimanded the mistress of the house, claiming that she failed to efficiently organize the household and did not know the first thing about handling an employee. Some women made the mistake of becoming too

---

[8]Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, "The Successors of Mary the First," LHJ, XVII (October, 1900), 5-6; (November, 1900), 15-16; XVIII (December, 1900), 13-14; (January, 1901), 9-10; (February, 1901), 9-10; (March, 1901), 13-14; (April, 1901), 13-14.

familiar with the servant while others went to the other extreme, hardly recognizing that the servant was a person with feelings, desires, and a life of her own. Parenthetically, such indictments of the mistress corresponded roughly with the magazine's growing trend, noted earlier, of criticizing the wife and mother. After enumerating the mistresses' shortcomings the magazine sought to ameliorate the problems with practical advice and encouragement, none of which supplied (nor could be expected to) what so many mistresses needed--formal training in managing personnel and time.

Meanwhile, some writers produced more studied explanations for the failure of the servant system. In 1906, Frances A. Keller revealed that the crux of the servant issue was the nature of the position. Referring to an experiment in Boston with about two hundred mill workers, the author related how young women overwhelmingly preferred working in factories "and other bad places" to working as servants in homes and she concluded that they would continue to hold that preference "until the conditions of household work are changed." Significantly, Keller actually accepted the "girl's" assessment that "the servility of their positions," curtailment of social activities, living in unattractive quarters, and "the long hours of duty" were plainly unacceptable. David M. Katzman's recent study corroborates the validity of servants' complaints,

concluding that "what reformers and housewives could not grasp was that the real victims of the servant problem were not the mistresses but the servants."[9]

In 1918, Frederic C. Howe, Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of New York, noted that the recent decline in immigration contributed to the shortage of servants and that economic prosperity further exacerbated the problem by opening to women other less monotonous, better paying jobs. Still, the Commissioner believed "the chief attraction that draws Bridget out of the kitchen" is marriage,[10] a conclusion not supported by historians.

In 1919, Zona Gale perceptively asserted that the "servant problem is not a domestic problem at all, and not by any means a problem of personal relationship. It is a labor problem." As part of a general shift "away from the caste distinctions," many women rebelled against labor they considered vassalage. "The lonely, overtime worker in the individual kitchen" was becoming a "plain anachronism" for a generation of women seeking greater economic and social independence and a sense of satisfaction in performing an important task. The solution

---

[9]Frances A. Keller, "The Housewife and Her Helper," LHJ, XXIII (January, 1906), 36; David M. Katzman, Seven Days a Week (New York, 1978), p. 265.

[10]Frederick C. Howe, "The Vanishing Servant Girl: The Problem That Confronts the Woman with Help in Her Home," LHJ, XXXV (May, 1918), 48.

to the servant problem was self-evident, Zona Gale declared: replace live-in servants with eight-hour home assistants. Many households were converting already as men and women contemplated the probability of the passage of eight-hour maximum hour laws and as more urban families chose to live in apartments and small houses where there was no room for servants' quarters.

Women would be far more likely to accept jobs in domestic service if they had reasonable hours and did not have to live in their employers' homes. And the mistress would probably find the new eight-hour assistants preferable to live-in servants since they would be fresher and would find more gratification from their jobs. If the mistress needed more than eight hours help she could easily have another assistant work for four to eight hours. One could arrive early in the morning to prepare breakfast and help get the children dressed, and as she was about to finish her day the other would arrive to complete the day's chores, help prepare the evening meal, and clean up afterwards.[11]

Clearly, by the end of the teens the Journal had abandoned its former position on the servant question. Gone were the pronouncements extolling the purported

---

[11] Zona Gale, "The Eight-Hour Home Assistant: How the Present Servant Will Go Out and the New Girl Come into the Home," LHJ, XXXVI (April, 1919), 35, 86.

advantages of having time to rest in the afternoon and of living and working in a wholesome environment. The shift in the magazine's attitude corresponded to changes in domestic service nationwide, because "about the time of World War I, . . . live-out and day work became more prevalent than live-in service and household work came to resemble other occupations." By 1919, "the twentieth-century pattern of domestic service had been set: the 'cleaning woman' had replaced the 'servant girl.'"[12]

In addition to the impact of the servant problem, technological developments promoted the metamorphosis in the Journal's portrayal of the homemaker. Initially the magazine was reticent about encouraging women to take advantage of new services, appliances, and products which could have relieved much of the strain of housekeeping, but by the late teens the Journal's stance was dramatically different.

In 1915, in an article that was a portent of the forthcoming deluge of articles on the "new housekeeping," Mrs. Julian Heath, Founder and National President of the Housewife's League, noted the effects of technology on housekeeping. In "The New Kind of Housekeeping: Why and How It is Different from the Old," she described how

---

[12]David M. Katzman, Seven Days a Week (New York, 1978), pp. 95, 145.

housewives eliminated such household chores as weaving, spinning, baking, soapmaking, preserving, washing, and dyeing by slowly transferring them to specialists outside the home. Further, thanks to new steam and electric devices, the homemaker no longer had to scrub clothes, carry coal or wood for cooking, or clean the mess made by candles and kerosene lanterns. Technology had "emancipated the home and made it a place in which human beings could not only live, but could also get the requisite rest and development." It transformed the homemaker from a producer to essentially a consumer. Moreover, as historian Sheila Rothman has put it, these advances "obviated the need for servants just at a time when domestic help was becoming less available."[13]

Considering the extent and magnitude of the changes brought on by technology, Heath further noted, it is no wonder that for many women everything "seemed to go wrong with the home and the profession of housekeeping." Keeping a home in the teens required manifestly different skills than it had a generation before, and many women had not made the transition.[14]

---

[13]Sheila M. Rothman, Woman's Proper Place (New York, 1978), p. 16; see also David M. Katzman, Seven Days a Week (New York, 1978), p. 130.

[14]Mrs. Julian Heath, "The New Kind of Housekeeping," LHJ, XXXII (January, 1915), 2.

A third factor contributing to the *Journal*'s changing view of the homemaker, one closely related to the impact of technology, was the magazine's conversion to the gospel of efficiency. Edward Bok and many of the magazine's contributors for years commented periodically on inefficiencies in the home, ridiculing the use of feather dusters and disparaging dust-catching decorations. To a degree its bolstering of domestic science courses was a call for domestic efficiency--but in the name of efficiency the magazine seldom endorsed the use of new appliances or the service of specialists.

By the teens, according to historian Samuel Haber, the *Journal* somewhat belatedly joined a national bandwagon for "domestic management;"[15] but once converted it enthusiastically preached the gospel of efficiency, a conversion which had far-reaching implications in the *Journal*'s attitude toward homemaking. As early as 1915, Mrs. Julian Heath noted that by using new appliances and hiring specialists the homemaker saved herself not only a great deal of drudgery but in the long run saved money. Many found they no longer needed servants. Mrs. Heath admonished women who discredited these changes as nothing but "new-fangled notions and tricks" which they had always done

---

[15] Samuel Haber, *Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920* (Chicago, 1964), p. 62.

without and would be able to continue doing without. Such reasoning was "silly."[16]

To housework, wrote Zona Gale, homemakers should apply the same "rules of division of labor and centralization of effort so successfully operative in the labor of men." Why would any woman insist on performing a chore she does not enjoy when an expert can handle it more efficiently? She is not relinquishing her responsibilities as mother and wife, only her tasks as homemaker.[17]

While by the late teens the average American homemaker had adapted quite well to the new homemaking, the Journal saw room for improvement by switching to general kitchens and dining roomless houses. In September of 1918, in "One Kitchen Fire for 200 People," an anonymous author reported on the very successful Montclair Cooperative Kitchen in New York City where neighborhood residents hired a "high-salaried chef" and capable assistants to provide three meals a day for members. Each family purchased as many meals as it needed per day from the "spotlessly clean, white-tiled kitchens." At two hundred servings per mealtime the kitchen operated at the peak of efficiency and still offered "'home quality'" meals. They delivered

---

[16]Mrs. Julian Heath, "The New Kind of Housekeeping," LHJ, XXXII (January, 1915), 2.

[17]Zona Gale, "Is Housework Pushing Down the Birthrate?" LHJ, XXXVI (May, 1919), 41.

the food ready to serve to each home in special containers so well insulated that even in below zero weather the food remained hot for several hours. When finished, the family returned the cannister to the porch to be collected by the cooperative's staff. Convinced that the ease and efficiency of this process was such a decisive improvement over the existing method of having each homemaker prepare food for her own family, the author triumphantly concluded that "the drudgery of the kitchen is gone, but the privacy of family life is retained."[18]

Six months later, Zona Gale energetically refuted point by point major criticisms against general kitchens. The facts proved conclusively that neighborhood kitchens could reliably distribute tasty, nutritious food at about the same cost as food cooked in the home, or even less when calculating the cost of the housewife's and servant's labor. Despite enormous improvements in many facets of homemaking, "in the kitchen alone the primitive, solitary, unorganized labor of our ancestors continues to be maintained." Zona Gale concluded her article with the emphatic demand that "the private kitchen must go the way of the spinning wheel, of which it is the contemporary."[19]

---

[18]"One Kitchen Fire for 200 People: No Necessity Any More for Each Family to Cook Its Own Meals," LHJ, XXXV (September, 1918), 97.

[19]Zona Gale, "Shall the Kitchen in our Home Go?" LHJ, XXXVI (March, 1919), 35, 50.

Architectural innovations also might contribute toward more efficiency in the home. In January, 1919, Charles Harris Whitaker, editor of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects, argued that the pressure of population growth demanded getting more people into less space and therefore made the single-family structure obsolete in certain areas. As the costs of land and materials rose, the standard one-family residence was so expensive that many people simply could not afford them. What a drastic change from the Journal's editorials and articles two or three decades before when the magazine decreed the single-family dwelling as the only place where a woman could exercise her God-given responsibilities.

In the same article, Whitaker championed the elimination of dining rooms and kitchens both in multi-family and single-family dwellings. Woman were already using laundry services, why not the general kitchen. He advised architects to "restudy the house itself as an industrial establishment, where every unnecessary step and all useless labor are to be eliminated." They should design houses without kitchens, although they should include "an emergency room, where cooking may be done in case of illness or through a breakdown of the central kitchen."[20]

---

[20] Charles Harris Whitaker, "Will the Kitchen be Outside the Home?" LHJ, XXXVI (January, 1919), 66.

A number of other articles took a different tack. "The present dining room is the most unthrifty and downright useless room in the house," claimed one writer, because it is used only a couple hours a day. Why not keep a table and chairs in another room and if the space is needed then the furniture could be moved off to the side?[21]

The changes in the Journal's concept of the house as home of course grew out of changing urban conditions. As the percentage of Americans living in cities grew the Journal had to keep in step by providing material appealing to urbanites. Ascending property prices, caused by the crush of people, meant single-family homes downtown were prohibitively expensive for most people while severe transportation problems took the glamour out of living in the suburbs. Hence, apartments and similar dwellings seemed "eminently attractive"[22] to a generation of Americans steeped in the pragmatism of William James and the efficiency doctrines of Frederick Winslow Taylor and stimulated further by the demands of patriotism during the Great War.

---

[21]George H. Barrington, "The Home Without a Dining Room," LHJ, XXXVI (January, 1919), 66; see also Carey Edmunds, "The New House Without a Dining Room," LHJ, XXXVI (February, 1919), 3; "Uncle Sam's New Houses That You Have Heard About," LHJ, XXXVI (February, 1919), 121.

[22]Sheila M. Rothman, Woman's Proper Place (New York, 1978), p. 15.

By the end of Edward Bok's editorship, the many departments of the _Ladies' Home Journal_ accepted the declining use of servants, endorsed the increased use of appliances and professional services, and in the name of efficiency suggested elimination of the dining room and kitchen from the home. But what effect did the _Journal_ anticipate these momentous changes would have on wife, mother, and homemaker? "Through the banishment of menial work from the house," Charles Whitaker contended, the home "will be made richer and a better instrument for enlarging the field of life." Simultaneously, preparing food in large general kitchens run like businesses would elevate the labor of cooking "to the dignity of an honorable human effort."[23]

Further, the new homemaking would improve the effectiveness of the mother. In "Is Housework Pushing Down the Birthrate?" Zona Gale asserted that when the children were very young the mother would stay home to be mother--not housewife and mother--and would be able to give her children the love and attention she could not supply if she still had to be housewife. Later, when the children were in school she could get a job since, according to Zona Gale's plan, school would last a couple hours longer per

---

[23]Charles Harris Whitaker, "Will the Kitchen be Outside the Home?" _LHJ_, XXXVI (January, 1919), 66; see also Dudley Harmom in collaboration with Ruby Green, "The New Day for Women," _LHJ_, XXXV (July, 1918), 32.

day and include more physical education and a hot noon meal. When the woman returned home from a satisfying day at work she enjoyed, she would be more relaxed and less exhausted than if she had labored all day at home performing tasks she disliked. Hence, in the evenings and on weekends she could concentrate almost exclusively on her children, thereby granting them more attention and affection than if she had to handle all homemaking chores herself.[24]

In 1919, the Journal's contributors seemed to concur that there remained one final vestige of the pioneering past and that was the kitchen. They predicted a time soon to come when man and woman would live "in equality--economic, social, political and intellectual; when the woman is free at last to develop and use her intellect, as the average woman knows that she has never yet been free to do." Such progress would be simply another of the natural "phases of democracy."[25]

---

[24]The title of that article, "Is Housework Pushing Down the Birthrate?" was grossly misleading. Zona Gale in only one place briefly quoted a British economist to the effect that unless they escaped the burdens of housekeeping women would continue to insist on few children until conditions reached a point of "racial extinction." Permitting such a statement in his magazine seems uncharacteristic of Edward Bok, and to sensationalize the title even more uncharacteristic. Zona Gale, "Is Housework Pushing Down the Birthrate?" LHJ, XXXVI (May, 1919), 41.

[25]Zona Gale, "The Eight-Hour Home Assistant: How the Present Servant Will Go Out and the New Girl Come into the Home," LHJ, XXXVI (April, 1919), 35, 86; Zona Gale, "Is Housework Pushing Down the Birthrate?" LHJ, XXXVI (May, 1919), 41.

That so many of the *Journal*'s writers believed that the general kitchen and dining roomless house were inevitable was a measure of the profound shift in the *Journal*'s view of the homemaker. Only two dozen years earlier Sarah T. Rorer, typifying the views of most writers at that time, sharply denigrated the general kitchen because its chief effect would be the destruction of "home life."[26] The growth of the cities, the benefits of technology, the shortage of domestic servants, and the popularity of the gospel of efficiency alleviated some of the problems of homemaking, but also imposed some new ones. The metamorphosis in the *Journal*'s view of the housewife confirmed these modifications, producing an almost entirely new creature which, by the end of the teens, emerged from its cocoon prepared to test its new wings.

---

[26] Sarah T. Rorer, "Cooperation in Housekeeping," *LHJ*, XII (January, 1895), 14.

CHAPTER VIII

THE NEW WOMAN

Accompanying the _Ladies' Home Journal_'s changing notions about woman's roles as wife, mother, and homemaker were corresponding changes in its attitude toward woman's activities outside the narrow confines of home. At the outset, all departments of the _Journal_ buttressed Edward Bok's convictions that female involvement beyond the hearth subjects women to physical, emotional, and mental strains which their feminine nature cannot transcend. Before the turn of the century, while organized feminism was still seriously splintered and struggling for survival, Bok's misgivings about the new woman apparently meshed comfortably with the sentiments of most _Journal_ subscribers. But the onslaught of feminism made Bok's attitudes increasingly anachronistic, forcing the _Journal_ to retreat from its initial position ultimately to surrender to the new woman and virtually all she stood for.

Prior to the turn of the century many of the magazine's writers played down the existence of the new woman. The Reverend T. DeWitt Talmage, D.D., reluctantly addressed the contentious issue only after receiving a deluge of requests from readers and encouragement from Edward Bok.

When finally he did broach the topic he explained condescendingly that he had not done so earlier because "he did not feel the importance of the subject." Important or not, Talmage's essay on the subject removed whatever doubt his readers may have had about his distaste for the new woman.[1]

Other contributors more readily acceded to the importance of the subject but insisted that it was just a passing fad, a temporary change in the cycle of attitudes and mores. There were plenty "protected" girls in every social and economic strata who, fostered in "the old, fine, true traditions," would doubtlessly convince society after a while that the high standards of the past deserved restoration. Just as the coarse and bold women of Queen Elizabeth's day had "been succeeded by the most modest flowering of English womanhood," so the new woman would be followed by a generation of unpretentious, upstanding women. Like a "thunderstorm," claimed another writer, "it is not a permanent atmospheric condition and will soon pass."[2]

But the storm did not pass, so the Journal embarked on a program to intensify its criticism of her in order to speed her demise. The most convenient method for analyzing

---

[1]T. DeWitt Talmage, "'Male and Female Created He Them,'" LHJ, XI (December, 1893), 14.

[2]An American Mother, "What the American Girl Has Lost," LHJ, XVII (May, 1900), 17; Mrs. A. D. T. Whitney, "Friendly Letter to Girl Friends," LHJ, XIII (September, 1896), 12.

the *Journal*'s attacks upon her is to divide the modern woman into two distinct subspecies--the new woman and her more radical sister, the platform woman--and then study the magazine's changing reactions toward each one separately. The use of these two categories is somewhat artificial because the *Journal*'s writers did not always draw a clear distinction between them. Nevertheless, the distinction simplifies the issue without appreciably distorting the facts.

In late nineteenth century editions of the *Journal*, the new woman was fundamentally a wholesome woman who, as a result of peer pressure, media propaganda, and lack of effective parental guidance, wandered from the straight and narrow path of Victorian behavior, not fully aware of the potentially devastating ramifications of her actions. In 1900, "An American Woman" outlined the innate weaknesses of the new woman in an essay that was representative of the opinions of most Victorian contributors. First, she noted, the modern girl had lost her "strength of repose," rushing pell-mell in quest of goals which even she could not define and which of course she could not attain since they ran counter to her feminine nature. There was no modest pliancy to her nature, for her life was "a headlong brawling current."[3]

---

[3]An American Mother, "What the American Girl Has Lost," *LHJ*, XVII (May, 1900), 17.

Moreover, the new woman's "incessant struggle" robbed her of her health. This was a particularly regrettable tragedy since she was the beneficiary both of remarkable accomplishments in medical science and sanitation and of splendid opportunities for healthful physical activities--rowing, fencing, golf, bicycling and so forth. All good reason dictated that she should be the "healthiest animal in the world," but she was not. Instead, nerve prostration affected her stomach and brain and required treatment from a nerve specialist, treatment consisting of a starvation diet of "beef juice and peptonoids." If she did not possess the wherewithal for treatment by a specialist, she resorted to bitters or opium pills which she purchased at a nearby store. Her "abnormal life" reduced the advanced woman to a "quivering, gasping bundle of nerves." These characteristics may not have been true of most new women, but they were true of many. According to recent studies, at the turn of the century the use of "silent friends" such as opium pills, bitters, and tonics by middle and upper class urban women was a very serious problem.[4]

---

[4]An American Mother, "What the American Girl Has Lost," <u>LHJ</u>, XVII (May, 1900), 17; Ruth Ashmore, "The Restlessness of Age," <u>LHJ</u>, XII (January, 1895), 16; John S. Haller and Robin M. Haller, <u>The Physician and Sexuality in Victorian America</u> (New York, 1974), pp. 271-303.

Regretfully, the new woman lost something "of far more worth than either health or repose," she lost her modesty. She lived "in the blaze of vulgar publicity," brazenly reporting in the newspaper every occasion when she invited friends to her house or visited someone else's. Hardly had her lover finished uttering his marriage proposal and she was off writing letters to everyone on her "visiting list" and providing editors with material for stories to appear in the Sunday papers. When reminded by the old guard that marriage is one of the most sacred and personal events of life and definitely nothing to advertise and flagrantly display before an entire city, she did not hesitate to express her annoyance that anyone should question the propriety of her actions.[5]

Her immodest clothing generated criticism as well. A number of writers condemned the new practice of wearing the décolleté to all sorts of social functions, to say nothing of her propensity to wear short sport clothing in public. The established standard had been "to dress so as to pass unobserved," but it seemed to at least one writer that the new measurement for fashion was "to dress so as to challenge admiration." For cycling, a short skirt three inches from the ground was permissible and for rainy days it was certainly sensible to wear "golf suits." But

---

[5]An American Mother, "What the American Girl Has Lost," LHJ, XVII (May, 1900), 17.

that was about as far as a woman should go. Throughout its regular departments the magazine tried to maintain the older dress codes more by positive example than by venemous criticism.[6]

Another disturbing characteristic of the new woman was her propensity to participate in women's clubs. Echoing Edward Bok's criticisms, many writers decried club activities because, as Ruth Ashmore noted, a woman cannot "speak on politics to-night and be interested in having a dainty dinner as a rest for her husband to-morrow night"; a woman cannot mix roles as wife and activist. Former President Grover Cleveland left little doubt of his predilections, charging that even the good clubs are a "menace" because they introduce women to ideas, activities, and new women, all of which have a "dangerous, undermining effect on the characters of wives and mothers." In other words, the clubs help convert women to feminism. Although clubwomen would have fiercely rejected Cleveland's conclusion, Karen J. Blair recently has shown that "the clubs were not estranged from feminism. In their vitality and ingeniousness at stretching convention through the manipulation of the lady's supposedly

---

[6]"Her Brother's Letters," LHJ, XXII (October, 1905), 19; Mrs. Burton Kingsland, "A Woman's Proper Dress at All Times," LHJ, XVII (July, 1900), 16.

natural traits, clubs became a significant part of the women's rights campaigns."[7]

Perhaps the most damning practice of the new woman was her deliberate decision "to make herself familiar with that class of prurient subjects formerly left to the knowledge of men." She conspicuously purchased and read indecent books, attended scandalous plays, and with men freely discussed "facts and ideas which her mother, even in her old age, cannot speak without a blush."[8]

One writer attempted to define more sharply the characteristics of the new woman by comparing the Gibson Girl, Theodosia Van Arnigher, to Henry James' character Daisy Miller. Outwardly, Daisy and Theodosia appeared much the same--always flirting, speaking in vulgar tones, and flouting convention. But there the similarities ended, for Daisy's behavior emanated from ignorance of refinement and, to a degree, naiveté, whereas Theodosia's did not. The Gibson Girl, or new girl, was sophisticated, well educated, and "elaborately informed" about a wide variety of topics and trained in "the habits of a polite society." Deliberately, she attempted to express individuality by

---

[7]Ruth Ashmore, "The Restlessness of the Age," LHJ, XII (January, 1895), 16; Grover Cleveland, "Woman's Mission and Woman's Clubs," LHJ, XXII (May, 1905), 3-4; Karen J. Blair, The Clubwoman as Feminist (New York, 1980), p. 117.

[8]An American Mother, "What the American Girl Has Lost," LHJ, XVII (May, 1900), 17.

"vulgarity," by posing as "a hoyden and a tomboy," and by being "slangy, incredibly self-assured, and serenely indifferent to the rights of others." With her sleeves rolled up to the elbows and her hands thrust into her pockets, she clomped about in her boots as manly as any grenadier. She yelled "Hallo" in a loud voice and after a bad shot on the golf course commented: "Holy Smoke! What a bum swat!" She was not an evil person, "for her morals are perfectly right." She had just permitted her reserve and modesty to atrophy. Daisy Miller's deportment was just as poor, the author said, but "she knew no better." Among other effects, this unfeminine behavior eroded the deference with which men her age treated the new woman. Taking the position, "Women: once our superiors, now our equals," men no longer looked upon her with reverence--and little wonder![9]

The vast majority of the Journal's early fiction represented the new woman in the same manner. Granted, a few isolated feminists cropped up before the turn of the century, but they were anomalies. One example was Missy who studied medicine and became a doctor. When her lover asked for her hand, she assented only after he assured her that their marriage was "not to interfere with her practice." Rudyard Kipling, in 1895, created a woman who was

---

[9]Winfield Scott Moody, "Daisy Miller and the Gibson Girl," LHJ, XXI (September, 1904), 17.

the match for a man in almost everything she attempted. She spoke several Indian dialects, managed servants and horses, and after a hard day's work rolled cigarettes with the men beside the campfire. (The cigarettes were for her brother; the Journal never approved of women smoking.) "She's as clever as a man, confound her," observed one character admiringly. And, in a few instances writers depicted incidental characters such as athletes, professionals, and assorted free spirits, but women of this fabric were extremely rare in the eighties and nineties.[10]

Later, in 1905, a unique character appeared in "Miss Million's Private Secretary." Winton Raye was walking home one evening when a beautiful woman in a sleek automobile stopped and asked if he wanted a ride, and of course he accepted. After a bit of intrigue, the inscrutable woman identified herself as Miss Million and hired Raye as her private secretary. That Miss Million was a very successful businesswoman, drove an automobile, and approached Winton Raye in such an unorthodox manner set her apart from virtually all other female characters prior to the nineteen teens. And Raye's position as

---

[10] Jeanette H. Halworth, "The Social Life at Marlborough," LHJ, XIII (August, 1896), 6; Rudyard Kipling, "William the Conquerer," LHJ, XIII (December, 1895), 5-6; see Margaret Allston, "Her Boston Experience: A Bright Girl's Picture of Modern Society and People," LHJ, XVI (October, 1899), 1.

Miss Million's private secretary introduced the unique feature of role reversal to the pages of the _Journal_.[11]

Miss Million, Rudyard Kipling's character, and the woman doctor were exceptional cases before the teens. In literally hundreds of other cases fictional women conformed substantially to Victorian modes, and in the few where they did not the authors either made excuses for or condemned their untoward behavior.

Far more vociferous than its criticisms of the new woman were the _Journal_'s denunciations of the woman's rights activist, the platform woman. Many of the magazine's Victorian writers employed the propagandist's handy artifice of stereotyping. Referring to the feminists in epithets--"uneasy sisters," "shrieking sisterhood," "masculine females," "wild women," and "unsexed women"--they set up a straw woman in the form of the most radical activists and then attacked that stereotype rather than the legitimate article. They sought to prove that these preternatural creatures were indeed distasteful and a threat to everything moral and upright.

The Reverend Charles H. Parkhurst claimed that the platform woman suffered from "andromania--'a passionate aping of everything that is mannish.'" He insisted that

---

[11]Gelett Burgess, "Miss Million's Private Secretary," _LHJ_, XXII (August, 1905), 3-4, 30.

any civilization which attempts to remake woman in the image of man is a "false civilization," and Heaven forbid that women of the United States should continue in that direction. The moderate new woman suffered some of the symptoms of andromania but the platform woman experienced a particularly debilitating case of it, taking exception to anything which distinguishes the sexes. The Reverend Parkhurst objected not one whit to woman expanding her sphere of activity, he claimed, but the preternatural platform woman was motivated purely by the desire to prove all "activities that are suitable for men are suitable for women."[12]

Ruth Ashmore added her voice to the outcry, expressing repugnance at "the loud screaming of those sisters of hers who, in their desire to repute their womanhood, become sexless." Ashmore asked rhetorically if the platform woman were equal to the simple woman who loves her children and her God and raises her children to be of good character. Of course not, and "no man, who is mentally strong, thinks so," she replied. His Eminence, J. Cardinal Gibbons complained that the platform woman replaced "modesty and gentleness, those two sweet handmaids of womankind," with "masculinity and aggressiveness." In his estimation, the

---

[12]Charles H. Parkhurst, "Andromaniacs," LHJ, XII (February, 1895), 15.

shibboleth of the movement seemed to be "masculinity is greater than motherhood."[13]

When the Journal's contributors were not calling the platform woman an andromaniac or a sexless creature they denigrated the "undesirable nature" of any woman who renounced a home and family for no better reason than to campaign extensively for women's rights. Aberrants with such misplaced values, everyone recognized, were "fit neither to vote nor to keep house."[14]

Many writers labeled the platform woman a "bachelor girl" because of her marked propensity to remain unmarried. By repudiating her divinely ordained functions as wife, mother, and homemaker, the bachelor girl relinquished any chance she had of becoming a "true woman." She did not even approach the status of the woman so irreverently called an "old maid"--so "kindly, loving, tender, with a halo of a romance about her." If the bachelor girl steadfastly refused to be married, she would have to take lessons in kindness and understanding from the old maid or else live a life devoid of meaning and fulfillment.[15]

---

[13]Ruth Ashmore, "The Conservative Woman," LHJ, XIII (February, 1896), 16; J. Cardinal Gibbons, "The Restless Woman," LHJ, XIX (January, 1902), 6; see also Ruth Ashmore, "The Bachelor Girl," LHJ, XV (April, 1898), 22.

[14]T. DeWitt Talmage, "'Male and Female Created He Them,'" LHJ, XI (December, 1893), 14.

[15]Ruth Ashmore, "The Bachelor Girl," LHJ, XV (April 1898), 22.

If the venerable Parkhurst, the motherly Ashmore, and the Reverend Talmage in their sermons and essays could not convince the _Journal_'s readers to steer clear of andro-maniacs and other sexless anomalies, perhaps some humorous jabs built on the same postulates might work better. And in the mid-nineties the _Journal_ tried that tack, commissioning John Kendrick Bangs to write "The Paradise Club," a series of satirical attacks on the modern woman.

In Bangs' Paradise Club, which "held neither a woman nor a serpent" as a member, one character discussed his strong-minded sister who had "all these queer notions" about woman having the right to do whatever man does. Not only did she insist on voting and attending "the theater at night alone," she also demanded to know "why if men can smoke women can't." After squabbling with his sister for several years about women smoking he finally acted as though he had capitulated. His sister then began to demur, concluding that because he agreed with her she might be wrong. Another member interjected that that was one of the many "queer things" about such women, they never want to agree with man, they just want to emulate him. At any rate, she began smoking and eventually was troubled that her fingers were turning yellow, although she observed that her brother's did not. He reminded her that he smoked cigars, that was the difference; and he chided her for being a dude instead of a

real man. So, he purchased some cigars as "black as the ace of spades" which "ought to have been called Flora Samsonian." Even he dared not smoke one, though he did not let her know that. She lighted her cigar and after a few minutes "suddenly remembered she had to write a letter." She never smoked again, he noted. When someone asked if he had proved his point, he said he had not; all he had done was prove her contention that all men are deceivers.[16]

John Kendrick Bangs dismissed other manifestations of andromania--suffrage, jury duty, intellectual superiority, and employment--in fashions equally as stinging. Like so many who addressed these issues in a serious vein, he refused to challenge the new woman and platform woman head on, choosing to attack caricatures instead.

The general impressions of the new woman and the platform woman the _Journal_'s contributors created in the late nineteenth and very early twentieth centuries corresponded with the views Edward Bok promulgated in his editorials and reinforced later in his biographies. However, by the teens the _Journal_'s writers began to abjure Bok's image of womanhood. Except in editorials the new woman emerged as a respectable, even an admirable, figure.

---

[16]John Kendrick Bangs, "The Paradise Club: When Lovely Woman Takes to Smoke," _LHJ_, XII (January, 1895), 11.

By comparison, the much maligned platform woman, while no longer a victim of so many vociferous attacks, never basked in even the faintest praise. Instead, the platform woman became a nonentity of sorts, almost totally ignored by the world's most successful women's publication.

The Journal's shift from supporting the Victorian woman to accepting the new woman did not occur overnight. To help ease the transition the Journal began portraying in fiction what can be best described in this study as a transition woman whose presence dovetailed the Victorian woman and the new woman. Gradually making her appearance early in the twentieth century, the transition woman, unlike the Victorian woman, was strong-willed and possessed traits of physical endurance, economic success, and insistent independence. Yet, she manifested these characteristics not out of a desire to prove her equality with man or to exercise some philosophical principle but in a matter-of-fact response to exigencies thrust upon her.

One such example was an eastern woman who moved west with her husband. When the cowhands brought him home dead one day she did not know what to do, for there was no one and no place to return to back east. After a while, upon the advice of a friendly old woman, she sold some of her husband's guns and ponies to buy a piece of land. Receiving only occasional assistance from friends, in the face of asperity she built a very successful ranch. Men

"exclaimed admiringly over her pluck" and dubbed her the "Cattle Queen." Throughout the narrative she "never took any particular pride in" her achievements nor felt compelled to persuade other women to emulate her. Insisting that she was not extraordinary, she observed in passing that if other women would apply "the same force and faithfulness" toward "activities that have an economic value" as many women exert in running a household they could "win for themselves the same success I have had."[17]

Before long, however, the transitional woman began losing the insouciance of the "Cattle Queen" and gaining instead some of the attributes of the new woman. By 1915, the transition woman had faded and the new girl was sprouting her new image full-blown both in fiction and non-fiction. One writer began her article by noting that the new girl was marrying older and sometimes not at all, a fact that for years the Journal had employed frequently to denounce the new woman. What made this article noteworthy was that the author erased the negative implications in that argument by empathizing with the new woman and, of all things, blaming her behavior on Victorian woman. In the author's estimation, the new woman avoided marriage because she had witnessed many Victorian women weld themselves so completely to their husbands that they lost

---

[17]Alice MacGowan, "A Girl Widow in the Great Southwest," LHJ, XXIV (June, 1907), 15, 56-57.

their own identities and, concomitantly, their self-assurance.

Indeed, the new girl had seen the lives of many older women so shattered by sudden loss that they could no longer cope with life. They were dazed because the world had "passed them by" while they were totally absorbed in the narrow confines of service to husbands and children. But, the author instructed, the new woman should not eschew marriage on the basis of bad examples, because the fault lay not with the institution but its practitioners. A woman can marry without dissolving her own identity or melting her personality into her husband's. It is perfectly understandable, indeed advisable, for a woman to insist that "I don't want love to make me the same note as Sam, only an octave higher. I want to be a different note that makes perfect harmony."[18]

Also in 1915, an even stronger affirmation of the new woman's position appeared in an article that was ostensibly a letter written by Kathleen to her lover after he had proposed to her. To help Peter understand why she was impelled to reject his suit, she recalled a number of experiences they had shared which had initially caused her uneasiness and later, upon reflection, anger.

---

[18] Dorothy Mills May, "The New Girl's 'Goblin': An Editorial," LHJ, XXXII (May, 1915), 3.

Peter's profound admiration of the relationship between Tom and Bessie, for example, had annoyed Kathleen. Tom failed to recognize Bessie's exhaustion with housework and her legitimate desire for social and intellectual development, and he never lifted a finger to help her. Contentedly, even smugly, Tom allowed Bessie to overwork herself doting on him. "It never did occur to you before, did it," she told Peter, "that there is no such thing as 'woman's work,'" that not all women are born to cook, and clean, and sew.

Peter's deep admiration for Uncle Jack and "fragile, helpless, pretty Aunt Nancy," likewise rankled Kathleen. Aunt Nancy was the sort of woman "whom every man wants to cuddle" and upon whom Uncle Jack lavished gifts; but what would Aunt Nancy have done if something happened to Jack? She could not have fended for herself. Kathleen disagreed with Peter's feeling that Aunt Nancy's "dependency [was] very beautiful" and charged that "your masculinity was gratified at the thought of a woman weeping at a twenty-four hours' absence." And what of Peter's mother? Peter had always proudly "pictured her as living entirely in the life of her husband and sons," mending, cooking, and cleaning. Peter had said that "'she just lived for us, she didn't care about outside things at all.'" What better evidence could there have been of Peter's insensitivity to the feelings of women?

Like any other "right-minded woman," Kathleen wanted to have a comfortable, clean home with wholesome food and an atmosphere of rest and inspiration and she was willing to do the work necessary to have it. "But that is no reason why she should enjoy the necessary manual labor as a thing in itself, or for a moment lose sight of it as anything but a means to an end." Kathleen told her lover at the end of the long letter that if, after one year's contemplation, he decided that he wanted something more than "a beloved automaton with my face and form to realize for you the dream pictures of your fancy," if he wanted a wife who had her own thoughts, tastes, and theories, then, and only then, he could ask her again to marry him. She for one had no intention of ever becoming a Bessie or an Aunt Nancy.[19] Defenders of Victorian womanhood must have drawn a collective gasp of astonishment at what they were reading in the _Ladies' Home Journal_.

So pervasive was the _Journal_'s acceptance of the new woman by the mid-teens that hardly a facet of the new woman failed to receive at least some praise. Mrs. George Grayson related an incident which illustrated not only how far woman had come since the turn of the century but also how thoroughly the _Journal_ had accepted the new woman. As

---

[19]"Her Letter to Him: After He Had Asked Her to Marry Him," _LHJ_, XXXII (May, 1915), 14.

part of her business responsibilities, the thirty-five year old Mrs. Grayson had to travel to a distant city on short notice. She telephoned a night letter to a hotel making a reservation for the following night and then reserved a place on a sleeper. Arriving at the hotel she walked straightway through the lobby to check in. After she was settled in her small suite she contacted the man with whom she had business and arranged a meeting the next day in her suite.

Mrs. Grayson marvelled at how quickly things had changed for women. Only a few years before she could not have done any of those things unaccompanied, or at least not done them without subjecting herself to the vilest gossip and most censorious glances. She would have had to slip inconspicuously into the hotel's drawing room; ring the bellboy and have him take her visiting card to the desk to register for her; move discreetly to her room; and hold her business meeting in the presence of a chaperone. That she could feel free to have done all this and to know that no one considered it inappropriate, she observed, exemplified the advancements women had made in less than a generation.

Meanwhile, Mrs. Grayson observed many other women visiting or conferring with men in a totally unselfconscious manner. Under Victorian ethics, "unadulterated friendship [an unfortunate and apparently unintentional

pun] between men and women was as 'the fourth dimension,' a thing outside nature, monstrous, unthinkable, grotesque." Those prudish and demeaning attitudes which for so long kept woman suppressed had virtually evaporated, marking a growing realization in America that, after all, man and woman do hold many common interests. "These are only small things, a few out of hundreds of commonplace occasions any woman can think of that not so long ago were not commonplace," Mrs. Grayson said; they provide women with larger experiences, more strength of mind, and richer living. In essence, the author praised many of the same practices which Aunt Patience and other _Journal_ advisors had excoriated two decades earlier.[20]

Two other attributes of the new woman movement which the _Journal_'s contributors accepted by the teens were club activity and college education. After curtailing its initial attacks on women's clubs the magazine began abetting them through a department edited under the auspices of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The monthly articles encouraged women's involvement in education, beautification, care for the indigent, and a host of other activities. As a result of World War I, some of the _Journal_'s writers expected the positive effects of women's

---

[20]Margaret T. Grayson, "Where the Current Has Brought Me; What I, a Woman, May Do Today that Yesterday I Could Not," _LHJ_, (June, 1915), 8.

clubs to mount. By having contributed so inexhaustibly during the war to the Red Cross, child welfare, community health, and education, woman had learned she could readily accomplish a great deal more with her time than she had ever dreamed possible. That plus new appliances and other conveniences would permit women, even those employed, to use women's clubs as weapons against ignorance, violence, mistreatment of children, and other evils. And that was tantamount to promoting the new woman movement, according to a recent book by Karen J. Blair. She states that women's clubs during the Progressive Era "rendered obsolete the notion that 'women's place is in the home,' and thereby made a significant contribution to woman's struggle for autonomy."[21]

Similarly, the Journal retreated from its original claim that college addles the weak mind of women. In 1911 and 1912, college education for women was a major issue. In one of the "Both Sides of the Question" series, the Journal pitted Hugo Munsterberg, Professor of Psychology at Harvard, against John Dewey, Professor of Philosophy and Psychology at Columbia, on the question: "Is Co-Education Wise for Girls?" Dewey favored and Munsterberg opposed

---

[21]Karen J. Blair, The Clubwoman as Feminist (New York, 1980), p. 119; "What are Women Going to Do?" LHJ, XXVI (May, 1919), 41, 114; William Howard Taft, "As I See the Future of Women," LHJ, XXXV (March, 1919), 27, 113; see also "The Ideas of a Forward-Looking Woman," LHJ, XXXVI (February, 1919), 35.

coeducational colleges. That the Journal treated this as a controversial issue indicated its conservatism, because for more than thirty years a majority of female college students had been attending coeducational institutions. In the school year 1909-1910, over three quarters of all female students were in coeducational colleges.[22]

Among other articles on the subject was a four month series, "What Has the College Done for Girls?" in which Edith Rickert discussed the results of a canvass of women who graduated from college between 1849 and 1909. She concluded that college improved the girl's health, gave her a broad education, and equipped her "to assimilate all the good forces of the world to her own growth, and to become more effective as a worker, as a citizen and as a personality." On the other hand, her study showed that perhaps colleges were "too academic: not practical enough" and that they did not prepare women adequately to become teachers or to be efficient homemakers. Rickert, therefore, maintained a conservative position but she did not, nor did other writers by this time, contend that women are incapable of the work. One writer challenged the old view that college creates sexless

---

[22]Hugo Munsterberger, "Is Co-Education Wise for Girls? Bi-Education and Co-Education," LHJ, XXVIII (May 15, 1911), 16, 32; John Dewey, "Is Co-Education Wise for Girls? What Co-Education has Done," LHJ, XXVII (June 1, 1911), 22, 60; Mabel Newcomer, A Century of Higher Education for American Women (New York, 1959), p. 49.

anomalies unsuited for marriage. Using government statistics she conceded that fewer college women get married but then claimed that those who do marry are much less likely to divorce. "Are not fewer right marriages of greater value to the community than a larger number with less happy results?"[23]

By the war years, the Journal supported liberal arts education and it carried dozens of advertisements each month for prep schools, colleges, and professional schools. It was responding to the changing mood of Americans; the number of women enrolled in American colleges rose from 56,000 in 1890 to 283,000 in 1920.[24]

In its new frame of mind the Journal also defended the new woman by placing changing behavior patterns in historical perspective. History teaches, asserted one writer, that when woman attempts to alter her behavior, dress, or thoughts, society raises stentorian objections and predicts devastating repercussions. Innovations as constructive as kindergartens, critics had declared,

---

[23]Edith Rickert, "What Has the College Done for Girls?" LHJ, XXIX (January, 1912), 11-12; (February, 1912), 9, 52; (March, 1912), 15-16; (April, 1912), 23-24; Albertine Flershem Valentine, "The Married College Woman and Divorce," LHJ, XXVIII (April 15, 1911), 22.

[24]Caroline Hazard, "Where the College Fails the Girl," LHJ, XXXII (March, 1915), 19, 72; Dudley Harmon, ed., "The New Day for Women," LHJ, XXXV (May, 1918), 30; Mabel Newcomer, A Century of Higher Education for American Women (New York, 1959), p. 46.

"snatched the babe from the mother's breast" and therefore portended the demise of maternal love. When woman went to medical schools and began to "recapture" obstetrics from men, it was "vulgar," "impudent," and "unsexed." And society excoriated Harper's Bazaar for defiling womanhood when it introduced women's faces in public print. Similarly, in the second decade of the twentieth century the tocsin was ringing again, warning of the enemy new woman. As so often had occurred in the past, the new alarms were wholly unwarranted and a century or so later people would look back and consider them false alarms.[25]

In the teens, the Journal also more frequently featured women as active, strong individuals. Comparing their behavior with the entreaties in "Just Among Ourselves" and other nineteenth century advice columns is interesting because it appears almost as if many of the later writers built their characters purposely to flout the do's and don'ts of Victorian advisors. No longer were repose and self-consciousness admirable traits. One character admitted her dad was grumbling because he never got to see her anymore. "He says that I don't walk--that I one step. I believe it's true. I'm just living to ragtime, and it's glorious fun." And just because it might cause people to

---

[25]Edna Kenton, "Whatever is New for Women is Wrong," LHJ, XXXIII (October, 1916), 12.

talk was no reason to eschew certain behavior. She even went to a play with a love scene "that would pump thrills into a wooden Indian."[26]

Probably the most unique example of the new woman appeared in 1918, in "Mildred Carver, USA: A Romance of the American Girl of Tomorrow." In this romance, Mildred Carver, the daughter of an industrial magnate, received her conscription notice for Universal Service, a domestic youth corps. Though her family was distressed over the prospects of her service, Mildred anticipated enthusiastically the opportunity to serve her nation and to learn many skills. It was a leveling experience, bringing her into daily contact with young people from all ranks and backgrounds: no one received special treatment on account of background or sex. Unencumbered by chaperones, the young people learned quickly to manage their own affairs and that helped Mildred develop tremendous self-confidence and a conviction that she was equal to man. During her tour of duty, this educated, refined young woman from a wealthy family worked on a road crew and municipal cleaning squad, in a flour mill, and on a farm where she drove a huge tractor. She learned about scientific management and other production techniques.

---

[26] "Her Diary: The Day to Day Story of a Modern Girl," LHJ, XXXII (October, 1915), 15; XXXII (November, 1915), 17, 89; XXXIII (December, 1915), 13.

After her stint in Universal Service, she found herself bored at home with her family and old friends. She recalled from her work on the farm that there was a desperate need for a special steel alloy for making more durable plows and machinery, so she tried to no avail to convince her father to begin developing such an alloy in one of his steel mills. Growing more restless she decided she must return to the Service. Her fearful mother reminded her that she did not have to work because she did not need money, to which Mildred replied, "I don't want to work because I want money, I want to work because I like it, because it interests me." When it dawned on her father that she actually intended to return to Service he offered her a position in one of his steel mills overseeing a new project. She performed marvelously.

Though Mildred Carver was the antithesis of the genteel womanhood which the _Journal_ had previously exalted, she reigned for an unprecedented nine months as the _Journal_'s leading heroine. This thoroughly appealing new woman testified forcefully to the magazine's rejection of Victorian woman.[27]

---

[27] Martha Bensley Bruère, "Mildred Carver, USA: A Romance of the American Girl of Tomorrow," _LHJ_, XXXV (June, 1918), 14-15, 56, 58; (July, 1918), 21, 48, 51-52, 54-55; (August, 1918), 21, 49, 51, 53; (September, 1918), 25, 83-84; (October, 1918), 21, 106, 108, 110; (November, 1918), 15, 92, 94; XXXVI (December, 1918), 29, 82, 84; (January, 1919), 13, 32; (February, 1919), 24, 92, 93.

In the late teens, more and more female characters exhibited the independence and self-reliance earlier reserved exclusively for men. No longer was it unusual for a female character to seek interesting, exciting employment, to unblushingly mention kissing her boy-friends, or to travel both domestically and abroad without a chaperone.[28] Indeed, by the end of Edward Bok's reign, the Journal had left the Victorian woman in the lurch and, however hesitatingly at first, struck up an affair with the new woman.

---

[28] Of the several dozen stories of this ilk, two that are especially worth noting are: Anne Warwick, "The Best People," LHJ, XXXIV (July, 1917), 13-14, 57; XXXIV (August, 1917), 21-22, 60-62; XXXIV (September, 1917), 17, 66-67; XXXIV (October, 1917), 19, 65-66; XXXIV (November, 1917), 23, 105-106; XXXV (December, 1917), 20, 102-103; XXXV (January, 1918), 15, 52-54; XXXV (February, 1918), 20, 78; Zona Gale, "The Girl Who Gave Her Eyes," LHJ, XXXVI (February, 1919), 11, 14, 57-58, 60.

CHAPTER IX

WOMAN SUFFRAGE

As the *Journal*'s perspective on the new woman changed, so did its position on a number of the fundamental goals of the feminist movement, including woman's suffrage. For several years the magazine was rather quiet on the suffrage question, but early in the twentieth century, with the suffrage movement gaining momentum and public discussion of the subject intensifying, naturally the *Journal*'s interest in it heightened. At first Bok's magazine, in classic Victorian rationale, denounced the idea of women voting; but eventually it resigned itself to the reality that American women were going to vote.

In one of only a handful of articles on woman suffrage before the new century, a writer rejected female suffrage defiantly, noting that she personally did not crave justice, but mercy; not equality, but chivalry. After all, the "very first right" all women "expect is to be treated better than anyone else." Still, if woman *must* have suffrage, she need not be so gauche and unfeminine as to hit the platform circuit, lobby legislatures, and demonstrate in public; suffrage was already within her grasp. All she needed to do to get the vote was to "put on her prettiest

clothes and cuddle up to her own particular man in her softest and most womanish way" and ask him sweetly for it. What man could resist the urgent appeal of his woman? At least a few advanced women must have read this article and bristled at the suggestion of groveling before man in such a manner.[1]

Meanwhile, other writers out of hand rejected the "mistaken notion that suffrage is a right inherent in personality" and scoffed at andromaniacs for wanting to vote only because men voted. The attacks against the suffragists' natural rights arguments subsided soon after the turn of the century because, as Aileen S. Kraditor notes, the suffragists switched from the natural rights argument to the "consent of the governed" premise at about that time.[2]

The Journal's anti-suffragists further contended that woman already had control of the ballot box, that "woman always has voted and always will vote." It is only in their imagination that men elect leaders and determine policies of state, because in reality it is women who determine a nation's leaders. George Washington's mother

---

[1]Lilian Bell, "From a Girl's Standpoint: Woman's Rights in Love," LHJ, XIII (June, 1895), 12.

[2]Charles H. Parkhurst, "Women Without the Ballot," LHJ, XII (June, 1895), 15; Aileen S. Kraditor, The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920 (New York, 1965), p. 44.

and not the male electorate made him President of the United States. Why women would want the ballot in the first place was a mystery to Reverend T. DeWitt Talmage, for she sits upon a "throne so high that all the thrones of earth piled on top of each other would not make for her a footstool," and far below her are the ballot box and the legislative halls.[3]

What a "feeble thing" man's suffrage is compared to woman's influence over affairs, insisted Talmage. An intelligent, upstanding Christian man can cast his vote, only to have it cancelled by the illiterate drunkard who follows him to the ballot box. However, when the daughter by her Christian demeanor, the wife by her industry, or the mother by her faithfulness casts her "vote," Talmage proceeded illogically, nothing can cancel it, "and the influence of that vote will throb through the eternities." It apparently did not occur to the theologian that a daughter by her immorality, a wife by her laziness, and a mother by her neglect could negate the "votes" of the good women, just as a drunkard's vote negated the Christian man's ballot. Another writer observed, the "insistence" upon woman's suffrage implies an "absurd glorification of the vote as an instrument of power." Wisdom demands that

---

[3]T. DeWitt Talmage, "'Male and Female Created He Them,'" LHJ, X (September, 1893), 14.

if the nation is going to change its practices there should be a good reason for it and Lyman Abbott could see no reason to permit women to vote--they already composed "the most potent of lobbies in the halls of legislation."[4]

A dozen years later, in 1905, Grover Cleveland took cognizance of the impact of the unwise, ineffectual woman as a major reason for opposing woman suffrage. To the popular suffragist assertion that woman's suffrage would uplift society, he countered that the ballots of those women who were wholly unqualified to vote would more than offset good women's ballots. Women have a strong tendency toward "social rivalries and jealousies," the former President said disparagingly, and if allowed to vote the poor women would have "a new opportunity to gratify their envy and mistrust of the rich," consequently supporting bad laws and dangerous candidates.[5]

Margaret Deland agreed with Cleveland's assertion that too many women voters would be unqualified because they have such a tendency toward "emotional shallowness" and "lack of thoroughness" when approaching social questions. They think they can destroy prostitution, she

---

[4]T. DeWitt Talmage, "'Male and Female Created He Them,'" LHJ, X (September, 1893), 14; Mrs. Humphrey Ward, "Why I Do Not Believe in Woman Suffrage," LHJ, XXV (November, 1908), 15; Lyman Abbott, "Why the Vote Would Be Injurious to Women," LHJ, XXVII (February, 1910), 21-22.

[5]Grover Cleveland, "Would Woman Suffrage Be Unwise?" LHJ, XXII (October, 1905), 7-8.

observed condescendingly, by passing very strict laws to close down all houses of prostitution, while failing altogether to recognize that such action might actually aggravate the situation by spreading the "poison" and that it only strikes the symptom and not the cause of the social illness. Hence, by allowing all women to vote, society would only be exacerbating the problem inherent in male suffrage--the unqualified outvoting the qualified. Deland, therefore, supported woman's suffrage for qualified women only. Historian Aileen Kraditor recognizes this as a major suffragist argument, but since Deland conceded that it would be impossible in practice to allow only the qualified women to vote, in the end her proposal was only a ploy to avoid overtly opposing woman's suffrage.[6]

The Reverend Lyman Abbott, manifesting a strong sense of nativism and class consciousness, added another dimension to the protest by expressing concern that voting women would become political pawns. Men tell their wives how to vote; in cities the police direct "vicious women" how to vote; and ecclesiastical organizations endeavoring to exercise political power induce strong support among women.[7]

---

[6]Margaret Deland, "The New Woman Who Would Do Things," LHJ, XXIV (September, 1907), 17; Aileen S. Kraditor, The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920 (New York, 1965), pp. 130-139.

[7]Lyman Abbott, "Why the Vote Would Be Injurious to Women," LHJ, XXVII (February, 1910), 21-22.

Charles H. Parkhurst addressed the question from a different perspective by directly challenging assertions made by some feminists that woman's intuitive powers, motherly instincts, and compassionate propensities made her especially well-qualified for voting. In measured words he conceded that woman suffrage might well lead to social betterment but that women who argue from that premise are walking on thin ice since womanly intuition, as great and effective as it is, cannot work by itself. In dealing with complicated social, political, and economic issues, "intuition counts for a good deal more by being moderately mixed with statistics" and consequently women would have to study issues thoroughly and know the candidates well before voting. The Country Contributor admitted that "women are not all good, not all honest, not all kind, and their sense of justice is notoriously fallible." Therefore, she said, conveniently disregarding statements she made in other columns about woman's moral superiority to man, the effect of women in politics would be essentially the same as men in politics.[8]

In the final analysis women truly committed to improving society did not have to wait until they could vote, reasoned Charles H. Parkhurst, there were multitudes of

---

[8]Charles H. Parkhurst, "Women Without the Ballot," LHJ, XII (June, 1895), 15; Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman, LHJ, XXV (September, 1908), 38.

activities through which women could express their compassion and exercise their motherly powers. Through benevolent organizations, churches, and schools they could have a profound effect by improving education, helping the poor and the sick, and adding meaning to the lives of people in general. "I am not antagonizing female suffrage," he explained, it is demonstrably true that "women have a great many more rights than they are using, and are standing at the threshold of innumerable doors of opportunity into which they have not yet entered." And that was the "kind of ministry" for which God created woman and in which "one woman is the equivalent of ten men." If women were as fervently committed to social betterment as suffragists claimed, Parkhurst was convinced that they would have been using weapons at hand far more vigorously.[9]

Suffrage statistics bore out Parkhurst's conclusion that women were not serious about social betterment. In those places where woman had had the right to vote for several years, said Grover Cleveland, after an initial burst of interest the level of registered women voters dropped off dramatically. For example, from 1894 to 1898, in Chicago the number of registered women voters dropped from 29,815 to 1,488; and in Cleveland from 1895 to 1898,

---

[9]Charles H. Parkhurst, "Women Without the Ballot," LHJ, XII (June, 1895), 15.

the number declined from 5,831 to 82. Lyman Abbott described a plebiscite on woman suffrage in Massachusetts where less than five percent of the possible women voters answered in the affirmative, the remainder either did not vote or voted against the idea. (Abbott did not indicate what the negative vote actually was.)[10] The figures that Cleveland, Abbott, and others cited corroborated a commonly held opinion among Journal contributors that the vast majority of women by nature were not interested in suffrage, as a weapon to fight social evils or for any other purpose. All the hoopla about woman suffrage was therefore the result of a carefully orchestrated and very successful effort by a small group of activists to create the impression that there was wide support.

There were two factors abetting that small band of platform women, Cleveland insisted. First, the activists manipulated many moderate women into creating women's clubs, knowing certainly that, whatever their professed goals and purposes, the clubs were "apt to pave the way to the reception of woman-suffrage radicalism." In the clubs, many considerate and conservative women who refused to endorse the demands of the suffragists nevertheless aided them by so "amiably tolerating" them. Moreover,

---

[10]Grover Cleveland, "Would Woman Suffrage Be Unwise?" LHJ, XXII (October, 1905), 7-8; Lyman Abbott, "Why the Vote Would Be Injurious to Women," LHJ, XXVII (February, 1910), 21-22.

the activists also cunningly employed to their advantage the chivalric traits of man, traits which impelled him to give women what they needed. If the suffragists convinced man that woman needed the right to vote, he would provide it. What irony! The suffragists would connivingly use man's propensity toward chivalry to steal from women in general the protection that same chivalry afforded them. Under chivalry, "a woman has the inalienable right of attacking without being attacked in turn. She may strike, but must not be struck either literally or figuratively." However, once woman breaks out of her natural realm by winning the right to vote, she enters the arena of challenge and disputation and therefore is no longer protected from counterattack.[11]

When women step into the sphere of challenge and disputation, anti-suffragists noted fearfully, the effect is that "women change politics less than politics change women." Politics lowers woman's ideals, dulls the delicacy of her perception of right and wrong, and in general robs from her some of that special quality that makes womanhood what it is. Or as the Country Contributor put it, since woman is especially "quick at intrigue," when she mixes in

---

[11]Grover Cleveland, "Would Woman Suffrage Be Unwise?" LHJ, XXII (October, 1905), 7-8.

"practical politics" she will discard her best ideals and become more contriving even than man.[12]

Incidentally, in one paragraph the Country Contributor added another element to her disapproval of suffrage. The "great barrier" to woman's participation in politics "is the natural physical one," and there are times "when home is the only proper place for a woman." Therefore, if woman must fraternize with man at the polls she should wait until she is at least fifty years old.[13]

One other argument against woman suffrage--the environment of the polling places--appeared occasionally in the Journal, usually in humor. John Kendrick Bangs, in his series "The Paradise Club" mentioned earlier, ridiculed the effect woman's suffrage might have on the actual voting process. The Married Man, after a heated argument with his wife over woman's suffrage, had a dream about life in a world with universal suffrage. Granted, some features of the new world were appealing and logical. Since the saloons and other places where voting commonly took place were simply not wholesome enough for women, it seemed sensible, and for that matter much more fun, to

---

[12]Grover Cleveland, "Would Woman Suffrage Be Unwise?" LHJ, XXII (October, 1905), 7-8; Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," LHJ, XXV (September, 1908), 38.

[13]Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," LHJ, XXV (September, 1908), 38.

attend a Ballot Ball which the women had organized. In his dream, however, he experienced one major drawback of the new process. At the Ballot Ball, when he wanted to dance the fourth two-step with a vivacious and attractive woman she would not agree to dance until she had seen his ballot, and then she refused to dance until he changed his vote to the other gubernatorial candidate.[14]

Around 1910, the _Journal_'s handling of the suffrage issue changed dramatically. Bok's magazine significantly increased the amount of print allotted to it and, more importantly, switched from its blatantly anti-suffrage stand to an ostensibly neutral position. The magazine claimed neutrality, but the preponderance of the material during that period opposed woman suffrage and, as shall be noted, the few contributors championing suffrage were very moderate, indeed conservative in tone. Still, that the _Journal_ would even feign neutrality bore significance.

---

[14]John Kendrick Bangs, "The Paradise Club: Dreams of Universal Suffrage," _LHJ_, XII (December, 1894), 36. Also, Finley Peter Dunne briefly attacked woman suffrage in one episode of a serial but, like most of this series which Dunne never completed, the attack was largely ineffectual. Parenthetically, the humorist was ill and, Bok noted, he "has not been satisfied with the story as far as it has gone." Further, since Dunne's "physical condition does not afford much hope that it will improve in the next chapters," Edward Bok announced an abortive end to the series. Finley Peter Dunne, "Molly Donahue, Who Lives Across the Street from Mr. Dooley," _LHJ_, XVII (March, 1900), 6.

One of the first major articles to appear in the *Journal*'s ostensibly neutral phase was a rousing attack on woman's suffrage. In a series entitled "Both Sides of Live Questions," the Reverend Lyman Abbott, briefly resurrecting the natural rights question, insisted "that voting is not a right, but a duty; not a privilege refused to woman, but a task from which she has been exempt in the past." Because woman already had so many responsibilities, he thought it gravely unfair to also make her accountable for governing eighty million people. Or did the suffragists intend to relieve her of some of her current responsibilities so she would not be overburdened? If so, which ones? Having thus set the stage, the Reverend Abbott raised a most fearful spectre. Since the primary purpose of government is the protection of property and persons, if woman takes command of government by having the vote, then should she not also be called upon to serve as a fireman, policeman, or soldier? Certainly, no one seriously suggested that she do that, he admitted, but if she participates in making the decisions then she must assume accompanying responsibilities.

If society intends to undergo such a thoroughgoing transformation, Abbott maintained, then it must have a compelling reason to do so. And there was none. The argument that women need the vote in order to protect themselves from men greatly aroused Abbott's indignation. It

is bad enough to have class set against class, worse to have race set against race, and absolutely perilous to have religion against religion, "but to set sex against sex is a degradation so deep that political polemics can no further go." The contention that woman needed more power was ludicrous, she already had more power than man. And the assertion that woman suffrage would bring significant reform did not square with evidence from states where women were already voting. Obviously, there was no compelling reason to shift from the status quo. "We need votaries to tend the sacred fire; and to them, as of old, is granted the prerogative of mercy and pardon to evildoers." Give woman the vote and you take away her special prerogatives. In short, "in taking the vote women will be selling their birthright for a mess of pottage."[15]

After Abbott's vociferous article, anti-suffrage articles took on a much more objective character, concentrating on two fundamental arguments: that woman suffrage had not produced any visibly positive results where it was in operation and that most women opposed suffrage. In 1910, Edward Bok commissioned Richard Barry to carefully investigate legislative records in states where woman suffrage was already in operation to see what effect it had

---

[15]Lyman Abbott, "Why the Vote Would be Injurious to Women," LHJ, XXVII (February, 1910), 21-22.

produced. Bok noted in the foreword to Barry's article that he had been committed to printing Barry's article regardless of the findings, although he was pretty sure the facts would prove that woman suffrage had not accomplished nearly as much as its proponents had claimed it would.

The editor was correct. Barry's analysis of legislative records in Idaho, Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado illustrated how those states provided no better laws for women's wages, hours, and working conditions than states without woman suffrage. Those four states provided less protection for child laborers than other states and their performance on prohibition, considered a primary litmus test for women voters, was no better. In fact, "even some of the drugstores in Denver, according to good authority, serve whisky [sic] and brandy to unescorted girls." And so it went, the states with woman's suffrage showed no more inclination toward higher moral stands, greater care for children, or stricter divorce and marriage laws than states without it.[16] These facts were not new to the Journal's readers, of course, but their quantity and strength reinforced substantially what Abbott, Cleveland, and others had been writing intermittently for years.

---

[16]Richard Barry, "What Women Have Actually Done Where They Vote," LHJ, XXVII (November 1, 1910), 15-16, 68-69.

The second of the Journal's two-pronged thrust against woman's suffrage during the neutral phase appeared soon in an article entitled, "Do You, As a Woman, Want to Vote?" Having submitted this question to a number of prominent women, the Journal published their answers, all of which restated in one way or another the same arguments presented in earlier Journal articles. The article quoted twenty replies, including those by such notables as Mrs. Benjamin Harrison and Ida Tarbell, and then listed the names of Mrs. Grover Cleveland, Mrs. Andrew Carnegie, Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer, Mrs. Elihu Root, and others who belonged to major anti-suffrage organizations. Set off in a box, the four-paragraph response from Mrs. Francis W. Goddard of Colorado attracted special attention. Admitting that she had been in the vanguard of the successful woman suffrage movement in Colorado and had been voting regularly since 1893, she had subsequently recanted her former views and in this article expressed unalterable opposition to woman suffrage on grounds that it had not produced any positive results. "The best thing" for Colorado and its women "would be if tomorrow the ballot for women could be abolished."[17]

The entire article, but especially Mrs. Goddard's statement, created "astonishment" among the Journal's

---

[17]"Do You, As a Woman, Want to Vote?" LHJ, XXVIII (January 1, 1911), 17.

subscribers and women deluged the Journal, protesting that she was virtually alone in her appraisal of the Colorado experience. The Journal countered with an article entitled "Is Mrs. Goddard Alone in Her Position?" and quoted the opinions of another dozen and a half prominent Colorado women who unanimously concluded that woman's suffrage "isn't doing politics any good in this state," that it "has produced no good effect."[18]

The Ladies' Home Journal's predilections against woman's suffrage were still evident, but the Journal in the name of objectivity did open its pages to advocates of woman's suffrage during this period. In the Journal's brief effort to show both sides of this and other issues, Jane Addams of Hull-House was invited to make a case for suffrage in the series "Both Sides of Live Questions."

The world-renowned reformer indicated that women often could not discharge their household duties satisfactorily and create a clean, healthy environment because of the impact of technology and urban living. Many of the tasks and responsibilities that had always been woman's were now handled by someone else. How could a tenement housewife keep the basement dry, the sanitary plumbing working properly, and the stairways fireproof? Formerly the

---

[18]"Is Mrs. Goddard Alone in Her Position That Woman Suffrage in Colorado is a Failure?" LHJ, XXVIII (April 1, 1911), 6.

responsibility of the homemaker, these tasks had since become the duty of the tenement or hotel landlord. Therefore, unless woman began asserting herself outside woman's normal sphere she could not correct these problems. "In other words, if women would effectively continue their old avocations they must take part in the slow upbuilding of that code of legislation which is alone sufficient to protect the home from the dangers incident to modern life."

Similarly, Addams proceeded, woman, who is charged with rearing and training children, must get involved with boards of education if they hope to have an optimum impact on their children's lives. They must make certain that the schools teach not only the three R's but also educate the children in such fundamentals as hygiene, sanitation, and cooking. Further, women recognize that children need attention outside of school hours as well and consequently should encourage the juvenile court reform movement, park and playground programs, and child labor legislation. In short, social, political, and economic conditions had changed so markedly that the only way women could discharge their traditional domestic duties was through political action.

Miss Addams dismissed the argument propounded by other contributors that women could accomplish these goals without the ballot simply by influencing their husbands and sons. She knew of too many cases where women had tried

but failed. Besides, women were not asking to take over men's affairs, they only wanted "to do their own work and to take care of those affairs which naturally and historically belong to women, but which are constantly being overlooked and slighted in our political institutions."[19]

In its effort to air both sides of the issue, it would have been difficult for the Journal to find a more conservative rationale to support suffrage. Jane Addams and a few other suffragists in the magazine remained essentially quiet on constitutional, equalitarian, and other arguments, choosing instead to promote woman suffrage primarily on the conviction that "the world is only a large home," to use Carl Degler's phrase.[20] Alice Paul and other noted suffragists were conspicuously absent from the pages of the Journal. Apparently, the ardent platform woman was fair game when the magazine wanted to attack suffrage but not when it needed a qualified spokesman for suffrage.

To give him his due, however, Edward Bok was probably convinced that Jane Addams' article, justifying woman suffrage by admitting that woman has a special sphere, represented the most tightly reasoned argument possible for woman suffrage because it incorporated at least some of his views of woman's role in society. Also, Addams' ideas

---

[19]Jane Addams, "Why Women Should Vote," LHJ, XXVII (January, 1910), 21-22.

[20]Carl Degler, At Odds (New York, 1980), pp. 298-327.

had just gained currency among a large element of the suffrage movement. For many years American suffragists had emphasized the benefits women would derive from suffrage, but Jane Addams' article, according to Aileen S. Kraditor, "may be considered the ideal expression" of a new major strain of suffragist thought "stressing what enfranchised women could do for the government and their communities." In other words, the suffragists were at last asking not what government could do for them but what they could do for government and community. The new rationale was part of an overall evolution in progressive thought from the idea that government should restrain man from violating others' rights to the notion that government should serve those who need help.[21]

A hint of the third phase of the Journal's changing attitude on woman's suffrage surfaced in 1918, as passage of the Nineteenth Amendment appeared imminent. For the first time, not a guest writer but an in-house editor wrote an article that did not at all attack woman suffrage. Dudley Harmon advised the Journal's readers that suffrage should not be an end in itself, only a means by which woman could achieve programs to conserve the best features of American society, heal its ills, and make

---

[21]Aileen S. Kraditor, The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920, (New York, 1965), pp. 65-71.

better provisions for the security of children.[22] While this was certainly not a rousing endorsement of woman suffrage, it was an admission that the magazine had lost the battle against suffrage. The *Journal*'s alternatives were few--silence, continued opposition, or graceful acceptance. To have remained silent on the hottest woman's issue of the day would have been inconceivable and to have continued its opposition would have been bad business, so the *Journal* made the best of the situation by reporting, rather objectively, the anticipated effects of this monumental change in the American political system.

The *Journal*'s new approach toward the franchise for women came into full bloom in 1919. One writer noted that woman had put a big question mark in American politics and that politicians were flailing about trying to find a method for classifying women voters to help put their performance at the polls on a calculable basis. Although a smattering of political experts reasoned that woman's intuition and her husband's opinions would most likely dictate what she marked on the ballot, said David Lawrence, most savants seemed to think that the husband's influence would not be particularly pronounced and that women voters would go through essentially the same process as men in

---

[22]Dudley Harmon in collaboration with Ruby Green Smith, "The New Day for Women," *LHJ*, XXXV (April, 1918), 29.

determining their positions on issues and candidates. They would pay careful attention to the news and analyze the effects and importance of events. Marie Cecile Chomel observed: "Women are just folks, and we are all pretty much alike in the last analysis." However, she reached a different conclusion in one respect, claiming that "on moral issues the women vote independently--and always will. On political questions they vote with their husbands."[23]

A general consensus emerged that women would be less inclined than men toward strict partisan politics, choosing instead to vote their consciences on issues and candidates rather than to be slaves to a party. Marie Chomel referred to experiences in Colorado where the number of split ballots jumped sharply when the franchise was extended to women. The ultimate result, she anticipated, was that anywhere women voted in large numbers they would "control the balance of power between the two great parties."[24]

Women also would be less inclined to engage in political back-scratching, because evidence in woman suffrage states indicated that women seldom made political deals. Just because a candidate promised to take a certain

---

[23]David Lawrence, "Mrs. New Citizen," LHJ, XXXVI (May, 1919), 33; Marie Cecile Chomal, "Does the Wife Vote Like the Husband?" LHJ, XXXVI (May, 1919), 37, 88, 92.

[24]Marie Cecile Chomal, "Does the Wife Vote Like the Husband?" LHJ, XXXVI (May, 1919), 37, 88, 92.

position on an issue, women felt, did not obligate them to deliver votes to that candidate at election time. Instead of operating on the assumption that a deal had been struck with the politicians, the women assumed that they had been successful in educating the politician on that point.[25] Therefore, the future looked promising for American politics but not so bright for machine politicians.

Contradicting many of its anti-suffrage pronouncements of preceding years, the Journal argued that woman's greatest interest and concomitantly her most profound effect through suffrage would be in the area of social legislation. Her husband would have the least influence over a woman on "any issue relating to a moral problem, education, health, prohibition, [and] closing houses of ill-repute," for on those issues "the woman voter is adamant and no wheedling can change her mind." When asked if she voted like her husband on social questions, one woman emphatically said no--but he voted like she did. Anna Howard Shaw, a suffragist and President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, went so far as to advocate the creation of two new federal executive departments, a Department of Health and a Department of Education, with a woman cabinet member heading each. She also felt that to protect women

---

[25]David Lawrence, "Mrs. New Citizen," LHJ, XXXVI (May, 1919), 33.

in industry a woman should be appointed Assistant Secretary of Labor. Woman's natural abilities made such appointments logical, in fact essential.[26]

By the spring of 1919, therefore, the unthinkable had occurred: the Ladies' Home Journal accepted woman's suffrage in the most idealistic terms. Through the ballot box, the magazine predicted, woman would have a pervasive influence in America, "an influence that frowns upon bossism always as something to be made obsolete in practice as well as in theory," and an influence on federal policies to go beyond the customary tariff, taxing, harbors, and public buildings issues. Woman's influence would address "the sociological and humanitarian facts of life--the improvement of living conditions and the public health, the welfare of men, women and children in health and right living as well as economic opportunity."[27]

The year was 1919. The time had arrived for American women to vote, for the Journal to predict momentous benefits accruing from woman's suffrage, and for Edward Bok to retire.

---

[26]Marie Cecile Chomal, "Does the Wife Vote Like the Husband?" LHJ, XXXVI (May, 1919), 37, 88, 92; Anna Howard Shaw, "Two New Cabinet Members, and An Assistant Secretary of Labor: A Woman," LHJ, XXXVI (April, 1919), 47.

[27]David Lawrence, "Mrs. New Citizen," LHJ, XXXVI (May, 1919), 33.

CHAPTER X

IN THE MARKETPLACE

Operating on the assumption that woman's proper place is in the home and that the new woman was an anomaly, for two decades the Ladies' Home Journal energetically oppugned feminist campaigns to create for women a more meaningful, productive life outside the home. But as female employment figures climbed and public acceptance of the phenomenon increased, the magazine's opposition to women in the marketplace haltingly gave way to resigned acceptance in the teens and then, almost overnight, to enthusiastic endorsement during the Great War.

Foregoing discussions of the magazine's view of the home as woman's sphere have explained the philosophical foundations of its early objections to female employment and there is no reason to repeat those arguments here. Beyond those, however, Bok's popular magazine aired other reasons why women should steer away from jobs outside the home. It forewarned its readers, for instance, that compared to men women receive poor pay. In pointing out the discrepancies between men's and women's pay, the Journal was by no means encouraging women to press for higher pay or for equal pay for equal work. Rather it was

discouraging women from taking jobs outside the home. Repeatedly the magazine importuned young women not to leave rural or small town life on the mistaken assumption they would find a blissful life of economic independence in the city because the typical wage in the city "barely keeps girls from starvation." These manifold cautions about the impoverished life of the marketplace were not designed to "crush the laudable ambition in any girl" but instead to cause girls to "realize its sorrows, its worries, and the small, almost infinitesimal, amount of enjoyment in it." In short, financial considerations dictated a woman should live at home.[1]

Historians have corroborated the Journal's charges. Overall, because women worked primarily in unskilled jobs, on the average their wages were only about half those of men. When comparing their pay for roughly comparable work, woman's pay still fell short by a third.[2] There was, of course, no hint in the magazine that women should initiate any action to rectify these gross inequities.

To be sure, the magazine's opposition to female employment was not universal. It conceded woman the right,

---

[1]Margaret E. Sangster, "Heart to Heart Talks with Girls," LHJ, XXI (October, 1904), 28; Ruth Ashmore, "Girl Life in New York City," LHJ, X (January, 1893), 14.

[2]Carl Degler, At Odds (New York, 1980), p. 382.

indeed the responsibility, to work when extenuating circumstances demanded it. The young woman living at home could justifiably seek employment when the additional income was necessary for the family to maintain a modest standard of living. A woman whose husband died or was a victim of debilitating illness or injury certainly had the prerogative of entering the marketplace. Seeking outside work for any other reason than economic necessity was not acceptable, however. "Let us speak the truth, brutal though it be," said An American Mother, "the woman who is forced by want into the market-place, and earns her living there deserves respect from man and God. But the woman who rushes into it, simply to win public notice, is out of place, and a weight on human progress." Far too many women to suit An American Mother sought employment for selfish purposes, although she noted hopefully that the trend seemed to be waning. The esteemed Ruth Ashmore scolded a girl who complained of the narrowness and frustration of working at home: "Get down on your knees and thank the good God who made you for the privilege of working at home, and of being out of the great world where there is no time for anything but work, where the sick and the helpless fall by the wayside unnoticed."[3]

---

[3]An American Mother, "What of the Woman Herself?" <u>LHJ</u>, XVIII (June, 1901), 10; Ruth Ashmore, "Girl Life in New York City," <u>LHJ</u>, X (January, 1893), 14.

The _Journal_ was replete with admonitions and innuendos that women, when forced to work, should limit their employment to jobs which utilized their God-given strengths and avoided feminine weaknesses. Positions as domestic servants, milliners, cooks, nurses, and baby-sitters were particularly suited to woman's abilities and therefore were positions she should seek.[4] Conversely, female employment in factories taxed women's abilities to such a degree that it was obviously out of the question, so much so that the _Journal_ was not even compelled to lash out against it.

When readers inquired about the magazine's stand on women pursuing professional careers in opera, theater, literature, and journalism, as apparently many did, the response was almost invariably negative, from both regular columnists as well as from famous and successful women. Ruth Ashmore asked a stage star if she would have become an actress had she known at the outset the travail she would endure--the long stints away from home, the loneliness of hotel rooms, and the knowing murmurs and stares commonly the fate of successful actresses. The star's instant response was: "'No; most positively no.'" When successful women did not specifically advise against careers in their respective fields, they usually made very clear the pain,

---

[4]Rose Terry Cooke, "How Can She Support Herself?" _LHJ_, VIII (March, 1891), 9.

sacrifice, and total dedication that success imposed on the individual and the low percentage of women entering the field who became even moderately successful.[5]

Young women also should not waste their time in esoteric academic study preparing for professional careers, the Journal proclaimed. A young man can attend college and be prepared for myriad professions; "But into what market will his sister carry her familiarity with protoplasms or the Semitic tongues?" Preparing for careers in medicine, law, and academia was manifestly out of the question because "education is most profoundly wise" when it recognizes the differences between the sexes and "trains a girl thoroughly for her own womanly work and her own place in life."[6]

Still, the magazine's demurrer to women in the marketplace did not translate into rejection of the working woman. In response to questions from readers, the Journal often professed that the working girl had "a recognized social position" and no longer needed to "shrink, hesitate, stammer and blush" when a person discovered that she was earning her own living. Or, as Margaret Sangster put it,

---

[5]Ruth Ashmore, "Her Letter and My Answer," LHJ, X (February, 1893), 16; see also Lillian Nordica, "Girls and Operatic Careers," LHJ, XII (December, 1894), 10.

[6]An American Mother, "Is a College Education the Best for Our Girls?" LHJ, XVII (July, 1900), 15.

"no one ever loses caste by doing honorable work in a faithful way."[7]

During the late nineteenth century, as the Ladies' Home Journal's writers persistently embellished the Victorian theme that woman's place is in the home, not in the marketplace, dramatic developments were underway in the American marketplace. According to William L. O'Neill, "between 1880 and 1900 the employment of women in most parts of the economy became an established fact. This was surely the most significant event in the modern history of women." Carl Degler and others agree with O'Neill's emphatic assessment. Women already made up one-sixth of the work force in 1890, compared to one-third in 1950, and 36 percent of the professional workers, as against 40 percent in 1950. And between 1900 and 1960, virtually no progress occurred in "the degree of sexual segregation in employment categories." Approximately 40 percent of women working in non-farm positions at the end of the century worked in domestic and personal service, almost 25 percent in industry, and most of the remainder as teachers, clerks and salespeople, and dressmakers, milliners, and

---

[7]Ruth Ashmore, "The Social Position of the Girl Who Works," LHJ, XV (December, 1897), 28; Margaret F. Sangster, "Girl's Problems," LHJ, XIX (March, 1902), 27.

seamstresses. Incidentally, 90 percent of all professional workers were teachers.[8]

The Ladies' Home Journal could not afford to remain oblivious to these momentous developments and, sure enough, from about 1900 to 1916, the Journal went through a transitional stage in its portrayal of woman in the marketplace. In this interim stage the magazine continued running numerous articles defending the Victorian position while simultaneously integrating more articles expressing discordant opinions.

During this transitional stage Bok's publication gradually expanded its list of approved occupations for women to include positions that did not specifically fit the Victorian scheme of woman's strengths and weaknesses. Women could step out of the home to pursue employment as teachers, stenographers, secretaries, typists, and saleswomen, for they did not unnecessarily tax woman's innate weaknesses. The magazine's tacit acceptance of these positions for women was evident in articles advising girls how to prepare for and behave in such positions and even some advising that there were many openings in these fields. No longer did women have to limit their job choices to the likes of baby-sitting, millinery, and

---

[8] William L. O'Neill, Everyone Was Brave: A History of Feminism in America (Chicago, 1969), p. 148; Carl Degler, At Odds (New York, 1980), pp. 376-377.

domestic service. Concomitantly, as described in the chapter on housekeeping, by the teens the magazine was no longer intent on idealizing the life of a domestic servant. The work was hard and not always rewarding, the hours were poor, and the degree of independence the servant had was insufficient; servants had sound reasons for seeking other employment.

Prior to the turn of the century, the *Journal*'s concept of woman's strengths and weaknesses had left open no door for women to enter factories since the environment was so hostile and the work so physical. But apparently the rising tide of females in industry was having an effect on the *Journal*, because beginning in 1903, the *Journal* occasionally recognized as acceptable even that type of labor, though it did not promote it. The Commissioner of Labor, Carroll D. Wright, directed attention to improvements that had occurred in factory labor over the preceding decades, attributing those improvements both to government regulations and to manufacturers' concern for employees' welfare. Thanks to these advancements, he said proudly, women already labored safely in most industries and typically used the positions as springboards to better paying jobs that were less demanding physically.[9]

---

[9]Carroll D. Wright, "What the Factory has Done for Women," *LHJ*, XX (October, 1903), 30.

Theodore Roosevelt effectively expressed this more relaxed early twentieth century view when he observed that factory work for women "presents problems, perhaps, rather than clear-cut evils." To determine the social ramifications of female employment in industry, the Chief Executive urged serious investigation of such questions as whether factory work caused women to neglect their families or to defer or abandon marriage. But whatever the findings of the proposed studies, it would be essential to take steps to improve working conditions and reduce to a reasonable amount the number of working hours per week for women.[10] Roosevelt's view expressed the prevailing progressive dogma that women's occupational opportunities should be broadened but women still required special protection not generally afforded to men.

The _Journal_'s liberalized attitude toward female employment was only part of the transitional view; the other facet was the magazine's persistent enunciation of the Victorian view of women in the marketplace. As the progressive view made incursions onto the _Journal_'s pages, the Victorian frame of mind continued a vigorous rear-guard action until 1916.

---

[10] "The President: Mr. Roosevelt's Views on Factory Laws for Women and Children," _LHJ_, XXIII (March, 1906), 19.

One writer observed that in the past when a woman pondered marriage she only had to think of the worthiness of the man and her love for him. However, things had changed and many successful businesswomen had to decide whether marriage really offered "all that it is supposed to offer." Men did not have to make that choice because they could pursue a career without interfering with their marital obligations. But many women did have to choose. Up to this point the article gave the impression that the author was on the brink of condemning unequal treatment of the sexes. But as it turned out, she used these points as the bases for discouraging women from entering the marketplace. When deciding if she should marry or move into the marketplace, a girl should consider carefully not only the immediate effects of her decision but also the long-term effects. If she dedicates her life to business she is destined to suffer far more loneliness than a woman who marries and has children, and her business will keep her so occupied she will not be able to enjoy the pleasure of the play or opera which she otherwise might enjoy. Indeed, the older she gets the less needed she will feel, and that is a withering experience, for next to being loved being needed is the greatest thing life can offer.[11]

---

[11]Margaretta Tuttle, "The Girl on the Fence: A Girl's Question and a Woman's Answer," LHJ, XXXII (September, 1915), 30.

The *Journal* made a final effort, in 1916, to shore up the sagging defenses of the Victorian view of women in the marketplace. Two articles recounted in the following paragraphs symbolized the transitional period by acceding to the fact that women could be successful in the marketplace while simultaneously making a valiant effort to prove the Victorian thesis that such unnatural behavior did not bring satisfaction.

An anonymous Famous American Novelist recounted how her brother and she, working for the same newspaper years earlier, simultaneously rose to approximately the same level of employment. He received sixty dollars a week while she received thirty-six. Incensed at this "manifestly unfair" action, she protested the inequity to her employer who unenthusiastically agreed to pay her the same salary as her brother, provided she would remain with the firm as long as he did and would take any assignment her brother might have to take. She said she had no idea how long he would remain nor, for that matter, how long she would remain. Her boss countered that "men like their work, they develop it, they take it into their lives. Women only want it for side issues." Later, after investigating the comparative tenures of men and women in the firm, she realized what he was talking about, for all female employees had been there for less than two years.

Earning the same as a male, Famous American Novelist had to endure assignments at midnight, visits to the morgue, getting "called down," and everything else male reporters experienced. She was proud of her accomplishments but admitted that the independence she had sought in employment was elusive and, after several years, asked herself: "Why will women always fancy that a four-walled office is a part of a wide and fascinating 'world' and a four-roomed house only a sort of Twentieth Century Cloister? Why is making money more important than spending it? Why is dictating a letter a more enviable duty than making a corn-meal-pudding?" Having fulfilled many women's dream of being "a man for awhile," the writer nevertheless reaffirmed the efficacy of wifehood and motherhood: "A woman who wants to be a man has missed the very essence of living."[12]

Another woman explained how life in the marketplace had been thrust upon her when her husband died without insurance or a comfortable estate. Because she had never worked before and did not have a college education, she for some time lived a hand-to-mouth existence while bitterness toward her husband for refusing to buy life insurance mounted inside her. Eventually, though, she made a

---

[12]Famous American Novelist, "When I Was a Man for Awhile and Why I Would Rather be a Woman," LHJ, XXXIII (May, 1916), 34.

"splendid living" selling insurance and her story might have been a fine testimonial on how women can succeed in man's world, but she eschewed that emphasis because she did not want to build up "false hopes for other women who may be induced to follow in my footsteps by this recital of my story." All she wanted to do was to convince readers of their need for life insurance so that they would not have to endure the agony she had suffered. In other words, she wrote her success story to discourage rather than to encourage women from entering business.[13]

Thus came the end of the second phase of the Journal's evolving view of women in the marketplace. To cover as many bases as possible the magazine for a decade and a half had sedulously criticized female employment in principle while simultaneously defending the social status of working women and providing them with a plethora of advice on how to behave and dress at work and play and how to select and decorate a flat. The Journal would have its cake and eat it too--advising against female employment but at the same time providing the type of material that would entice the burgeoning female work force to subscribe to the magazine.

As the second phase was in its final throes, there were hints of a dramatic change in the offing. By 1916, in contrast to those stories just related, a smattering of

---

[13]"How I Saved Other Wives from Trouble by Telling Them My Own Story," LHJ, XXXIII (November, 1916), 31.

articles and stories emerged picturing career women in very positive colors. The traditional view of marriage "as the easiest and pleasantest solution to their economic problems" lost ground to a more modern notion instructing women to develop economic independence by getting jobs and developing their occupational skills so that they could advance in their positions and earn better salaries. Said one writer, the time had arrived when a woman could "enter practically any profession or engage in any pursuit" she preferred.[14] The Journal recognized at last that employment offered a reasonable option to marriage.

A clue to the momentous effect the Great War would have on the Journal's portrayal of woman in the marketplace occurred in June, 1916. The celebrated H. G. Wells claimed that England's war experiences had already demonstrated that in every form of occupation--clerks, shopkeepers, railway workers, automobile drivers, police, and many others--women "have been found efficient beyond precedent and intelligent beyond precedent." Their remarkable service in so many areas had "revolutionized the estimate of their economic importance," to say nothing of their military importance, and all evidence indicated that the new class of independent bachelor women would be a permanent

---

[14]Ruth Neely, "Where Your Job May Lead," LHJ, XXXIII (September, 1916), 28; see also Helen B. Gladwyn, "How I Became a Confidential Secretary," LHJ, XXXIII (September, 1916), 32.

fixture in England. In Wells' estimation, two factors contributed to the expected permanence of the bachelor woman: first, "the increased unmarriedness of women" and, second, "the decreased absorption of married women in domestic duties."[15]

Even in 1916, such positive pronouncements were rare. But in 1917, it came, almost overnight--an almost complete conversion to the feminist rationale that woman possesses the same prerogatives in the marketplace that man does. And what precipitated the turnabout? Women's stellar performance in many new occupations during the Great War and the *Journal*'s unabashed patriotism combined to spur Bok's magazine to adopt this point of view it had been resisting diligently for many years.

Once the Congress of the United States had voted to enter the fray, those changes Wells had seen in England became evident in the United States and the opinions he expressed in his article presaged the revolution in the *Journal*'s attitude toward woman in the marketplace. Indeed, in the summer of 1917, in "Which One of These Jobs Can You Fill?" the magazine sought to mobilize American women by depicting two dozen jobs that women in the United States, Canada, and England were performing, ranging from trolley conductors, carpenters, and "trainmen" to policemen

---

[15] H. G. Wells, "The Woman and the War," *LHJ*, XXXIII (June, 1916), 10, 59-62.

and munitions makers. Women were even learning to fly airplanes, the article boasted.[16]

Over the next months writers typically praised women workers for their dedication and thoroughness. Miss Henrita M. F. Reid, Secretary of Bush Terminal Company and reportedly the highest salaried woman on Wall Street, was responsible for hiring and firing six thousand employees. She had found that women took to positions as "longshoremen" like "ducks to water" and according to some foremen were the "'best help we've ever had.'" Reid did not force women to take men's jobs but certainly encouraged them to do so; and most did, finding "masculine attire" fascinating and new skills and nomenclature exciting. And to top it off, the author bragged that the women earned the same wages as men for the same work.[17]

By November, 1917, the Journal played an even more active role in the war effort, identifying specific jobs available for women, telling them how to apply and emphasizing that in many instances women got the same pay as men. Contrary to all previous declarations, the Journal urged its readers to take employment in munitions factories, steel mills, and other physically demanding jobs.

---

[16]"Which One of These Jobs Can You Fill?" LHJ, XXXIV (August, 1917), 29.

[17]Harriet Sisson Gillespie, "Where Girls are Really Doing Men's Jobs," LHJ, XXXIV (November, 1917), 83.

The magazine reassuringly noted that very few women failed to meet the challenge of man's work and often actually did better work than the men they replaced. One author gave women a primer on the procedures for applying for jobs and at the end of the article attached a list of establishments under federal contract which were employing women. And soon the Journal kept women abreast of War Department regulations for hours, wages, rest periods, seats, night work, and lifting.[18] Articles of this type appeared regularly until about the time the armistice was signed.

The Journal also inaugurated a monthly series edited by Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, Chairman of the Woman's Committee of the Council for National Defense, and published a myriad of articles such as "Want a Job? Some Suggestions to Women Seeking War Work," prepared by Dudley Harmon in cooperation with the United States Employment Service. While the Journal warned women to investigate the jobs they were interested in so that they did not inadvertently accept an assignment not to their liking, it did nothing to discourage them from working. Occasionally the Journal pictured women at new tasks and once buoyantly displayed eighteen women dressed in different uniforms ranging from

---

[18]Dudley Harmon, "What are These War Jobs for Women: Where They Are and How to Get Them," LHJ, XXXIV (November, 1917), 39, 91-92; Dudley Harmon in collaboration with Ruby Green Smith, "The New Day for Women," LHJ, XXXV (June, 1918), 30.

traditional nurse outfits and military uniforms all the way to the bloomer-like uniform of "Uncle Sam's Girl Munition Worker."[19]

Beginning the last half of 1917, and picking up tempo until after the armistice were articles commenting on "The Woman Who Has Gone" and "The After-the-War Woman." In these articles the Journal contemplated the lasting effects of the war on the new woman and concluded that the American woman would never be the same again. The war had enlarged woman's opportunities and then cemented many enormous changes in the nature of homemaking and the availability of employment outside the home.

Writers commenting on the war's expected effects on woman's role in society seemed of one accord that woman's role would be much broader in postwar America. The only debate was how much broader. William Howard Taft, after applauding woman's Herculean wartime labors in factories and elsewhere, readily admitted that after the war women would and should have a much wider variety of jobs regularly open to them. Formerly, the "powerful effect" of habits and custom "to restrain reasonable and needed reforms" had impeded woman's struggle for the right to earn her livelihood in any job of her choosing. But new forces

---

[19]Dudley Harmon, "Want a Job? Some Suggestions to Women Seeking War Work," LHJ, XXXV (November, 1918), 40; "Do You Realize How Many Women are in Uniform," LHJ, XXXV (November, 1918), 139.

were at work severing the bonds of sexual prejudice, showing their unsoundness, inutility, and injustice. Collapse of the "bonds of senseless convention" would pave the way for "an expansion of woman's usefulness and an opportunity for her greater independence, and this without at all interfering with the home or the family." What a sharp contrast these views made with the attitudes propounded in the Journal by Taft and others just five years earlier. Still reflecting his conservatism, though, Taft predicted that women would probably voluntarily relinquish to men those jobs that required the greatest physical power and endurance, turning instead in larger numbers to jobs such as domestic service and teaching for which they were better suited physically.[20]

Taft's appraisal of the war's impact on woman was about the most restrained to appear in these war and post-war articles, as most writers anticipated that women would continue employment after the war in many of the same jobs they held during the war. Emily Newell Blair illustrated statistically that "the movement of women has really been from the home into the office, from the office into the factory, and from the textile into the munitions." After the war women would have no trouble finding jobs either

---

[20]William Howard Taft, "As I See the Future of Women," LHJ, XXXVI (March, 1919), 27, 113.

in heavy industry or in the more traditional female occupations. Moreover, they would continue moving into altogether new positions, such as gas and electric inspectors, since homemakers would prefer having women instead of men come into their houses for inspections. The probable removal of the ban against married female school teachers would also be a boon to women seeking employment. Events proved Blair's prognostications unjustifiably optimistic, because employment statistics reveal that "either in numbers or in range of occupations, . . . the war had little permanent or long-range effect upon women's work patterns."[21]

In one of his columns, Dudley Harmon listed some of the "war courses" offered for women in American colleges and predicted they would become "peace courses" as well. Most he listed were part of the regular curricula although some carried no credit. A sprinkling of those offered for women were agriculture, automobile operation and repair, clinical methods in social work, dental hygiene, drafting, history, navigation, and medical laboratory methods.[22]

---

[21] Emily Newell Blair, "Where are We Women Going," <u>LHJ</u>, XXXVI (March, 1919), 37, 58; Carl Degler, <u>At Odds</u> (New York, 1980), p. 419; see also Dudley Harmon, "Must I Really Go to Work? Are Women's Services Really Needed Now, and for What?" <u>LHJ</u>, XXXVI (January, 1919), 22.

[22] Dudley Harmon, ed., "The New Day for Women," <u>LHJ</u>, XXXV (May, 1918), 30.

As profound as these changes were in the Journal's scheme for woman, Bok's magazine was not totally converted to female equality in the marketplace, for there was no commensurate encouragement for women to become doctors, lawyers, or ministers. The Journal did not attack such ideas, it simply did not promote them.

Although there was some disagreement about exactly what type of work woman would do following the war, the writers agreed that women would work and forcefully insisted that they should receive equal pay for equal work. The Journal stressed the thesis that "work is work, and whether done by man or woman, is worthy of its hire." Thanks to the War Labor Administration under Felix Frankfurter, said Emily Newell Blair and others, the government's Standards Governing Employment of Women in Industry assured the application of the equal pay principle. According to historian William L. O'Neill, however, the government's effort to require equal pay for equal work had very limited success and therefore did not presage a bright future for women's wages.[23]

To the argument that business could not afford to pay women the same as men, Blair and others typically responded

---

[23]Emily Newell Blair, "Should a Woman Get a Man's Pay? Is the Sexless Job the New Note in Women's Work?" LHJ, XXXVI (April, 1919), 39, 156; William L. O'Neill, Everyone Was Brave: A History of Feminism in America (Chicago, 1969), p. 197.

to the effect that "a business that cannot pay such a rate of wage as will suffer a man to maintain the American standard of life is not economically justified." To the argument that women workers used their wages to purchase superfluous good and therefore did not need wages as high as men, contributors provided statistical evidence that the vast majority of women workers turned over their income to cover family expenses. Further, Blair noted, "If the women are to be paid a lower wage rate they will underbid the men."[24]

Former President Taft praised the National War Labor Board for standing firm on this issue and he actually proposed that if they were not given equal pay, "women ought to organize. Indeed, they ought to associate their unions with those of the men engaged in the same work." He fully expected most existing unions to stand strongly behind equal pay for women, "but if organized labor is to oppose the right of women to do any lawful work by which they seek to earn a living, then they should be given the ballot at once, for this presents an issue which they can and should win by their votes." After some of his earlier anti-suffrage comments, it is hard to believe that the rotund former President was actually endorsing the ideas of women

---

[24]Emily Newell Blair, "Should a Woman Get a Man's Pay? Is the Sexless Job the New Note in Women's Work?" LHJ, XXXVI (April, 1919), 39, 156.

voting and participating in unions and equally hard to believe that the Journal was broadcasting his views. "If we enter the field for fair combat," said another contributor, "we must stand for equal wages, man for man, woman for woman, occupation for occupation." And women should not agree to work for equal wages without accepting the responsibility of uniting for collective bargaining.[25] The Journal had traveled far to even intimate support for women's labor unions, and it did so several times in 1919.

Continued employment of women outside the home, the Journal contended, would have a positive effect upon relations between man and wife and professional relationships between man and woman. Because the "most frequent source of unhappiness in marriage is dependence of a woman on marriage for her material future," economic independence would allow her to wait longer to get married and thereby reduce the chance of her rushing pell-mell into marriage at an early age in quest of financial security. Or, as one writer put it, the woman will be "less dependent upon matrimony as a means of obtaining food, clothes and shelter. The pay envelope and not the marriage license will be the

---

[25]William Howard Taft, "As I See the Future of Women," LHJ, XXXVI (March, 1919), 27, 113; Emily Newell Blair, "Where are We Women Going?" LHJ, XXXVI (March, 1919), 37, 58; see also Meyer Bloomfield, "The Englishwoman Who Worked," LHJ, XXXVI (April, 1919), 55-56; Meyer Bloomfield, "What the English Working Woman has Proved," LHJ, XXXVI (May, 1919), 51-52.

one important future meal ticket for woman after the war." Under these conditions there may be fewer marriages but "you may be sure that there will be better marriages."[26]

Further, whatever minimizes the inequality between husband and wife should concomitantly improve their relationship by shoring up their mutual respect without reducing in any way mankind's basic "yearning for home and children." "Sex independence," the natural outgrowth of "economic independence," would ultimately have the salutary effect of breaking down "the time-honored domestic process by which the wife obtained her point of view and adapted her whole mode of existence to that of her husband." Such a change might initially grate upon male vanity, but "it will have the larger effect of stabilizing the domestic relation." But would not "the overthrow of that ancient masculine tyranny" signal the demise of romantic love? Quite the contrary, it would form the foundation of a "great revival in romantic love."[27] With these words the Journal was totally renouncing the notion of the modestly pliant woman that had been the fulcrum in its early portrayal of personal relations between the sexes.

---

[26]Isaac F. Marcosson, "The After-the-War Woman," LHJ, XXXV (September, 1918), 28, 87.

[27]William Howard Taft, "As I See the Future of Women," LHJ, XXXVI (March, 1919), 27, 113; Isaac F. Marcosson, "The After-the-War Woman," LHJ, XXXV (September, 1918), 28, 87.

Relations between man and woman in general would improve also because woman had lost her "single-track mind." New opportunities and accomplishments had opened new insights in women and a better understanding of the realities of human existence. Hence, she would develop into a much better companion and friend to man without losing one iota of her femininity.[28]

Women's activities which a year or two earlier had precipitated "comment, even jest," had since become "a matter of routine," said Isaac Marcosson. Americans had discarded in the "scrapheap" many "fetishes" including the "widespread delusion" that woman was the weaker sex. Emily Newell Blair also affirmed the *Journal*'s newfound enthusiasm for the new woman and her future. "It seems that never again will a woman have to apologize if her desire for service spills beyond her own doorstep."[29]

The *Ladies' Home Journal* had been staunchly opposed to women in the marketplace prior to the turn of the century. During the first decade and a half of the twentieth century the *Journal* gradually took some of the edge off its opposition to the employment of women outside the home,

---

[28] "The Ideas of a Forward-Looking Woman," *LHJ*, XXXVI (February, 1919), 35.

[29] Isaac F. Marcosson, "The After-the-War Woman: What is She Going to Become, and Where, Too, Will Be Her Place?" *LHJ*, XXXV (June, 1918), 13, 90, 92; Emily Newell Blair, "What are We Women Going to Do?" *LHJ*, XXXVI (May, 1919), 47, 114.

acceding to employment as long as it did not challenge too harshly the patterns of woman's innate strengths and weaknesses. However, within the brief span between America's entry into the Great War and Woodrow Wilson's return from the peace talks in Paris, the Journal with startling speed became a bouyant convert to woman's equal rights in the marketplace.

CONCLUSION

The *Ladies' Home Journal* offers a unique perspective for examining American attitudes toward woman's role in society during the Progressive Era. Since to be a successful woman's magazine it had to appeal to large numbers of women, especially those in the growing middle class, the *Journal* could neither tout radical feminist principles nor defend for too long moribund Victorian womanhood. So, as the American mood toward woman evolved in that period, the *Journal* correspondingly revised its portrayal of womanhood, and its industry-leading circulation figures demonstrated it was enormously proficient in capturing the popular temperament. The import of the magazine's permutations on the woman question is all the more profound when measured against its editor's persistent espousal of the genteel concept of woman. Edward Bok grudgingly permitted the *Journal*'s image of woman to change, despite his personal predilections, because he knew that he must do so in order for the *Journal* to continue outdistancing its competition.

At the outset, Edward Bok's editorials as well as opinions expressed by writers in other departments conformed closely to the Victorian doctrines held by a large segment of the American population. In almost every

respect the Journal's early depiction of woman matched what H. Carleton Marlow and Harrison M. Davis have defined as innatism in their historical analysis of American attitudes toward woman. Innatists claimed that woman is intellectually, emotionally, and physically inferior to man while morally and intuitionally superior to him. Since man's nature is more physical and woman's more metaphysical, the innatist theory propounded a moral double standard, requiring woman to maintain a higher moral standard than man, and assigned special spheres to the sexes. Woman's God-given traits dictate that her sphere is the home, for she is constitutionally unfit to perform adequately in the realm of politics and business. While innatists restricted woman's sphere of activity to the home to protect her from competing with man, they also placed her atop a magnificent pedestal so she might be appropriately exalted.

Gradually, the Journal's adherence to these innatist precepts gave way to what Marlow and Davis assert is the pillar idea of twentieth century American thought on woman --differential equality. This concept admits there are differences between the sexes but denies altogether that the differences denote any relationship of superiority and inferiority.[1] To be sure, vestiges of innatism were still

---

[1] H. Carleton Marlow and Harrison M. Davis, The American Search for Woman (Santa Barbara, 1976).

visible in the Journal after World War I, but the strident declarations of man's superiority and woman's inferiority had gone by the wayside. Concomitantly, the boundaries of man's and woman's respective spheres in society had blurred to such a degree that the Journal no longer wasted much type trying to defend those boundaries.

In 1919, then, when Edward Bok retired, the Ladies' Home Journal was in the mainstream of twentieth century American thought on woman's role in society and was contributing to the rise of the new woman. It acceded to female employment outside the home, which opened a new world to woman and simultaneously emancipated her from the need to marry for economic security. By relaxing its attitude on divorce, the Journal expanded woman's range of alternatives in an unhappy marriage. When it endorsed participation in woman's clubs, Bok's magazine inadvertently directed many women into reform activity and even converted some to certain limited feminist goals, suffrage being the best example. And by promoting frank instruction of children and adolescents in sexual matters, the Journal attacked the Victorian double moral standard and indirectly challenged the notion that woman is physically inferior to man.

Edward Bok's editorial management of the Ladies' Home Journal typifies a dichotomy in the American spirit which philosopher George Santayana discussed, in 1911, in his

famous essay "The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy." Santayana observed the binary character of the American mind--the American Intellect "has floated gently in the backwater" while the American Will "was leaping down a sort of Niagara Rapids." As he described it, "The American Will inhabits the sky-scraper; the American Intellect inhabits the colonial mansion. The one is the sphere of the American man; the other, at least predominantly, of the American woman. The one is all aggressive enterprise; the other is all genteel tradition."[2]

In his years as editor of the Journal, Edward Bok represented in microcosm that same bifurcation of Will and Intellect. The spirit which prompted the substantial changes in the Journal's attitude toward woman was "aggressive enterprise" while Bok's personal philosophy on woman was "genteel tradition." Bok, in Twice Thirty, confessed that he literally had "two personalities"--Edward Bok the editor and Edward W. Bok the person. Except for a couple brief periods during his editorship, especially at the end of his tenure, Edward Bok ruled as the practical, efficient editor. However, "during the last two or three years of my editorship . . . the personality of Edward Bok was slowly being submerged." The time had come when Edward W. Bok

---

[2]George Santayana, The Genteel Tradition: Nine Essays by George Santayana, ed. Douglas L. Wilson (Cambridge, 1967), p. 40.

could no longer allow his magazine to publish material so foreign to his personal views. He was the personification of the dichotomy in the American mind.[3]

In 1959, Henry F. May concluded that the period from 1912 to 1917 marked the "end of American innocence" and the "beginning of our own time." The changes that occurred in the Ladies' Home Journal substantiate May's thesis by illustrating that the Journal's loss of innocence (or collapse of the Genteel Tradition) transpired almost simultaneously with America's loss of innocence.[4]

The American woman in 1919 no longer resembled Edward Bok's Victorian ideal. She was working in large numbers outside the home, bearing fewer children, denigrating household chores, divorcing and then remarrying, wearing scandalous attire, and preparing to vote. And the Journal issued its stamp of approval to these changes. Hence, when he stepped down after thirty years as editor of Ladies' Home Journal, Edward Bok was grievously disillusioned about the American woman. She had not fallen from her pedestal; she had deliberately stepped down and he inadvertently had assisted her.

---

[3]Edward W. Bok, Twice Thirty: Some Short and Simple Annals of the Road (New York, 1925), pp. 371-383.

[4]Henry F. May, The End of American Innocence (New York, 1959).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editorials

Feminine Traits

Bok, Edward, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, X (February, 1893), 12.

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, XI (June, 1894), 14.

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (December, 1894), 16.

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (March, 1895), 12.

__________, "Problems of Young Men," Ladies' Home Journal, XIV (March, 1897), 35.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIV (July, 1897), 14.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (June, 1898), 14.

__________, "In an Editorial Way," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (June, 1908), 5-6.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIV (October, 1917), 36.

Marriage and Divorce

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, VIII (March, 1891), 10.

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, X (March, 1893), 12.

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, X (May, 1893), 12.

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, X (August, 1893), 14.

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (December, 1894), 16.

__________, "Problems of Young Men," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (January, 1895), 12.

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (March, 1895), 12.

__________, "Problems of Young Men," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (January, 1896), 14.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (September, 1896), 14.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (October, 1896), 14.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIV (March, 1897), 14.

__________, "Problems of Young Men," Ladies' Home Journal, XIV (March, 1897), 35.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIV (November, 1897), 14.

__________, "The First Flowers," Ladies' Home Journal, (April, 1898), 18.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (June, 1898), 14.

__________, "The Ease with Which We Marry," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (April, 1900), 18.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (May, 1900), 14.

__________, "The American Man and the Country," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (July, 1900), 14.

__________, "Is It Worthwhile?" Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (November, 1900), 18.

__________, "The Editorial Page," Ladies' Home Journal, XVIII (March, 1901), 16.

__________, "To a Young Man about to Marry," Ladies' Home Journal, XVIII (October, 1901), 16.

__________, "The Beginning of Married Life," Ladies' Home Journal, XVIII (November, 1901), 16.

__________, "What Should a Young Wife Stand For?" Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (July, 1902), 18.

__________, "The Unmarried," Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (November, 1902), 16.

__________, "The Editorial Page," Ladies' Home Journal, XXI (July, 1904), 18.

__________, "Why I Wanted My Wife to be My Wife," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (February, 1914), 5-6.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (March, 1914), 5-6.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (March, 1915), 3-4.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (September, 1915), 5-6.

__________, "The Home Pocketbook: An Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (March, 1916), 11-12.

__________, "The American Woman and Her Home," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (September, 1916), 34.

__________, "The American Woman and Her Home," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (October, 1916), 42.

Heath, Mrs. Julian, "Are Wives Wasting Their Husband's Money?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (January, 1914), 3-4.

Motherhood

Bok, Edward, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (March, 1895), 12.

__________, "Problems of Young Men," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (May, 1895), 14.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (November, 1896), 14.

__________, "What Should a Young Wife Stand For?" Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (July, 1902), 18.

__________, "The Editorial Page," Ladies' Home Journal, XX (September, 1903), 16.

__________, "The Ratio of Real Mothers," Ladies' Home Journal, XXI (January, 1904), 16.

__________, "The Editor's Personal Page," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (January, 1907), 1.

__________, "In an Editorial Way," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (February, 1907), 5.

__________, "The Editor's Personal Page," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (May, 1908), 1.

__________, "The Editor's Personal Page," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (September, 1908), 1.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (May, 1914), 5-6.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (May, 1915), 4.

Marketplace

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, X (April, 1893), 18.

__________, "Problems of Young Men," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (May, 1895), 14.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (December, 1895), 20.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (February, 1896), 14.

__________, "Mary Anderson as She Is To-day," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (March, 1896), 9-10.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (February, 1898), 14.

__________, "Young Men in Business Hours," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (October, 1898), 14.

__________, "What Women Find to Do All Day," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (April, 1899), 20.

__________, "The Return of the Business Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (March, 1900), 16.

__________, "Is the Newspaper Office the Place for a Girl?" Ladies' Home Journal, XVIII (February, 1901), 18.

__________, "The Wisdom of New York," Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (June, 1902), 16.

__________, "The Mother of America," Ladies' Home Journal, XX (October, 1903), 16.

__________, "In an Editorial Way," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (January, 1907), 5-6.

College

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, X (October, 1893), 16.

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, XI (July, 1894), 14.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (February, 1896), 14.

__________, "Should Our Girls Go to College?" Ladies' Home Journal, XV (August, 1898), 14.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (May, 1900), 16.

__________, "Women as 'Poor Pay'," Ladies' Home Journal, XVIII (June, 1901), 14.

__________, "The College and the Stove," Ladies' Home Journal, XX (April, 1903), 16.

__________, "What is the Matter?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXVIII (June, 1911), 5.

Club Activities

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (November, 1896), 14.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (September, 1898), 14.

__________, "The Rush of American Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (January, 1899), 14.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (October, 1900), 16.

__________, "In an Editorial Way," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (October, 1907), 7-8.

__________, "In an Editorial Way," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (March, 1908), 5-6.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXVII (January, 1910), 5-6.

New Woman

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, X (August, 1893), 14.

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (June, 1895), 14.

__________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (August, 1895), 12.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIV (September, 1897), 14.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (June, 1898), 14.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXVII (November, 1910), 15.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (April, 1916), 12.

Deportment

___________, "At Home with the Editor," Ladies' Home Journal, X (March, 1893), 12.

___________, "The Blot on Our American Life," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (July, 1895), 15.

___________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (June, 1896), 14.

___________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (July, 1896), 14.

___________, "Breaking Down the Fences," Ladies' Home Journal, XIV (August, 1897), 14.

___________, "Girls and Their Use of Slang," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (December, 1897), 20.

___________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (May, 1898), 14.

___________, "Where Are the Pretty Girls?" Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (May, 1899), 20.

___________, "A Woman's Questions," Ladies' Home Journal, XVIII (April, 1901), 16.

___________, "The Social Life of a Young Girl," Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (September, 1902), 16.

___________, "The Young Girl at the Matinee," Ladies' Home Journal, XX (June, 1903), 16.

___________, "The Editorial Page," Ladies' Home Journal, XXI (February, 1904), 16.

___________, "The Editorial Page," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (July, 1906), 16.

___________, "In an Editorial Way," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (April, 1907), 5-6.

___________, "In an Editorial Way," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (June, 1907), 5-6.

___________, "In an Editorial Way," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (July, 1907), 5-6.

__________, "In an Editorial Way," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (January, 1908), 5.

__________, "The American Girl: An Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (May, 1908), 5.

__________, "In an Editorial Way," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (June, 1908), 5-6.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXX (March, 1913), 5-6.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (April, 1914), 5.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (April, 1916), 12.

__________, "Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (November, 1916), 87.

__________, "War Editorials," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (January, 1918), 26.

Articles and Short Stories

Feminine Traits

"American Girls and Titles," Ladies' Home Journal, X (February, 1893), 8.

An American Mother, "Have Women Robbed Men of Their Religion?" Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (February, 1900), 17.

"As a Bachelor Sees Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (January, 1908), 12.

"As a Physician Sees Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (March, 1907), 16.

Ashmore, Ruth, "The Business Girl and Her Employer," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (February, 1898), 21.

__________, "The Foundation of Physical Beauty," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (November, 1898), 24.

__________, "Side Talks with Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (December, 1898), 41.

Barr, Amelia E., "Why Do Not Literary Women Marry?" Ladies' Home Journal, X (November, 1893), 10.

Bell, Lillian, "From the Girl's Standpoint: Men as Lovers," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (February, 1896), 6.

Browne, Junius Henri, "Are Women Timid?" Ladies' Home Journal, X (April, 1893), 8.

Cabot, Cornelius, "How Shall a Young Man Decide?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (March, 1914), 17, 79.

Cahill, Mabel Esmonde, "The Art of Playing Tennis," Ladies' Home Journal, X (June, 1893), 6.

Call, Annie Payson, "Why Is My Husband So Irritable?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (November, 1908), 30.

Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (February, 1914), 30.

__________________, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (March, 1916), 32.

Dufour, Yvonne, "As a Woman Sees the After-the-War Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (October, 1918), 12.

Harrison, Mrs. Burton, "The Well-Bred Girl in Society," Ladies' Home Journal, X (February, 1893), 4.

Hazard, Caroline, "Where the College Fails the Girl," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (March, 1915), 19, 72.

_______________, "Where the Girl Fails the College," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (April, 1915), 20, 79.

"Her Brother's Letters," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (April, 1906), 32.

Kingsland, Mrs. Burton, "Dangers of a Social Career," Ladies' Home Journal, X (January, 1893), 6.

Lawrence, David, "Mrs. New Citizen," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (March, 1919), 13, 103.

Marcosson, Isaac F., "After-the-War-Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (June, 1918), 13, 92.

Mitchell, S. Weir, "When the College Is Hurtful to a Girl," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (June, 1900), 14.

Mott, Mrs. Hamilton, "Sending a Girl to Boarding-School," Ladies' Home Journal, X (August, 1893), 17.

Parkhurst, Charles H., "Andromaniacs," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (February, 1895), 15.

__________, "College Training for Young Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (May, 1895), 15.

Preston, Alice, "The Things of Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, XXI (October, 1904), 24.

Sangster, Margaret E., "My Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (November, 1900), 38.

Talmage, T. DeWitt, "The Curiosity of Eve," Ladies' Home Journal, X (February, 1893), 14.

A Well-Known Pastor, "As a Clergyman Sees Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (September, 1907), 24.

"Why I Have Not Remarried--Yet," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (February, 1914), 14, 42.

"The World and His Wife," Ladies' Home Journal, XX (October, 1903), 18.

Marriage

An American Mother, "Is a College Education Best for Our Girls?" Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (July, 1900), 15.

__________, "A Talk I Had With My Husband and What Came of It," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (March, 1918), 42.

Ashmore, Ruth, "The Bachelor Girl," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (April, 1898), 22.

__________, "The Conservative Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (February, 1896), 16.

__________, "Side Talks with Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, VIII (January, 1891), 12.

__________, "What to Expect from a Young Man," Ladies' Home Journal, XIV (June, 1897), 27.

__________, "The Young Husband's First Year," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (February, 1895), 16.

Beecher, Mrs. Henry Ward, "What Is a True Home?" Ladies' Home Journal, VIII (December, 1890), 8.

Brooks, Lilian, "The Wisdom of the Dove," Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (January, 1902), 8.

Brown, Anna Robertson, "The Girl Who Goes to College," Ladies' Home Journal, X (October, 1893), 24.

Call, Annie Payson, "Why Is My Husband So Irritable?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (November, 1908), 30.

Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (August, 1907), 26.

__________, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (May, 1908), 32.

Cutting, Mary Stewart, "The Suburban Whirl: The Story of a Young Couple in the Suburbs," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (January, 1907), 7, 50.

"A Free Woman: My Own Story of My Emancipation," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (August, 1914), 7-8, 44-45.

Garland, Hamlin, "The Doctor," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (December, 1897), 7-8; (January, 1898), 7-8; (February, 1898), 9-10.

__________, "The Wife of a Pioneer: A Tribute," Ladies' Home Journal, XX (September, 1903), 8.

Gibbons, J. Cardinal, "The Restless Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (January, 1902), 6.

Goodnow, Charles N., "My Experiences with Unhappy Married Folks," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (January, 1913), 14.

Halsted, Carolyn, compiler, "The Best Kind of Husband," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (March, 1906), 18.

__________, collator, "How to Make Marriage a Success," Ladies' Home Journal, XXII (March, 1905), 10.

Herself, "What Being a Woman Has Meant to Me," Ladies' Home Journal, XXVI (December, 1908), 18.

Hodges, Dean, "The Business of Being a Wife," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (January, 1906), 19.

Howard, Frances Tyman, "The Green Hat: A Story of a Wooing--And an Incident," Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (August, 1902), 3-4.

Kilbourne, Fannie, "'And Forsaking All Others'," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (October, 1915), 19, 87.

Lanigan, Alice Graham, "Unknown Wives of Well-Known Men," Ladies' Home Journal, VIII (February, 1891), 3.

Lusk, Alice Freeman, "The Wife of the Minister: What Has the Church the Right to Ask for Her?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (November, 1915), 27-28.

MacGrath, Harold, "Playing the Game," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (August, 1918), 23, 77.

Magruder, Julia, "A Heaven-Kissing Hill," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (April, 1898), 9-10; (May, 1898), 7-8; (June, 1898), 11-12; (July, 1898), 9-10; (August, 1898), 10-11.

A Minister's Wife, "The Church Engaged My Husband, Not Me," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (August, 1900), 28.

________________, "Ideas of Two Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (October, 1915), 28.

Monroe, Anne Shannon, "When a Girl Has No Business to Marry," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (May, 1908), 14, 72.

Moody, Helen Watterson, "What It Means to Be Engaged," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (February, 1899), 15.

________________, "What It Means to Be a Wife," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (March, 1899), 26; (April, 1899), 22.

Mott, Sarah Curtis, "The Child That Is to Be," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIX (January, 1912), 5-6, 55.

Parkhurst, Charles H., "The Father's Domestic Headship," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (November, 1895), 15.

________________, "The Unit of Society," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (March, 1895), 13.

________________, "The Young Man and Marriage," Ladies' Home Journal, VII (November, 1890), 15.

Richmond, Grace, "The Homemaking of Juliet," Ladies' Home Journal, XXI (April, 1904), 3, 48; (May, 1904), 3, 46; (June, 1904), 15-16; (July, 1904), 13-14.

________________, "Red and Black: A Romance Wherein Red Pepper Burns Comes Back and Has a Distinctly New Experience," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (March, 1919), 9, 74; (April, 1919), 21, 116; (May, 1919), 16, 156.

Roich, Katharine, "The College-Bred Woman in Her Home," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (July, 1899), 14.

Sangster, Margaret, "Girls' Problems," Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (October, 1902), 31.

Scott, Elizabeth Wood, "Problems that Vex Ministers' Wives," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (January, 1908), 31.

Steele, D. M., "Some People I Have Married," Ladies' Home Journal, XVIII (June, 1901), 2.

Talmage, T. DeWitt, "'Male and Female Created He Them'," Ladies' Home Journal, XI (December, 1893), 14.

Thanet, Octave, "That Man: Your Husband," Ladies' Home Journal, X (February, 1893), 8.

A Wife, "Why I Would Not Marry My Husband Again," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (August, 1908), 18.

The Wife, "Twenty Years of Humiliation with My Husband," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (September, 1907), 25.

The Wife Herself, "The Purple Hat: Its Share in Solving a Wife's Allowance Problem," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (July, 1915), 16, 60.

Divorce

Abbott, Lyman, "How Do You Explain These Things?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (March, 1914), 23.

Addams, Jane, "Why Girls Go Wrong," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (September, 1907), 13.

Ashmore, Ruth, "Side Talks with Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (December, 1894), 35.

______________, "Side Talks with Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (February, 1895), 26.

______________, "Side Talks with Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (July, 1895), 29.

______________, "Side Talks with Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (February, 1898), 21.

Barbour, Ralph Henry, "Holly: The Romance of a Southern Girl," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (August, 1907), 5-6, (September, 1907), 15, 69; (October, 1907), 14, 87; (November, 1907), 16, 84.

Brady, Cyrus Townsend, "Sanderson of My Parish," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (February, 1907), 13.

Cooper, Courtney Ryley, "A Man Who Is Casting Out Divorce," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (March, 1914), 20.

Cox, Mrs. James Farley, "The Council Chamber," Ladies' Home Journal, XX (May, 1903), 22.

Evans, Frances, "About Men," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (November, 1898), 19.

______________, "About Men," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (December, 1898), 24.

Gibbons, J. Cardinal, "A National Evil So Prevalent That Marriage Is Getting to be Little Better than a System of Free Love," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (March, 1913), 10, 24.

Hall, Margaret Seymour, "The Rector of St. Peters," Ladies' Home Journal, X (April, 1893), 1-2.

"Her Brother's Letters," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (May 1906), 8.

Howard, George E., "How Can We Check the Increasing Divorce?--What Better Marriage Laws Would Do," Ladies' Home Journal, XXVII (November, 1910), 21-22.

Kingsland, Mrs. Burton, "Good Manners and Good Form," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (July, 1907), 32.

Laughlin, Clara E., "What Two Women Have Come Through," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (August, 1907), 11, 42.

Lee, Jeannette, "Another Woman: A Unique Story of the Eternal Mystery of Love," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (February, 1916), 13, 69.

Lewis, Sinclair, "A Widower for a While," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (July, 1918), 13, 65.

Magruder, Julia, "A Beautiful Alien," Ladies' Home Journal, XI (December, 1893), 7-8; (January, 1894), 5-6; (February, 1894), 7-8; (March, 1894), 7-8; (April, 1894), 3-4; (May, 1894), 5-6; (June, 1894), 7-8.

Parkhurst, Charles H., "Marriage and Its Safeguards," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (July, 1895), 15.

Perrine, William, "The Beautiful Mrs. Fitzherbert," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (January, 1908), 7-8.

"The President: The President's Views on a Uniform Divorce Law," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (September, 1906), 17.

"The Story the Actress Told: Being the True Story of One of the Most Famous Actresses of the Stage Today and Now Told in Public for the First Time," Ladies' Home Journal, XIV (November, 1907), 13, 82.

Valentine, Albertine Flershem, "The Married College Woman and Divorce," Ladies' Home Journal, XXVIII (April 15, 1911), 22.

Motherhood

An American Mother, "What of the Woman Herself," Ladies' Home Journal, XVIII (June, 1901), 10.

Ashmore, Ruth, "The Bachelor Girl," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (April, 1898), 22.

_____________, "What to Expect from a Young Man," Ladies' Home Journal, XIV (June, 1897), 27.

Aunt Patience, "Just Among Ourselves," Ladies' Home Journal, VIII (June, 1891), 21.

Blake, Emily Calvin, "The Six Great Moments in a Woman's Life: The First--Sixteen and in Love," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (January, 1908), 22.

Brown, Barnetta, "Mothers' Mistakes and Fathers' Failures," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (December, 1899), 37; (January, 1900), 30; (February, 1900), 32.

Calvin, Emily Ruth, "The Binding Tie: An Incident in the Life of a Young Married Couple," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (November, 1906), 11, 86.

Coolidge, Emelyn Lincoln, "The Young Mother's Club," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (January, 1906), 38.

Country Contributor, "Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (April, 1907), 34.

__________________, "Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXVIII (May 1, 1911), 28.

Deland, Margaret, "I Didn't Know--," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (March, 1907), 9.

Eliot, Charles W., "The Normal American Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (January, 1908), 15.

________________, "The Part of the Man in the Family," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (March, 1908), 7.

A Famous American Novelist, "When I Was a Man for Awhile: And Why I Would Rather Be a Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (May, 1916), 34.

A Farmer's Wife, "The Letter of a Farmer's Wife," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (February, 1907), 48.

Garland, Hamlin, "The Wife of a Pioneer: A Tribute," Ladies' Home Journal, XX (September, 1903), 8.

Gilmore, Inez Haynes, "Sylvia's Sissies," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (October, 1918), 22, 132.

Griggs, Edward Howard, "Edward Howard Griggs' Talks: The Moral Training of a Child," Ladies' Home Journal, XX (February, 1903), 17.

Howard, William Lee, "Why Didn't My Parents Tell Me?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (August, 1907), 32.

Lindsey, Ben B., "Why Girls Go Wrong," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (January, 1907), 13.

Mabie, Hamilton W., "Which Novels are Wise for the Young?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (September, 1908), 34.

Mack, Julian W., "What I Have Learned from Hundreds of Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (May, 1908), 6.

Masson, Thomas L., "The Only Real Sacrifice," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (August, 1918), 30.

Nearing, Nellie M. L. and Nearing, Scott, "When A Girl Is Asked to Marry," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIX (March, 1912), 7, 69-70.

Moody, Helen Watterson, "Amy and I," Ladies' Home Journal, XVIII (February, 1901), 21.

____________________, "The True Meaning of Motherhood," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (May, 1899), 12.

Oemler, Marie Conway, "Anybody Want This Little Boy?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (February, 1916), 16, 59.

Parkhurst, Charles H., "The True Mission of Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (April, 1895), 15.

"Personal Experiences of Mothers: The Mistake I Made with 'My Little Daughter'," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (February, 1914), 28.

"The President: Mr. Roosevelt's Views on Race Suicide," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (February, 1906), 21.

Richmond, Grace, "The Whistling Mother," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIV (August, 1917), 8.

Riis, Jacob, "Mrs. Roosevelt and Her Children," Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (August, 1902), 5-6.

Roosevelt, Theodore, "The Successful Mother," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (June, 1908), 10.

Sangster, Margaret, "Mrs. Sangster's Heart to Heart Talks with Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, XXI (May, 1904), 26.

Scovil, Elizabeth Robinson, "Playthings for Children," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (January, 1895), 24.

____________________, "Suggestions for Mothers," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (December, 1894), 37.

Sprague, Marion, "The Letters of Two Mothers," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (March, 1906), 28.

Ward, Herbert D., "The Bridal Mirror," Ladies' Home Journal, XXI (May, 1904), 7.

"What I Did with My Two Daughters: The Experiments of a Father and How They Worked Out," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (March, 1908), 10, 56.

Wolbarst, Abraham, "The Tragedy of the Marriage Altar," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (October, 1908), 26.

Housekeeping

Barrington, George H., "The Home without a Dining Room," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (January, 1919), 66.

Burdette, Robert J., "The Taskmistress of Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, X (November, 1893), 16.

Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (February, 1906), 28.

__________, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (July, 1907), 24.

__________, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (November, 1907), 34.

Edmunds, Carey, "The New House without a Dining Room," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (February, 1919), 3.

Gale, Zona, "The Eight-Hour Home Assistant: How the Present Servant Will Go Out and the New Girl Come into the Home," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (April, 1919), 35.

__________, "Is Housework Pushing Down the Birthrate?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (May, 1919), 41.

__________, "Shall the Kitchen in Our Home Go?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (March, 1919), 35, 50.

Harmon, Dudley and Smith, Ruby Green, "The New Day for Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (July, 1918), 32.

Heath, Mrs. Julian, "The New Kind of Housekeeping," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (January, 1915), 2.

__________, "Are Wives Wasting their Husband's Money?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (January, 1914), 3-4.

Howe, Frederick C., "The Vanishing Servant Girl: The Problem That Confronts the Woman with Help in Her Home," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (May, 1918), 48.

Keller, Frances A., "The Housewife and Her Helper," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (January, 1906), 36.

Nearing, Nellie M. S. and Nearing, Scott, "Four Great Things a Woman Does at Home That Make Her the Greatest Power in America Today," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIX (May, 1912), 12, 64-65.

Moody, Helen Watterson, "What It Means to Be a Wife," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (March, 1899), 26.

"One Kitchen Fire for 200 People: No Necessity Anymore for Each Family to Cook Its Own Meals," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (September, 1918), 97.

Parkhurst, Charles H., "The Unit of Society," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (March, 1895), 13.

Phelps, Elizabeth Stuart, "The Successors of Mary the First," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (October, 1900), 5-6; (November, 1900), 15-16; XVIII (December, 1900), 13-14; (January, 1901), 9-10; (February, 1901), 9-10, (March, 1901), 13-14; (April, 1901), 13-14.

Rorer, Sarah T., "Cooperation in Housekeeping," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (January, 1895), 14.

Swift, Janet H. M., "The Contrariness of Francesca," Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (April, 1902), 6.

"Uncle Sam's New House That You Have Heard About," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (February, 1919), 121.

Whitaker, Charles Harris, "Will the Kitchen Be Outside the Home?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (January, 1919), 66.

Williams, Mrs. Talcoll, "The Most Famous Cook in America," Ladies' Home Journal, XIV (February, 1897), 7.

New Woman

Allston, Margaret, "Her Boston Experience: A Bright Girl's Picture of Modern Society and People," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (October, 1899), 1.

An American Mother, "What the American Girl Has Lost," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (May, 1900), 17.

Ashmore, Ruth, "The Bachelor Girl," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (April, 1898), 22.

_____________, "The Conservative Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (February, 1896), 16.

_____________, "The Restlessness of the Age," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (January, 1895), 16.

Bangs, John Kendrick, "The Paradise Club: When Lovely Woman Takes to Smoke," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (January, 1895), 11.

Bellamy, Edward, "Women in the Year 2000," Ladies' Home Journal, VIII (February, 1891), 3.

Blair, Mrs. Elmer, "The Work of Women's Clubs: Preserving the Public Health," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (October, 1916), 30.

Blethen, Joseph, "The Girls of Flat G," Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (February, 1902), 7.

Brown, Anna Robertson, "The Girl Who Goes to College," Ladies' Home Journal, X (July, 1893), 14.

Bruére, Martha Bensley, "Mildred Carver, U.S.A.: A Romance of the American Girl of Tomorrow," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (June, 1918), 14, 58; (July, 1918), 21, 56; (August, 1918), 21, 53; (September, 1918), 25, 84; (October, 1918), 21, 110; (November, 1918), 15, 94; XXXVI (December, 1918), 19, 84; (January, 1919), 13, 32; (February, 1919), 24, 93.

Burgess, Gelett, "Miss Million's Private Secretary," Ladies' Home Journal, XXII (August, 1905), 3, 30.

Cleveland, Grover, "Woman's Mission and Woman's Clubs," Ladies' Home Journal, XXII (May, 1905), 3-4.

Country Contributor, "A Plain Country Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (January, 1916), 26.

Cowles, Mrs. Josiah Evans, "A Call to Club Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIV (June, 1917), 72.

Curtis, Isabel Gordon, "A Woman's Club That is Worthwhile," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (October, 1906), 72.

Dewey, John, "Is Co-Education Injurious to Girls? What Co-Education Has Done," Ladies' Home Journal, XXVIII (June 1, 1911), 22, 60.

Eaton, Walter Prichard, "Ruth Grenville--Feminist: Her Adventures in the City That Doesn't Care," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (August, 1914), 3, 39.

Ferguson, Katharine, "The Autobiography of a Girl: From Her Sixteenth to Her Twenty-Sixth Year," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (October, 1899), 10; (November, 1899), 6; XVII (December, 1899), 10; (January, 1900), 14; (February, 1900), 12; (March, 1900), 2; (April, 1900), 10; (May, 1900), 6; (June, 1900), 10; (July, 1900), 8.

Friend, Ella McKenna, "The Recluse of Fountainebleau," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (July, 1895), 7.

Gale, Zona, "The Girl Who Gave Her Eyes," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (February, 1919), 11, 60.

Gatlin, Dana, "Missy 'Cans' the Cosmos: It Was Really A Good Chance to Enlarge Her Field of Vision and Broaden Her Horizon," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (March, 1919), 21, 67.

Gibbons, J. Cardinal, "The Restless Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (January, 1902), 6.

Grayson, Margaret T., "Where the Current Has Brought Me; What I, a Woman, May Do Today That Yesterday I Could Not," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (June, 1915), 8.

Halworth, Jeanette H., "The Social Life at Marlborough," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (August, 1896), 6.

Harmon, Dudley, editor, "The New Day for Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (May, 1918), 30.

Hazard, Caroline, "Where the College Fails the Girl," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (March, 1915), 19, 72.

_______________, "Where the Girl Fails the College," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (April, 1915), 20, 79.

"Her Brother's Letters," Ladies' Home Journal, XXII (October, 1905), 19.

"Her Diary: The Day to Day Story of a Modern Girl," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (October, 1915), 15; (November, 1915), 17, 89; XXXIII (December, 1915), 13.

"Her Letter to Him: After He Had Asked Her to Marry Him," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (May, 1915), 14.

"The Ideas of a Forward-Looking Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (February, 1919), 35.

Kenton, Edna, "Whatever Is New for Women Is Wrong," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (October, 1916), 12.

Kingsland, Mrs. Burton, "A Woman's Proper Dress at All Times," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (July, 1900), 16.

Kipling, Rudyard, "William the Conquerer," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (December, 1895), 5-6.

Lanigan, Frances E., "The Right Sort of Women's Club," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (May, 1899), 14.

MacGowan, Alice, "A Girl Widow in the Great Southwest," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (June, 1907), 15, 57.

May, Dorothy Mills, "The New Girl's 'Goblin': An Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (May, 1915), 3.

Melius, Marion, "A Woman's Club That Was Helpful," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (November, 1908), 65.

Moody, Winfield Scott, "Daisy Miller and the Gibson Girl," Ladies' Home Journal, XXI (September, 1904), 17.

Moore, Mrs. Philip N., "What Women's Clubs Expect to Do," Ladies' Home Journal, XXX (January, 1913), 30.

Munsterberg, Hugo, "Is Co-Education Wise for Girls? Bi-Education and Co-Education," Ladies' Home Journal, XXVIII (May 15, 1911), 16, 32.

Oppenheim, James, "Her Blue-Eyed Way: It Was the Way Isabel Creighton Sewed Up Dan Master's Heart," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (February, 1916), 15, 73.

Parkhurst, Charles H., "Andromaniacs," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (February, 1895), 15.

Pennybacker, Mrs. Percy V., "What the Woman's Club Has Done," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (May, 1914), 26.

Porter, John Heffron, "The Girl Who Wanted to Be Young: And Who Was Thought by the Younger Set to Be a Window Smasher," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (April, 1914), 21, 95.

Rickert, Edith, "What Has the College Done for Girls? I: Has College Injured the Health of Girls?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXIX (January, 1912), 11-12.

_____________, "What Has the College Done for Girls? II: Has the College Really Helped Girls?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXIX (February, 1912), 9, 52.

_____________, "What Has the College Done for Girls? III: Where the College Has Failed with Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIX (March, 1912), 15.

_____________, "What Has the College Done for Girls? IV: How Can the College Be Bettered?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXIX (April, 1912), 23-24.

_____________, "What Women's Clubs Have Really Done," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIX (October, 1912), 12.

Ritchie, Robert Wells, "The 'Fem-in-in-ist' of Jumbo Mills: Whipsaw Merril's Girl Comes Home," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (November, 1916), 15, 110.

Sawyer, Ruth, "The Painted Horses: When a Girl Left Them and Entered a Real Girl's World," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIV (November, 1917), 9, 98.

Shaw, Anna Howard, "The Woman's Committee of the United States Council of National Defense," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (February, 1918), 28.

Sutherland, Abby A., "The Girl That We Love: A 'Commencement' Editorial," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (July, 1916), 10.

Taft, William Howard, "As I See the Future of Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (March, 1919), 27, 113.

Talmage, T. DeWitt, "'Male and Female Created He Them'," Ladies' Home Journal, XI (December, 1893), 14.

Underhill, Carolyn A., "The Club Woman's Guide," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (September, 1915), 34; (October, 1915), 54; (November, 1915), 76; XXXIII (January, 1916), 30.

Warwick, Anne, "The Best People," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIV (July, 1917), 13, 56; (August, 1917), 21, 62; (September, 1917), 17, 67; (October, 1917), 19, 66; (November, 1917), 23, 106; XXXV (December, 1917), 20, 103; (January, 1918), 15, 54; (February, 1918), 20, 78.

"What Are Women Going to Do?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (May, 1919), 41, 114.

Whitney, Mrs. A. D. T., "Friendly Letter to Girl Friends," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (September, 1896), 12.

Wood, Mary I., "Federation Educational Work," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (July, 1915), 21.

____________, "Our Part in Conservation," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (April, 1915), 27.

____________, "What We Can Do for Her," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (May, 1915), 27.

____________, "What Women's Clubs Are Doing," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXI (March, 1914), 33; (April, 1914), 49; (July, 1914), 49.

____________, "The Woman's Club This Year," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (January, 1915), 3.

Woman Suffrage

Abbott, Lyman, "Why the Vote Would Be Injurious to Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXVII (February, 1910), 21-22.

Addams, Jane, "Why Women Should Vote," Ladies' Home Journal, XXVII (January, 1910), 21-22.

Bangs, John Kendrick, "The Paradise Club: Dreams of Universal Suffrage," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (December, 1894), 36.

Barry, Richard, "What Women Have Actually Done Where They Vote," Ladies' Home Journal, XXVII (November, 1910), 15, 69.

Bell, Lilian, "From a Girl's Standpoint: Woman's Rights in Love," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (June, 1896), 12.

Chomal, Marie Cecile, "Does the Wife Vote Like the Husband?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (May, 1919), 37, 92.

Cleveland, Grover, "Would Woman Suffrage Be Unwise?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXII (October, 1905), 7-8.

Country Contributor, "The Ideas of a Plain Country Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (September, 1908), 38.

Deland, Margaret, "The New Woman Who Would Do Things," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (September, 1907), 17.

________________, "Third Way in Woman Suffrage," Ladies' Home Journal, XXX (January, 1913), 11-12.

"Do You, As a Woman, Want to Vote?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXVIII (January, 1911), 17.

Dunne, Finley Peter, "Molly Donahue, Who Lives Across the Street from Mr. Dooley," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (March, 1900), 6.

Harmon, Dudley and Smith, Ruby Green, "The New Day for Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (April, 1918), 29.

"Is Mrs. Goddard Alone in Her Position That Woman Suffrage in Colorado Is a Failure?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXVIII (April, 1911), 6.

Lawrence, David, "Mrs. New Citizen," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (May, 1919), 33.

Parkhurst, Charles H., "Women Without the Ballot," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (June, 1895), 15.

Shaw, Anna Howard, "Two New Cabinet Members, and an Assistant Secretary of Labor: A Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (April, 1919), 47.

Talmage, T. DeWitt, "'Male and Female Created He Them'," Ladies' Home Journal, X (September, 1893), 14.

Ward, Mrs. Humphrey, "Why I Do Not Believe in Woman Suffrage," Ladies' Home Journal, XXV (November, 1908), 15.

Marketplace

Allen, Viola, "What It Means to Be an Actress," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (May, 1899), 2.

An American Mother, "Is a College Education Best for Our Girls?" Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (July, 1900), 15.

__________________, "What of the Woman Herself?" Ladies' Home Journal, XVIII (June, 1901), 10.

Ashmore, Ruth, "Girl Life in New York City," Ladies' Home Journal, X (January, 1893), 14.

____________, "The Girl Who Aspires to Art," Ladies' Home Journal, XIV (September, 1897), 18.

____________, "The Girl Who Is Employed," Ladies' Home Journal, XIII (December, 1895), 24.

____________, "Her Letter and My Answer," Ladies' Home Journal, X (February, 1893), 16.

____________, "The Social Position of the Girl Who Works," Ladies' Home Journal, XV (December, 1897), 28.

Blair, Emily Newell, "Should a Woman Get a Man's Pay? Is the Sexless Job the New Note in Women's Work?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (April, 1919), 39, 156.

__________________, "What Are We Women Going to Do?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (May, 1919), 47, 114.

__________________, "Where Are We Women Going?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (March, 1919), 37, 58.

Bloomfield, Meyer, "The Englishwoman Who Worked," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (April, 1919), 55-56.

________________, "What the English Working Woman Has Proved," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (May, 1919), 51-52.

Bruére, Martha Bensley, "Mildred Carver, U.S.A.: A Romance of the American Girl of Tomorrow," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (June, 1918), 14, 58; (July, 1918), 21, 56; (August, 1918), 21, 53; (September, 1918), 25, 84; (October, 1918), 21, 110; (November, 1918), 15, 94; XXXVI (December, 1918), 29, 84; (January, 1919), 13, 32; (February, 1919), 24, 93.

Cooke, Rose Terry, "How Can She Support Herself?" Ladies' Home Journal, VIII (March, 1891), 9.

"Do You Realize How Many Women Are In Uniform?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (November, 1918), 139.

Dutton, Louise, "When Lila Turned Wage-Earner: A Young Wife's Experiences in the Realm of Economics," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (June, 1916), 13, 68.

A Famous American Novelist, "When I Was a Man for Awhile: And Why I Would Rather Be a Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (May, 1916), 34.

Gillespie, Harriet Sisson, "Where Girls Are Really Doing Men's Jobs," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIV (November, 1917), 83.

Gladwyn, Helen B., "How I Became a Confidential Secretary," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (September, 1916), 32.

Gordon, Elizabeth G., "What It Means to Be a Newspaper Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (January, 1899), 8.

Harmon, Dudley, "Must I Really Go to Work? Are Women's Services Really Needed Now, and for What?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (January, 1919), 22.

______________, editor, "The New Day for Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (May, 1918), 30.

______________, "Want a Job? Some Suggestions to Women Seeking War Work," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (November, 1918), 40.

______________, "What Are These War Jobs for Women? Where They Are and How to Get Them," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIV (November, 1917), 39, 92.

______________ and Smith, Ruby Green, "The New Day for Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (June, 1918), 30.

Hooper, Emma M., "What It Means to Be a Dressmaker," Ladies' Home Journal, XVI (July, 1899), 24.

"How I Saved Other Wives from Trouble by Telling Them My Own Story," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (November, 1916), 31.

"The Ideas of a Forward-Looking Woman," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (February, 1919), 35.

Marcosson, Isaac F., "After-the-War-Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXV (September, 1918), 28, 87.

Mason, W. L., "Women's Chances as Breadwinners," Ladies' Home Journal, VIII (February, 1891), 8.

Neely, Ruth, "Where Your Job May Lead," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (September, 1916), 28.

Nordica, Lillian, "Girls and Operatic Careers," Ladies' Home Journal, XII (December, 1894), 10.

"The President: Mr. Roosevelt's Views on Factory Laws for Women and Children," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIII (March, 1906), 19.

Putnam, Herbert, "What It Means to Be a Librarian," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (February, 1900), 22.

Radford, Maude, "When Men Come In: It Complicates the Problem for Girls Who Seek World Careers," Ladies' Home Journal, XXIV (February, 1907), 19, 59; (March, 1907), 18, 71.

Sangster, Margaret E., "Girls' Problems," Ladies' Home Journal, XIX (March, 1902), 27.

____________________, "Heart to Heart Talks with Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, XXI (October, 1904), 28.

____________________, "My Girls," Ladies' Home Journal, XVII (October, 1900), 38; (November, 1900), 38.

Taft, William Howard, "As I See the Future of Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXVI (March, 1919), 27, 113.

Tuttle, Margaretta, "The Girl on the Fence: A Girl's Question and a Woman's Answer," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXII (September, 1915), 30.

Wells, H. G., "The Woman and the War," Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIII (June, 1916), 10, 62.

"Which One of These Jobs Can You Fill?" Ladies' Home Journal, XXXIV (August, 1917), 29.

Wright, Carroll D., "What the Factory Has Done for Women," Ladies' Home Journal, XX (October, 1903), 30.

Secondary Sources

Books

Banner, Lois W., Women in Modern America: A Brief History, New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1974.

Barker-Benfield, G.J., The Horrors of the Half-Known Life, New York, Harper & Row, 1976.

Blair, Karen J., The Clubwoman as Feminist: True Womanhood Redefined, 1868-1914, New York, Holmes & Meier Publishers, Inc., 1980.

Bok, Edward William, The Americanization of Edward Bok: The Autobiography of a Dutch Boy Fifty Years After, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.

__________, A Dutch Boy Fifty Years After, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.

__________, Twice Thirty: Some Short and Simple Annals of the Road, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.

Calhoun, Arthur W., A Social History of the American Family, Vol. III: 1865-1919, New York, Barnes & Noble, 1960.

Degler, Carl, At Odds: Woman and the Family in America from the Revolution to the Present, New York, Oxford University Press, 1980.

Ditzion, Sidney, Marriage, Morals and Sex in America: A History of Ideas, New York, Octagon Books, A Division of Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1975.

Flexner, Eleanor, Century of Struggle: The Woman's Rights Movement in the United States, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1959.

Haber, Samuel, Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Haller, John S. and Haller, Robin M., The Physician and Sexuality in Victorian America, New York, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1974.

Irwin, Inez Haynes, Angels and Amazons: A Hundred Years of American Women, Garden City, New York, Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., 1933.

Katzman, David M., Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America, New York, Oxford University Press, 1978.

Kraditor, Aileen, S., The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920, New York, Columbia University Press, 1965.

Marlow, H. Carleton and Davis, Harrison M., The American Search for Woman, Santa Barbara, Clio Books, 1976.

May, Henry F., The End of American Innocence: A Study of the First Years of Our Own Time, 1912-1917, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1959.

Mott, Frank Luther, A History of American Magazines, Vol. III: 1865-1885, Vol. IV: 1885-1905, Cambridge, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957.

O'Neill, William L., Divorce in the Progressive Era, New York, New Viewpoints, A Division of Franklin Watts, Inc., 1973.

__________________, Everyone Was Brave: A History of Feminism in America, Chicago, Quadrangle Books, 1971.

Pivar, David J., Purity Crusade: Sexual Morality and Social Control, 1868-1900, Westport, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, Inc., 1973.

Riegel, Robert E., American Feminists, Lawrence, The University Press of Kansas, 1963.

Ross, Ishbel, Ladies of the Press, New York, Harper, 1936.

Rothman, Sheila M., Woman's Proper Place: A History of Changing Ideals and Practices, 1870 to the Present, New York, Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1978.

Ryan, Mary P., Womanhood in America: From Colonial Times to the Present, New York, New Viewpoints, A Division of Franklin Watts, 1975.

Santayana, George, The Genteel Tradition, edited by Douglas L. Wilson, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1967.

Sinclair, Andrew, The Better Half: The Emancipation of the American Woman, New York, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

Stage, Sarah, Female Complaints: Lydia Pinkham and the Business of Women's Medicine, New York, W. W. Norton & Co., 1979.

Steinberg, Salme Harju, Reformer in the Marketplace: Edward W. Bok and "The Ladies' Home Journal", Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1979.

Wood, James Playsted, Magazines in the United States: Their Social and Economic Influence, New York, Ronald Press, 1949.

Woodward, Helen, The Lady Persuaders, New York, Ivan Obolensky, 1960.

Articles

Herman, Sondra R., "Loving Courtship or the Marriage Market? The Ideal and Its Critics, 1871-1911," American Quarterly, XXV (May, 1973), 235-52.

McGovern, James R., "The American Woman's Pre-World War I Freedom in Manners and Morals," The Journal of American History, LV (September, 1968), 315-33.

Rosenberg, Charles E., "Sexuality, Class and Role in 19th-Century America," American Quarterly, XXV (May, 1973), 131-53.