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Various scholars have examined the historical development of women’s consumer magazines, the advertisements of product manufacturers, and the social construction of the idealized American woman. This study is a qualitative historical analysis of the dramatic cultural turn that took place during the early decades of the twentieth century and how those changes were expressed within the editorial content of *Good Housekeeping* and the advertisements of iconic food producer, the Campbell Soup Company. Both positioned themselves as vital to women’s education, thereby having a significant effect on the traditional private sphere of womanhood and the male-dominated public sphere.

During the years of this study, 1905-1920, the United States was in the midst of rapidly transforming from a small-scale agricultural economy to consumer capitalism, which profoundly reshaped the essential structure of society and changed the fundamental nature of everyday life. The mass production and wide distribution of goods created new public concerns, such as the safety of the food supply and the veracity of advertising claims made by product manufacturers. On the surface, it appeared that *Good Housekeeping* and Campbell Soup primarily intended to inculcate white, middle-class women in a discourse of consumerism, most often represented by idealized images of the modern New Woman. However, as this study demonstrates, the cultural work done by both entities was far more complex than just instilling consumerist behavior in women.
Early on, *Good Housekeeping* tapped into women’s desire for political participation, and the magazine actively encouraged their mobilization in order to tackle significant national issues, such as purifying the food supply, lowering the infant mortality rate, promoting temperance, maintaining the home front during war, and supporting suffrage. While these efforts were supposed to take place in a manner not detrimental to home life, they did in fact provide an opening for women to have demonstrable impact on American culture and history. Campbell Soup typically promoted traditional roles for women, but it too became a vital component in shaping attitudes about what it meant to be a modern woman, wife, and mother in the early twentieth century--most often embodied in the idealized images of the New Woman.
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CHAPTER I.
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

At the dawn of the twentieth century, America was a country undergoing great transformation. The decades leading up to the new century were comprised of vast industrialization and technological developments that changed how many Americans fundamentally lived and profoundly reshaped the essential nature of society. While opportunities for individual entrepreneurship and immense self-made wealth were beginning to dwindle, the middle class was burgeoning, and mass consumer culture emerged alongside new opportunities for leisure. In addition, the immigrant population swelled in large numbers, creating an increasingly pluralistic society. Moreover, adding to growing class tensions, a great women’s movement for equal rights had been underway for decades. Both of these historical and cultural changes created fear that the privileges of dominant societal institutions were being threatened. The convergence of these conditions appeared to intrude upon the power and authority of white American males and, in turn, contributed to an evolving redefinition of what it meant to be masculine, as well as what constituted femininity and womanhood.¹ Like the gendered category “men,” American women were a heterogeneous amalgam differentiated by race, ethnicity, religion, and class. During this era, society began to ask the question—just who was the American woman and what did she represent? Various images of the idealized woman emerged, with none quite as ambiguous and contested as the modern New Woman.

By 1900, the very way in which life was conducted had changed, and even though national discord was prevalent, there was a sense of unbridled possibility for the middle class. The industrial revolution had increased the manufacturing of common mass goods, and new modes of distribution from trains and automobiles to mail order catalogs and department stores
made an abundance of everyday products accessible to nearly everyone across the United States. Manufacturers could now conduct business more easily on both sides of the country, and many companies resolved to capitalize on the latest innovations. In this new age of commodity consciousness, regional firms such as the Campbell Soup Company took advantage of newly developed “scientific” methods of advertising and distribution techniques as a means to capture a national market. American advertising gave shape to this new culture of consumption, which William R. Leach refers to as:

> An urban and secular one of color and spectacle, of sensuous pleasure and dreams. It subverted, but never overturned, the older mentality of repression, practical utilitarianism, scarcity, and self-denial. It slowly encompassed service and comforts as desirable goals, intermingling competition and cooperation, blurring the lines between work and leisure.

Advertising emerged in direct response to the needs of the new industrial economy, and its appearance in mass circulation publications ensured that new products and developments were communicated broadly to a wide audience. In fact, Dennis Kervin maintains that advertising, highly intertextual in nature, exists solely in support of capitalism and functions as a “meta-meaning system” in which various codes draw upon social knowledge to create ideology. Early advertising began as a simple trade, but soon was transformed by the infusion of artistry and what many claimed were “scientific principles.” Believing that advertising could produce emotional effect, ad men began applying theories of psychology to their occupation, giving it an aura of professional credibility. When successful in its purpose, advertising “provides the nexus for negotiating the relationship between people, things, and social meaning . . . [and] women
enter into the people-thing relation differently than do men.’

From the beginning, modern advertising was a patriarchal system of meanings, imbued with verbal and visual codes that stressed difference, particularly concerning gender. Men and women were perceived to be naturally biologically different and separate in traits, attitudes, and behavior. In particular, advertising promised to expand the province of women by providing them with luxuries that would increase efficiency, leisure time, and general attractiveness, all attained via active consumption. However, the reification of this mythology is not achieved within a single ad, or in ads placed within a specific timeframe, but rather it emerges as a result of a system of messages that become institutionalized over time to produce accepted ideology.

By the early twentieth century, advertising was viewed as essential to America’s unique way of life and economic prosperity. Literary critic Leo Spitzer referred to advertising as “an Americanism”--because, although it originated elsewhere, it reached its full potential in this country. In his efforts to define the essence of Americanism at mid-century (1954), David M. Potter drew a correlation between what he believed was central to the national character of America, plentiful abundance, and the institution of modern advertising. In a capitalist society framed primarily by consumerism, the manufacturing of fantasy to transform women’s lives emerged as one of the most powerful elements of the twentieth century. According to Potter:

Advertising created modern American radio and television, transformed the modern newspaper, evoked the modern slick periodical, and remains the vital essence of each of them at the present time. Marconi may have invented the wireless and Henry Luce may have invented the news magazine, but it is advertising that has made both . . . what they are in America today.
Regarding its influence on society, Potter compared advertising to other significant American institutions of social control, such as education and religion in its ability to transform daily life and sway attitudes and beliefs.\textsuperscript{12} Alongside the rise of advertising during the final decades of the 1800s, the mass press began to thrive and prosper as new mechanization methods facilitated an increase at every level of the production process, including “print, paper-making and techniques of illustration.”\textsuperscript{13} While magazines had been growing in popularity for decades, they began to flourish in numbers, and their ability to reach a much larger readership was substantiated. It was during this time that influential women’s magazines, such as \textit{Good Housekeeping}, emerged to stake their claim on the consciousness of the American woman.

Concurrently, middle-class white women evolved as an important consumer group, targeted by manufacturers and advertisers alike. While most women maintained a strong presence within the domestic sphere of home and family, there were new opportunities enabling them to enter some aspects of the public sphere, such as business, education, and government. Accordingly, popular ladies’ journals of the era began to expand the notion of domesticity in efforts to influence women’s ventures outside the traditional boundaries of home, including their behavior as consumers. However, the ability to wield power and authority—in the private and public spheres, at home and abroad—still was considered solely a man’s biological right. Thus, women’s incursions into the public domain, even if sanctioned by dominant culture as necessary to economic development, were viewed with cultural apprehension and as potential threat to the very essence of masculinity.\textsuperscript{14} By the late 1800s, a new depiction of the American woman began to surface that was imagined in opposition to the feminine ideal. The New Woman became a telling indicator of the trials and tribulations of a society in transition, and she emerged to symbolize the many ideological struggles inherent in modernity.
As women increasingly broadened their cultural horizons, the idealized concept of the nineteenth-century woman, the “True Woman” as she was known, gave way to the “New Woman” at the turn of the century. She appeared in innumerable ways in popular literature and art, as well as within the pages of women’s service magazines. While the New Woman was an enduring image representing vast societal change, as a visual marker she developed significantly from her inception in the 1880s through the 1920s. In mass culture, during the course of nearly five decades, the New Woman evolved from being a figure of much derision and debate to an icon of modern womanhood, laden with many new duties intended to serve the overall good of the nation.

Early depictions of the New Woman were tremendously polarized. Female novelists typically depicted her in a positive manner, while those in the conservative press (both male and female) portrayed the “masculinized” New Woman as resoundingly responsible for institutional anarchy. She stood in stark contrast to the overtly feminized True Woman of the 1800s, who embodied the very essence of womanly goodness in service to men, children, and country. Critical of the traditional roles of women, the New Woman was not necessarily the creation of the suffragist movement, but she was born of women’s mounting dreams of emancipation, most notably from the bonds of domesticity. By the turn of the century, the image of the New Woman, while still the subject of much societal debate, became the personification of modernism and consumerism—no longer just a vessel of feminist identity but an object of capitalist discourse. However, co-opted by popular magazines and advertisements, various aspects of this newly re-feminized concept were not all that “new,” as they drew upon doctrine of the previously constructed Victorian-era “cult of true womanhood.”
Like the True Woman, the evolving imagery of the New Woman was represented by iconography that represented society’s trepidation about changing cultural behaviors, attitudes, and values. As such, analysis of the New Woman cannot be separated from social, economic, political, or historical contexts. Nor should it be isolated from the cultural texts that constructed the image—some of which reinforced the concept of idealized womanhood, and some of which attempted to subvert it. Therefore, while the attainment of true womanhood in the nineteenth century had been promoted as the desired universal condition for all respectable women, depictions of the New Woman were often quite conflictive in nature. The New Woman was a volatile concept open to heated contestation in the 1880s and ‘90s, but by the early 1900s, she was widely adopted by mainstream culture and transformed into a compromised figure that supported the maintenance of the status quo within the domestic realm. More often than not, women were encouraged to aspire to the roles and responsibilities attached to the co-opted image in service to concepts of modernism—primarily those addressing issues of household technology, domestic economics, and personal aesthetics. Nevertheless, even this represented a culturally dangerous melding of the private and public spheres. Moreover, those women who sought public opportunities were viewed with suspicion, as dominant culture feared that their aspirations would irreparably alter the very fabric of patriarchal American society. The New Woman occupied a liminal space between the two realms.

Who Was the New Woman?

In the 1880s and 1890s, there was a “vague perception . . . that women were in the process of no longer being the same” and various levels of society began exploring this cultural phenomenon. Gynocentric writers had been examining the plight of women since the 1850s in
politicized fare such as Barbara Leigh Smith’s *A Brief Summary, in Plain Language, of the Most Important Laws Concerning Women* (1854). But it was popular British writer Sarah Grand who first used the actual term “new woman” in her lengthy novel *The Heavenly Twins* (1893) and then again in an 1894 article, “A New Aspect of the Woman Question” in the *North American Review*. In the essay, Grand defined her as “a type of well-educated, middle-class woman who was openly critical of the traditional roles established for women, especially marriage and motherhood, and who was influenced by the feminist movement to speak out in favour of equal education for woman and equal purity for men and women.” While Grand may have coined the term and succinctly described the soon-to-be archetype, the idea of the New Woman had existed for at least a decade in works of fiction, art, and social commentary. The concept evolved alongside the development of New Journalism in the 1880s and 1890s, an era of transition widely viewed as “a manifestation of and symbol for a more general crisis . . . the period defined itself as marked by innovation in a range of cultural and social forms . . . but also simultaneously as dying, decadent.” In particular, the New Woman became a symbol of a perceived gender crisis, one that questioned the meaning of both femininity and masculinity.

The cultural definition of femininity stood in direct opposition to masculinity. For most of the nineteenth century, the social construction of *manliness* grew out of a middle-class doctrine of separate spheres based on sexual specialization. Woman’s sphere was private and domestic, while man’s was public and of the world. To be manly was to protect one’s family (as well as to take a paternalistic attitude toward the lower classes) and to provide for the family financially, which required hard work, self-restraint, and self-mastery. But this was based on a socio-economic system of small-scale capitalism that had begun to disappear by the late 1800s. Changes were underway, and middle-class white men began to feel insecure about their ability to
provide and to make their financial mark. Immigrants were not only having an impact on the economic system of the country, but in the political sphere as well, and policies were enacted to combat this perceived incursion. In addition, women were asking for the right to vote, to obtain education, and to work outside of the home. If “male power” meant the ability to “shape the future of the nation,” then what were men to do? While historians have debated the degree to which an actual gender crisis existed, one need only look to characterizations of the New Woman to understand the level of cultural anxiety during the period.

Several female novelists, including Grand, created female characters who questioned their identity within general society as well as within male-female relationships, particularly matrimony. Olive Schreiner’s *The Story of an African Farm* (1883) is widely recognized as the first New Woman novel. As this new genre developed, the experimental narratives featured female characters who were becoming emboldened by thoughts of empowerment, but who often suffered from the debilitating effects of modernism. A book reviewer of the day referred to the burgeoning archetype as “the woman of the feminist movement--the slight, pale ‘bachelor’ girl--the intellectualized, emancipated bundle of nerves that modern conditions were producing.” In an 1897 essay entitled “The Psychology of Feminism,” Hugh Stutfield appeared to sum up male attitudes toward these new female characters by identifying two schools of New Woman writing, referring to them as the “purity school” and the “neurotic school.” However inchoate, the New Woman of fiction questioned the limitations of femininity and often viewed her primary role, as keeper of well-ordered domesticity, as an empty existence. Marriage, sex, and motherhood formed a matrix of issues central to the concerns of the early New Woman novelists. They imagined their characters engaged in a feminist agenda, whether openly or just beneath the surface, placing them in situations in which they were conscious of progressive reforms.
Justification for emancipation was typically predicated on woman’s superior morality and what that could potentially mean to the public sphere.\textsuperscript{27} Plain and serious, the New Woman desired to move beyond the domestic realm and engage in paid professional work, education, and even politics. She strived for personhood, not womanhood.\textsuperscript{28}

There were those who dismissed the New Woman novelists and their characters as irrelevant, but Beetham maintains that, in actuality, the novels created an apprehension that somehow fiction would negatively affect the reality of everyday life. She says:

Conversely, woman writers like Sarah Grand turned to fiction because they believed reading was central both to the formation of individuals who identified themselves as ‘New Women’ and to the collective meanings of the term . . . writers like Grand came themselves to represent the New Woman for their readers, a shift made possible because the printed word was perceived as at the centre of the political struggle over gender relations.\textsuperscript{29}

Often the New Woman novelists were accused of misrepresenting reality and creating female characters that in no way illuminated the actual conditions of womanhood. Inevitably, the New Woman archetype made its way into essays, plays, poems, realist fiction, and social commentary, and the image permeated all levels of literary and artistic society.\textsuperscript{30} However, Kate Flint cautions that although the New Woman novels did not usher in an era in which sex, marriage, or female self-determination were openly discussed, even in the novels themselves, but they did provide a forum in which women could possibly identify with one another as members of a shared culture. Flint says:
Even if ‘New Woman’ novelists did not reward such efforts with fairy-tale happy endings, thus emphasizing the struggles ahead, these fictions served, potentially, as confirmation of the fact that independently-minded women readers were not without others who thought and felt along the same lines.\textsuperscript{31}

Grand was closely associated with the genre and addressed the “Woman Question” in two novels, the aforementioned \textit{The Heavenly Twins} and \textit{The Beth Book} (1897).\textsuperscript{32} And there were many others who contributed to the body of woman-centered fiction at the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{33} They portrayed the New Woman in a primarily positive light, describing her as a self-confident, independent female seeking social, economic, and political empowerment as well as moral enlightenment. And her exterior appearance was important from the beginning. She was most often depicted as a college-educated young woman who was sporty and slimmer than her mother, having thrown off the restrictive, voluminous garments of her Victorian foremothers. This, too, was seen as an affront to civilized society. Attire was important to the construction of gender, and women’s new freedom of movement was culturally coded as masculine, and therefore considered highly inappropriate dress for proper ladies. An essay from 1894 described the appearance of the prototypical New Woman:

\begin{quote}
She dresses simply in close-fitting garments, technically known as tailor-made. She wears her elbows well away from her side. It has been hinted that this habit serves to diminish the apparent size of the waist. This may be so. Men do not always understand such things. It certainly adds to a somewhat aggressive air of independence which finds its birth in the length of her stride . . . In
the evening simplicity again marks her dress. Always close-fitting
and wholly simple. Very little jewellery, and close-fitting hair . . .
Her hands are steady . . . her attitudes are strong and independent,
indicative of a self-reliant spirit.34

While this description is devoid of any overt hostility or negativity, attitudes toward the
New Woman were by no means homogenous, and she was the target of endless scrutiny, open to
multivalent readings regarding her significance in culture. Perhaps like no other signifier of the
times, the New Woman was the embodiment of myriad issues relating to modernity. As such,
other writers and commentators of the day were not as benevolent in their depictions as were the
New Woman authors.35 Many in the popular press (male and female) regularly placed the New
Woman within dubious gender constructs, describing her dress as mannish, eccentric, and vulgar,
and her behavior as impudent and improper. These women became the source of ridicule in
essays and were lampooned in social satire cartoons. The image of the New Woman was the butt
of the joke, often portrayed as “disgustingly masculine”—smoking cigarettes, riding bicycles,
eschewing corsets in favor of bloomers, appearing in public without chaperones, and working
outside the home. She was also portrayed as lonely, unfulfilled, and manless. Decidedly
unattractive to men, the New Woman threatened the feminine ideal.36

Sexuality was central to the image of the New Woman, as she appeared to forgo marriage
and children for opportunities to work outside the home, which was undeniably a masculine
prerogative. Criticism of professional working women was even harsher as they were often
depicted as “whores, bluestockings, or desiccated old maids.” In popular imagination, women’s
roles outside domesticity were limited to that of prostitutes or spinsters. Roberts, however,
views these negative portrayals as a “signal of success--of the New Woman’s ferocity, a measure
of her threat.”37 Similarly, Ann Ardis sees the backlash against the New Woman as evidence of her being a “straw man”--a figure used to draw attention away from any evocation of emancipation for women.38 The image of the New Woman could be controlled by mainstream culture, but the new woman of reality could not. As time would tell, the image was a fluid, yielding tool that could be commodified and used as a means of representation to serve the mainstream cultural imperative. On the other hand, women who were fighting for suffrage, reforms, and empowerment were a destabilizing element in society, not so easily restrained by powerful institutions, such as the press and advertising.

Not all conservative depictions of the New Woman were ugly and menacing, even though they could be just as detrimental to women’s pursuit of self-fulfillment and societal respect. Many artists of the day portrayed the New Woman as attractively complacent and malleable. The pen-and-ink artist, Charles Dana Gibson, published a folio of his work in 1894 that created an immediate sensation.39 His iconographic young woman became known as the “Gibson Girl,” and she contributed largely to the perception of how a New Woman should look, in both fashion and attitude, particularly as constructed by advertising (Fig. 1). By 1900, the Gibson Girl became the prototype for images of women in advertising, and other artists emulated her. Gibson-style females were sophisticated, elegant, and voluptuous, and appealing to both men and women.40 While the Gibson Girl was not intended to represent real new women and their political struggles, the image was so ubiquitous that the two became conflated, and the Gibson Girl became one of the most popular representations associated with the New Woman in the mind of the public.
Gibson’s drawings of fin-de-siècle American women were undoubtedly intended to generate male appreciation, and boldly he positioned women as active participants alongside men, outside the domestic sphere. Köhler claims that the Gibson Girl, regardless of which artist drew her, was depicted as being aware of her attractiveness to men, and she showed willingness to compromise--but she was also determined to make her mark on the world. This became the model for an entire generation of young American women who sought broader education and access to wider social and political opportunities. Popular magazines of the day regularly used Gibson’s drawings of athletic, free-spirited women within their pages or on the cover, and reformer Charlotte Perkins Gilman claimed that the outdoorsy Gibson Girl was “representative
of the process of female liberation from conventional social values.”43 However, even though the Gibson Girl often was shown outside the traditional bonds of household drudgery, she was nearly always the object of the male gaze (Figs. 2 and 3). Her physical charisma and presence within the public sphere, while alluring, was most often viewed as central to male anxiety—a sexually attractive object who posed a threat to male-dominated institutions. To control her image was to continue to disenfranchise her.

Fig. 2. The modern New Woman was depicted as sporty and outdoorsy.44

Fig. 3. New Woman attire was close fitting and body-conscious.45
Sally Ledger and Roger Luckhurst described the New Woman of 1900 as a “cultural phenomenon made possible by the burgeoning women’s movement of the Victorian years.” The Anglo-American model was a global icon, having been created by British New Woman novelists and adopted in America as a symbol of the strife of modern times. In France, she was known as la femme nouvelle, taking center stage in many French theatrical productions and challenging conventionality. And as an archetypal image, she was prevalent in all the great cities of Europe, from Vienna and Brussels to Munich and Heidelberg. As a central character, transformed by the times, the ubiquitous New Woman continued to be the vogue subject of many literary works throughout the first decades of the twentieth century. Both female and male novelists featured her, but Robbins claims that while most female writers used the archetype to explore political issues, primarily sexuality and gender roles, male writers tended to exploit the popular notion of the New Woman as an oft-amusing or emotionally tortured but fashionable character. Robbins says that eventually “the New Woman was co-opted into male-authored fiction as a vehicle for masculine fantasy rather than for feminine emancipation.” Magazines and advertisers played a significant role in transforming the once powerful, feared image of the New Woman that had arisen during the 1880s into a more mainstream, “civilized,” and controllable iconic female figure.

In *Disruptive Acts*, Mary Louise Roberts provides a useful means to distinguish the popular depictions of woman-as-image—the embodiment of societal values and uncertainties—versus references to real women who were engaged in social reforms. While both are variously described as “new women,” she distinguishes the former from the latter by capitalization, e.g., the cultural image is written as *New Woman*, while the political-sociological phenomenon it actually represented is *new woman*. This study will follow that same format for the sake of
clarification. The differentiation is noteworthy, as Roberts says that the mainstream press provided regular doses of drama that cleverly fused together real life and imagination, thereby effectively “blur[ring] the distinction between fantasy and reality, unloose imaginings, and facilitate[ing] a reader’s translation of fictions into probable life plots.” The real work that new women were engaged in, particularly progressive social reform and suffrage, became central to the musings of magazine editorial content and advertisers. And the significance of their political, economic, and social gains were interwoven into the narratives told by advertisers to sell their products, most often represented by the culturally constructed image of the New Woman.

A Confluence of Circumstances

The discursive dogma associated with the New Woman prescribed female cultural roles both within and just outside the boundaries of the domestic sphere. Messages that communicated the attainment of ideal womanhood were widely promoted within popular reading materials of the day, such as women’s service magazines. Magazine editors and product advertisers lauded this depiction of woman-as-she-should-be, while at the same time they viewed her with cultural apprehension and anxiety. Therefore, the societal tension resulting from women’s burgeoning sense of independence amidst dominant culture’s desire to maintain the status quo can be examined in these periodicals, both within the editorial content and in the increasingly prevalent advertising for consumer goods. Beetham claims that the primary project of women’s magazines was to subsume women’s identity within the domestic sphere and to guard against “deviant femininities” that evolved out of the labels new or modern. Both magazines and advertisements intended to influence women’s behavior, and perhaps most
importantly, her buying habits since *fin-de-siècle* middle-class American women had become
undeniably essential as a viable niche consumer group.

However, while advertisers and editors could influence women to buy new goods or try
recently developed technologies, they had to use those same persuasive arguments to affect male
attitudes. Purveyors of economic capital understood that, ultimately, women were a conduit
through which consumer products and ideas entered the domestic sphere. But this was achieved
only after they had successfully convinced male wage earners of the potential merits and
viability of those products. For men, at stake was not only the cost and novelty of new
household items, but more importantly perhaps, the concern that bringing the latest concepts and
technologies into the home would upset the delicate balance of domestic life. Thus, early
twentieth-century magazines and advertisements were not simply forms of idle entertainment
and trivial information, but rather they had power to manipulate acutely the way in which home-
life would be conducted and transformed.

Referring to women’s magazines past and present, noted scholar Mary Ellen Zuckerman
says, “Women’s journals operate on a continuum; at times they lead, at times reflect, at times lag
in their presentation of women’s lives. Always, they remain embedded in the consumer culture
that gave birth to them.”53 What follows in subsequent chapters is analysis of the editorial
content of *Good Housekeeping*, a culturally significant women’s magazine of the era. The study
is conducted by evaluating in tandem the advertisements from one of the most influential and
long-lasting consumer goods producers, the Campbell Soup Company. The project attempts to
discover, explicate, and evaluate how, together, both venues offered prescriptive measures for
the idealized modern American woman during the first two decades of the twentieth century.
Central to the concerns of magazines and advertisements was how the image of the New Woman
could be controlled in order to sell products and influence women’s social, economic, and political forays outside the domestic sphere. Not an easy task, as real women were experiencing a rapid cultural transformation along with the rest of the nation. As a result, during the span of this study, the primary image of the modern American New Woman evolved from mother to militant to martyr.

The drastic transformation of representations of women arose from a confluence of circumstances, ranging from the political environment to the progressive reforms movement to advancements in technology in all aspects of society. The New Woman, Campbell’s Soup, and Good Housekeeping, while seemingly disparate and unrelated entities, all emerged during this era. The earliest incarnation of the Campbell Soup Company came to be in 1869, and Good Housekeeping began publication in 1885. Both corporate institutions are still in existence today (2006), and are noteworthy not only for their remarkable longevity, but for the constancy and consistency of their messages to female consumers. From the earliest years, they specifically targeted women as a means to secure the domestic sphere in the economic sense, and thus, influence the ideology of American society as it pertained to family life. This goal is reflected in their marketing strategies for more than one hundred years. Over time, both entities came to signify much more than just the consumer products and editorial content they overtly promoted. For example, early on Good Housekeeping entered the realm of consumer policy and politics, and to this day, its Seal of Approval denotes product efficacy and consumer protection. As for Campbell Soup, the company’s ubiquitous advertising and merchandising has become as much a part of American culture as the food it sells.

Cultural texts, such as advertisements and magazine content, communicate information about the society that created them within the context of the historical moment in which they
were produced. Texts, visual and verbal, are constructed within a social context, and as such, they provide insight into the underlying attitudes, ideas, beliefs, values, and politics embedded within a society’s dominant ideology, as well as looming changes or resistance to it. This perspective presumes that discursive practices, as conveyed through cultural texts, influence and organize society on both social and political levels through distributions of power and privilege.  

During the early decades of the new century, women’s primary identities--as mothers, wives, and consumers--transformed greatly, mirroring changes in society. While there were various omnipresent images that embodied a range of discourses and practices regarding gender roles, the one that was most often associated with the evolving nature of woman was the modern New Woman. As mentioned before, by the turn of the century, the New Woman had become a ubiquitous figure that could be found in myriad discursive texts, visual and written, and interpreted in countless ways within a maelstrom of social change. This study deals primarily with the cultural imaginings of the *New Woman* in advertising culture, rather than the actual sociological phenomenon identified as *new women*. Based on that theoretical foundation, it provides an historical and cultural mapping of women’s domestic lives between the years of 1905 and 1920 as prescribed within the pages of *Good Housekeeping*, in conjunction with the Campbell’s Soup advertising placed in the magazine. Both contributed to the ideological trope that reified woman-as-chief-consumer as a seemingly powerful role, but tempered by the fact that she was nearly always beholden to the purchasing power of her wage-earning husband.

The following analysis of the intertextual triad of advertising, magazines, and consumer ideology relies on both descriptive and prescriptive approaches. Howells succinctly explains the distinction between the two approaches:
In the former case, an ideological approach to the study of visual culture seeks to reveal the social and political ideas and assumptions rather than to evaluate. A prescriptive approach, on the other hand, does involve judgement of the ideas revealed within a text.  

This project identifies Campbell’s Soup advertisements (and the primary product they promote, condensed soup) as cultural artifacts, or discursive texts, open to diverse multivocal meanings. It then seeks to analyze the ads within the context of Good Housekeeping’s editorial content and the culture in which they were produced, in order to analyze women’s changing roles and responsibilities during the first part of the twentieth century. In addition, it also provides insight into evolving eating and dining habits, changing priorities of family life, as well as growing concerns about nutritional health and safety, and the resulting policies and behaviors that addressed those issues.

As historical documents, the resources analyzed herein provide opportunity to deconstruct how mass consumer society sought to define the ideal modern American woman as prescribed by the prevailing domestic ideology of the day. Was she the idealized modern New Woman as co-opted by mainstream magazines and advertisements? Or did dominant culture actually fear that the New Woman would, with her broad range of aspirations, perhaps not so ideally reorient the boundaries of traditional domestic life, forever changing its structure and societal influence? Did ladies’ magazines and the advertisements they contained actually create a “cult of new womanhood” in order to subsume women’s new identities outside the domestic sphere? How did Campbell’s Soup ads, from the moment they were first placed in women’s magazines (1905), reflect, reinforce, or reject notions of this “cult of new womanhood”--the
modern woman of the early twentieth century, as she was ideally constructed within the pages of *Good Housekeeping*?

**A Word about Primary Sources**

As mentioned above, the examination of Campbell’s Soup advertisements in *Good Housekeeping* between the years 1905 and 1920 as related to the editorial content and the evolving image of the New Woman represent the foundation of this study. The majority of the research was conducted by analyzing those primary source materials, but at this point, it is necessary to explain the challenges that presented.

Researchers who rely on archival materials as resources for their work undoubtedly understand that often it is not a perfect world we discover. Frequently what is listed in resource catalogs does not accurately represent what is actually in a collection, and perhaps more frustrating at times is the inaccurate or incomplete information we receive when inquiring. While I encountered many knowledgeable, helpful reference librarians in my pursuit of materials for this study, ultimately the best information was garnered by actually visiting several collections firsthand. In addition, as I conducted my search for original issues of *Good Housekeeping* and the Campbell’s Soup ads they contained, I learned a great deal about changing preferences regarding research subject matter.

Although many scholars today find value in the contents of old, popular magazines and advertisements, it is apparent that this truly is a relatively recent phenomenon. While there are several nearly complete collections of *Good Housekeeping* available in Ohio and Michigan, almost all of those found in academic and public libraries were bound in volumes minus their
front and back covers, as well as the advertising section that was originally located in the back of every issue.

The practice of including all advertisements in a special section separate from the editorial content is unique to *Good Housekeeping* during the period of this study. At a time when other popular periodicals, such as *Ladies’ Home Journal* and the *Saturday Evening Post*, were already integrating the ads throughout the editorial pages, *Good Housekeeping* did not begin this practice until the middle of 1916. They did accept advertising before that time, but until 1915, the only ad that appeared near editorial content was placed inside the front cover. (By way of clarification, in 1915 there were a few ads placed amongst the editorial pages, but the majority were still located in the back advertising section.)

Some of the *Good Housekeeping* subscriptions that went to public and academic libraries eventually were bound into volumes. Binderies, in an effort to conserve space economically, more often than not, removed both the front and back covers and the special advertising section before binding the issues into volumes. It is apparent that when this was done, the editorial content was thought to be of primary importance, but the artwork on the covers (often featuring illustrations by famous artists) and certainly the product ads inside were considered throwaway materials. This presents quite a challenge for researchers today who find cultural and historical significance in those very items.

But how times have changed! With the recent boom in collections of nearly everything associated with popular culture, both the ads and covers of vintage women’s service magazines, including *Good Housekeeping*, have become hot commodities. A researcher may be delighted to begin working with a 1916 *Good Housekeeping* issue, replete with integrated ads, only to find that some unscrupulous collector or dealer has stolen some of the ads or the cover, to be framed
as art or sold as vintage collectibles. So while the editorial content of early twentieth century *Good Housekeeping* is relatively easy to locate in intact condition, tracking down the Campbell’s Soup ads was a much more difficult task.

Several nearby libraries carry *Good Housekeeping* from its earliest issue (May 1885), and I found them quite useful, even though most of the issues through 1915 are minus their covers and advertising section. The University of Michigan’s collection is located in the Buhr Storage Facility, and the staff there was helpful in providing me with access to view the volumes. The Toledo-Lucas County Public Library also has a full run, but they too are in a storage facility (temporarily) without public access, so special arrangements had to be made to view a portion of the collection. (Eventually, the entire run will be available on the general access shelves.) I owe gratitude to Joanne Loolen in the Director’s Office for granting access and making special arrangements for me to view a portion of the collection in the main library.

Perhaps the most easily accessed and nearly complete collection of *Good Housekeeping* can be found at Oberlin College. Located in their periodicals department, these volumes are unique because in addition to issues from the late 1880s through the years of this study and beyond, for the most part, they were bound with their front and back covers intact. (Note that some covers are missing, undoubtedly scavenged over time by unprincipled collectors and dealers.) However, they were not bound with the special advertising section. Even, so, Oberlin College was integral in supplementing any lack of specific issues in the other archival depositories.

So while the editorial content of *Good Housekeeping* is relatively easy to locate, its early ads are not. Having challenged myself to locate as many Campbell’s Soups ads from *Good Housekeeping* as possible, I eventually managed to find a good majority of them from various
sources. In particular, there are two people instrumental to my success that I need to thank. Beth Bartle, Archivist at the Campbell Soup Company World Headquarters in Camden, New Jersey was kind enough to speak with me about their collection and to try to locate the ads I needed. But in the early years, the corporation did not keep records of which ads went into which magazines, probably because from 1905 onward they advertised in a plethora of consumer magazines every month. Most likely, their emphasis was on tracking the effectiveness of those advertisements, rather than recording the placement of each ad. However, Ms. Bartle did send me perhaps the most coveted advertisement I have received to date, an elusive Campbell’s Soup ad that was placed in *Good Housekeeping* in 1905, the very first year the soup company began placing them in consumer magazines. For that, I am quite grateful.

But Good Housekeeping’s Susanne Williams, Director of Consumer & Reader Services, sent the vast majority of early Campbell’s Soup advertisements to me. *Good Housekeeping* has an extensive corporate archive located at its headquarters in New York City, but unfortunately, it is closed to outside researchers. Without a staff or time to spare, Ms. Williams personally went through ten years of back issues of the magazine (12 issues per year) and copied every available Campbell’s Soup ad for me. The bulk of my ad resources during that ten-year time-period came from Susanne Williams and *Good Housekeeping*, and I cannot thank her enough. In addition, *Good Housekeeping*’s esteemed editor-in-chief, Ellen Levine, sent me a gratis copy of Aric Chen’s book, *Campbell Kids: A Souper Century* (2004). The people at *Good Housekeeping* went well beyond any expectations of help, and I am deeply appreciative.

As for the Campbell’s Soup advertisements that continue to elude me, there are other somewhat less reliable sources available. The popular online auction site eBay is a vault for nearly everything under the sun, and I have managed to purchase a few individual ads from that
source. However, it is not without drawbacks because the earliest ads in *Good Housekeeping* did not include the name of the publication anywhere on the page. So it is usually impossible to verify that an early ad did indeed come from *Good Housekeeping*, and it is equally difficult to know in which year and issue it appeared. However, later ads were better marked, so they are valuable when found.

Nirvana to a researcher of this type of material is finding an intact issue of *Good Housekeeping* earlier than September 1916. If it is truly intact, it will include all of the editorial content, as well as the front and back covers (which contain inside ads) and the special advertising section in the back of the magazine. In general, intact periodicals prior to 1920 are difficult to find and usually the cost is prohibitive if you are looking for more than just a few. Infrequently a library will have some unbound, complete issues from that era. For example, the College of Wooster has a smattering of intact *Good Housekeeping* issues from 1906 and 1907 that are available to researchers, but they have strict guidelines about usage, more specifically, no photocopying is allowed.

In addition, *Good Housekeeping* underwent several significant changes from 1885 when it was first published through the final year of this study, 1920, which also have an impact on research today. When viewing an online record for *Good Housekeeping*, researchers will note that often it will be broken into two or three separate records. There is a legitimate reason for that, primarily a result of a subtle name change. From 1885 to 1909, the magazine was entitled *Good Housekeeping*. But between the years of 1909 and 1916, it was officially called *Good Housekeeping Magazine*. This picayune detail undoubtedly to the average person, but researchers of this archival material will find that it is treated as two separate records, as if they
are separate publications. (In 1916 the name reverted back to *Good Housekeeping*, and sometimes this results in a third record.)

Sometimes the change in publishers is reflected in library records in a confusing manner. Here is an attempt at simple clarification of that issue. *Good Housekeeping* was first published in May 1885 by Clark W. Bryan & Company in Holyoke, Massachusetts, and soon after it moved to Springfield, Massachusetts. John Pettigrew took over for a short time in 1898, followed by George D. Chamberlain from 1898 through 1900 (all in Springfield). Then in 1900, the Phelps Publishing Company of Springfield began publishing the magazine. Researchers who do hands-on analysis of the publication will notice that there is a significant change in appearance (an upgraded, more modern look) in the June 1911 issue. This is a result of yet another new publisher, American Home Magazine Company, aka Hearst, which bought the magazine from Phelps and moved the operation to New York City. (In May 1914, the publisher name became the “International Magazine Company,” which was also a Hearst property). The Hearst Corporation continues to publish the magazine today.

While the stylistic changes made in the magazine do not impact library records, future researchers may want to be aware of them since they do affect what is contained within the actual issues, bound or unbound. As mentioned above, the first advertisements placed within editorial content appeared in 1915. But ads within the editorial content were rare, and the special advertising section continued to be the primary source of consumer goods marketing. (All Campbell’s Soup ads were located in the special advertising section in the back.) However, in September 1916 the magazine underwent its most significant stylistic change by evolving out of its small folio-size format to a much larger, more visually substantial size, in keeping with other publications of the day. It was also at this time that advertisements were placed throughout the
editorial content, much as they are today. As such, after 1916 entire issues were bound in volumes including their covers (unless they have been scavenged), plus the entire editorial content and advertisements.

**Study Theory and Methodology**

We don’t so much write *the* meaning of a period as a history of some possible meanings; we study what was able to emerge within, and against, what seems at first glance at least, to be a dominant field of social perception.

Dana Polan, *Power and Paranoia*

This study is a qualitative historical analysis of the discursive practices intended to inform and mobilize American women during the early years of the twentieth century, and of the strategies used by one of the leading women’s journals, *Good Housekeeping*, in conjunction with a predominant product manufacturer and advertiser of the day, Campbell’s Soup. Both venues consistently prescribed idealized behaviors and attitudes meant to be practiced by women seeking social and cultural acceptance and, to some extent, political power. More specifically, when referring to the constructed “ideal” image of woman, early mainstream magazines and advertisers were typically only speaking to the middle-class white woman who had the economic means and access to become market consumers. These women were portrayed as the re-feminized New Woman. And the spirit of the new century and modernism--technologies, products, and ideas--became embodied in her freshly created image, as she transformed from the much-derided target of conservative ire in the 1880s and 1890s to become the darling of editors and advertisers alike in the early decades of the 1900s.
Various methodologies can be employed to decode and interpret cultural artifacts. Four previous works, in particular, inform the way in which this study is conducted. In *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials* (2001), Gillian Rose maps out several viable methodologies such as content analysis, semiology, psychoanalysis, and others. I have chosen to focus on a critical visual and textual methodology that relies on discourse analysis as its primary mode of evaluation. According to Rose, the critical method is an approach “that thinks about the visual in terms of the cultural significance, social practices and power relations in which it is embedded; and that means thinking about power relations that produce, are articulated through, and can be challenged by, ways of seeing and imaging.”\(^{57}\) In doing so, it is necessary to explore issues of cultural meaning as they relate to power, privilege, and ideology within historical context.

Whether it is popular images of the sophisticated New Woman or the ubiquitous beloved Campbell Soup Kids, visual imagery always is constructed with great intent through various “practices, technologies, and knowledges.”\(^{58}\) As such, Rose offers several points that inform the analysis of both visual images and texts. She says: “1) an image may have its own visual effects; 2) these effects, through the *ways of seeing* mobilized by the image, are crucial in the production and reproduction of visions of *social difference*; 3) but these effects always intersect with the *social context of its viewing* and the *visualities its spectators bring* to their viewing.”\(^{59}\)

For example, visual images often work in tandem with written text to create sites of conflicting resistance and acquiescence, and these sites often lead to the construction of social difference. Whether implicitly or explicitly, social categories are created that include some groups while excluding others. That factor is pervasive throughout this study as both *Good Housekeeping* and Campbell’s Soup, following early twentieth century dominant ideology,
excluded women of color from their intended target group, as well as poor and working-class white women, because they were not perceived to be viable conduits to economic power and capitalistic enterprise. Even white unmarried women or middle-aged women (or older) typically were disqualified from the primary discourse of the editorial content and advertisements. This is highly apparent in descriptions of the modern New Woman, as well as visual depictions of her. Thus, when dealing with archival artifacts, in order to unpack their cultural significance, it is highly necessary to examine them within historical context and attempt to understand the social conditions that led to their creation.

In addition to what is anticipated by the creator of the visual communication, it is important to analyze how the message might be understood and acted upon by various groups of spectators--in this case, female readers and consumers. The study of visual culture encompasses a broad range of meaningful practices that become embedded within the larger framework of culture on whole. Judith Williamson’s seminal treatise *Decoding Advertisements: Ideology and Meaning in Advertising* (1978) primarily relies on a semiotic, psychoanalytical approach, but for this study it provides foundational understanding of how advertising intersects with ideology. Williamson says that advertisements give the appearance of offering the spectator, or consumer, free will to choose. The ad itself assumes a certain spectator position or point-of-view into which the consumer situates herself. This in turn gives the impression that spectators freely choose their own social positioning and identity through consumption, when in fact it has already been determined by the prevailing ideology of the institution that created it. As a result, advertisements do not so much produce consumption as they produce the consumer’s subject identity, which, in turn, influences buying habits that reinforce specific social positions.
Katherine Toland Frith provides an interdisciplinary approach to decoding American advertisements that includes elements of several theoretical positions, including literary theory, feminism, postmodernism, Marxism, semiotics, and cultural studies. In *Undressing the Ad: Reading Culture in Advertising* (1997), she says:

Advertisements sanctify, signify, mythologize, and fantasize.

They uphold some of the existing economic and political structures and subvert others. Not only does advertising shape Americans; it shapes Americans’ images of themselves. It is only through learning to critically deconstruct the codes of advertising that we can begin to learn the limits of these codes.

By embedding cultural value within an ad, advertisers and goods manufacturers effectively succeed in “marrying aspects of the product to aspects of the culture.” Thus, spectators or consumers of advertising who embrace the messages conveyed create various subject positionings based on consumption habits, and these identities inevitably shift over time, taking on new cultural responsibilities, as this study contends in subsequent chapters.

According to Frith, ultimately the goal of this type of analysis is to perform an oppositional reading that seeks to “expose the social and political power structures in society that combine to produce the text.” Her approach is decidedly useful in deconstructing ads to uncover three levels of messages to which consumers are subjected, which she calls the foreground and background of an advertisement. The three layers include an ad’s explicit meaning (or surface meaning), which is the overall impression projected to a viewer; its implied meaning (or the advertiser’s intended meaning), which is the sales strategy; and its unintentional
meanings (or the cultural, ideological meaning), which influence the deep-rooted beliefs of consumers and are often viewed as natural rather than constructed.\textsuperscript{65}

While Frith and Williamson deal specifically with advertisements as discrete vehicles, Ellen McCracken takes a more holistic approach to the analysis of advertisements within the context (and content) of magazines, which is also the primary goal of this project. In her study of women’s magazines in the 1980s, McCracken calls for critical textual analysis that relies on the foundational work of Fredric Jameson and Roland Barthes in mass culture to explore both elite and popular texts as part of a continuum within capitalist society. In particular, Barthes’ semiotic method provides means to examine the interrelatedness of written, verbal, and visual text as communicative systems.\textsuperscript{66} Regarding the cultural connection between high-and lowbrow texts, McCracken claims:

These broader definitions are especially necessary in an age when technological advances and increased opportunities for financial gain through the production of commodified culture have greatly widened the scope and audience of mass culture. Critical techniques refined through years of literary analysis offer models for decoding the familiar, naturalized texts of mass culture.\textsuperscript{67}

McCracken’s work serves to remind that women are not passive consumers of the discursive practices they encounter in the pages of magazines. But, neither are the texts passive as they present month-after-month an “authoritative grand narrative of reality . . . [that] appears to be a women-centered articulation of the world. Rendering thousands of aspects of everyday life as knowable, controllable entities, women’s magazines suggest, much as nineteenth-century realist
narrative did, that an apparently comprehensive and straightforward detailing of the everyday can capture reality discursively for readers.68

In addition to the theoretical foundations of decoding advertisements provided by Frith, McCracken, and Williamson, Rose’s fundamental approach to discourse analysis is essential. She divides this methodology into two types, although she explains that they are not entirely distinct from one another. Drawing upon the work of Foucault and Rosalind Gill, the first form of discursive evaluation uses the term “discourse” to refer to all forms of talk and texts, and it is most concerned with discursive formation and its productivity.69 The second form is more concerned with “the practices of institutions than [with] visual images and verbal texts . . . [and is more concerned with] regimes of truth, institutions and technologies.”70 While this project concentrates primarily on the first methodology, when relevant it also incorporates information about the institutions that promulgated certain ideologies influencing the textual artifacts.

For example, if the study had been devised using the latter methodology, it would be more concerned with larger institutional issues and business practices, such as how Campbell’s Soup advertising was produced: which advertising agencies were used; who the copywriters and illustrators were; how much ad space cost; who placed the ads; what its market strategies were; how it dealt with competition, etc. It would also explore similar issues with regards to Good Housekeeping by examining the types of work produced by various editors, columnists, poetry and fiction writers, reporters, artists, as well as information about circulation and subscribers. While occasionally some of those elements are mentioned throughout the study, they are only done within the relevant context of evaluating the conveyances of the advertisements and the editorial content as they directed women to view the world through a certain ideological lens. By extension, Rose’s first method of discourse analysis can be used to unpack the ways in which
advertising and magazine articles intended to impact early twentieth-century women’s thoughts about themselves personally, their societal roles, and their place within the nation as a whole. Relying on the first methodology with support from the second provides a means to evaluate in tandem the visual images and rhetoric contained in both venues and how they either reinforced or subverted dominant ideology.

But what is meant by the term discourse? Rose describes discourse as “groups of statements which structure the way a thing is thought, and the way we act on the basis of that thinking. In other words, discourse is a particular knowledge about the world which shapes how the world is understood and how things are done in it.” For example, many of the common marketing words used in early ads to describe products, including Campbell’s Soup, actually referred to desirable conditions of modernity--time saving, efficiency, cost effectiveness, etc. Consumers who chose to use those products were also choosing to associate themselves, personally, with those positive qualities. Therefore, a woman who chose to purchase and bring into her family domain an efficient product was herself, efficient (and modern)--desirable adjectives often associated with the New Woman. Literary theorist Terry Eagleton draws the connection between discourse and ideology, describing it as “the unending ‘dialogue’ of human history is as often as not a monologue by the powerful to the powerless . . . discourse is always caught up with a power which may be by no means benign; and the discourse in which it most signally fails to recognize this on its own.”

In addition to the unequal power relations often generated in discursive practices, visual culture plays a significant role as well, making the consumer see things a certain way, while other things purposefully remain unseeable. Discovering what is not shown is sometimes just as important as decoding what is shown. Culture critic, John Berger, believes that images
provide insight into history even more than verbal texts, but visual evidence of the past is often mystified by analysts who “obscure [it] in order to justify the politics of the present.”\textsuperscript{74} We implicitly participate in this by attaching a selective understanding of reality to the images we view. Thus, even if the image appears to be female-centered, in patriarchal society the implied spectator and consumer of cultural images is male, thus the perpetuation of an androcentric view of reality and the reinforcement of cultural stereotypes.\textsuperscript{75} In this cultural perspective, men are the surveyors and women are the surveyed. This sets up a dialectic in which woman is twice surveyed—externally by men and internally by herself, which in turn creates her own self-perception.\textsuperscript{76} In \textit{Good Housekeeping’s} editorial pages and Campbell Soup advertisements during the era covered by this project, the unspoken and unseen illuminate an ideology that, on the surface, perceived women as a great homogenous monolith. In actuality, it was based on great social stratification that eliminated many women (non-white, poor, working class, and aging) from economic access and empowerment.

This way of perpetuating social practices and beliefs through discourse also relies on intertextuality, which refers to “the way that the meanings of any one discursive image or text depend not only on that one text or image, but also on the meanings carried by other images and texts.”\textsuperscript{77} When used analytically, intertextuality provides a means to question the underlying assumptions presented in cultural texts (such as the advertisements and magazine content in this study). New meanings are generated by juxtaposing myriad fragments of past texts that, in their reconstituted, embedded form, produce new textual bodies that give the consumer a feeling that is often vaguely recognizable at the subconscious level, and therefore, comfortable. Intertextuality is yet another way that ideological messages remain concealed in mass culture texts and become sites open to a multitude of interpretations.
If we parse an advertisement and examine other texts, past or present, from which it draws its discursive message, the leap from “eaters of soup” to “patriotic heroines” can be made, as intertextuality often relies on the spectator’s nostalgic, emotional memory of other texts. As this study will attempt to show, this had significant impact on how women were addressed in the ads and how the editorial content positioned them socially. During a span of nearly twenty years when the ideological winds blew wildly in all directions, woman-as-consumer transformed from housekeeper-mother to suffragist-politico to patriot-and-saver-of-the-nation in the multitudinous discourses of the day. And this was most often embodied in the idealized, but anxiety-producing, images of the New Woman.

Discourse also includes notions of power and privilege, a theoretical argument introduced primarily by Foucault who says that discourse produces human subjects and disciplines them into behaving in ways that serve a particular ideology. But it is important to understand that power, as Foucault situates it, is not only imposed from upper echelons of society, but rather exists everywhere at all levels and is positioned accordingly. By examining predominant discourses within a given timeframe, it becomes possible to view how visual images and texts create a specific point-of-view that is either accepted or rejected by spectators, who are, in this study, middle-class white female consumers of childbearing age.

Central to the construction of power is knowledge. We see this clearly in ads for consumer products that attempt to educate women by giving them carefully derived information that promises to empower them as consumers (or so the ads claim). Foucault would see this as a form of disciplinary conditioning that in the end serves powerful institutions, not individual subjects. According to Foucault, knowledge and power are inextricably bound because “all knowledge is discursive and all discourse is saturated with power, [and] because the most
powerful discourses, in terms of productiveness of their social effects, depend on assumptions and claims that their knowledge is true."80 Throughout the period covered in this study, the search for absolute Truth is prevalent in the editorial content of Good Housekeeping, in the stated business mandates of the Good Housekeeping organization, and within most of the advertisements found in the magazine, including those placed by Campbell’s Soup. Truth, whether in advertising claims or efforts to regulate the purity of manufactured foodstuff, was an important watchword in the discourse of modernism that signified Progress.

There are several other terms used throughout the study that should be explained here. In particular, the complex, multi-layered meaning of “culture” as it is referred to herein needs to be examined. Rose speaks of the “cultural turn,” referring to the changing attitude of social scientists (and cultural historians, as well) that has taken place during the last several decades. This cultural turn, or shift, “has become a crucial means by which many social scientists understand social processes, social identities, and social change and conflict.”81 Society creates complex systems of meaning that are conveyed through a multiplicity of cultural practices, such as the magazine article directives and advertising messages examined in subsequent chapters.

Drawing on the work of Stuart Hall, the term culture has come to represent the practices of social life and living as constructed by sets of processes, whether explicitly or implicitly enacted.82 According to Hall:

Culture, it is argued, is not so much a set of things--novels and paintings or TV programmes or comics--as a process, a set of practices. Primarily, culture is concerned with the production and exchange of meanings--the ‘giving and taking of meaning’--between the members of a society or group . . . Thus culture
depends on its participants interpreting meaningfully what is around them, and ‘making sense’ of the world, in broadly similar ways.\textsuperscript{83}

Increasingly in postmodern society, the visual has become an integral means of conveyance of cultural narratives, open to many interpretations. Rose claims that the predominance of visual images and their associated societal messages came to the forefront during, or perhaps as a result of modernity, a condition she refers to as ocularcentrism.\textsuperscript{84}

However, visual imagery as a form of communication is not limited to its production via technologies or aesthetic interpretation. Donna Haraway reminds us that the visual is never innocent as it often signifies power relations that create hierarchies of social difference. These constructed differences of gender, class, race, gender, sexuality, etc., are refined so that the visual condition appears to be “normal” and universal.\textsuperscript{85} It is imperative, then, to analyze how both visual and written texts are created by institutions (mass circulation consumer magazines and product advertisers) to promote various ideologies intended to order the world in a way that is advantageous to those very institutions.

Culture critics and historians believe that discourse conveys complex ideological notions about the world. Ideology is typically expressed unconsciously or subtly by being disguised either implicitly or explicitly through discourse. Discursive texts whether verbal, visual, or both, can become battlegrounds for competing and sometimes contradictory positions, either upholding or challenging dominant ideologies. Cultural products, then, convey ideas about how the world is or how it should be perceived, as
well as how social groups should see each other in it. Often ideology does not take the form of direct statements or reflections on culture, but rather it lies in the narrative structure of the discursive texts employed. Throughout this project, the questions are asked: *what story is being told, by whom, and for what purpose? What cultural work was being done by Good Housekeeping and Campbell Soup during the period of this study?*

But how does ideology operate in culture? Marx and Mannheim first introduced the concept in the early nineteenth century to explain how dominant mainstream culture regulates society by imposing specific beliefs, ideals, and perspectives on it that maintain the status quo. These are upheld in ways that seem normal and natural to the majority. Thus, they are unconsciously accepted within culture, resulting in the production of social behaviors such as bigotry and class inequality. Marx viewed this as a means to distort reality in order to control the most fundamental operations of society. Terry Eagleton's definition of ideology describes it as “the ways in which what we say and believe connects with the power-structure and power-relations of the society we live in. . . those modes of feeling, valuing, perceiving and believing which have some kind of relation to the maintenance and reproduction of social power.”

Hall says ideology is a “struggle for discursive power in which communicators try to establish preferred meanings in texts and ‘common-sense’ views of reality.” Film scholar Graeme Turner also describes ideology as being unconscious, and refers to perhaps the most predominant visual texts today, movies. As with advertising, film texts are “a kind of battleground for competing and often contradictory positions. The ideology of films does not take the form of direct statements or reflections on culture. It lies in the narrative structure and in the discourses employed--the images, myths, conventions, and visual styles.” The same can be said for the impact of other visual texts, such as magazine illustrations, advertising images,
and perhaps even the images conjured up by the words of editors. They presented women with myriad ideas regarding issues such as family, gender, sexuality, race, etc., most often from a perspective that privileged their representative institutions with economic and social power. In turn, consumers of these ideas and products were bestowed with a perceived sense of cultural capital, whether it was political, economic, educational, or social.

Ideology is a powerful mechanism because the individual in society perceives herself as a fully integrated member operating with free will, thus becoming subject to the seemingly natural dominant ideology and the institutions or groups that control it. In this project, the ads and editorial content are constructed in ways that make the acceptance of the message seem completely natural. What woman doesn’t want to make life easier for herself and for her family? Who doesn’t want to become more informed and, as a result, live a better lifestyle? In the discourse of early twentieth-century magazines and advertisements, woman became reified as chief consumer, a role that was applauded for its contributions to the country’s economic well-being and the improved health and happiness of husbands and children. At the same time, this new female identity, often depicted as the New Woman, was derided as passive, even engaging in forbidden pleasurable activities (such as shopping) that could lead to the softening of morals if women did not remain vigilant. But in the oft-competing discursive tropes found in magazines and advertisements of the era, the dominant ideology of modernism and mass consumerism metaphorically represented the path to moral enlightenment, political power, and economic success for white middle-class women, their families, and by extension, America, herself.
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CHAPTER II.
CAMPBELL’S SOUP TAKES CENTER STAGE

When the United States received an invitation to participate at the *Exposition Universelle et Internationale de Paris* in 1900, it responded affirmatively to the summons as though challenged to prove the nation’s vitality to all citizens of the world. “It was recognized by every intelligent man of affairs that the time had fully come when the United States of North America should assume its proper place in all the international assemblings of the nations of the world.”1 The Exposition encouraged nation-states and their colonies to flaunt industrial strength, artistry, and trade prowess. Essentially, it presented the opportunity to compete for status of most civilized in the areas of art, architecture, science, agriculture, medicine, commerce, education, and social concerns, as well as methods of conducting war or preserving peace.2 It was also an important venue for turn-of-the-century businesses and firms to stake their claim on the world stage, and for leaders of the modern age to make their names known.

The Paris Exposition of 1900 was considered the greatest world’s fair to date, measured by sheer physical size, number of exhibits, attendance, and cost. It featured the most technologically sophisticated inventions, as well as the most *avant-garde* artistic endeavors. More than fifty million people visited and were mesmerized, in particular, by two astonishing highlights, both making their debut at the Exposition: the *trottoir roulant*, a moving sidewalk, and the *palais de l’électricité*, a pavilion dedicated to demonstrating the various uses of electricity.3 The daily scene on the *trottoir roulant* was described by the esteemed British periodical, *The Art Journal*:
The Moving Pavement has been the mirth-giver of the Exhibition, and looked at from that point of view only, would have fully justified its inclusion there. It has exercised a marvelous attraction over all classes and all nations, and a most interesting sight it has been to watch the crowds using this novel mode of locomotion. Rich and poor, young and old, Parisians and provincials, Americans and Orientals, Arabs and Esquimaux jostling, walking, falling, laughing, all in the best of humours, it has been a sight to refresh one indescribably after the serious business of sightseeing in the Exhibition.4

When not partaking of merriment created by the novel trottoir roulant, attendees would participate in pursuits that were more serious. They lined up by the thousands to view the myriad exhibits proudly displayed by the nations of the world in their individual ephemeral palaces. It was an opportunity to become enlightened by the dawning of a new age of science and technology. The United States erected a pavilion on the Quai des Nations between the Turkish and Austrian buildings. An American eagle statue with outstretched wings crowned the dome of the edifice, and its great frontal arch was flanked by an allegorical figure representing the Goddess of Liberty riding triumphantly on the Car of Progress. A statue of an equestrian George Washington occupied the entrance of the grand palace, designed in the style of the Capitol Building. The massive structure was 9,935 square feet in area (nearly eight acres) and stood 167.5 feet high, “in a style worthy of the dignity and position of the nation which it represents.”5 More than 7,000 individual American exhibitors were present, showing off everything from huge steel buildings and telescopes to bicycles and automobiles.
However, America’s presence at the Exposition was not solely about positioning itself among the other dominant modern nations of the world, but rather it wanted to reassert national self-identity, one hundred and twenty four years after declaring independence from Great Britain. What was really at stake in Paris for the United States was a testament of what it meant to be American at the turn of the twentieth century, based in large part on both individual and commercial accomplishments. The official catalog of U.S. exhibitors (1900) stated: “The American citizen is himself the most notable element in this retrospective exhibition.”

Technological progress was the great watchword as the inhabitants of the world caught glimpse of what the twentieth century had in store for them. Visitors from all parts of the globe marveled at the products of modernity displayed in vast palatial hallways. Amidst the thousands of exhibits featuring the latest in fin-de-siècle technology and artistic endeavor was a commercial item that undoubtedly generated curious reactions from patrons—a small tin can with a brilliantly colored label that purportedly contained ready-to-eat soup, so condensed it could feed a family of six just by adding water. Regardless of its meager outward appearance, Campbell’s Soup proclaimed it was the answer to every busy homemaker’s need for efficiency and ready-made nutrition. Although not as amusing as the trottoir roulant, or as life changing as the technology promised within the palais de l’électricité, condensed soup was nonetheless an important invention that had the potential to reorient the dining habits of people around the world.

While Campbell’s condensed soup was certainly one of the more humble upstarts at the 1900 Paris Exposition Universelle, it did not go unnoticed by the awards committee. Dr. John T. Dorrance, a chemist who had invented the formula for condensed soup just three years earlier, was so confident in the quality of his product that he entered the competition. Campbell Soup was awarded the coveted Gold Medallion for Excellence, winning over their two primary
competitors in the canned soup market, Franco-American Food Company and James H. W. Huckins & Company.\textsuperscript{9} This was no small success. Calling the competitions at the Exposition “bloodless battles for prestige,” Mandrell explains the significance of the achievement:

> The awards (or lack of them) could make or break an artist, craftsman, or inventor who offered his unique skill for judgement by the international juries. The expositions launched or ended careers, made or destroyed fortunes, and established or weakened the reputations of great firms.\textsuperscript{10}

Eventually, the company placed a replica icon of the gold medal center stage on its red-and-white labels where it stayed for nearly one hundred years (Fig. 4).\textsuperscript{11} Thus the Campbell Soup Company (still known then as the Joseph Campbell Preserve Company) made its grand entrance onto the international consumer stage in 1900.\textsuperscript{12} And more than a century later, what began as a humble entrepreneurial enterprise, has become a mega-conglomeration, sporting a company logo that is among the most recognizable advertising symbols in the world. Currently in the United States, more than half of all soup purchased is Campbell’s Soup. In addition to savvy business practices, Michman and Mazze attribute this market dominance to Campbell’s “brand power, with the concomitant factor of brand loyalty and repeat patronage.”\textsuperscript{13} But how were these elements built and sustained over more than a century? Is it the \textit{actual} product or the \textit{concept} of the product that elicits such consumer allegiance? Campbell’s soups are so visually identifiable that their image alone can conjure up powerful nostalgic memories of loving mothers, healthy children, satisfied husbands, and idealized traditional domestic life, thanks in large part to their prolific advertising legacy.
Women at the Epicenter of Cultural Change

The Campbell Soup Company traces its history back to 1869. Other successful American companies began roughly at the same time, most notably Coca-Cola, Ivory Soap, Camay, Hershey’s Chocolate, Budweiser, American Express Traveler’s Cheques, Quaker Oats, Kodak, and a few others. All are successful brands that have had some degree of lasting impact on American culture. But the history of Campbell’s Soup, and in particular its ubiquitous advertising aimed directly at women, represents the intertwining of many integral elements of late nineteenth and early twentieth century culture. Campbell asserted its product dominance primarily in women’s service magazines and other popular periodicals of the era long before radio and television commercials became the leading form of advertising.
Other consumer goods prevalent during that period contributed to the idealized images of women as enacted by advertising. Beauty and garment products, for instance, clearly dictated how women should dress, look, and behave, and like Campbell’s ads, they tied appropriate female behavior to consumption habits. Nearly a decade before Campbell’s Soup entered the realm of consumer advertising, those types of manufacturers used the allure of the burgeoning modern New Woman to sell their products. But over the decades, most of those products eventually fell out of favor with the public, so they are only quick snapshots of moments in social history. On the other hand, because of its longevity, Campbell’s advertising acts as a template, a cultural landmark, that places women central to some of the most predominant ideological functions of society—managing the family; nurturing and nourishing children; satisfying husbands; providing domestic labor; purifying the food supply; raising healthy, responsible citizens; contributing to war efforts; bolstering or saving the national economy; and ultimately, symbolically representing American patriotism. All this in a bowl of soup!

But why *soup*? Why has this commonplace food item been so conducive to modeling the idealized American woman, as well as creating enduring images of nostalgia and family tradition? Is there anything inherent in soup that lends itself to stylizing womanhood and patriotism? Or could any product be manipulated through advertising to create these images? Certainly, a great portion of Campbell’s powerful imagery is a result of its longevity, spanning from 1869 to the present—encompassing all of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first century. But if the concept of soup can be understood as a cultural artifact and analyzed as such, it becomes possible to discover the many layers of meaning that are conveyed metaphorically through advertising it in images and text. As imagined within the *mise-en-scène* of Campbell’s
advertising, soup is not only a visual metaphor, the use of one object to describe something else. It becomes an ideological marker, laden with multiple levels of meaning over time.¹⁶

For example, soup as a consumable foodstuff can be a component of a meal, or it can comprise a complete meal. Either way, it is typically full of multiple ingredients and can fulfill a variety of nutritional requirements—layers of possibilities exist. Soon after creating their condensed version, Campbell discovered that its soups should be marketed not just as single-use items, but rather, they could be utilized as ingredients in other recipes. Thus, versatile condensed soup becomes a multi-use product. If the concept of ready-to-eat soup is examined from a more industrial point of view, it also is laden with multiple meanings. Historically, preparing homemade soup was difficult, laborious, and time-consuming. By attaching discursive maxims of modernity, such as productivity, sophistication, laborsaving, time-efficiency, etc., to the advertising of condensed soups, Campbell’s product became tied to notions of progress itself.

It is no accident that a food product is the source for such interpretation. In Campbell’s advertising, soup is a cultural artifact, coded differently depending on the time in which it was being advertised, and always open to multiple interpretations. And as a foodstuff, soup has the capacity to have a significant function within the domestic sphere. There has always been a close historical and cultural connection between women and food. A primary aspect of women’s work within the home has been the preparing, preserving, and serving of food to nourish family members. In contrast to other non-food consumer goods that were established during the same time period and carried similar messages to female consumers, this deeply embedded connection between women and food is perhaps the primary reason Campbell’s advertising has been so powerful and persuasive, and its effects so long-lasting.
Mr. Campbell’s Soup: An American Icon

More than one hundred years after winning the venerated gold medal in Paris, Campbell’s Soup products have become part of the fabric of everyday life, often associated with Americana itself. Most people are familiar with the jingle introduced in 1931: “M’m! M’m! Good! M’m! M’m! Good! That’s what Campbell’s Soups are, M’m! M’m! Good!”

Campbell’s primary corporate symbol, the dimple-kneed Campbell Soup Kids developed in 1904, is still prevalent today, personifying not only product qualities, but ideals about America, as well. The product’s dominant shelf presence in any grocery store in the country, large or small, is undisputable. Photo documentarians Martha Esposito Shea and Mike Mathis describe Campbell Soup’s significance in contemporary life:

Campbell soup is as American as apple pie and the Fourth of July.

Cans of tomato, chicken noodle, and cream of mushroom soup, sporting the company’s distinctive red-and-white labels have found places on millions of dinner tables around the globe.

Concurring that Campbell’s condensed soup has indeed become a staple of American living, Vogue food critic, Jeffrey Steingarten, claims in his cultural history cookbook The Man Who Ate Everything (1997) that aside from Nestle’s Toll House Cookies, the recipe for Campbell’s Green Bean Bake is “the most popular back-of-the-box recipe ever created.” A blend of Campbell’s popular cream of mushroom soup combined with canned green beans and crunchy processed onion rings, who hasn’t experienced this culinary staple at a family reunion or company gathering? Dismayed that Durkee reduced the size of the onion ring can, requiring consumers to purchase two instead of the typical one needed to complete the recipe, a perplexed Steingarten phoned Campbell. While the company could not solve the onion ring downsizing
problem, they did tell Steingarten that “three of the five top-selling supermarket foods are
Campbell’s soups . . . [and] every evening in America, one million cans of Campbell’s soups are
used as an ingredient in dinner, about a third of all the soup they sell. Thursday night is the most
popular.” Campbell’s also stakes claim to the invention of another family meal favorite, the
classic Tuna Noodle Casserole, their second most popular recipe of all time. In 2004, the
Campbell Soup Company was the largest producer of soups in the world, claiming more than
70% of the United States market and selling more than 500 varieties in 122 countries.

Today, while the culinary merits of Mr. Joseph Campbell’s canned soup may be
debatable, its iconic status is undoubtedly entrenched in American culture. In addition to being
recognizable to nearly everyone, the products have become autobiographical symbols through
which America’s transformation can be traced, from the industrial age and the rise of the middle
class to the development of a national consumer market economy. Early on, Campbell began to
shape its corporate image by taking inspiration from uniquely American elements recognizable
to most. Company history claims that executive Herberton Williams attended a football game
between Cornell University and the University of Pennsylvania on Thanksgiving Day 1898.
Williams became so inspired by Cornell’s crisp new red and white uniforms, he was unable to
get the striking image they made on the football field that day out of his mind. Upon returning to
company headquarters, he influenced the other executives to adopt the brilliant colors for their
can labels. Today, Campbell’s Soup cans are still one of the most immediately recognizable
item on grocery store shelves, thanks in large part to their distinctive color scheme. While the
college football connection provides an interesting anecdotal snippet of popular culture,
Campbell’s Soup became a true icon of modernism when an avant-garde artist looked to it for
artistic stimulation.
Pop artist Andy Warhol immortalized Campbell’s Soup in multiple series of paintings he did beginning in the early 1960s (Figs. 5 and 6). Warhol was raised in a working-class immigrant family in Pittsburgh. They struggled financially, and growing up, canned soup was all his mother could afford to feed him.\textsuperscript{23} Further advancing the soup’s autobiographical ties to American culture, the artist claimed that inspiration for his paintings came from eating a can of Campbell’s Soup every day for lunch. But why paint such an ostensibly humble consumer good? Warhol also depicted glamorous, internationally worshipped celebrities such as Marilyn Monroe, Elizabeth Taylor, and Elvis Presley, so why a can of heat-and-serve soup? Goldberg offers an explanation:

This brand of soup, which is as popular in the States as Coca-Cola . . . [was] a logical choice, because its logo is blazoned over every street corner and magazine, so a few more multiplications won’t make much difference.\textsuperscript{24}

Simply put, Warhol painted what he saw and what he liked. He was more interested in manipulating quotidian symbols in new ways than in trying to recreate expected notions of reality (Fig. 7). By the sixties, Campbell’s Soup was commonplace, primarily because it had become one of the most prolific advertisers in history, and female consumers had chosen to make it a staple of the kitchen pantry. Even as an adult, Warhol claimed to love Campbell’s Soup (tomato was his favorite). But it is important to remember that he did not paint images of the actual product he consumed, soup, but rather chose to immortalize its outer package, the throwaway tin can, the image most shown in advertising. Many of Warhol’s predecessors had depicted product packages in their still life paintings, and Hine views this as commentary on human mortality.
Packages, which promise to preserve the perishable, offer a kind of 
debased immortality . . . [hinting] at the banality of what can be 
preserved . . . [offering] visions of a kind of prosperity that is at 
once comforting and hardly worthwhile . . . Warhol’s soup cans are 
full of condensed promise . . . emblems of mortality in a consumer 
culture.25

Warhol perhaps viewed his interest in Campbell’s outer packaging in less analytical terms. He 
believed that art could be found in ordinary items that, when translated onto canvas, represented 
an aspect of American identity.26 He reportedly said, “I feel I represent the U.S. in my art.”27 
Nonetheless, it was Campbell’s packaging and advertising that made an indelible mark on 
Warhol’s artistic expression.

Campbell’s relationship to American identity, while initially forged more than sixty years 
before at the Paris Exposition Universelle, became visually rooted as a result of Warhol’s 
fascination with the product’s outer packaging and his daily consumption of its contents. When 
Warhol’s first series of soup can paintings was exhibited the art world was outraged and 
mystified, but the publicity was immediate, and the impression lasting.28 While Warhol and 
Campbell’s Soup are forever inextricably connected in a visual sense, Michman and Mazze 
claim their correlation is even more significant for Campbell. “The physical colors of red and 
white and the art of Andy Warhol have made Campbell a legend in the soup industry.”29 The act 
of painting and displaying soup cans as art, and the ensuing debates about whether the result was 
crass commercialism or deep-rooted cultural critique, elevated the product itself to iconic status 
in American culture. By bestowing the designation of art to Warhol’s painted images of its soup 
cans, Campbell’s became even more readily identifiable to the average consumer.
Fig. 5. Andy Warhol painting, 1962.  

Fig. 6. Andy Warhol painting, 1962.  

Fig. 7. Andy Warhol paintings, 1965.
But could something found in nearly every cupboard in America actually be art?

Goldberg refers to this as “iconography of the banal”--converting stereotypes of the American Dream into art.  But in depicting Campbell’s Soup on canvas, Warhol was only interested in its outer visual appeal. In his work, only the can is depicted, an empty sign, while the true product, the soup itself, becomes unimportant. Warhol’s soup cans and soup boxes were representative of consumer culture and mass production, more so than the actual contents contained in the original product. The goal of such a society, as depicted on canvas by Warhol, is to be endlessly reproducible and readily available, indicative of the culture’s fascination with symbols of mass consumption. Like a sea of red-and-white soup cans stacked from floor to ceiling in a supermarket display, the outer packaging is what stimulates consumers’ imaginations, more so than thoughts about the contents inside. Goldberg describes it:

Objects, commodities, but also fetishes, idols and icons--the

Campbell’s cans signify the most trivial reality and at the same time withdraw from and transcend the real . . . clichés of clichés,

which underline the unreality of what is the reproduction of a reproduction, a second-hand reality . . . Warhol gives his trademark image the final once over and replaces illusion with simulacrum.

Because of its outer packaging and its plebian utilization, convenience food is particularly open to this type of postmodern interpretation. Roland Barthes describes the connection between food and culture, saying “Food is not only a collection of products, it is also, and at the same time, a system of communication, a body of images, a protocol of customs, situations and conduct.”

Warhol’s painted soup cans and boxes parodied the commonplace in consumer society and the concept of modernity itself, as symbolized by advertising images.
By the mid twentieth century, the Campbell Soup Company was regarded as one of the most prolific and powerful advertisers of all time. The industry even created a special moniker that refers to the specific placement of its high impact ads. Known as “The Campbell Soup Position,” it is the first page following primary reading matter in a periodical. Believing that an ad situated in that space would have the most influence on consumers, the Campbell Soup Company always tried to place its ads there. Thus, the advertising industry came to identify the location by the company’s name.38

However, as previously stated, during the mid-to-late nineteenth century, many consumer goods gained great popularity only to eventually lose favor with the public. Campbell Soup can attribute its longevity to one basic factor. Both the product and its advertising found a huge, receptive audience among American women during the first quarter of the twentieth century and beyond, in large part due to its early relationship with women’s service magazines, such as Good Housekeeping. Warhol may have immortalized Campbell’s Soup visually and symbolically, but the economic success of the product is a result of women responding to the advertising and choosing to make it an essential household item. Corporate executives understood as early as 1900 if they wanted their product to out-profit and out-last the competition, they needed to win over the hearts and minds of the American female consumer. And their present-day advertising strategies still rely on this tried-and-true strategy.

Famed chef, Nathalie Dupree, frames the seemingly perpetual connection between Campbell’s soup and women:

In my family, as in most others, there was homemade soup, and there was Campbell’s. Each was distinctive, and each was recognized as good and serving a purpose. There was never a time
when the women of any of the generations of my family relied on homemade soup to feed their families. They were busy, strong-minded, hard working women who didn’t have the time to make soup from scratch or who couldn’t always find the ingredients in midwinter.39

From its inception, that is where Campbell’s Soup came in--as helpmate to harried housewives, hungry children, and demanding husbands--an influential position within the space of the American home that inventor John Dorrance recognized early on, and he created advertising to fill that substantial perceived need.

The Grand Old Brand: Early History of the Campbell Soup Company

While the story of Campbell Soup Company’s origins provides an interesting slice of American business history, it is also a compelling narrative of the nation’s changing relationship with food. It also depicts how the technological advancements of the industrial age and the ideological concepts of modernism impacted the American family and, in particular, women. The story of soup, Campbell’s soup to be more specific, provides insight into America’s evolving eating preferences and the connections among mass consumption, female consumerism, the influence of advertising, and the establishment of a major American industry--prepared foods.

The earliest incarnation of the Campbell Soup Company began during the period of the Civil War when entrepreneur Abraham Anderson started a small canning operation in urban Philadelphia, a major transportation center. Soon after, he moved his business to the rural side of the Delaware River to what was then a burgeoning manufacturing hub, Camden, New Jersey.
The 1860s marked a time when the United States began to evolve rapidly from agrarian culture to industrial nation. The country’s population grew tremendously, and production opportunities for manufacturers expanded because of increasing demands for new products that could be transported throughout the country. In addition, as people began to move farther away from major urban centers, the need for less perishable foodstuffs grew. The development of better modes of transportation such as the transcontinental railway made it possible to meet this growing desire for fresh produce and meats in major points across the nation. Abraham Anderson was a tinsmith and icebox manufacturer who was interested in exploring another relatively new food preservation method, the tin can. As a result of his foresight, he capitalized on the public’s mounting demand for freshly preserved foods, and by 1868, he was producing 50,000 canned goods a year.

The concept of convenience foods pre-dates the introduction of tin cans and other forms of food preservation. A variety of convenience foods prepared by specialists and ready to eat “on the go” was available in many urban areas as early as the 1700s. These items were not just the choice of travelers or the wealthy elite, but rather, they found favor with the urban poor. Buying ingredients and preparing food was expensive, labor intensive, and required specialized space. Often, poor people could more easily afford ready-made prepared foods rather than meals they had to make on their own. Thus, from the earliest times, pre-made and packaged foods primarily catered to lower and middle classes.

When tin cans were developed, that increased the types of foods that could be bought in a pre-made format. Tin cans were introduced in America in 1818 by Englishman Peter Durand, and were first used to pack seafood, such as salmon, oysters, and lobsters, in addition to corn and tomatoes. Initially tin cans were expensive and laborious to produce, requiring the expertise of
skilled tinsmiths. But they were lightweight, virtually unbreakable, and easily transported, so quickly they became part of the American economy. With the California gold rush, the invention of the can opener in 1858, and the need for canned goods during the Civil War, tin can usage increased greatly, and many other food items (such as other vegetables and fruits) were also packed and shipped cross-country.\textsuperscript{47} Even so, the general public did not regularly consume food packaged in tin cans until the 1890s.

In 1869 fruit and vegetable merchant, Joseph Campbell, joined Anderson and the two began doing business under the firm name Anderson & Campbell in 1873. Together they canned fresh produce, such as fruits, vegetables, jellies, condiments, catsup, and mincemeat. Their specialty was beefsteak tomatoes, and they became one of hundreds of small canneries that dotted the American landscape at that time. Brand name products became available in the United States before the 1860s, but they remained primarily regional in sales until the end of the century.\textsuperscript{48} Trans-continental, mass transportation made it possible for people to buy consumer goods from third parties, rather than directly from the manufacturer of a certain good. Thus, the concept of brands developed as a means to protect inventors from illegal copycats and as an attempt to ensure that product quality was standardized.\textsuperscript{49} Anderson and Campbell seemed to understand the importance of developing brand identity, and they made the most of inventive product depiction early on. Jones further explains the importance of establishing a product name brand:

\begin{quote}
A brand is more than an object; it is a relationship between the brand-as-object and the consuming public, a relationship that derives from a unique combination of associations attached to a product (name, package, history, advertising, promotion, and so
on) by which consumers differentiate one product from another.

Neither the product nor the brand is a static entity. Products change all the time . . . What endures is the sense of the brand.50

Building on the previous reputation of Anderson, the two men were best known for their canned beefsteak tomato, which became the first advertising symbol of their company. The Anderson & Campbell beefsteak was touted as being so large each one would fill a single can.51 One of the early labels showed two hardy farm lads struggling to haul a robust tomato nearly as big as they were! “The celebrated beefsteak tomato” the label proclaimed (Fig. 8).

![Anderson & Campbell beefsteak tomato label](image)

Fig. 8. Anderson & Campbell used mythological images in their early labels.52

While the gigantic tomato, towering over its human cohorts and representing bountiful fecundity, was an awe-inspiring marketing logo for Anderson & Campbell, it was not a particularly unique approach. The practice of associating consumer goods with recognizable folklore symbols was common among manufacturers and mass marketers. During the mid-
nineteenth century, fantastical iconography associated with ancient fertility symbols, sacred trees and plants, and rites of springtime or harvest often was incorporated into food label illustrations. Consumers’ readiness to suspend disbelief and associate the label motifs with intangible product qualities such as “goodness,” “value,” and “homemade” was possible because of their willingness to engage in the realm of myth and folklore.

Even so, Anderson & Campbell were early pioneers in using fanciful packaging to establish a brand product (Figs. 9 and 10). Another label for their preserves show an overflowing cornucopia of fruits brilliantly displayed against the backdrop of a clear blue sky. They relied on romanticized arcadian images of perfectly formed produce and pastoral farm scenes to evoke a sense of nostalgia in an era that increasingly relied on mechanization. Since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, decreasing or replacing human labor with machinery was a goal, and ironically, “Campbell Soup was one of the earliest companies to experiment with continuous-process manufacturing.” This process decreased the need for human labor, while turning out mass quantities of goods almost automatically. So while the packaging created a
sense of wistful reminiscence, man and nature working in harmony to produce sustenance, the actual method of production was the epitome of machine-dominated modernity.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, the fertile Delaware River region was bustling with commerce and innovation, and consumers excitedly tried new products. For the most part, Anderson & Campbell found a receptive market in the Philadelphia-Camden area. The majority of canneries were located in the northeastern United States, and therefore, northerners had become used to eating food from tin cans during the Civil War. As the public’s desire for canned foods increased after the war ended, Anderson & Campbell prospered. The company was awarded a medal for quality at the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia. However, although successful, the partnership was short-lived. It disintegrated that same year because the two could not agree on the future direction of the company. In an amicable agreement, Joseph Campbell bought Abraham Anderson’s share of the business. As part of the deal, he received all the buildings, equipment, and recipes.

The true genesis of the Campbell Soup Company as we know it today began with the new firm, Joseph Campbell & Company. In 1882, several key partners joined the enterprise: Campbell’s son-in-law, Walter S. Spackman; his nephew, Joseph S. Campbell; and the influential Arthur Dorrance, a wealthy lumber and flour merchant from Bristol, Pennsylvania. That incarnation of the company continued with the primary business that Anderson & Campbell had begun earlier, primarily, canning and selling vegetables, jams, jellies, mincemeats, condiments, several types of soups, and tomatoes. Offering their wares from horse-drawn wagons in the Philadelphia-Camden area, Campbell and partners began creating an identifiable local market niche for their canned goods and preserves. Seeing the company’s fleet of
Percheron horses delivering goods to local grocers became a regular occurrence along the Delaware River.\(^{63}\)

Tomatoes continued to be one of company’s most popular items, and many southern New Jersey farmers began growing crops specifically for Campbell. Tomatoes must be processed soon after being harvested from the fields to ensure freshness, so beginning as early as 5:45 in the morning, area farmers continuously brought bushels to the bustling factory.\(^{64}\) Shea and Mathis describe a common scene in the Camden landscape: “Local legend has it that the roads leading to the Campbell facility ran red with the pulp and juice of tomatoes that bounced off the wagons as they rode along the cobblestone streets.”\(^{65}\) Campbell’s was making its colorful mark on the local economy in innumerable ways. The company also managed to grow during the decade by developing successful business practices such as the direct handling of branding and advertising, while the actual distribution of product was left to wholesalers.\(^{66}\)

By 1892, the company, now called the Joseph Campbell Preserve Company, claimed their canned goods were the “Best in the World.”\(^{67}\) They manufactured approximately 200 different products, and the most popular item was a condiment already loved by Americans, ketchup. Campbell’s version was called “Beefsteak Ketchup,” taking advantage of the company’s earlier market success with its canned beefsteak tomatoes.\(^{68}\) Since the mid-1700s, ketchup had been a staple of the American kitchen, and Campbell viewed it as one of their most important products.\(^{69}\) Always actively involved in the company’s day-to-day operations, the aging Joseph Campbell retired in 1894 and handed over the reigns of the organization to partner Arthur Dorrance.\(^{70}\) This would prove to be a watershed event in the life of the organization because three years later it would lead to the most important hire in company history. After Dorrance took the reigns, the company began to consider the possibility of using advertising as a
means to reach a broader audience and compete effectively with the hundreds of other existing canneries. Initially, they established a conservative advertising budget. In an effort to expand their market, one hundred large painted signs, mostly promoting Beefsteak Ketchup, were installed in Philadelphia, New York, St. Louis and several other locations.  

Fig. 11. 1895 Campbell’s label.  

Fig. 12. 1897 Campbell’s label.

Increasingly, Americans had become accustomed to the concept of adding prepared foods, or convenience foods as they eventually would be called, to their diet. In 1895, the Joseph Campbell Preserve Company began manufacturing ready-to-serve beefsteak tomato soup, similar to products sold by its competitors. But “convenient” was something of a misnomer as the heavy 32-ounce cans were not easily portable. It is perhaps interesting to note that its white label featured the same illustration previously used by Anderson & Campbell—a gargantuan red tomato suspended between the shoulders of two brawny farm boys. (Figs. 11 and 12.) Customers could buy these unwieldy items from their local grocer, but they were
relatively expensive, difficult to transport, and required considerable storage space. Even so, the public was interested in modern goods that promised ease of labor. Typically, they found out about new products by seeing locally placed advertisements on small placards, large billboards, or in some newspapers or trade magazines. Like its marketplace rivals, Campbell’s was committed to finding its way into the kitchen cupboards and onto the tables of American families. Beefed-up advertising efforts seemed the next logical step, although company executives were wary of the practice.

By the time general manager Arthur Dorrance hesitantly hired his 24-year-old nephew in 1897 as chemist, the company had already broadened its variety of products to include other prepared meats, sauces, plum pudding, fruits, and the aforementioned ketchup. The young Dr. John Thompson Dorrance was an M.I.T. graduate (Fig. 13). He was also relatively wealthy and quite ambitious. As a European-trained chemical engineer and organic chemist, he was keen to become an integral member of the Campbell team.75 Company history says that Dorrance was so eager to prove himself to his uncle that he bought his own laboratory equipment and agreed to work for a token salary of just $7.50 per week.76

Fig. 13. Dr. John T. Dorrance, inventor of condensed soup.77
Dorrance was also something of a gastronome, and while studying in Europe, he had developed a penchant for Continental cuisine. He was disappointed with the choices he found in America, which had achieved a notorious reputation for its poor quality eggs, butter, and meats, primarily due to a lack of reliable preserving techniques. The sophisticated Dorrance particularly missed the many varieties of soup eaten with several meals a day in European culture, including breakfast. Particularly in Germany where he had studied, soup was believed to be essential to proper diet. An early eighteenth century English proverb describes soup’s cultural significance: “Of soup and love, the first is best.” While Dorrance may have concurred with the sentiment that soup was an integral component of gentlemanly meals, its actual origin was quite utilitarian, and its preparation typically associated with women’s work.

Soup began as a primary source of nourishment when food was prepared in one pot over an open fire. Multiple available ingredients, such as meats, vegetables, or grains were simmered together in water, and family members would serve themselves right out of the stockpot. Over the centuries, changes in lifestyles contributed to new modes of eating and dining that were more structured. By 1700, formal dining no longer was reserved for nobility, and privileged families began eating meals comprised of separate courses, known as dining à la française. Each dish was placed in a different serving receptacle and set on the table during the appropriate course. Soup was part of the first course, and often at least two kinds were served in elaborate and inventive vessels called soup tureens. Keeping with proper etiquette, the soup course was intended to dispel initial hunger, so it was served in small quantities, typically less than a half bowlful per person. During the early industrial age, mass produced soup tureens were churned out so that families of modest economic means could properly partake of the soup course, as
well. By the late nineteenth century, family dining habits had evolved into a less formal style, called *à la russe*, in which food dishes were served from a sideboard rather than on the actual table. As a result, the use of tureens eventually declined since they were no longer necessary for tabletop display, somewhat lessening soup’s showy importance to the family meal. But the concept of soup as an essential part of the meal persisted, however laborious the task of preparing proper soup might be.

In the first decade of the new century, Margaret E. Sangster, one of the early editors of *Woman’s Home Companion* published a guide to assist women in learning all the appropriate responsibilities of young wives and mothers. Called *The Woman’s Book: A Thousand Handy Helps* (1907), the tome contained a special section on the preparation of homemade soup. According to the “world-famous cooks whose names are synonyms for the best-spread tables and most appetizing bills of fare [who] have contributed their wisdom to one of the books in this unique collection . . . Soups are naturally divided into two great classes: soups with stock and soups without stock.” While Sangster and her cohorts intended to enlighten and educate young brides in proper cookery, the complexity of creating soup alone surely intimidated many a novice housewife.

For example, the subject of soup stocks illustrates the degree of knowledge women needed in order to properly cook for their families (and meet societal expectations). Soup itself is comprised of two main elements, the stock and the garnish. Collins describes it as such: “The garnish is all those ingredients--meat, vegetables, butter, that are added to the soup and give it its name (the vegetables, for instance, in vegetable soup). The stock is the highly flavored liquid to which the garnish is added.” In other words, stocks are used as the base around which the final soup product is made. But this is, perhaps, not as simple as it seems. According to Sangster’s
treatise, there are several essential varieties of stock, each including its own methods of preparation and care. Brown soup stock is always made with beef, as is bouillon. White soup stock can be made with either chicken or veal, and consommé should be made with two or three kinds of meat, usually beef, veal, and fowl. The basis of lamb stock is self-explanatory, although its preparation is no less involved. Inexpensive and easily procured seasonings for stock include turnips, carrots, celery, onions, and parsley (vegetables); thyme, savory marjoram, bay leaf (dried sweet herbs); and cloves, allspice berries, peppercorns (spices).

On the other side of the table are soups made without stock, including cream soups, purées, and bisques; the description of each includes lengthy and detailed instructions for preparation. Sangster’s culinary experts provide very specific directions to make soup, a process that could take as much as ten hours. It was especially important to learn how to cut vegetables properly. For example, to create Petit Marmite soup, one should “Wash and scrape carrot, and cut in eighths lengthwise, then in halves crosswise; there should be one-half cupful.”

In all, a proper modern American woman should be ready and able to prepare at least twenty-six varieties of soups and stocks--from consommé aux pâté and Amsterdam clam soup, to cream of tomato soup and purée of split pea soup. That a turn-of-the-century woman could feel inadequate in the kitchen is no surprise!

Perhaps, then, it is no wonder that Dr. Dorrance found American cuisine lacking in soup consumption. Americans had not grown accustomed to eating soup regularly like Europeans, but he felt this could become an acquired habit. What the United States did offer a budding food scientist was an abundance of seasonal fresh fruits and vegetables, as well as an entrepreneurial spirit in which to explore possibilities and invent new methods. The Joseph Campbell Preserve Company had only two competitors in the ready-to-serve soup market, Franco-American (which
Campbell would purchase in 1915) and James H.W. Huckins & Company (most commonly referred to as just “Huckins”). Both companies manufactured already-prepared canned soups in “bulky half-pint, pint and quart containers,” and they each sold only about a million cans of soup each year. In addition, the soups retailed for twenty-five to thirty-five cents a quart, which was too expensive for the average middle-class family.

Dorrance suspected the potential market for canned soup was much larger, but the current cost of production and the heaviness of the containers were prohibitive. Ironically, at that time only the wealthy could afford to buy ready-to-eat soup, which was considered a luxury for the elite class. But Dorrance believed the average housewife of modest income also would be interested in a similar product, if she could afford it. The large-sized cans were quite expensive to pack, store, and distribute, but Dorrance recognized a potential market opportunity if only he could figure out a way to bring the cost down without sacrificing taste. Working in the laboratory at the large, recently built Campbell Soup factory in Camden, he began to develop techniques that would give the company market edge over its competitors. Dorrance explained his idea succinctly by saying:

I think there is a big market for a new kind of soup. Not just canned soup, but condensed canned soup. It would cost less to ship, would take less room in the store, and could be sold for less to the housewife . . . With that kind of convenience, why would anybody go to the bother of making her own soup?

Dorrance was convinced he could invent a feasible method to produce condensed soups. By studying French cuisine, Dorrance knew that an excellent quality soup stock was essential to creating a condensed version that the public would be willing to purchase. By using less water to
begin with during the creation of the soup stock, and by developing a strong stock that would not lose its flavor when diluted during the final preparation stage in the home, he found that 32-ounces of prepared soup could be put into a 10 ½ -ounce can. His formula eliminated the need for the unwieldy containers typically used to ship and store pre-made uncondensed soup, and it dropped the cost of production to one-third the original cost. As a result of the dramatic decrease in can size, the public could buy the 10 ½ -ounce version for a dime--a bargain since it could feed a family of six--and considerably less expensive than the original cost of nearly thirty-five cents for the uncondensed version. This discovery changed the course of the Joseph Campbell Preserve Company forever.

It is important to note that while Dorrance was the first to invent a formula for condensed soup in America, soup was not the first condensed food product. During the Civil War, Gail Borden developed a method to condense milk by evaporating out all of its water content. The resulting substance was easily transported to the Union troops, and then by adding water back in, it reconverted into drinkable, nourishing milk. And decades before Dorrance concocted his formula for Campbell, a condensed soup formula had been attempted in France. According to Collins:

Compressing and concentrating soup stocks was not unheard of at the time; in France there existed an even more concentrated soup stock, the *tablette de bouillon*, and the American Eliza Ledlie’s 1857 cookbook devoted two pages to the preparation of a jellied ‘portable soup’ which was ‘congealed into hard cakes, resembling glue’. 
Even earlier, a similar item referred to as “portable soups in cakes” was reportedly used to ease the ailments of ill sailors aboard Captain Cook’s attempt to navigate the globe in 1772–1775. But evidently, regardless of what these inventions offered in portability, convenience, and purported medicinal qualities, they lacked the primary feature necessary to create public interest—satisfactory taste. Dorrance had an instinctual sense of what the market would accept in new products, and he believed the three key ingredients were: appearance, odor, and taste. All must be pleasing to the consumer. The doctor was convinced his version would satisfy the public, but he had to persuade them to try it first.

Condensed Soup: English Thoroughness and French Art

If Dorrance was going to conquer the ready-to-eat soup market, he had to overcome two main obstacles. He had to persuade Americans to eat more soup, and he had to convince consumers that condensed soup was good quality food. The first impediment was cultural and historical. At the turn of the last century, although Americans did not consume soup the way Europeans did on a daily basis, many parts of the country had regional soup favorites—terrapin soup in Maryland, bean soup in Boston, oyster stew in New York, and “pepperpot,” a favorite in nearby Philadelphia. But soup was not a mainstay of the American diet. However, Dr. Dorrance was certain that America’s palate could be cultivated through education and advertising. He understood the fundamentals of creating a market need, as well as the power of appropriately advertising one’s product to the correct target market, even to a skeptical public. Dorrance believed he could turn America into a nation of soup-eaters, but the key was appealing to women.
The second barrier was economical and personal. Making homemade soup was a time-consuming process that required the use of considerable fuel resources. But more American women were moving away from using stoves fueled by wood or coal in favor of cooking on gas-burning stoves. As a result, it had become relatively easy and quick to heat-up a ten cent can of Campbell’s soup, which also cost considerably less than its competitors’ more expensive ready-to-eat versions. This was a positive development for Dorrance, but there was another more personal hurdle to confront. Dorrance suspected that women might unfavorably compare his inexpensive canned soup to their own homemade soup when it came to a matter of actual taste. His primary goal was to convince them that his soups should not be directly judged against their made-from-scratch versions. Instead, Campbell’s soups represented something technologically new and innovative that should be considered in addition to their current kitchen fare—a modern convenience that was flavorsome, too. Dorrance was convinced that, with the right product and enough positive publicity, he could sway the opinion of the American woman. According to Shea and Mathis, “Aside from being a chemist and the father of condensed soup, Dr. John T. Dorrance was also the company’s chief cheerleader.” Thus, the young chemist personally took his soups directly to grocery stores, offering taste tests and educating the public along the way.

In addition to introducing this new product to consumers, especially housewives, Dorrance needed to persuade them to actually try the product. He was aware that condensed soup packaged in small tin cans might draw interest from the shopping crowds, but to create a real market for the product, they must be convinced of its efficacy. Collins quotes a familiar industry saying: “People aren’t interested in the tin can, they’re interested in what’s inside.” While housewives might marvel at the technology that could turn a small tin can of soup into a
meal for an entire family, Dorrance knew they would only buy if it was good tasting. He needed to convince them that the canned varieties should not be perceived as a replacement for traditional homemade soups, but instead they should be added to housewives’ repertoire of food preparation. And equally important, condensed soups may taste different than homemade soups, but they were still high quality nutrition. Once effectively convinced, then Dorrance knew that housewives would find a way to persuade their husbands that condensed soup was good soup.

To help convince the public that his culinary creations were not only inexpensive but also good quality, Dorrance himself arrived at grocery stores in Boston, setting up displays in grocers’ windows and offering samples of his original five varieties of soup. The public reaction was initially one of curiosity, but the demonstrations became an almost instant success. As a result, Dorrance hired other food demonstrators to offer on-the-spot taste tests in various grocery stores and to show that his products were easy-to-prepare, time-saving alternatives to labor-intensive, expensive homemade soups. Above all, he wanted people to see for themselves that his condensed soups tasted good. The five original varieties—Tomato, Consommé, Vegetable, Chicken, and Oxtail—were chosen carefully and were specifically devised to meet the needs of busy homemakers. According to Collins, the five original soup flavors represented a “nice blend of sophistication and solid value” that Fannie Merritt Farmer (1857-1915), the famous turn-of-the-century cookbook author and culinary expert described as “combining ‘English thoroughness and French art.’ They were not exotic or unusual, but neither were they something the average housewife could or would whip up just before dinner.” For years, American women’s cooking had been unfavorably compared to the culinary skills of their French counterparts. In their 1869 domestic science book, sister reformers Catherine Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stowe lamented:
Where is the so-called cook who understands how to prepare soups and stews? These are precisely the articles in which a French kitchen excels . . . French soups and stews are a study and they would not be an unprofitable one to any person who wishes to live with comfort and even elegance on small means.  

When it came to the issue of cooking for the family, Dorrance believed that women were ready to be persuaded by the modern ideals of versatility, variety, and efficiency, and he was correct. The roving taste testers hired by Dorrance found women generally receptive and ready to accept new prepared food products.

Historically, women were responsible for finding means to preserve food necessary to sustain the family through the agriculturally stifled winter months. During the growing season, rural women harvested the family garden for fresh ingredients with which to prepare meals. But the woman of the house in urban areas had to shop for fresh produce nearly everyday. Even though canned foods made their debut in the mid 1800s and were regularly used during the Civil War, until the turn of the twentieth century they were still a fairly uncommon food item in grocery stores and households alike.  

In fact, the act of shopping at the local grocer in the nineteenth century was quite unlike today’s experience. Jones describes it:

There were no branded goods on the shelf. Everything was shipped, stored, and sold in bulk. Shoppers grabbed crackers out of barrels, scooped peanut butter out of crocks, fished pickles out of huge jars, and spooned beans out of boxes. They asked grocers to cut them slabs of bacon. It was essentially hand service by the grocer. This all changed when prepackaging and trademarks came
onto the scene. The way Americans ate and shopped changed radically with the invention of the can opener in 1858.\textsuperscript{108}

As for fruits and vegetables, most grocers sold locally grown fresh produce when it was in season. But both urban and rural women struggled to provide food for the family during winter months. Without the benefits of modern refrigeration, fruits, vegetables, nuts, and meats were preserved through the winter by one of several methods: drying (desiccation), salt curing (creating excessive acidity), freezing, or canning (boiling and placing in an airtight vessel). However, these methods were still somewhat primitive and unreliable in the late 1800s.\textsuperscript{109} Spoilage was a constant worry, and none of the food preservation methods available were failsafe. Nutritional health and safety were always serious concerns.\textsuperscript{110}

Dorrance promised women relief from this chore and its uncertain outcome, and women literally bought the concept. Campbell’s five original varieties of soup soon began appearing in the American kitchen, eventually becoming a common staple in households everywhere. In addition, this milestone invention allowed the company to forge past its chief competitors. At the time Dorrance joined the Joseph Campbell Preserve Company in 1897, it was no longer a profitable business, losing approximately sixty thousand dollars that year.\textsuperscript{111} But within a year of Dorrance’s technological achievement, the company began concentrating more on the new addition to its product line, condensed soups, and less on other products, and soon it became profitable again.\textsuperscript{112} So much so that four years later the company began paying an unbroken series of cash dividends to investors.\textsuperscript{113}

In 1898, the company made another fortuitous decision--to solidify the company’s image as depicted on its labels. During this period, the American public was no longer just buying general foodstuffs, it was slowly becoming accustomed to name-brand products. The first step in
creating a successful brand is creating visual iconography that is easily identifiable, followed by cohesive marketing strategies. Accordingly, acting on executive Williams’ hunch that Cornell University’s eye-catching red-and-white color scheme would stand out on grocery shelves, Campbell’s can labels were simplified and unified in design. The picturesque but old-fashioned agrarian illustrations were removed, and the Campbell name was highlighted. The name of the product was boldly written in modern black and gold lettering. According to packaging expert, Thomas Hine, “Just as the soups were concentrated to save transportation cost and space on the shelf and in the kitchen cabinet, so was the expression of the can.” Soon afterward, the esteemed Gold Medallion for Excellence awarded at the 1900 Paris Exposition Universelles was added to the center of the new, cleaner-looking label (Fig. 14).

According to company history, adopting the new colorful can labels represented “the single most successful promotional decision Campbell ever made. Thanks to the success of the condensed soups in the red-and-white cans, the company [was] profitable for the first time in many years, and in 1898 Dr. John Dorrance [received] a ‘hefty’ increase in salary to $9.00 per week.” While one could debate that choosing the Campbell Soup Kids as corporate symbols several years later rivals the significance of the graphic design on the labels, undoubtedly the red-and-white imagery has been at least as enduring as the image of the Kids. Text included on the earliest version of the soup can packaging reinforced the notion of the products’ high quality. The brilliant red-and-white labels proclaimed: “We select the very best obtainable fresh meats, butter, and vegetables which are blended with fresh herbs in preparing our soups. This alone is the secret of their high quality.” Thus, by the late nineteenth century, more than sixty years before Warhol immortalized them, Campbell’s soup can labels had begun to make an impact on consumers, both visually and conceptually.
With the success of condensed soup, Dorrance wanted to expand the company’s market reach. Up to that point, the company’s advertising efforts had been conservative and included placing large painted signs to promote Beefsteak Ketchup. But Campbell was about to broaden its public exposure. A form of marketing known as transit advertising had been popular in the United States since the 1850s when signs were first placed on horse-drawn streetcars in New York City. Through the decades, the advertising placards were made to look more professional, and by the 1880s, they were organized and installed neatly on display racks inside streetcars. In 1899, Dorrance managed to convince company executives to place Campbell’s advertising cards in one-third of all New York City streetcars, presuming that its target market, the savvy female shopper, preferred to ride rather than walk. Campbell’s sales began to increase considerably, and by the end of the year, every streetcar in New York City carried the company’s advertisement.

Many of the car cards, as they were called, had the slogan: “Campbell’s Soups, Look for the Red and White Label” or “Particular Soups for Particular People.” Others included a large illustration of a Campbell’s can supported by a catchy jingle promoting the virtues of soup. Often they feature a short, four-line ditty written by ad man Charles Snyder, who would
purportedly play a significant role in company history just a few years later. The car cards coincided with colorful, elaborate displays that Campbell placed in grocery store windows so that they could be seen easily by window shoppers and passersby. The public responded favorably to the bold advertisements, and as a result, by 1899 sales of Campbell’s soup increased by 100% in New York City. Based on that success, similar ads were placed inside streetcars in other urban areas, and three years later 35,000 cards were placed in more than 370 large cities across the country. By the turn of the twentieth century, Campbell’s Soup had become a nationally recognized brand on its way to becoming a staple in every American household. However, it was no small task for Dorrance to convince his colleagues to invest more heavily in other, more expensive forms of advertising, such as mass circulation consumer magazines.

In the 1880s, manufacturers primarily used chromo cards, or trade cards, as their main method of advertisement, and these, according to Mehaffey, “were more often a part of the nineteenth-century child’s visual experience than illustrated books.” These brightly colored, illustrated advertising cards featured consumer goods and their benefits, and the public adored them. Storekeepers handed out the small cards to their customers, and manufacturers placed them within product packaging. Typically advertising cards depicted attractive females engaged in a domestic activity while using the featured product--creating a visual narrative of romanticized white feminine domesticity that connoted a “generic ideal of consumer citizenship.” Wildly popular with adults and children alike, they played a significant role in introducing the public to the new commodity culture and inculcating images of the domestic white female consumer as its most recognizable icon.

While merchants and manufacturers had used various types of regional advertising for quite some time in addition to chromo cards, advertising of consumer goods on a national level
came into general use in the 1890s. This was the advent of the strategic advertising campaign, a
more unified attempt to build brand names and associate them favorably with a particular
manufacturer. Proactive businessmen began to consider the ad campaign essential to the
marketing of their products. But the practice was viewed with some skepticism. Established
companies generally looked upon those who sold advertising, ad men, with distrust.129 However,
since Dorrance’s streetcar gamble paid off, he knew it was time to move beyond the streets and
actually enter the homes of the American housewife, within the pages of her favorite reading
materials, magazines. Dorrance was not alone in his belief that advertising promised great profit.
In 1900, total U.S. advertising expenditures were $450 million, and Campbell’s was poised to
enter the fray.130
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CHAPTER III.
THE POWER OF MRS. CONSUMER

In 1929 home economist and former editor of *Ladies' Home Journal*, Christine Frederick (1883-1970), penned her well-known treatise *Mrs. Consumer*, dedicated to President Herbert Hoover and intended to consolidate her considerable knowledge about middle-class homemaking. As self-appointed spokesman for Mrs. Consumer, the American woman, Frederick was an efficiency expert who proclaimed, “The American advertiser has taught the American housewife to think constructively of her job.”\(^1\) An obvious proponent of advertising and its influence on the domestic sphere, for decades Frederick enthusiastically encouraged housewives to buy a plethora of new goods in the name of household efficiency, an effective means to keep women’s primary work firmly planted within the domestic sphere. From innovative appliances and more efficient methods of cleaning to new recipes and cleansing products, she bolstered the notion that advertisers and manufacturers should always address women as homemakers and consumers.\(^2\) But her mantra was not solely about keeping women abreast of the latest laborsaving devices, Frederick viewed the practice of “consumptionism” as a new national doctrine, one that ensured progress and enlightenment for the rest of the world.\(^3\) According to Frederick, “[Consumptionism] is admitted today to be the greatest idea that America has to give to the world; the idea that workmen and the masses be looked upon not simply as workers or producers, but as *consumers.*”\(^4\) During the first quarter of the new century, ideologically, the concept of material consumption had begun to surpass manufacturing and production in national economic importance. “In the post-Industrial Revolution era, abundance was not a product of the hands, but of the purse . . . [and] Mrs. Consumer has made 85% of household purchases.”\(^5\)
By 1900, a fundamental ideological shift had occurred wherein purchasing power had become America’s unique calling card to the rest of the world. Product advertisers promoted the idea that the act of buying, rather than the production of goods, would lead to economic (and by extension, political) success, ensuring American dominance. And clearly, central to the success of this new cultural dogma was the active contribution of women as they honored their traditional yet expanded roles as keepers of the home flame and chief consumers. Frederick was a primary contributor to the scientific home economy movement, and she vehemently believed that women should be involved in all modes of production.\textsuperscript{6} For the wheels of commerce to turn smoothly, according to Frederick, women were to be consulted about their product needs, and businessmen had better listen, or else.

Mrs. Consumer can kick the whole program out of the kitchen window . . . if she decides that in some lines she wants more rather than less variety. Mrs. Consumer . . . when she isn’t consulted, she takes her unconscious revenge by her usual deadly weapon, failure to buy. For greater efficiency in production and distribution she positively \textit{must} be consulted. Loss and bankruptcy may be the cost of failure to do it . . . Mrs. Consumer of today is the sophisticated flapper of yesterday, who--quite literally--‘knows her groceries.’\textsuperscript{7}

While there is something to be said for Frederick’s passionate and almost warrior-like rhetoric, her book was written post-World War I and pre-Great Depression, and ironically, Americans would soon undergo some of the most difficult economic times ever experienced by the nation, requiring a delicate balance of conservation of resources alongside continued but reduced consumption. Indeed, women had come a long way during the first several decades of
the new century, but it had not been without continual struggle for political and economic empowerment. And while women had become a powerful consumer group by the late 1920s when Frederick wrote *Mrs. Consumer*, many historical challenges had faced them along the way.

The Idealized American Woman

As the Victorian age gave way to the Progressive era, America experienced converging economic and cultural changes. It was a period of intense debate as grass-roots consumer activism flourished, intent on forcing manufacturers to follow quality standards and ethical business practices. But perhaps as important to the transformation of culture were the gendered discursive practices that sought to define the very nature of consumption or consumerism and its enormous impact on society. As the middle class increased in population, they aspired to greater economic status. Carolyn Kitch identifies the “two chief components of the upwardly mobile ‘aesthetic of imitation’--culture and consumption--[as] the province of women, who were homemakers, magazine readers, and shoppers.” That powerful concept was embodied in the image of the New Woman, who represented not only what women were experiencing, but also the changes the country was undergoing. As icon, visualizations of the New Woman mirrored the culture’s attitudes about gender, race, class, and sexuality, and she was portrayed as such in advertisements for consumer goods and in the advice offered by women’s periodicals.

The modern inventions of the industrial revolution had wrought significant changes to the very essence of human life, its values and belief systems. As a result, the intellectual and political discourse of the day reflected an ensuing anxiety pertaining to elements of modernity and, in particular, consumerism. A fundamental question about the characteristic nature of consumer culture was posited within the realm of gender roles. Were people naturally producers
or consumers? And who was best suited to assume those roles, men or women? A cultural byproduct of both the increased consumer demand in the marketplace and the socio-political discourse of the day was the gendering of consumption, itself. Kathleen G. Donohue offers a summary of the debate:

Even though the consumer is a universal identity, encompassing both men and women, those who debated the proper political role of the consumer tended to do so in gendered terms. Those who wanted to establish the consumer as an active and pivotal player in the political sphere defined him as male. Those who wanted to establish the consumer as a passive and marginal political identity coded her female. In both cases, however, it was not the connotations surrounding the consumer but those surrounding gender that determined what the political role of the consumer should be.11

Historically, the identification of consumers and producers in American culture was infused with notions of negative vices contrasted with positive qualities. According to Donohue, “While the consumer was generally associated with luxury, sin and corruption, the producer evoked images of thrift, industry, virtue, and progress.”12 By the end of the nineteenth century, Thorstein Veblen attempted to codify consumption within gendered terms by answering the question of whether the politically powerful position of consumer was decidedly male or female. While he conceded that women were the primary consumers for the domestic domain, he marginalized their economic contributions by proposing that, in reality, women were not active marketplace participants, but rather their consumption and thus tangential political power was
realized only in service to their husbands. This belief continued to dominate attitudes about women and consumerism throughout the early decades of the twentieth century, and advertisers typically marketed to men by persuading their wives to try new products first.

During the 1890s, this ethos was embodied within the gendered roles assumed by men and women, and was manifest in numerous ways. Professional, organized advertising arose during the same period, creating the advent of a relatively new male identity, the aforementioned “ad man”—a thinking man’s profession, presumably based in business principles and dependent on scientific research. On a parallel, yet distinct, track was the evolution of Frederick’s modern “Mrs. Consumer.” This was a decidedly feminized role that placed women’s important cultural and economic opportunities in the traditional space of the home, while at the same time trivializing them as frivolous buyers of goods that were meant to increase leisure time. Even if woman’s consumption was most often in service to her husband and family rather than herself, the long-standing connotation persisted. Essential to the discourse of consumption was the belief that advertising should “educate desire,” meaning that it was incumbent upon ad men to educate women in a way that would tame their irrational, insatiable appetite for consumer goods. Circuitously, advertising was largely responsible for creating anxiety in housewives that suggested that they need only purchase certain goods to become more adept at being women; all the while any desires they had were to be suppressed by the same vehicle that created them—advertising. Peiss examines the historical and cultural associations between women and mass market consumerism, inculcated for more than one hundred years as seamless and natural:

And these terms [femininity and consumption] have been mutually reinforcing. Consumption is coded as a female pursuit, frivolous and even wasteful, a form of leisure rather than productive work.
In turn consumer identity obscures women’s important contributions to economic and political life.\textsuperscript{16}

Women’s identity as chief consumers, particularly of domestic goods, therefore was a mark of gender, defined as a passive economic role. This created an objectifying cultural positioning in which female consumers continued to be perceived as receivers of economic labor, rather than producers of it. Peiss claims: “Far from being a natural or inevitable phenomenon, however, this feminized image was rooted in a specific historical development, one in which women themselves played a key role.”\textsuperscript{17} Frederic Jameson suggests that, in capitalism, all people tacitly consent to be passive toward the ideological operations at work in mass culture in exchange for various forms of gratification.\textsuperscript{18} In this instance, the dichotomy created was one of men as active producers or manufacturers of culture, while women participated willingly (albeit at a subconscious level) as submissive consumers of the products of male labor. The ramifications of this transcend the simplistic notion of women as purchasers of mass goods and, instead, becomes “an entire way of life,” represented as social and class status based on consumption habits.\textsuperscript{19} Thus, turn-of-the-century consumerism reified the sexual subjugation of women to men as it regulated their behavior. Novelist Henry James associated women’s role as consumers with a form of psychosexual voracity, and in 1904, he depicted consumer culture as “two huge parted lips”--undoubtedly female lips.\textsuperscript{20} The pleasures of womanhood were to be experienced within this new, yet limited cultural role, and advertising worked to secure woman’s positioning. McCracken explains the power of magazines and advertisements:

\begin{quote}
Each functions as an idealized mirror image of the woman who gazes at them in which the everyday and the extraordinary are conjoined. While viewing the magazines, the woman herself
\end{quote}
participates in the construction of the idealized images; she performs a kind of pleasurable work by combining fantasy with elements of her everyday reality . . . Whether a perfect face, dress, meal, or furniture arrangement, these symbols appear all the more attainable because they urge the viewer to link the fantasy to her everyday life. 21

Thus, intimately connected to the actual activity of consumerism were the images that supported it, not just those of the goods for sale. Equally important were how the women in the ads were constructed, both visually and textually, in relation to the products. In Imaging American Women: Idea and Ideals in Cultural History, Martha Banta views the historical period between 1876 (the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition) and the end of World War I as the era of “the woman as image,” during which time idealized visualizations of the American woman became the predominant symbol of America herself. 22 As she notes:

[During that time] image-making and image-reading had become a major cultural activity, as well as the means for interpreting the nation’s achievements and gauging its weaknesses. Even more, ‘Woman’ and ‘American’ coalesced around the types of desire and fear underlay the very formation of that culture. 23

The advertising industry capitalized on the power of this cultural phenomenon, and the most popular images were variations of the New Woman. Embodied within her messages were prescriptions for broad national concerns such as health and safety, consumerism, fidelity, freedom, and nationhood.
Peiss points out that, while the late nineteenth century represents a synergy of economic and cultural changes in society that created a mass consumer market, it was also an era in which women were increasingly more visible in the public sphere. In greater numbers than ever before in America, by the 1890s women sought education in colleges or technical schools, took employment outside the home, and began to actively engage in political debate and functions of democracy. Many middle-class females became involved in the women’s club movement, which exposed them to political activities such as promoting progressive social reforms. These functions not only widened women’s sphere of influence, they also brought together women from different social and economic classes. But although there was diversity amongst women who entered into various aspects of the public sphere, the typical messages offered by women’s magazines portrayed them as a homogenous monolith, comprised of aspiring middle-class white homemakers who strove for perfection in all things domestic. While often acknowledging and even encouraging women’s public service activities, typically magazines and product advertisements conceptually framed these forays as service to home and family, and during times of national crisis, as service to country, rather than legitimate entrance into the public sphere.

As women’s roles changed, so did the discursive texts that sought to define them. While increasing numbers of women were making inroads into the public sphere, society adopted Veblen’s social dichotomy regarding consumerism. Even though women were encouraged to embrace this seemingly powerful new role, the very activities at its core, shopping and buying, were labeled as trivial and decidedly feminine, sometimes in the most derogatory way. Ironically, what had once been a labor-intensive utilitarian necessity, foraging for resources to keep the household running properly, now was associated with leisure activity. As early as the 1890s, conceptually, shopping was transformed into a pleasurable pastime for women, supported
by an abundance of department stores in urban areas and visually reinforced in the pages of women’s service magazines.

American department stores themselves were a complex locus of class and gender contestation. They flourished by creating a dynamic atmosphere of dreamy utopian possibility to all those who entered the labyrinth, weakening resistance and relinquishing self-denial. According to Leach:

[Department stores] communicated festivity, vitality, beauty, and fantasy, revealing the signature of individual stores and the inner possibilities of store life . . . [They], however, did not simply ‘sell’ commodities: they intervened with advertising skills to amplify the excitement of possibility inherent in the commodity form. They attempted to endow the goods with transformative messages and associations that the goods did not objectively possess.26

Department stores promised individual happiness, which could only be attained via a secular and public institutional setting.27 Schaum views the stores as a form of democratization of consumption that engulfed shoppers with a plethora of goods, creating voracious appetites, and irrational longings. However, while the stores provided the illusion that their wares were available to everyone, class tension increased as a result of the reality of lower-class desires and patrician class economic privilege.28

The gendered sexual politics of shopping point to how even though the act of consumption was often coded as feminine, the culture of consumption presented an arena of contestation between men and women. While “clothing manufacture, shopping and selling were characteristically female activities,” men controlled department stores.29 As more young women
sought paid work outside the family, many found employment as salesgirls in male-operated department stores. Reekie views the 1890s world of retailing as “not so much a struggle for control over the national culture . . . [but rather] as a contest between women and men over the effects and implications of an international culture of consumption.”\(^{30}\) Central to this disputed space were female consumers who were supposed to provide unpaid toil, which was trivialized by patriarchal society. But at the same time, men greatly benefited economically from the fruits of that labor. Even illustrations of modern women that on the surface appeared to be positive often portrayed women as idling away precious time while passively engaging in leisure activities such as shopping.\(^{31}\) The unpaid labor of buying goods was not given the respect due any other job necessary to the survival of the family. As early as the 1880s, the *New York Times* reported that shopping was becoming a vice among women, an addiction that should be stifled.\(^{32}\) Shopping, of course, took place in the public realm, and public life was male.

Shopping (and buying) became associated with activities such as leisure sports for women, and this perception seeped into the popular consciousness. Köhler examines how ubiquitous images of the popular Gibson Girl were often shown attired in sport outfits, posing, but not actually engaging in physical activities. Her image dominates any environment in which she is placed, but rarely does she find happiness amidst this outside realm.\(^{33}\) Köhler says that the Gibson Girl has the potential to embody the “aspirations to self-reliance and independence that American middle-class women see in her,” but that her (male) creator only allows her a modicum of independence from the duties of the domestic realm.\(^{34}\)

Just as ad men played an important role in marketing products and consumer ideology to women, high-powered male editors were integral in educating their readers about how to evolve appropriately into a masculine vision of idealized womanhood--achieved, of course, from within
the pages of their popular periodicals. The Gibson Girl and other similar depictions of the modern American female were featured regularly alongside messages that sought to control women’s ambitions and desires. The textual and visual discourse within the magazines was created by men to influence the behaviors and attitudes of women. Alongside the overt advertising touting the latest consumer goods, the editorial pages (usually comprised of fiction, poetry, helpful tips, advice, and recipes) most often encouraged women to think of themselves as the chief purchasing agent in the household, thereby creating a new identity for females that came with the territory of being a modern woman. Most women accepted their new identity as consumer, even though the role was positioned safely within the confines of traditional domesticity, and therefore open to constant societal scrutiny. Like the other popular magazines of the era, Good Housekeeping intended to educate women in consumerism, all the while introducing them to the most modern household technologies and the latest brand-name goods. Modern woman’s identity became framed within the brands that she chose to purchase, as touted by male editors and marketed by predominantly male advertisers.

The New Woman Faces the Twentieth Century

In its 105th year, Good Housekeeping reflected on women’s lives at the turn of the twentieth century, and described them as one of continual toil:

It took the strength of an ox to scrub kitchen floors, knead masses of dough, and to survive that dreaded of all chore days, Blue Monday; a day that meant lugging, soaking, boiling, rubbing, wringing, and rinsing clothes. What
followed was the inevitable exhaustion and headaches of Tuesday.37

Indeed, women’s daily occupation was to manage the household, which included everything from non-stop cooking and cleaning, managing domestic help and child rearing, to husband pleasing. In response to the issue of household tedium, a social movement had been brewing for decades in an effort to reform domestic life. By the late 1800s, several women’s magazines positioned themselves at the crossroads of the movement, and thousands of women began to look to these periodicals to help liberate them from slavery of the home. The earliest ads for household goods promised women relief from drudgery, but to achieve this domestic freedom, they needed to become educated about modern technologies, whether it was the latest sewing machine, fireless cooker, or something seemingly as mundane as the preparation of condensed soup. Women also had to take responsibility for their own domestic emancipation. In addressing the reality of “blue Monday,” reader “A.S.M.” submitted an essay to the July 1905 issue of Good Housekeeping, explaining how she had to take control of the duties that gripped her every day of the week:

The proverbial blue Monday, with its insistent duties, and alas, its tired bodies, bad headaches, cross tempers and feeling of inertia, was for some time a weekly occurrence in our household, as it is in many others; indeed . . . Sunday was not the day of joy and rest to me that it was to the other members of my family.38

After describing her multitudinous responsibilities, reader “A.S.M.,” although unable to relieve herself of anything, was able to rearrange her schedule, but only after getting her entire family’s approval. To an early twentieth-century homemaker, this was considered progress.
It was within the pages of the magazines, both the editorial and advertising sections that the issues of consumerism, gender politics, and the separation of male and female spheres collided, creating a cultural tension that often seemed contradictory in its conflicting traditional/progressive messages to women. New inventions and domestic methodologies were considered modern and progressive, but typically, the underlying subtext to women was conservative in its attempts to keep women placed solidly within the confines of home, in service to husband and children. By 1900, discursive narratives of the domestic sphere had quite a long, entrenched history that inextricably tied women to concepts of home and family.

To understand the responsibilities born by the New Woman at the turn of the twentieth century, it is important to understand the environment from whence she emerged. Historically, the concept of the domestic sphere, or as more typically described, home, has occupied an important place in American culture, bringing to mind well-worn phrases such as home sweet home, home is where the heart is, there’s no place like home, and dying for one’s homeland. To the untrained eye, the historical idea of home may seem devoid of politicization: however, the evolution of that cultural construct has long been emblazoned with gender, racial, and class stratification. While the female-centered novelists may have imagined new models of womanhood, most women existed within a framework of everyday life that privileged a masculinist vision of the world. As women in 1900 could look forward to emerging modern technologies intended to lessen their burden, they continued to contend with the predominant essentializing belief that woman’s natural state was that of marriage and maternity.

Historically, the American home of the 1800s was imbued with multi-layers of discursive practices that placed both women and men’s roles within strict frameworks of values and beliefs. While women, men, and children obviously inhabited the home together, within the discursive
space of the domestic sphere, their roles were differentiated and categorized separately, a practice that magazine editors and advertisers continued to promote into the next century. Barbara Welter, Nancy Cott, and Linda Kerber, preeminent historians of women’s culture, have written extensively about the dominant nineteenth century dogma, the “cult of true womanhood” or the “cult of domesticity,” which was based on strict codified roles for women that placed them as the moral guardians of domestic life. This staunch image of woman sought to restrain her within the basic tenets of the “cult of true womanhood,” sustained by its dogma of piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity. However, it is important to note that real women had been challenging this conceptualization for decades as they worked actively for many reforms in the public sphere, such as abolition, suffrage, and temperance, the ideology of true womanhood required that a woman’s sense of self-identity existed only in relation to others. More often than not, feminists used the fundamental discourse that firmly placed women within the home—that they were morally superior to men—as they transgressed into the public realm. They asserted that women could improve conditions because they could bring domestic morality to civic life.

By the second half of the 1800s, the increasing development of industrialization, abolition of slavery, arrivals of large numbers of immigrants, and expansion of the frontier had great impact on the structure of the American family unit. This new wage labor economy was based on principles of differentiation, specialization, and mechanization that moved commodity production outside the family home and into the factory or firm. Farms and small businesses still existed, but large corporations soon dominated the economy. As a result, these societal changes also drastically affected the roles that women played in the economy. The concept of separate spheres was largely a result of a Victorian ethos that resulted from burgeoning capitalist society. Paralleling the new economic structure of the Republic, the mode of production was separated
from the family, thereby creating a new discourse of two spatially separate, gendered spheres. Women were no longer involved in wealth-producing types of work that had been conducted at home during pre-industrial times but now occurred outside of the family structure. Thus, women lost their primary avenue of access to the economic system. As Maria Mies states, “The creation of the private family in contrast to the public economic and political sphere constrained women’s independence . . . to benefit the interest of the state and the church in controlling women’s bodies and labor.”40 Partly in response to this new reality, a domestic science movement surfaced in the late 1800s.

The consequences of industrialization ushered in an era of progressive reforms. Americans began looking to experts in all fields to help solve the problems created by modern life. Those involved in the scientific home management movement sought to redefine the basic utility of the home and believed that, through education, women could once again serve the good of the nation. Since women were no longer involved in the production of household goods, “the housewife must learn to consume them efficiently.”41 New technologies and advertising contributed to the burgeoning success of the movement. In addition, effective management of the home was directly related to a new outside profession for women, home economics. This presented an interesting paradox in which some women freely chose to work outside the domestic sphere as home economist experts, but their primary objective was to keep the majority of women securely embedded within their traditional roles as homemakers. And with the new “science” of homemaking came many new responsibilities. Home was to become a site in which battles were waged against various societal ills, such as “infant mortality, contagious diseases, intemperance, divorce, insanity, and pauperism.”42 Advertising was instrumental in educating women about their new civic responsibilities.
Thus, the construction of the separate spheres continued to be predicated on differently prescribed, specialized sex roles that served the economic and political project of capitalism. While the public sphere was comprised of vast open spaces where enterprise thrived under the direction of men, the private sphere, or the home, continued to be the province of women. As Ewen claims, “The primacy of industrialism was making a captive anachronism out of the home-defined woman, while the pre-dominant patriarchal ideal still sought to contain her within the traditional domain.”

Although women generally were denied access to the public sphere and were, in many cases, bound by the actual physicality of the home, men were legally and morally masters of that domestic domain. Women were responsible for making a home for their husband and children, but they had no authority to deny access or protect the so-called woman’s sphere from daily incursions of the male gender. Thus, the home a woman occupied was never quite her own. In addition, households that had once been extended with slaves, servants, and other non-family members during pre-capitalism were now becoming much smaller family “units.”

Households became homes—managed by women, but ruled by men.

Recent feminist researchers have challenged the notion of separate spheres and have shown that both domains, private and public, held some permeability for men, as well as women. However, Rutherford claims “the concept . . . can still be useful largely because nineteenth-century social commentators themselves used the metaphor.” The ethos of separate spheres demanded that woman’s vocation was biologically determined and conducted within the parameters both physically and psychologically of the home. While gender roles and work roles prescribed to nineteenth-century men allowed them to move freely between the separate spheres, escaping from the work world into the home and then back again into the outside environment, women were restrained by the conceptual border between the two. For women, home and work
occupied the same physically bound space. Therefore, women’s work role did not allow for any relief from her vocation.\textsuperscript{46} The domestic sphere belonged to women only in the rhetorical sense, as legally and economically men controlled it.

Even so, most women desired to meet standards of social respectability and achieve status bestowed upon a True Woman because it signaled membership into the community and a modicum of economic and political access, albeit subjugated. From middle-and upper-class women to the poorest classes, from women in urban areas to those on the frontier, and to all women regardless of race or ethnicity, the ideology of true womanhood permeated American society’s perception of what a woman should be--but not all women could truly gain such status. Generally, a recognized true woman of the 1800s was white and middle-upper class.\textsuperscript{47}

But what purpose did this paradigm serve, and how was it achieved? In times of great national change, it provided a symbolic ordering of life based on religion, the family, and of course, the home. Women were responsible for creating a space of solace for men, a safe haven in which they could escape the moral degeneracy of the public realm and the business world. As the “angels of the home,” wives and mothers provided the proper religious environment that maintained the moral purity of men. Femininity at mid-century was shrouded in a discourse of purity, and women were responsible for the purification of society. However, the burgeoning feminist movement and some women’s desire for enfranchisement threatened the balance of idealized domestic bliss, and many women actively participated in the quest for social, economic, and political empowerment. The changing nature of women’s role in society was commonly referred to as the Woman Question, and it was hotly debated within the popular press. Those who supported female emancipation via access to education and suffrage drew volatile ire from conservative forces who sought to maintain the tenets of traditional femininity and
domesticity. Journalists regularly attacked feminist campaigners, referring to them as “Revolting Women, Wild Women, the Shrieking Sisterhood, harridans, and hags.” According to the dominant discourse, these women were not pure. So it is equally important to recognize that the new woman of the 1880s and 1890s gained visibility and some modicum of public entry as a result of the political activism of her Victorian foremothers.

While the majority of women were denied education equal to that of men, they did have access to various kinds of reading materials, and most often, they read ladies’ journals and novels. These resources, in addition to religious literature, heavily promoted powerful and compelling images of true womanhood to their female readership. Literature intended for women dealt with issues of utmost importance to her development as a true woman and covered such topics as homemaking, motherhood and child-rearing, wifely responsibilities, proper etiquette and behavior, female education and appropriate social obligations. But the overarching, single canon revealed by the published literature was that of domesticity and the creation of the ideal woman. Thus, the True Woman of the nineteenth century stood in stark contrast to the image of feminists who were often scoffed at within the pages of the popular press. As we will see in subsequent chapters, elevating the particular precepts of true womanhood was a successful strategy of social containment, not unlike the discursive practices that would become pervasive in early twentieth-century magazines and advertisements. Like the basic tenets of true womanhood, the domestic ideology of the early twentieth century did not provide for women who chose not to marry or bear children--both wifedom and motherhood were essential to the maintenance of cherished traditional values. Women who disregarded those principles were branded as improper, unattractive, and without morality. The New Woman and all that she represented appeared to undermine women’s primary duty--to produce offspring. And many of
the women who actively participated in efforts to bring about reforms actually did view this ideology as a form of enforced motherhood.

At the dawn of the new century, the American home maintained its status as the primary site in which sexual order and the cultural imperative could be preserved. Because women were denied venues for public discourse, typically, privilege could be attained only through association with white males. The key place for this affiliation to take place was within the bounded, politicized zone of the home. This domestic ideology was powerful and pervasive, and early twentieth-century advertisers capitalized on this abiding connection, all the while using variations of the New Woman in their ads. So while the New Woman appeared to be the modern, independent daughter of the Victorian True Woman, they continued to have much in common. Their ancestral bond was forged through a century of indoctrination, largely promoted through popular reading materials that placed heavy burdens on the female sex to prevent the moral turpitude of an entire nation from within the confines of the home.

While the progressive era New Woman, as depicted often by the charming Gibson Girl, became the visual darling of popular culture, like the True Woman, the image was strictly controlled. Even though she may have looked different, and in some respects, behaved more independently, she still was haunted by the responsibilities of her predecessors. Regardless, by the turn of the twentieth century, consumerism was clearly a fundamental responsibility of the modern American woman, herself an offshoot of the old-fashioned True Woman. But did the New Woman become a stereotype, devoid of any historical, intertextual connection to her activist foremothers? And was there an actual “cult of new womanhood” promoted in popular culture and marking a “new” femininity--one that had tamed the New Woman of the 1890s and
traded the tenets of the True Woman (piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity) for consumerism, modernism, patriotism, and hyper-domesticity?

*Good Housekeeping*  
and the Higher Life of the Household

Magazines came into existence in the mid-1700s, but they really began to flourish alongside American consumer culture in the late 1800s. Just as the mass production of consumer goods became a societal force during that time, so did the national magazine industry, made possible by new printing technologies and better modes of distribution. An increasing number of publications known as women’s service magazines sought to whet the appetite of female readers who were hungry for serial literature, tips on housekeeping and childrearing, and news about the latest domestic inventions. This relatively new variety of periodical was typically “small-folio in size, highly departmentalized, and personal in tone.”

By the late 1800s, several ladies’ magazines were known as the “Big Six”--*Ladies’ Home Journal, McCall’s, Delineator, Woman’s Home Companion, Pictorial Review, and Good Housekeeping*--so entitled because they led all other journals in circulation and ability to attract substantial advertising revenue. “Characterized by low price, high volume, and advertising support, these journals soon reached hundreds of thousands of female readers across the nation.” They appealed to middle-class female interests (broadly defined) by providing enticing fiction and specialized service departments intended to educate the fairer sex in everything regarding home and family. Standard topics included mothercraft, cookery, housekeeping, servant issues, and keeping husbands satisfied--anything that influenced the domestic sphere. Advertising assured that women were kept abreast of the latest goods and services, as consumerism was now a woman’s “job.” As chief household purchasing agent, it
was the wife-mother’s responsibility to procure modern goods for the family at a reasonable cost and most efficiently to use the latest kitchen gadgetry. This was a continual message conveyed not only in the advertising pages of the magazines, but throughout the editorial content, as well.

In 1985, President Ronald Reagan sent a letter to the editor of *Good Housekeeping*, John Mack Carter, offering congratulations on the 100th anniversary of the magazine. The letter was published in the May issue, and in it the President said, “Not many publications can claim the proud distinction of providing a century of service to our nation.” That brief description underscored *Good Housekeeping*’s intended contribution to American society from the beginning, particularly its message to women. Perhaps more so than its competitors, from its inception *Good Housekeeping* concentrated on home and family matters, overtly indicated by its subtitle: “A Family Journal Conducted in the Interests of the Higher Life of the Household.” The first issue, dated May 1885, promised to fulfill its mission “compounded of about equal portions of public duty and private enterprise; to produce and perpetuate perfection--or as near perfection as may be obtained in the household.”

The magazine was founded in Holyoke, Massachusetts, by newspaper editor, Clark W. Bryan, who, from the beginning created an interactive and participatory atmosphere with his readers. Readers paid $2.50 per year for a subscription and were encouraged to send in questions, as well as to contribute tips for other women about housekeeping, cooking, and raising children. In the popular “Discoveries and Observations” department of the magazine, readers would submit homespun advice to others about cooking, gardening, and housekeeping. Mott describes the publication as “very scrapbookish, full of household hints, fashions, cookery, puzzles, poetry, and a little fiction.” *Good Housekeeping* undoubtedly fit nicely amongst all of the other reading materials that women kept at hand in their home. Like other ladies’ journals of
the day, from the beginning *Good Housekeeping* actively promoted women’s role as household consumer and used popular watchwords to instill the message. McCracken claims that “two frequent ideological code words that women’s magazines use to promote consumption are ‘advice’ and ‘information’. . . [thus creating an] ‘ideology of advice/ideology of information.’”62 *Good Housekeeping* sought to make consumerism a comfortable, albeit new and important, job responsibility for women, and the interactivity of the magazine with its readers created a safe haven on which they could rely.

In the early days, the wholesome charm of the magazine was intended to appeal to lower middle-class women who perhaps aspired to higher socioeconomic status.63 Like the other women’s journals of the day, *Good Housekeeping* implicitly promised women “admission” to higher society within its pages. After Bryan’s suicide in 1898,64 the magazine changed hands a few times before being purchased by the Phelps Publishing Company, which published several agricultural journals at the time.65 In 1900, with James Eaton Tower as editor, *Good Housekeeping*’s circulation was approximately twenty-five thousand, well below the level of some of its sister competitors, but still a substantial and growing readership.66

From the beginning, advertising was important to the success of consumer magazines, finding its place within women’s periodicals beginning as early as the 1890s. Before that time, most advertisements appeared in local newspapers and trade magazines. But manufacturers soon realized that to reach a broader market, it was advantageous to place their ads in mass circulation consumer publications. Small advertisements (usually less that a quarter-page) were placed in magazines in the 1890s, but within ten years, full-page ads became the norm for most national manufacturers.67 The significance of advertisers “discovering” national magazines should not be underestimated. This inextricable link was a tremendously important factor in the explosion of
consumerism as a mainstay of American culture in the early twentieth century. Both Campbell’s Soup and Good Housekeeping can attribute much of their early market success to this historic phenomenon.

Magazine publishers sought to appeal to a specialized audience and geared their editorial content accordingly. And once advertisers identified a niche market, such as the economic opportunities presented by women’s service magazines, they were able to effectively influence consumer behavior and place their products into homes. From the beginning, advertisers of domestic products used psychological and emotional tactics to instill exaggerated notions of inadequacy in female readers. Ewen claims “a given ad asked not only that an individual buy its product, but that [she] experience a self-conscious perspective [implying] that [she] had previously been socially and psychically denied.” The implication is that when the woman then buys something, her guilt and frustrations are alleviated by associating herself with products intended to make life easier for her family. A happy female consumer creates a happy household, or so the advertising promised.

In the ensuing years, overall national ad revenue exploded from $190 million in 1890 to $682 million in 1914. Ladies’ Home Journal garnered the most advertising revenue of all women’s periodicals, charging a whopping $4,000 in 1899 for an advertiser to claim the coveted back cover. By 1914, that rate had jumped to $6,000 for a full-sized ad. By contrast, the cost of a full-page ad in Good Housekeeping was a bargain at only $560. This was due to its significantly smaller size, lower circulation, and the fact that all the ads were located in a special ad section at the back of the magazine rather than being integrated within the main editorial content. While several magazines placed ads alongside the reading materials, a practice that
was not without its critics, *Good Housekeeping* inserted a special advertising section in the back of each issue that contained no editorial content, only pages of commercial advertisements.\(^72\)

Even though advertising had become commonplace at the turn of the century, consumers still viewed it with some apprehension, not always sure that the claims being made were true. To ease its readers’ concerns about the efficacy of advertised products, *Good Housekeeping* offered a guarantee. And in 1901, the magazine created the innovative hands-on Experiment Station as a way to reinforce its commitment to champion consumer interests. *Good Housekeeping* positioned itself as fulfilling a public duty, because, like its competitors, it wanted to win the trust of female readers. To ensure the merits of consumer goods, staff members systematically tested all the products and methods that were written about and advertised within its pages.\(^73\)

The stated intent of the Experiment Station was for the staff of the magazine to work hard so women did not have to—“The Experiment Station was to be a central headquarters to which all may apply for help toward the higher life of the household.”\(^74\) At that time, *Good Housekeeping*’s dedication to only endorsing tested products distinguished it from its rivals.

By 1902, the magazine proclaimed an “Ironclad Contract” with its readers to guarantee the reliability of the products advertised within its pages. It read:

> We mean that you shall deal with our advertisers in the confidence that you will be fairly and squarely treated. If, in spite of all our care, some advertisement should be admitted through which any subscriber is imposed upon or dishonestly dealt with, we will make good to such subscriber the full amount of the loss.\(^75\)

The practice of guaranteeing advertised products was not uncommon in women’s service journals. And some manufacturers garnered reciprocal support by actually featuring the
magazines that had endorsed their products within their own ads. However, the effect of guaranteeing the legitimacy of products should not be overlooked, particularly concerning the purity of consumer foods. During the 1880s and 1890s, several pure-food bills were introduced in Congress, but there were already numerous powerful product manufacturing lobbies at work, and none of the proposed legislation passed into law. American families, and particularly mothers, were left to fend for themselves and hope for the best as it pertained to the health of their children and the food they ingested—a very serious issue of national proportions. The purity discourse of the 1800s that had situated the True Woman central to the morality of the country now took on new meaning. By 1900, purity (while it still had moral implications) came to be associated with domestic goods, particularly food and medicine. Throughout the early years of Good Housekeeping, this social issue had substantial impact on editorial content, as well as on the advertising within its pages. This will be discussed in more detail in subsequent chapters.

The Kids Enter the Scene

While Good Housekeeping was just beginning its marketing campaign to promote consumer advocacy, one of its soon-to-be leading advertisers was gearing up to enter the magazine arena. As noted previously, Campbell Soup’s appearance at the Exposition Universelle et Internationale de Paris in 1900 represented the culmination of great societal changes like never before seen. Advancements in manufacturing made it possible for Campbell to offer the public a new product that was both nutritious and easy to use, thereby satisfying the ever-growing societal demand for women to manage the home in the most laborsaving and cost efficient way possible. And the effectiveness of commercial advertising was unmistakable. Society was attuned to this persuasive visual medium, having grown accustomed to the brightly
colored posters wrought during the *belle époque* that advertised everything from the latest theatrical release and the most recent bicycle technology to supposed miracle-producing pharmaceuticals. By the early 1900s, the marriage between advertising and American consumer culture was fully consummated, and Campbell Soup was on the verge of becoming one of its most prolific procurers. Even the eye-catching red-and-white label on the diminutive can paid homage to the business world’s increasing reliance on striking visual images to sell products.

Soon after John Dorrance’s innovative style rocketed the Campbell Soup Company past its more established competitors in Paris, the 27-year-old was elected Director and Vice President. His primary goal was to convince Campbell executives to invest in new equipment and expand their advertising campaigns. In 1899, the company had spent a mere $10,000 on advertising, but only two years later, it raised the ad budget to $50,000. In addition, the product line was increased to twenty-one different varieties of condensed soup. Dorrance stuck with an already successful formula, seeing to it that the new flavors united a touch of haute cuisine with preparatory ease. “These soups accomplished a careful merging of American and Continental cooking traditions, creating a product line both cosmopolitan and quite common.” By 1904, the company already had begun to contribute to America’s changing dietary habits by selling 16 million cans of ready-to-eat soup. Company sales totaled $900,000 for that same year, and condensed soup sales comprised $750,000 of the total amount.

Undoubtedly, Dorrance had created a unique product, but now he had to generate strong brand identity for the company. He knew the time was ripe to broaden their market by advertising nationally to women across the country. Dorrance not only proved to be a gifted scientist, but during his more than thirty year reign at Campbell he demonstrated his business acumen time and time again by developing advertising strategies that ensured a huge
international market for his little cans of soup. Before long, a percentage of American housewives believed that they needed pre-made soups in order to properly provide for the nutritional needs of their family. “Here is the prescience of Dr. Dorrance and those who followed his leadership in sensing a need for a product before the consumer was even aware of it, creating the product in the best way possible, and then creating a niche for it.” Campbell’s condensed soup was soon to become a staple of the American kitchen.

As the Campbell Soup Company moved forward into the new century, Dorrance was about to make another monumental business decision. It is unlikely, however, that even he realized at the time that the company would become a permanent part of Americana, both economically and symbolically, more than one hundred years later. That fact, in large part is the result of a fortuitous advertising decision made in 1904: the selection of the Campbell Soup Kids as the company’s iconic, most enduring (and endearing) corporate emblems. Adopting the image of spunky children to personify intangible marketing qualities such as “youthful vigor, taste, nutrition, and quality” created a conduit through which modern mothers became emotionally tethered to Dr. Dorrance’s product, condensed soup.

Having experienced considerable success several years earlier by placing advertisements on streetcars in the largest cities across the country, Dorrance and company were ready to expand their marketing techniques. Jingle writer Charles Snyder, who had been writing the car cards since 1899, suggested that in addition to its catchy slogans, the company should consider adopting a mascot to “speak” his words to the public. It was 1904, and many other goods manufacturers were using similar devices quite successfully—ZuZu the ginger snap clown for the National Biscuit Company, Force Cereal’s Sunny Jim character, and Nipper, the adorable dog that promoted RCA’s phonographs. Susman views this development of character-based
advertising as indicative of society’s transition from a culture that valued “character” to one that elevated the importance of “personality” above true character.85 Having personality makes one stand out from a crowd, or in the case of a product, stand out on the grocery shelf.

The development of advertising characters coincided with the increase in availability of national brand products. Brand name products cannot be disentwined from advertising, as they encourage consumers to associate intangible values with a certain product in the blink of an eye. The significance of branding should not be underestimated: “A product is something that is made in a factory; a brand is something that is bought by customers. A product can be copied by competitors; a brand is unique.”86 As the symbolic representation of a brand, a successful advertising icon can elicit a mosaic of meanings relating to a variety of ideals, values, and beliefs, such as loyalty, love, trustworthiness, or patriotism.87 The employment of such advertising strategies encourages consumers to “relate” to the projected personality of the spokescharacter, the embodiment of certain positive qualities with which the consumer should want to be associated. Buying the product somehow instills in consumers a sense of attaining those very same qualities, no matter how abstract or nebulous.88 In a more practical sense but no less symbolic, as representative of a brand, advertising characters become a sort of shopping shorthand for consumers. Jones explains:

Symbols are easy to buy because they can discriminate between brands vividly, in contrast to rational product evaluation, which is hard work and time-consuming. Therefore people actively cooperate and collude in endowing products with symbolic and metaphoric meanings, because these meanings are useful in helping them form habits. Thus, the favorite, trusted brands
become signposts through the clutter of media messages and supermarket facings.89

So it is no surprise that, as Dorrance was committed to developing Campbell as a major national brand, he was open to the idea of finding a corporate mascot. Coincidentally, while jingle writer Snyder was extolling the benefits of adopting a spokescharacter, Theodore Wiederseim, Jr., employee of a lithograph manufacturing company in Philadelphia, was vying to gain Campbell as a client. Wiederseim’s wife, Grace, was a freelance illustrator of children’s books and comic strips who featured roly-poly children in her sketches.90 To get the Campbell account, Wiederseim presented various ideas and included some of Grace’s precocious-looking characters in his advertising layouts.91 Members of the Campbell’s advertising committee immediately were won over by the wholesomeness of the spirited tots, and the Campbell Soup Kids came to life, first appearing on streetcar placards.92 Like the soup they promoted, the Kids were instantly popular with the public, and as a result, they were able to “vocalize” the company’s basic consumer philosophy with its primary tenets of quality, convenience, economy, and taste (Fig. 15). Aric Chen describes the lasting appeal of the Kids:

For one hundred years, these rosy-cheeked, cherub-faced youngsters have grown with the country, reflecting its cultural shifts while espousing its ideals and aspirations. They have promoted the Red Cross, inspired Americans to buy war bonds and, later, encouraged children to conserve electricity and build self-esteem. They’ve donned costumes of all nations, traveled to locales far and wide, played grown-ups and dress-up, and, of
course, rollicked in good-natured fun. And all the while, they have heartily and happily slurped their Campbell soup.  

When the Kids made their first appearances on streetcars in 1905, the reaction was immediate. Campbell was besieged with requests from the public for copies of the ads, and the company obliged by only charging fans fifteen cents to cover the cost of mailing. Mothers brightened up nursery walls with pictures of the chubby tots, and schools placed them in kindergarten rooms. As a result, early on in their lives children developed a lasting relationship with the Campbell Soup Kids, and by extension, the product they promoted, canned soup. Their continual exposure to Campbell’s products was perceived as something positive, friendly, and trustworthy, thanks to the qualities personified by the Kids.
Mothers also forged conceptual relationships with the apple-cheeked mascots and bought their message of product quality and reliability that, in some sense, replaced the connections they had experienced previously with their local grocer. “Before canned and packaged foods, shoppers had enjoyed close relationships with their grocers, who had helped them scoop and shovel out quantities from barrels and jars.”97 Previously, female shoppers had entrusted the nutrition and safety of their food to the local grocer—even though the purity of goods remained a serious, ongoing issue. Now, advertising had taken over as the predominant form of information and product quality assurance. It was not really the canning companies or food manufacturers that women were asked to trust, but rather it was advertising that became the mediator of the message about product safety and purity. Whether or not women trusted the advertising became the hurdle that most producers needed to jump with success. And the Campbell Soup Kids proved to be an ingenious device to guarantee mothers that the condensed soup they were buying was both nutritionally good for their children and pure.

As it were, by 1905 the public was about to become inundated with Kids’ imagery, especially within the boundaries of the domestic sphere. Their adoption as company emblems occurred just as another major decision was being made by Dorrance and his advertising executives. It was during that same year that Campbell’s began placing advertisements in the most popular women’s magazines of the day, including Good Housekeeping and Ladies’ Home Journal, among many others.98 The Campbell Soup Kids were featured prominently in many of these ads, and thus, infatuated consumers had the opportunity to enjoy the ubiquitous tots right in their own homes. The public’s obsession with the Campbell Soup Kids lasted for decades as requests for copies of ads continued to stream in.
Children in particular were drawn to the cheerful Kids feisty cuteness. Both verbally and visually, the Kids communicated to children in ways that were appealing to them but with a wisdom that was aimed at adult consumers. Cleverly, the Kids not only expressed in understandable terms the corporate values of the Campbell Soup Company, but they promoted prevailing societal ideologies, as well. They became a visual metaphor of the corporate philosophy of the Campbell’s Soup Company. While there is no real way to understand the immediate popularity of the Kids, one can speculate that they not only personified the company they represented, but they also mirrored positive human elements that consumers wanted to see in themselves. The birth of the Campbell Soup Kids coincided with the adolescent era of modern America and her “relentless faith in progress and can-do spirit.” From the beginning, the Campbell Soup Company fully embraced the Kids as its corporate symbol and imbued in them both its public and internal mission statement, one of optimism (in progress) and loyalty (to brand and country). As a nod to the Kids’ ability to effectively communicate corporate ideology, from its inception in 1912 through 1936, the rowdy mascots graced every cover of the corporation’s employee publication, *The Optimist*, which was also sent to grocers. In the public’s perception, visual metaphors operate very differently from verbal metaphors and thus become a powerful device to attract brand loyalty:

Whereas verbal exaggeration quickly reaches the point of rejection on the grounds of disbelief, this does not happen with the visual metaphor. Whimsy and hyperbole are acceptable in [visual] metaphor, but can be counterproductive in verbal communication. . . Visual metaphors evoke mental processing on
the part of consumers, who must interpret the metaphors to extract their meaning.101

In addition, visual metaphors can change over time--be updated or used differently--and consumers typically allow for the transformation without creating backlash. In fact, advertising icons must change with the times to continue to be culturally relevant. Advertising icons fulfill a similar role to that of storytellers--they reflect societal changes, and they become part of the myth of how we define ourselves at a given moment in time. Like the icon Barbie of the latter half of the twentieth century, the Campbell Soup Kids have changed over time to keep up with new cultural attitudes and interests. In particular, their appearance has evolved to reflect changing standards of physical well-being. Albeit chunky by today’s fitness requirements, initially the Kids were depicted as active and outdoorsy. Regularly they were allowed to venture beyond the domestic realm of mothers and real children, doing everything from driving cars to flying planes, activities that at that time were decidedly within the male sphere. While they globetrotted, ironically the Kids’ primary directives to adult female consumers implied that they could best support their country from within the boundaries of home and family. As a result of their broad popularity, in essence the Kids became the influential voice through which children were encouraged to speak to their mothers. Children across America wore lapel pins emblazoned with the phrase “I Am a Campbell Kid,” as if the true intention of the Kids was ownership of hearts and minds within the domestic realm.102 Ultimately, however, even though women had begun to make some buying decisions with regards to the household, it was men who had to be convinced that a product was worthy of purchase. So the corporate goal of the Kids’ messages was to provide women with persuasive arguments that would influence males to accept condensed soup into their kitchens and onto their dining tables.
The connection between the adorable renderings of the Kids and the company’s attitude toward Mrs. Consumer is evidenced in a letter reprinted in Chen’s book, sent twenty-five years after the mascots were introduced. Printed on stationery from “The Home of the Campbell’s Kids,” the letter is dated October 17, 1929 and reads:

Dear Miss Nancy:

It was very nice to hear from you again and we are sending you some of the very old Campbell’s Kid illustrations which you requested and two full size Campbell’s Kids pictures.

The Campbell’s Kiddies have been drawn to show the joyous benefits of good health brought about by eating the right foods, getting plenty of sleep and fresh air.

To allow you and your Mother to become better acquainted with the many delicious Soups prepared in the Campbell’s Kitchens we are enclosing a detailed description of each.

Let us hear from you again, Nancy, at any time you want more of the latest Campbell’s Kids and we will send them.

Yours very truly,
Campbell Soup Company

Eat Soup and Keep Well!103

In addition to being highly persuasive in their messages to children and mothers, the Campbell Soup Kids represent what was perhaps the first example of a wildly successful mass franchising of popular culture merchandise. The public could not only receive copies of ads or letters from the Kids, but by 1909 they could buy Campbell Soup Kids dolls, send Campbell Soup Kids postcards, or show their devotion to the Kids by purchasing numerous other promotional items (Fig. 16).104
Within five years of their inception, the Kids completely personified the Campbell Soup Company and greatly helped to boost company sales. But all of this was made possible, primarily, by the advertisements regularly placed in women’s magazines. In 1905, just one year after their creation, the Campbell Soup Kids were about to make a grand entrance into middle-class households all across America within the pages of women’s service magazines, including *Good Housekeeping*. 

Fig. 16. Example of an early Campbell Soup doll. ¹⁰⁵
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CHAPTER IV.
MOTHERS: 1905 – 1910

By 1905, American housewives were faced with an exponential explosion in newly developed domestic technologies. For twenty years, Good Housekeeping had informed readers on how best to modernize the home and keep the family intact. In that same year, attuned with the times, the Joseph Campbell Preserve Company placed its initial advertisements in consumer publications, including Good Housekeeping. This represented the soup company’s first foray into the arena of national marketing and sales. During this time, it was also undergoing some internal changes. When Campbell’s condensed soups were first introduced in 1897, the firm manufactured about ten cases a week. However, by 1905 that number had risen dramatically to nearly 40,000 cases produced every week (representing twenty million cans per year). As the profitability of soup increased and the company placed its manufacturing and marketing emphasis there, sales of its other products such as canned preserves began to slide. Soon, the company made a dramatic decision to discontinue its line of preserves, jellies, jams, and fruit butter, and it also stopped canning goods for other labels.

With the exception of its popular canned pork and beans, a household favorite introduced in 1904, the company was out of the preserves market. As a result, it underwent another name change, now becoming known as the Joseph Campbell Company. The success of Campbell’s product line, which was largely due to a focused marketing message delivered by the Campbell Soup Kids, created the potential for Dorrance to boost his advertising budget. From a conservative $20,000 in 1899, it would eventually increase to approximately $200,000 by the year 1910. The reality that America had become “a nation of soup eaters” was evident in the
daily calendar of menus *Good Housekeeping* provided every month. Soup was suggested for nearly every luncheon and dinner, and the variety was staggering: clear soup, cream of pea soup, split pea soup, cream of celery soup, consommé with noodles, tomato and rice soup, tomato with beans soup, spinach soup, cream of cauliflower soup, corn chowder, barley soup, chicken soup, black bean soup, potato soup, and onion soup were recommended just in the month of January 1905 alone!³ It is certainly no surprise that more and more women began turning to Campbell’s Soup to alleviate the labor of soup preparation.

*Good Housekeeping* was also reaping the rewards of its success amongst women. In 1905, readers paid 15 cents a copy, money considered well spent as the magazine provided much needed educational information on “household management and domestic economies.”⁴ Advertising told women that to be modern and efficient, they need only to master these new inventions and ideas. But how could a woman learn to operate and maintain new appliances? How could she understand new methods of cooking, cleaning, and childrearing? Would she be aware of all the new food products out on the market and be able to create the latest recipes? Bolstered by the new science of domestic education that was promoted by home economists, since the late 1800s women had learned to rely on service magazines, like *Good Housekeeping*, to teach them to become better homemakers. Each month, the magazine addressed them with articles about modern technology such as “The Electric Bell” and “Canning as an Art” (June 1905), “Municipal Housekeeping” (January and March 1906), “The Refrigerator” (February 1906), “Chemistry in Dishwashing” (September 1906), “Foods Made in the Laboratory” (August 1907), “Canned Goods: How to Buy the Best” (April 1908), “Cooking in the Modern Way” (May 1910), and “Education for Motherhood” (June 1910), to name just a selected few.
Young brides, in particular, were addressed recurrently and often patronizingly in the magazine as a separate group of women who were in calamitous need of assistance. Throughout 1905, there was a regular feature called “The Bride’s Primer” that made light of new brides’ foibles, all the while trying to teach them proper kitchen behavior:

This is the Bride. What is the Bride doing? The Bride is cook-ing.

The Bride wears a small white Apron and Ruf-fles. Is she not sweet? See the hot fat fly! The small white Apron and Ruf-fles are just the things to catch the drops of Fat.\textsuperscript{5}

In Part II of The Bride’s Primer, the poor silly bride sees the results of her cooking and clothing fiasco, as her kitchen fills with smoke, and the fire turns her white ceiling brown.\textsuperscript{6} However, not all readers found these primers necessarily helpful--or humorous. In the September 1905 issue, an unmarried Massachusetts woman submitted this letter:

There are many, many girls of a marriageable age who need the instructions given in the Primer. There is so much of the injustice --nay, crime--done to both young women and the men whose wives they become revealed in the Primer, that the humorous side of it does not appeal to me.\textsuperscript{7}

Readership was almost entirely female, and editors and advertisers alike addressed them with the assumption that they were all mothers and housewives in dire need of tutelage. As such, their role as domestic consumers was implicit. Thus, the messages conveyed within the editorial content and supporting advertisements promised modernized domesticity to all, the acceptance of which would create better women overall, albeit with a multitude of roles and responsibilities as wives, mothers, daughters, patriots, and perhaps at the top of the list, consumers.
So it is not surprising that thousands of women regularly submitted questions and their own tips to the mass circulation magazines in order to gain better understanding of the changing world around them. In *Good Housekeeping’s* “Discoveries by Our Observers and Experimenters” department, readers were encouraged to share solutions pertaining to proper management of the home. In the January 1905 issue of the magazine, topics ran the gamut from the ways in which husbands and wives should spend evenings together, and tips for making a house more beautiful through Japanese flower arranging and dainty doilies, to troubles with stoves and chimneys. Food ingredients and recipes were always an important theme, and women eagerly interacted with their fellow readers by offering advice to perceived common dilemmas, such as:

A clubwoman told me that her fellow-members had come to the conclusion that ORANGES were not so good as formerly, because each member had had a bitter pudding. I told her the cause, and perhaps others might like to know how to make orange pudding that isn’t bitter.  

Reader “C.H.S.” continued on to provide a lengthy, detailed recipe for making a delicious orange pudding acceptable to the most discerning clubwomen, amidst which she graciously divulged the following: “The secret of avoiding a bitter pudding is in not heating the oranges.” While the necessity of making good-tasting desserts does not appear on the surface to impact quality of life issues, the interactions that took place in the magazine presented a sort of safe haven in which women could learn the science and craft of homemaking and motherhood. Essential was the sense of support they perceived from other female readers who also sought to make a successful transition into the modern age.
And what of the New Woman? Or the Gibson Girl, for that matter? Where did they fit into the discourse of motherhood and homemaking within women’s service magazines and advertisements in the early years of the new century? Coming on the heels of the tumultuous rhetoric of the 1880s and 1890s, Köhler says:

Around 1905, the discourses focusing on women’s roles in American society resembled a historical anachronism . . . [women] had increasingly tried to unite their traditional domestic responsibilities as wives and mothers with their new options as female professionals in order to define their place in the complexity and diversity of American life. They had demanded their right to choose between attending college and entering the modern professional world or, rather, following a more traditional pattern of life that favoured home and family with or without a college degree.¹⁰

The image of the New Woman continued to be fraught with ambiguity, and in particular, the issue of motherhood was the target of continuous debate. In the early years, New Women writers agreed that the primary female imperative was education, but they did not share the same opinion about issues of sexuality or the importance of women’s maternal role. While some eschewed the very notion, insisting that intelligent, educated females should forego it in favor of involvement outside the domestic realm, other women-centered writers of the day, such as Sarah Grand and George Egerton, viewed motherhood as essential to female self-identity. They insisted that being a mother was indeed a powerful and noble role for women to undertake.¹¹
Ironically, as the new century progressed, motherhood was about to become an even more entrenched concept than it had been during the Victorian era. Female reformers (still referred to as “new women”) continued to be active in their progressive, political pursuits, and young college-aged women, still depicted as Gibson Girls, sought higher educational opportunities at an ever-increasing rate. The reality of life had not taken a step backward, but the social commentary offered in the popular press had subsumed its portrayal of female identities within more mainstream fare. Just a decade earlier, the Gibson Girl had represented an idealized, liminal time in young women’s lives, between adolescence and true adulthood, when they were free to pursue education as single and independent persons. While the Gibson Girl prototype continued for at least another decade to be the model for young women in magazines and advertisements, the discourse surrounding her was in the process of change. Even the Gibson Girl was maturing and settling into her assigned role as mother and homemaker, as her creator sardonically attested. In a 1905 interview with The New York Times, Charles Dana Gibson described the Gibson Girl as “dead--I mean married.” Kohler comments: “As a married woman, she cannot act as the Gibson Girl any longer; a liberated American wife would have been beyond the artist’s imagination.” As for the New Woman, increasingly she was becoming the icon most associated with the modern, consumer-sophisticated homemaker.

For the first time, Good Housekeeping addressed the issue of the New Woman in its June 1905 “College Girls’ Number.” The young woman on the cover of the magazine hardly imitates the pristine attractiveness of a college-aged Gibson Girl. Dressed in western attire, she is shown wildly galloping a horse, riding crop held high, long, loose hair flying, with a facial expression that is decidedly strong-minded (Fig. 17). The editorial section of the magazine features a short essay entitled simply “The New Woman,” that takes a refreshingly positive
approach in its assessment, albeit carefully containing its enthusiasm within traditional boundaries of femininity. It focuses on what was considered the New Woman’s typical attributes, both mentally and physically, and states: “She is here to stay. Her numbers are increasing. But she is not at all the creature that paragraphers and cartoonists make fun of. Such miscalled ‘gentlemen of the press’ simply do not realize the evolution that is going on in woman’s realm.”

Fig. 17. *Good Housekeeping’s* College Girls’ Number, June 1905.

This assessment is a far cry from the deviant descriptions of the New Woman so prevalent just a decade before. But to the *Good Housekeeping* columnist, the transformation that woman was undergoing was primarily associated with her desire for higher education and “common sense” that would enable her to “make the best use of her capabilities” in service to
The New Woman was lauded for throwing off the conventions of dress and striving for sensibility, individuality, health, and even athleticism. All of this was considered better preparation for woman’s true province, that of wife, mother, and helpmate.

[The New Woman] is more delightfully feminine than ever--the attractions of her womanhood more charming . . . The woman of the future will be in the best sense more of a woman than ever, be she rich or poor, in high station or low, educated by the schools or by experience. She is to-day better qualified than formerly to be herself happy and useful, and to make others so, whether wife or maid, at home or at work.¹⁸

Interestingly, the editorial did recognize that many women were choosing outside work, but in the public realm, like in the home, a woman’s true contribution would be in nurturing the well-being of others. Finally, boys and men were warned that they, too, must advance in their own thinking about women’s roles if they were to be worthy of the New Woman.¹⁹

The issue also featured an article entitled “Extension of College Work to Mothers” that addressed the subject of older women, primarily “retired school teachers, maiden ladies, and mothers,” who were enrolling in higher education.²⁰ In 1905, this “species” of college student certainly was considered an oddity on campus, and the author notes that members of the male student body dubbed them “pelicans.” These women, the author says, are interested in improving themselves, “but they have not the craze for money making”; thus the reason that there were not men of an equivalent age or rank amongst their numbers.²¹ In the essay, mothers especially are encouraged to participate in college courses not only for the exposure to new information and culture, but so that they could become more companionable to their own
college-aged children. “There certainly are no evil results of this extension of college work to mothers. Even outside of their personal advancement, there are manifold good results.”

Again, similar to the discourse surrounding traditional-aged college women, higher education for mothers was endorsed by the mainstream only if it was pursued in service to others.

**Motherhood as National Service**

By 1905, the social construction of woman as wife, homemaker, and mother found its way into the national political discourse on many levels. To understand this, it is necessary to examine the evolving redefinition of motherhood in relation to ensuing anxiety about the perceived dwindling power base of white middle-class men. The late 1800s had ushered in growing concerns about the meanings of *manliness* and *masculinity*, and this developed into a backlash against the emerging emancipation of women. Like the New Woman, the concept of the New Man emerged in the 1880s and 1890s in response to apprehension over women’s increasing independence and the onslaught of male immigrants into the workforce.

In the past, women typically had entered the workforce only out of financial necessity rather than choice, between 1880 and 1900 the number of adult females employed in the public realm doubled in size. And the trend continued so that in 1910, twenty percent of women 16 years of age and older became part of working America. Middle-class men felt threatened by these changes in public life, and society began to question what it meant to be a man and what defined manliness. Home life became central to the dangers perceived beyond its boundaries. In an April 1905 essay entitled simply “The Peace at Home,” *Good Housekeeping* addressed this societal concern. The perception that home life was changing was not just a symptom of male anxiety, but rather
some believed that working women and the encroachment of public life were responsible for its declining status:

> It is dinned in our ears in these days that the home, in the familiar sense of the word, is disappearing . . . heaven pity the children and the husband if the change becomes widespread! . . . More than ever before, the home should be a refuge, a sanctuary . . . In other days a man’s house was his castle; in these days the walls of the castle have been flung down, and the interests of the public life press in from every side. Every woman who is anxious to uphold finer standards of our civilization must, as she enters life, make it one of her objects to sustain the privacy and the retirement of the home . . . [as she is] the builder of empires.25

This was a common concern echoed in the general press throughout the era. Even feminist Charlotte Perkins Gilman submitted a lengthy article “The Home: Today, Tomorrow” to *Good Housekeeping* in July 1907 in which she decried the decline of the American household. Perkins charged that the home was becoming “no place for children”; “the servant problem” was growing steadily worse; and simply, that there was less in general that constituted “home-life.” Gilman’s solution? Wiser mothers, nurses, and teachers instead of servants (undoubtedly female), and children-friendly spaces within the home could remedy the depletion of the domestic sphere.26

> The discourse associated with home life revealed the interconnectedness of race, ethnicity, and gender in the American national consciousness and demonstrated how terms such as “manliness” and “civilization” were utilized to construct a fiction about American greatness.
It is during this time period that, according to Bederman, the trope of the dominant white male became a fixture in discourses about civilization, having taken a marked evolutionary path that solidified political, economic, and social dominance as an unalienable right of the Anglo-Saxon male. The concept of the New Man came to embody not only white male supremacy, but also American imperial dominance. But it should be noted that, unlike other historians, Bederman steadfastly maintains that there was no actual identity crisis for most men at the turn of the century, as most white males were still quite confident in their positions of authority.27

But there is no doubt that, framed within discursive issues of ideal gender roles, the definition of professionalism came under fire, as it had been at the forefront of female emancipatory ambitions for decades. To feminists, a professional woman was one who chose freely to work in the public sphere, and as a result, created a means to support herself, independent of men. To men, a professional was male and white. This was the threat posed by early depictions of the New Woman who aspired to a life of professionalism and public commitment.28 However, alongside this had evolved the notion of housewifery as a legitimate profession, albeit unpaid. This was due in large part to the efforts of female proponents of the domestic science movement (over a range of time), such as the Beecher sisters, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, and Christine Frederick, to name just a few.29

While the shifting trope of housewifery may not have posed much of a threat to men within the public realm, the women who promoted it were indeed working outside the home. These and other women undoubtedly created stress on the working man’s ego. For middle-class men, their sense of manliness was derived from a sense of power achieved from their work, and now they felt this was being impinged upon by professional women, as well as working-class immigrant men.30 In addition, many women chose teaching as their profession, and there was
growing concern that young boys who were exposed to female teachers in the classroom would become overly feminized as a result. Influential psychologist, G. Stanley Hall, whole-heartedly supported the notion that boys, under the direction of adult men, should be given the freedom to express their “ancestral savagery.” On the other hand, young females should begin early in life to prepare themselves for motherhood. While Hall believed that the very future of boys’ masculinity was being denigrated by their close connection to females in the home, at church, and in school, even so, it was a mother’s duty to prepare her male children for a life of unbridled manly independence.\textsuperscript{31}

The Victorian canon of masculinity was based upon the “veneration of character and emotional restraint.”\textsuperscript{32} But by 1905, that had changed to an idealization of values expressed as “passionate manhood.” Minton describes it as “unrestrained primitive instincts (e.g., lust, greed, assertiveness), competitive sports, and militarism. Theodore Roosevelt’s personal example of ‘the strenuous life’ was emblematic of the new manhood.”\textsuperscript{33} Indeed, in relation to the shifting idea of masculinity, none other than the President himself was discussing homemaking and motherhood at the level of national politics. Roosevelt played a formidable role in developing the ideology of America as a dominant imperial power based on its heritage of Euro-Anglo male supremacy. Using the rugged outdoors as his backdrop, Roosevelt’s personal philosophy of the “strenuous life” required that men engage in robust sport and exercise as a means to develop virility and conquer effeminacy. Roosevelt’s political mission was framed within an ideology that saw race and manhood connected, as were nationalism and civilization, and this became the foundation for his foreign policies, as well. Imperialism was not just a means for economic advancement, but also a way to morally advance, in his view, the more civilized race.\textsuperscript{34}
Theodore Roosevelt believed strongly in the connection between manliness and Americanness, and instrumental to this ideal was the biologically determined role of women. In Roosevelt’s America, womanhood was the only profession available to the female gender, and most important to that was the role of motherhood. Housework and consumerism were intrinsic to the profession of womanhood, but it went far beyond that into the realm of empire building. Roosevelt believed that the future of the nation’s greatness depended on women dedicating themselves to the growth of strong, patriotic sons. In turn, masculinity was determined by a man’s “will, work, and readiness for moral (and mortal) combat.”

To summarize Roosevelt’s gender-laden, nationalistic position:

There are certain old truths which will be true as long as this world endures, and which no amount of progress can alter. One of these is the truth that the primary duty of the husband is to be the homemaker, the bread-winner for this wife and children, and that the primary duty of the woman is be the helpmeet, the housewife and mother.

Ironically, in the home, woman’s femininity was responsible for creating vigorous masculinity. Just as the ideology associated with the cult of true womanhood had situated women central to the moral purification of men, to Roosevelt, motherhood required women to be responsible for the patriotic fiber of men. And patriotism was essential to manliness.

 Appropriately, this indoctrination could only take place within the nurturance of home. The continued ideological separation of genders into their “natural” spheres was essential in Roosevelt’s worldview, and to accomplish this, women, and more specifically mothers, had to be placed back up on the domestic pedestal from which the New Woman had allegorically leaped.
What ‘country’ meant to man, the ‘home’ meant to the American woman. If a woman loved her country, she—first and foremost—had to love her home. Duty to her family and in a wider sense to her nation was a basic female virtue that could be realized best by her exclusive concentration on the domestic realm. This was the place where ‘True Americanism’ grew; it therefore needed to be protected against any outside influence or change.38

Quite obviously, Roosevelt was recalling notions of true womanhood so prevalent during his boyhood. Accordingly, he believed that women’s most important specialized duty was that of motherhood, and as a discrete task, this “offered the best opportunity to women to heighten their domestic power.”39 But Roosevelt’s concerns were not just of the theoretical nature. In the 1890s, he became particularly concerned with the falling birthrate of the white population, which he attributed to the influx of immigrants into the labor market, thus lowering wages and making it difficult for white men to provide for their children.40 In his four-volume history of the American western frontier, *The Winning of the West* (1889-1896), Roosevelt said that the “warfare of the cradle can undo the warfare of the frontier.”41 Once in office he promoted a national program to increase the white birthrate. Therefore, through public policy and rhetoric, Roosevelt was responsible for creating discourse at the national level that revered motherhood and celebrated male sexuality, as it was responsible for producing children—and this was the greatest service to the public welfare.

But ultimately, manliness for Theodore Roosevelt was not tied to overt sexual performance, but rather to linking race and gender with imperialistic nationalism, as well as “reinvigorating male authority by tying it to white racial supremacy and to a militaristic, racially
based nationalism.” During the Victorian era, motherhood was an automatic corollary to marriage that proposed to increase a woman’s usefulness, garner her more social prestige—and anchor her to the home even more significantly. Being a mother was also supposed to be her climax of blissful happiness. At the turn of the century, Roosevelt adopted this vision of domestic vocation, and especially motherhood, as national service. In a time of great national expansion and mobility it was important that boys, who would someday be men occupying important positions of government and industry, be properly educated to serve the Republic.

Thus it was believed that, like the True Woman of the 1800s, modern mothers also had the most influence over the welfare of future generations of improved men. The success and stability of a self-governing nation depended on the virtue of its citizens, and social progress was dependent on the strength of individual character. Therefore, women were obligated to devote their lives to a vocation that was perceived to have the greatest impact on the success of the public sphere, even though they were still routinely denied full access to it solely based on their gender. Regarding the True Woman, Cott claims that motherhood was portrayed as the path to self-fulfillment, but in actuality, it was designed to ensure the child’s development and growth through the self-negation of the mother. The New Woman found herself in the same cultural predicament, laden with the responsibility of nation building, and also responsible for the stabilization of manliness. In the early 1900s, as the middle class grew in numbers and prosperity, there was concern that parents were spoiling their children, especially sons. The end result, it was predicted, would be a nation of men who were not strong enough to be productive citizens. The June 1905 issue of Good Housekeeping addressed this issue in an article entitled “The Spoiling of Boys and the Making of Men (During the Summer Vacation).” The essay addresses both parents, but the accountability to teach boys how to work like real men fell
squarely on the shoulders of their mothers and was directly related to the development of masculinity.

Throughout the early decades of the new century, motherly sacrifice in service to nation continued to be a trope maintained within the pages of women’s magazines, such as *Good Housekeeping*, and the ads contained therein, including those for Campbell Soup. The January 1905 issue of *Good Housekeeping* featured several articles about how mothers should best raise their young children, a theme central to most issues of the magazine between 1905-1910. From the fictional article “The Incubator Baby” about the trials and tribulations of caring for a sick child to “The Abuse of Baby’s Arms” in which mothers were severely chided for dragging misbehaving children by the limbs, women were constantly told that they needed to improve their mothering skills.47 The tutorial “Child Discipline: Lassoing the Will” provided various attitudes about how to discipline children. In particular, it focused on corporal punishment of children in the home and at school. For parents, particularly mothers, strict discipline was associated with creating respect, good citizenship, and even national dominance. The advocacy of strenuous punishment was also in keeping with the values of passionate manhood. Author Lee McCrae posed this rhetorical question to his female readers: “So shall we have a race of law-keeping citizens, honoring their parents and thus blessed ‘unto the third and fourth generations,’ ruling themselves and therefore able to rule the world?”48 Women were treated to monthly doses of ideologically injected tomes about the proper methods of raising children and the serious consequences for not heeding the advice.
Creating Motherhood in a Bowl of Soup

“He is the Subject, the Absolute – she is the Other.”

Simone De Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*

By no means was building the character of future American patriots an easy task for mothers. Advertising messages abounded that forged the link between consuming domesticity and civilized nationhood. As their role of primary household consumer increased during the early part of the twentieth century, one of the leading issues facing mothers was the unregulated quality of mass produced goods and the often-unscrupulous advertising that promoted such items. Civilization was associated with purity and healthfulness, and up to that point, the purity of food, the effectiveness of medications, and the workmanship of products were unregulated by the government. Not only were products themselves often defective and even dangerous to consumers, advertisers could make any claim, no matter how false, and suffer no legal consequences. Even more distressing for women, food products purchased at the local grocer quite often were contaminated with insects, mold, or other spoilage. With few government controls, manufacturers sometimes substituted cheap and even harmful ingredients, but failed to indicate this on the labels. Women and their families were essentially at the mercy of product manufacturers.

And the health and disease concerns of mothers were quite serious. *Good Housekeeping* featured an article in its January 1906 issue called “Woman’s War on the White Plague” in which the author (Lillian Brandt) encouraged mothers to become crusaders against the outbreak of tuberculosis.49 She told them to seek out the latest medical information and advice, and then set about creating a home atmosphere to combat the disease. While the preventive measures in the home were limited to adequate ventilation and regular doses of sunshine, mothers were
expected to become the first wave of defense in the public sphere where they should fight for the sanitary conditions of all public buildings, but especially schools, hospitals, and civic institutions.50

While many women’s periodicals claimed varying degrees of commitment to the issue of health, Good Housekeeping intended to change national standards and policies, especially regarding food safety. By 1905, all food advertised in the magazine was tested in the Good Housekeeping Experiment Station. In a lengthy, detailed declaration, the October 1906 issue boldly announced the establishment of the “Good Housekeeping’s Standard of Excellence for Pure Food Products,” and after extensive testing, the results were to be published monthly in a department called “Good Housekeeping’s Roll of Honor of Pure Foods.”51 Products that passed inspection received a five-pointed star with the words “Pure Food Assurance – Good Housekeeping,” and women began to rely on this designation when they made purchases for the household.52 In addition, just as the “Roll of Honor” put a check on the ethical practices of product manufacturers, Good Housekeeping’s promise of an “Ironclad Contract” kept advertisers honest about their claims.53 Immediately popular with female consumers, indeed this practice distinguished Good Housekeeping and its advertisers from other competitors, and the magazine’s assumption of this quasi-regulatory role was intended to provide one less thing about which mothers needed to worry.

The groundwork necessary for Good Housekeeping to effectively take up the cause for better food standards began several decades before the magazine instituted its “Roll of Honor” and “Ironclad Contract.” Individual crusaders had been waging the battle for some time, most notably, Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, who was the chief chemist for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. As a true pioneer in the field of consumer advocacy, Wiley had a burgeoning
national reputation among American women resulting from his work for a national maternity-care policy. But he perhaps became better known as the creator of the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906. Since the late 1800s, Wiley had been actively involved in various Congressional campaigns to enact pure-food legislation. And in 1902 he spearheaded the radical “Poison Squad,” a group of volunteer men who “tested the effects of chemicals and adulterated foods on themselves” in order to change the current standards which Wiley felt were sorely lacking to the detriment of the American consumer. Ironically, his unorthodox efforts and the ensuing publicity led to camaraderie in unlikely places, as both the Federated Women’s Clubs and major canneries joined forces in favor of legislation. As a result, Dr. Wiley’s pure-food crusade came to fruition on June 30, 1906, when President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Pure Food and Drug Act. Unfortunately, the Act did not solve all the problems of adulterated products with which so many housewives had to contend. Wiley became a member of the five-man team that comprised the National Committee on Food Standards, but there were still powerful political lobbies in place, and he had made many enemies in Congress, as well as in the food and patent medicine industries. But it was a step in the right direction for consumers, and Good Housekeeping realized that it too could help lead the fight for better pure food standards.

The Experiment Station evolved into the Good Housekeeping Institute, and its opening was announced in the February 1910 issue. The Institute consisting of the Model Kitchen, Testing Station for Household Devices, and Domestic Science Laboratory. It officially opened its doors January 7, 1910, and was managed by Helen Louise Johnson, a noteworthy home economist. To keep up with the thousands of letters that poured in from magazine readers, a staff of home economists and consulting engineers were brought on board to do comparative analyses of myriad household-related products. The testing services were free for both the
manufacturers and the public. Johnson explained her hands-on approach to her staff by saying, “Work with your hands, before you write with your pen.” Every product was thoroughly examined before readers’ queries were answered.

Dr. Harvey W. Wiley made his first official appearance as a regular contributor to *Good Housekeeping* in the January 1909 issue. The Chief of United States Bureau of Chemistry submitted an essay entitled “Household Cookery” in which he discussed the potential harmful effects of cooking done in the home. Advocating that colleges teach the art of cooking as a public service, Wiley asked that women change their lackadaisical attitude toward meal preparation and look to the women of France for inspiration on how best to improve their culinary skills.

Early on, women were asked to affiliate with *Good Housekeeping* to ensure pure food standards. The September 1906 issue invited both individual women and members of the club movement to become active in the “The Pure Food League,” the primary objective of which was to enforce the national pure food law, to fight for state purification standards, and to ensure that food could be obtained at a reasonable cost. This was a momentous step in which a service magazine linked the political willpower of women, and especially mothers, to the public sphere. The significant reliance on the persuasiveness of civilization ideology and its concomitant issue, the discourse of purity, was readily apparent. The last objective of the Pure Food League was:

To promise right living, better citizenship, the higher life of the household, correct methods of business, to an extent that eventually shall make the American people the most perfect on earth, and to be guaranty of quality for American products in the markets of the world.
Indeed, the world did begin to follow suit, and *Good Housekeeping* monitored its progress beginning with its January 1910 issue and the essay “International Action on Pure Foods.” In America, *Good Housekeeping* identified an ideal ally in its campaign for pure foods—the women’s club movement. The magazine began covering the movement extensively, such as the lengthy exposé “The Woman’s Club Woman” that highlighted the most influential and accomplished members of the movement, complete with photographs. Within the magazine, women’s clubs were heavily indoctrinated into the crusade for pure food standards and told that this was the real work that they should undertake. How? By putting together committees to inspect “shops, bakeries, slaughter houses,” and submitting their findings to the Pure Food League. They could also effect change by “inviting health and food officials, food manufacturers, wholesale and retail grocers” to their clubs to deliver information and answer questions. Women’s clubs were also given specific missions, such as reforming the milk supply through the insistence on new methods of inspection. According to *Good Housekeeping*, this was the perfect venue for women’s clubs.

The passage of the Pure Food and Drug Act in 1906 and *Good Housekeeping’s* subsequent foray into the issue naturally led to concerns about the erroneous nature of food labels and the often inaccurate, sometimes fantastical claims made by advertisers. In the past, the most important function of the label was as artistic indicator of the product it contained. Consumers relied on advertising, not labels, to inform them about ingredients, and this was often done in a highly inventive, even whimsical manner. But the rhetoric associated with the discourse of purity and the heightened awareness of potential food-related health concerns changed the purpose of labels forever. Crusaders of the pure food movement turned to the issue of labeling as early as 1907, and the first mention in *Good Housekeeping* occurred in the April
issue. A year after the passage of the pure food legislation, many food manufacturers were carrying the government guarantee without having updated their labels with the latest ingredients information, which created an atmosphere of confusion for consumers. Preservatives and other ingredients suspected of not being healthful were under attack, and homemakers and grocers alike were urged to fight for better consistency of information on labels. Good Housekeeping ran many articles debating the issue and even showed manufacturers, grocers, and consumers what a proper label should contain.67

As a result, food manufacturers took notice immediately. In 1906, one of the largest canners and packers in the country submitted this statement: “We use no artificial coloring of any kind having discontinued the same some years ago.”68 However, the issue of food purity continued to saturate the editorial content of the magazine throughout the period, and it remained unresolved at the end of the decade when Good Housekeeping included the article, “Death from Home-Canned Fruit: Lessons to be Learned from the Fatal Poisonings of Eleven Persons.”69 This was serious business, especially for manufacturers of canned goods, like Campbell Soup. Even though the ad warned the public about home canning accidents, it also called attention to the public’s increasing reliance on canned foods produced by large manufacturers. Such publicity could destroy a firm’s reputation immediately. Advertisers, particularly those for food, realized that to effectively find favor and develop trust with female consumers they needed to speak to the efficacy and safety of the products they promoted. Acknowledging its profound influence on American culture, Good Housekeeping addressed the issue of product advertising in its March and May 1909 numbers and implored advertisers to “provide information, not persuasion” and to “give the public the facts.”70 But by the end of the decade, it was clear that
the issue of inaccurate labels had not yet been resolved, and the magazine vowed to keep up the fight.\textsuperscript{71}

![Campbell's Soup Ad](image)

**Fig. 18.** First Campbell's Soup ad in *Good Housekeeping*, February 1905.

Advertising veracity was already a major social issue when Campbell’s Soup decided to begin placing national advertisements targeting female consumers, particularly mothers. The first Campbell’s Soup ad was placed in the February 1905 issue of *Good Housekeeping* and boldly announced: “Sixteen million cans sold in 1904” (Fig. 18).\textsuperscript{72} While typically the early print ads expanded on the short four-line jingles that were so popular on streetcars in the late
1800s by providing lengthier descriptions of the product’s benefits--especially those pertaining to its healthful and economic properties--the very first 1905 ad was relatively succinct and to the point. It offers “21 kinds” of soup for “10 cents a can.” The ad is simplistic in its styling. It features a large can of tomato soup and a prototype of a female Campbell Soup Kid sitting on a small stool, staring up pensively at the advertising copy, which claims:

Rich, nourishing and substantial. Made from the best that grows in the heart of New Jersey’s finest farming district. High grade in every sense of the words. Over sixteen million cans sold in 1904. Everything is done. The blend, the pare, the toil, the care. All you need do is: ‘Just Add a Can of Hot Water and Serve.’ One can makes sufficient Soup for the average family.73

Speaking to the purity of the product, the ad implied that if American mothers had trusted the brand enough to feed their families nearly one-hundred million bowls full of soup in 1904, Campbell’s clearly had proven itself to be a quality food, safe enough to be served in the best households. Just as female consumers had learned to welcome service magazines into their homes to provide education and entertainment, Campbell’s Soup was ready to find its way onto their tables, supplying laborsaving, cost-effective, and healthy nourishment for their families. To demonstrate the company was complying with the new Pure Food and Drug Act, the November 1906 Campbell’s Soup ad proclaimed:

In Keeping House

There’s lots to learn,

Especially about soup: how hard it is to make it bad.

Why bother about this, with all its tedious detail?
We make the best soups possible every day, and they only cost a dime a can. Campbell’s Soups please the most particular palate, They are prepared under the most approved sanitary conditions.

**U.S. inspected and passed, under Act of June 30, 1906.**

**Establishment No. 262**

The following month’s ad was even more explicit in its attempt to establish the company’s commitment to purity: “Sanitary Conditions--Throughout our plant: Personal cleanliness compulsory upon the part of every employe; Cooking utensils thoroughly sterilized.”

Undoubtedly, Campbell wanted to allay any fears on the part of American mothers.

Between 1905 and 1908, nearly every ad placed by Campbell’s Soup in *Good Housekeeping* spoke to the purity of the product and featured one of the Campbell’s Soup Kids. While the illustrations during this period do not feature an adult woman, i.e. *mother*, her responsibility is implied whether she is in the ad or not. Most of the earliest ads feature the Campbell’s Soup girl alone as she responds to the message imparted in the marketing jingle. Harkening back to Joseph Campbell and Abraham Anderson’s earliest strategies to associate their products with homegrown goodness amidst the reality of heavy industrialization, the advertising copy frequently mentioned condensed soup’s humble beginnings. “The farmers supply us with vegetables, the very pick of their crops, and in the stock the same high-grade character is insisted upon.” The use of the word *character* is no accident as it refers not only to the overall quality of the soup, but also to the Campbell’s employees who created it. Thus, a level of trust is intended to be forged between the corporation and the consumer by personifying the factory experience. This transference of value from goods to humans is intended to have a
positive, relatable effect on consumers who opted to buy condensed soup for their families, most notably mothers.

Many of the ads played upon the perceived vulnerability of the modern woman as she sought to learn the latest methods and keep up with new inventions, all the while keeping her family safe from harm. The August 1906 ad overtly states that the actual preparation of the product has been taken out of the hands of unskilled mothers and is now produced by trained professionals. “They (the soups) are prepared by people trained through many years for that purpose. You, yourself, could not make them better, no matter how cleanly, how skillful, or how careful you are.”77 This ad clearly is intended to point out the inadequacies of the average housewife. It creates a need for the product in her kitchen repertoire, rather than just an efficient product that saves time and labor. There is an implied danger that, if a mother chooses not to feed her children Campbell’s soup but rather opts for the homemade version, then the unsanitary conditions of her kitchen will likely do harm to them.

In the ads during this era, the female Campbell’s Kid occupies a shifting position within the mise-en-scène. Often she seems to be representing the child who will benefit from her mother feeding her nutritious Campbell’s Soup, and she responds accordingly. But sometimes her identity is constructed as a mother, albeit occupying the body of a child. In the February 1906 ad, she sits on a chair, peeling vegetables. With a tear running down her face, the words beside her read “No care, No pare, No mix, No fix.”78 Had she only chosen Campbell’s Soup instead of trying to make it from scratch, her life would be much easier—and happier. Just two months later, in the April 1906 issue, she is indeed much spunkier as she gets ready to fulfill a social obligation of a well-mannered lady: “Ready in wink, for the sudden guest. No heat, no hurry, No waste, no worry.”79 In the September 1906 ad, the girl is now made to look like a wise
old woman, or in this case, Mother Nature. While the ad promotes the notion that Campbell’s products are created in sanitary conditions using scientific methods of production, the focus is on the soups’ link to nature, which is decidedly a female entity. “In Partnership With Nature--She provides us with the best--on her part. We give this best the treatment it deserves--on our part.” As such, the ad effectively links scientific methods of industrialization (coded male) to the essential raw ingredients of nature (coded female).

In May 1906, the ad differentiates between the consumer of the product and the person who prepares it. “Soups known the world over for their rare purity and flavor. They satisfy both the consumer and the cook:--Because they are healthful, wholesome and absolutely dependable. Acknowledged everywhere as the standard of soup perfection.” While the hyperbole is typical of marketing copy of the day, it is difficult to discern how the ad is differentiating between “the consumer and the cook.” Is it addressing the person who buys the soup, typically the mother as consumer, who then hands it off to a servant to prepare (the cook)? Or is the cook the mother, who prepares it and then provides it to her husband and children to eat--the consumers? Again, in the April 1907 ad, the diversity of soup is illustrated in a number of ways that also speaks to the many roles played by the woman of the house. It reads:

Puts an Edge on Appetite and Satisfies It

The housekeeper knows this the moment she tries our product;
The family knows it from the pleasure and the food they get;
The grocer knows it from the quantity he disposes of:
In every way you look at them,
Campbell’s Soups fit into the emergencies of housekeeping.
Just the right thing for the sick-room;
Just the right thing for that unexpected guest;
Fine when you get home after the theatre;
The quickest food value you ever knew.\textsuperscript{82}

Typically, the ad shows a can of tomato soup, but it also mentions three of its other twenty-one varieties--chicken gumbo (okra), beef, and pea. While this ad clearly points to Campbell’s attempt to describe the diversity of its products and how many needs they can fulfill, as an historical artifact, it also illuminates the primary functions of women within the household--consumer (purchaser of goods), housekeeper (manager of the home environment), nursemaid, and social entertainer, to name just a few.

Women’s social obligations are again the focus of the May 1907 ad. “When your husband phones: ‘I’m bringing a man home with me,’ and you happen to be short in some important detail, Or he hasn’t allowed you time enough to do the right thing in the right way, Then remember Campbell’s Soups.”\textsuperscript{83} Obviously, the modern New Woman, as depicted in advertising, was largely responsible for the success of her husband in the business world. “The man” referred to in the ad is an important client or contact who must be impressed by how the husband runs his household, via the deportment of his wife. As middle-class men increasingly feared the encroachment from male immigrants and professional women in the workforce, advertising told them to turn to the wife-mother for security and support in the workplace, via the home. A successful wife in the home could distinguish him from less fortunate workers. While the True Woman had been responsible for her husband’s moral purity, the New Woman of advertising was instrumental to his economic status. The domestic woman becomes an essential tool in quashing the public perils of the traditional masculine role. And the consequence for not impressing business guests? It is alluded to in the September 1907 ad: “In any household
complication, the scorching roast, the sudden guest; Just use this meaty condensation, and he’ll forgive you all the rest: Campbell’s Soups.”84 Sometimes even the most competent homemaker needed to be rescued from her own inadequacies, and consumer goods were the answer. (Also interesting in this ad is the reference to burgeoning technology only available to upper-middle-class homes in 1907, the telephone.)

Condensed soup as energy tonic becomes the theme of the ads that appeared in the summer of 1906. In June, the female Kid once again symbolizes a child. Asleep in a chair with a doll beside her, the copy seems to draw a parallel between the red richness of tomato soup itself and the blood in the poor exhausted girl’s veins: “Indoors when you are tired and hungry. Outdoors after the romp, the run. When the blood leaps in the veins and it must have food to keep it red and fine, then --Campbell’s Soups are what you need.”85 This is the first ad to allude to the healthful benefits of the soup by relating to its positive impact on bodily functions, rather than just the ingredients it contains (Fig. 19). The connection between nature and health makes another appearance in February 1907, the message imparted borders on medicinal claims:

For The Well, The Sick, The Strong, The Weak, The Young,
The Old--There can be found nowhere a more perfect food than Campbell’s Soups. Perfect--because they strengthen the invalid and refresh those who are in good health. They are without a single harmful element. They contain only the nourishment of nature’s most wholesome products without adulteration.86

The male Campbell’s Soup Kid makes his first appearance in the July 1906 issue of Good Housekeeping. While he is dressed as a hunter, he is decidedly not embodying the symbol of a grown male or a father. Hunting cap askew and pigeon-toed, he looks confused as a bird lands
on the tip of his rifle (Fig. 20). The copy beside him reads: “If Tommy Toot forgets to shoot, Here’s something better that will suit. Here’s the vigor.” The October 1906 ad again features the male Kid, but this time as a football player—“The foot-ball lad keeps strong and glad; And so would you, if you had--Campbell’s Soups.” Note that while the young girl in the June 1906 falls asleep from exhaustion after outdoors activity, the young male is featured in full physicality, ready for more strenuous play, as long as he gets a tonic of Campbell’s soup. While the intended meaning of the earlier male ad implies there is no need for men to hunt for nutrition anymore since mothers can so easily whip up a batch of heat-and-serve soup, the latter one is all about spirited male leisure time as important to masculine development. But ideologically, both ads rely on intertextuality to frame their messages—both reference Roosevelt’s philosophy of the strenuous life for boys and men. While the little boys in the ads do not have the skills yet to provide for a family, it is necessary for their mother to supply the vigor and strength in the form of nutrition that will enable them to develop into robust, passionate manhood. The January 1908 Campbell’s ad is even more explicit in its reference to Roosevelt’s dictum. It states plainly: “A Simple Food for a Strenuous Life.”

Fig 19. *Good Housekeeping* ad, June 1906.  
Fig. 20. *Good Housekeeping* ad, July 1906.
Elemental to the discourse of consumption was the promise of its therapeutic benefits—just participating in consumer culture created healthful living. The theme of Campbell’s Soup as a healthful tonic is revived in the January 1910 and the July 1910 ads. In the first ad, the title of the scene is “The Food for Tired Workers” and it depicts a husband coming home to greet his wife and mother at the table. He bends down and affectionately places his arm around his mother’s shoulder, as the wife looks on approvingly. “You can build real strength and energy on Campbell’s Soup,” the ad reads. The man is about to become re-energized from the stress of the business world through the loving nurturance of the women at home, and of course, Campbell’s Soup. And just to reinforce that the soup is reinvigorating the man of the house, rather than the women he has returned home to, the short jingle at the bottom says:

For Nineteen Ten all brainy men
Make good resolves galore.

So I’ll eat Campbell’s Soups; and then –

Resolve to eat some more.

Typically, when a man is in need of revitalization, he is still depicted as active and healthy. However, when a woman is in need of a healthful tonic, she is shown as being ill and in need of nursing and medication. Uncharacteristically, the July 1910 ad does not feature a table setting, but rather a woman sitting on a wicker chair, propped up against a comfortable-looking blanket (Fig. 21). She smiles weakly at the nursemaid who is bringing her a bowl of soup. Again, the connection is made between the fragile constitution of women and the femininity of nature. Called “A Real Strength Builder,” the ad says:

Nature certainly knows how to put up a delicious ‘spring tonic’,
good for any day of the year. She doesn’t put it in ugly-looking
bottles either; but in a shape so inviting that your mouth fairly 
waters for it. And nature’s tonics often do you more good than 
medicines too . . . Every physician knows that such tomatoes are 
full of elements which promote digestion and purify and enrich the 
blood . . . You can hardly find a food in which natural tonic and 
aperient properties are combined so perfectly with easily-digested 
nourishment . . . Surely there never was a prescription more 
agreeable to ‘take.’92

Fig. 21. Good Housekeeping ad, July 1910.
While Campbell’s Soup had been making health claims in its ads for nearly six years, this is one of the first to draw a direct correlation between the effects of eating soup and medicinal properties. The jingle at the bottom of this ad nearly sounds like a pagan goddess chant. As the female Campbell Soup Kid throws her arms up into the air, she cries out: “O, moon to-night, So round and bright, You’ll soon grow pale and thinner. This would not be, If you like me, Ate Campbell’s Soup for dinner.”

Housework was not an element of Roosevelt’s “strenuous life,” and women who were perceived as not being able to handle their responsibilities were depicted as weak and sickly, thus many Campbell’s Soup ads addressed this issue. Henry Van Dyke, who pathologizes the issue in the January 1905 number, accentuates this belief: “The strenuous life for a girl is a form of hysteria. It is a functional disorder. It sacrifices strength for spasms.” Somewhat amazingly, the April 1906 issue of Good Housekeeping contained a lengthy article written by a man entitled “Housecleaning as Physical Culture.” As a scientific experiment in strenuous living, writer George Wharton James, in lieu of gymnasium exercise, committed himself to the tasks of a housewife for more than a week. His conclusion?

I learned a great respect and sympathy for ‘women’s work.’ I find that a woman who does this kind of work has to work harder than I had thought; she well earns the paltry sum we sometimes kick at having to pay . . . I want the wives who read what I have written to hand the sketch over to their husbands, and when the men feel like going to the gymnasium for exercise let them try a hand at home and see how they ‘pan out.’
Although it is nearly a certainty that many women applauded Mr. James’ assessment and felt a degree of vindication, it is indicative of the paternalistic nature of patriarchal society that the work women did every day was only validated, by a man, after he had transformed it into the object of a scientific experiment.

**Pampered Maids and Inefficient Housewives**

The early twentieth century was a time of great invention and innovation, but often viewed as marred by relentless labor unrest and rising concerns about unchecked immigration policies. The pressure women felt to fulfill their ancestral obligation to the domestic sphere, while at the same time breeching the boundaries of home as modern women were encouraged to do in service to others, was evident by 1905. While *Good Housekeeping* attempted to order social life by keeping the domestic sphere in check through the promotion of homemaking as a form of professional administration, even it could not ignore the discord of public life as it seeped into the home. Sometimes referred to euphemistically as “the servant question,” the issue was typically described as the “strife between capital and labor” or more to the point, “the relation between the housewife and those in domestic service,” most often characterized by the lack of “good help.”

Labor issues between employers and their servants were nothing new, but by 1905 new challenges were facing middle- and upper-class homemakers. While some women were making strides in the outside world, the conceptualized space within the home continued to be divided along lines of idealized gender roles of husbands and wives. And adding to the tension was the growing distrust of those in domestic service, usually based on their race, ethnicity, or working-class status. To understand how the home of the early 1900s continued to be a politicized zone
in which differently gendered bodies would collide and yet not fully meet, and women of diverse ethnicity could not cross an invisible line, it is necessary to remember the prevalent discourse of the day. The concept of true womanhood during the 1800s had originated in a belief in *natural* distinctions based on the historical, anthropological Darwinist and Lamarckian theories about evolution and biological causation, which were used to justify male gender superiority. In addition, according to Bederman, male preeminence was linked to white supremacy because Anglo-Saxons were believed to be superior to all other races. But if nineteenth-century discourse was clear about white men’s superiority over all women and all peoples of color, it also positioned women in hierarchical opposition to one another within the boundaries of the home. In the early twentieth century, at a national level, influential individuals such as Roosevelt kept this at the forefront of mainstream discourse.

For middle- and upper-class women, homemaking was not about doing the daily housework themselves, but instead it was about the management of the home, including decision-making about how best to meet the needs of the family. During this period, the term *housekeeper* referred to the main woman of the house, the administrator of the private sphere, not to the hired cleaning lady. And a women’s empowerment within the boundaries of the home was a result of controlling the household budget and managing the servants. Therefore, domestic servants continued to be a necessary, if unwelcome, aspect of family life in the early 1900s:

The domestic servant is not, and cannot be, a part of the family; she never in all her history has had more than a semblance of such a relationship and even that semblance has long disappeared. The presence of the domestic employee in the family is not essential to the existence of the family; the domestic servant comes and goes,
but the family remains. More than this it must be said that the presence of the domestic employee does something to destroy the integrity of family life. Family life presupposes the existence of congenial taste and sympathetic relationships.99

Sometimes women were encouraged to dismiss their maids in order to save the family. In the January 1905, a reader only identified as “Housekeeper” claimed that since she dismissed her maid four years ago, her family “have had so much more comfort and saved money in so many little ways, that we look back to the days of her reign as a period of slavery and darkness.”100 Note the obvious rhetoric associated with the description of the servant. She refers to the anger and impatience her “Phyllis and Bridget and Norah” demonstrated while in her employ, causing the family much discomfort. In particular, the economic benefits to the family were noteworthy. “Norah was receiving three dollars a week and wasting and eating five dollars’ more.”101 “Housekeeper” dreamily describes the “pretty cream pitcher,” “nicer linen,” “new gloves,” “coveted book,” or various laborsaving kitchen devices that would enable her to set a better table now that she could buy them with her sans Norah savings. As she extols the blessed relief one feels from doing one’s own housework, “Housekeeper” sighs: “My present maid, myself, . . . can make an omelet and stir up a tin of muffins for breakfast without being put out of sorts for the whole day.”102 Other solutions to the inefficiency of servants were even more radical than dismissal. In “The Domestic Service Problem,” author Philip Verrill Mighels calls for a reformation and professionalization of household work that is predicated on young girls being sent to a training program that is a “semi-military organization or industrial army, to be housed in a barracks, and then to drill, train and discipline every member in the army’s ranks.”103 Young
women emerging from such training would undoubtedly, according to Mighels, take extreme pride in their work and their status would protect them from the wrath of abusive homemakers.¹⁰⁴

Articles about the problems associated with domestic servants appeared in nearly every issue during this era, and took myriad societal positions in a variety of attitudinal tones. From “Entertaining Without Your Maid” (October 1906) to “Virtues of the Chinese Servant” (March 1906) to “My Zulu Housemaid” (March 1907), Good Housekeeping, like other popular magazines, united readers in their quest for efficient, tranquil domesticity. However, that all women in the domestic realm were not created equal in the minds of the service magazines was also clearly obvious. In the article, “The ‘Heart’ of the Servant Question,” author Ella Morris Kretschmar overtly pits women against one another, suggesting a microcosm of class struggle and racial divisiveness within the conceptual borders of the home. On one hand, she concedes that the modern homemaker is unlikely to be familiar with contemporary labor problems, or the terms used to describe them--“open shop,” “walk out,” “employers’ association,” and “end of strike.” But why would she? Those issues suffused a man’s world of business and were likely beyond her grasp. On the other hand, a modern women needed to be aware that the burgeoning economic and labor struggles being grappled with by the outside world were undoubtedly impacting the private sphere. The relationship of mistress and maid is complex and imbued with historical and cultural considerations, and Kretschmar recognized this. She wrote with an obvious distaste for servants (usually immigrants or working class), but with perhaps even more disdain for housewives who managed them poorly. As an expert given privileged editorial space within the magazine, her opinion would have been read with high regard by female subscribers, who undoubtedly became alarmed if they recognized their own situation in her descriptions.
According to Kretschmar, women were responsible for ensuring that no external strife permeated home life, but at the same time, she encouraged them to recognize that labor relations were changing dramatically. Victorian-era moral cleansing was now associated with the modern purification of domestic work. But the message was mixed, and if a woman could not properly control her domestic help, ultimately it was due to her own inadequacies as a home manager:

Conscience has compelled me to the conviction that the American
domestic is the most highly paid, pampered, arrogant and
discontented wage earner in the world; to the further conviction
that she has been made what she is, first and chiefly, by general
labor conditions; and secondly, by the inefficiency and
indifference of the American housewife.105

Servants who had the propensity for sympathizing with labor concerns, either overtly or covertly, posed a threat to the safety of family life. Kretschmar warns of the serious consequences for not heeding labor’s united action, citing recent incidents in which extremists engaged in “hearse-tippings, meat and coal famines, loss of work, and even murder . . . Russian ideas may take root, but they will never flourish in American soil.”106 Finally, what Kretschmar calls for is a professionalization of the maid class, to be trained and considered as skilled laborers like blacksmiths, jewelers, carpenters, and chemists, not unlike the homemaker-scientist called for in the prior decades in an attempt to lend dignity to housework and mothercraft.107 Clearly, the politicized discourse of mistress-maid relations infused the household with class- and race-specific tensions that fell squarely on the housewife to appropriately keep in check.
James Eaton Tower retained his position as the editor of *Good Housekeeping* when his magazine reached a circulation of more than 200,000 in 1908.\textsuperscript{108} The magazine’s revenue from advertising was also bolstered as it now included nearly thirty pages of good quality ads in its special section located as a separate section in the back of the magazine.\textsuperscript{109} Mott credits the rise in circulation to four factors—“general prosperity, more aggressive and informed management, the improved appearance of the magazine, and a greater emphasis on fiction by well-known writers.”\textsuperscript{110} While the quality of literature offered within its pages became a major drawing factor of the magazine, resoundingly women were reminded not to ignore their domestic responsibilities in favor of reading. In a cynical sidebar in the March 1906 issue, there is a smart little illustration of books and kitchenware tumbling from the sky only to land near a feather duster. The caption reads: “It is easier to weep over the heroine’s troubles than to dust the parlor.”\textsuperscript{111} Women’s first priority was obvious, and they were urged to revel in their natural “calling” as housekeepers. “Higher housekeeping” became a euphemism for the employment of “scientific” methodologies within the home. Housewives were told that if they could just find the fun in their work, just as many businessmen did, it would not be such a grind but rather a pleasure. In “The Higher Housekeeping--It Might Be Called the Easier Housekeeping, or the Jollier Housekeeping” (October 1909), women were informed of this philosophy:

> There are times when bad housekeeping is good housekeeping. The house was made for man, not man for the house. The moment one feels one’s emancipation from the house and one’s mastery over it, that moment the housekeeping becomes an interesting and inspiring pursuit.\textsuperscript{112}
The expectations placed on women had not decreased, but the philosophy of “higher housekeeping” prescribed a mind-over-matter approach to the drudgery of domesticity. And if a homemaker could employ good help, all the better for her family’s happiness.

Early in its inception, advertising reinforced stereotypical notions of race and ethnicity (as well as gender), which strengthened the already ingrained discourse of nineteenth-century colonialism. In Mehaffy’s study of early advertising trade cards, she demonstrates how, even during the era of the True Woman, consumerism was equated with domesticity, and commodity culture positioned middle-class white women central to the project of capitalism. The iconography of trade cards continually mirrored Euro-Anglo women against black women, and this served to mythologize the former as consumers of labor, while the latter were masculinized as providers of labor. In keeping with the canon of true womanhood, white women were portrayed as pious, pure, and domestic, while black women were most often depicted as primitive. As trade cards sought to conform to the mission of the cult of true womanhood, Mehaffy says:

Within this narrative, the middle-class, white domestic ideal . . .

enlight[ens] and civilize[s] the home and the nation, but her mission is newly enhanced by name-brand, time-saving commodities and appliances . . . Temporally located in a precarious balance between a reified past and a technologically progressive present . . . [the] card’s imagery assures that ideal feminine domesticity will remain intact, and even be enhanced with the advent of commodity culture.
After the turn of the century, the American New Woman replaced the True Woman in advertising, and the ethos of religious piety and moral purity evolved into one of secular education, urbanism, and progressivism. However, the emphasis on domesticity as essential to femininity remained intact, and the commodification of otherness, positioned as difference, continued to be necessary to the project of middle-class modernity. Typical advertisements for domestic goods, such as those placed in Good Housekeeping by Campbell’s Soup, conflated racial and ethnic minorities as the labor-producing, non-consuming Other.

This discourse carried over into the advertisements for consumer goods, and Campbell Soup began incorporating servants into their illustrations. Perhaps in keeping with Good Housekeeping’s new emphasis on well-respected popular literature, in the same issue Campbell’s began running ads that dispensed with the centrality of the Campbell’s Soup Kids in favor of more sophisticated drawings and much longer narrative descriptions. The Kids and the singsong jingles were relegated to a small sidebar located at the bottom left corner. In addition to the emphasis on urbane illustrations, the copy is heavy and detailed. Every ad features a domestic tableau that typically shows a family situation comprised of husband and wife, sometimes with guests, and often in the care of servants. Central to the scene of marital life is the significance of Campbell’s soup, which is no longer just healthy nutrition for children, but instead it is positioned as central to the very fabric of domestic relations. The October 1909 ad features a husband and wife sitting across from one another at an elegantly set table. The woman, slender and serene, is a prototypical Gibson Girl, post-marriage. Her husband, who appears to be a bit older and more mature than his wife, looks at her tentatively as she uses a ladle to serve soup from a tureen. “Perfectly Delicious” says the caption, followed by lengthy details about how the soup is made in the processing plant before it ever reaches the family table.\textsuperscript{116}
In the December 1909 ad, a similar couple is shown having guests for dinner. The husband and the other sophisticated couple look directly at the wife as she is being served by a white female servant. This is one of the first ads that depicts a servant, and the class division is clear. All eyes are on the woman of the household as she is responsible for this wonderful fare, while the maid’s eyes remain downcast on the food she is serving. “The Finest of Appetizers” is the caption underneath the scene, and in this way, Campbell was attempting to position its soups not just as a main or side dish, but also rather as an important course in a multi-course meal.\textsuperscript{117} Despite the fact that the servant is white, her otherness is clearly apparent. Her mannerisms suggest that her working-class, possibly immigrant, background positions her as a laborer, rather than a consumer, and not a welcomed member of the family unit.

With these new style ads, Campbell was clearly trying to establish itself as the soup brand of middle classes women who aspired to an upper-class lifestyle. And amidst the reality of labor struggles in the workforce and perceived shortage of domestic help, they created a fantasy universe in which servants were docile and trustworthy, and the domestic sphere was still a tranquil haven away from the rigors of the business world. Several ads during this era assume an elevated status of consumer, such as the one placed in the September 1910 issue. Called “In the country home” it shows husband, wife, and an attractive female guest being waited on by a white male servant, presumably in the couple’s second home, away from the city. In the background, there is a sketchy outline of an automobile with driver.\textsuperscript{118} The husband and wife gaze adoringly at each other as they enjoy the fruits of their privilege and the soup that is being served. Climbing one-step further up the social ladder, the December 1910 features a regal older man dressed in formal military garb, sitting beside, but a proper distance apart from, a lady who clearly is entranced by her dinner partner. The table is laden with bouquets of flowers and full
formal place settings, and garlands billow in the background. Titled “A Formal Affair,” the narrative in the ad conjures up images that marry the political life of high society with the ambitions and dreams of average housewives:

If you have the idea that only a high-priced food-product can satisfy fastidious people, you will be surprised to know that a certain Washington hostess accustomed for years to entertain the most important personages in the “diplomatic set,” provides her table regularly with Campbell’s Soups. Yet she is no different in this form many other sensible women of her class.119

While the December 1910 ad does not actually depict a servant, a full bastion of domestic help is clearly implied. Mehaffy describes the role of the racial or ethnic Other, implied or otherwise, as “instrumental in the bourgeois woman’s mastery of consumer culture” (Fig. 22).120

Fig. 22. *Good Housekeeping* ad, December 1910.
Both female and male servants appear in Campbell’s ads throughout this period. The February 1910 is the first to feature a male servant, a mature black man who is portrayed as a butler (Fig. 23). “The Real Quality” conjures up images of domestic colonialism as it shows an older, well-to-do couple and their college-aged daughter, ready for dinner. While the manservant is serving soup, his eyes are fixed downward on the bowl he is placing in the front of the daughter, and the husband and wife are engaged in serious conversation, barely aware of the servant’s presence. Again, the narrative copy beneath the illustration is densely detailed with information about how the soup is made. But undoubtedly, the main attraction for magazine readers is the family dynamics within the scene. One senses that perhaps the couple is discussing their daughter’s future and not necessarily agreeing on the direction it should take.

Fig. 23. Good Housekeeping ad, February 1910.
A young woman’s expectations also appear to be the subject of the May 1910 ad, which features a middle-aged couple and their post-adolescent daughter (Fig. 24). In this scene, the husband is pointing directly at his daughter, obviously providing some sort of stern fatherly advice about economic homemaking. Whether it is welcomed or not remains ambiguous, as the daughter’s face, while looking toward her father, is void of obvious expression. A young black maid, who is serious and sullen as she holds a can of soup to illustrate the father’s example, is serving the family. The mother fixates her eyes on her husband. “The Reason Why” is the title of the scene, and the copy begins: “How is such perfect tomato soup as Campbell’s possible at the price?” The daughter is learning how to become a successful wife and mother under the severe tutelage of her wise father. When depicted in Campbell’s ads of this era, the adult male head-of-household always appears self-assured and steadfast, in body language and mannerism. Women, on the other hand, look to men for approval of their behavior. This ad, like most others, also encodes the message that the ideal consumer is female and white. The black servant can recommend Campbell’s Soup as a top brand-name commodity, but she is undeniably a laborer rather than a consumer of the product. Her white mistress ultimately makes the decision about what to buy and serve.

Fig. 24. Good Housekeeping ad, May 1910.  
Fig. 25. Good Housekeeping ad, June 1910.
Indoctrination of young men is depicted altogether differently. The June 1910 ad shows a young boy on the verge of adolescence who is seated at a place of prominence at his grandparent’s table (Fig. 25). As his aging grandparents look on lovingly, the boy receives the first serving of soup from a kindly, older white male servant who places his hand familiarly on the high back of the boy’s chair, which resembles a throne. The scene is called “Simply the Best,” and it is clear that it not only refers to the product being served but to the young boy’s education and future. In general, young or old, males are incorporated into Campbell’s ads to oversee female behavior or to benefit from their nurturance. Whether implicitly or explicitly, mothers and wives are surveyed by the male subject, regardless of his age, and they are beholden to his scrutiny.

Religious observation is the focus of the March 1910 advertisement, and it obscures the line of demarcation between two distinct spheres—religion and commerce. In keeping with the rituals surrounding Easter, the scene is described as “A Lenten Delicacy” and showcases a husband, wife, and their pastor being served by a young white female servant. The action within the mise-en-scène is similar to other such ads: the maid lifts the lid off the soup tureen to get the wife’s approval to serve as the men look on with anticipation. The holy man’s fingers are crossed in a relaxed, patient manner in front of his chest, with his thumbs pointed upwards, creating an obvious church steeple effect. In part, the dense copy reads: “It is served in many of the most luxurious and best-appointed homes and on the most important occasions.” While the man of the cloth is supposed to be parsimonious by profession, he is giving tacit approval to the conspicuous consumption and lavish lifestyle of his hosts, as indicated by the advertising copy.
Perhaps it is interesting to note that while the race of the servants in these ads fluctuates between what appears to be African American and Caucasian, ethnicity is not so easy to discern. However, the age of the domestic help is determinable. During this time period, all of the male servants are depicted as middle-aged or older, while the females are decidedly much younger—late teens to mid-twenties. In all cases, the servants do not engage in eye contact with family, and the husbands, wives, children, and guests do not appear to even notice that they are being served. These entrenched visual narratives proscribe that only middle-upper class white Americans can be authentic consumers—status never available to the racial, ethnic, or lower-class Other. In the discourse of consumption, servants become visual props, accessories to notions of bourgeois modernism.

Again, in the August 1910, the telephone becomes symbolic of modern technology in service to the well-being of the middle-class domestic sphere. In “Send Another Dozen,” a proactive wife/mother calls her local grocer to order enough cans of Campbell’s soup to stock her pantry. Throughout this period, young female servants are often positioned as helpmates to harried new wives. And in this ad, a white maid is dutifully standing by the mistress of the house, holding a can of soup, perhaps having just told her, “Mum, this is the last can of soup!” Women are reminded how easy the product is to make and how well organized it makes them appear. In the November 1910 ad, a young homemaker is quietly making out her grocery list. “That’s Easy!” exclaims the caption, and the copy tells all wives and mothers: “Easy to decide on; easy to prepare. And it puts your mind at ease on the first critical point of your little dinner, or luncheon, or supper.” The narrative is intended to support women in their quest for modern efficiency, but it actually trivializes their responsibilities by the insertion of “little,” as it describes the thrice daily, undoubtedly painstaking event of meal preparation.
With or without domestic help, homemakers were expected to be competent and resourceful, all the while maintaining their attractiveness to men. And women were warned about the consequences of not doing so: “My good madam, you polish your tables, you scour your kettles, but the most valuable piece of furniture in the whole house you are letting go to rack and ruin for want of a little pains. You will find it in your own room, in front of your own mirror” (Jerome K. Jerome, September 1905). But the November 1908 issue prescribes an “easy” solution in “The Housekeeper Beautiful: Why and How the Busy Wife and Mother Can Retain Her Good Looks” by Lillian Dynevor Rice. She gives this advice:

A certain dear sexagenarian, famous alike for her cookery and her exquisite daintiness of dress, was once asked how she contrived to look so spotlessly charming even during elaborate dinner preparation, and her reply, embodying much, was: ‘My dear, a lady can always cook like a lady.’ Nowadays . . . the housewife has no valid excuse for making a burnt offering of herself when roasting, broiling or frying, nor need she drop to the level of the quadrupled when floors must be scrubbed or carpets laid. She can rule triumphant as queen of the kitchen, empress of the household, and need not resign the more extended sovereignty of ruler of hearts and lady of beauty.

And how exactly were housewives and mothers supposed to retain their majestic appearance amidst an environment of crying babies, demanding husbands, disobedient servants, and household chores? According to Mrs. Rice, this could easily be achieved through the use of the many new products and technologies available to relieve women of domestic drudgery. By
using the correct stiff-handled brush, the latest silver polisher, or straight-from-the-can condensed soup, the New Woman could ensure her good looks, even into old age. This was one of the many mythologies, manufactured by advertisers and magazines alike, that promulgated domestic ideology.

Even so, amidst the entrenched messages of traditional housewifery, by the end of the first decade of the new century, *Good Housekeeping* began running essays that openly questioned the traditional roles of women. In the December 1909 issue, Grace Duffield Goodwin wrote a review of the new book, *Marriage as a Trade* by Mary Cicely Hamilton. Goodwin subtitled her assessment “Woman Once More Discovered to Be an ‘Adjunct to the Frying Pan,’” as she characterized Hamilton’s perception of matrimony as a means of subsistence and servitude. While Hamilton viewed the state of being unmarried and childless as the only salvation to women, Goodwin chastised her for reopening the wounds of their foremothers, saying, “Evidently Miss Hamilton has just awakened, with her industrial independence, to conditions that fifty years ago had aroused many thoughtful women.” Regardless, the fact that Goodwin designates their new woman predecessors as “thoughtful women” seems to indicate the opening of a political fissure in the discourse of women’s service magazines, one that was not about to be sutured back together without enormous struggle and debate.
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CHAPTER V.
MILITANTS: 1911 – 1915

For decades, the traditional domestic life of American housewives had been the lifeblood of ladies’ magazines, such as *Good Housekeeping*. Occasionally, women’s forays into the public sphere were gingerly touched upon, but this typically was limited to specific civic service, such as the women’s club movement participation in pure food standards and label reform, which had been actively encouraged by *Good Housekeeping*. Even though women’s suffrage had been a prerogative of feminists since the mid-1800s and an early element of the mainstream press’s anxiety over the New Woman, it had not been a topic of concern for *Good Housekeeping* during its first twenty-five years of publication--that is, until 1910.

“Aunt Jemimy’s Attack of Suffragitis” appeared in March 1910 and used the invented vernacular of an African American wife and mother to introduce to *Good Housekeeping* readers a one-sided version of women’s equality. Cally Ryland wrote the essay, and the narrative technique and tone had been employed in the magazine many times before. Most notably, Dorothy Dix regularly contributed a popular series, “Mirandy,” in which she spoke about women’s issues through the perspective and language of her main character, a black woman who struggled mightily and sometimes angrily with her role as a woman living in a man’s world. This persona, as assumed by white women, allowed them to safely address panoply of female issues, usually within the scope of the domestic sphere, but sometimes crossing over into the public realm, as well.

In Ryland’s essay, she speaks through the stereotyped embodiment of the familiar nurturing black woman who was known to white consumers through two decades of advertising as Aunt Jemima. Black characters, particularly women, had been institutionalized as
advertising symbols since the use of trade cards in the 1870s, and they were often depicted in primitive degrading circumstances. Advertising cards, like the modern ad campaigns to follow, were mirrors to “American social attitudes and prejudices.”\textsuperscript{2} The most famous black advertising symbol was Aunt Jemima, created in 1889 to sell breakfast food. She was intended to be the epitome of southern hospitality and the strong, self-reliant black woman that Eldridge Cleaver in 1968 compared to “the other side of the coin of the myth of the beautiful dumb blonde. The white man . . . deposited her in his kitchen--that’s the secret of Aunt Jemima’s bandanna.”\textsuperscript{3}

Scholars maintain that after the abolition of slavery, the invention of Aunt Jemima and other iconographic black images, such as Uncle Ben (Uncle Ben’s Converted Rice), Rastus (the Cream of Wheat chef), and the Gold Dust Twins (Gold Dust Washing Powder), was a means to integrate prejudicial beliefs and fears about free blacks into mainstream white culture.\textsuperscript{4} Many Campbell’s Soup ads during this period featured middle-upper class families being served soup by servants, but the depiction of those portrayed varied from month to month and none became a standard, recognizable figure associated with the brand. However, it is clear that the servant class represented in the ads is distinct in either race or class from the primary consumers who are always Caucasian, well-to-do economically, and often harried as a result of the stress of modern living. For instance, the May 1911 ad in \textit{Good Housekeeping} features a scene of commonplace domesticity--a white mother kneeling on a stool while she busily attempts to adjust the back of her teenage daughter’s dress. Standing beside her is a young black female servant who appears to be asking her if it is appropriate to serve Campbell’s Soup. The woman’s approving answer: “That’s Right!” White women’s frailty and weak disposition continue to be remedied by ready-made soup, while strong black women do not suffer such maladies--or are not given the latitude to express such neediness, as the ad indicates:
Think what a sure reliance you find in Campbell’s Tomato Soup in the midst of ‘nervous’ tiring work. Think how much bother and fuss it takes off your mind; how invigorating it is, and how it nourishes and tones you up. You get all the fine tonic qualities of fresh ripe tomatoes in Campbell’s Tomato Soup.5

While the woman in this particular ad does not conform to the traditional iconography of a mammy, she is indeed a variation on that theme. According to Kern-Foxworth, Aunt Jemima’s success as advertising icon was due to the ability of her creators to reinforce through her dominant societal attitudes about black people, in particular, women. As the stereotypical “happy slave,” “devoted servant,” and “natural born cook,” Aunt Jemima assuaged white fear and frustration over the increased melting pot condition of American society and perceived threats to home life.6 Indoctrinated by this popular and pervasive advertising discourse, female writers such as Ryland and Dix adopted similar strategies to illuminate what they perceived to be the universal female condition in their essays for Good Housekeeping. Speaking through the voices of uneducated black women, white writers felt free to discuss their own concerns about motherhood, wifedom, and disenfranchisement.

And so it was, in March of 1910, when the issue of suffrage was finally broached in the pages of Good Housekeeping, through the familiar and much beloved advertising icon, Aunt Jemima. In the essay, Aunt Jemimy, mother of eleven children and wife to “dat lazy, good-fuh-nothin’ Jonas” describes how she came to exchange her “nervous posterity” for the disease of “suffragitis.” Attending suffrage meetings nearly every day had led her to a life of discontent at home, and she began boycotting all her motherly and wifely obligations. The result? For the first time, her husband Jonas and her seven living children were taking over the chores, while she
sat back in amazement that it took a whole family to accomplish the work of one woman!\textsuperscript{7}

Remarkably, Aunt Jemimy is able to set aside the guilt she feels for disregarding what her own mother taught her about woman’s duties, and for the first time, she is willing to let the meat burn on the stove and the children fall in the fire “jes’ de way Jonas is allus done.”\textsuperscript{8}

While Aunt Jemimy’s “affliction” is suffragitis, Ryland’s essay makes no specific mention of women seeking the right to vote, but it does indeed speak to a level of female dissatisfaction that was rarely subject to debate within mainstream domestic discourse, especially within women’s service magazines. Through the comical and non-threatening, albeit prejudicially based, persona of Aunt Jemima, Ryland opens a virtual pandora’s box of women’s political ambitions to the readers of \textit{Good Housekeeping}.\textsuperscript{9} Of course, enfranchisement had been on the agenda of American feminists since even before the Republic was founded, when in 1647 property holder Margaret Brent of Maryland asked for the right to vote in legislature. Two hundred years passed until a watershed moment in women’s suffrage took place in Seneca Falls, New York--the official assemblage of the Women’s Rights Convention. Little more than twenty years later, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony founded the National Woman Suffrage Association in 1869, the same year that the state of Wyoming allowed women to vote for the first time.\textsuperscript{10} Following on the heels of Stanton and Anthony, the National American Woman Suffrage Association was founded in 1890.\textsuperscript{11} The political aspirations and activities of new women in the nineteenth century set the stage for everything that would follow in the early decades of the 1900s.

Mainstream American culture tended to dismiss the unabashed efforts of early feminists as the notions of a disgruntled radical few, but the foundation of women’s political involvement was formed there, as well as within more conventional frameworks. During the 1800s,
traditional female political participation was characterized by voluntarism that developed as counterpoint to, but in support of, male-dominated politics. Law and custom separated women from the public sphere in which male politics took place, but according to Michael McGerr, women were not barred entirely from the political arena.\textsuperscript{12} During the course of nineteenth-century political campaigns:

Women made food for rallies, sewed banners, and decorated meeting halls. In cities and small towns, women often attended indoor political meetings. In the countryside, women went to outdoor rallies. Torchlight parades in cities were another matter: women could watch from windows, but notions of respectability may have kept many of them from the streets . . . [However,] women were not always spectators: younger women and girls sometimes participated in campaign events, mainly as symbols of beauty . . . [such as] the Goddess of Liberty.\textsuperscript{13}

Thus, women played an important role in the rituals associated with male electoral politics, and often served as representative icons and images for male political platforms. In this sense, women were encouraged to breach the conceptual boundary between home and public life, both literally and metaphorically, but their roles were largely an extension of the work they performed within the ethos of separate spheres. However, this experience in the male political world prepared some women for the eventual evolution of their own activism.

Denied the right to vote, McGerr shows that women began developing their own distinctive political tactics that expanded the notion of domesticity into the public arena through active involvement in charitable and reform organizations.\textsuperscript{14} Primary examples of this new style
of female politics include the founding of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, the American Equal Rights Association, and the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA), and the aforementioned women’s club movement that concentrated on a variety of social and civic concerns. Empowered by the number of women attracted to these volunteer organizations, activists began mobilizing en masse to change male attitudes and behaviors—holding conventions, writing petitions, publishing pamphlets and posters, and sending female delegates to meet with male legislators. However, McGerr warns that these individual groups most often did not support each other’s motives and actions, and criticism from other female activists was typically the harshest, making any form of true female solidarity nearly impossible during the early years.15

As the new century began, the suffrage movement had become somewhat stagnant. But suffragists were about to embark on a new political style, one that stepped up the ritualistic aspects of politics and combined those with tactics borrowed from male techniques made popular in the final decades of the 1800s—more specifically, political campaigning based in “education” and “advertising.” In the new educational approach of male politicians, campaign marches, parades, and rallies were replaced with other forms of communication. Electoral power was shifted to the offices of national committees, and this became the primary means of educating the public and the media on a particular political agenda. In addition, injecting advertising into the political campaign was a way to elevate the importance of a candidate’s personality into the debate on his politics. Interestingly, McGerr views this new style of male campaigning as a feminization of the process because “education” literally took male participants away from the streets, their domain, and placed it into the homes in the form of newspapers and informational pamphlets for the “ideal citizen” to “pore over by the fireside.”16 This is the way women had
been learning about the world for centuries. In addition, the new reliance on advertising positioned the ideal voter as someone who, like women, was an avid consumer, readily indoctrinated to the visual and verbal discourse dispensed by product advertisements. In this new campaign model, the political candidate and his platform became the product, available for public consumption and accessible to women, even though they had no legitimate vote.

Perhaps, then, it is no surprise that leading suffragists such as NAWSA president, Carrie Chapman Catt, began to employ these very organizational methods to reignite the issue of women’s suffrage. While women’s political roles during the 1800s had been largely limited to those of the voluntarist nature, women were not inexperienced when it came to political expression, even if they had witnessed it primarily from the sidelines. As a result, they began exploring a range of approaches for achieving equality, and Progressive Era women’s politics became far more proactive, and even militant in years to follow. While men’s politics had begun to temper its reliance on street politics, women chose to incorporate those older styles into their cache of strategies. In addition to the newer educational and advertising techniques, female activists appropriated many of the rituals they had performed in the past as helpmates to male political aspirations, but now they were intended to generate support for female causes. However, they did not just copy the male styles of old, but rather they created new forms of political expression that were decidedly their own. Taking to the streets, space that once was strictly male domain, these activities, to some extent, represented the intersection of the modern new woman, new technologies, and politics. Suffragists readily incorporated the latest innovations in order to access as many people as possible, and as a result, they began spreading their message by traveling cross-country on trolleys, cars, and trains.
In addition to distributing volumes of printed educational literature, leaflets, and brochures, handing out colorful slogan buttons, and hanging huge banners and to-the-point petitions, various publicity stunts articulated the cause:

One suffragist went up in a balloon; a circus manager agreed to put a Votes for Women sign on an elephant; . . . pageants, plays, concerts and public social functions . . . a handsome float in the labor day parade; speaking at vaudeville shows . . . The suffragists also staged elaborate pageants and *tableaux vivantes*--still scenes of costumed figures intended to dramatize the plight of women.  

Visual display and intense color coordination was a hallmark of suffragist political rallies. Some American groups chose to use the color scheme of the militant English suffragists--purple, white, and green; while other more conservative groups chose yellow as their predominant color. Women activists would stop at nothing to get their message to the people and generate allies. Like the fictional Aunt Jemimy in Ryland’s essay, many women obtained a sense of empowerment and solidarity in suffrage events, even if their participation created a clash of roles within the household. And because of this, it was not an easy task to get large groups of women to agree to take part in the public spectacles. Often women were compelled not to march in parades by the males in their life--husbands, friends, employers. Moreover, even older, more conservative suffragist leaders considered the marches unladylike and immature. Nevertheless, that did not quell the fervor of the suffrage movement, and gradually it began to infiltrate the pages of traditional women’s service magazines like *Good Housekeeping*. 
The Childless Wife

In its twenty-sixth year of publication, *Good Housekeeping*’s editorial focus stayed the course, as it continued to concern itself almost exclusively with traditional domestic issues. However, there emerged a few indications that even the sanctity of the magazine’s main objective was being penetrated by the political reality of the outside world. While the New Woman within its pages almost entirely had become a fixture of modern advertising and consumerist allusion, American new women were becoming more involved in public sphere activities beyond the watchful control of husbands and fathers. Initially the crack in the armor took place within the home, particularly in the affiliation between wives and their husbands, as indicated in the January 1911 issue. Reader “G.C.” sent a letter to the editor, upset that, according to her, women always attribute their success, within or outside the home, to men.

I think as a sex we are proud to acknowledge the help and encouragement that our husbands give us, and even if we know that it is mostly through our own hard, ceaseless toil that success is finally reached, we can always find some reason for sharing our honors with them. Is this true of men? I fear not. Many, many cases I know of where the husband’s success is due only to the wife’s efforts to save his money for him, or insist on him pushing ahead when he is discouraged and ready to give up; and yet when success finally comes, he takes the credit of it all. I know there are some exceptions, but I am afraid they are rare.20

The issue of marriage came under constant scrutiny during this period, as in the March 1912 issue, and conservative experts sought to maintain traditional ideas about the primary male-
female relationship. Amidst the many culinary tidbits—“boiled mutton is more delicious if a large white onion and tablespoonful of Worcestershire sauce are cooked with it” and “few people know how delicious calf’s liver is when baked instead of fried”—there appeared an article entitled “Who Should Marry.” In it, Rev. Samuel McComb supports the popular “scientific” notion of eugenics to illustrate his belief that “marriage is a duty” and that “marriage today calls for higher qualities, especially in the case of the man, than at any previous time.” Why single out men? The reason expressed by McComb is that many a high quality, cultivated woman “is awakening to the possibilities of her nature” and becoming altogether discontented with the very idea of matrimony. No doubt fueled by new economic opportunities in the business world and political aspirations in the civic arena, many women, he feared, were choosing to remain single.

Female choice was an altogether new concept that threatened to upset the delicate balance of the long-entrenched ethos of separate spheres. As a result, the state of marriage and growing concerns about motherhood become central themes in Good Housekeeping in the ensuing years. These issues become intertwined with women’s burgeoning political and economic aspirations, viewed as the real menace to domestic traditions and male dominance.

In July 1911, reader “Mrs. H.P.L.” creates a firestorm of debate in her letter to the editor entitled “The Childless Wife,” in which she claims that most children are not the result of planning. While indeed, she did desire to have children, “they did not come,” and despite her unintended childless condition, she continued to assume all the regular responsibilities of a housewife. However, she laments not receiving credit from family and friends for keeping a fine home, and in fact, she is most often criticized for having an abundance of leisure time. Mrs. H.P.L. attributes this to most mothers actually being jealous of the childless wife, and she implores them to understand that the condition is not necessarily by choice. Nevertheless, “H.P.L.’s”
letter is interesting in the subtext of satisfaction she expresses in being childless. While she clearly is conflicted and feels enormous pressure to defend herself against societal expectations, she reluctantly admits to preferring her childless state when she describes the horrors of babysitting misbehaving children of friends and family and the havoc they wreak on her beautifully serene home-life.

Obviously, in tandem with McComb’s essay, the March 1912 issue of the magazine warns women about the ramifications of remaining childless. “The Dangerous Age in Woman: The Peril of the Childless Woman, Through Divorce” by Newell Dwight Hillis (also a minister), says that women in their thirties and forties should place all their emotional attention onto the development of their children. So what of the childless woman of that age?

There are some women that have refused a woman’s work, and have become mere social and industrial parasites, carrying around half a donkey’s load of finery in their trunks, and half the dress of a butterfly on their backs. They are going through life perpetual manikins, for the exhibition of dressmakers’ art, and the inevitable result is disgust with themselves at forty.24

From Hillis’s perspective, women who do not have children, either by choice or biology, are destined to become silly, insignificant creatures who contribute nothing to society or the nation. This is an obvious reinforcement of Rooseveltian dogma that positions women’s sole cultural contribution as an unending supply of future mothers and male citizens. According to the author, fathers and mothers invest enormous shared capital in their children, and he describes the ideal economic arrangement of marriage:
Marriage is an exchange of gifts, and the daily bartering must be about even. Success is the fruitage of a man’s life through things, and happiness for a woman is the fruitage of what she is through her work for her children and her home.\textsuperscript{25}

In Hillis’s estimation, inevitably as time marches on, those in childless marriages eventually lose respect for one another, and divorce is the predictable result. A new subscriber from Idaho responds to the burning issue and charges that women who choose to remain childless are “Too Fond of Easy Street.” She says, “Why not have children? We have really little else to do . . . I know [not] of a more pitiful sight than a childless old couple.”\textsuperscript{26} That rousing endorsement of motherhood was not an uncommon sentiment as expressed by female readers of \textit{Good Housekeeping} at the beginning of the second decade of the 1900s. However, it was not the only perspective, and alternative views about everything from childrearing and marriage to social reform and civic activism were a growing concern for readers, editorial contributors, and advertisers, alike. The discourse associated with domesticity was transforming, and an undercurrent of discontent was brewing within magazine content. While the majority of the issues explored during this period were restricted to rhetoric that continued to obligate women to family and nation, on a parallel track was the acknowledgement that some women, i.e., new women, were exploring the public realm in an increasingly political manner and their goal was active involvement, economic opportunities, and first and foremost, obtaining the vote.

During this same period, the Campbell’s Soup advertisements placed in \textit{Good Housekeeping} did not acknowledge women’s civic or political lives. However, the ads began to rely less on scenes of motherhood and more on three primary domestic relationships: those between husband and wife; between hostess and guest(s); and between mistress and servant.
Women pleasing the men in their life continued to be a theme, but often with a twist. The message drawn was that the skillful wife could trick her mate into believing she was doing things the old-fashioned way: “The first time you use one of Campbell’s Soups on your table don’t tell the men folks who made it. Let them think it is home-made until they have eaten it. See if they don’t think the cook is a wonder.” Women who made this consumer choice were called “independent and good managers.” But lest wives believe that they can indeed fool their wise husbands, the January 1914 ad taught them otherwise. It featured a well-dressed man getting ready to taste a spoonful of soup, blindfolded: “You’d know Campbell’s Tomato Soup with your eyes shut.” The message? Campbell’s soups are so good and unique that the discerning man can distinguish them from other brands just by their aroma and taste. Husbands, therefore, could give tacit approval to wives to choose the laborsaving product in place of homemade versions. In a continued effort to associate the product with elevated status and discriminating taste, other ads showed that powerful, wealthy men preferred Campbell’s, too: “The man owns railroads and steamship lines. He lives in a palatial home surrounded by every luxury. His table is supplied with the best the world can afford. Yet he cannot procure anything better than Campbell’s Soup.”

In addition, Campbell’s soup was featured as central to women becoming admired, adept hostesses. “There’s one quality you always notice about a successful hostess – Ease.” And in February 1911: “Just now – with the season for entertaining at its height – is the best time of all the year for the clever hostess to get acquainted with Campbell’s Soups.” The March 1914 ad was particularly atmospheric and inventive in its depiction of Campbell’s role in upscale entertaining (Fig. 26). It shows three well-dressed people (two women–possibly mother and daughter, and one man–the husband/father) dining in what appears to be either a restaurant or
perhaps a very lavish household dining room. A distinguished male servant in a bowtie is serving them soup on a tray. The ad reads:

In the finest homes at the best-appointed tables *Campbell’s Tomato Soup* is recognized as a dinner-course of faultless quality and suited to the most important occasions. Served in bouillon-cups topped with whipped cream it makes an especially inviting appeal to the discriminating guest.\(^{32}\)

Fig. 26. *Good Housekeeping* ad, March 1914.
In numerous ads, women gather together and share the secret of using Campbell’s soups to impress their families and guests, and they share tidbits about unique ways to prepare it. Throughout this era, the pristine environment of well-bred ladies is essential to Campbell’s creation of the woman-as-hostess image:

What makes your dinner a success? Snowy linen, delicate china, shining silver and glassware correctly placed, and your own evident enjoyment and ease in knowing that your dinner is exactly right. That’s the beauty of Campbell’s Soup.\(^{33}\)

In the ad quoted above, a young mistress of the house is instructing her equally young white maidservant in the proper placement of the dinner table. But as the “servant problem” continued to plague financially secure American households, Campbell developed another tactic:

‘And only one maid! How do you manage so nicely?’ How does any women with only one maid – or sometimes with no help at all – manage dainty little luncheons and other company affairs with perfect smoothness and ease? She takes advantage of modern ideas. She avoids needless and useless labor. For one thing, the modern house-wife uses Campbell’s Soup.\(^{34}\)

This is a clear attempt to market to middle-class women by helping them envision life in high society, while at the same time asking them to maintain a perfect home life without the benefit of additional help (Fig. 27). Eventually, servants were no longer featured in the ads, or only infrequently, as fewer households actually employed outside help. In the March 1912 ad, a stylishly attired woman tells her husband and their guests:
‘Yes. Now-a-days house-keeping means home-keeping.’

Her guests, engrossed, ask her to explain this statement further:

‘But doesn’t it mean a lot of drudgery just the same--specially in the culinary department’?

Confidently the young homemaker replies:

‘No, not if you manage it right. I have all the handy contrivances that save more than they cost. And we never make our own soups.

I use Campbell’s Soups.’ (Fig.28)35

Figs. 27 and 28. Good Housekeeping ads, February 1912 and March 1912.
The Watchdog of the Kitchen

By 1912, *Good Housekeeping* had a readership of approximately 300,000, and subscribers paid $1.50 per year. The magazine’s subscription price was comparable to the other Big Six sister magazines, but its circulation still was considerably lower. Readers received a monthly magazine containing approximately 125 pages of editorial content, and a bulky, ever-growing special advertising section in the back. Recently, newspaper industrialist, William Randolph Hearst, whose growing media empire produced other notable women’s magazine titles such as Cosmopolitan, had purchased the magazine. Hearst moved the *Good Housekeeping* operation to New York City, and a year later, he recruited renowned editor William Frederick Bigelow from *Cosmopolitan* to steer the helm at *Good Housekeeping*, a position that would last for nearly three decades. To have a male editor as the head of a top magazine aimed at women’s domestic issues was a most common occurrence during that era. Bigelow’s ideological influence on the overall nature of the magazine is perhaps summed up best by his insistence that “men’s and women’s interests are largely identical.” Even so, Bigelow should be credited for expanding dialogue that questioned women’s traditional roles and allowed for the emergence of alternative perspectives.

Under Bigelow, *Good Housekeeping* immediately was modernized in appearance and content. All departments of the magazine were expanded, including the fiction, poetry, non-fiction, scientific, and service departments. First-class writers such as Somerset Maugham, Booth Tarkington, Mary Robert Rinehart, Kathleen Norris, and others contributed long serials or short stories, and *Good Housekeeping* became known as perhaps the most important fiction journal during that time. Poets Edna St. Vincent Millay, Ogden Nash, and Ella Wheeler Wilcox also contributed heavily to the magazine. While the fiction offerings tended to be mainstream in
their appeal to the domestic, “feminine” side of its women readers, the newly expanded non-fiction pieces were often decidedly more progressive, commenting on women’s contributions to public life, and delving into their dissatisfaction with traditional domestic roles.

In addition, magazine editors courted well-known illustrators like Howard Chandler Christy, James Montgomery Flagg, Charles Dana Gibson, Rose O’Neill (creator of the cherubic, naughty Kewpies), Norman Rockwell, Arthur Rackham, and N.C. Wyeth, all of whom garnered even more fame by providing enticing visuals to the fiction and poetry presented in *Good Housekeeping*. In particular, artist Jessie Willcox Smith contributed cover illustrations to the magazine for sixteen years that featured “devoted mothers and [their] adorable children.” Typically, the image of the mother in her own right was not the primary theme of the cover, but rather her nurturing of children was the central focus.

Upon assuming control of the magazine, owner Hearst conducted a nationwide search to fill the position of director of the Institute’s Bureau of Foods, Sanitation, and Health, an office developed specifically to report on pure foods initiatives. In 1912, the Institute garnered much publicity when Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, former chief chemist for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, became director of the Good Housekeeping Institute’s Bureau. As previously mentioned Dr. Wiley was one of the primary advocates of the 1906 Pure Food and Drug Act and had a national reputation that preceded his new appointment. Women respected Wiley especially for his efforts to secure a national maternity care policy, and when he resigned from the government in 1912, a newspaper headline read: “Women Weep as Watchdog of the Kitchen Quits After 29 Years.” His arrival at the Good Housekeeping organization was a triumph for Hearst, and Wiley became a powerful influence on its readers for years to come.
Wiley was officially introduced to the readers of *Good Housekeeping* through the formal presentation of his wife (Fig. 29). In the April 1912 issue, she was featured in an essay called “Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley: The Notable Wife of the Great Champion of Pure Food” by Katherine Graves Busbey. Upon initial analysis of the article, one cannot help but to be struck by the photograph that accompanied the piece--Mrs. Harvey in her wedding gown, complete with bride’s bouquet and flowing veil. However, somewhat awkwardly, the photo’s caption conflicts with the image and provides a degree of insight into her true nature. It reads: “In fact, Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley quite charminly does not fulfill the old-fashioned idea as to what a ‘platform woman’ should look like.” What is Mrs. Wiley’s platform? Busbey’s essay revealed that she was a staunch suffragist and president of the Washington Equal Suffrage Club. Thus was disclosed the details of Mrs. Wiley’s true passion--political activism in an effort to secure equal advancement for women.

Fig. 29. Mrs. Harvey. W. Wiley, introduced in *Good Housekeeping*, April 1912.
Busbey’s piece was the first to appear in *Good Housekeeping* that explicitly tied together the notion of woman suffrage and broader social reforms, and Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley became the embodiment of that idea—the New Woman, taken seriously. The article revealed that Mrs. Wiley was also a staunch advocate for consumer protection and the requirement that all manufacturers provide accurate labeling to indicate, not only the purity of their ingredients, but that their businesses operate under sanitary conditions and provide workers with honest wages, a belief shared with her husband. Mrs. Wiley was quoted in the article, disclosing the crux of the couple’s relationship:

Dr. Wiley has been a suffragist for twenty years, and that is one reason why I am proud of him. We are going to raise the suffrage flag on the tallest mast of the pure food ship.46

This statement was momentous, and it foretold of the immediate future direction of *Good Housekeeping*. Perhaps then, the photo of Mrs. Wiley in her wedding dress was not just to illuminate her womanly charms and traditional status, but rather it stood as metaphor for the melding of women and some notable men in the battle for a more egalitarian American society. Under Wiley, the magazine was soon to become a hotbed of activity battling for consumer and business reforms, as well as a forum to debate the critical “votes for women” issue.

The April 1912 issue clearly was an attempt to show “the woman behind the man,” which was not an uncommon strategy during the era, as men’s status was often measured by the quality of the wife they chose. Mrs. Wiley provided to the women of *Good Housekeeping* an accessible gateway to her husband and the unique position he was about to assume within the organization. Dr. Wiley was not just taking a job at *Good Housekeeping*, he was importing into it an ideology. Readers got their first official look at the doctor on the cover of the May 1912 issue--somewhat
startling because it was the first since 1885 that did not feature an illustration of women, children, or a general scene of domesticity. The portrait of Dr. Wiley, looking somewhat stern but kind, is underscored by the straightforward caption: “Dr. Wiley’s first article on Pure Food.”47 A large portion of the issue was devoted to Wiley’s mission, and his first article “Our Opportunities in an Unbounded Field” was preceded with a lengthy introduction by the magazine’s editor. In part, it read:

Dr. Wiley has the entire freedom of our pages: to wage the fight for purity and honesty whenever and wherever he believes a blow can be effectively struck; to throw light in dark places, if such he finds; and from his unequaled knowledge of foods and dietetics, to give our people instructions in sound and happy living.48

Arthur Wallace Dunn endorsed Wiley’s good character and significant past accomplishments in a piece entitled “Dr. Wiley and His Work: A Character Sketch from the Pen of a Friend.” In the issue’s feature article, Wiley himself outlined his mission, which broadly encompassed the following issues: sanitation problems associated with manufacturing, dishonest weights and measures of goods, inaccurate labeling practices, meat from animals with tuberculosis, impure foods in general, and fighting for regulatory legislation to combat the current problems (Fig. 30).49 From the May 1912 issue onward, Wiley had significant impact on the focus of the magazine, and on a monthly basis, he contributed articles, answered readers’ questions, and directed the organization’s efforts to keep manufacturers and advertisers honest in an effort to purify the nation’s food supply.
In particular, canned food was of significant concern to the nation, and in some circles, eating such goods was still condemned for fear of harmful impurities. In April 1913, Wiley addressed the situation in the essay simply titled “Don’t Be Afraid of Canned Goods.” Of greatest concern were the injurious adjuvants--chemical preservatives, artificial sweeteners, and bleaching agents--that most canners used in their processes. Wiley assured readers that the National Organization of the Canners of the United States was actively involved in the elimination of these additives and making great progress in purifying their products. However, there were other issues at hand. Wiley’s article demonstrated the difficulty Americans still faced
in 1913 regarding the year-round accessibility and availability of needed nutrients. He cautioned that canned vegetables and fruits were, because of unavoidable constraints in canning, largely canned water. While they did provide some nutritional value, Wiley advocated eating fresh foods instead, when possible. In addition, there were more cultural issues at stake—the fear that many Americans, primarily women, were opting for the “vogue” of canned goods out of convenience and an effort to save labor—their own. Adroitly, Wiley was both fair and even-handed as he ensured readers that canned goods were safe and provided nutrition when fresh foods were not available, while at the same time cautioning them not to opt “for the easy way out” when providing for their family’s dietary requirements.50

Unlike the advertisements placed in Good Housekeeping during its initial five years, between 1911 and 1915 Campbell’s Soups, for the most part, discontinued constant overt references to the manufacturing processes that ensured the soup’s purity. Instead, it took a more abstract approach to the issues most important to Dr. Wiley and began to focus more on women’s relationship with their grocer. By promoting the idea that Campbell’s soups were now carried by grocers all across the country and widely available, the messages were intended to demonstrate the product’s wide acceptance. Its favorable reception in American grocery stores and kitchens was indicative of its safety. For instance, a well-to-do couple visiting their country home on the weekend, need not worry: “All grocers sell these pure and wholesome soups. You can be supplied anywhere if you only insist on it.”51 A good, practical manager (housewife) should “always order by the dozen, at least, when you buy.”52 The July 1914 advertisement shows a relatively unique scene of market life. As a woman holds up a can of Campbell’s soup in discussion with her grocer, a young boy peers through the store’s glass window over a display
of Campbell’s soups, and the caption describes his “inward longing” as he exclaims: “Gee! I wish I was a grocer!” (Fig. 31)\textsuperscript{53}
Campbell’s was also cognizant of the issues surrounding fresh foods versus canned products. Showing men and women picking fresh vegetables in a field, the December 1911 ad sent this message to concerned consumers:

Right off the vines! Green, tender, delicious – *these* are the peas we use for Campbell’s Pea Soup. They cost us twice what we would have to pay for dried peas such as ordinarily used. But the flavor is worth the difference. The question of cost never enters into the quality of Campbell’s Soups.\(^{54}\)

Other ads rely on similar strategies to associate the canned ingredients with their fresh progenitors. The November 1913 ad refers to Campbell’s soup as “The flavor of spring,” and then provides a narrative description of the garden-fresh, hand-picked vegetables that go into its making.\(^{55}\) There is even an attempt to associate clam chowder with natural freshness. The September 1912 ad features a young boy at the seaside, digging for clams, as the copy describes how the clams used in Campbell’s soup are: “Shipped right from their beds every winter night except Saturday and Sundays; washed and opened the next morning *by hand*; every clam separately examined; and then made immediately into Campbell’s Clam Chowder.”\(^{56}\)

The October 1914 Campbell’s Soup ad appeared to speak directly to Dr. Wiley’s abiding concern over the standardization of weights and measures of manufactured goods. It featured a large scale with a smiling woman indicating that a can of Campbell’s soup passes muster, as the caption reads: “It lifts a weight of care. You don’t have to worry over the ever-lasting ‘three-meals-a-day’ question when your larder is provided with Campbell’s Tomato Soup.”\(^{57}\) The company promised female consumers that they could feed a family of six on just one can. While
no ad refers directly to Dr. Wiley or his policy-making issues, it is evident that, at least indirectly, the ads spoke to the issues with which he was most concerned.

Dr. Wiley’s work at the Good Housekeeping organization was exclusive—he contributed solely to the magazine, and his tenure there was lengthy, influential, and productive. During the nineteen years that he directed the Good Housekeeping Institute’s Bureau, Wiley sought to educate women on all aspects of health and healthful living. He fought for tougher government inspection of many foods, including meat, milk, whole-wheat flour, sugar, and butter—all-important staples of the American diet during the early twentieth century. Another closely related issue was that of infant mortality, and Wiley wrote a series of articles for *Good Housekeeping* dealing with that subject matter. Under Dr. Wiley’s indispensable direction, the company steadily moved forward in its efforts to change national policies regarding food safety and label standardization, enlisting its readers as primary advocates for the cause. From his Good Housekeeping laboratories in Washington, D.C., Wiley and his staff monitored government policies while testing the products to be written about or advertised within the magazine. In concordance, the magazine began publishing a “Tested and Approved” list of approved products. In addition, the Bureau began offering the official “Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval” only to products (foods, drugs, cosmetics) that passed stringent testing procedures. The Seal was an oval with the words “Tested and Approved by the Good Housekeeping Institute Conducted by *Good Housekeeping Magazine.*” Homemakers were assured that a product (food or non-food) bearing this insignia had been thoroughly tested and guaranteed by the expert staff of the Good Housekeeping Institute.

In addition, Wiley was significant in shaping the ideological course that the magazine followed during his tenure at the Bureau. While Wiley and staff would work behind the scenes
to lobby for pure food as well as the testing of advertisers’ products, *Good Housekeeping* magazine reported the findings. Those product manufacturers that met with approval, could use the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval on ads placed in other magazines, as well.60 In an unprecedented move, Hearst gave Wiley direct veto power over any advertisements for food, drugs, and toilet articles whose claims did not meet the standards of the Bureau’s rigorous requirements.61 Thus, as a result of the influence of Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, by 1912, *Good Housekeeping* was no longer just a vehicle to entertain and educate readers, it was an actual organization and foundation for consumer protection. This set it apart significantly from other women’s periodicals of that era and further underscored its contribution to the cultural perception of women as educated, sophisticated consumers, and more importantly, assets to the nation’s economy.

However, further analysis of *Good Housekeeping*’s editorial content, particularly during this period, illustrates the cultural tension that existed within its pages regarding women’s changing roles during that era. According to Zuckerman:

They presented some of the most progressive thoughts on these subjects, and at the same time mirrored American’s conflicting and shifting views. Most clearly, they educated on this topic; presenting a continuous flow of information about women’s expanded sphere of activities and commentary about the effects of these transformations. Readers of the mass circulation women’s journals in these years could not remain unaware that women were moving into new areas. A number of articles expressed anxiety about the future of the home.62
Like its sister periodicals, *Good Housekeeping* often presented a schizophrenic viewpoint of women’s prescribed place within society. While the popular fiction offerings and service department editorials tended to stay safely within the confines of “accepted” behavior for proper women, the nonfiction features that reported on the lives of real women across the nation (and increasingly in more international coverage) tended to be more politically and socially progressive.\(^{63}\) Coverage of modern technologies also highlighted this contradiction. New inventions were intended to lighten a woman’s workload, making her more efficient, but what should she do with her projected free time? Would middle-class women choose to step outside the home and exercise their new, possibly political, options? In an effort to secure the sanctity of the traditional American home, both the editorial and advertising pages sought to instruct women on what to do when not housekeeping or childrearing.

**Maniacs or Martyrs?**

Amidst the many articles concerning maternal instinct, child hysteria, matrimonial training, beauty specialists, and tricky butchers, there appeared in the January 1911 issue of *Good Housekeeping* a short editorial, “An Object Lesson,” announcing Washington State’s decision to grant full voting franchise to women. The main focus of the essay was female decorum, and it attributed much success to Washington women’s decision not to use militant methods in their efforts to achieve the vote. *Good Housekeeping’s* editor, while seemingly offering approval of the vote, warns new women with radical tendencies to learn from the examples set in the West:

Here is an object lesson for the smart, feverish, notoriety-loving young women, many of them recent graduates of college, who
would, seemingly, introduce among us the madhouse antics of the English suffragettes. The American citizen does not need a dynamite bomb to secure the passage of a new idea through his frontal bone.\textsuperscript{64}

The Editor concludes with a message sent to the magazine from a male supporter of women’s suffrage, who summarized the monumental decision:

The campaign was quiet and dignified, and the women were womanly. There seemed to be more men than women in favor of it. The men seemed to feel that it was just, and were not afraid to trust the women with the ballot.\textsuperscript{65}

That statement exposes volumes about the cultural ramifications of gender politics in 1911. Just as the New Woman of the 1890s was disparaged viciously in the press for being too masculine--in dress, mannerism, and attitude--thirty years later, mainstream society continued to fear her. That apprehension was predicated on the belief that, by allowing women into the public sphere of men, they would undoubtedly become less womanly, threatening all that meant to American culture, especially regarding the inviolability of the home. At stake were the traditional values of home, motherhood, marriage, and nationhood. Could women, some of whom now had the power to vote on the most important issues of the day, be trusted to support the continued interests of men, as it had always been, or would they truly upset the apple cart and change the very fabric of American patriarchal life? It is, perhaps, not surprising that many women did not support enfranchisement, as women’s power for centuries had been inextricably intertwined with their proximity to male dominance. The ethos of separate spheres was deeply ingrained in both genders.
“An Object Lesson” did not go unnoticed by readers. “Alice H.” from London submitted a letter to the Editor in the May 1911 issue entitled “The Suffragette’s Side.” As a proud English suffragette and member of the Women’ Social and Political Union, “Alice H.” took umbrage with the Editor’s characterization of British feminists. She admits that initially she had been disturbed by the militant tactics of her countrywomen. But upon attending one of the their meetings, she found them to be, without exception, “the most womanly of women--gentlewomen who would be welcomed in the highest drawing rooms of the land for their personal charm and culture, and filled with enthusiasm and love for humanity that recalled to mind the early days of the Christian faith.”

“Alice H.” goes on to describe the brutality faced by the suffragists at the hands of one thousand police when twelve “gentlewomen,” led by Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst, attempted to present a petition to the prime minister. She recalls the stories her mother told her about Florence Nightingale and Josephine Butler who, decades before, had been accused of unwomanliness as they sought to bring about positive changes in society. In the end, “Alice H.” spoke only for the women of England, as she eloquently described the necessity for egalitarian society and a hope that America would eventually follow the Englishwomen’s lead.

The May 1911 issue is perhaps most notable not only for the forthright presentation of “Alice H.’s” feminist fervor, but also for its extensive coverage of women’s burgeoning public experiences. Alongside her letter to the editor is another entitled “A Working Girl’s Lunch,” in which reader “G.P.W.” describes to other young working women how they can best prepare a hot, nutritious lunch in the office, at little expense. While perhaps not as dramatic or memorable as that written by Alice H., G.P.W.’s letter is a poignant little slice-of-life reminder of how some women’s lives were changing, and how foreign to many of them was the environment of male-dominated business. In addition, the magazine continued to court members of the women’s club
movement with articles such as “The Business Woman’s Lunch: What is Done, in a Few Cities, to Supply Wholesome Luncheons at Low Cost, as Indicating What Should Be Done in Many Other Cities.” The lengthy subtitle summed up the story as it characterized Chicago as an “inspiring example” of a city that had begun to cater to “the schemes” of women’s clubs.\(^{68}\) As the members began to expand their interests beyond the discussion of literature and music into more civic and politically minded enterprises, the availability of suitable meeting places became an issue. Most women did not have the discretionary income to spend on regularly-scheduled luncheons in establishments of good reputation, and thus came the concept of charging club fees and pooling the money together to secure appropriate meeting sites, \(avec\) the purest foods, of course. *Good Housekeeping’s* willingness to devote considerable space to the subject matter is indicative of its readers’ widespread and growing interest in women’s activities outside the home.

Perhaps most notable in the May 1911 issue is a short cultural review entitled “A Vast Movement” that described the nationwide jubilee of women, which gathered to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of women’s work in foreign missions. Representing many religious denominations, in April thousands of women had met in New York City, Denver, Philadelphia and more than thirty other cities where they held rallies and pageants, created tableaux, and showed moving pictures “to illustrate the stages of missionary progress.” According to the essay, the attendees’ ultimate goal was to “seek the world-wide emancipation of women and children, and the awakening of the indifferent in home lands.”\(^{69}\) Women’s involvement in social, religious, and even political causes had been taking place for decades in American life, at many different levels of society. Finally, women’s service magazines were beginning to openly
take notice and awaken to the power of female mobilization and its increasing occurrence in mainstream culture.

The February 1912 issue of *Good Housekeeping* represents a watershed moment in the magazine’s history, as it devoted ten pages to suffrage and those women who were at the forefront of the American movement. Mary Holland Kinkaid wrote the article entitled “The Feminine Charms of the Woman Militant: The Personal Attractiveness and Housewifely Attainments of the Leaders in the Equal Suffrage Movement,” an obvious attempt to offset women’s political aspirations with their staunch, unwavering dedication to home and family. The use of the term “militant” is noteworthy. However, the purpose of the essay was not to mobilize the ordinary housewife into a life of radical feminism, but rather to quell any fears readers might have been experiencing because of the emerging debate over women’s right to vote and its inclusion in mainstream discourse. In a somewhat unusual move, William Frederick Bigelow, the editor of the magazine, provided this characterization at the beginning of the essay:

EDITOR’S NOTE. – Through popular misconception the woman who seeks to vote has been represented as a strident creature, mannish in attire and of unattractive personality. Far from this, the American leaders in the woman’s suffrage cause prove to be women of exceptional charm, proficient in all domestic accomplishments, as the facts and pictures in this article will prove.  

Bigelow clearly sought to establish the difference between American suffragists and their “madhouse” British counterparts. However, Kinkaid’s work was thoughtful in its attempt to provide a trajectory of narrative history relating to women’s desire for voting rights:
It is more than fifty years since the hoop-skirted ladies who sat at home doing tatting and worsted work were the first to hear the startling theory that a desire to vote would destroy feminine charm and would unfit women for efficiency in the domestic arts. It was the mere wanting to vote that would eliminate all natural, womanly interests; men said so and the truth of the statement was taken for granted, although the pioneers who began the struggle for what they called “equal rights” were women that conformed to the best homemaking ideals of the time.71

She explained that suffragists, for a half century, “patiently endured ridicule and misunderstanding” because they wholeheartedly believed that the vote would come naturally as a result of women, in general, attaining greater education and moving into the workforce. Those early activists, who thoroughly were indoctrinated into an ethos of domesticity, had no desire to desert their homes and neglect their babies, but rather they sought justice and democracy for all. Kinkaid claims that modern sisterhood (circa 1912) was less about abstract ideals and more about the spiritual significance of suffrage as it contributed to the overall good of national life. The definition of “citizenship,” in particular, was undergoing transformation that embraced the notion of “heroic service,” which included women’s roles in safeguarding the home, preventing unscrupulous child labor activities, protecting factory workers, and improving civic conditions.72

Contrary to Kinkaid’s assertion that women had waited patiently for the vote to come to them naturally, Dorothy Dix’s fictional creation, Mirandy, blamed it on women’s lack of backbone and lack of assertiveness. Opting for the more proactive approach, in the same issue of Good Housekeeping outspoken Mirandy provided this advice to readers:
Dat’s de reason dat we women can’t vote, an’ ain’t got no say so ‘bout makin’ de laws dat bosses us. Ain’t we got de right on our side? Yassir, we’se got de right on our side, but we ain’t got de backbone in us to jest retch out an’ grab dat ballot.73

What Dix could express through an unsophisticated but passionate black woman, Kinkaid had to present in language that acquiesced to the mainstream. She assured readers that today’s suffragists were just as dedicated to home and family as were the early pioneers of the movement. And thus began a litany of the domestic accomplishments of the most visible American suffrage leaders, including Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt (president of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance), Mrs. Jean Nelson Penfield, (acting chairman of the Women Suffrage Party), and a host of other women active in the movement.74 While Kinkaid’s treatise provided interesting insight into the everyday lives of the women it featured, their political activities were subsumed by their traditional domestic accomplishments, which were akin to the everyday responsibilities of the average American housewife of the era. It is apparent that the real objective of the story was to tame the moniker “militant” into a reference for an active, albeit pleasant, participant in national heroic service.

As successful as Kinkaid was in presenting the suffrage leaders as attractive, docile, and non-threatening, this did not quash the debate. The anti-suffragists struck back in the July 1912 issue in the article “The Non-Militant Defenders of the Home: Wherein the Anti-Suffragists Present a Solid and Comely Front, as Against ‘The Feminine Charms of the Woman Militant.’” Written by Grace Duffield Goodwin, author of Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons and president of the District of Columbia Anti-Suffrage Association, the article gave equal time and exposure to women at the forefront of the anti-suffrage movement who claimed that the very notion of
suffrage was a foreign import that threatened to destroy “our home life in this country.” The primary argument of the anti-suffragists was predicated on nationalism, gender distinction, and the differentiation of sex roles, i.e., men and women were not biologically the same, and as women, they did not want to take on male responsibilities, nor should men take over their primarily domestic roles. They chided the radical suffragists for denigrating “wifehood and motherhood” and for “passing severe judgment on men,” when it was men who had made women what they were, based on their economic strength on the world stage.

The antagonism to men has become in some cases a severe

denunciation of American men--all men, just men! But are

American men so bad after all? This entire feminist movement has

sprung from nations where women are not considered and cared

for as they are here . . . American men have made American

women the most favored on the face of the earth to-day--too highly

favored, say shrewd students of our social conditions. Goodwin linked economic status, class, and ethnicity as she laid out an argument against suffrage that depended largely on simplistic nationalistic and anti-immigrant ideology--did women want to be treated the way foreign women are? The way immigrant wives were treated by their husbands when they came to America? Was the country losing its fundamental “Americanness” as a result of the large influx of foreign immigrants? According to the author, in American society, men who made a good living wage were obligated to take care of their wives and children in a manner befitting their status--why would a woman want to wrest away that responsibility? As for those men who were not responsible husbands and fathers, according to Goodwin:
It is the fault of women if men are not to be trusted now, and the way to remedy it is not to hustle them aside and rush ourselves to the front, but to use every bit of our influence to better their present actions, with hands clean of all political pitch, and to make homes of such ethical and educational value in the community that wifehood and motherhood will not be regarded as incidental but as fundamental relations.\textsuperscript{77}

Within the pages of \textit{Good Housekeeping}, the suffrage debate was not going away any time soon.

Suffrage and women’s political roles were at the forefront of \textit{Good Housekeeping}’s content throughout 1913 and well into 1914. The feature story of the February 1913 issue, “The New Chapter in Woman’s Progress” by Mabel Potter Daggett, was replete with a photo of women reveling in a suffrage parade, as well as pictures of leading female political activists such as Miss Jane Addams and Miss Frances A. Kellor, amongst several others.\textsuperscript{78} Daggett credits the General Federation of Women’s Clubs as “the gateway by which women in large numbers have passed into civic life,” and recites the recently won battles for women’s suffrage on a state-by-state basis: Washington in 1910, California in 1911, and Oregon, Kansas, Michigan, and Arizona in 1912, with Idaho, Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming having done the same in earlier years.\textsuperscript{79}

Unlike her predecessors in other essays that appeared previously in the magazine, Daggett did not placate the mainstream as she proudly delivered the accomplishments of women across the country in political and civic life. Women adapted the techniques they had learned during decades of providing volunteer work for male politics to create their own campaign methods for suffrage. As a result, they were able to transform the domestic skills honed within the home into dexterous proficiency in the public sphere:
It was the man-kept city that was wrong. It was about as successful as the man-kept house. As quietly as she might have taken the broom from his hands, woman is now taking over many municipal tasks for which she is specially fitted—the regulation of the food supply, sanitation of the streets, the supervision of the schools and even the amusement places. She is now watching over city markets with the housewifely eye that once took critical note of the pantry shelves.80

With enfranchisement now legal in ten states, women were assuming diverse public positions, including: superintendent of school system, sanitary food inspector, policewoman, lawyer, city council representative, mayor, state government official, to name but a few. What had begun as “municipal housekeeping” at the turn of the century—women taking responsibility for keeping the street clean in front of their home and learning the scientific aspects of electricity—in one short decade had blossomed into full-blown civic and governmental involvement at all levels of society. *Good Housekeeping* could no longer ignore the movement, and the magazine began devoting large portions of its primary content to women’s political issues.

However, lest readers forget the continued reality of most women’s lives, Dorothy Dix contributed a hard-hitting sketch of female oppression in August 1913. Entitled “The Handicap of Sex,” Dix reminded the American public that just being born female, in and of itself, was a disadvantage in all the most important aspects of life, as well as some of the most picayune:

Theoretically it is no disgrace to be either a woman or poor, but in both cases, it is an almighty inconvenience, and shuts you out from most of the fun and profit of life. Especially is this the case if you
are a lady person, for there is nothing in the wide world from going upstairs holding a lighted lamp in one hand and a baby in the other, and the front of her dress between her teeth, to being debarred from the polling booth because she belongs to the angel sex, that it isn’t harder for a woman to do than it is for a man to do, just because she is a woman.  

Dix acknowledged the recent political strides made by her sex, but cited example after example of male privilege, made to the disadvantage of the “six-million wage-earning women in the United States.” As she ended her piece, Dix was more disgruntled and sad than hopeful: “At the present moment so great are the handicaps of sex to a woman that no mother can look in the face of her girl baby without feeling like tendering profuse apologies to the unfortunate infant.”

Dix’s essay appeared alongside one story in a series of feature articles concerning the horrific problem of child labor in America. The “Children in Bondage” series ran in Good Housekeeping in four consecutive issues, May through August 1913 and provided readers with insight into the lives of thousands of poor and working-class children who toiled in America’s factories, mills, and fields. During that time period, young children and teens, male and female alike, worked for sub-standard wages and long hours, battling constant illness, disease, unsanitary and unsafe working conditions, and even death. That series of articles, perhaps even more than the regularly run features on pure food standards, located women’s public power within the realm of rectifying the nation’s problems, which stemmed from unethical, male-run business practices. What men had created, women were held responsible for repairing. This presented another extension of Roosevelt’s doctrine of “motherhood as national service.”
The October 1913 issue of *Good Housekeeping* is immediately recognizable for its striking cover and headline: “Maniacs or Martyrs? Will a Woman Die for Just the Vote?” The “Woman’s Work Number” featured artwork by famed illustrator, Coles Phillips, a regular cover art contributor to *Good Housekeeping* during the era. Amidst a color scheme of pink and black, it showed an attractive New Woman banging a gavel with her comely-gloved hand, and eyes defiant (Fig. 32). The feature story of the issue was written by Samuel Merton and entitled “The Measure of the Militants,” an exposé of the tactics used by English suffragists and the violent
response of the British government. Once again, *Good Housekeeping’s* inserted an “Editor’s Note” at the beginning of the piece, explaining why it was being run and asking readers to be open-minded. The story was lengthy (twelve pages) and included numerous photos of British feminists scuffling with police, who handled them with unabashed aggressiveness. The first photo was accompanied by this caption:

> It would have been unfortunate for the government if a suffragette had died--in jail; so in jail, instead of being tortured to death as of old, a woman was tortured to life. It saved the embarrassment of martyrs--and was a good story to tell, if you forgot the tradition of British liberty. Is a mere vote worth it?84

By today’s standards, Merton’s views might seem archaic and prejudicial, but when analyzed within the time it was written, he presented a fairly balanced account of the underlying historical causes and conditions of British (female) militancy. He was quick to point out, however, that American women lived in a society much more prone to egalitarian attitudes toward females, and thus militancy was unnecessary.

In addition, Merton did provided a valuable historical trajectory for the development of militant suffrage in England in contrast to circumstances in America. Throughout the piece, there was an underlying subtext demonstrating the concern of mainstream culture that American suffragists would very well adopt similar tactics--and were that the case, how would American men respond? “Could this thing, which is of almost daily occurrence in England, happen more than once in all America? . . . Would our police stand by, passive? And if so, would American women bear it in ‘womanly’ silence?”85 Merton took the American press to task for its casual, infrequent reporting of events in Great Britain, and even for validating unsubstantiated rumors
that favored police versions of “the facts” over the women’s. Speaking of himself in third person, Merton told readers what he had heard recently from “the man on the (American) street”:

He has heard it said of Mrs. Pankhurst, for example, that ‘she ought to be given twenty years at hard labor’; ‘she ought to be kicked’; ‘she is a faker’; ‘she is a bluffer’; ‘the British government is too easy on these women; they ought to take the leaders out and shoot them. Then they might restore order.’

Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst, stalwart leader of the British suffragists and epitome of the militant new woman, was featured in a center-page compilation of photos that had captions illustrating the ambivalent attitude of Merton, and almost certainly, the American public, in general.

Referring to Mrs. Pankhurst:

The inspiration and center of the tumult, the director of the fray—saint or merely sinner—Which?

The pantheon of the immortals has in her a new figure, one the world will no more forget than it will Joan of Arc.

Were Pankhurst and her cohorts to be lauded or feared? To be emulated by American women or destroyed by British police? During the next year, Good Housekeeping readers were about to get the opportunity to decide for themselves.

Awash in a Sea of Purple, White, and Green

In an unprecedented move, the magazine ran a series of articles written about, and by, none other than the grand dame of suffrage militancy, Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst. The next month’s issue officially presented Pankhurst to the readers of Good Housekeeping. Alongside an
article with the half-hearted title, “Making the Most of Motherhood,” Pankhurst was introduced to the American public in a brief, two-page essay, “The Story of the Women’s War.” It was the first in a monthly series of articles that appeared in *Good Housekeeping* through July 1914. The December 1913 issue contained several articles devoted to the issue of suffrage. In “Mrs. Pankhurst--The Woman,” Rheta Childe Dorr, author of *What Eight Million Woman Want*, began her essay with this testimonial:

> Revolutions and revolutionists have always had for me a singular fascination. The fact is that I have always had an instinctive understanding that revolutions are always right. They do not happen, and they cannot happen, until people have exhausted every other means of righting intolerable wrongs. Revolutions are interesting because they are so efficient. They do such a complete job, and desperate and sanguinary as their processes usually are, there is never any return to the outworn and rotten civilization which they destroy.88

Dorr’s statement was remarkable not only for its honest intensity, but that it was being made in a woman’s service magazine that, for nearly thirty years, had as its primary mission the promulgation of mainstream domestic feminine culture! Housekeeping, childrearing, and cooking were now a venue for open discussion about revolution and overthrowing the traditional cultural guard. Dorr admiringly equated the English suffragist movement to that of Russian terrorists who, at the time, were trying to overthrow the czar and his regime.89

At the behest of *Good Housekeeping*’s William Frederick Bigelow, Dorr was sent to Paris to meet with Pankhurst and to escort her to America. Upon arrival, like any other foreign
visitor, the Englishwoman was required to pass through Ellis Island. When Dorr requested that she continue to accompany Pankhurst through the process, an astounded official said that doing so would require her to temporarily waive all rights as an American citizen. Dorr, herself a committed suffragist, replied:

I have been called upon to waive my rights of citizenship ever since I reached voting age. I think I can afford to keep on waiving them for this occasion.90

Dorr described the incident: “So it was that, as a woman without a country, I went with the outlawed woman of another country down New York Bay to where Bartholdi’s great bronze woman forever holds up the flaming light of liberty.”91 But while Pankhurst’s arrival to America caused a sensation in the press, she was not met with open cheers and welcoming arms. She was detained at Ellis Island and immediately found guilty of moral turpitude by American officials. During her imprisonment of several days, Dorr recalls that Pankhurst spoke to everyone that she came into contact--guards, attendants, prison matrons, and other immigrant detainees--and she won them over resoundingly with her calm, intelligent demeanor, her unassailable knowledge of historical precedence, and her vast understanding of politics. Dorr described Pankhurst’s magnetism:

She is a well-bred, highly cultured English lady . . . She is gentle and gracious and extremely democratic. She is a most eloquent speaker . . . Mrs. Pankhurst’s power lies in the strength of her character . . . She believes that [the women’s movement] is of such supreme importance that all other reforms can afford to wait until women are free to work for them . . . This is what I make of
Emmeline Pankhurst, leader of the greatest revolt of women the world has ever witnessed . . . She is the idea incarnate of the women’s revolution, which comes with a sword to bring peace and order to a distracted world.92

Dorr’s article is followed by one written by feminist newspaper woman, Rose Young, entitled “The Women Who ‘Get Together.’” As tandem to the Pankhurst essay, Young laid out the progress made by the American suffragist movement, with an emphasis on its most visual and dramatic campaign strategies. Accompanying the article were numerous photos of women marching in parades with banners and placards, dressed in costume, riding horseback, and speaking to crowds of both men and women. Young describes how one Midwestern woman was making jams to sell at her local grocer in order to raise enough money “to pay her society dues and contribute what is left to the local campaign fund.”93 Often met with bemused stares, aggressive taunts, or demeaning laughter, undeterred American suffragists all across the country were taking to the streets for political and economic equality. And the readers of Good Housekeeping, if not already aware of the movement, were learning of it now, alongside information about the latest recipes and novel household appliances.

Emmeline Pankhurst’s first article in Good Housekeeping appeared in the January 1914 issue. In “The Making of a Militant,” she embraces the moniker and explains her basic philosophy to the women of America: “When lives are being broken, the breaking of a window is a small matter.”94 She had come to her position as a suffragist through her dedication, even as a small child, to fight for justice for the poor and the enslaved. She had listened to stories and read books about the great emancipators of the past. And while she was raised in a privileged English home, it became apparent to her early on that the education of her brother was of utmost
importance to the family, while her education and that of her sisters was scarcely an issue at all. One night while she was in bed, her father hovered over her and, almost under his breath, said: “What a pity she wasn’t born a lad.” With that epiphany, Emmeline Pankhurst understood what it meant to be born a woman in a patriarchal society that situated women as inferior to men in all matters of consequence. Her rise to the top as the leader of the English suffragist movement was a long journey that combined the traditional expectations for a woman of her status--marriage to a physician and mother to five children--with the unusual path of active politics. In her first article for *Good Housekeeping*, she not only provided a personal account of her own political awakening, she also detailed the aggressive and often violent response of the British government to the suffrage movement (Fig. 33).

The February and March 1914 issues of the magazine contained parts two and three of Pankhurst’s lengthy “The Making of a Militant” series, in which she provided further details about her many years as leader of the English suffragists. Unapologetically and without the elicitation of sympathy, she described the brutal harassment that she and thousands of women suffered over the years at the hands of police, as well as her numerous imprisonments. Yet, her political conviction only grew stronger, and significant political strides indeed were made. Pankhurst continued to contribute to the magazine, and in April, a new series began, “The Advance of Militancy.” *Good Housekeeping*’s introduction to Pankhurst’s latest essay stated:

> It has been seen that it was a mistake to look upon her [Pankhurst] as a notoriety-seeker or one lacking in the finer instincts of womanhood--a mother--stirred to indignant and determined protest by the very laws which she was asked to execute. It is a struggle up that Mrs. Pankhurst is leading not a fight for sex freedom or for
release from the duties of wife and mother. Home is still the
citadel of mankind, though the complexities of modern life are
working against it. The advocates of suffrage think women can
stop this disintegration; knowing this the great majority of both
rank and file look with pride upon the present obligations it does
not seem unreasonable to hope--to expect--that the triumph of
‘votes for women’ will mean a victory for the home.96

Fig. 33. Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst, Good Housekeeping, February 1914.
Clearly the mainstream cultural landscape had begun to openly recognize the most significant and volatile political issue of the day. But women’s magazines were not yet willing to cede their basic ideology that home was the most important societal tradition, and women were solely responsible for maintaining its wellbeing. Although women were playing an ever-increasing role in public affairs, and national enfranchisement was beginning to seem like a \textit{fait accompli}, women’s first responsibility was still to husband and children--for the sake of the nation. As the rhetoric of the suffrage movement incorporated more militaristic language, the primary battlefield continued to be the home.

In parts two and three of “The Advance of Militancy” series (appearing in May and June 1914), Pankhurst continued to discuss English politics, but she never openly advocated for American women to engage in the same sort of tactics. Instead, she wanted Americans to understand their suffragist sisters’ need for radical and sometimes violent tactics. All three articles in the series presented a straightforward, incredibly detailed, historical retelling of the English suffrage movement. But in the May 1914 issue, alongside Pankhurst’s history lesson, Rose Young contributed the essay, “What is Feminism?” While it cannot be considered outright political advocacy, Young was a knowledgeable, educated writer who undeniably knew how to present an argument. The term feminist had appeared in \textit{Good Housekeeping} several times before, usually in reference to members of the suffrage movement and sometimes derisively (especially in the early years), but more often it was a descriptive label without obvious judgment attached to it. However, Young’s article represented the first essay to specifically address feminism as an ideology. She began simply:

\begin{quote}
Has the question reached your home town yet? If it has not, it soon will . . . ‘Femi-what?’ your average citizen will venture.
\end{quote}
'Feminism? Something about women, isn’t it?’ ‘It’s the women’s movement’--‘It’s the furthering of the interests of women’--‘It’s the revolt of the women’--‘It’s the assertion of woman’s right to individual development’--‘It’s the doctrine of freedom for women’--‘It’s woman’s struggle for the liberation of her personality.’

The feminism of 1914 had as many definitions as people who attempted to characterize it. Young described “the woman question,” the focus of the New Woman of the 1890s, as having expanded to include “the man question” and “the children question.” According to Young, suffrage was only one piece of the feminist agenda, which included women’s demand for higher education, economic opportunity, rights of person and property, political enfranchisement, and female individualism. Nevertheless, Young smartly explained that being a suffragist did not necessarily make one a feminist, and vice versa. As an example, she said that the staunch feminist Emma Goldman inexplicably was anti-suffrage, and there were others who had fought for women’s right to education who also eschewed women’s right to vote. Young advocated that feminism needed include all matters of equality, and at its core was the right for women to develop as individuals without stripping them of their communal responsibilities.

Young continued to be a strong proponent of women’s civic and political activities throughout the era, contributing articles to Good Housekeeping on nearly a monthly basis. In “What Next for Women’s Clubs” (June 1914), she reported on the upcoming twelfth biennial convention of the General Federation of Women’s Clubs which was set to meet in Chicago later in the month. Thousands of women were expected to attend, and Young detailed the rise of the club movement from its early days as a social venue for women to its status in 1914 as a viable
nexus of female activism. While the clubs continued to focus primarily on civic, educational, and cultural projects, they also had become meeting places for women to collaborate politically on issues such as suffrage.

For years, Good Housekeeping had been instrumental in supporting club activities as it had recognized early on that large groups of women could have significant impact on the organization’s pure food and standardized labeling programs. Female mobilization had been instrumental in successfully pushing the Good Housekeeping Institute and Dr. Wiley’s national food policy agenda. Thus, Good Housekeeping can be credited for supporting women’s work, as well as providing a venue to Emmeline Pankhurst, Rose Young, and other women who were attempting to change national voting laws. But how far that support would go was about to be put to a real test with the outbreak of war in Europe in the summer of 1914.

Emmeline Pankhurst’s final essay appeared in July 1914. It was simply titled “Why I Am a Militant” and finished her communication with the readers of Good Housekeeping. Perhaps coincidentally, perhaps not, the other most significant article in the issue was one that was concerned with the ideology of manliness, which had been of such great concern to Theodore Roosevelt and his contemporaries since the 1890s. Written by noted author Thornton W. Burgess, “Making Men of Them” was aimed at female readers, i.e., mothers, and relied on the old adage that women were responsible for raising good men and citizens. Burgess encouraged all American boys to join a relatively new male-oriented organization, the Boy Scouts of America, in order that they learn the skills that would make them real men and productive American citizens. Burgess believed that the rise in male delinquency and boys’ natural tendency to find fellowship in “gangs” could be averted through participation in a
brotherhood that focused on the development of “wise leadership, sound bodies, clean morals, and self-reliant character.”

The article, which was enthusiastically endorsed by Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy, was quite lengthy and hearkened back to Roosevelt’s doctrine of strenuous living, in which boys and men could best serve their nation through physical development and dogged manliness. By the time boys turn twelve, it was suggested that wise mothers “cut the apron strings” and hand over their sons to a “supplied hero”—the scoutmaster. The “patrol” and “troop” nature of the organization supplied the gang spirit that boys were naturally drawn to, and through guidance supplied outside the home, every average boy would develop the “qualities which every mother desires her son to possess—manliness, chivalry, courage, honor, thoughtfulness for others, moral and physical stamina, integrity and independence in thought and deed.”

In other words, boys were supposed to development individual character, which feminists had been promoting for women for decades against all odds. While Burgess assured readers that the Boy Scouts were not militaristic in nature (somewhat ironic as it follows Pankhurst’s essay proclaiming her proud militancy), he also told of recent incidents in which the Boy Scouts, ages twelve to seventeen and dressed in full military-inspired garb, had come to the assistance of the police on more than one occasion. These included, most notably, “the famous suffragette parade in Washington; at which Boy Scouts put the police to shame by doing the very thing I had described, holding back a turbulent crowd when the police failed to do so.”

This article would be the first in a long line that would re-emphasize the need for Roosevelt’s doctrine of “motherhood as national service.” This time, women were enlisted in an effort to develop strong boys, physically robust enough to endure military service in far-away lands.
War broke out in Europe in the summer of 1914, and immediately *Good Housekeeping* ceased running articles on feminism, suffrage, and women’s politics in general. Gone were Emmeline Pankhurst and her radical militant Englishwomen; gone were reports on the mobilization efforts of women’s clubs; and gone were the essays about feminism and the accomplishments of its diverse participants. Now, only “Mirandy” dare broach the issue of women’s right to vote. The July 1915 issue contained another Dorothy Dix offering, “Mirandy on Votes for Women,” and it was only through Dix’s character that the magazine once again debated the issue of woman suffrage, which was to be put to a general vote in the upcoming fall elections. In her inimitable way, Mirandy ruminates that the decision to allow women to vote would not be voted upon by women themselves. In this exchange, she complains to her (male) pastor, Brer Jinkins:

‘Humph,’ says I, ‘de legislacher says hit’s a givin’ de people of de state de chanst to vote on whedder women shall be given suffrage or not, but I takes notice dat dere ain’t nary a woman gwine to have de right to cast a vote on dat subject. An’ de reason for dis is dat women ain’t people. Women are just *its*. Dat’s the reason dat we are fightin’ for de vote. We are tired of being *its*, an’ we wants de ballot to put us on de map as people.’

In response, Brer Jinkins, tries to console and contain Mirandy by telling her that women are better than people--they are delicate members of “de angel sect, an’ ev’ybody knows dat angels an’ politics don’t mix no mo’ dan ile an’ water.” Through the heated conversation of Mirandy and Brer Jinkins, Dix was foreshadowing the repositioning of women in response to wartime. The New Woman was about to revert back to the True Woman, angel of the house and heroic
mother of the nation. Motherhood once again became the primary theme of the magazine and its advertisers. While Campbell Soup had used the Campbell Soup Kids periodically throughout the era, they had not been the dominant theme. Instead the company had opted for upscale images of the educated, urbane New Woman in her role as home manager--a home in which children undoubtedly existed but were usually unseen in the ads. However, by the end of 1914, the Campbell Soup Kids, epitome of the idealized mother-child relationship, again became the central focus of the soup ads.

Only stalwart feminist Rose Young continued to publish articles in *Good Housekeeping* that focused on women’s opportunities outside the home. In a series entitled “Your Daughter’s Career” that ran between July 1915 and November 1915, Young presented a different career path to young women every month (lawyer, doctor, journalist, artist, etc.), and she stressed the necessity for women to become skilled and economically independent. But even in those articles, there is a subtext of anxiety associated with the European crisis, and Young emanated a sense of urgency that women must not give up their individual aspirations if survival was to be secured. H. Carson Davies’ “The Prayer of an Unemployed Girl” in the April 1915 issue underscored the fear that women’s economic position was about to take a turn for the worse. What had once been a shameful thing for most women--to have to work outside the home--was now becoming more of a necessity. And for those unfortunate women who were without the support of parents or husbands, outside employment was their only means of survival.

In years immediately preceding the outbreak of war in Europe, the nature of motherhood had become a significant component of the debate regarding women’s rights. But by the end of 1914, it was revived, once again, as the most important of all womanly professions, superceding everything else--in stark contrast to Young’s series on professional careers for women. In the
December 1914 issue, the magazine began a new series entitled “Mothercraft.” The first essay, “Mothercraft: A New Profession for Women,” was written by Sarah Comstock who described its purpose as such:

This is the first of a series of articles which tell women how to become better mothers--treating motherhood as a craft, and recognizing, with due reverence, the fact that many women who bring to their approaching of motherhood souls full of love bring also heads full of ignorance, as regards to the all-important questions, How can I make Baby live?109

Several photographs accompanied the article, showing mothers in various engagements with children, but perhaps the most significant appeared on the first page: it showed a stern, unhappy-looking woman, dressed perhaps as a nurse, surrounded by ten babies. She looks positively overwhelmed by them, as they demand her immediate attention. The primary focus of the piece was the myriad responsibilities women must assume for the health and well-being of their children--something that every woman should look upon with utmost seriousness. According to Comstock, women were to become skilled in all aspects of childhood diseases, their prevention and cures; the complex nutritional needs of children; and the total psychological and emotional development of their children. For Good Housekeeping readers who, for the past several years, had been inundated with accounts of female emancipation, as well as stories about the political, economic, and educational opportunities now available to them, this surely must have seemed like a return to the early days of the twentieth century.

The raging war in Europe went unmentioned in Good Housekeeping until March 1915. That issue featured a poem “A Prayer for European Women” by Irene Avery Judson. And this
was the magazine’s first printed recognition that the troubles in Europe were not going away any
time soon. The May 1915 issue also included “A Prayer for Peace,” which read in part:

God in thy heaven, make all right with the world. These days of
life are also days of death; the fields that are fit for flowers are also
fit for cannon; on ten thousand farms there is footing for every
weight of war-machine. Keeper of men’s passions, we pray that, if
it may not be before the falling of the flowers, then before the
ripening of the fruit that men at war will go trooping home as
children, tired after play, turn eagerly to their mothers.110

Undoubtedly, peace was on the minds of all Americans, and the term itself began to
communicate a multiplicity of meanings with broad, global significance. With the advent of
World War I, other commonplace words that were part of the national discourse were also about
to take on new connotations. In particular, the term militant, which had been so widely and
negatively associated with radical feminists and especially English suffragists, was appropriated
into a new service obligation for American women.

As 1915 came to a close, women were encouraged by Sarah Comstock to take on yet
another paraprofessional role in the domestic sphere--the “home nurse militant.” With the war in
Europe, and American doctors and nurses being called away in the line of duty, mothers were
obligated to learn everything they could about providing home medical care for their children
and husbands. Comstock’s “Home Nurse Militant” articles appeared in Good Housekeeping in
September, October, and November 1915, and she viewed it as a call to arms:

It’s up to women! Almost every woman some day assumes the
role of home nurse. And the day has come when the home nurse
must be a militant, if we’re ever to slash off ciphers from our overwhelming mortality statistics. But there’s no militancy without a weapon. The only weapon that can ever frighten this enemy is knowledge, and it’s time every woman demanded it for the protection of her entire household. And having it, she’s got to answer the call to arms. That call leads, first and foremost, to the frontier.¹¹¹

Suffragists and clubwomen had used similar rhetoric alike to persuade women to engage in the civic and political arenas in order to better their communities, as well as their own lives. For years, contributors to Good Housekeeping such as Dr. Harvey Wiley had encouraged women to enter the area of social reforms and assist him in his efforts to pass pure food legislation. Therefore, the rhetoric chosen by Comstock in her “Home Nurse Militant” articles was not unfamiliar to readers of the magazine. What was different was that she was using political, militaristic language to convince women to once again increase their obligations, roles, and responsibilities within the confines of the home, for the good of the nation. To further establish the ideologically laden concept of the home nurse militant, in December 1915, Comstock took over Rose Young’s “Your Daughter’s Career” series to promote, what else? Nursing.
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The advent of war in Europe had an immediate impact on American life years before the United States officially entered the battle, and this was evident in the pages of Good Housekeeping. Never before had women’s primary domestic sphere roles, as chief household consumers and mothers of future citizens, held such importance for the nation. What had been an ever-increasing emphasis on woman’s individualistic development was transformed, once again, into woman’s dutiful responsibility, as a gendered group, to home, family, and nation. Within the discourse of the popular press, female mobilization no longer referred to suffrage and women’s involvement in social reform issues, but rather it meant joining the war effort en masse from within the home. Female mobilization became the backbone of American mobilization in an effort to save Europe. Quickly, women learned that consumerism was now about conscious conservationist behavior in the home and at the market. Housewives were encouraged to embrace new methods of food preservation and cookery, which in most cases seemed like a reversion to pre-modern technologies. And as it had done for more than thirty years, Good Housekeeping was at the forefront of teaching women the proper and most efficient methods of home maintenance in service to the nation.

The American home took on new significance as it now represented the primary place in which young boys were prepared to become almighty soldiers on a continent far away, in battlefields that were becoming all too real. Liberty and democracy on a global scale were at stake, and mothers were the caretakers of patriotism on the American home front. Perhaps a less abstract responsibility for women in the domestic sphere (but no less monumental) was that of the home militant nurse, first touted by writer Sarah Comstock in Good Housekeeping during the
earliest years of World War I. Previously the “angel” of the nineteenth-century home, the modern twentieth-century wife-mother now became surrogate healthcare provider, guardian of American values--and symbolic martyr for her country. Advertisers were well aware of the nation’s changing mood, and almost immediately, they began to engage in more militaristic rhetoric to sell products. The September 1916 Campbell’s Soup ad in *Good Housekeeping* depicted the male Kid hunkering down behind a barricade of soup cans, firing an enormous rocket launcher across the sea at the coastline in the distance. Relying on the patriotic fervor of recognizable war-related words, it read:

> Your ‘first line of defence’ – *Good food and good digestion!* These are the first and most important protection for all your physical resources. The enemies of robust health have no chance even to *land* on your constitution when its ‘coastline’ is properly defended. And there isn’t a defence in the whole line which gives you better protective service than Campbell’s Tomato Soup.¹

While advertisers jumped on the jingoistic bandwagon, what became of the New Woman? During the early years of the new century, she had been constructed culturally in two ways--as a militant suffragist and social reformer--the “new woman,”--or as a malleable advertising icon, the “New Woman,” open to myriad representations and interpretations, most of which demonstrated the dichotomy inherent in modern living and capitalist consumer society. As war raged in Europe, becoming an increasing threat to peace in America, both those related yet incongruous images of the American woman were merged into an even more abstract notion of womanhood. Like her True Woman foremothers, the modern New Woman once again became the spiritual center of home and nation, and her image represented America’s primary
values and virtues in the time of war--liberty, democracy, freedom, and traditionalism. But, in addition, she was expected to adhere to all the recent developments of modernity, including becoming an active member of the workforce, something that would have been anathema to her proper grandmothers.

Initially, the average stay-at-home woman was concerned with having some extra “spare money” to buy the “little comforts” that could make a woman happy.² References such as these began to appear in Good Housekeeping around 1916 and are both culturally and economically relevant. They point to the continued position of women in the home--laden with consumerist responsibilities and tantalized by advertising, but beholden to the purse strings of their husband. However, such references also indicate that the downward spiral of the American economy was quickly becoming an issue as the country felt the pressure of the Great War overseas. In households across the country, men’s salaries were no longer sufficient to cover all the expenses associated with maintaining a proper middle-class household. What was most necessary was sacrifice, and the U.S. government assumed the primary role of informing its citizens of their patriotic obligations. Women were central to instilling the notion of sacrifice into everyday living. Stephen Ponder claims that “World War I was the first of the twentieth-century wars in which the U.S. government deployed recognizably modern techniques of mass persuasion to manipulate public opinion.”³ For women, the primary day-to-day concern was how best to feed their family most nutritiously and economically, without impinging on resources necessary to the war effort. Wives and mothers were on the frontline of the food conservation issue.

By 1916, war and food were inextricably linked within both editorial content and advertising in Good Housekeeping, and the scarcity of resources and ingredients was the
predominant theme. The first questions about food shortages was sent to Dr. Wiley in February 1916 in a letter entitled “The War vs. Benzoate.” New Jersey” writes:

Since benzoate of sodium (which we use to preserve our pie-fillings) is so scare and getting more so every day, we must hurry to find something to take its place. Could you tell me what I could use that would take the place of this soda and still comply with the Pure Food Laws?4

Like so many of the letters sent to the magazine by readers, the content of "A.C.S.’s" conscientious question provides multiple layers of insight into the times in which she lived. There was an obvious fear of long-term food shortages, but also that the treasured rituals associated with family mealtime were about to be disrupted, which in turn might further erode the sanctity of American home life. It also points out the degree to which the U.S. food supply was already intertwined with the global marketplace, and how the war might negatively affect American eating habits and nutritional needs. This is indicated by Wiley’s answer, undoubtedly a disappointment to reader “A.C.S. New Jersey”:

When the United States Government, contrary to the law, justice, ethics, and human rights, issued an illegal indulgence to manufacturers of foods to preserve them with benzoate of soda, it put the wheels of food reform back for half a century. Since benzoate of soda is made chiefly in Germany, the war has placed an embargo upon its importation and skyrocketed the prices, practically driving it out of the few remaining places where it still had a vogue. There is no preservative tolerated by the Pure Food
Law which can take its place. No, I forget; there is another poison
which Uncle Sam tolerates, the fumes of burning sulphur. You
may saturate your goods with this poisonous and stifling substance
without let or hindrance, but you must ‘watch out’ or some state
‘goblin’ll git you.’

As the war eventually turned into years of struggle, American women would be tested to meet
the daily nutritional requirements of their family, all the while responding to the economic
sacrifices required of all citizens.

**Mothers Making Boys Fit for Service**

In the same issue in which Wiley vented his frustrations against the U.S. government and
its lackadaisical attitude toward pure food reform, there appeared another article encouraging
parents (primarily mothers) to begin preparing their young sons for wartime service through the
endorsement of strong and vigorous outdoor life. Similar to Thornton Burgess’s essay in 1914
about the Boy Scouts, “Making Boys Fit for Service” by Woods Hutchinson, A.M., M.D.,
recommended that young boys be encouraged to engage actively in spirited “boyish sports,” and
that mothers release them from the “desk servitude” of school. Hutchinson, also a proponent of
Roosevelt’s “strenuous life” ideology, actually blamed the culture of school and academic
learning (typically conducted under the tutelage of female teachers) for the softening of male
behavior and attitude, something that required immediate correction if American males were to
be fit for service in either the business world or the war. The debates over the ever-changing
nature of appropriate masculinity and femininity became increasingly more significant as the
skirmish in Europe escalated. Harkening back to the turn of the century, women’s service
magazines like *Good Housekeeping* began to overtly reinforce the trope of the dominant white male, emphasizing the connection between masculinity and *Americanness*, and the notion that *patriotism* was fundamental to *manliness*.

Mothers were responsible for raising “fit” boys, and fitness was not just associated with physical health. Instead, it became a euphemism for an all-encompassing philosophy that included nurturance of the male mind, body, and soul through the assistance of recognized scientific authorities. Mothers who instead relied on their own inept intuition, family traditions, or the assistance of well-meaning neighbors were called “foolish.” And the stakes were high. Women were reminded that they needed sufficiently to prepare their sons for the battlefield or, when the war ended, young men equally ready to enter the high-pressure world of business.

When the United States officially entered the war in the spring of 1917, a parable printed in the March issue of *Good Housekeeping* warned women of the risks involved during wartime motherhood, and the last line read: “Take heed that you choose in all things wisely, blessed Mothers of Men!”

Indeed, “motherhood” and “mothercraft” once again became the preeminent themes in *Good Housekeeping* and many of the advertisements it contained each month. Contributor Mrs. Louise Hogan began a series in February 1916 entitled “Mothers and Children” in which she covered such topics of day-to-day concern such as the nutritional needs of children, their digestion problems, bottle-feeding, and household remedies for infant constipation and diarrhea. Most of the “Mothers and Children” essays centered on children’s proper dietary requirements, which became a more serious issue as the war progressed. Hogan’s work coincided with Dr. Wiley’s interests in pure food reform and infant mortality rates, and she was equally concerned with the toll placed on mothers during war. According to Hogan:
The chief cause of sickness and death among infants in summer are improper food and hygienic neglect . . . A large percentage of deaths of infants under one year of age is due to intestinal trouble which is directly traceable in the majority of cases to impure food . . . The mother will need plenty of rest and sleep--at least eight hours a night and a nap during the day. In this way only can she keep her nervous system in a stable condition. If necessary to neglect household duties in order to secure such rest, let her do it, as it is far better to have the housekeeping suffer than the baby.11

Widespread warfare created an atmosphere in which special attention toward mothers was tied directly to the well-being of children and the security interests of the nation as a whole. It was also during this period that Mother’s Day became a nationally recognized day of commemoration with a Presidential proclamation in May 1914. Hogan explained the purpose behind this new celebration of mothers in May 1916:

It might help to overcome the growing lack of consideration for absent mothers among worldly-minded, busy, grown-up children; the thoughtless neglect of home-ties engendered by the whirl and pressure of modern life, the lack of respect and deference to parents among children of the present generation, and the need of reminding almost every one of the debt each person owes a mother.12

While Hogan proved to be a stalwart advocate for children’s health and happiness, she understood that motherhood had become a debated issue in recent years, and some women
actually considered it to be a burden. Almost woefully, she wrote in the “Mother’s Day” essay: “Motherhood is a distinct vocation, and should be a joyful one. But often the joy of motherhood is the only compensation a woman has for a life of sordidness, care, and monotony.”13 But with each passing month of America’s involvement in the war, motherhood became essential to the nation’s sense of morale. The December 1917 issue of Good Housekeeping featured an illustration of a mother and child drawn by notable artist Jessie Wilcox Smith. The figures in the drawing were intended to emulate the Madonna and baby Jesus, encircled within a frame of heavenly cherubs. The mother grasps the baby tightly with both hands as she gazes out intently at anything that might harm him. In the same issue, Theodosia Garrison contributed “A Prayer for Mothers of Men,” in which she interwove the traditional telling of the Christmas story with the tribulation of the current war, ending her prayer with this plea: “God grant this night that Mary’s Son bring back your sons to you.”14

Within the pages of Good Housekeeping, times had changed for young girls, too. Long gone were the feminist writings of Rose Young, who had dedicated many months in 1915 to opening doors to young women in her “Your Daughter’s Career” articles. Instead, the woman who took over Rose’s series, Sarah Comstock, author of the “Mothercraft” essays and stalwart purveyor of information on “home nurse militancy,” offered this to readers in September 1916: “Today’s Schoolgirl, Tomorrow’s Mother.” Boys were not alone in being prepared for an inevitable adulthood based largely on essentialized biological differentiation. Just as it was considered inevitable that the properly masculine male be prepared to do the battle of war, or the battle of business, proper young females were to be trained by their mothers and female school teachers to become the educated mothers of tomorrow. Comstock ruminated on everything considered appropriately feminine, from concerns pertaining to lack of proper diet, bathing, fresh
air, and posture, to issues about physical beauty—all discussed in an effort to prepare young women for their inevitable role as mothers. And in keeping with the continued social concerns of the magazine, controlling infant mortality rates was something that girls also needed to become concerned with at an early age, according to Comstock:

The young girl of today: a being in whom the spirit and the flesh are most exquisitely mated, with pride in her superb young body, pride in her eager young intellect, and a faith in her own spiritual wholesomeness that shines before her like a star . . . Like mother, like daughter; when a mother holds up her child, she holds up a mirror to herself; to prepare a girl in her teens for life in her twenties—and after—is to solve today the infant-mortality question of tomorrow.  

Comstock’s concern for ideal femininity was far-reaching as demonstrated in October 1916: “Today’s Schoolgirl: Gowning Today’s Schoolgirl Properly Prepares Her to Be the Mother of Tomorrow.” But lest readers think that it was just another frivolous essay on female fashion, or a more political tome dealing with feminist dress reform, Comstock made clear that teaching young girls the correct way to dress themselves was a mother’s duty and a matter of national public health. In this article, the author demonstrated to mothers the most appropriate attire for their teenaged daughters, describing everything from proper underwear to the health reasons associated with certain outer garments: “A winter of fashions which expose her bronchial passages naked to the blizzard, followed by a summer of sweltering days and fur about her shoulders, can hardly be called well-balanced dress.” As had become the accepted approach of the day, to bolster her own influence, Comstock quoted recognized, credentialed
authorities on the matter of appropriate female dress, such as Dr. Ralph Oakley Clock of the American Public Health Association.

Uncle Sam Enters the Kitchen

General health concerns were prevalent throughout the war years, and nearly every issue of *Good Housekeeping* during the era contained some health-related information for readers. Repeatedly, women were made aware of their own delicate deficiencies, usually associated with the presumed biologically engendered condition of overly active nerves, often referred to as “hysteria” or “neurasthenia.” In “Selfishness and Your Nerves,” H. Addington Bruce proclaimed that most “functional nervous and mental maladies” are an issue of moral choice and upbringing, rather than a true medical condition. Mothers were warned to take precautions not to instill the same malady in their children, particularly daughters. Morally flawed mothers would just lead to more of the same in the future, which was not good for the overall health of the nation. And a strong America was essential to victory in Europe. Bruce’s article was accompanied by a picture of a woman, undoubtedly tortured by her own uncontrollable nerves, with a caption that reads:

Suffer from insomnia? Sssh! don’t tell any one about it until you investigate: it may be because you are subconsciously selfish. So says the psycho-analysts, at least. The trait often persists from infancy--almost--and so the scientists now assert that the selfishness of childhood is visited upon the grownup--even unto the wee small hours of the morning.
But if self-induced health maladies were not enough for mothers to worry about during wartime, there were actual disease-carrying germs to be afraid of, not only lurking in public places, but within the safe haven of the home, as well. Since Dr. Wiley’s earliest work in the late 1800s informing American citizens about the many health hazards associated with impure food, drink, and drugs, the public had become much more aware of the hidden dangers in the environment. In “Mountains and Mole-Hills,” Woods Hutchinson encouraged people not to be overly phobic about unseen strains of bacteria and viruses. But in doing so, he managed to talk about a plethora of very real diseases, primarily associated with food.20 As the war required more economic and industrial resources, keeping the American food supply plentiful and disease-free became the responsibility of all citizens, but particularly women.

American infant mortality rates were a serious public concern during this era, and Dr. Wiley addressed it head-on in the June 1917 article “How Can These Things Be?” He warned readers that more infants died during the three months of summer than at any other time of the year. The war in Europe had created stress on America’s food supply, and the 1,250,000 babies who would be entering their first summer months in 1917 potentially would be affected. According to Wiley: “unless conditions are materially improved, eighty-four thousand--one out of every fifteen--of these children will die before the twenty-first of September.”21 The causes for the impending deaths were attributed to three primary factors: first--heat; second--improper food; and third--infection.22 Wiley strongly advised mothers to eschew many traditions of the past, such as bundling infants during summer months, in favor of dressing them in light, loose, airy clothing, and sponging children with cool water to keep down body temperature. Mothers of infants were also encouraged to continue breastfeeding during the summer months rather than
attempting to wean, if they could maintain a proper, healthy diet for themselves. And the nutritional needs of mothers were abundant, as Wiley explicitly detailed in the article.  

It was evident in the article that, as the summer of 1917 began it was not an easy task for mothers to meet their own substantial dietary requirements, let alone that of their infants, older children, and other family members. The purity and plentitude of the food supply was inextricably linked to Wiley’s third summertime concern, infections, about which new mothers were sternly warned. In another article in the same issue, the director of the Good Housekeeping Bureau of Foods, Sanitation, and Health also specifically addressed the importance of women during wartime, linking them to the prevailing problems of worldwide food impurity (which Wiley referred to as the “dietary sword of Damocles”), poverty, and hunger.  

Regarding wartime diet, American women were an integral part of the overall battle plan, according to Wiley, and it was their patriotic duty to tackle these issues within the domestic sphere and also in the public environment. As a long-time social reformer and suffragist, Wiley was sincere in his admiration for the accomplishments of women on the home front, harkening back to his close ties with the Women’s Club movement and their involvement in pure food reform nearly a decade before. Now, women’s work was even more specific, necessary, and sacrificial:  

A patriotic woman told me since war was declared that it was a pity that women could take so small a part in the conflict. I replied: ‘Women win wars. Women are fighting the great battles in Europe today. Women fought the battles of the Civil War. Women will fight and win the battles of this present war’ . . . I should urge the women to begin at home in their own families and now, before the stress shall come upon us, to order their diet
according to its nutritive properties and not according to its taste and flavor.\textsuperscript{25}

Undoubtedly, Wiley was a progressive reformer and a visionary. He took a proactive approach in warning the readers of \textit{Good Housekeeping} about potential impending shortages in the food supply, even before the U.S. government put its own informational campaigns into motion. But Wiley was no fear-monger. Always confident and supportive, he provided specific instructions on how to cope with the situation. Wiley instilled the notion that, during the war crisis, wasting food was anathema. There had been shortages in the previous wheat crop, and bread, an important staple of the American table, was already becoming less plentiful. Wiley explained to readers how to use the entire wheat shaft in bread making, instead of throwing portions of it away. In addition, Americans would need to learn to restrict their consumption of meat, limiting it to just one meal a day, with a recommendation that Tuesdays and Fridays become entirely meatless days. Women were encouraged to revert to the days of preserving meats through curing and drying, and the canning (or drying) of fruits and vegetables was also recommended.\textsuperscript{26}

Wiley’s writings in \textit{Good Housekeeping} echoed governmental efforts, but he provided readers with very specific techniques and strategies for everyday living based primarily on his long-time philosophy of nutritional dietary requirements and overall good health. While patriotism and sacrifice were significant watchwords, Wiley never used them just as manipulative abstractions--his advice was always practical, detailed, and precise. In addition, ever the compassionate, Wiley encouraged \textit{Good Housekeeping} readers to view the necessary sacrifices through a lens of egalitarianism, and as a matter of global concern and commitment:
If the scarcity of foods should continue and become more acute, then bread and meat tickets are to be issued, so that no one class of the community can get more than its share, no matter how rich or powerful it should be. We must share our food-supply with our Allies and not keep it all for ourselves. We must be willing to take our share of all sacrifices and all privations.  

During 1917, President Woodrow Wilson’s Committee on Public Information (CPI) and the U.S. Food Administration also began warning the general public that food supply shortages were inevitable. Under the direction of Herbert Hoover, the Food Administration created strategic persuasive campaigns aimed at “the nation’s food producers, householders, and consumers to conserve food for U.S. troops and Allies.” Uncle Sam was about to enter the American kitchen, and women had been called to duty. Proactively, Wiley warned his Good Housekeeping readers about the inevitable changes to come and the importance of the strength of their conviction:

It is not a pleasant thought that the strong arm of the nation shall come into your kitchen and dictate what you shall eat. But that is not the question. It is not pleasant to think of the recruiting officer coming for your young sons, but he is coming. This is harder than to dictate what you shall eat . . . There is no one factor more important than the nutrition of our people. This [essay], in brief, is an outline for mobilizing our food-supplies to secure the greatest economy and efficiency . . . One good effect of the war at least will be that the people of this country will be instructed in the
fundamentals of nutrition, not alone in the adornments of cookery.

This war is no child’s play; it means sacrifice of all that is dearest
to humanity--human life . . . Let us anticipate the food dictator.
Let us begin so to order our meals as to save and become more
efficient. This is a war for humanity. Its success will depend upon
how the humanity that fights the war is fed.29

According to Ponder, in general, the appeals were accepted by the public because they tapped
into the pervasive mood of the country, which had concerned itself for several decades with
progressive reforms. In particular, the campaigns drew upon humanitarian and voluntarism
sentiments that appealed to those who were concerned with poverty and hunger issues, as well as
those engaged in other reforms, such as the pure food movement and suffrage.30

As they had done during the early years of the pure food movement, again advertisers
turned their attention away from more esoteric messages that supported the trope of modernism,
such as those associated with laborsaving efficiency, good hostessing, public prestige, and the
achievement of elevated social status. During the previous five years, Campbell Soup had
encouraged women to seek a higher cultural calling in the name of modernity--with the
assistance of sufficiently compliant hired help, an urbane-looking domestic environment, and
hostess skills that rivaled any empress or senator’s wife. Instead, the current ads spoke to issues
related to the war--public health, strong boys, prepared girls, and once again, nurturing mothers.
Now Campbell’s ad messages positioned soup as a source of well-rounded, single-bowl,
healthful nutrition--a necessity as the scarcity of food appeared to be on the horizon. The ad that
appeared in April 1917, not long after the United States had entered the war, illustrated this
refurbished approach:
‘It’s a meal in itself!’ That is what thousands of people say about *Campbell’s Vegetable Soup*. And in truth, this popular food product contains practically every element of nourishing and satisfying repast. The strengthening juices of good meat, the tissue-building properties of choice vegetables and hardy cereals, the delicious flavor of fresh herbs and delicate spices – they are all temptingly combined in Campbell’s Vegetable Soup. *We make the strong full-bodied stock from selected beef.* And this stock also contains the nutritious marrow of the bones. We use the best Maine-grown white potatoes and Jersey sweet potatoes, fine big yellow turnips, Chantenay carrots – red and tender all through, “baby” lima beans, small peas, green okra, tomatoes, celery, and the juicy “Country Gentleman” corn. We add rice, barley and “alphabet” macaroni made from the best Durum wheat. And we give a final snappy touch with little white leek and sweet red peppers . . . *Good soup is a most important and valuable food. It is a positive necessity if you want to maintain a properly-balanced diet. And it should be eaten once every day at least. Your physician will endorse this statement.*\(^{31}\)

In this ad, notice the emphasis on all ingredients for which housewives were warned they would face shortages--meat, wheat, and fresh produce. The copy is also lengthy and detailed, a strategy that the company had used more than ten years before, when it first began placing advertisements in mass circulation magazines. During that period, this style had been strategically employed to
address issues brought to the surface by the advocates of the pure food movement. But in those earlier ads, the emphasis primarily was on the cleanliness process for making pure prepared soup and the professionalism and hygiene of Campbell’s workers, as they related to the public health of consumers.

Then, during the five-year period immediately preceding the U.S. entry into the war, Campbell’s had shortened its ad copy significantly, allowing sophisticated illustrations of domestic situations to tell the story of their product’s benefits—benefits which were less concrete, but which were about creating a more refined and fashionable image of the middle-class that rivaled that of the idealized upper class. The Campbell’s Soup Kids appeared very infrequently in those ads, as the company had opted for more artistic illustrations of families, with the emphasis on communication between husbands, wives, and other adults. Now the Kids resumed their position as the dominant focal point of the advertisements placed in Good Housekeeping. The April 1917 ad featured no less than six different Kids. Five of them are carrying a different fresh ingredient to the chef, who, all smiles, is ready to prepare the wholesome “meal in itself” for the American public. While the war was not mentioned overtly, it provides serious subtext to the surface message of the ad. Campbell’s Soup, still inexpensive and capable of feeding a family of six per can, was positioning itself to be an indispensable tool in the housewife’s wartime kitchen pantry arsenal.

In an effort to communicate complex American values to its citizens during the time of war, the creators of public visual images (primarily the government and advertisers) relied on mythological female images to project their nationalistic messages. Banta describes how the public (both adults and children alike) were regularly “ignited by patriotism at the sight of World War I posters . . . by such illustrators as Howard Chandler Christy, James Montgomery Flagg,
Many of those well-known artists contributed regularly to *Good Housekeeping* cover art, as well as to illustrations that accompanied its literary content. In these artistic wartime imaginings, women were most often constructed to represent the figures of Columbia, Liberty, and America, and all that those fabled and traditional ideals encompassed—virtue, democracy, freedom, and allegiance, to name just a few. Advertisers had long incorporated mythologized depictions of women in their ads to aid consumers in the interpretation of cultural values and desires, so the public was accustomed to subconsciously translating such images.

Mythological figures were also used to elicit an emotional response when the government wanted public support for new war-related policies, as in the July 1917 issue of *Good Housekeeping* (Fig. 34). The American woman is depicted nobly and regally as Columbia, draped in a flag, with arms outstretched as she watches over two young soldiers who sit protected at her feet, guns in hand. The illustration accompanies an article entitled “And Youth for Service” written by Peter Clark Mcfarlane in which he asks mothers to support the Congressional proposal for Universal Service—an inscription plan intended to not only benefit the current war, but perhaps more importantly, future wars, by requiring military service of all twenty-one year old males. The caption read:

‘Here,’ says Columbia, ‘is the surest guarantee that American may never know another war—a young manhood trained in arms, and thereby better fitted both physically and mentally for citizenship and the arts of peace, but ever ready to fly to the country’s defense. Such is the bright promise of Universal Service.’
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Fig. 34. The American mother as “Columbia,” *Good Housekeeping*, July 1917.
The battle in Europe meant continual loss to women, particularly mothers, who were asked to give up their sons to the great war machine for the sake of the nation. As the months progressed and America sank deeper into the conflict, motherhood assumed a whole other identity associated with the various sacrifices required of women--heroic martyrdom. Now, on the covers of *Good Housekeeping* and within its pages, if women were not constructed as symbolic mythical figures, then they were pictured as nurturing mothers protecting the welfare of the nation’s children. The illustrations depicting chic, sophisticated New Women looking strong and independent, which had dominated the covers of *Good Housekeeping* for the past several years, were all but gone, replaced by touching domestic images of mothers and young children usually drawn by Jessie Wilcox Smith.

The July 1918 issue of the magazine underscores the connection between woman-as-myth (imbued with multitudinous values) and woman-as-universal-mother. Rose O’Neill, well-known artist of the beloved cherub-like “kewpies,” contributed an illustration in celebration of the Fourth of July. It depicts the Statue of Liberty as a young, nurturing mother, sitting in a relaxed position high atop a pedestal and surrounded by more than thirty kewpie babies who are attending to her, as well being embraced and protected by her (Fig. 35). American mothers had come to represent the very essence of American goodness and compassion toward the rest of the world. In addition, their personal sacrifice was essential to the power of these images. In January 1918, an essay simply entitled “The Mothers” by Maurice Maeterlinck, underscored the sacrifices that women were supposed to make for the sake of their nation:

> It is they who bear the main burden in this war . . . And yet they do not weep as the mothers wept in former years. All their sons disappear one by one; and we do not hear them complain or moan
as in day’s gone by, when great sufferings, great massacres, and
great catastrophes were enwrapped by the clamors and
lamentations of mothers. They do not assemble in the public
places, they do not utter recriminations, they rail at no one, they do
not rebel. They swallow their sobs and stifle their tears, as though
obeying a command which they passed from one to the other,
unknown to the men.35

Fig. 35. America’s Lady Liberty as “mother to the world.”
For mothers, heroic martyrdom required that they suppress any opposition to the war. To be a martyred mother was to be a true American patriot. The portrayal of both woman-as-protector and woman-as-martyr became the primary visual metaphor for what American soldiers were fighting overseas to preserve. Typically, this “new” popular artistic interpretation of the American woman brought together her two primary wartime roles—defender of health and provider of nutrition. This symbolism is evident in the illustration that appears alongside the essay “The Mobilization of Women” by Donald Wilhelm in June 1917 *Good Housekeeping*. In it, two women stand shoulder-to-shoulder. One woman is dressed as a nurse, cradling an infant tightly to her bosom as she stares defiantly ahead at anyone or anything that might seek to do harm to the child. Her comrade is dressed as a hardy farm girl, pitchfork held like a defensive weapon as she looks warily at interlopers who might do harm to her crops or her children (Fig. 36). This is the re-imagined American New Woman during World War I, as the caption indicates:

Side by side they will perform their war-ordained tasks—the devoted wearer of the red cross of healing and easement for pain-tossed bodies, and that prodigy of the present, the Woman of the Machine, whose astounding capabilities for industry are only beginning to be guessed. An emancipated womanhood it is that unstintedly offers its services toward a new birth of freedom on earth.36

Women had proven in the past that they were capable of successful mobilization efforts on the part of social and civic reform—from abolition, dress reform, pure food reform, and suffrage, to name just a few female-centered causes of the era. Now the nation was requiring them to
become a strong mobilizing force for the sake of the world. And the concept of the New Woman took on an entirely different connotation that had little or nothing to do with female actualization, individuality, or emancipation. Nevertheless, there was a consumerism component to this newly conceived notion of female mobilization that required women to embark on a stiff regimen of food conservation. American women were needed in the war effort, and they responded accordingly and admirably. During the years that the United States maintained active involvement in the war in Europe, *Good Housekeeping* and its primary advertisers reinforced the notion of female mobilization with great ferocity. Two years into the European conflict, editor Bigelow summed up the war effort as conducted on the home front this way: “Sacrifice, Saving, Service, these are the three chief things that America has learned from the war—the glory of sacrifice, the nobility of saving to share with others, and the joy of service.” Women were essential to the success of all three.
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Fig. 36. The “Mobilization of Women,” *Good Housekeeping*, June 1917.
Wheatless, Meatless, and Sweetless

[Cooking] means the knowledge of Medea, and of Circe, and of Calypso, and of Helen, and of Rebekah, and of the Queen of Sheba. It means the knowledge of all herbs, and fruits, and balms, and spices; and of all that is healing and sweet in the fields and groves, and savoury in meats... [It] means much tasting, and no wasting; it means English thoroughness, and French art, and Arabian hospitality; and it means, in fine, that you are to be perfectly, and always, ‘ladies’ – ‘loaf-givers.’

John Ruskin, The Ethics of the Dust

The ancient trope of ladies-as-loaf-givers still was entangled with the changing ideologies associated with women’s roles during the first two decades of the twentieth century. Even though, typically, the New Woman had been represented as a sophisticated modern woman who variously labored efficiently, productively, and stylishly within the domestic sphere, this was done amidst her increasing forays into the public realm where she contributed to the community in myriad ways. But the New Woman was never freed from her obligations as chief loaf-giver. During the height of World War I, women’s historical and cultural ties to the provision of food became an essential part of the war effort. And the sophisticated New Woman, wise and worldly, whether she was the symbol of advertising’s dream consumer, or her living counterpart --new women who fought for social reforms and suffrage--became, at least temporarily, a thing of the past. The New Woman, as she had been constructed just a few years earlier, faced a form of public erasure within women’s service magazines, including Good Housekeeping.

The number of articles about food that appeared in Good Housekeeping increased exponentially as the war raged on. They covered a wide range of issues, from what to eat on a daily basis, how to live out of your own garden, and information about specific food item shortages, to how to create patriotic-themed treats. But in every case, controlling and conserving food and associated resources became the primary thrust of all women’s service magazines during World War I, including Good Housekeeping.38 Editor William Frederick Bigelow
identified a plan for readers in “What the Editor Has to Say” in July 1917. The war’s impact on American life and culture was evident in Bigelow’s writing, as he described the loss of employment by thousands of workers and the need for all Americans to come together for the common good of the nation. The availability of food was central to the magazine’s concerns: “There is just so much food for all the world’s hungry millions; a crum wasted is a crum gone forever.”

In support of the war effort, Bigelow called for the prohibition of alcohol--the first time that the issue was mentioned in the magazine. Explaining that the precious grains required to produce beer and whiskey were needed to make bread for the troops and the starving citizens of Europe, Bigelow asked men to sacrifice their taste for liquor for the sake of the country. However, since the majority of his readers were women, it is clear that the esteemed editor intended for women to take up the cause within their own family circle. Wiley reinforced the magazine’s position regarding temperance in the same issue with his treatise, “Booze or Bread.” In his inimitable way he stated his case simply: “It’s The People vs. John Barleycorn . . . Both she [America] can not have.” The shortage of grains, especially wheat, was creating a cultural shift in the American eating (and drinking) experience, and Wiley anticipated that the wheat shortage could have a positive effect on what he identified as a male drinking problem in America:

Among the individual rights which have always been dear to the American citizen, the privilege of eating and drinking what he likes has been most cherished. His table has been in no small degree the index of his ability as a citizen, and he has insisted on loading it as he pleased. Not until the needs of war became
imperative, therefore, did any one attempt to interfere with the diet of the American citizen . . . To the extent that this invasion of the individual right been pushed that our people are now accepting not only restriction but absolute prohibition in respect of harmful beverages.\textsuperscript{41}

The Department of Agriculture and the Food Administration were responsible for broadcasting the government’s food policies to housewives, and this was echoed in Bigelow’s July 1917 editorial: “Begin to eat more corn-meal and hominy-grits in place of wheat flour and wheat breakfast foods. Try the wheatless breakfast tomorrow and then extend the wheatless idea to other days or meals.”\textsuperscript{42} Up to that point, corn had not been a regular staple of the American diet, as it is today, and it was not typically used as an ingredient in other dishes. Instead, corn primarily was considered to be a feed for livestock. In addition, corn was only indigenous to the Americas, so European women had no experience using it as a component in their daily menus. In fact, a corn-kitchen had been introduced as a novelty item at the \textit{Exposition Universelle et Internationale de Paris} in 1900, the same forum at which Campbell’s Soup was originally introduced to the world community. Mr. F. C. Murphy brought southern American cooks to Paris to present corn products such as hoe-and-Johnny-cakes to “thousands of hungry and curious individuals. Most of them apparently liked it.”\textsuperscript{43} But regardless of the openness to corn shown by the Parisian crowds, it did not catch on in Europe. There were also more practical reasons that America’s allies preferred wheat to corn. The latter had greater susceptibility to spoilage when shipped overseas. In addition, except for Italy, the rest of Europe did not have corn-milling machinery.\textsuperscript{44} Thus, during World War I, what the Continent wanted from America was wheat, which effectively diminished the supply with every passing month.
America viewed itself as a protector, and while the Allies were not in a position to use the country’s bountiful supply of corn, they undoubtedly relied greatly on U.S. troop strength, industrial military resources, and other food supplies. America’s intent and self-assuredness was visualized in the November 1918 Campbell’s Soup ad. The male Kid is depicted as the mythological Atlas, standing atop a can of Campbell’s tomato soup and holding a globe of the world above his head (Fig. 37). The continents of North and South America, Europe, and Africa are clearly visible, and the main caption reads: “The Modern Atlas--Let him help you carry your burden.”

The big world-burden today is the food problem. America asks ‘How shall we feed our fighters, our Allies, and also maintain the full strength and vitality of our people at home?’ It is a question of wise economy. And the heaviest part of the burden falls on you – the conscientious American housewife.

Fig. 37. Good Housekeeping ad, November 1918.
American housewives may have been unaware of the many ways in which corn could supplement the daily menu, but they knew full well that it was their responsibility to find new ways to feed the citizens at home. Corn was a viable option, but most people were not knowledgeable about the various forms in which corn was available. To support the somewhat radical notion that corn could superbly replace wheat on the American dinner table, the Department of Agriculture published a free bulletin, listing fifty different wheatless recipes, suitable for breakfast, luncheon, and dinner, that used corn as a substitute.47

Wartime required sacrifice of all kinds, and perhaps nowhere was it more prevalent than in the constant discussions about bread. The government promoted “liberty bread,” a darker, coarser loaf made with wheat substitutes and sold to women in place of traditional wheat bread. This was directly tied to economic aspects of the war effort, but it was also bound with more abstract value-laden concepts that, in Good Housekeeping, were intertwined with issues such as moral obligation and temperance: “Now that we have realized that the salvation of the world depends upon the control of our appetite, and have broken away from the worship of white loaves, let us not return to our idolatry after the world is saved.”48 William Leavitt Stoddard provided Good Housekeeping readers with additional ideas for wheat substitutes in “Bread in Wartime.” He suggested that women buy their own small gristmills and learn to grind other grains such as barley, rice, rye, and oats, or use corn and potatoes to make wheat-substitute flour suitable for baking bread and cakes.

How can the American housewife do her bit? In many lines, to be sure, but particularly in the bread line. As a nation we have much to learn of new--and better--breads for old, and a first duty of the
nation’s housewives is to master the making of novel loaves from unfamiliar flours.\textsuperscript{49}

Certainly, women tried the various other grains suggested by Stoddard to make their bread, but corn had several other advantages in addition to taste, availability, and ease of use.

Dr. Wiley intended to demonstrate corn’s versatility to women in January 1918 in his essay “Corn to the Rescue.” But he also framed his argument for the use of corn within more aggressive terms regarding cultural eating preferences:

Too much have we eaten our corn as mutton, pork, beef; we should use it more as bread and cereal. This is a good year to begin, with over 3,000,000,000 bushels in our bins, and the Allies pleading for every peck of wheat we can spare. Judgment and patriotism demand that we help in this way--and it’s not a bad way either.\textsuperscript{50}

Wiley, in his typical detailed manner, educated readers about the substantial nutritive properties, which were unlike that of wheat--wheat provides more protein, while corn provides more fat. Wiley claimed that the nourishment received from both was equitable. Based on livestock studies, a corn-fed diet and a wheat-fed diet produce nearly the same end result.\textsuperscript{51} In a country that was becoming increasingly more concerned about hunger and was experiencing shortages of both wheat and meat, Wiley’s stance was in strong favor of a corn-based human diet, at least for the duration of the war. Ultimately, choosing to use corn was considered patriotic, as indicated by Caroline B. King’s entry in the same issue, “Patriotism calls for Corn Bread.” She provided readers with a short history of corn--patriotic, she said, because it was “the one truly American grain.”\textsuperscript{52} Before reciting the various delicious corn recipes that modern women could serve their families, King illustrated its use by the Pilgrims and its acceptance in the home of the venerable
Revolutionary forefather, Benjamin Franklin. Corn had been welcomed into the early American diet, and in time of war, it was again an important necessity.

Women demonstrated the will to comply with governmental requirements and suggestions regarding food, but substitute ingredients were not always easy to come by nor simple to prepare. How to make palatable bread without wheat presented a huge hurdle to mothers trying to keep their family’s dietary requirements on par with standard nutritional recommendations. By late 1918, the projections for the American wheat crop were increased over the previous year, so the Food Administration gave approval for millers to produce “Victory flour,” a “fifty-fifty” flour comprised of half wheat and half of one of the substitute wheat grains. Women rejoiced at this decision because the “wheatless loaf [of bread] was exceedingly difficult, almost impossible to make at home with real success.” Women could buy Victory flour, which was already mixed by millers. Good Housekeeping taught them how to use Victory flour to bake a “patriotic loaf”--which must have felt like a significant victory unto itself. However, the possibility for baking patriotic loaves did not imply that the wheat shortage crisis was over because the war was still in full swing. The next month, Good Housekeeping encouraged women to use toasted potatoes as bread in an article replete with photos to enhance the instructions: “Steam them [sliced potatoes] about ten minutes; Dry well with a clean towel; Toast as you would bread [in the oven] and top with butter and salt. Eat with your hands like you would a piece of bread.” Normalcy had not yet returned to the American kitchen.

In December 1917, the magazine called upon women to enlist in “an army of food conservation.” Presented by the director of the Good Housekeeping Institute, Mildred Maddocks, the official-looking doctrine declared: “Wanted: Recruits For An Army of Kitchen Soldiers! If the Allied Peoples and Their Soldiers Are to Have Enough to Eat Next Year, You Must Fight Your
Battles in Your Kitchen Now! Will You Sign This? To enlist, women were asked to sign and submit the following pledge to *Good Housekeeping*:

I, The member of the household entrusted with the handling of food, do hereby enlist as a Kitchen Soldier for Home Service and pledge myself to waste no food and to use widely all food purchased for this household, knowing that by doing so I help conserve the foods that must be shipped to our soldiers and our Allies.

Kitchen soldiers also agreed to abide by a five-part “Code,” with the first rule reading in part: “I will faithfully follow every suggestion laid down by the National Food Administration.”

Through voluntary enlistment, *Good Housekeeping* readers were publicly aligning with the U.S. government and showing their patriotic commitment to support the efforts of Hoover and his Food Administration concerning food conservation, for as the document stated, “food must be saved.”

Since its inception in 1885, *Good Housekeeping* had always been a venue wherein women could share household ideas with one another, and this was no different. Kitchen soldiers received an elaborate certificate marking their official entry into service. And for every “good idea” of food conservation submitted and published in the magazine, *Good Housekeeping* agreed to pay one dollar.

Women responded to the campaign, and Florence Taft Eaton was officially introduced as the first kitchen soldier in the January 1918 issue. “Of course I enlist, gladly. I have two sons in the army--one in France--and my words come from the heart.” As part of her commitment to the war effort, Eaton agreed to “pare potatoes and apples even more thinly; I could bake potatoes in their jackets, and make these jackets edible by first scrubbing them thoroughly and then
rubbing them over with a bit of suet.” Small gestures in cooking techniques such as these illustrate the degree to which people feared starvation in America, as it was occurring amongst the Allies. As the war raged on in Europe, the rhetoric associated with the kitchen soldiers became increasingly militaristic.

The March 1918 issue proclaimed: “A Gun for the Kitchen Soldiers.” The “gun” was metaphorical and referred to the resources needed by women so that they could arm themselves against poor nutrition--in this case, a complete list of menus from the magazine. They were detailed, precise, and based on scientific principles of present-day nutrition, taking into account the number of family members and their ages, and then calculating the amount of nutrients each person needed to remain healthy. In keeping with the kitchen soldier code, all ingredients were to be carefully measured or weighed and then divided for each family member according to their specific protein and overall caloric needs. Maintaining compliance as a kitchen soldier required an on-going commitment to nutritional meal preparation that could challenge a scientist. Within months, Kitchen Soldiers were an accepted institutionalized part of Good Housekeeping. The June 1918 issue even featured “A Kitchen Soldier Wedding,” replete with a patriotic “war wedding cake”: “With crossed flags and swords and an eagle spreading wings atop it, this wartime wedding-cake is truly unique.”

During the war effort, many terms took on complex systems of discursive meanings. “Enlisted” was not just associated with the military obligation of men, but rather it came to suggest various forms of voluntary service for women, such as those who chose to enlist as kitchen soldiers. While the government decreed that some form of service was the duty of every patriotic citizen, women’s service was largely about the choices they made in the kitchen and market, and their ability to conduct family life in the most economically thrifty way possible. It
is not surprising, then, that companies such as Campbell’s Soup incorporated the most recognizable wartime words into their advertisements, such as the one appearing in the May 1918 Good Housekeeping (Fig. 38):

With this good soup we do our part, To make the nation strong,
And so, with honest hand and heart, Help Uncle Sam along.

Enlisted for Service – Every true American today has a part to play in the Nation’s service. Your part as a responsible and thrifty housewife centres largely about the question of wise economy in food. Our part as makers of wholesome and economical soups is to help you and every American housewife in solving this ever-present problem. These nourishing soups not only help you to do your part in patriotic food conservation but in using them you gain for yourself and your family substantial benefit both in health and purse.⁶⁴

Fig. 38. Good Housekeeping ad, May 1918.
While shortages of meats and fats had been discussed prior to January 1918, it had become a particular concern by the time Eaton became the first *Good Housekeeping* kitchen soldier. Readers were strongly urged to conserve all fat and to begin using it differently. For example, instead of using traditional shortening in bread or cakes, women were taught how to cut off all the fat from meats, reduce it to liquid, and then strain it through cheesecloth so it could be used in baking.65 Body fat also became an issue associated with the war. “How Much Fat Will You Give?” asked Americans to assess their own excess body weight, and if overweight, to voluntarily lose that body fat so that others might benefit. The article by Eugene Lyman Fisk, M.D. is highlighted by the disembodied head of a plump, middle-aged man, who is smiling rather diabolically at what one can only surmise is his own greed and selfishness in the face of world hunger (Fig. 39). The extreme degree to which the nation was worried about shortages of foodstuffs is clearly evident in Fisk’s opening statement:

There are in the country large stores of fat about which we seldom hear. There are about 200,000,000 pounds of it on the bodies of our citizens that could profitably be surrendered. Is this fat available? Can we consume it without cannibalism? Most assuredly. This fat can be burned in millions of human furnaces, and thus release for food consumption other fats or greatly needed fuel foods, such as wheat, corn, oats, barley, and rye.66

Fig. 39. Overweight Americans were motivated to give up body fat for the war effort, *Good Housekeeping*, January 1918.
Without a doubt, Fisk’s approach to encouraging people to eat less so that others may eat more was unique. In case his plea for patriotism did not induce the plump to curtail their personal intake, Fisk used life insurance studies to demonstrate the increase in death rates associated with being overfed. And lest those did not provide enough incentive, excess body weight was measured in loaves of bread--perhaps one of the most valuable commodities in a society that was becoming increasingly wheatless. But ultimately, the incentive to burn one’s own excess body weight was supposed to be derived from a sense of national obligation:

We hear a good deal about food speculators and food hoarders these days--but how about the fat hoarders? A man forty pounds overweight is carrying on his body the equivalent in fuel value of 135 one-pound loaves of bread . . . Are you one of the 20,000,000 people in this country who can serve your country and at the same time improve your health and appearance? If so, will you not do it?67

Advertisers attempted to address the issue of just how much food was appropriate to eat during wartime without limiting their own profit potential. They walked a fine line between wanting to stabilize their own profits, without seeming unpatriotic, as national economic instability was pervasive. Campbell, perhaps more than most product manufacturers, had always positioned its soups as healthful and economic, and therefore it could easily situate them within governmental guidelines for food consumption. So while Campbell’s ads continued to encourage consumers to buy read-to-eat soup, it also persuaded them to eat what was necessary for good nutrition in service to the health of America (Fig. 40):
Serve by saving – wisely. *You cannot serve your country well by sacrifice without wisdom.* Self-denial, to be effective, must be coupled with judgment and practical sense. Money saving must go hand in hand with health saving. ‘Nobody ought to eat less than is necessary for good health and full strength,’ says our National Food Administration, ‘*for America needs the full productive power of all its people!*’

Fig. 40. *Good Housekeeping* ad, June 1918.
The worldwide meat and dairy shortage was addressed in February 1918, and housewives were asked to come to the rescue. Hoover asked women to use every part of the animal, including all organ meats—hearts, livers, kidneys, brains, tripe—which could not be shipped abroad because of spoilage concerns. The Food Administration persuaded families to eat meat in only one meal a day, and to substitute other sources of protein, mainly beans, peas, lentils, and eggs, during other meals. Recipes using meat substitutes or organ meats were provided to give women some creative ideas for mealtime: tripe oysters, sautéd pickled tripe, mock sweetbreads, stewed beef hearts and prunes, and liver dumplings were the suggested fare in February 1918.69

The shortage of meat was an issue for all Americans, but the rising cost of available meats was equally troublesome in an economy that was suffering greatly.

Dr. Wiley suggested that families alter their meat consumption altogether and begin relying on vegetable and nut substitutes for the long term. Up to that time, nuts had been used almost solely as condiments or dessert, but Wiley advocated the use of nuts as the primary source of protein and fat in every family meal, if possible. The nutritious benefits of nuts are highly valuable and efficient, as he explained: “An ordinary man at ordinary labor would be sustained, in so far as heat value is concerned [energy], on one pound a day of almonds or of coconut.”70 But unfortunately, like other recommended substitutes, nuts were not plentiful or accessible to the average person, and some nuts were quite costly.71 The one exception was the lowly goober. Peanuts were plentiful, easy to grow, and cheap—and highly undervalued by Americans as a foodstuff, according to Wiley. They could be made into oils and butters, and Wiley encouraged his readers to use peanut products as substitutes in their cooking. Ever the visionary, Wiley proclaimed: “The aristocratic Arachis hypogaea—the plebeian goober—has rosy prospects of a brilliant future.”72
While eggs were approved as a substitute for meat and protein, fresh eggs were not always available, especially to people living in cities. Eggs were an essential ingredient in baking everything from bread to cakes, muffins, and pies. They were also a favorite breakfast dish. Florence Spring, in December 1918, provided housewives with insight into how to make breakfast breads that were not only wheatless, but also eggless. By now, women were familiar with the many substitutes for wheat, but those for eggs were less known. While there was no simple means for finding a true egg substitute in 1918, Spring provided recipes for concocting batters that required various combinations of milk, buttermilk, sour milk, molasses, apples, small amounts of shortening, and other ingredients, added to ground grains. Women learned to improvise with what they had on hand, and *Good Housekeeping* was an invaluable monthly resource that kept them apprised of the latest innovations in wartime cooking and conservation. Just like the lowly goober, cheese was undergoing an image remake, too. In “The Rediscovery of Cheese,” Dorothy B. Marsh intended to relieve cheese of its appetizer status, and move it onto the family table as a substitute for meat. Following Wiley’s persuasive techniques, Marsh compared favorably the nutritional qualities of cheese to meat, and encouraged women to use it throughout the meal, either alone or as an ingredient in a variety of dishes. The author exclaimed “Eat less meat, more cheese!”

In addition to families learning to eat meals that were often wheatless and meatless, they were soon faced with the prospect of also being sweetless. Like other primary staples of the American diet, sugar was becoming scarce as well. Sugar was a relatively new addition to America’s palate, as it had only become a favorite ingredient in during the previous one hundred years. But not everyone had developed a sweet tooth. There were some sugar naysayers, including Dr. Wiley, who eschewed its over-use as a potential health hazard. Originally, sugar
came from sugar cane and was only produced in small amounts. However, in 1811, Napoleon promoted the development of the beet-sugar industry, and the consumption of sugar increased dramatically alongside production rates. By 1889, Americans were consuming fifty pounds of sugar per person annually. And by the start of the war in 1914, that amount had increased to eighty-six pounds. Certain new foods made their debut during World War I because of shortages. Prior to the war, American were used to eating sweetened pickles. But with the high cost of sugar as well as its limited availability, the concept of sour pickles was introduced. Sourness was innate to the pickling process, and canners had learned to counteract the sour taste with the addition of sweeteners--but no more. The Food Administration encouraged citizens to use everything possible from their gardens and to can excess fresh produce to ensure they had enough food during the winter months. But unsweetened pickled cucumbers held little enticement for most people. *Good Housekeeping* addressed the issue in September 1918 with Eleanor Record Sigel’s “Sour Pickles Are Patriotic Pickles.” In it, she introduced readers to numerous options for using sour pickles, such as various types of relish, salads, and sauces--“India relish, fine cucumber relish, pickled cauliflower, pickled spiced onions, green corn salad, celery sauce, green chili sauce, and ripe tomato sauce,” to name but a few of her innovative suggestions.

Clearly, however, Americans enjoyed sugar in their diet, and its shortage was cause for alarm. Luckily, there were a variety of substitutes that women could use in place of it in their cooking. In “Help from the Honey Bee,” Rachel F. Dahlgren offered these suggestions:

> The honey crop of 1918 is likely to exceed even the large 1917 crop. Besides, bee-keeping is delightful home work for women--light, interesting, out-door work. In the present revival of our
grandmothers’ industries, the beehive is bound to find a place in
every woman’s garden.76

One can appreciate Dahlgren’s sunny, optimistic outlook on bee-keeping as a viable option for creating a sugar substitute in the face of war, food shortages, poverty, and hunger, but this particular essay did not address the restrictions inherent to urban dwellers who typically had no room for a garden, let alone a beehive. However, she did offer other suggestions in addition to honey that were perhaps more accessible to city women, that is if they could find them on their grocer’s shelves--maple syrup, molasses, corn syrup, and brown sugar.77

As with the campaign for overweight Americans to cut their own body fat so that others could be properly nourished, the consumption of sugar was also associated with gluttony and weak character. In “Sugar and Character: Are You the Sugar Pig in Your Family?” readers were asked to maintain a sugar ration allowance equal to that of the Allies--one-half pounds per month per person. However, Americans were currently eating two pounds each per month, and to that Good Housekeeping proclaimed: “Shame on any American who tries to make it [the ration amount] more! Honor to any American who makes it less!”78 Housewives were provided with visual representations of the allowable amount of sugar to be used in any situation, assigned by the day, the week, and the month, with individual family members restricted to their own allotment of the sweet stuff. One cup of coffee was allowed one cube of lump sugar--no more. To combat the sugar shortage, women were instructed only to serve fresh fruits for dessert instead of making sugar-laden dishes. This, however, was not an option for many families because fresh fruit was an even more expensive alternative and not always available.79 One reader from Nebraska offered her solution for satisfying her family’s sweet tooth:
In order to conserve sugar I have instituted the following plan in our home: I put the daily allowance of sugar into the sugar bowl each morning, and whatever is left at night is emptied into a jar in the pantry. Whenever there is a sufficient amount in the jar, I can then use it in making a pie or cake. But no pie or cake is made until the quantity saved warrants it. This is an added incentive to the sugar lovers of the family.80

To her credit, the reader from Nebraska seemed to be successful in implementing her regimented plan, but not every housewife found her family so compliant, especially when one member turned out to be the home sugar pig, as this New York City reader soon learned:

Who is the sugar pig in your family? For every family has a sugar pig. I found this out when I tried the plan of individual sugar bowls to accustom my family to the new régime. A common fund was assigned to the kitchen to be used in cooking dishes eaten by us all. Then the remainder of the monthly allowance was divided equally, and each person had his own supply in his own bowl. After the first week, when each one saw his sugar, going, going, going, the most careful measuring and distributing began . . . Saving sugar became a personal problem, thus shifting the responsibility from the home-maker who usually plans and proportions for all . . . And we found out that one member ate most of the sugar in our family, had been eating it for years, but we never knew it before. And we had to make a no-poaching rule to
protect the one who ate the least. Saving sugar is not a matter of family adjustment but of individual sacrifice in these days.\textsuperscript{81}

While the New York City sugar pig remained anonymous to readers, the homemaker’s letter demonstrated the degree to which women took their role seriously as guardian and commander of food rations in the home. \textit{Good Housekeeping} in alliance with the U.S. Food Administration had remarkable success in curtailing citizens’ consumption of certain foods and instilling new foodstuffs into the American culture of eating.

Women were creative in their efforts to find substitutes that could successfully imitate long-standing family traditions. The December 1918 issue of \textit{Good Housekeeping} addressed this in “Patriotic Christmas Sweets.” At the top of the article, there is a poster from the Food Administration that warns citizens to reduce their consumption of sugar-sweetened drinks that proclaims, “Sugar Means Ships. For your beverages 400 million lbs. of sugar were imported in Ships last year. Every Ship is needed to carry soldiers and supplies now.”\textsuperscript{82} The article discussed the fact that English children would be going without candy at Christmas that year, but with some ingenuity American mothers could still provide their little ones with sweet treats. Mothers were taught to make hard candies using butter and various types of syrup, including either white or dark corn syrup, molasses, sorghum, or honey.\textsuperscript{83}

Throughout the year, families who were used to eating desserts had the option of consuming “Victory pastries” instead. These were made without any sweetener whatsoever, but women could imitate the fluffiness of traditional pastries using a flour substitute, small amounts of shortening, baking powder, cold water, and salt. After baking, the pastry could be filled with fruit, a dab of whipping cream, or custard to satisfy the taste buds’ craving for sweets.\textsuperscript{84} But with the supply of milk and butterfat limited, creating any type of dessert could be the cause of
stress for cooks. But the ever-resourceful Mabel Jewett Crosby presented several new options to women in August 1918’s “Frozen Without Cream,” showing them how to create frozen desserts such as fruit sherbet, milk sherbet, and simple custard sans cream. Crosby even shaped the ice cream-like concoctions into patriotic molds—a reminder of what the sacrifice was all about.85

The campaign to encourage women to prepare, preserve, and obtain food differently than they had in the recent past posed a potential threat to large processed food companies like Campbell’s Soup. Women were encouraged to save every scrap and morsel from the preparation of every meal and create yet another meal with it. The most salvageable use for leftover meat, vegetables, and even milk and fish, was the soup kettle. Unlike the pre-condensed soup days when women were instructed to carefully select and prepare the ingredients for their soup stock in accordance with the French art of cookery, wartime soup called for women to be creative with whatever slivers of ingredients they had on hand. And all could be blended together in a soup kettle to supplement any meal.86 The practice was even sanctioned by Herbert Hoover, who offered readers this advice:

Don’t put into the garbage-can what should go into the soup-kettle.

Nourishing soups can be made from scraps of meat and vegetables that are usually thrown away . . . Let us, at this time, utterly refute the old saying that the wastes in the kitchen of a prosperous American household would feed a French family.87

Concerned that women would turn away completely from ready-made soups, Campbell countered with their own Hoover dictum in their July 1918 ad in Good Housekeeping (Fig. 41). The ad shows the female Kid holding a magnifying glass to a copy of a “Home Card,” distributed by the U.S. Food Administration to all homes in order to tell them how to best deal
with the food crisis. Smartly, the little girl is magnifying just one phrase: “Use soups more freely.” The ad read:

Why Mr. Hoover said it – *Why your first Home Card advises –*

‘*Use soups more freely’ – Because good soup is not a ‘frill’ nor an ‘extra,’ but a nourishing health-giving food which should be eaten by every family every day, a fact well recognized by the highest dietary authorities. You are in line with the urgent food requirements of our Government, and at the same time you meet an essential health requirement of your family in a most practical way through the regular use of Campbell’s Vegetable Soup.*

Fig. 41. *Good Housekeeping* ad, July 1918.
Another concern for the corporate food processors was the issue of home canning, which was also seeing a revival. It had been of particular concern during the heightened years of the pure food reform movement, but now it was a wartime necessity. In May 1918, *Good Housekeeping* proclaimed, “Home Canned Food is Safe” and promoted its resurgence within the American kitchen. The May essay even tied canning to unique aspects of American-ness that harkened back to the hardiness and determination of the nation’s earliest pioneers. “Home canning is a custom peculiar to America. Let it aid our country in time of war and make food plentiful during the coming winter.” The magazine maintained its earlier position that the canning of fruits and vegetables required adherence to “scientifically accurate” time scheduling, but with the proper attention and care, women could successfully produce home canned foods.

However, canning fruits did present some conservationist conflict because typically sugar was added to the mix. Mildred Maddocks, Director of the Good Housekeeping Institute, reminded readers that there were several viable sweetener options, even for canning. Both corn syrup and honey sufficed nicely in place of regular sugar, and as a result, canning once again became an integral part of women’s wartime kitchen service. But this time she was not only providing for her family throughout the winter months, she was also saving the nation. When canning was not an option, women were encouraged to learn various methods for drying perishable foods. While their grandmothers had been adequately schooled in these preservation techniques, modern women had been educated by advertisers to opt for modern products and appliances. Thus, drying food was a relatively new concept to most. According to Marsh: “Every home should make drying a part of its program of patriotic thrift.” No matter the state of one’s kitchen, drying was an option. Housewives could resort to sun-drying, electric-fan
drying, attic drying, gas-range drying, coal-range drying, kerosene-oven drying, and even drying in a water bath.\textsuperscript{94} During the war, overt mentions of buying “convenience foods” were curtailed.

Even so, Campbell’s advertising strategies did not change radically during wartime. They continued to persuade consumers that the product was healthful, cost efficient, and laborsaving. They did, however, incorporate the popular rhetoric of the times into their advertising messages in an attempt to address the most pressing needs facing women. The January 1918 ad in \textit{Good Housekeeping} features a Kid waving a flag with a “C” on it, with the rhyme: “I’ve joined the Entente against worry and care, In homes of the free and the brave. Old General Grouch is stampeded for fair, Wherever my banner I wave.”\textsuperscript{95} The primary advertising copy in this ad situates Campbell’s Soup as the housewife’s collaborator in wartime service:

\begin{quote}
Here is your faithful ally--real and substantial aid in solving the vital problem that confronts you every day--the problem of the home table. Think what it means to have a supply of \textit{Campbell’s} wholesome \textit{Vegetable Soup} always at hand on your pantry shelf! Every sensible housewife today is earnestly striving to provide her table with food that is not only appetizing and nourishing but at the same time economical. And there is not a food-product in your larder which combines all these qualities more completely than they are combined in Campbell’s \textit{Vegetable Soup}.\textsuperscript{96}
\end{quote}

At the end of the war, the January 1919 Campbell’s ad succinctly summed up women’s primary roles during the war. The illustration shows three Kids, one dressed as Uncle Sam, another as a cook (or housewife), and the third as a nurse, marching hand-in-hand (Fig. 42):
Arm in Arm--With Uncle Sam on one side and the American housewife on the other, *Campbell’s* wholesome *Tomato Soup* is in the advance guard of health and good cheer. It is a favorite alike, with our heroes abroad and their families at home.  

Fig. 42. *Good Housekeeping* ad, January 1919.
Taming the New Woman

When the war ended in late 1918, it became evident almost immediately in *Good Housekeeping* that what the country wanted most was to get back to a feeling of normalcy. While the government would be involved in the treaty negotiations and reconstruction efforts in Europe for some time, on the home front, there was a sense that the worst was over, and life could begin anew. But where did that leave women? And had the concept of the New Woman been all but erased during the wartime era of the mythologized mother? Prior to the war, *Good Housekeeping* had concentrated its efforts, successfully, in involving Women’s Club members in the pure food movement, and the magazine had even dedicated nearly a year’s worth of editorial content to coverage of woman’s suffrage. For the most part, all that had come to a halt when the war broke out in Europe, several years before the United States became officially involved.

But the magazine had not suddenly become apolitical. With the ceasefire, Wiley and Bigelow embarked on a mission to get behind the legions of people, primarily women, who wanted to enforce prohibition. During the war, both men had tied the issue of temperance to the country’s shortage of wheat, the primary ingredient in alcohol and beer. In May 1919, Bigelow wrote this editorial:

> Along with an undoubted majority of the citizens of these United States, Good Housekeeping welcomes the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution. For too long a time we have been partners in a great crime, giving men the privilege of debauching their fellows and luring from them their money, while we stood in the shadows and awaited our share. In a sense, we were worse than the saloon-keeper.\textsuperscript{98}
Indeed, the Eighteenth Amendment passed and became law in January 1920. However, Wiley continued to write about his concerns regarding prohibition, primarily that those who opposed the law would find other ways to continue to produce and drink alcohol. Even before the law went into effect, in November 1919, he warned readers that U.S. distilleries were moving their plants to Mexico, and that some alcohol producers were applying for patents to sell alcohol as medicine. Just as he had been the primary stalwart activist for the pure food reform movement, Wiley clearly had found another cause to promote to readers of *Good Housekeeping*.

Suffrage also became a topic of interest once again in the magazine. The new women who were on the frontlines of the issue had not halted their activity during the war, but some groups had placed a great deal of energy into supporting the war effort on the home front. Even so, state by state, suffrage had been put to the test and was winning. In November 1917, voters of New York State voted “yes” on the issue of full suffrage, and E. S. Martin (who admittedly opposed suffrage) covered that monumental victory in *Good Housekeeping* in the February 1918 issue. But with the passage of the legislation came many questions regarding equality within the household. As indicated in readers’ letters, some husbands threatened that if their wives got the vote, then they would need to pay half the household bills, regardless of whether or not they had any income. It is notable that these particular statements occurred during the apogee of war, when the economy was in a stranglehold, and women willingly mobilized *en masse* to secure the health and well-being of their families and to maintain a semblance of peace and normalcy at home.

During that time, even though women’s political issues took a backseat to the greater worldwide politics, *Good Housekeeping* did cover the controversy that swirled around the picketing of the White House by suffragists in 1918, during the height of the war. The essay
illuminated the split that had occurred between the major suffragist groups a few years before, with Alice Paul heading the more militant, British-modeled National Woman’s Party, and the more moderate veteran Carrie Chapman Catt leading the National American Woman Suffrage Association, which had been founded in 1890.100 Paul’s group had begun increasing the pressure on President Wilson to get behind a national suffrage amendment, and when he proved unresponsive, they picketed the White House in 1916 and symbolically burned him in effigy in the summer of 1917.101 In the March 1918 issue of *Good Housekeeping*, Catt presented her side of the dispute with militant suffragists in the essay “Why We Did Not Picket The White House.”102 These temperate presentations of suffrage were the only articles to appear during the war.

Unlike militant British suffragist Emmeline Pankhurst, who was given her own series of articles in *Good Housekeeping* prior to the start of the war, American radicals Alice Paul and her sisterhood were never given the same editorial space in the magazine. Women’s politics were not off-limits in *Good Housekeeping* at war’s end, but many of the primary contributors to the magazine assumed a relatively conservative position that at times seemed capricious in light of the magazine’s recent past history and the beliefs of its primary figureheads. Wiley was a long-time suffrage supporter, and Bigelow had openly vowed support for women’s equal rights. Nevertheless, the vast majority of articles that appeared immediately following the cessation of war were decidedly unreceptive to causes that promoted the individualistic development of women as independent from service to others. Bigelow even sighed that perhaps the war had ended too soon for American women to have learned any lasting lessons. More specifically, he was referring to women’s character in the immediate aftermath of the war:
But the following weeks [after the war ended] brought their
disappointment to many who had seen in the war the renascence of
American womanhood, for the manifestations of individualism
seen everywhere as soon as the fighting was done were not merely
the signs of reaction following strain, as had been hoped, but an
almost complete rebound to old thoughts and ways of living.
‘People had not forgotten themselves as much as they thought they
had,’ was the remark of one woman who is still doing her level
best to spend her life for others.\textsuperscript{103}

According to Bigelow, it was now time for women to use the lessons of service developed during
the war and apply those to other causes that would continue to benefit others, namely America’s
children. Articles about mothers and their responsibilities to child welfare and reform were
abundant in 1919 and 1920, not surprising since the war had left many children fatherless and in
poor health. Articles such as “Community Mothering” seemed to set the overall tone of the
magazine’s post-war outlook on women’s roles.\textsuperscript{104}

Discussion about marriage also indicated a heightened level of pre-war/post-war
disconnectedness. In some instances, the frail state of marriage was tied to both the impact of
the war and suffrage. The article “Women and Marriage” by W. L. George warned of the
“superfluous woman”—those who for reasons of war or of politics, i.e., suffrage, would never
marry. The “shortage of males” as a result of war-related deaths had left “an excess of women”
in many countries, including the United States. Superfluous women would likely never find a
man to marry. And suffrage had perhaps created an even greater gap between the sexes,
according to George:
The suffrage propaganda has done much to shatter this attitude. By raising a definite sex issue, by maintaining it in a state of extreme publicity from 1905 to 1918, it has banded together millions of women and to a certain extent banded them together against men . . . It is also likely that women will no longer submit to modern marriage as expressed by our divorce laws.\textsuperscript{105}

George also warned readers of “closer companionship among women . . . [resulting in] an intense sex-loyalty hitherto unknown to them.”\textsuperscript{106} The cultural anxiety expressed in \textit{Good Housekeeping} immediately following World War I had hints of that which had permeated the popular press at the turn of the century, resulting from the political and cultural machinations of the New Woman.

But the issue of suffrage could not be ignored for long. As more states ratified the national suffrage amendment, male politicians rallied to get the inevitable female vote. \textit{Good Housekeeping} published an article in November 1919 entitled “What Women Should Vote For” by Anne Martin that demonstrated the concerns that filled the political air. Looking toward the 1920 elections, the first in which American women as a group would have a political voice, Martin explained the enormous task facing them:

Women voters of America, fifteen million strong, today hold in their hands the fate of parties, the choice of the next President, the future of social and industrial policy of the United States. But without a program this power is nothing; their votes will be frittered away between the parties on issues set up by the politicians themselves. What \textit{is} their program?\textsuperscript{107}
The initial tone of Martin’s question is indicative of *Good Housekeeping’s* general position toward women’s political activities in the period immediately following the Great War. While overtly supportive of women in the public and political spheres, the magazine did not waiver from its long-standing, paternalistic approach of educating women in ways that would not be disruptive to the cultural status quo and the stability of its number one concern, family life. But Martin’s article, perhaps because she was indeed a woman who would soon be voting herself, was comprehensive in the information it provided to women. She was clearly concerned that male politicians would use their long-entrenched political power to persuade women to vote in ways not in their own best interest. Thus her essay provided an excellent overview of the issues that were confronting women at the end of the second decade of the twentieth century: the high cost of living, especially regarding food; the high death-rate of women in childbirth; the lack of governmental support for maternity and infant care; and the need for programs to feed hungry children and laws to ensure women equal pay for equal work and general equality with men.\(^{108}\)

In the aftermath of the war, Martin was perhaps the best example of the politically active new woman who used the pages of a traditional woman’s service magazine, *Good Housekeeping*, to mobilize women toward important causes that directly affected their own quality of life and that of their children. In a lengthy communiqué published in the February 1920 issue, Martin introduced readers to a Congressional bill sponsored by the Children’s Bureau and intended to prevent deaths related to maternity and infancy. Martin sharply laid the foundation for the debate:

> Last year our government spent $47,000,000 to protect farmers against avoidable losses of hogs, corn, and cattle. In the same period it spent, in an effort to prevent the avoidable loss of mothers
and babies, just $47,000,000 less. And we lost 250,000 babies, and nearly 23,000 mothers died in childbirth. Such discrimination in favor of hogs and corn should cease . . . Protection of maternity and infancy by the state is recognized as a principle of government in every great country in the world except our own.\(^{109}\)

Martin’s detailed article included a plea for readers to take a proactive stance and insist that their Congressional leaders pass the Sheppard-Towner Bill for the public protection of maternity and infancy. *Good Housekeeping* readers, both men and women, were asked to fill out and sign a form letter to each of their Senators. The magazine’s goal was to get five million petitions in the hands of Congress by the time of the vote.

The following month, Bigelow wrote a rousing, supportive editorial detailing the magazine’s efforts and informing readers of new developments. This was the new battle he and Wiley had been waiting to wage for some time. Wiley had long been a proponent of reform efforts that would decrease infant mortality rates, derail childhood hunger, and promote better overall family nutrition. As a man who believed in formalizing efforts, Wiley started “The League for Longer Life,” intended to prescribe healthful living through the power of the pen and the vote. The League was situated within the increasingly complex web of the Good Housekeeping Bureau of Foods, Sanitation, and Health, of which Wiley was still the director.

As for Anne Martin, her passion for the maternity and infancy issue was undeniable. She began writing a series of articles for the magazine detailing personal, tragic stories that underscored the need for the Sheppard-Towner legislation and provided readers with dramatic statistics to support her research. In July-August 1920, Martin’s efforts were joined by that of Mary Stewart in “The New Politics,” another detailed article about the recent efforts in Congress
to pass the maternity and infancy protection bill. Stewart had addressed the Senate in person and made “an eloquent and powerful plea for the passage of the bill, pointing her plea with a hint that was equal to a demand.” In response to Stewart, Senator Ransdell acknowledged that the “women of the nation have the power to force the passage of the bill.” The year 1920 was undeniably an important year for American women. Editor Bigelow applauded the final ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment in August, writing a moving, celebratory editorial in the November issue. However, Congress had still not voted upon the Sheppard-Towner Bill, and while prohibition had been passed into law, the anti-prohibitionists were not giving up the fight. Battles had been won, but the wars were not yet over. Bigelow encouraged women, with their newly won rights to support both efforts because their “victory makes this possible--now.”

As 1920 came to a close, *Good Housekeeping* was positioned to keep up its commitment to an ideology of better living, better nutrition, and better housekeeping through the mobilization of its women readers. And for the time being at least, the New Woman, former icon of unabashed consumerism was no longer front and center in the pages of *Good Housekeeping*, having been replaced by the metaphorical, mythologized mother image who was still needed to care for the orphaned children of the world. However, new women--*real women*--now had a legitimate voice in the political functioning of their society, and they had successfully begun to break down forever what historically had seemed to be the impenetrable boundary between the domestic and public spheres. As for Campbell’s Soup, at the end of 1920, they continued to do what they did best--appeal to consumers by acknowledging and supporting the many struggles and successes experienced by middle-class women, as the November ad in *Good Housekeeping* demonstrated (Fig. 43):
Here is the ticket, it’s clear, Which stands for a league of good cheer. For this candidate, I candidly state, I’ll vote every day in the year. The winning ticket--Campbell’s Tomato Soup wins not only on its delicious flavor but on its wholesome quality and healthfulness.\(^{114}\)

Fig. 43. *Good Housekeeping* ad, November 1920.

The illustration in the ad is of what else--the female Campbell Soup Kid, holding a ballot on which she has placed an “x” beside her choice of “tomato.” She is a spirited, active voter voicing her opinion amidst a backdrop of cheering political conventioneers--*or are they simply satisfied American consumers?*
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