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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Before the introduction of the paper garment pattern for homemakers and dressmakers were frequently required to take an old garment apart in order to have a pattern with which to construct a new garment. Other methods used to obtain a pattern included drafting a pattern from body measurements; tracing a small, scaled pattern from a periodical or book and then increasing the size of the tracing to the appropriate scale; draping muslin directly on the body and then using the draped and cut pieces for a pattern. The paper garment pattern, therefore, grew out of a distinct need to make the dressmaking process less time consuming and easier than it had been. Today the homesewer can purchase a graded and stylish pattern with easy-to-read instructions at any fabric store, many department stores, some variety stores and even in some drugstores and grocery stores.

The beginnings of the paper garment pattern industry in America have been considered obscure and have been controversial. Several authors (Post, 1976; Furnas, 1969; Tate and Glisson, 1961) have commented briefly on the
The beginnings of the paper garment pattern industry in America. 

Furnas (1969) stated that standardized paper patterns in graduated sizes were first made from tissue paper by Mme. Ellen Demorest who promoted the patterns in her magazine, *Mme. Demorest's Mirror of Fashions*. Post (1976) alluded to the possibility that Mme. Demorest was the first to present paper patterns to home sewers in America, however, a firm statement was not made. Tate and Glisson (1961), Siciliano (1955), and Simplicity Pattern Company (1975) attributed the beginning of the paper garment pattern industry in America to a New England tailor, Ebenezer Butterick, and his wife, Ellen, in 1863. One question underlying the present research was: Who first made and marketed graded and sized paper garment patterns in America?

The Buttericks were more successful than Mme. Demorest in their pattern making endeavors based on the fact that the Butterick company has continued to manufacture and market patterns to the present time. What happened to Mme. Demorest and her tissue paper pattern interests was not clear. Mme. Demorest's products and services reflected the latest fashion ideas of Europe and New York. Butterick's patterns were a reflection of the current fashions actually in existence in New York.

By the end of the 19th century, several additional pattern companies had been established. McCall Pattern Company began operations in 1870, according to the historical
comments published by the company. Vogue Pattern Company commenced business operations in 1905. By 1927, at least eleven pattern companies had been established, including Advance, Pictorial Review and the New York Pattern Company, which produced private brand patterns with the names of individual retailers on the envelopes (Business Week, 1935). Of the numerous pattern companies in business in the early 20th century, only a few continue to be in business at the present time. What happened to the pattern companies established in the middle to late 1800s and the early 1900s that are not presently in existence? Why did some of the pattern companies prosper and grow while others did not? What contributions did the pattern companies make to the pattern industry and to the consumer? The above questions were prominent factors in determining the focus of the study.

As the pattern companies grew and vied for shares in the sales market, various innovations were instituted to attract customers. In 1920, McCall introduced the printed pattern which greatly increased pattern sales because the printed patterns were easier to use than perforated patterns (Barron's, 1958). On the printed pattern, not only was each pattern piece labelled by name, but there were also printed instructions on each piece and printed construction lines on the pattern pieces. Thus, printed patterns were easier to understand, easier to use and the cut fabric easier to construct accurately than had been the case when the home sewer used perforated patterns.
In the 1920s, well-known dress designers styled patterns for the various companies (Business Week, 1943). Standardization of sizing in commercial patterns boosted sales after 1930. There may have been other less obvious innovations instituted in paper patterns. What were the innovations and how and why did they occur? What types of interaction were there among the pattern companies? What was the influence of that interaction on the pattern companies? What outside influences affected the pattern industry?

**Statement of the Problem**

It was the purpose of the researcher to document the history and development of the paper garment pattern industry in America to the present time, and to relate the growth of the industry to social and economic events and to general technological advancements in other industries. The study was focused on the major pattern companies that produced patterns for general home sewing rather than the limited specialized pattern such as those for making costumes, lingerie or ski wear.

**Justification**

The fabric of the history of the pattern industry had not been tightly woven. Except for a few scattered
statements, little had been reported regarding the history of the pattern industry and how it affected and was affected by prevailing economic conditions. In 1871, just 13 years after beginning production of patterns, the E. Butterick Pattern Company sold six million patterns (Business Week, 1935). In 1946, 120 million patterns were sold by American companies in one year. In 1958, American pattern company sales reached approximately $10-million and by 1970, the pattern industry represented a $150-million market. Department stores and chain stores represented the major distribution sources for most pattern companies through the 1940s (American Fabrics, Summer-Spring, 1956). Other reports in periodicals included such information as 1) the extent to which pattern sales increased during World War II (Business Week, 1943); 2) new sewing courses offered by pattern companies (Business Week, March, 1943); 3) how pattern sales related to yard goods and notion sales in 1943 (Printer's Ink, December, 1944); and 4) how "Jiffy," or super simplified, patterns have affected the industry (Business Week, 1970).

Very little research had been focused on the history of the paper garment pattern industry in America. However, such research would place the important pattern industry in perspective relative to social and economic events. The results of the study would also extend the knowledge of the paper garment pattern industry relative to the technological history of the United States.
The relativity of the paper garment pattern industry to American social and economic patterns had not been examined. The history of the ready-made garment industry and its importance in the social and economic history of the United States has been examined by several authors such as Daves (1967) and Corbin (1970). The history of the textile industry has been surveyed, also (Appleton, 1858; Walton, 1936; White, 1836). The recorded history of the pattern industry in America remained fragmented at best until the present study was undertaken.

Home economists have stated a need for historical studies. Skjelver (1971) asserted that the application of historical methods in all areas of home economics could yield a much needed body of facts which could contribute to the solutions of problems confronting home economists and other professionals concerned about today's families and their environment. Budewig (1964), in a paper presented to the American Home Economics Association (AHEA) annual meeting, urged home economists to use the historical method to increase the body of knowledge so urgently needed to strengthen the field of home economics in the academic world.

Troutman (1977) has been working on a problem to document the existence of historical records regarding American drafting methods and technology for the period 1607 to 1908. She urged others to preserve these and other historical records.
A preliminary report of the Home Economics Research Assessment Planning Projection (1977) included the statement that "to describe historic textiles and costume accurately and to relate characteristics of production, distribution, technical processes and artistic expression to characteristics of the producing groups" should be an objective of future home economics research.

In 1970, the Association of Administrators of Home Economics, in the study National Goals and Guidelines for Research in Home Economics, stated one of the research areas needing more intensive investigation was "Cultural, historical and geographic factors affecting clothing modes." The question of pattern industry impact on clothing modes remained unanswered.

Interest in all aspects of American history--economic, political, business and social--increased as the country celebrated the bicentennial year in 1976. In recent years, the interest in women's studies and in the pursuits of women has grown. The increased attention given to American history and women's studies gives the present study additional importance.

Objectives

The objectives in the study of the paper garment pattern industry were as follows:
1. To trace and document the history of the industry and to identify related social, economic and technological events.

2. To examine the internal and external, vertical and horizontal growth of individual companies within the industry, that is growth within companies through expansion, or growth through external expansion or acquisition of similar, related or non-related businesses.

Limitations

The limitations of the study were in the areas of resources and time period covered by the study. The limitations were:

1. Incomplete or missing business records of existing pattern companies and for pattern companies no longer in existence.

2. Destruction of correspondence, catalogs and patterns due to improper storage and natural disasters.

3. Lack of concern by the existing pattern companies for individual company history, leading to the conclusion that some records may exist but their whereabouts are unknown.

4. A time expanse so great, 1863 to 1976, that details regarding personalities in the industry and the impact of related industries could not be pursued in depth.
Organization of Presentation

Chapter II of the present study describes the discovery methods or procedure utilized in completing the study. The remainder of the study is organized to trace and document the history of the pattern industry, as discovered in the course of the research. The findings of the research are recorded in five chapters: early pattern history, a discussion of Demorest vs Butterick as developers of sized patterns, the development of graded and sized patterns in America by Ebenezer Butterick, early Butterick competitors and the establishment of additional pattern companies in the 20th century. The findings in each of the five chapters are arranged chronologically. For ease of reference, a chronology is presented in Appendix A. The final chapter includes a summary and the researcher's observations and conclusions based on the findings in the study.
CHAPTER II
DISCOVERY METHODS

Based on an intensive search of the literature and discussions with various people in universities and the homesewing industry, the researcher found that very little had been written regarding the pattern industry. Only a few scattered comments existed and there was no continuity regarding the history of the industry. The present study was designed to provide a record of the events and developments in the history of the paper pattern industry. Such a record would increase historical knowledge of the industry and provide a means of examining the pattern industry in a broad context, within the technological, social, economic and political history of the United States.

A library search of available references and documents provided the researcher with an inventory of possible resources in Washington, D.C., New York City, and other areas in the Northeast. Therefore, a plan was developed for 1) an exploratory trip for preliminary examination of primary resources--documents and artifacts--and secondary sources, and 2) a second trip for an intensive investigation of the resources. Data were collected on Burroughs Unisort cards.
Exploratory Trip to Identify Resources

Prior to the first trip, contacts and appointments were made where the researcher's investigation demonstrated materials might be available. Letters and phone calls were sometimes, in and of themselves, productive in establishing the type and depth of materials held by a company or institution. When the exploratory trip was made, necessary contacts were established with personnel in existing pattern companies to collect data. Data were collected in Washington, D.C. and New York City and, in Massachusetts, in Boston-Cambridge, Sterling, Worcester and Fitchburg. During the exploratory trip, Albany, New York and Sturbridge Village were visited, also.

The Warshaw Collection at the Smithsonian Institution, in Washington, D.C., contained numerous patterns dating from the late 1800s. Pattern envelopes, pattern pieces and instructions of any sort were examined and notes were made regarding any dates indicating when the pattern might have been issued. Patent information, the extent of cutting instructions, and finishing directions were noted. Pattern envelope dimensions were taken. Information regarding markings and notches on pattern pieces was noted, such as whether pattern pieces exhibited printed construction markings or perforated construction marks, and how extensive the markings were. Sizes of patterns and measurement criteria used for determining pattern size were noted. Any additional
information given was observed, such as fabric and trim suggestions, yards of fabric required in particular widths in given sizes.

Various pattern company publications were examined, such as magazines and fashion sheets. Since the number of magazines or fashion sheets available in the Warshaw Collection was limited, all of them were examined with regard to the following: dimensions, number of pages, editorial format and type and placement of advertising. Display techniques with regard to pattern fashions were observed in detail, such as: whether representations of patterns or styles were drawn or photographed, how many styles were displayed on a page, how large the representative drawings or photographs were. Information regarding the copy used when pattern styles were displayed in catalogs was studied and the following questions asked: Was a garment name given? Was the garment described and in how much detail? Was the price of that pattern given? Were yards of fabric and trim, needed by a customer, given? Was there a list of sizes in which that pattern was made? What other information was given on pages portraying pattern styles?

From the above information, ideas could be formulated and supported regarding how patterns and publications displaying patterns changed over time. Changes in company policy could be observed and evaluated through publications. Technological change could be observed by examining changes in pattern pieces, envelopes and instruction information.
The Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., provided a wealth of information during the first and second trips. A stack pass was obtained which allowed the researcher to go into the library stacks and take books from the shelves, one by one, and examine tables of contents and indexes for pertinent information. During the first trip, pattern drafting books, sewing instruction books and pamphlets and other publications were searched for any comments regarding patterns, or the pattern companies and the establishment and development thereof. The existence in the Library of pattern company home catalogs and counter catalogs was ascertained. The Library of Congress also held copies of many periodicals published by pattern companies as well as other fashion journals. A search of many catalogs and periodicals was planned for the second trip to Washington.

In New York, appointments with pattern company personnel were confirmed. During the first New York trip, attempts to get into existing pattern companies to see archival materials or company records were somewhat frustrated. Personnel with whom the researcher had corresponded were reluctant to take responsibility for allowing a researcher to see records whose confidentiality was uncertain. The first trip was essentially non-productive with regard to the pattern companies. Contact was made with a public relations representative of the American Home Sewing Association. She made some contacts with top
management people in the pattern companies to try to help the researcher get to materials held by the pattern companies.

The Boston-Cambridge, Massachusetts, area was replete with materials. The R. G. Dun Company ledgers, held by the Baker Library at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, contained extensive information about early Butterick Company business, how it was formed and capitalized and the struggles experienced in early years. The ledgers, in themselves interesting, and the information contained in them will be discussed in later chapters.

Sterling, Massachusetts, where Ebenezer Butterick and Ellen Butterick and Butterick's partners, Abner Pollard and Jones Wilder, were born and reared was visited. The Sterling Historical Society was helpful in providing background information regarding the founders of the Butterick Company. The Society also owned some of the first Butterick patterns which were examined and photographed. A direct descendant of the Buttericks made herself available and some oral history was gathered from her statements.

In Fitchburg, Massachusetts, the Fitchburg Historical Society was able to provide copies of some articles from the local newspapers which were of interest. Since Ebenezer Butterick had been a tailor and later a producer of paper patterns in Fitchburg, he was mentioned
in several histories of the area. Fitchburg and Sterling are within 30 miles of each other, and were rich sources of historical information.

The time between the first and second trips was used to assess data recently collected, to determine data which were needed and the most efficient way to obtain it, based on knowledge gained during the first trip. Additional contacts were made with personnel in libraries and museums and with personnel in the pattern industry. Appointments made during the first trip were confirmed and some additional appointments were arranged.

Second Trip: Washington and New York

Much of the time in Washington was spent in the Library of Congress in the stacks looking at pattern company home catalogs, counter catalogs and other pattern company publications. Notations were made regarding the catalogs and the information contained in them which might signal changes in the particular pattern company with regard to policy or technology. Such elements were noted as changes in format, announcements of changes in various aspects of patterns, changes in presentation of pattern styles and changes in information regarding the patterns.

Pattern company publications, other than catalogs, proved interesting. Many of the publications were
general women's magazines or tabloids containing copy of general interest to women. Changes in company policy and corporate structure were observed through the women's magazines and tabloids published by a company. Industry changes could be seen through comparisons of the publications examined. In women's magazines, announcement of mergers of companies or of changes in ownership were often made.

The Census Bureau was contacted but due to the Bureau's attempt to protect individual privacy, information which might have been useful will not be made public for some years to come. A visit to the Securities and Exchange Commission yielded a small amount of information about one of the pattern companies. A limited amount of information was obtained from the United States Patent Office in Washington.

Visits to the pattern companies still in existence, whose corporate offices were located in New York, were very fruitful. By the time the researcher had reached New York for the second trip, letters had been written and contacts made by various individuals and organizations interested in the research effort, in which the pattern companies were asked to aid the researcher in whatever ways possible. Also, it appeared to the researcher that informal communications within the industry had taken place indicating that the researcher was, in fact, working
on a serious study. Therefore, gaining access to some company records seemed easier than it had been previously.

Through examination of company records, the changes in corporate structures and policies could be seen more easily than through the indirect methods of looking at patterns and publications which had been generated by the companies. Therefore, company records of all sorts were examined in detail. However, as mentioned in Chapter I, "Limitations," one of the problems was that in many instances existing pattern companies have not believed it necessary to preserve records which might have been helpful. The Butterick Company, in the Butterick Archives, has preserved documents and artifacts pertaining to the Butterick Company in particular and to some of the other pattern companies in general. There was frequently a paucity of records at other companies. What did exist, in all instances, was noted and studied in detail.

Several pattern company executives and employees were interviewed at length. Many of the interviewees had been with a given company or in the industry for many years. Industry gossip often led the researcher in a productive search for facts regarding a particular question.

The presentation of the data and the analysis are combined in a descriptive manner. Whatever interpretation was deemed necessary has been included on a continuing basis within the chapters. The following chapters are historically chronological in disposition, and data
fulfilling the objectives are presented on a continuing basis throughout the five chapters.

**Analysis of Data**

The data were recorded on Burroughs Unisort cards. Categories were determined and the cards were punched so that specific information could be retrieved using the Unisort card pic. The cards were filed by date; therefore, data could be retrieved by date and by category.

Data were analyzed so that individual pattern companies could be examined and the facts regarding the companies interrelated. The interrelated data concerning individual pattern companies provided a basis for statements pertaining to the pattern industry. In addition, data concerning individual pattern companies and the pattern industry were correlated to economic, political and social conditions in America. The researcher drew on her strong background in history and in textiles and clothing, to aid in the analysis of the data.

The data were subjected to external and internal criticism. External criticism helped the researcher determine the authenticity of the evidence. Internal criticism was employed to establish the credibility of the evidence.
CHAPTER III

GARMENT PATTERNS: SLATE TO WOOD
AND WOOD TO PAPER

All systems of Garment Cutting are reducible to two classes, namely, Pattern
and Scale Systems [italics in the original]. Pattern plans, as far as I am informed are
never used by the Professional Tailor [italics in the original]. The reason
is obvious - inferiority.

Cummins, 1876, back cover

An unknown French explorer has been credited with
being the first to discover records of a pattern for use
in making clothing. The records, found in Roman catacombs,
dated from the 12th century. The patterns, according to
two writers (Loiselle, 1938; Butterick Archives, "Romance
of the Dress Pattern"), were first made by cloistered monks
and consisted of only two pieces, a sleeve and a piece
from which identical front and back pieces were cut. Most
garments during and before the 12th century were roughly
cut from rectangular sheets and blankets, belted with a
cord. One size fit all, or one size really fit no one very
well, for garments were primarily to cover the body. For
most men and women, style and fashion were not important.
Paper was practically unknown and parchment was far too costly for anything but the most important documents during the 12th century. Patterns, therefore, were made of irregularly wrought pieces of slate and were hung on the dark walls of the catacombs for safe keeping (Butterick Archives, "The Romance of the Dress Pattern"). Tools were few and methods of making garments were rough and undeveloped. Therefore, little change occurred in pattern construction until the mid-13th century.

In the late 12th and early 13th century, church vestments began to change. As church vestments changed, the garments of the common man began to change also. No one cut or color of garment was the rule as it had been in the past.

A French master tailor, Charles Daillac, in the mid to late 13th century, conceived the idea of making parts of his patterns from thin wood. Since styles changed only every 50 years or so, and construction remained the same, Daillac believed the wood pattern pieces would save time in the making of garments. The Tailors' Guilds fought the introduction of the thin wood pattern pieces fearing that general knowledge of trade secrets would lessen the importance of their trade (Butterick Archives, "The Romance of the Dress Pattern").

Marcel Tassin, Master Tailor, became tailor to the English captive king of France, Jean LeBon. Tassin's
sole duty consisted of keeping the king attired as the
grandest and most fashionably dressed person anywhere.
Hearing of Daillac's idea, Tassin made patterns of heavy
cardboard for the types of garments the king wore most often.
Tassin believed that a well constructed pattern would help
in the production of a well-made garment. Tassin went to
France with King Jean when the king was released. After a
dispute with the guilds of France was settled, the use of
the cardboard patterns was tolerated (Loiselle, 1938).

Toward the end of the 13th century, the structure
of both men's and women's clothing became more complicated
than it had been previously. Fashion changed with increas­
ing frequency. The growing middle class of Europe seemed
determined to spend new riches on clothes.

The art of garment making was raised to new levels
with the making and keeping of pattern pieces. The idea
 gained approval and by the end of the 14th century dress­
makers and tailors had sets of patterns (Loiselle, 1938).

With the coming of the 15th century, an increasing
interest in fashion developed. Various necklines were
introduced while sleeves also gained in importance. For
men, tights had been perfected. For the ladies, skirts
became so long that often they had to be carried over the
arm; trains were the mode by the late 1400s. Small waists
were in vogue; therefore, corsets were developed. By the
time of the Renaissance, the sleeves, bodices and skirts of
garments had become so well-defined that tailors and
dressmakers were fitting garments to the individual. The
use of wooden or cardboard pattern pieces continued for the
basic design of a garment, with detailed fitting being done
after the basic garment pieces were cut.

By the end of the 14th century, various fashion
publications began to appear. A Swiss painter, Jesse Amman,
began publishing a fashion journal in Frankfort, which was
written in Latin. The French paper *Les Modes de la Cour
de France* appeared soon thereafter. English journals sub­
sequently appeared (McCall Pattern Company, "A History of
Patterns," N.D.).

Various tailors contributed to the further develop­
ment of patterns and pattern design during the 16th and 17th
century as the structure of garments became increasingly
sophisticated. An unknown Parisian tailor wrote a book
describing various methods of planning and calculating a
given design. This book and others provided accurate
details not heretofore available. Such works became a
guide for many garment makers (McCall Pattern Company, "A
History of Patterns," N.D.).

The increasing availability of tailor's and dress­
maker's paper pattern shapes diminished the importance of
garment makers' trade secrets. In England, the patterns
had been so important to the garment makers that they were
referred to as "Gods." Patterns were mentioned in wills as
a legacy to sons.
Through the end of the 18th century the skill of an experienced and good dressmaker or tailor was needed for two distinct purposes: 1) forming pieces for a garment, and 2) joining the garment pieces. As fashions became more complex, the task of dressmaking or tailoring became more complex. The problems of the dressmaker were amplified by changing fashion, the changing size of customers, constantly changing types of corsets and the non-symmetrical human form (Godey's, April, 1854). By the early 19th century men's suit coats were sculptural forms created more by cut than the drape of the textile. A gentleman's figure was more a product of the tailor's art than his parents' genes (Kidwell, 1979).

New sewing techniques and tools were needed by the beginning of the 19th century for several reasons. An increasing number of people wanted "city" clothes but could not afford the services of a professional garment maker. The creation of closely fitted garments meant that additional time and skill were needed to produce a garment and, therefore, the cost of an individual garment was increased. Pressure existed to keep prices down so that a growing population could afford to purchase the newest fashions. The pressure to keep the prices down for custom made clothes was especially strong in America.

The inch-tape measure, developed some time in the early 19th century was, at that point in time, perhaps the
single most important contribution in the development of the entire garment making industry, as well as the pattern industry. Prior to the inch-tape measure, a tailor or dressmaker used a narrow strip of paper on which notations were made. Notches were made along the edges of the tape for each measurement needed in the making of a suit. The tapes were then initialled and kept to aid in the making of future garments for the customer (Kidwell and Christman, 1974).

About the same time as the introduction of the inch-tape measure, various drafting systems began to be developed. The increasingly sophisticated drafting systems paved the way for graded and sized paper garment patterns. The drafting systems, as they were developed in the 19th century, were generally too complex for most amateur sewers.

The invention of the sewing machine, in the early to middle 1800s provided additional thrust for a less complicated method to join the shapes and sizes of pieces required for making a fashionable garment. Barthelemy Thimonier, a French tailor, developed the first mechanical sewing device for commercial operation in 1830. Walter Hunt developed the first American made sewing machine sometime between 1932 and 1934; however, many historians give Elias Howe, Jr., credit for inventing the first practical sewing machines in the 1840s. It was Issac M. Singer who invented the sewing machine, in 1850, that later came into
common use in homes throughout the United States (Cooper, 1968).

Garment makers still needed a less complicated way to obtain the basic pieces required to make a garment. Godey's Magazine of April, 1854, stated "if some ingenious Singer would invent a machine that would cut and fit our... dresses...the agony of weeks would be over in a few days."

The early drafting systems in America were called proportional systems. The systems based on the proportional method assumed that by using only the measurement of a particular part of the body, such as the breast or chest measurement, it was possible to predict all other measurements. Various systems used various measurements as the critical one. A great stride forward was made when it was recognized that a person's breadth was not necessarily directly related to height or that chest circumference was not directly related to hip circumference (Kidwell, 1978).

Direct measure drafting systems were based on measurements taken directly from the body and applied to the drafting of a pattern. Hybrid drafting systems, destined to become the most complex, used both proportional and direct measure methods. A drafting system continued to be sought which could be easily learned and was accurate.

Numerous drafting tools were developed which would later be helpful in the drafting of graded and sized patterns. Meanwhile, the new drafting tools helped in implementing the new drafting systems. Many women were
anxious to learn to use the drafting tools and the new drafting systems. Successful dressmaking was one of the few paths to dignified economic independence for women.

In America during the early 19th century, miniature pattern diagrams appeared in some fashion magazines, such as Peterson’s and Godey's Magazine, but the patterns had to be traced, enlarged to scale and then scaled up or down to fit the user. In the mid-1800s, full sized patterns, with the pieces overlapping each other, were printed on oversized paper, folded and put into some of the popular ladies' magazines and fashion journals (Plate I). These patterns, too, had to be traced and then fitted to the user. One size fit all. To complicate matters further, frequently the outlines of several patterns were superimposed one over the other, each pattern to be traced being engraved with a different style of line (Plate II). Unsized patterns and various drafting systems existed together for several decades throughout the early to middle 1800s.
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Plate I

Unsized Pattern for One Garment
With Pieces Overlapping
Plate II

Unsized Patterns for Three Garments:
Jacket, Cape and Skirt
CHAPTER IV

DEMOREST vs BUTTERICK: FROM UNSIZED PATTERNS TO SIZED PATTERNS

The encyclopedias I have consulted... both state that Ebenezer Butterick was the inventor of the paper pattern and that his pattern business was launched in 1863. Encyclopedias frequently print errors; in years of research on many subjects I have listed some 100 errors in the Columbia [University Encyclopedia], and more than that in the Britannica, so this does not surprise me--although it does complicate things. "Madame Demorest's Patterns" were definitely placed on the market in the Fall of 1860. [sic]

Unpublished letter of Herma Briffault, researcher for William J. Demorest, grandson of William Jennings Demorest

William Jennings Demorest was a widower with two children when he met and then married Ellen Louise Curtis in 1858. At the time of his marriage he was in business in Philadelphia, having just experienced bankruptcy in New York as a dry goods merchant. It was Ellen Demorest, watching her maid cut out a dress from a crude brown-paper pattern, who conceived the idea for making accurate, mass produced patterns to be used by home sewers. William Demorest began promoting the idea. The family moved back to New York and the Demorests began to manufacture and distribute tissue
paper patterns (Edwards, 1884). The first issue of the quarterly magazine *Mme. Demorest's Mirror of Fashions* appeared in the Fall of 1860 with a pattern inserted in each issue. Under the name "Madam Demorest," Ellen Demorest established her Emporium of Fashions on Broadway in New York. The Emporium of Fashions was engaged primarily in dressmaking and millinery, but the operations were eventually extended to include a variety of fashion and dressmaking related dry goods (Warshaw Collection, Trade Cards).

The pattern business started by the Demorests remained one of the most important enterprises under the roof of the Emporium of Fashions. The Fall 1861 issue of *Mme. Demorest's Mirror of Fashions* contained advertisements for many types of unsized patterns and also for the Demorest drafting system, which was probably a hybrid system. Three years later, in 1864, virtually the same advertisements appeared, with the addition of an advertisement noting the availability of patterns cut to measure. Readers were advised that if they sent the cost of the pattern--20 cents to 25 cents--with three measurements--circumference of bust, waist and the under arm length--a pattern could be custom cut to fit their figures.

Meanwhile, Ebenezer Butterick, in 1863, had begun to mass produce graded and sized patterns. (Butterick and his business are to be discussed extensively in the following
chapter.) At the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia, both Demorest and Butterick exhibited sized patterns (Butterick Archives, "Butterick Company and the 1876 Centennial Exhibit," N.D.). There is no solid evidence as to when the Demorests began to produce sized patterns instead of unsized and custom cut patterns, but there seems to be no doubt that it was sometime after Butterick began selling his patterns. This researcher has seen no evidence that the Demorests were producing graded and sized patterns before Ebenezer Butterick. The Demorests were mass producing unsized, or one-size-fits-all patterns, before Butterick began making his graded and sized patterns. The Demorests were not only producing unsized patterns, but also patterns custom cut to fit individual customers. Other tailors, dressmakers and promoters of specific drafting systems were also selling unsized patterns and custom cut patterns. The practice continued for several years even after the graded and sized Butterick patterns were available.
CHAPTER V

EBENEZER BUTTERICK: TAILOR TO ENTREPRENEUR

ALWAYS use a professional pattern.
Very few home dressmakers are expert
enough to make their own.
Corderoy, 1966, back cover

Like many inventors of drafting systems, Ebenezer
Butterick was a tailor by training and trade. Born May 29,
1926, Ebenezer Butterick began as a youth to be an appren-
tice tailor in Worcester, Massachusetts, not far from his
home at Sterling, Massachusetts. There is some disagree-
ment as to whether or not Ebenezer followed his father in
the tailoring business. A comment in an R. G. Dun and Com-
pany Ledger made reference that the Butterick family was in
the ready-to-wear clothing and tailoring business and that
Ebenezer was "bred to the business" (R. G. Dun Ledgers,
Vol. 1, p. 421). However, local histories (Crane, 1907;
Worcester Sunday Telegram, January 15, 1967) claim that
Ebenezer's father was a farmer and a carpenter.

Local narratives also state that at the urging of
his brother, Francis, a butcher, Ebenezer moved to Fitchburg,
Massachusetts, about 30 miles from Sterling, Massachusetts,
and opened a small tailor shop in 1858 (Kirkpatrick, 1971).
According to R. G. Dun and Company ledgers (Vol. 1, p. 421), sometime after May, 1857, Ebenezer moved from Sterling to Leominster, for he intended to go into the clothing and tailoring business with George A. Pollard in a firm to be called "Pollard and Butterick."

A report appeared in the Dun ledger that on February 12, 1858, before Pollard and Butterick could merge their efforts and interests, the sheriff closed Butterick's tailoring establishment on a claim of about $1,000 which Butterick could not pay (Vol. 1, p. 421). A later entry suggests that perhaps the money was owed to George Pollard's father, Ami Pollard. An entry dated September 10, 1859, declares that Ami Pollard took Butterick's stock (probably meaning Butterick's inventory of goods) for what was owed him. Ami Pollard was said to be worth money. The reporter for R. G. Dun and Company speculated that Ami Pollard would have George Pollard run the business. However, the February 6, 1860, entry noted that Ami Pollard sold the stock he had taken from Ebenezer Butterick to Abner W. Pollard, another son, though Abner was said to have no capital. Ami Pollard took a mortgage in return for the stock. At the time, Abner Pollard was only 24 years old and the Dun report said of Abner "... consider him a rather fast young man, would not trust without good security" (Vol. 1, p. 428). The March 12, 1865, R. G. Dun ledger entry included a statement about Abner Pollard and his business "...doing good
business but upon borrowed capital--recently married" (Vol. 412, p. 128).

Both the Pollard family and the Butterick family made their homes in Sterling, Massachusetts. According to descendants of Ebenezer Butterick (Personal interview with Ruhamah Gaw, April 17, 1978), Ebenezer was a friend of both George and Abner Pollard during their school days in Sterling. It is also a fact that Ebenezer Butterick's wife, Ellen, was Ami Pollard's daughter, her maiden name having been Ellen Augusta Pollard.

In following Ebenezer Butterick and his attempts to do well in the tailoring business, the R. G. Dun and Company ledgers indicate that in April, 1862, Butterick set up a tailoring business in Fitchburg and used his brother's name, I. S. Butterick (Vol. 1, p. 159). The entry notes that Ebenezer had little or no capital since he had failed in a business a few years previous to the time of the entry. There is no notation as to which of Ebenezer's businesses failed, only that he compromised with his creditors at 50 cents on a dollar. The credit reporter advised potential creditors to use "much caution" in allowing credit. A January, 1863, entry indicates that Butterick was still in business "but not supposed to be worth much money."

In March, 1863, the Dun ledger indicates that Ebenezer's business had somehow been taken over by one of the Pollards and a man named Marshall. Perhaps Ebenezer Butterick sold
his business in order to devote his time to the making of patterns.

According to an unpublished biography held by the Sterling Historical Society (N. D.), in June, 1863, Butterick announced that he intended to make graded and sized patterns which could be used by tailors and home sewers. An abundance of whimsical stories have grown up concerning how Butterick came up with the idea of making patterns. One such story suggests that Butterick's wife, Ellen, was cutting either a child's dress or a shirt for Ebenezer, on the dining table, when she suggested to her husband that her job would be so much easier if she only had a pattern to use. It is probable that Butterick, in his trade as a tailor, was quite familiar with the use of various master patterns and also with several types of drafting systems. It would not have been difficult for Butterick to use the knowledge to produce his first graded patterns. In fact, it was not uncommon for a tailor to cut a pattern to fit a customer and then if the customer could not afford to have the tailor make his or her apparel, the customer would pay only for the pattern. Experimental cutting of patterns which resulted from Ebenezer's idea was done in Sterling. The first patterns, a set of graded shirt patterns, were cut from stiff brown paper and placed on the market. The patterns were an immediate success. They were inexpensive, easy to use, and could be used over and over. The Buttericks returned to Fitchburg later in
1863 seeking bigger and better manufacturing and distribution facilities. The Buttericks took a home in Fitchburg, at 41 Grove Street. Patterns were cut and folded by the family in the sitting room (Crane, 1907).

Again, popular folklore indicated that it was Ellen Butterick who suggested that mothers would benefit from having patterns for children's clothes. Ebenezer, taking his wife's suggestion, designed a Garibaldi suit for young boys which was attractive and easily made at home. Giuseppe Garibaldi was, at the time, an international war hero. The patterns for Garibaldi suits were created to look like the uniforms worn by Garibaldi and his men. Ebenezer's nephew, Clarence Butterick, age four years, was the model and furnished the first measurements for the new patterns for children (Kirkpatrick, 1971).

The success of the shirt patterns and the Garibaldi suit patterns was so great that the Buttericks, looking for additional manufacturing and distribution space, moved their business operations to an unoccupied school building in Fitchburg. A number of family members were employed in the making of the popular new patterns (Crane, 1907).

Only the first few patterns produced by Butterick were of stiff brown paper. Almost immediately, patterns were cut from tissue paper which could be folded easily by the producer and then unfolded easily by the purchaser. The early patterns were notched or perforated to indicate construction details. Sometimes, depending on the
complexity of the pattern, it appears that the patterns were both notched and perforated, but sparingly. The pattern pieces were cut by hand and then folded together by hand. There were no envelopes in which to insert the pattern pieces. There was no picture of the garment included with the pattern pieces. There were no guides indicating how the pattern pieces might be economically laid on the fabric. Indeed, in many cases, it appears that scarcely even enough pattern pieces were included, for no pieces were given for facings and, sometimes, pockets. Ideas for trim and attaching it came from the seamstress using the pattern. Directions for construction of the garment were meager--sometimes only three or four sentences. The instructions, printed on a stiff piece of paper measuring approximately three and three-quarters inches square, were lightly glued onto the outside pattern piece.

The patterns were first sold door-to-door by Mr. A. L. Howard who was the first traveling salesman for Butterick (Wilkins, 1967). In 1864, Jones W. Wilder, a friend of Butterick's, began selling Butterick patterns. An entry in an account book of Wilder's, dated February 28, 1864, reads "Monday. This day I commenced travelling [sic] for Ebenezer Butterick." The day must have been successful for Mr. Wilder purchased that day, among other things, a pint of gin and a new whip (Butterick Archives, Wilder account book).
Patterns were boxed, 100 patterns per box, and sent to dry goods stores and the like, on request and after payment for the order was made. The first box of 100 patterns was purchased by James Tuttle and Company of South Acton, Massachusetts, for $10, about August 17, 1863. Ebenezer Butterick kept the $10 bank note received for the patterns. The note is held by the Sterling Historical Society.

Various sources differ as to the exact time Ebenezer Butterick moved to New York. His patterns had already been introduced in New York and had been successful. It was apparent that the business needed a metropolitan base. In late 1863 or early 1864, Butterick moved to New York. Sometime in 1864, Ebenezer's brother-in-law, Abner W. Pollard, joined Ebenezer in New York and lived with him in the back of the shop at 192 Broadway (Sterling Historical Society, Butterick papers). Butterick was not listed in the 1863/1864 Wilson's Business Directory of New York. He was listed in the 1865/1866 directory under the heading "Fashions, Reporters of." The listing described Butterick and his business as follows: "Butterick Ebenezer, patterns and fashions for gents', youths' and children's clothing at wholesale and retail, 192 B'rdway" [sic]. The patterns were still being produced in Sterling and shipped to New York for distribution and sale. In the back room of his New York office at 192 Broadway, Ebenezer slept on a bed of his own invention which folded up against the wall. During
the day the same back room served as a workshop and store room. The front room was where customers bought patterns (Sterling Historical Society, Butterick papers).

The year 1864 was important for Butterick patterns. Butterick produced the first fashion plate, albeit a small one, showing models of some of the children's patterns available at that time. Charles Currier, also from Massachusetts, lithographed the first Butterick posters in 1864. The posters were sold by mail order to Butterick customers (Butterick Archives, Posters).

The Civil War undoubtedly had its affect on Ebenezer Butterick's pattern business. New fabrics were scarce as were ready-made clothes. Women were looking for inexpensive and easy ways to clothe their families. With a paper pattern that could be used over and over, time ordinarily used in drafting a pattern was eliminated. Because Butterick patterns were sized, there was usually little need to spend time and materials in sizing a "one size fits all" pattern or in enlarging a small scaled pattern. If fabric was short due to war-time needs, a skirt could be cut with a little less fullness.

Men fighting for a particular cause needed and desired uniforms for identity. With the Civil War came, for the first time in America, clothes (uniforms) cut in standard sizes. Standard sizing in uniforms led to standard sizes in other men's ready-to-wear clothing, with
the government, in conjunction with the ready-to-wear producers, setting national standards for the sizing.

The availability and use of sewing machines in private homes increased steadily. The use of the sewing machine increased the use of patterns and vice versa.

On December 7, 1865, Butterick manufacturing operations and family members formerly living in Fitchburg were moved to Brooklyn; the office in New York City was retained for sales. Some friends and relatives, mostly women employed in the manufacturing of the patterns, moved to Brooklyn in December, 1865. Local Sterling oral history indicated that many of the women did not like Brooklyn or New York and soon returned to the Sterling/Fitchburg area (Personal interview with Ruhamah Gaw, April 17, 1978).

An R. G. Dun and Company credit reporter in the New York area made a ledger entry dated March 25, 1866, that classified Ebenezer Butterick as a fashion reporter. According to Butterick's own statements, he was 39 years old at the time, married, a tailor by trade and had been in business for 15 years. Butterick stated that he had started his pattern business with $7,000, and in 1866, had $6,000 in capital "clear of all liabilities" (Vol. 412, p. 124). The credit reporter stated that outside sources had vouched for Butterick saying that he was reliable, trustworthy and paid his bills promptly.

Another Dun Company entry dated March 4, 1867, reports that Butterick had stated that he asked for no
credit and paid cash for everything he bought. The credit reporter wrote in the ledger that Butterick "does very small business and has but very small means and has to travel through the country to sell his fashions" (Vol. 412, p. 124). The ledger entry continued to identify Butterick as a "fashion reporter."

Volumes of Wilson's Business Directory of New York City for the period 1863 through 1868, indicate that there were several persons who made and sold dress patterns during the period. However, the names remained in the directories for only two or three years. A search was made to discover exactly what type of business was carried on by the persons listed. No important information was discovered. Butterick was listed at various times, under several different headings, such as "Fashion Reporter" and "patterns of the Fashions."

On July 1, 1867, Ebenezer Butterick, Jones W. Wilder and Abner W. Pollard, all boyhood friends, signed a co-partnership agreement which brought their individual talents together in the pattern business. The firm was named E. Butterick and Company. According to the articles of the agreement, the men were "in the business of Fashion Reporters and Pattern Manufacturers." The co-partnership was designated to be of five years and ten months duration with renewal possible. Butterick contributed to the business "all his patterns, books and book accounts, furniture and tools used in his business." Butterick was
paid for the above named contributions and also for the
good will he had already contributed to the business.
Other than the above mentioned payments, the profits were
thereafter to be divided equally among the three partners
(Butterick Archives, Co-partnership agreement).

Business was brisk in the late 1860s and early
1870s for the new company which had been formed and moved
to larger quarters at 589 Broadway, with Ebenezer Butterick
as President, Jones Wilder as general agent and Abner
Pollard as secretary. Wilder, trained in law and a highly
motivated, energetic man, had taken a patent in 1866 on
a spring device probably used in the stapling or perfor-
ating of the early Butterick patterns (U.S. Patent No.
57,647, August 28, 1866). It appears that Wilder was the
most energetic of the three partners and was constantly
pushing the company towards expansion. It was Wilder who
was responsible for the company's turn from men's and
children's fashions to women's fashions; he predicted
there would be more money in the producing of patterns
which featured women's clothes. It was also Wilder who
suggested the establishment of the Metropolitan Monthly
magazine (Butterick Archives, Changes in Butterick manage-
ment).

Not only was Wilder traveling and selling patterns
to every store he could, but the Butterick company sought
agents in every far-flung corner of the country. A letter,
with the date 1867 penciled on the top margin existed in the Butterick Archives, and solicited "good, live" agents to sell Butterick patterns. The letter additionally stated that "over 1,500 different kinds and sizes of patterns" were being cut. According to the letter, the following terms were stipulated for potential agents: no agent could sell or duplicate the patterns, and in the future anyone who copied Butterick patterns was to be prosecuted; selections of patterns would be put together for less than $10 and those only for places of less than 3,000 inhabitants; agents' contracts were for one year, to be renewed if the agent did a good business; patterns were sold to agents at two-fifths of the retail price; patterns which agents had on hand that were considered undesirable could be exchanged and credit given to the agent equal to one-half of the original wholesale cost. Agents were advised to order and reorder patterns by number rather than by name or description since "There are so many patterns of similar shapes, that it is impossible to find names for all, and not confound them." The letter also comments on the availability of publications from Butterick, such as the "Ladies' Reports," the "Boys' Report" and so on (Butterick Archives, Advertisement for Agents). Since other publications were not mentioned, this writer believes the letter was indited before 1868. The large agencies, those having showrooms for patterns, were called Fashion Bazaars by the Butterick Company.
Only five years after the first pattern was conceived, E. Butterick and Company, at Jones Wilder's urging, began publication of Metropolitan Monthly in July, 1868. The Metropolitan Monthly was established to spread fashion news and increase consumer demand. The magazine was first distributed through the Fashion Bazaars located in various towns and cities. Later, the publication was also circulated by mail.

Butterick patterns had changed little since their inception. In 1870, patterns were still not contained in envelopes. The pattern pieces were simply folded together in a small package and then the pieces pinned or stapled together. The tissue pattern pieces were notched and perforated. Directions for cutting, construction and finishing continued to be quite brief, four to six sentences. The directions were printed on a piece of tissue paper or slightly heavier brown paper and sometimes included a drawing of the garment. Other information given on the small label included the name of the garment, the pattern number, the price of the pattern and, sometimes, the amount of fabric needed for a given size.

Brief sewing lessons were included in the Metropolitan Monthly. Extensive directions, with drawings, were included regarding how body measurements should be taken so that correct pattern size could be ascertained. The emphasis placed on body measurements indicates that selection of proper pattern size was somewhat problematic for many women.
Despite the devastating results of the Civil War and the anguish of Reconstruction, E. Butterick and Company prospered with patterns and publications. The *Buffalo Daily Courier*, March 18, 1869, stated that Butterick patterns were a solution to some of the perceived social ills of the time stating

> Here at Butterick’s 589 Broadway location has been solved one of the grave social problems which was tending toward a dissolution of the family ties. The making of their own dresses is an occupation that will prove a blessing to restless women who, in the bans of their idleness, have turned after the false gods of suffrage.

Other statements appeared stating that the sewing machine had done more to make homes happy than the piano, and following the sewing machine came Butterick patterns. The public at large had cast a benevolent eye on E. Butterick and Company. By 1870, the future looked bright and prosperous for the business. The idea of graded and sized patterns for homesewers, seamstresses and others producing custom-made garments was well received and successful both in the United States and Canada. In 1871, 6,000,000 patterns were sold by E. Butterick and Company (Butterick Archives, Papers regarding Butterick company history and patterns).
CHAPTER VI

BUTTERICK COMPETITION:
THE ROYAL CHART TO 10-CENT PATTERNS

Each pattern company makes a pattern with definite physical characteristics and system of interpretation of the pattern on the cloth...Money spent in a good pattern is money saved.

Billings, N. D.

Graded and sized patterns as developed by Ebenezer Butterick were highly successful. The success of the Butterick patterns was probably what prompted a Scotsman named James McCall to begin production of patterns which he had designed.

At age 30, James McCall set up a business in New York City selling "tailor's trimmings." The year was 1859. McCall, like Butterick, had participated in various phases of the clothing and tailoring business. He had learned the tailor's trade in Scotland and was a full journeyman tailor when he came to America (Mott, 1957). McCall stated, in 1859, to an R. G. Dun and Company reporter, that he had about $2,500 cash capital for his new tailor's trimming business, with an additional $800 expected from collections related to his old business. McCall had evidently married well since his father-in-law was willing to endorse him if
he needed it. The Dun ledgers reported that McCall was a capable and good business man, "if anything, too cautious" (Vol. 216, p. 771). An 1866 Dun report stated that McCall appeared no longer to be in business. What happened to McCall and his business during the seven years from 1859 to 1866 is uncertain.

In 1867, McCall, previously the agent for "The Royal Chart," a system for drafting patterns, secured the United States copyright for "The Royal Chart." The system included a perforated tool to be used in the hybrid system. McCall advertised "The Royal Chart" in several family magazines and fashion magazines of the day and stated that the Chart had proven itself superior to all other drafting systems.

In 1870, McCall was listed in the New York City directory as a seller of sewing machines. He was reported by R. G. Dun and Company has having the right to sell the Eliptic Sewing Machine in the United States, Scotland and Manchester, England. McCall was judged to be reliable, though his worth or means could not be established (Vol. 228, p. 426). Mr. McCall enthusiastically advertised both "The Royal Chart" and the Eliptic Sewing Machine in various publications.

Dun credit reporters stated in 1871 and 1872, that McCall's business continued to do well and expanded. McCall Pattern Company ("A History of Patterns," 1977) claims that James McCall began to produce and sell patterns in 1870.
The first McCall patterns were folded and stapled into magazines in 1870 and several different sizes of a pattern were superimposed one over the other. In 1871, McCall was touting his Bazar cut paper patterns with the same exuberance as he had Eliptic Sewing Machines and "The Royal Chart."

It was not until late in 1873 that McCall reported to R. G. Dun reporters that he had given up the sale of the Eliptic Sewing Machine in the United States, retaining his agency in Scotland. He claimed to have invested $49,000 capital in his pattern business, owing little or nothing on the business. At the time, McCall owned $75,000 worth of real estate in New York City and outside the city. McCall continued to be regarded by the business community as a good and prudent business man (Vol. 319, p. 500).

It was also in 1873, that James McCall began to publish a magazine, The Queen, to promote his patterns. A recent history published by the McCall Company states that The Queen was the first magazine for women ("The History of McCall's Patterns," N. D.). The basis for such a claim is not known. In September of 1873, the first volume of the tabloid-type publication appeared. McCall had previously advertised in numerous well known family magazines and women's magazines. He had also published a small pattern catalog, Catalogue of Bazar Paper Patterns, which advertised not only patterns but also "The Royal Chart." In an 1872 catalog, McCall stated that he was
looking for agents "in every town and city of the United States" for the sale of Bazar Patterns (1872, No. 2). McCall, like Butterick, discovered that he needed to communicate directly with customers and potential customers to show them the various patterns he had to offer. Unlike Butterick, McCall had a model for making and marketing his patterns--Butterick patterns. It is not known to what extent McCall used or did not use Butterick patterns as a model. Based on examination of the early patterns of both companies, it appears that early McCall patterns were very similar to early Butterick patterns in most aspects.

While Butterick patterns probably used a hybrid system for cutting patterns, James McCall claimed to be using a proportional system based on "bust" measurement. To help him in the development of patterns, McCall enlisted the aid of brothers Herman and Shamu Moschocowitz saying that "What Worth is to Paris, Moschocowitz is to New York--the highest authority on all matters pertaining to fashion" (Harper's Bazaar, October 21, 1871, p. 671).

Late in 1874, McCall changed the name of his pattern company from James McCall and Company to James McCall and Brothers. He had no partners but he was desirous of distinguishing his pattern interests from his sewing machine business being transacted in England and Scotland. He was still being described as a prudent businessman by R. G. Dun reporters (Vol. 319, p. 500).
Though James McCall and his pattern business prospered through the Panic of 1873, the Butterick company was not so fortunate. Over 5,000 businesses failed in the years following the collapse of Jay Cooke's powerful banking firm. Railroad speculation combined with over expansion in industry, agriculture and commerce weakened the financial position of the United States. Decreased European demand for American goods further weakened the economic structure. Butterick and his partners, like other businessmen, expanded their business in the face of the economic prosperity of the late 1860s and early 1870s. R. G. Dun had been correct in the assessment that pattern industry stock itself was of little or no value should a company experience financial difficulties. The Butterick company spent large amounts of money on advertising. In late 1872, the building at 555 Broadway which was leased at $21,000 per year, plus the expenditures for improvements and equipment amounted to a total outlay of over $200,000 (R. G. Dun ledgers, Vol. 412, p. 200). Though profits were large, the company was kept short of ready capital and caution was advised for creditors. In 1873, some of the financial strains appeared to ease somewhat and Butterick credit ratings improved.

In 1874, a branch of the business was set up in London by Butterick. Money was tight again due to expansion efforts, this time of a horizontal nature. R. G. Dun reports continued to be optimistic stating that the business was
conducted with skill and energy and that the principals in it were honest (Vol. 412, p. 200). At the time the London office was being established at 177 Regent Street by Wilder and Pollard, the company assets were valued as follows: presses and material in the printing office, $50,000; paper manufactured, $25,000; machinery, $50,000; accounts receivable, $5,000; fixtures and other properties in the building, $50,000. Total assets were valued at $250,000, with accounts payable of $50,000. The company claimed that their magazine was now self-sustaining and the catalog nearly so. The Dun ledger then states, regarding Butterick's claim of assets: "This estimate no doubt presents fairly their own estimate of resources, although others might materially reduce some values." It is interesting and amusing to note that someone who read the ledgers at that time, penciled in the word "would" over the word "might" in the foregoing statement. The ledger goes on to note that at the date of entry, October 20, 1874, even though expenses were heavy, the company was doing a profitable business and its credit was good. It was also pointed out that the opening of a manufacturing branch in London was "viewed by some with concern, but at present there is no denying the success and profitableness of their business" (Vol. 412, p. 107). It appeared that all was well in late 1874.

Even in the early months of 1875, business appeared to be good, though money was still tight due to expansion
efforts. The company was still paying all its debts and had a liberal line of credit. The January 16, 1875, Dun ledger entry states that the company "may be cramped at times for means, but we see no serious obstacle to their eventual success. Their expansion is already very efficient. Their safety rests on their keeping within present limits" (Vol. 412, p. 107). The June 4, 1875, ledger entry stated that the company was still meeting its notes and doing well. Just 21 days later, on June 25, 1875, the Dun ledgers note that expenditures for new fixtures, machines and supplies, plus expenses involved in the opening of the London branch, were causing money to be tight. It cost the Butterick company approximately $65,000 to establish the London branch according to the Dun ledgers. The ledger entry states that the company was experiencing some problems in meeting its debts, saying "They are evidently in a precarious position... if a few months can be bridged over, may be able to get in good shape" (Vol. 412, p. 107). According to the Dun ledger, the business paid a large profit. The outlook for Butterick was still viewed optimistically.

The October 20, 1875, R. G. Dun and Company ledger entry indicates that E. Butterick and Company failed. The Dun ledger statement of the Butterick company was "Have suspended payment are preparing a statement of their affairs which will be ready in 8 or 10 days, at which time they will call a meeting of creditors and will be governed by their
advice, as to what course they shall pursue [sic]." The company, on October 25, offered its creditors 50 cents on the dollar, unsecured, payable in six, twelve, eighteen and twenty-four months. The ledger entry of December 7, 1875, stated that company creditors had accepted the 50 percent offered "on their own note unendorsed [probably meaning that Butterick, Pollard and Wilder did not personally endorse the notes] extending over 2 years." The credit reporter, whose identity and biases are unknown, stated in the entry "It is the general opinion that they will never pay it" (Vol. 412, p. 200zz).

The Butterick company, making the same mistake as other growing businesses in the mid-1870s, had over expanded. It is not known whether part of their failure was due to accounts receivable which they were unable to collect, or not. Unlike many others, they at least attempted and were successful in paying creditors a part of what the creditors were due.

The Delineator, the publication which had begun as a quarterly in 1872, and had supplanted The Metropolitan in 1874, as a monthly women's magazine, ceased publication briefly in late 1875 and early 1876, during the height of Butterick financial problems. The Metropolitan, which had been renamed Metropolitan Fashions in 1874, served as a monthly fashion sheet illustrating some of the currently available Butterick patterns.
The establishment of McCall's patterns may have contributed to Butterick's financial problems. It appears that McCall probably captured a fair share of the pattern market as soon as the McCall patterns began to be distributed. The first McCall patterns began to appear just about the time that Ebenezer Butterick and his partners, Jones Wilder and Abner Pollard, were making plans to expand their business abroad. Indications are that at the time Butterick's offices were being expanded, McCall patterns gained a strong foothold in the marketplace. McCall's as well as Butterick patterns were being sold on a nationwide scale.

To add to Butterick's marketing problems, another competitor appeared on the horizon. The new competitor had a name that was already known nationwide among dressmakers, tailors and homesewers: Domestic Sewing Machine Company. Until about 1871, Domestic Sewing Machines were scarcely known outside Ohio. Manufacturing operations, originally in Toledo, Ohio, were gradually moved to New York. By 1875, representatives of the Domestic Sewing Machine Company (DSMC) claimed that 100 machines per day were being sold. It was rumored in the business community according to the R. G. Dun and Company ledgers (Vol. 373, p. 1486), that the Singer sewing machine company was providing capital for DSMC and that Singer, in fact, made the Domestic Sewing Machine. Whether or not the above statements are true is not known. However, sometime between 1871 and
1874, the DSMC began to manufacture and sell patterns, calling them simply "Domestic" patterns. It was in an R. G. Dun ledger entry dated January 28, 1874, that the pattern business instituted by the DSMC was first mentioned. A very brief statement indicated that the pattern operation of the company was profitable. By November 24, 1874, the pattern operation of DSMC had increased in size and sales and had, in general, been improved. In 1875, the treasurer of DSMC stated that the Pattern Department of DSMC was identical with the sewing machine operation and part of the same business. The treasurer claimed that the pattern department was a "money making part of the business and steadily increasing" (Vol. 373, p. 1593). According to the Dun reporter, the company had been over extended during the early to mid-1870s, but that they were "working things out" (Vol. 373, p. 1993). Apparently the DSMC had fallen into much the same trap as Butterick by over extending. It is probable that the symbiotic relationship of the pattern department and the sewing machine division kept the company from getting into the serious financial difficulties experienced by Butterick.

It seems apparent that the DSMC's pattern department was successful from the beginning. However, the pattern department of DSMC did not have to be totally self-supporting. The sewing machine operation could help support the pattern department until the pattern department was firmly established. Additionally, Domestic
patterns were provided with instant nationwide name recognition through DSMC. Name recognition undoubtedly helped the newly organized pattern department. Butterick did not have the advantage of name recognition through another product. McCall, to a lesser extent, probably benefited from some name recognition on a nationwide basis through association with "The Royal Chart" and the Eliptic Sewing Machine. Additionally, in choosing the name Bazar for his patterns, McCall was able to trade on the name of Harper's Bazaar, where his name could be associated through the advertisements that he frequently placed with the magazine. Trading on a name that had status was as common in the 1800s as it is today.

Seeing the success of paper patterns, others attempted to jump on the bandwagon, as would be expected. Various small pattern manufacturers and distributors sprung up, most of them staying in business 10 years or less. An example of one such business was the New York and Paris Fashion Company, 687 Broadway, New York, which was organized in 1877. The three principals in the company stated to R. G. Dun and Company that their business was importation of fashion plates and reprinting them, and the manufacturing of patterns. The Dun report recommended that no terms other than cash be extended to the business since none of the principals had anything financially and two of them had judgements and other claims against them.
In 1878, a creditor asked R. G. Dun and Company for advice as to how they might collect money owed them by the New York and Paris Fashion Company. Dun noted the inquiry in its ledgers and stated that it was very doubtful that the creditor could collect the debt, stating "It is possible that the amount could be worried out of them [New York and Paris Fashion Company]" (Vol. 448, p. 1401). In late 1878, a judgement was obtained against the New York and Paris Fashion Company for a debt it owed. The company went into receivership and was sold out under order of a court.

Several pattern manufacturers or distributors flourished only briefly in the mid to late 1800s, while others stayed in business and were quite successful. Frank Leslie, publisher of a number of successful magazines, was listed in Wilson's Business Directory of New York City in 1878 under the heading "patterns for Dresses, & etc." There is no evidence that Frank Leslie either created or manufactured any paper patterns. A possible explanation is that through his magazines, in which there were often patterns included, Leslie distributed patterns for others or bought patterns from other manufacturers. Annssley Burdette Smith was listed under the same heading as Frank Leslie, although it appears that she was primarily interested in the hybrid drafting system she had developed. Smith did offer sized patterns to the public through her catalog, but she recommended that each woman order a dress
pattern custom cut especially for her which could later be used to alter or modify all other patterns. Cornwell patterns of Philadelphia were sized also. They were based on Willet Cornwell's self-fitting chart, which was actually a drafting system. Magazines such as *Harper’s Bazaar* offered patterns by mail. *Harper’s Bazaar* patterns were actually manufactured by Grosfeld and Company of New York. Grosfeld probably manufactured house brand patterns for others as well.

Stable businesses continued to operate and even began once again to show profits despite the rigors of the depression subsequent to the Panic of 1873, and the resulting failure of many businesses, including pattern businesses as the New York and Paris Fashion Company. In the middle to late 1870s and early 1880s, four major pattern companies which produced sized patterns, Butterick, McCall, Demorest and DSMC, existed along with several smaller firms.

The fashions of the times continued to be complicated in design and line. The increased use of the sewing machine probably contributed to the complexity of dress construction for the time taken to produce a garment was considerably reduced by use of a sewing machine. Aniline dyes had been introduced and garments were multicolored and brightly hued. Previous to the mid-1800s, dresses had been primarily one piece. By 1870, many women were wearing dresses comprised of several parts. Commonly, a dress had a jacket bodice, sometimes with short or long basques forming a kind of
overskirt, and a separate skirt. Sometimes an overskirt was used. Blouses, for wear at home only, were available.

The pattern companies were aided by women's use of garments or costumes with many separate parts. There is perhaps no better place to see the separate parts that made up women's various complete costumes than in pattern catalogs. The pattern companies rarely included all the parts of a costume in one pattern. The catalogs showed separate patterns for jacket bodices, overskirts, underskirts, blouses, sleeves, coats and undergarments. Pictures in fashion magazines and other types of publications frequently failed to show the various parts and complexities of a costume, whereas pattern catalogs did.

Butterick, McCall and Demorest were publishing various magazines and pattern catalogs when the DSMC established a subsidiary in 1876 called Blake and Company to publish the Domestic Monthly, a general family magazine which featured Domestic patterns and advertised Domestic Sewing Machines. The Catalogue of Domestic Fashions had been established earlier to present currently available Domestic patterns to the public. In 1878, Dun noted that, in general, business was good for the DSMC "considering the depressed times" (R. G. Dun ledger, Vol. 373, p. 1600), and in April, 1879, the same Dun ledger stated that the DSMC's paper fashion business was showing excellent returns.
Meanwhile, E. Butterick and Company was struggling to get on its feet, to become solvent financially and to pay off its creditors as promised. Predictions about the company's success potential were pessimistic. On June 8, 1876, the reporter for R. G. Dun and Company stated "They have paid the first installment of their compromise but are slow already on new accounts and there is very little confidence felt in their ultimate success. We cannot recommend them for credit at present" (Vol. 412, p. 200a/6). Butterick continued to pay compromise debts as well as current bills; however, Dun continued to advise caution with regard to extending credit to the company. In June, 1877, a notation in the Dun ledgers indicated that some members of the business community believed the Butterick company to be making money again. Dun was still cautious with regard to credit since "...their assets are at all times so valueless except to those continuing the business" (Vol. 412, p. 200a/6).

Apparently it was Jones Wilder who guided the company aggressively towards solvency and growth. By 1880, Butterick had paid off the company's debts and was believed by the business community to be doing the best trade of anyone in the pattern business. It was Wilder who pushed the Delineator forward from a local magazine of rather narrow scope to a national magazine with wide scope which appealed to a broad audience, including women and their families. Between 1880 and 1881, the Delineator's national readership doubled. The Butterick Company had, by 1880, established
additional offices in Paris, Vienna and Berlin. In 1881, Butterick established a subsidiary called The Butterick Publishing Company and placed all of its publication efforts within the subsidiary. In 1894, the Delineator broadened its editorial appeal and in 1897, the magazine included fiction for the first time, following the trend of many publications (Mott, 1957). Butterick's horizontal growth was aided by such innovations as the distribution of fashion sheets through its agents and retailers.

Helen Cushman, business archivist and researcher in the Butterick Archives, reckoned that Butterick first began to produce counter catalogs or counter books about 1875 (Cushman, 1972). The counter catalog contained fine woodcut illustrations of the complete line of Butterick patterns and was intended for use at fabric store counters. Domestic made use of counter catalogs, also. In the late 1870s, DSMC advertised in the Domestic Monthly that the counter catalogs could be found at their agencies and contained styles not found in other Domestic publications. Though no records have been found indicating just when McCall and Demorest began using counter catalogs, it is almost certain that they used them as a marketing device at about the same time that Domestic and Butterick did. There was no other logical way to show illustrations of all the currently available patterns made by a particular company. Despite the need to cut costs of doing business during an
economic down-turn, the existing and effective pattern companies realized that good communications with consumers and retailers was essential.

The major pattern companies existing in the late 1800s advertised their patterns extensively, both in their own publications and other publications having nationwide distribution. The companies were fiercely competitive with each other and often listed the advantages of their own patterns and warned customers to beware of imitations which were not as good. The company issuing the warning then indicated how its patterns could be distinguished from imitations.

Despite the fierce competition which was bound to exist, each pattern company benefited from the advertising and marketing of the other competing companies. Each benefited from the innovations of its competitors. Differences in sized patterns of the late 1800s were negligible. The changes that were made in patterns or the differences that existed, consisted of such factors as whether or not seam allowances were included in the dimensions of pattern pieces. The width of seam allowances, shapes and quantities of perforations, number of notches and placement thereof changed somewhat over time. Weight and type of tissue paper and whether or not small pattern pieces were included for such items as pockets, trims and facings differed slightly from company to company. Cutting and
construction instructions changed little—the difference consisting of whether instructions were brief or very brief.

The home catalogs of the various companies, through the late 1800s were similar also. The formats changed somewhat from time to time with the size of catalogs varying from a large tabloid to a small digest measuring approximately 5 1/2 inches by 8 3/4 inches. All home catalogs were calculated to give customers the opportunity to select patterns at their leisure at home. Counter books or counter catalogs, used at the fabric stores and yard goods departments of department stores, were larger and usually of sturdier materials than home catalogs. Counter catalogs were designed to promote on-the-spot or impulse buying of both patterns and fabrics. Monthly women's magazines or family magazines were designed to keep women comfortably in touch with the times and to remind them of the availability of fashion conscious patterns. Advertisements found in catalogs were related directly to needlework. Advertisements in women's magazines were related to those issues which concerned women and their families.

The pattern companies, by the beginning of the 20th century, had become printing houses as well as pattern manufacturers. The pattern companies believed that their product required constant promotion and exposure. The objective was accomplished primarily through the various publications. In addition to the regularly published catalogs and magazines, special editions of color plates
and magazines were printed. Fashion sheets which were brief digest-sized pamphlets showing a few popular pattern fashions, were published by the companies for their agents to give to customers with purchases. In addition, trade cards were used for advertising purposes.

By the end of the 19th century several new companies had joined the ranks of the pattern manufacturers. In 1881, the Universal Fashion Company was organized under the partnership of Herman H. Nieman and Edward Lange. Edward Lange was also half owner of the successful Trow Printing and Bookbinding Company (R. G. Dun ledger, Vol. 256, p. 3295). The Universal Fashion Company produced pattern related publications and manufactured patterns for several years, changing its name to the Universal Pattern Company by 1888. In 1899, the women's magazine Popular Fashions offered patterns which had been made by the Universal Fashion Company. The Popular Fashion Company stated that any design in its magazine would be made to order when requested. The patterns were made of manila paper and were pinned and pencil marked to indicate the placement of trimming. The patterns were made in any bust measurement required and quotation of prices was given upon application for a pattern.

The Standard Fashion Company was organized in 1887 by Mr. Franz Keowing. Mr. Keowing had formerly been the manager of Butterick's Chicago office. Mr. Keowing reportedly (Butterick Archives, Papers regarding the
Butterick company) had a disagreement with the Butterick company. He was quite familiar with the pattern business through his affiliation with Butterick and saw the possibility for an additional successful pattern company. Mr. Keowing knew that many retailers across the country were anxious to install pattern departments for the purpose of stimulating the sale of dress goods, trimmings and findings. The retail firm of Strawbridge and Clothier was signed during the Standard Fashion Company's first year of business in 1887. More than 20 years later, Strawbridge was still handling Standard patterns and doing the largest pattern business of any department store in the country.

Butterick sales, too, were growing fast. Thus, several months passed before Butterick realized that the Standard Fashion Company had signed contracts with some of the largest merchants in the country and was becoming a very strong competitor.

The Standard Fashion Company was successful from the start. The company told prospective agents that it was "the only pattern company which has always exchanged unsold patterns at cost and repurchased them for cash from agents who desired to quit for any reason whatsoever" (Butterick Archives, Pamphlet about and by the Standard Fashion Company, N.D.). The Standard Fashion Company also stated that they sold to only one merchant in a locality. Standard Fashion Company advertisements often listed names of agents...
in various places, with an accompanying statement that a
certain one was "formerly a Butterick agent."

Mr. Keowing, knowing the importance of the **Delineator**
to Butterick, realized that the Standard company needed a
lively magazine also. It was a tribute to the prestige
of the **Delineator** that Standard's new publication, the
**Designer** was almost identical in appearance and format to
the **Delineator**. In fact, after a few issues had been printed,
the name of the **Designer** was changed to the **Standard**
**Delineator**. The change resulted in litigation between the
two companies and the Standard company was forced to return
to **Designer** for the name of its magazine (Butterick Archives,
Papers regarding the Butterick company).

The usual distribution procedure was for a pattern
manufacturer to sell to only one merchant in an area and
to refuse to sell to a merchant who would not sell his
patterns exclusively. Contracts were drawn and these and
other provisions were cited in the contract. Each pattern
company had its own policy concerning exchange or repurchase
of unsold patterns from retailers. It was not uncommon for
an individual pattern manufacturer to have various pattern
exchange and repurchase policies depending on the size and
distribution ability of the retailer (Personal interview,
Mr. Sydney Keane, Vice President and consultant, McCall
Pattern Company, 1978). The ramifications of the above stated
policies are to be discussed in the following chapter.
In general, the pattern industry prospered during the last few years of the 1800s. Although there were problems for the pattern companies, none matched the economic difficulties that immediately followed the Panic of 1873. The years from 1873 to 1896 were marked by erratic economic alternation with a general downturn in business and occasional upward thrusts which lasted only briefly. In general, the pattern industry saw steady increases in consumer acceptance and buying, if not all out prosperity. A few set-backs for individual companies and the industry occurred, but were not life threatening. In March of 1880, DSMC had a fire which burned company records and some pattern inventory but the company was insured and was soon growing and expanding again (R. G. Dun ledger, Vol. 373, p. 1600a/17). In 1881, an extremely severe winter hurt many businesses including the pattern industry.

Growth was the by-word, for the most part, in the last quarter of the 19th century. The Universal Fashion Company grew internally and established offices in London and Paris (R. G. Dun ledger, Vol. 256, p. 3295). The Domestic Sewing Machine Company named its pattern division the Domestic Fashion Company and established an office in Atlanta (R. G. Dun ledger, Vol. 376, p. 1600a/17). In the late 1800s, DSMC manufactured some of its own patterns but also purchased some from other manufacturers which were in
Domestic pattern envelopes. DSMC had realized several years earlier that as more women purchased patterns, more sewing machines would be purchased also. Standard Fashion Company increased its sale of patterns from 987,410 patterns in 1887 to 7,465,000 patterns in 1896 (Butterick Archives, Papers regarding the Butterick company).

The Demorests continued to produce both sized and unsized patterns into the 1890s and then seem to have dropped out of the pattern business. The Demorest pattern business was not sold to the Butterick company in 1888 as was thought by the Demorest's grandson, expressed in a letter addressed to the Butterick company, dated January 22, 1958 (Butterick Archives). Demorest patterns continued to be advertised in Demorest's Family Magazine in 1896. Indications are that the pattern business was abandoned by the Demorest family about 1896 when the magazine was sold to another firm. In 1898, when Ellen Demorest died, no mention was made in her obituary of the pattern business which she had organized (New York Times, August 11, 1898).

Butterick and McCall continued to thrive, growing internally by expanding their operations to other cities both in the United States and abroad. Vertical growth continued in both companies as each expanded its printing and publishing efforts.

Early in March of 1884, James McCall died leaving his personal estate and his business fully solvent. The
McCall business was directed by James McCall's wife for about six years (R. G. Dun ledger, Vol. 319, p. 699).

When James McCall died, McCall's magazine for women, *The Queen*, had reached a circulation of over 300,000, a high circulation for its time. In the decade following the death of James McCall, the company ownership changed hands several times subsequent to its sale by Mrs. McCall. In 1890, the firm was reorganized as McCall Publishing Company with George H. Bladworth as President. Mr. Bladworth had been one of the chief members of the McCall organization for several years. Mrs. Bladworth was editor of *The Queen*, writing under the name May Manton. The firm's ownership changed hands twice more and in 1893, The McCall Company was incorporated under the laws of the state of New York. In 1891, the name of McCall's magazine, *The Queen*, was changed to the *Queen of Fashion*. The McCall Company was purchased, in 1893, by a strong businessman, James Henry Ottley. When Mr. Ottley purchased The McCall Company, circulation of the *Queen of Fashion* had dropped to 12,000. Under Mr. Ottley's supervision, circulation of the magazine was increased to 75,000 in one year. The magazine began to exhibit a good variety in content. Mr. Ottley opened new McCall company offices in Atlanta, Chicago, San Francisco and Toronto (Mott, 1957). In 1896, the magazine displayed its first photographic cover. The magazine, in 1897, was renamed *McCall's Magazine*, with the subtitle, *Queen of Fashion*. The subtitle, used to identify the magazine to old
readers, was eventually dropped. Many changes in ownership, with resulting changes in company policies, had not helped the McCall company and at the turn of the century, circulation was down to 200,000 (Peterson, 1956).

Mr. J. W. Pearsall, a renegade in the manner of Mr. Franz Keowing of Butterick and then the Standard Fashion Company, founded the New Idea Pattern Company in March, 1894. Before organizing the New Idea Pattern Company, Mr. Pearsall had been manager of the pattern division of DSMC. Subsequent to a disagreement with DSMC, Mr. Pearsall decided to establish his own pattern business. Pearsall had a valuable assistant, a Miss Nichol, but very little capital with which to start a business. At first, patterns were purchased from other manufacturers, placed in envelopes bearing the New Idea Pattern Company name, and then sold by mail order through almanacs issued by patent medicine houses. Only a very few patterns were cut in the New Idea Pattern Company shop (Butterick Archives, Paper regarding the Butterick company).

Early in January of 1894, Mr. Pearsall obtained a loan and with some of the money began an advertising campaign to promote his 10-cent patterns which could be mail ordered, and the company would pay the postage if more than five patterns were ordered at one time. Early advertisements for the New Idea patterns appeared in farm journals, small newspapers and a few well-known magazines. By April of 1895,
1200 to 1500 patterns a day were being cut. The New Idea Pattern Company was, by this time, manufacturing all its own patterns and the mail order business had grown so large that 50 to 60 pattern folders were required to handle the orders received (Butterick Archives, Papers regarding the Butterick company).

Up until 1895, Butterick, Standard, McCall and other patterns had been selling for as high as 30 cents, yielding a very substantial profit for all concerned. With such strong competition, the New Idea Pattern Company had to make a novel presentation in order to win public preference. The appeal to the public was made on the basis of price. New Idea patterns were retailed at 10 cents but merchants were charged the same price by New Idea as by Butterick and other competitive companies. By this time merchants had realized that the pattern department in a store generated tremendous purchasing influence over many other departments within the store. Merchants, therefore, were happy to handle the New Idea 10-cent patterns with no profit to themselves. The New Idea Pattern Company had sold merchants on the value of a pattern department as an indirect sales producer. The New Idea Pattern Company was so successful with the sales production feature of patterns that even in 1976, pattern companies sell to merchants on this basis. Women were attracted to the stores with the special bargain feature. A merchant not already under
contract with one of the other pattern companies could make a big advertising feature of the fact that he was selling patterns with just as high a value for 10 cents, while the merchant across the street was selling the same commodity for 25 or 30 cents. In a word, the New Idea Pattern Company was willing to give merchants of the country an opportunity to do a bigger business in every other department in their store, provided they were willing to assume the expense of selling the pattern.

The other existing pattern companies had seen their greatest growth through developing a demand for their product with the consumer. The New Idea Pattern Company had built its business by developing new methods of distribution and with low prices, thereby gaining popularity with the consumer and therefore with the retailer. The other pattern companies were forced to lower their prices which broke the monopoly on the New Idea method of merchandising. The New Idea Pattern Company was somewhat handicapped when other companies lowered their prices, but the company continued to grow.

In October, 1896, the New Idea Pattern Company began publication of the Woman's Magazine. The magazine resembled the successful Delineator and Designer magazines in many aspects. New Idea was also producing fashion sheets for merchants to distribute, free, to their customers. In general, the New Idea fashion sheets were reputed to be more refined and attractive than the fashion sheets
distributed by the various other pattern companies during the late 1800s (Godey's, April, 1897).

By the turn of the century, probably a dozen pattern manufacturers existed. Only those that gained widespread acceptance and use have been examined here. Women liked the mass produced, graded and sized patterns. Patterns for clothes were not a new concept, for as seen in previous chapters, they had been used for centuries. However, just as securing fashionable clothes was difficult and usually expensive, securing fashionable patterns was also difficult and usually expensive, whether with regard to time or money. Until Butterick and others developed the paper pattern for mass consumption, fashion had existed mostly for the rich. Through patterns, fashion could be had by many and this fact contributed to the lessening of differences between social classes. With the advent of the sewing machine, patterns and other labor saving devices, women found they had more time for self-education and other pursuits.

Despite the erratic economic alternation that lasted from 1873 to 1896, as the gold standard was threatened, the years following the Civil War were productive for the paper pattern industry. In general, the Civil War brought forth aggressive young men who were full of creative ideas. People were ready to accept bold innovations in technology. Jeffersonian principles of government, with its hands-off business philosophy, helped big business. The war and the
resulting national systems of railroads made it possible for national markets to develop, where before mostly local markets existed. Postal service throughout the country continued its rapid expansion. There was capital from government contracts during the war and then during Reconstruction. Those with capital and energy grabbed the opportunities. There was a rise in southern textile production.

The ready made clothing industry, with organization characterized by a sub-contract system and sweat shops, expanded as a result of the introduction of cutting machines and mechanized pressers. The shoe industry output increased. Growth in related and non-related industries stimulated growth in the pattern industry. Women wanted increasing numbers of good quality, fashionable clothes. With patterns, their desires could be satisfied. The older pattern companies such as Butterick and McCall prospered and grew, and newly organized companies including the Standard Fashion Company and the New Idea Pattern Company were formed to meet the increasing demand of the public for more pattern fashions. Of the pattern companies that survived through the turn of the century, all grew internally, establishing new stores and outlets for their goods; all grew horizontally, taking an increasingly large share of an expanding market; all grew vertically by going more or less into the publishing business as well as being in the pattern manufacturing business. The 20th century held nothing if not great promise.
CHAPTER VII

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY:
PAPER PATTERNS TO PAPER TRUSTS

The company [American Can] has a stated policy of diversifying into any new area to which it can bring unique and specific value by its technology, marketing ability or manufacturing capacity. Investigation of new opportunities which would benefit the company because of profit or technological possibilities continued. Annual Report, American Can Company, 1968 (the year Butterick joined American Can).

The business community had, in 1897, seen a sharp upturn in the economy. The year 1900 offered various reassurances to business. First, in 1900, the country elected McKinley, a Republican, as President. The Republican victory was seen as a chance for business and labor to flourish with a minimum of government interference. Secondly, the passage of the Gold Standard Act was seen as a long step towards attainment of a sound currency.

The late 1800s and early 1900s were times of business consolidation and bureaucratization. Through the early 1900s, businessmen continued forming mergers despite the protests against them. So strong were the influences of big businesses, especially the businesses resulting from
trust formation, that for awhile the question was whether government would control business or business would control government. The problem which government had to solve was how to control business without crippling it.

Just as the Civil War had, to some extent, brought about a national market to augment the previous markets, the existence of a world market in the early 1900s was brought about by corporate growth and consolidation, increased production, new technology and new modes of transportation and communication. Urbanization contributed to both increased consumer demand for goods and to better, faster and wider distribution of goods than previously. The pattern industry profited from the various aspects of rapid industrialization. As will be seen in the following analysis, the pattern industry grew in all possible directions during the 20th century.

The Pictorial Review Company was established just after the turn of the century. The facts concerning the beginnings of the company are somewhat clouded. Popular legends (Peterson, 1964; Butterick Archives, "The Romance of the Dress Pattern") suggest that in 1899, William Paul Ahnelt, a German immigrant, established the Pictorial Review Company. Supposedly, the company was capitalized with $13, a sum Mr. Ahnelt symbolized by incorporating the figure "13" into his trademark. Mr. Ahnelt had, before establishing the Pictorial Review Company, brought a large number of original Paris models to the United States. He
put the collection on exhibit in New York and soon designers from all parts of the country were rushing to view it. The demand for copies of the collections was so great that Ahnelt decided to have them sketched. Ahnelt sold copies of the sketches and thus, according to popular legend, began the Pictorial Review Company.

Available evidence does not support the legend cited above. A copy of Pictorial Review magazine dated September 15, 1899, Volume 1, Number 1, describes itself as "a monthly review of trade offerings in fashion, fads and follies." Advertisements appeared in the fashion magazine for the McDowell Garment Drafting Machine and for the McDowell System of Dress Cutting. The September, 1899, issue spoke in terms of drafting when speaking of making garments. The March, 1900, issue of Pictorial Review described itself as "an illustrated monthly of practical fashions for women devoted to dressmakers, ladies' tailors and milliners, professional and amateur." In June, 1900, the magazine offered "patterns cut to fit every garment illustrated," evidently meaning that patterns were individually cut to size for any garment illustrated in the magazine. By July, 1900, the company apparently had an inventory of some of the illustrated fashions, in "regular" sizes. Waists (blouses), jackets and skirts, in regular sizes, were $1.50 each if not in the pattern inventory, and if the same fashion were cut "especially to fit," one dollar extra was charged. Full
costumes were three dollars each. Patterns in inventory, of waists and skirts, were 20 cents each. The patterns could be obtained by mail order only.

Mott (1957) stated that the *Pictorial Review* magazine began in 1899 as a house organ of Albert McDowell's business which sold systems of dressmaking and tailoring. The evidence supports Mott's theory.

McDowell named the publishing business, which advertised his drafting system, the American Fashion Company, and named himself as the editor of the publications. According to McDowell's own statements in *Pictorial Review* (August, 1903), the magazine was just one of several publications under the management of the American Fashion Company, founded in 1888. The August, 1903, issue of *Pictorial Review* stated that a decision had been made to "sever" the publication of *Pictorial Review* magazine from the American Fashion Company as a separate entity. The August, 1903, issue of the magazine also stated that the sale of paper patterns was very profitable, as evidenced by the number of large and successful producers of patterns, and that the *Pictorial Review* pattern department was enjoying very good profits.

It was in 1903, that the American Fashion Company/Pictorial Review Company stated its goal of establishing pattern agencies in every "city, town, village and hamlet" (August, 1903). The new Pictorial Review Company, seeking
capital, advertised for stockholders through the *Pictorial Review* magazine, limiting to 100, the number of shares any one subscriber could buy. It was in 1903, that William P. Ahnelt was first listed in *Pictorial Review* as president of the newly formed company. It is not known, presently, how long Ahnelt had been associated with McDowell before 1903, or under what circumstances they joined their efforts. Perhaps Ahnelt had been providing McDowell with "stock" patterns even while McDowell continued to tout his drafting systems. The establishment of the *Pictorial Review* magazine may have provided an outlet for the combined efforts of the two men.

Offerings of both patterns and drafting systems appeared side by side in many publications well into the 20th century. Some companies producing or selling patterns allowed advertisements for drafting systems to appear in their publications. Generators of pattern drafting systems often produced both sized and unsized patterns in addition to drafting systems, and advertised the patterns as well as the drafting systems. Among professional dressmakers and home-sewers, advocates for drafting systems and paper patterns could be found. Those advocating the use of drafting systems for obtaining a pattern claimed that drafting a pattern based on individual needs was the only accurate and, therefore, proper way to obtain a good-fitting garment. Those advocating the use of sized paper patterns cited time and
ease of use as primary factors for their choice, saying that the patterns were skillfully sized and easily adjusted to one's own needs. Professional dressmakers and tailors were the most staunch defenders of drafting systems, fearing, in some instances, that the use of patterns might erode the need for their services. Less proficient in drafting skills, homesewers were the most vigorous supporters of paper patterns. Fortunately, for the pattern companies, homesewers greatly outnumbered dressmakers and tailors, and, in truth, many women found that they could manage the construction of some garments formerly made by dressmakers and tailors, through the use of patterns. An increasing number of women were able to use the patterns successfully as the patterns were improved in overall quality and style and as the construction information accompanying them was improved. Increased pattern sales attest to this fact.

Additional pattern companies were formed near the turn of the century. Some of the companies were manufacturers of patterns, their products being distributed under various brand names. Some companies distributed patterns but did not manufacture them. Some companies manufactured and distributed their own patterns. Other companies existed as pattern manufacturers or distributors and then began publishing a journal, magazine or catalog to inform customers and potential customers concerning
their patterns. Some magazine publishers, seeing the success of the paper patterns, began to manufacture or distribute patterns.

Examples of publishers who began manufacturing or distributing paper patterns, or pattern manufacturers or distributors who also became publishers, abound. *Harper's Bazaar*, a well known publication of the late nineteenth century and throughout the twentieth century, began to advertise and sell patterns through the magazine. Included in the patterns were advertisements for the other various publications of Harper and Brothers. *Harper's Bazaar* advertised that "full directions for making and trimming" the garment were inside each pattern envelope (*Harper's Bazaar*, March, 1898, p. 52). Typically, the "full directions" consisted of approximately five sentences regarding the cutting and construction of the garment and three sentences describing the finished skirt and the trimming thereof. *The Young Ladies Journal*, a publication of the International News Company, sold patterns by mail order only which were manufactured by J. Gurney and Company of New York. J. Gurney and Company probably also manufactured patterns for other companies; the company did not distribute any patterns under its own name, from all appearances. *The Toilettes* Publishing Company, which published a fashion journal, *Toilettes*, began selling individually custom cut patterns in the late 1800s. A cloth
model was given with the pattern, which was guaranteed to fit. If the customer believed she did not need the cloth pattern to aid her in making the garment, the price could be discounted by 25 percent. In the early 1900s, Toilettes, with the publisher's name changed to the Toilettes Fashion Company, began selling stock size patterns along with cut-to-measure patterns.

Meanwhile, Condé Nast, who had been a classmate of Robert J. Collier at Georgetown University, was given a job with Collier's magazine. While associated with Collier's, Condé Nast organized, as a personal venture, the Home Pattern Company in 1905, to manufacture and sell dress patterns under an arrangement with the Ladies Home Journal. It was not long before The Curtis Publishing Company, publisher of the Ladies Home Journal, bought the Home Pattern Company. In 1913, Toilettes magazine, formerly published by Toilettes Fashion Company and then the Peerless Pattern Company, was purchased by Condé Nast and the Home Pattern Company. In late 1913, the Home Pattern Company announced that the name of the Toilettes magazine would be changed to the Criterion of Fashion, featuring Ladies Home Journal patterns. The patterns were available through agents as well as by mail order.

Before taking over publication of Toilettes, Condé Nast had quit working for Collier's in 1907, to go into business for himself. Condé Nast Publications began in
1909, when Mr. Nast published Vogue magazine which had been in existence since 1894. Vogue had existed as a fashionable magazine for high society. Mr. Nast changed the editorial policy of the elite magazine somewhat, causing it to become primarily a fashion journal featuring the clothes of fashion leaders, for fashion leaders. When Mr. Nast purchased Vogue, the magazine had already introduced patterns to its readers as part of its editorial format (Butterick Archives, "The Condé Nast Story," N.D.).

Patterns became a part of Vogue magazine almost by luck and accident. In 1905, a woman named Rosa Payne went to Vogue editors and asked them to feature a pattern she had made. The editors, in a receptive mood, printed the pattern (Butterick Archives, Vogue Pattern Book, 1959). The reader could obtain Ms. Payne's pattern by clipping a coupon and sending it, with 50 cents, to Vogue. The coupon patterns were hand cut, in one size only, by Ms. Payne, on her dining room table. Vogue and Ms. Payne apparently saw sizing as no problem. The chic, the prevailing, the only permissible bust measurement was 36 inches, so far as Vogue was concerned. Coupon patterns, the perfect size 36, appeared weekly. The current weekly pattern was 50 cents with the coupon; previously appearing patterns were 25 cents with the coupon and 35 cents without the coupon. For those women who did not "fit the Vogue mold," for a perfect size 36 pattern, the magazine offered three alternatives: 1) Patterns cut from the
illustrations in Vogue. Selected styles seen in Vogue could be rendered in a pattern in regular sizes ranging from 32 inch to 46 inch bust. The patterns were of heavy paper and pinned together. Prices were given weekly. 2) Patterns cut to special measure. A measurement blank was sent on request and Vogue would cut a pattern to the individual customer's measurement. The package consisted of a flat pattern from which to cut the garment, and a made-up duplicate to be used as a model in the construction of the garment. Prices for the service were given weekly with selected styles. 3) Special models. Vogue magazine advertised that it had crinoline models of some styles which had been designed by "the best designers." The special models were not usually seen in Vogue. If the customer was unable to come into the Vogue showroom at 364 Fifth Avenue, New York, selection could be made for her by Vogue personnel. The styles were sold with or without the made-up crinoline model. It was suggested that if a customer could not come into the showroom to select a style, she should order a made-up duplicate in addition to the flat pattern (Vogue, February 23, 1905). The crinoline models or duplicates were said to be especially useful for dressmakers to show customers.

Demand for Vogue patterns increased steadily and soon Mr. Nast decided to increase the range of styles available, setting up a separate pattern department within Vogue
In 1914, the Vogue Pattern Company was formed as a subsidiary of Vogue magazine and Condé Nast Publications (Butterick Archives, "The Condé Nast Story"). The Vogue pattern appeared to be well on its way to high fashion success.

Just as McCall and other pattern companies were undergoing various changes at the turn of the century, so also was Butterick. In April, 1894, Jones Warren Wilder died after serving the Butterick company for almost 30 years. Wilder, who had masterminded the solution to the Butterick company's financial disaster in 1875, had not been active in the company for several years before his death. Before his death, Jones Wilder had brought his son, George Warren Wilder, into the Butterick company. Ebenezer Butterick had been in poor health for some years and in 1899, he and Abner Pollard sold their interests in the business to George W. Wilder and some of his business associates (Yankee, November, 1959). By 1900, no one of the three founders of the Butterick company was still connected with the company.

In 1894, the Delineator, still one of the country's leading women's magazines, broadened its editorial appeal. Following the trend of many periodicals, the Delineator ran its first fiction article and in the early 1900s, the previously fashion oriented Delineator gave an increasing amount of space to home departments, general articles and fiction (Butterick Archives, Butterick publications). In
1900, *Delineator* circulation was approximately 480,000* (Mott, 1957). From 1907 to 1910, Theodore Dreiser was editor of the *Delineator*. Whether or not Dreiser was a man who understood only one kind of woman, called "a lady of easy virtue," as was suggested by Helen Woodward (1960), is uncertain but it is certain that under his leadership the *Delineator* thrived and grew (Swanberg, 1965).

George W. Wilder was as energetic and hard driving a business man as had been his father. As president of the Butterick company, Wilder urged the company to new heights of growth. On February 8, 1900, the majority stock holders and directors of the Butterick Publishing Company, Limited, unanimously advised all holders of Butterick Stock to accept the offer of The Federal Publishing Company to buy Butterick stock at the agreed upon terms (Butterick Archives, Unpublished letter, February 8, 1900). Thus, in 1900, with George W. Wilder as president, The Federal Publishing Company was established as a holding company, owning immediately, the stock of The Butterick Publishing Company.

It was in 1900, also, that the new holding company, The Federal Publishing Company, purchased the successful Standard Fashion Company. Several factors led to the decision of The Federal Publishing Company (for clarity herein, to be called Butterick) to try to purchase The Standard

---

*Circulation figures to the mid 20th century were not always very reliable. Publishers tended to "stretch" figures.*
Fashion Company. The most commonly given reason for acquiring The Standard Fashion Company was that Butterick recognized a strong competitor in the Standard company and believed that both effort and expense could be saved and a higher quality of service rendered by both companies if they cooperated and worked in unison. Negotiations with Mr. Frank Koewing, who had once worked for Butterick, were successful and he sold his company to Butterick. The combining of the two companies made possible a great reduction in the expense of securing fashion information, for the same sources supplied news for both fashion departments. Butterick began to incorporate some of the merchandising methods used by Standard. The two pattern companies retained individual sales forces. No attempt was made to restrict either sales force as to the field they should cover and a healthy competitiveness grew between the separate sales forces (Butterick Archives, Papers regarding the Butterick company).

Another, less frequently discussed, reason for Butterick's acquisition of the Standard company was due to an editorial error in the Delineator. An editor at Butterick made an unauthorized change in the name of the Delineator. The name was changed from the Delineator to Butterick's Delineator. With this change, the editors of the Standard company saw an opportunity to identify itself with the status which had accrued to the Delineator. The Standard
Fashion Company changed the name of the Designer to the Standard Delineator. Butterick attempted to get a restraining injunction which would have kept The Standard Fashion Company from continuing the use of the new name, but was unsuccessful. When Butterick acquired the Standard company, the name of Standard's magazine was changed back from the Standard Delineator to the Designer (Butterick Archives, Butterick publications).

After almost two years of cooperation, the damaging effects of the competition which had existed between Butterick and Standard were obliterated and it was obvious that there was considerable advantage in the interdependence of the two organizations. The merger of the two companies was so satisfactory and profitable that Butterick determined to try to follow a similar plan in acquiring the New Idea Pattern Company.

The New Idea Pattern Company, in the eight years of its existence prior to 1902, had shown a virility and efficiency which excited the admiration and perhaps a little envy of the other existing pattern companies. The New Idea company had clearly helped merchants see that the greatest and most important value of patterns was not so much in the direct profit resulting from actual pattern sales, but in the vast indirect and certain sales of dress goods and accessories which pattern sales compelled.
Realizing that the New Idea company had a firm hold in its field and a prosperous future before it, Butterick company decided to try to negotiate the purchase of the vigorous competitor. Complex maneuvers, for tax purposes, led to the purchase of all of the stock of the New Idea Pattern Company and the New Idea Publishing Company by The Federal Publishing Company (Butterick) in December, 1902. As in the case of the acquisition of the Standard Fashion Company, Butterick decided to let the New Idea company operate with an individual sales force for its pattern sales, and a separate editorial staff for the Woman's Magazine. The Butterick company recognized that the most valuable assets which they had purchased from both Standard and New Idea were their trademarks, brands and good will. The publications of the two recently acquired companies had established a reputation for a type of fashion which was different from Butterick's and if those features had been eliminated, the properties would have been deprived of much of their value (Butterick Archives, Company records).

The three companies combined, then, with the idea of reducing the expense of securing fashion information from important fashion sources. There was, however, no attempt to suppress the individual translation of the fundamental fashion information by any of the three companies. The magazines of the three companies, the Delineator, the Designer and the Woman's Magazine became known as "The Butterick Trio" (Swanberg, 1965).
Following the purchase of the Standard and New Idea companies, the matter of adequate space and suitable facilities became a matter of paramount importance for Butterick. The business had moved to larger quarters many times, allowing sufficient area for growth, and yet soon found itself cramped for space. In 1904, the Butterick Building at 161 Sixth Avenue, New York, was completed. The Butterick company continued, in 1976, to occupy the 300,000 square foot building. During the period which elapsed between the planning of the building and its actual occupancy, the business had grown to the extent that it was impossible to include all the departments under one roof (Butterick Archives, Papers regarding the Butterick company).

The Butterick Building, and its contents, was interesting in itself, for the times. Construction was begun on the Butterick Building in 1902, and completed in 1904. The building was on the site of Richmond Hill Mansion where General Washington made his headquarters during the Long Island Campaign in 1776. John Adams lived in the Richmond Hill Mansion in 1789, as did Aaron Burr, in 1797. The mansion was later purchased by John Jacob Astor and shortly before it was razed, in 1849, it was used as a theater for production of amateur plays (Butterick Archives, History of Butterick Building and site).

At the time the Butterick Building was built, it was of great interest to engineers since it was the first skyscraper to carry heavy moving machinery such as printing
presses above the lower floors. Eighty-six printing presses occupied three entire floors. Mr. Wilder bought the first Lambert color presses, made in France, and, according to Butterick records (Butterick Archives, memorandum, N. D.), was the first one in America to do big color-process printing. Butterick also established its own photo-engraving department. Butterick had been one of the last strongholds of the wood engraver. The Butterick presses printed eight magazines in four languages—English, French, Spanish and German. In 1904, Butterick employed 3,000 people in two leading businesses—the manufacturing of paper patterns and the developing and printing of fashion publications (Butterick Archives, Papers regarding the Butterick company). Butterick was one of the largest magazine publishers in the United States, publishing 32 periodicals and numerous other pamphlets and books.

Mr. George Wilder, in somewhat poor health, determined that the "Butterick Trio" needed an editorial director, an advertising director and an art director (Swanberg, 1965). He wanted more printing business. Wilder had furnished the capital with which Everybody's Magazine was purchased from John Wanamaker, and therefore had been a director, as the second largest stock holder, from the time the Ridgeway Company was first incorporated. The Delineator, the Designer and the Woman's Magazine had so thoroughly developed that they demanded an increasingly concentrated amount
of attention. The manufacturing business of The Butterick Company had grown to great proportions, and the growth of the magazines naturally had been commensurate with the growth of the manufacturing business (Butterick Archives, Butterick publications).

An alliance between The Butterick Company and The Ridgeway Company seemed advisable, so that the three Butterick publications could be still further developed under the guidance of Mr. Ridgeway. Also, Butterick would secure an additional popular magazine. Therefore, in 1909, The Ridgeway Company was purchased by The Butterick Company for about a million dollars, to secure a profit-making magazine and three top-notch men for management (Butterick Archives, Butterick publications).

Mr. Ridgeway, in his success with Everybody's Magazine, had proven himself an expert publisher and managing editor. Mr. Ridgeway brought to Butterick two of the top members of his staff, Robert Frothingham, advertising director, and Ray Brown, art director. It was hoped by George Wilder, that through Mr. Ridgeway and his assistants, the Delineator, the Designer and the Woman's Magazine would have more thorough, more efficient and more editorial administration. Unfortunately, such was not the case. Mr. Ridgeway moved his office to the new Butterick Building, ripped out walls over the entire 12th floor and had it decorated by Louis Tiffany at a cost of $200,000. He then
mounted his editorial throne, but he was not successful, due perhaps in part to poor health. Robert Frothingham was unsuccessful as advertising director, and Ray Brown, though extremely well-liked by all, was not successful as art director. *Everybody's Magazine* gradually changed from a money maker to a money loser, until, in the early 1920s, *Everybody's Magazine* was losing as much as $400,000 a year (Butterick Archives, Company records).

While Butterick publications were experiencing some problems, McCall's magazine circulation, previously hurt by several changes in ownership of the McCall Company, doubled in the two years from 1899 to 1901, from 100,000 to 200,000 subscribers, and then circulation increased steadily until it reached 1,000,000 in 1908 (Mott', 1957). Meanwhile, Mr. and Mrs. George Bladworth formed a new pattern company in Chicago in 1904, calling it the May Manton Company. The magazine which was published by the Bladworths and featured May Manton patterns was known as *Dressmaking at Home*. Mrs. Bladworth, in the early 1890s, had been editor of McCall's magazine, the *Queen of Fashion*, while her husband was president of the McCall company. The May Manton Company was in business for a relatively short period of time, and what happened to it is not known at this time.

The early 1900s were a time of growth for the pattern companies as well as the rest of the economy, but the times
were not without problems. The country suffered a somewhat severe recession in 1907 during which time the government eased its policy against trusts. However, by 1910, as the economy improved, antitrust suits were again started and proceedings were initiated against monopolies. In February, 1913, the 16th amendment to the Constitution was adopted which authorized Congress to impose taxes on personal income.

In early 1914, George Bladworth of the May Manton pattern company wrote a treatise on the ills of contracts made by the various pattern companies with their retailers. Bladworth contended that the contracts restrained trade unfairly. In many instances pattern company contracts demanded that a given retailer sell no patterns but the ones of the contracting company. In order to prevent a retailer from switching to another company's patterns, other benefits or incentives such as free storage cabinets for patterns were included in a contract. Mr. Bladworth wrote in his treatise, *The Injustice of Pattern Contracts*, that retailers were cheating themselves out of customers by not carrying several pattern brands in their pattern departments. Mr. Bladworth advised retailers to accept patterns only on consignment since they lost money by investing in patterns or signing a pattern contract. Bladworth stated that retailers wasted money if they bought fashion sheets for free distribution just to advertise another man's goods,
and threw money away if they circulated mail-order advertisements for patterns. He also contended that retailers could make money if they handled patterns only on full consignment and sold patterns only on commission. Big money could be made if the retailer sold patterns that created a big demand for dress material. Mr. Bladworth claimed that his booklet was written in response to a request from a special committee appointed by the Indiana Retail Dry Goods Dealers Association for information regarding pattern contracts. The dry goods merchants sought to investigate pattern company sales methods.

The pattern companies defended their position with regard to contracts by saying that there was no restraint of trade in that a merchant could choose the pattern company with which he wished to deal and that the choice was based on knowledge of the retailer's customers and their needs and desires. The pattern companies also believed that a retailer could not afford the space or capital outlay required to stock more than one pattern company's patterns. Pattern company personnel also believe the contracts protected both the retailer and the pattern company from damaging instability (Personal interviews: Bob Brown, Sales promotion director, Simplicity Pattern Company, June 6, 1978; Sydney Keane, June 5, 1978).

In the same year that George Bladworth was demanding stricter laws, the Federal Trade Commission Act was passed
by Congress in September, 1914. The Act was designed to prevent unfair methods of competition and unfair business practices in interstate commerce. In October, 1914, the Clayton Antitrust Act was passed. The Clayton Antitrust Act was particularly applicable to the contracts used by the large pattern companies. The act prohibited tying contracts, such as contracts based on the condition that purchasers would not buy or handle the products of sellers' competition. The act also prohibited price discriminations which would tend to create a monopoly. Penalties for violations of the new act were stringent. Thus, in 1915, many pattern retailers started selling more than one brand of patterns. As will be seen later, pattern companies began to employ other tactics to convince retailers to handle their patterns exclusively. In the meantime, pattern users began to find more than one company's patterns available at pattern counters. Customer buying preferences, plus the increasingly skillful advertising by pattern companies created the atmosphere for the fair competition urged by George Bladworth. In such an atmosphere only the strongest companies could survive, and some companies, such as the May Manton Company, did not survive the competition. In the mid-1920s, Butterick unsuccessfully defended itself in a restraint of trade suit filed against the company in Canada (Butterick Company Combines Investigation, January, 1926).
Competition for customers increased among the pattern companies. The pattern companies endeavored to improve their particular patterns in order to gain greater customer acceptance. The customer's problem of selecting the proper size pattern which would result in good fitting garments, remained a problem. Patterns, counter catalogs, home pattern catalogs and other pattern company publications contained elaborate written and illustrated instructions regarding how to take body measurements in such a way as to insure the selection of a pattern which fit properly.

Packaging of patterns changed in the late 1800s and early 1900s. A document in the Butterick Archives ("Patterns Then and Now," N. D.) states that pattern envelopes first came into use between 1900 and 1910. This may have been the case for Butterick, but the researcher examined many old patterns and found that several McCall patterns believed to have been produced before 1900 were contained in envelopes. Placing pattern pieces in envelopes instead of applying a label to the pinned or stapled pattern pieces facilitated more convenient storage and sale of the patterns. Also, the envelope offered additional space for layout, cutting and construction directions, and for information regarding pattern size, price and suggestions for fabric and trims.
By the early 1900s many patterns that were considered more complex than the average by the pattern maker included a separate printed instruction sheet. Those first instruction sheets were very brief by today's standards with regard to how a pattern should be laid out on fabric and constructed. There were very few illustrations on the early instruction sheets. In 1919, Butterick patented its printed instruction sheet calling it "The Deltor," coined from the title of the Butterick magazine, the Delineator (Butterick Archives, Company records). In 1976, the word "deltor" was still being used in many areas of the midwestern United States to describe any pattern instruction sheet published by any pattern company, just as many people used the term "kleenex" to describe any brand of facial tissue.

Condé Nast made an effort to simplify the use of Vogue patterns. Vogue patterns advertised that in order to make construction easier than it had been before, each of its patterns was being cut in three colors--the lining in brown, the trimming in green and all other parts in straw colored tissue.

In 1908, the May Manton Pattern Company obtained two separate patents. One patent obtained by May Manton provided for marking seam allowance and basting lines on the pattern with a system of tabs with graduated markings (U. S. Patent No. 886,378, May 25, 1908). The second
patent provided for a blanket pattern sheet with several pattern pieces outlined on it. Perforations were used so that the pattern pieces could be torn away from the blanket sheet. Seam allowances and other construction lines were also marked with perforations (U. S. Patent No. 891,936, June 11, 1908). In 1919, the McCall pattern company became the first to do away with the perforations and to print all the needed information on the pattern pieces. Cutting lines, seam allowances and other construction marks were printed on the pattern pieces. The idea of the printed pattern and the use of it were revolutionary in the pattern industry. The McCall patents expired in 1938 (McCall Pattern Company, "A History of Patterns," N. D.) and the method of printing patterns became public domain. When the McCall patents expired, many pattern companies quickly began printing patterns instead of using perforations.

Whether or not to allow for seams and how much to allow continued to be controversial. Some pattern companies made no allowances for seams, leaving that to the sewer. Other companies allowed seams of variable widths. In one pattern, seam allowances might range from one-quarter inch for one seam to one inch for another seam. The seam allowances, if included, were sometimes marked with perforations, or in the case of McCall's patterns, seam allowances were printed on the pattern. In some cases
however, seam allowances were included on pattern pieces but were not marked on the pattern pieces.

World War I had very little effect on the pattern industry. Butterick earnings went down slightly, in 1914, probably as part of a financial reaction to the war in Europe. The downward trend continued slowly until 1918, during the United States involvement in the war, when earnings increased sharply (Butterick Archives, "Butterick Earnings," 1975). There was no significant curtailment of goods considered essential to the pattern industry or to home sewers in general. If anything, the use of patterns increased sharply, if briefly. Pattern company counter catalogs carried pictures of the new military-influenced fashions. Home pattern catalogs and women's magazines illustrated the patterns available with military details. Editorials commented on war relative to fashions.

Despite the war, the pattern companies continued to be innovative in seeking new customers. Several of the pattern companies began to introduce color in counter catalogs on a limited basis, usually a light brown or yellow in addition to the customary black and white used in the drawing of the pattern fashions. Increasing amounts of information regarding the patterns were given in the catalogs, for instance, fabric suggestions, amounts of trims needed and notions or findings required.
White, Weld and Company, owners of McCall Corporation which produced McCall patterns, and the McCall Company, a subsidiary of the McCall Corporation which published *McCall Magazine*, installed William Bishop Warner as President of the company in 1919. In 1919, when Warner took over as company president, *McCall's Magazine* had a high circulation but the magazine had attracted many subscribers with patterns and rose bushes as premiums. Advertisers were not impressed with *McCall's* readership and advertising revenues were low (Peterson, 1964). White, Weld and Company poured money into the publishing enterprise to improve the editorial content. Both circulation and advertising revenues rose sharply (Mott, 1957).

The management of White, Weld and Company had decided to try to push the McCall Corporation toward growth. In 1919, McCall Corporation and Popular Science Publishing Company formed the S-M News Company, an organization for distribution of magazines to newsstands. In 1923, McCall began operation of its new printing plant in Dayton, Ohio. The company printed not only its own publications but also the publications of other companies. The new printing operation was so successful that the plant was enlarged several times over the following years. In 1927, pattern production operations were moved to Dayton, although the designing of patterns and the making of master patterns remained in New York (McCall Pattern Company, Company records).
Small pattern companies continued to be formed. The Fashionable Dress Publishing Company was established in 1915 (Fashionable Dress, November, 1917). The company published a magazine, Fashionable Dress, and sold its own patterns through the magazine. There was a showroom for the patterns in New York City. It is not known whether the company manufactured its own patterns or not. The Fashionable Dress Publishing Company appears to have stayed in business for a relatively short period of time. What happened to the company is not known.

Vogue patterns opened a retail outlet on Fifth Avenue in New York in 1917. The company had previously sold patterns only through Condé Nast publications. A few years later, Vogue allowed department stores to sell its patterns on an exclusive basis, that is, the line of patterns was carried in only one store in a city. B. Altmans, in New York, was the first store to stock Vogue patterns. By 1944, Vogue patterns were stocked in 600 leading department stores throughout the United States (Butterick Archives, "Historical Notes on Vogue Patterns," 1970).

The middle to late 1920s was a period of unprecedented prosperity albeit a somewhat false prosperity. Corporations increasingly applied their earnings to satisfying capital needs, adopting a conservative dividend policy. The chemical industry, given a fillip by World War I, made
spectacular gains, especially in the field of dyes, synthetic fibers and plastics. The introduction of rayon in 1909 had inaugurated a new era of synthetics. Rayon production was ten times as great in 1929 as it had been in 1919. Natural fiber textile production increased also. Cotton manufacturing in the Southern Piedmont was accelerated by the utilization of hydro-electric power. Although the South had almost 13 million spindles in 1914, against less than 11 million for Massachusetts, the former produced coarse cotton goods while New England specialized in finer grade cloth (White, 1936). Silk and wool goods made rapid advances, also.

National advertising gained in dignity and importance as growth and change accelerated in the social and industrial spheres. National advertising in magazines and newspapers in the early to middle 1900s was an outstanding demonstration of the impelling logic of mass production via journalism. Advertising revenues were over 78 times as much in 1922 as in 1902 (Mott, 1957). Americans everywhere were being indoctrinated, on a regular schedule, in ways of living and thinking in classless America. The media to which Americans were exposed introduced them to a standard of living which included the delights of automobiles, fashionable clothes and new foods being mass produced for the many instead of the few.

After the Armistice of 1918, public spirit and international interest turned into self interest and the
need to have a good time. There was a delighted concern over and interest in the frivolous. There was, in the 1920s, a desire to shake off the restraints of puritanism and long standing conventions of decorum. People in general and women in particular sought new freedom to experiment with new ways of thinking and living.

Young women spearheaded the rebellion of the 1920s. New attitudes and new freedom could be most easily seen in the radically changed appearance of young women of the 1920s. In 1919, women were still wearing ankle-length dresses over a complex order of figure altering underpinnings of corsets, chemises and petticoats. By 1925, hemlines had been lifted all the way to the knee, hair was worn short and women had become addicted to the most durable fashion innovations of the 20th century--flesh-colored stockings.

Feminism had gone into a new phase. During World War I, women had taken jobs because they were needed to help increase war-time production. Jobs brought women both economic and then social freedom. After the war, many women kept their jobs. The vote had been won and women were asserting the right to enjoy themselves in the same manner as men and with men. Hedonism came with the relaxation of social codes.

Economically, the boom years lasted from 1923 to October, 1929. During the period the automobile industry grew rapidly. The radio industry matured, including radio
advertising. There was a rise in construction of all types, from office buildings to accommodate burgeoning business to suburban communities and resorts. Chain stores and chain services multiplied geometrically. Between 1922 and 1929 the physical production of agricultural, manufacturing, mining and construction industries grew by 34 percent (Cary and Weinberg, 1975). Goods could be produced, but they also had to be sold. Sales, salesmen, sales campaigns, sales contests, sales conventions, sales promotions were the keys to getting goods from sources into the hands of consumers. Marketing research, consumer research and psychology produced the information on which persuasive advertising was based.

Almost every industry boomed during the '20s except the home sewing industry. A booming economy, women working outside the home and a rapid increase in consumer goods, including clothing, made home sewing almost an anachronism. Women had characteristically sewn in order to have high fashion clothes at low affordable prices. Ready-made clothing in the 1920s was relatively well made, plentiful and affordable by many women. With fashions changing more rapidly and more drastically than ever before in American history, many women were reluctant to invest time and energy in the making of a garment that might be out of fashion almost before it was completed. Additionally, the day of the 10-cent pattern appeared to be gone forever for patterns ranged in price from 50 cents to two dollars. In
the late 1920s, the cost of a pattern was sometimes almost as much as the cost of three or four yards of cotton fabric.

Mr. Joseph M. Shapiro, an advertising salesman for a New York fashion trade magazine, saw the imbalance in the cost of patterns and fabrics. He was not able to understand why a few pieces of tissue in an envelope should cost so much. It was out of this market imbalance that the idea for Simplicity patterns was born. The year was 1927. Mr. Joseph Shapiro's son, James, was prominent in getting the new enterprise started (Personal interview, Mrs. Caroline Hutchins Shapiro, May 30, 1978).

The new Simplicity pattern company was immediately successful. The researcher several times heard the following story regarding Simplicity's beginnings in the pattern industry, relative to other factors operating in the industry at the time. According to various unofficial sources, the F. W. Woolworth Company approached the Butterick company asking them to produce low priced house brand patterns. Butterick refused to manufacture a house brand pattern for Woolworth for three reasons: 1) Butterick was afraid it would find itself in the position of competing with itself, 2) Butterick was concerned that manufacturing a low priced house brand pattern would damage its reputation for creating high styled patterns, and 3) Butterick was fearful that lower priced patterns would not be self supporting and could cut into Butterick company profits.
Butterick was a conservative firm, unwilling to take the risk of a new enterprise with an uncertain future.

Joseph Shapiro and his son were willing to take the risks that Butterick declined. It appears that Woolworth provided some help in getting the Simplicity company started. Simplicity had immediate outlets all over the country for Simplicity patterns under the Woolworth house brand name of DuBarry (Personal interview, Bob Brown, June 6, 1978).

The Butterick company was once again having difficulties in the middle to late 1920s. George Wilder, head of the Butterick enterprises, had been in ill health for some years. His intermittent participation in management of the company contributed to Butterick instability. In 1926, George Wilder sold his controlling interest in Butterick to S. R. Latshaw and Joseph A. Moore (Butterick Archives, Changes in Butterick management).

Latshaw and Moore decided to improve Butterick's position in the pattern industry by consolidating and concentrating efforts. Management actions were sweeping and expensive. In July, 1926, the Designer Publishing Company, Incorporated, purchased by Butterick in 1900, was merged with the Butterick Publishing Company, which was part of The Butterick Company. In October, 1927, The Federal Publishing Company, which had been established strictly as a holding company, and the New Idea Publishing Company, purchased by Butterick in 1902, were dissolved (Moody's, 1936).
Butterick, effectively, went out of the printing business. During World War I, the Butterick printing plant had been unionized. Union shop practices plus the high New York wage scale made it advisable for Butterick to have the printing of many of its publications done somewhere outside of New York. Butterick sold its printing plant and most of its printing equipment and made a 10-year contract with the Cuneo Press in Chicago for the printing of its magazines, catalogs, sales literature and other printed materials (Butterick Archives, Papers regarding the Butterick company). Butterick management had determined that effort should be put into continuing and amplifying a creative rather than a manufacturing business.

Butterick management decided on a policy of centralization to promote greater efficiency and to cut costs. The number of branch offices was decreased. All bookkeeping and other central office functions were centered in the New York office. Machine bookkeeping was installed. By combining, consolidating and eliminating various operations, Butterick was able to effect economies in manufacturing, stocking and handling, thereby bringing almost all company operations under one roof in the Butterick Building. Butterick was also able to rent unused space in the Butterick Building to some other companies (Butterick Archives, Company records). Butterick tightened its belt in the face of a downturn in home sewing and an adverse economic climate in the pattern industry.
Agents who carried Designer patterns and advertisers who had used either the Delineator or the Designer were compensated in various ways when the companies were merged. Butterick offered merchants who had carried a stock of Designer patterns an equivalent line of Butterick patterns. The substitutions were made at no cost to the merchant. Butterick salvaged more than half of the pattern accounts of the Designer Publishing Company (Butterick Archives, Company records). The combining of the Designer and the Delineator was not quite as simple. When publications are combined it is not always certain whether readers will continue an allegiance to a new publication resulting from a combination of publications. Advertisers concerned with the number of subscribers they were reaching needed assurances of a continued wide audience. The combined circulation of the Delineator and the Designer had been 1,700,000. The new Delineator guaranteed its advertisers a circulation of not less than 1,250,000 (Mott, 1957). At the time of the combination, the Delineator was selling for 20 cents a copy on the newsstands. The price of the new Delineator was set at 25 cents a copy (Peterson, 1956). A short time later, management at Butterick decided to reduce the price of the Delineator to 10 cents per copy. The decision to reduce the price was made for several reasons: 1) many competing magazines were selling for less than 25 cents a copy, 2) Butterick wanted the new Delineator to appeal to the
younger matron, and 3) management believed that a lower price would help increase circulation (Butterick Archives, Company records). Butterick strategy worked. By the end of 1928, total subscriptions to the Delineator rose from 1,350,000 to 2,014,166. Circulation revenues were in excess of circulation expenses for the first time in several years (Mott, 1957).

Meanwhile, Simplicity's success was becoming increasingly evident as Simplicity entered the marketplace with new marketing ideas. The company recognized that in order to break into the market with an impact great enough for assured success, the outlets for pattern distribution needed to be expanded materially. Starting with the Woolworth stores, Simplicity began the expansion of pattern distribution beyond the traditional department stores to thousands of smaller stores throughout the country, thereby creating the base for sufficient sales volume to justify a low priced pattern ("Simplicity," Standard and Poor's, October 19, 1977). The venture was daring, considering that the costs of designing and producing a 15-cent pattern were as great as the costs of designing and producing a one dollar or two dollar pattern.

Simplicity's entry into the market was auspicious. Riding a tide of unprecedented prosperity marked by conspicuous expansion of the consumers' durable goods industry and unprecedented securities speculation, the American
economy as well as the world economy began, as early as 1927, to collapse of its own weight. The Wall Street stock market crash, in late 1929, marked the overt beginning of the worldwide Great Depression. The depression years which stretched into the mid-1930s, were years of increased sales for the home sewing industry, including the pattern industry. Women found they had little or no money to buy ready made clothing. With tight money, an increasing number of women sought to save money by buying fabric and patterns to make clothes for themselves and their families or they bought patterns and remade clothes from those they already owned. Even with increased home sewing, the pattern industry found the depression years difficult. Pattern industry sales hit bottom in 1932, but were on the rise within a year (Butterick Archives, Company records).

Butterick in particular suffered depression woes. Mr. T. F. Harrison, former managing director for Butterick in the United Kingdom, stated in a memorandum (Butterick Archives, N. D.) that in 1929-1930 Butterick went through a crisis in the United States and was almost forced into liquidation. Butterick continued to struggle with rapidly declining sales from 1931 through 1934 (Butterick Archives, "Butterick Earnings," 1975). In 1933, Moody's Manual of Investments (pp. 2090-2091), in its routine report on The Butterick Company, assigned a stock rating of "Ca" to Butterick stock, a rating used for company stocks that
"usually have something definitely the matter with them when considered as investments." By 1933, libel laws prevented the graphic, intimate and frequently subjective accounts of business problems such as those offered in the early R. G. Dun ledgers. A memorandum in the Butterick Archives, dated January 6, 1975, which included the profit figures from 1909 through 1966, stated that factors which influenced the profit figures were being researched.

In 1935, The Butterick Company filed for bankruptcy for the second time in its 73 year history. A reorganization plan was filed by Butterick and approved by its principal creditors in May, 1935 (Moody's, 1938). The company was incorporated again, in New York, in January, 1936, pursuant to the reorganization plan filed in 1935.

In the late 1920s, women were still struggling with the problem of selecting the right size patterns for themselves and other family members. Unreliable pattern sizing was hurting the cause of home sewing. Consumers were increasingly knowledgeable and complained of the poor sizing they found in patterns. In January, 1926, Ethel Phelps presented a paper in the Journal of Home Economics (p. 38) which told of the conflict and confusion in the actual measurements and proportions of patterns. Patterns which had been designated as being the same size by different pattern manufacturers or distributors had different measurements. In 1928, the United States Bureau of
Standards called a conference of pattern makers and users. The objective of the conference was to standardize pattern measurements. Anthropometric measurements were taken of a sample of women across the country by home economist Ruth O'Brien and a team of researchers, sponsored by the Division of Trade Standards of the United States Bureau of Standards, the Department of Commerce and the National Retail Dry Goods Association. The researchers and the sponsors of the project presented a draft of the sizes for dress patterns which had been compiled from the anthropometric measurements, and from dimensions used by experienced pattern and garment manufacturers. There were some objections to the proposal based on some internal differences between dress manufacturers, but the report was ultimately accepted. In February, 1929, most of the pattern companies agreed that the new measurements and sizing standards for patterns should go into effect by January 1, 1930. The pattern manufacturers agreed to use the new sizing standards, reserving the right to add whatever styling fullness was deemed necessary. The new sizing standards were the same for the pattern manufacturers and ready-to-wear manufacturers. Pattern sizes were to have been positively correlated to ready-to-wear dress sizes (Frazier, 1975). Statistical data gathered on pattern measurements in 1928, again in 1930 and then again in 1931, showed that there was greater uniformity in pattern measurements in 1930 and 1931 than in 1928 (Journal of Home Economics, April, 1929, p. 272).
In the 1920s, nearly all pattern manufacturers or distributors developed some type of separate pattern instruction sheet similar to the Deltor. Each company called the instruction sheet by a different name, such as "printo gravure" by McCall, and "Pictograph" by Pictorial Review. The names given the instruction sheets were trademarked. The directions were not general directions for cutting and construction, but a special sheet for each particular pattern style. Directions were both written and illustrated, in a step-by-step presentation.

Whenever one pattern company began to offer a new service or innovation, competing companies found new services to offer. Butterick began publishing bulletins to assist dressmakers and home sewers in solving various sewing problems with which they were confronted. The Butterick company established its own Department of Home Economics and invited customers to correspond with the company regarding any problems they encountered in sewing and using patterns. Butterick also established an Educational Service Department as an aid for home economics teachers. The McCall company provided merchants carrying its patterns with the "McCall's Ad Sheet" in an effort to update merchants' merchandising techniques. The Home Pattern Company offered its merchants and salespeople a publication similar to the "McCall's Ad Sheet" called "News from Home." Through the 1920s, each pattern company employed the saleswomen needed to operate the pattern
departments in stores. Individual pattern companies also began to sponsor fashion shows which featured their patterns. Many times the fashion shows were co-sponsored by well known fabric manufacturers.

Items such as counter catalogs, home catalogs and pattern envelopes were being improved throughout the development of the industry. Pattern styles were no longer displayed haphazardly in counter catalogs and home catalogs. Counter catalogs were divided into sections that were tabbed. Frequently there were tables of contents on the inside front cover of the counter catalog (counterlog). Counterlog patterns were frequently indexed and cross referenced by pattern number and counterlog page number. Instructions concerning how to take body measurements and transfer the measurements into a correct pattern size grew more elaborate. Instructions regarding how and when to alter patterns were given in detail in counterlogs and on the instruction sheets included in pattern envelopes. Some companies tried shading or stipling some pattern pieces, leaving others white and making some a solid color in order to differentiate between pieces used for linings and those used in the outer sections of a garment. There was still no uniformity of seam allowance among the pattern companies in the 1920s and 1930s. Posters were used for advertising in stores and were then sent to local schools and YWCA's when the stores were finished with them. McCall
claimed to be the first to have full color illustrations on pattern envelopes and in counterlogs. The color illustrations first appeared in 1932 (McCall Pattern Company, "Milestones in Progress").

The publishing industry experienced change as a result of new technology and new ideas, just as other industries did. The mode concerning editorial format changed often. Most pattern company home catalogs went through various changes in name and in editorial format throughout the development of the industry. Sometimes the home catalogs were offered in tabloid form, sometimes magazine format and sometimes in digest form and size.

The establishment of the Simplicity Company and its innovative advertising and marketing techniques brought about many changes in the industry. Simplicity's new low priced patterns, distributed both under the name of Simplicity and DuBarry, coupled with the effects of the depression, brought all pattern prices down. Also, pattern companies, noting Simplicity's success in marketing more than one line of patterns with different styling and comparable pricing, began to manufacture more than one line of patterns with various styles and price levels. McCall began a new line of patterns called Simplex. The New York Pattern Company apparently distributed patterns under its own name for a very short period of time in the 1930s and specialized in various grades of patterns with various
house brand names (Barron's, 1958). Simplicity placed a considerable amount of advertising in national magazines and the other pattern companies followed suit. Several of the pattern companies sponsored weekly or bi-weekly newspaper columns dealing with home sewing and fashion. Individual pattern companies and fabric manufacturers co-sponsored newspaper advertisements on an increasingly regular basis.

Simplicity was so successful from the beginning that in 1930, just three years after the company was established, Joseph Shapiro's son, James, founded the company's Canadian subsidiary and then a British subsidiary in 1932 (Annual Report, Simplicity, 1976). Simplicity management was convinced that the successful marketing techniques it had used in the United States could be utilized just as effectively in many other countries.

Simplicity formed new subsidiaries, other pattern companies were established and already established pattern companies offered additional services in the face of the nation's greatest economic disaster. In the interim between the Presidential election, November 8, 1932, and the inauguration of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, March 4, 1933, economic conditions reached grave proportions. The banking system had weakened further with the closing of more than 5,000 banks since 1930. By inauguration day almost every bank in the country had closed or been placed under restrictions by state proclamations.
Roosevelt immediately took hold with the aid of the 73rd Congress which convened in special session on March 9, 1933. Roosevelt urged vigorous national leadership, stating that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Roosevelt held Congress in session until it had enacted a comprehensive body of legislation affecting banking, industry, agriculture, labor and unemployment relief. The body of legislation enacted during the 73rd Congress, plus later legislation, was known as the New Deal. The New Deal was aimed primarily at relief and recovery.

Under the New Deal, the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) was initiated. The NIRA was designed to revive industrial and business activity and to reduce unemployment. It was based on the principle of industrial self-regulation, operating under government supervision through a system of fair competition codes. The act created the National Recovery Administration (NRA) and formalized the fair trade codes that had been used by many industrial and trade associations in the period after World War I. Under the NIRA, fair competition codes drawn up by associations and approved by the President were enforceable by law. Actions under codes and agreements were exempt from the operations of the antitrust laws.

The NRA ultimately affected about 500 fields and a total of 22 million workers. The NRA was initially successful, but code violations soon became increasingly frequent;
complaints of cut throat competition and unfair price fixing became numerous. The National Recovery Review Board reported in May, 1934, that the NRA was encouraging monopoly and cartelization to the detriment of the small businessman. The Supreme Court, in 1935, held the NIRA unconstitutional (Sellers and May, 1969).

The pattern industry fell under the auspices of the NRA and therefore the NIRA. Pattern industry codes were not approved before the NIRA was declared unconstitutional. The NRA and its attempts to regulate the industry had little effect on the industry and yet from hearings regarding the establishment of pattern industry codes, much can be learned about the industry and management's view of the industry at the time of the hearings.

Through review of the NRA hearings of 1934 (National Archives, "Code for Fair Competition," 1934), the pattern industry could be seen as an aggregate. Various statistics were reported to the NRA as representative of the industry. Some of the statistics were as follows: 1) the number of companies in the industry at the time was nine, 2) total annual sales or gross revenue for the industry in 1933 was $15,000,000, 3) total number of employees which would have been affected by the code, presumably all employees except those in management positions, was approximately 2,700. Pattern industry representatives stated that they employed 2,336 people in
1929. Employment in 1934 was 15.4 percent higher than in 1929, uncommon for the times. Production of the industry in 1934 was slightly below industry production for 1929. Employment was up since the industry was complying with NRA regulations which called for a 40-hour week, with no overtime. Prior to 1933, most manufacturers had a 48-hour work week. More people were hired in 1933 and no employee worked more than 40 hours per week. Without trying to determine whether industry practices at the time were fair or unfair, it was of interest to the study to look further at some information regarding the state of the industry.

In 1934, the pattern industry was a labor intensive rather than a capital intensive industry. Some companies were still cutting pattern pieces by hand, though many used bandsaws. The collating, folding and insertion of patterns and instruction sheets was done by hand. Patterns were taken to storage shelves and picking tills by hand. The picking and collating of dealers' and branch office current monthly selections and daily reorders was being done by hand (National Archives, "Code of Fair Competition," 1934). In 1976, all of the above operations were being done by machines and in some cases, by computers.

Pattern manufacturers continued to have contracts with the merchants who distributed their patterns. Industry spokesmen defended the use of contracts, within the bounds of the Clayton Antitrust Act, so vehemently that
there is reason to believe the NRA had previously found fault with the contracts (National Archives, "History of the Proposed Code," 1943).

Pattern industry representatives defined the industry in 1933. That definition of the industry was refined and confirmed by industry representatives in 1934 (Appendix B). Principal products of the industry were specified as paper dress patterns, pattern catalogs and books of fashion. In defining the industry and the industry members, the representatives of the industry recognized that there were different classes of members in the industry—makers of expensive patterns versus makers of inexpensive patterns, and members who were newcomers to the industry versus old members of the industry (National Archives, "Code for Fair Competition," 1934). At NRA hearings, representatives of industry and the NRA recognized that pattern makers sold a style service and that the patterns in and of themselves had little intrinsic value (National Archives, "History of the Proposed Code," 1943), a view expressed in the R. G. Dun ledgers in the late 1800s.

The NRA reviewed the code proposed by the industry and found it inconsistent with NRA policy on several counts. Most of the points of the code which were criticized by the NRA had to do with hours employees were allowed to work. One count dealt with industry wages and
simply stated "The minimum wages are too low" (National Archives, "Code for Fair Competition," 1934). It is almost certain that the NRA considered individual company earnings in making the above statement regarding wages. Although the nine companies that comprised the industry in 1934 were not mentioned by name, pattern companies known to be in business in 1934 are listed in Appendix C.

Neither the Great Depression in general nor the NRA in particular damaged the pattern industry to any extent. Compared to other industries, the pattern industry endured and grew with relatively few problems. In 1932, at a time when businesses had closed by the hundreds and over 12 million people were unemployed, employment and production by the pattern companies apparently leveled off but did not decline appreciably.

Simplicity Pattern Company had been constantly growing and expanding since its inception and, in 1936, Simplicity purchased the Pictorial Review pattern company and the Excella pattern company from the Hearst Corporation (Annual Report, Simplicity, 1937). After the purchase of the Pictorial Review and Excella pattern companies by Simplicity, Hearst featured Simplicity patterns editorially in Good Housekeeping magazine.

In the 1920s and 1930s, many women's magazines featured their own brands of patterns. When Simplicity purchased Pictorial Review and Excella pattern companies
both pattern makers and magazine publishers had begun to recognize that a large, nationally known pattern line could achieve a greater drawing power in the market than any magazine's own patterns could generate among its readers. Magazine owners and publishers had begun to realize that it was almost impossible to maintain a publishing staff and also a small fashion/pattern making staff.

Several other pattern companies or distributors were established in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Due to a lack of records it is not known exactly when some companies were established or what happened to them over the relatively short period of time they remained in business. The New York Pattern Company, Incorporated, distributed New York patterns from about 1936 to about 1941, advertising that their patterns represented New York styles and were cut and fitted to U. S. Bureau of Standards measurements. The New York Pattern Company specialized in making house brand patterns with retailers' names printed on the pattern envelopes. The Hollywood Pattern Company was established in the early to mid-1930s. The company featured patterns that were reputedly preferred by Hollywood stars. Counterlogs and home catalogs featured articles about Hollywood stars and their life styles, with photographs of the stars. Photographs of the stars also appeared on pattern envelopes. Patterns were distributed under the name Hollywood Patterns at least until
1947. The Library of Congress has no catalogs for the Hollywood Pattern Company after February, 1947. In Delaware, in March, 1929, the Paris Pattern Company was incorporated to sell and distribute, in the United States, patterns made from designs which had been obtained from French designers of women's and children's clothes. The Paris Pattern Company had contracts with more than 100 department stores for the distribution and sale of Paris Pattern Company patterns. The Paris Pattern Company had a contract with Curtis Publishing Company to publish and describe the designs of the Paris company each month in the Ladies Home Journal (Moody's, 1931, p. 2397). After 1934, the Paris Pattern Company was no longer mentioned in Moody's Manual of Investments.

In 1932, the Advance Pattern Company was established (Barron's, April 21, 1958). The company immediately made sizeable incursions into the sales of other pattern companies. Advance patterns offered high style at a lower price than Vogue and Butterick, thereby competing successfully with high style, high priced pattern makers and with manufacturers of cheaper patterns with less than high style.

High styled Vogue patterns continued to be successful. In 1926, a Canadian office was opened to supply the demands of Canada and England. By 1933, English demand was great enough to justify the establishment of a pattern manufacturing plant in London. Vogue patterns were so
popular that at one point, in 1925, the circulation of the semi-monthly *Vogue Pattern Book*, Vogue's home catalog, exceeded the circulation of Condé Nast's *Vogue* magazine (Butterick Archives, "Historical Notes of Vogue Patterns," 1970). Throughout the 1930s, Vogue counterlog's tabbed sections carried high fashion titles as "Vogue Couturiers," "A Suburban Wardrobe," and "For the Young Woman About Town." In the late 1930s, a section of the counterlog featured patterns which were said to have been selected by famous women such as Helen Hayes and Gertrude Lawrence. In 1931, Butterick brought suit against Vogue for alleged infringement of Butterick's patented sewing instruction sheet, the Deltor (Butterick Archives, Company records).

In the early 1930s, most pattern companies did not maintain a large staff of home economists. In 1934, Caroline Hutchins, a graduate home economist, joined Simplicity. Simplicity's management was one of the first to recognize that if the home sewing market was to be maintained and expanded it must be done by educating large numbers of people, especially the young, in the skills and creative enjoyment of sewing. By educating young people and others, Simplicity hoped to create a positive image for home sewing and at the same time to build future markets. Caroline Hutchins initiated many of the educational programs still used by the company (Personal interview, Mrs. Caroline Hutchins Shapiro, 1978).
In the late 1930s, Simplicity began to publish a magazine called *Modern Miss*. *Modern Miss* was editorially directed at high school age girls, one of the first magazines to be directed to a teenage, female audience.

Other pattern companies worked with local schools in promoting patterns and home sewing, also. McCall, Advance and even Butterick began to see education as a means to expand market potential. Fabric manufacturers also increasingly saw education as a means to increase the potential of the home sewing market. Pattern companies, with the help and support of fabric and notions companies, sent representatives to local schools to give fashion shows and to instruct home economics teachers in the latest sewing techniques. Teaching aids were developed and sent to teachers free of charge. Sewing machine companies also began to realize the importance in educating potential customers and they, too, began offering help. Sewing contests became commonplace with money or scholarships being offered as rewards to outstanding seamstresses. Women, old and young, were encouraged to sew, to compete by using their sewing skills, to have their own fashion shows (*Business Week*, February 16, 1935). Pattern companies, fabric companies and sewing machine companies worked with people of all ages, using newly developed educational materials and techniques, through schools, 4-H clubs, women's clubs, department stores, fabric stores--anywhere
that women gathered and were willing to listen to the home sewing story and how to make its success their success.

Simplicity's aggressive corporate growth put pressure on the other pattern companies to become more aggressive than they had been before Simplicity was established. Internal and horizontal growth was evident in all of the pattern companies in the 1930s. Simplicity's acquisition of the Pictorial Review and Excella pattern interests demonstrated Simplicity's external growth. Many of the companies, during the '30s, experienced some vertical corporate growth also. McCall Corporation acquired interests including Consolidated Magazine Company, the Magazine Photo Engraving Corporation, the New Publishing Company and Economy Leases, Incorporated (McCall Pattern Company, company records).

Simplicity's vertical growth was aided by its purchase of the North American Pulp and Paper Corporation (Annual Report, Simplicity, 1937). With the purchase of North American Pulp and Paper, Simplicity became the first fully integrated pattern company. The pulp and paper subsidiary held by Simplicity not only supplied Simplicity with all its own paper needs, but also the paper requirements of other pattern companies, plus the paper needed by other non-related industries. The acquisition of the North American Pulp and Paper Corporation was especially advantageous to Simplicity during World War II when paper
goods for non-military use were sometimes in short supply (Annual Report, Simplicity, 1937-1941).

Butterick had reorganized in 1935 after declaring bankruptcy. The recession of 1937 still had to be confronted by Butterick and the other pattern companies. It was during the recession that publication of the Delineator ceased. In Helen Woodward's (1960) history of women's magazines, the demise of the Delineator was reported to have occurred because The Butterick Company realized that the general magazine business was not worth its while and therefore quietly folded the Delineator. In addition, Woodward stated that Butterick had started the Designer magazine. None of the above statements were true. Butterick had purchased the Standard Fashion Company in 1900 and Standard's magazine, the Designer, was part of the purchase. The Designer was merged into the Delineator in 1927. Butterick did indeed cease publication of the Delineator with almost no warning with the April, 1937, issue. The next month the Delineator, which had ranked number five in circulation among women's magazines, merged with Hearst's Pictorial Review, which ranked number four in circulation among women's magazines (Mott, 1957). Circulation jumped immediately after the combination but advertising revenues lagged and the Hearst organization, which sold its Pictorial Review pattern interests to Simplicity, killed the Pictorial Review magazine. It was the largest magazine to die up until that time (Peterson, 1964).
When the McCall patents on printed patterns ran out in 1938, many other pattern makers began to print their patterns. Some, such as Vogue and Butterick, continued to perforate their patterns for another 10 to 15 years. Vogue and Butterick believed that perforations were just as serviceable as printed markings. Also, Vogue and Butterick pattern users were thought by the pattern companies to be generally more skilled dressmakers who were accustomed to using the complex high styled patterns. Additionally, conversion to a printed pattern was expensive.

When Simplicity purchased the Pictorial Review and Excella pattern companies, the company took over Pictorial Review and Excella outlets and gradually discontinued the Pictorial Review and Excella lines. In 1939, Simplicity was the most widely distributed and largest selling pattern in the United States (Business Week, March 13, 1943). Low priced DuBarry patterns were doing well also, and Woolworth increased the price of the patterns from 10 cents to 15 cents.

In late 1939, pattern companies and other industries were beginning to sense the consequences of Hitler's war which was spreading and affecting all of Europe. Simplicity and others reported that foreign business was adversely affected through a lack of continuity in shipping and by increased costs of doing business caused by unfavorable exchange rates and increasing foreign taxation (Annual Report, Simplicity, 1939).
World War II brought drastic changes to almost all Americans in nearly all phases of their lives. Because World War II had a long range impact on the pattern industry, the war years will be reviewed briefly in the following paragraphs. Since America had been directly involved in World War I for such a short time, from 1917 to 1918, the effects were neither as long lasting nor as deeply felt as in World War II. During most of the 1930s American attention was centered on domestic problems. American isolationism reached its peak in the early 1930s. To the post-World War I disillusion was added the disillusion of the depression. Traditional suspicion of Europe was multifaceted and sometimes contradictory. Many young people were pacifists. Some liberals wanted to concentrate on building a good society in the United States. Roosevelt, though not an isolationist in his own philosophy, was primarily concerned with getting his programs of national economic reforms through Congress and into action and he courted the support of the isolationists.

American isolationist policies changed little in the face of challenges to the world order in the mid-1930s. Though most Americans disliked the Hitler regime that took power in Germany in 1933, few desired to do anything about it. The Western European powers were ineffective in dealing with the aggressive actions of Italy, Germany, Spain or Japan. American policy towards European and Far Eastern crises was dominated by a determination to keep out of war
rather than prevent it. Neutrality legislation was passed in an effort to prevent the mistakes that many people believed had allowed the United States to be drawn into World War I. It seemed clear to aggressive nations that as long as the United States itself was not attacked it would not interfere in any conflicts outside. Japanese and German aggression continued. Major war was manifest when Germany acted on its threats to take over Poland. France and England declared war on Germany. The United States Congress repealed the arms embargo and placed shipments of arms and other commodities on a cash and carry basis for the Western Allies. Americans hoped that by helping to supply arms, a Western victory would be assured without further American commitment. A stalemate existed for a few months and then the Germans conquered first Denmark and Norway and then the Low Countries. German units began to pour into France in a lightning attack from Belgium. Hitler believed England would collapse under the pressure of previous German victories. Instead, England's new prime minister, Winston Churchill, announced his determination not only to resist but ultimately to destroy the Nazi enemy.

Before the fall of France, opinion polls showed that most Americans wanted to avoid war at all costs. After the fall of France, when British survival was threatened,
opinion gradually shifted. The decision that British survival came first was, however, neither universal nor clear-cut.

Roosevelt won his third term as President by a very narrow margin, but once again securely in office he began to push for and receive more solid commitments to insure British victory. In 1941, the United States entered into an undeclared naval war with Germany. Hitler invaded Russia making Russia an ally of the United States and Britain.

Meanwhile, Japan, with Hitler's approval, moved into southern Indo-China and headed for Malaya and the Dutch East Indies. Diplomatic discussions between Japan and the United States only clarified the incompatible positions of the two countries. On December 7, 1941, the Japanese attacked the American Fleet at Pearl Harbor. The next day Congress declared war on Japan. Three days later Germany and Italy declared war on the United States. Japan's attack united the American people for war as nothing else could have done.

The war years were marked by an enormous expansion of the government's role as supplier of capital needs. In June, 1940, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a government lending agency established at the height of the depression, was authorized to make loans for acquiring, producing or stockpiling strategic raw materials and for
constructing, expanding and operating plants (Cary and Weinberg, 1975). The government began to guarantee or participate in loans made by banks to finance war production.

By 1940, the effects of the United States military program were being felt in government expenditures, industrial output and national income. The entry of the United States into the war brought large scale mobilization of manpower and resources, with economic activity making giant strides. The War Production Board (WPB) was established with authority to mobilize the nation's resources for a total war effort. There were specified allocations of strategic and critical war materials. There were extensive price controls on all commodities, except farm products, and on rents in defense areas. Rationing began in December, 1941, with auto tires. Later, rationing was extended to various food items, shoes, gasoline and other goods which utilized materials needed for the war effort.

During the war years, the pattern industry was affected by the war just as were most industries in the United States. Butterick, perhaps, was the company most affected. In 1941, at the onset of the war, The Butterick Company once again found itself in a precarious financial condition. The quality of products of the pattern division had deteriorated. Because of the poor quality products of the pattern division, the company had lost many of its
retail outlets. In all areas of the pattern division the staff was inadequate and morale was low. Equipment and machinery were not only almost completely worn out but also out-dated; replacements were needed. Manufacturing operations were being carried on under outmoded and high cost conditions in New York. The company was operating at a loss and had a deficit of more than $1,700,000 with practically no liquid resources (Annual Report, Butterick, 1952). There was no hope of new financing.

A change in management helped move the company toward economic recovery. Early in 1941, Mr. Leonard Tingle, a banker and an astute businessman, took over The Butterick Company and became its president. Working capital had to be built before many of the things that were needed could be done. Mr. Tingle oversaw every aspect of the company in the years to follow. He and his staff laid out a long range plan that called for improvement of the product through better designing and by a change from the old-style perforated pattern to a modern printed pattern, modernization of manufacturing methods, organization of a printing plant for the pattern division and the opening of new outlets for the sale of Butterick patterns (Butterick Archives, Company records).

Such changes as were possible were put into effect immediately. Manufacturing costs were reduced and the combination of an improved product and war-time conditions brought additional volume that made it possible for the
company to start making money in 1943. The earnings of war-time years were used to pay off debts and to get ready for the further changes that had to be made as soon as the company could accumulate the capital and build up the credit needed to go ahead with the full scale program (Butterick Archives, Company records).

Altoona, Pennsylvania, was selected as the site for a new modern manufacturing plant. The $400,000 plant was completed and all manufacturing operations moved there in 1948. The new plant was a major factor in controlling manufacturing costs. Printing of patterns, pattern envelopes and other materials, and bookbinding, formerly done by contract with a number of outside firms, was done in the new Altoona plant. New offset printing presses were installed which printed in four colors rather than two colors (Altoona Mirror, February 4, 1948).

At the onset of America's entry into World War II, five companies were selling patterns over the counter, according to an unpublished industry-wide report found in the Butterick Archives: Simplicity, McCall, Advance, Butterick and Vogue ("The Pattern Industry's Place in the War-Time Economy," December, 1943). A few other small companies sold patterns through magazines and newspapers. All of the five major pattern companies had been adversely affected by the 1937-1938 recession. Pattern sales skyrocketed during the war, giving the pattern industry a much needed boost. The report "The Pattern Industry's
Place in the War-Time Economy" proposed to explain, briefly, five aspects of the pattern industry relative to the war effort, as follows: 1) the universal impact of the pattern industry on the families of America, 2) the industry's importance to the economic life of the nation through conservation of manpower and materials, 3) the value of home sewing and pattern use as a check on war-time inflation, 4) war-time morale as it is influenced by home sewing, dressing and style, and 5) the small cost in paper consumption to accomplish the four preceding objectives.

The slogan developed by the pattern industry during the war years was: "So much for so many for so little." A survey by Crowell Publishing Company in 1940 (Butterick Archives), reported that 67 percent of all women in the United States made at least some of their own clothes or clothes for their families. Working women as well as housewives made clothes. Reasons given for sewing were: recreation, relaxation, change of activity, self expression in contrast to generally monotonous functions, to get style and quality at an affordable price, to avoid shopping problems caused by inconvenient store hours and to avoid picked-over ready-to-wear stock.

The pattern industry report (1943) stated that severe limitations on pattern production would, in effect, bring about rationing of clothing. The report stated that
the government aimed to increase the supply of textiles for civilians and to make sure the supply went as far as possible through proper attention to its distribution, use and repair.

The report, "The Pattern Industry's Place in the War-Time Economy," (1943) explained how consumers and the pattern industry could help each other in the war effort. The report cautioned the consuming public: "Don't buy more than you need, don't buy it before you need it and make it last as long as you can." The pattern industry reply stated: "One big way to help the public 'do its part' is to provide the basic tools and materials to do it. Patterns are the tools." The pattern industry contended that home garment production should be increased because it conserved civilian goods, saved millions of man-hours for war production in the ready-to-wear industry, retarded inflationary tendencies by keeping clothing costs in line, maintained civilian morale by keeping people reasonably well-dressed, and because it was an absolute economic necessity for the mass of people making up the low income groups. The industry asserted that all of the above objectives could be accomplished at a disproportionately low cost in paper. The entire pattern industry consumed only .05 percent of the total paper production in the United States in 1941 (U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1942).
Most clothing was not rationed during the war, but rationing was effected in clothing by other means. In the ready-to-wear industry dresses, coats, suits and other clothing came under war-time restrictions through General Limitation Orders L-85, L-116 and L-118, issued by the War Production Board (Kixmiller, 1943). The purpose of the limitation orders was to conserve fabric. The limitation orders forced manufacturers to conserve fabric by establishing restrictions on the amount of fabric that could be used in garments. The orders stated that no dress could be manufactured with French facings; a belt or sash over two inches in width; balloon, dolman or leg-of-mutton sleeves; more than two pockets; cuffs over three inches. The restrictions limited such basics as the sweep of a skirt, the length of skirts and the width of collars. Almost every conceivable garment worn by men, women and children fell under the restrictions of the General Limitation Orders. The only exception to the orders were apparel such as bridal gowns, burial gowns, robes and vestments required by the clergy and the judiciary, historical costumes for theatrical productions and uniforms manufactured for the military.

For many months the pattern industry had anticipated the regulations which would limit the fabric that could be used in dresses made from patterns, and in their designing and quarterly discards the pattern companies had
taken that probability into consideration. The ready-to-wear industry limitation orders, which limited the amount of fabric that could be used in ready-to-wear garments, had been issued months earlier. The new regulation for the pattern industry, in essence, stated that after September 1, 1942, no one should make a master pattern, that is a new design, the measurements of which would exceed the maximum measurements prescribed by General Limitation Orders L-85, L-116 and L-118, which were the limitation orders for ready-to-wear dresses, coats, suits, lingerie and lounging wear (Kixmiller, 1943). Fortunately, the regulation did not cause any radical change for most pattern companies because the pattern companies had been working toward this end long before the actual order was issued (Butterick Archives, Company records). General Limitation Order L-153 made one further restriction which stated that after February 1, 1943, no manufacturer should sell, deliver or distribute any pattern that exceeded the maximum measurements by more than five percent.

The content and editorial format of pattern catalogs changed somewhat during the war years. There was a noticeable change from high quality heavy or slick paper to a poorer quality light weight paper in counterlogs and home catalogs. The number and quality of the colors produced in illustrations were reduced. Fewer pattern styles were presented in catalogs and other printed materials. There
was an increase in black and white illustrations and a decrease in illustrations with color. Photos in catalogs disappeared almost entirely. The overall size of catalogs decreased both dimensionally and in number of pages produced. The number of pattern styles featured on each page of a catalog was increased.

Patterns changed also during the war. The quality of the tissue paper used decreased somewhat. Due to General Limitation Orders restricting the amount of fabric that could be used in a pattern fashion, the actual amount of tissue used in a single pattern decreased proportionally. Pattern envelope illustrations featured black and white drawings instead of colored ones. McCall produced a special line of low priced patterns called the "economy group" which were featured in a special economy group catalog. Almost all the pattern companies, except Vogue, began to produce patterns directly related to war needs, including patterns for nurses uniforms, Red Cross uniforms, hospital patient gowns and hospital operating gowns. Patterns for work clothes were produced as well as patterns for blouse fronts and dickies which would help stretch a wardrobe.

In 1941, the Simplicity annual report noted that there had been a general improvement in the economy of the paper industry which benefited Simplicity profits. In 1943, Simplicity acquired a second paper mill, Tarentum Paper
Mills in Tarentum, Pennsylvania. The cost of raw materials, supplies and services rose during the war years. Selling costs and administrative costs rose also. Despite constantly rising costs and uncertain conditions, the war years were the most profitable years the pattern industry had ever experienced. In the last years of the war, there were critical labor shortages.

By the end of 1944, the war effort began to wind down and the War Production Board issued orders permitting limited reconversion of industry from war to civilian output. The War Production Board was terminated in 1945. Before the close of November, 1945, all rationing programs were ended except for sugar and rubber tires. The reconversion shift at the end of the war was virtually completed by 1947 and civilian production sought to meet shortages in many consumers' durable goods.

There was no conversion problem for the pattern industry. Pattern companies were making the same product after the war as before the war. Capitalizing on the new interest in sewing, pattern companies began offering sewing courses through major department stores, teaching women to assemble dresses according to factory methods, then to add the fine details of a dressmaker. Retailers provided free lessons to customers on the assumption that the cost of the lessons would pay off in sales of patterns, dress goods, thread and sewing accessories (Business Week, October 3, 1970).
Pattern sales hit new peaks in the mid-1940s. Surveys made by Simplicity before the war showed that 50 percent of all American women sewed at home. In 1944, surveys showed that 82 percent of all American women sewed at home. Sales in 1944 were more than double the sales of 1940. Dress goods sales increased 40 percent from 1943 to 1944 (Annual Reports, Simplicity). Sewing machine companies, unable to produce sufficient quantities of machines due to war-time restrictions, sold sewing machine servicing and sewing instructions instead of machines (Business Week, March 13, 1943). Simplicity's 1944 annual report stated that now the company had "sufficient working capital to fully exploit post-war business opportunities."

By 1945, there were more sewing machines in homes across the country than there were telephones, and sewing machine companies had heavy backlogs of orders (Printer's Ink, December 8, 1944). The increased interest in sewing was due to the rise in ready-to-wear prices, the fact that individual sizing problems could be dealt with, and the idea that women could express individuality and creativity by making their own clothes. Women leaving war-time jobs and going back into the home found increased time to sew. Fashion changes in ready-to-wear stimulated sewing. Magazines with advertisements of clothes, furniture and other goods created "needs."
The late 1940s were marked by inflation and strikes. The inflationary upturn which lasted through the late 1950s was accelerated by the removal of government economic controls, deferred post-war demand, and financing for defense and foreign expenditures. Despite the shift of population from rural to urban life, in general, pattern company sales continued their upward climb. Sales promotions through retailers, fashion shows, women's magazines and schools were continued and expanded. The teen market was cultivated with an increasing amount of care.

The use of designer created styles by the pattern companies boosted sales. As early as 1920, the Delineator featured designs by such Paris designers as Cheruit, Lanvin, Doucet, Premet, Chanel and Bulloz, but there were no line-for-line copies of the originals. In 1949 Vogue became the first of the pattern companies to devote a section of their counterlog to designer patterns. The section was called "Paris Original Modes" and designers' names were attached to each pattern. Until the early 1960s, Vogue was the only pattern company permitted to purchase samples or original models for pattern duplication, thereby making it possible for American women to have their own copies of the famous French fashions at reasonable cost (Butterick Archives, Papers regarding the Butterick company). Other pattern companies simply interpreted or copied the essence of French designs when they desired. Through the use of
designer patterns the high fashion look could be brought to the budget wardrobe.

It was not until 1950 that Butterick began to issue printed patterns. Simplicity had begun to issue printed patterns several years earlier than Butterick. In both companies the conversion from perforated to printed patterns was gradual with both perforated and printed patterns being sold at the same time by the same company. Printed patterns offered the customer more accuracy in the lines of the pattern itself and it was much easier to understand printed information than the complicated puzzle of different sizes and shapes of perforations.

Pattern companies, especially Simplicity and McCall, had for many years labelled individual patterns in counterlogs and home catalogs as "Easy to Sew" or "Easy to Make," "Quick and Easy" or "Simple to Make." With increasing regularity, in the 1940s and 1950s, whole sections of counterlogs were set aside containing illustrations of easy to make patterns.

With World War II ended and profits high, the pattern companies began to expand, building new plants and looking for new sources of distribution. At the same time the individual companies looked for ways to become more efficient and to cut waste. Intermittently in the 1950s, the pattern industry experienced brief and usually shallow
recessions. In 1950, Simplicity closed its St. Louis plant to effect cost control. The cost of labor and materials had advanced sharply and the piece goods market, to which the pattern industry was and is closely tied, was experiencing a decline (Annual Report, Simplicity, 1951). Post-war dollars were being spent for durable goods such as televisions, refrigerators, cars, home furnishings and electrical appliances. The threat of the Korean war hung over the country and people rushed to buy goods they believed might become scarce. Also, there were no new trends in fashion to focus interest on clothing or to quickly outmode existing garments. Simplicity was able to realize appreciable economies in the early '50s due to its vertical organization. Simplicity had one central location, made its own tissue for patterns, operated its own printing, binding and engraving departments.

Pattern company earnings were up again by 1951 and 1952 despite cost increases across the board. By 1953, earnings had increased by 51 percent over 1952 (Annual Reports, Simplicity and Butterick, 1951-1953). Simplicity was printing, instead of perforating patterns in all of its subsidiaries by the mid '50s (Annual Report, Simplicity, 1954). The FTC issued a complaint against Simplicity in 1954 for the sole purpose of requiring Simplicity to cease and desist from continuing certain trade practices. The FTC charged that the company in
effect had a monopoly of the pattern business in the national chain stores. Simplicity opposed the complaint. In 1956, the FTC dropped all charges except those dealing with the company's terms of sale for catalogs and cabinets with its retail merchants. Despite problems with the FTC, Simplicity's earnings were up through 1957 when sales were curtailed slightly by an uncertain economy and extremely bad weather. The FTC complaint that Simplicity did not give equal terms of sale to all its customers was settled in 1959. Simplicity was required after June, 1959, to give all customers the same terms with regard to all cabinets and catalogs (Annual Reports, Simplicity, 1954-1959).

By 1951, Butterick was selling its patterns through several mail order catalogs including Sears Roebuck, Montgomery Ward, and in Canada, Robert Simpson (Annual Report, Butterick, 1951). Butterick publications, sewing related and others, were showing good profits. Profits in 1952 were improved by 18 percent over 1951 due to Butterick's new outlets and consumer acceptance of the printed patterns. Improvements in styling and presentations in Butterick catalogs and other printed media used to promote pattern sales also helped improve sales and profits. By 1955, the unit sales of Butterick patterns were 120 percent greater than they had been in 1950 (Annual Report, Butterick, 1955). The Butterick Pattern Book experienced a moderate increase in circulation and advertising revenues
in 1955. In 1956 and 1957, Butterick began establishing a new division to develop business in Latin America and distribute Butterick patterns. Research was being done to develop better and more effective markets and merchandising techniques in 1957. In 1958, Butterick began distributing patterns in grocery stores, drugstores and similar outlets through the use of self-service display racks or carousels. The patterns on the carousels represented a condensed stock of Butterick's best selling patterns. In 1960, Butterick launched the Butterick Home Catalog to replace the Butterick Pattern Book. The new method of merchandising patterns from a self service display rack met with wide acceptance in countries all over the world where Butterick patterns were sold (Annual Reports, Butterick, 1951-1960).

The Vogue pattern division of Condé Nast grew in the 1950s also, though more conservatively, in keeping with its high style image. Plant operations were expanded and updated in 1956. In March 1957, the first issue of Vogue patterns to contain the combined printed and perforated methods was distributed. A great deal of promotion and advertising accompanied the launching of the new patterns. The new patterns were so well received that management decided to take the next step in the modernization process and have a wholly printed pattern. Vogue was the last of the five major pattern companies in existence to try to cultivate the teen market. In 1956 an
Educational Department was added to Vogue Pattern Service to promote the use of Vogue patterns among young people. In 1956, only 850 stores carried Vogue patterns and about 1,000 stores had a Vogue pattern mail order service for its customers. In 1957 and 1958, about 550 new stock accounts were added, bringing the number of stores that carried a stock of Vogue patterns up to 1,400 (Butterick Archives, Vogue Pattern Book, 1959).

In late 1960, The Butterick Company, Incorporated, started negotiations with The Condé Nast Publications, Incorporated, and in January, 1961, a licensing agreement was signed by the two companies that gave Butterick the right to manufacture and distribute Vogue patterns and pattern publications throughout the world (Butterick Archives, Leonard Tingle, Letter to employees, January 20, 1961). Condé Nast was, in 1960-1961, making a profit in publishing and wished to divest itself of the Vogue Pattern division which, by comparison, was not profitable for Condé Nast (Butterick Archives, "The Condé Nast Story"). Butterick believed that the addition of Vogue patterns would almost double the annual business of Butterick's pattern division and add about 50 percent to the total dollar volume (Annual Report, Butterick, 1961).

Butterick management believed that the two pattern services would not be competitive. Vogue patterns were high styled and sold at relatively high prices—75 cents to $3.50. Butterick patterns were aimed at the intensely
competitive mass market, with prices ranging from 40 cents to 75 cents. Adding Vogue patterns to the Butterick operation gave Butterick a world-wide pattern service at all fashion levels and at all price ranges. Butterick sought to preserve the character and exclusiveness of the Vogue line; therefore, the Vogue designers and other personnel remained at the Condé Nast location on Lexington Avenue in New York City. Condé Nast publications such as Vogue, Glamour, Mademoiselle and others, continued to feature Vogue patterns (Butterick Archives, Unpublished memorandum of Vogue Pattern Service, January 20, 1961).

In 1961, the English production of Butterick patterns was converted from perforated to printed patterns (Annual Report, Butterick, 1961). In November, 1962, Butterick consolidated the pattern facilities of Vogue and Butterick patterns within the Butterick operations. Improvements were made in Vogue and Butterick promotion and merchandising operations. Vogue/Butterick maintained manufacturing and warehouse facilities in London, Paris, Milan, Toronto, Sydney, Melbourne, Auckland and Johannesburg, as well as six major cities of the United States (Annual Report, Butterick, 1962).

In the 1940s and early 1950s, the numbers of home sewers increased at a greater rate than the female population. Between 1944 and 1957, the number of girls and women over 12 years of age increased 12 percent, while.
the increase in home sewers was 52 percent (Journal of Home Economics, October, 1957). The increased sales of patterns in the 1960s could be largely attributed to the "do-it-yourself" fad that swept the United States and other countries. In an article from Forbes magazine, dated May 1, 1967, Mr. James J. Shapiro, president of Simplicity, stated that women no longer sewed because they had to as they had in the 1930s, but because they wanted to do something creative. In the five years between 1962 and 1967, Simplicity's earnings soared 125 percent on a 55 percent increase in sales. The company had captured over 50 percent of the home pattern market by the middle to late 1960s (Annual Report, Simplicity, 1960-1967). Mr. Shapiro claimed that homesewing competed with "books, movies and beer drinking" for a woman's time. To fight those competitors, Simplicity advertised in more than 24 major publications in the United States and abroad, employed television advertising and other promotions through schools, department stores and chain stores (Forbes, May 1, 1967).

Mr. Sydney Keane, former vice-president and later a consultant at McCall's, stated in an interview in 1978, that the style of women's clothing in the 1960s had a great deal to do with the surge in home sewing. Said Keane, "What really changed this business was the simple shift in the 60s. It became so simple it could almost be put
together with a staple gun." As styles became simpler in the 1960s, and less structured, designer patterns and regular stock patterns became easier to sew than in previous years. In the 1960s, McCall, Vogue and Butterick began to feature American designers as well as European. In addition, new sewing methods were developed to accommodate new fibers and fabrics available in the market.

In 1961, Simplicity became the first American pattern company to introduce American patterns in Japan. The Japanese Simplicity patterns were produced in the western manner and sized especially for the Japanese figure. The Japan plant was eventually closed for the experiment had not worked as hoped. Japanese women continued to draft their own patterns as they had been taught, buying and using Simplicity patterns only so that pattern instructions, which had been printed in both English and Japanese, could be used as an English primer. The patterns themselves were often used by Japanese ready-to-wear manufacturers to cut thousands of ready-to-wear garments (Personal interview, Mrs. Caroline Hutchins Shapiro, 1978). The Graphical Technology Corporation (GTC) was purchased in 1967 by Simplicity to provide Simplicity with new pattern grading capabilities provided by high speed electronic data processing techniques. In 1969, Simplicity was the defendant in an action by California Computer Corporation for alleged infringements of a patent for pattern grading; the suit was later dropped.

The McCall Corporation, like Simplicity, expanded and grew in the 1960s. In the early 1960s, McCall's, Dayton, Ohio plant was printing more than 50 magazines for other publishers, including Newsweek, U.S. News and World Report and Reader's Digest. In 1961, McCall acquired Saturday Review magazine, and later added a full range of fashion and trade publications. By 1970 the McCall Printing Company produced more than 100 nationally circulated magazines from 12 plants across the country. In 1961, McCall Corporation created a book publishing division (McCall Pattern Company, Company records). The National Publishing Company of Washington, D.C. was acquired by McCall Corporation in 1962, and a year later, Foote and Davies, printing and publishing company of Atlanta, Georgia, was purchased.

In the 1960s, Mildred Graves Ryan joined McCall as its Educational Director. Ms. Ryan brought her experience as author, teacher and business executive to McCall, with the purpose of expanding McCall's teenage market. By 1970, Ms. Ryan's department was reaching over 45,000 schools in the United States and Canada and she supervised a staff of 77 people. The philosophy of McCall's
Educational Department was to present sewing not merely as a skill but as an art (McCall Pattern Company, Company records).

In 1968, Norton Simon, Incorporated, a conglomerate, was formed. The McCall Corporation, Canada Dry and Hunt-Wesson Food formed the nucleus of the new Norton Simon corporation. In 1975, the McCall Printing Company and the McCall Publishing Company were sold by Norton Simon, leaving the McCall Pattern Company as a part of Norton Simon. In 1976, McCall Pattern Company consisted of three divisions: the Domestic Pattern Division, the International Division, and the Publication Division. The conglomerate reached out for companies in other areas of interest. By 1976, Norton Simon had acquired other interests, including Halston, Max Factor and Avis Rent-a-Car. McCall and its image was somewhat submerged in the corporate image of a large conglomerate.

In the period 1959 through 1964, the number of pattern units sold by the major pattern companies was up from 90 million to 100 million. Vogue/Butterick sales during the 1959-1964 period tripled (Butterick Archives, "Butterick Earnings," 1975). The central factor in Butterick growth was the exploitation of the entirely new channel of distribution, the supermarket, via Butterick self-service revolving display racks. In three years Butterick placed its new sewing centers in more than
9,000 markets in the United States and other countries. In 1964, Butterick made a move into the European Common Market through the purchase of a Belgian pattern company. All overseas pattern operations were converted to the printed pattern in the late 1960s (Annual Reports, Butterick, 1959-1965).


In March, 1966, The Advance Pattern Company was purchased by Puritan Fashions, Incorporated, a ready-to-wear company in New York City (New York Times, March 30, 1966). Shortly after Puritan Fashion Company gained control, Advance patterns disappeared from the pattern market. Since further information has not been made available to the researcher regarding the Advance Pattern Company, very little is known of the Advance company or the cause of its demise.

With the acquisition of Vogue/Butterick by American Can Company, the submerging of McCall Pattern
Company into the conglomerate known as Norton Simon and the demise of the Advance Pattern Company, Simplicity remained as the only pattern company which had not either gone out of business or become a part of a conglomerate as America approached its bicentennial year. On December 31, 1976, James J. Shapiro retired from Simplicity, leaving the pattern industry with not one of its founders still active in the industry as the country finished celebrating the bicentennial year. Thus, the end of an era was marked in the pattern industry.

As part of a conglomerate, facts regarding an individual company are not as easily obtained through annual reports and other records. The incidents and circumstances of a company's corporate life are subordinate to the circumstances and workings of the conglomerate as a whole. The praxes of the individual companies are submerged and lose some degree of importance as a separate entity when compared to the whole.

With facts and figures of individual companies submerged in the annual reports and records of a conglomerate, it became increasingly difficult for the researcher to determine the direction of individual companies in the 1970s. Also, facts and figures regarding the 1970s were not completed. Data regarding the '70s were secured primarily from personal interviews and the recent annual reports of the Simplicity Pattern Company,
which remained an independently owned and managed company through 1976.

Simplicity annual reports stated that pattern sales rose through 1972, and then declined through 1976. The rise and decline of Simplicity sales was typical of the rest of the pattern industry according to Mr. Sydney Keane of McCall's (Personal interview, 1978). Mr. Keane asserted that in 1972 pattern sales and home sewing peaked. After 1972, pattern sales decreased until, in 1976, sales were off by 20 percent. According to Simplicity annual reports and Mr. Keane, the home sewing industry, as part of the national and world social, political and economic community, suffered a decline due to existing conditions within the international community. Women in the mid-'70s began to worry about the increasing costs of food, housing and utilities; clothing decisions were postponed. An increasing number of women were working outside the home and there was less time for sewing. Also, there was no dramatic change in fashion and no compelling new direction in popular fashion. Blue jeans were de rigueur in almost every situation from picnics to weddings. There was, through 1976, a decreasing emphasis on apparel, according to Mr. Keane.

Throughout the early to mid-1970s, the pattern companies made several innovative and stimulating offerings to the public. "Quick and Easy" and "Jiffy" type patterns
increased in numbers. Recognizing the fact that home-sewers also pursued other needlecraft activities, patterns for crochet, embroidery and decorator items for the home were developed and introduced. Interest in sewing apparel for and by men was promoted by all the pattern companies. Pattern company sales continued to decline through 1976, the entire home sewing industry was soft and by the end of 1976, the future of the pattern industry seemed uncertain.
When the researcher began the present study in the Autumn of 1977, information regarding the individual pattern companies and the pattern industry and its place in American history was very meager. Various museums, libraries, historical societies and businesses were contacted; however, the information obtained was general, repetitive and frequently not documented. The researcher continued to seek the elusive resources, facts and information that logic suggested were available. Common sense and knowledge of the business community prompted the researcher to believe that business records did exist and once they were found, would lead to other sources of information needed to complete the study. The search was continued.

Data collection was both discouraging and exciting. Sometimes all avenues of discovery seemed to be obstructed. One tiny ray of light was always enough to keep the researcher's hope alive. Eventually, sufficient personal contacts were made with people in the industry and in libraries and museums that access was gained to important
materials. The project and the data collection became increasingly exciting. The evidence uncovered was very interesting and, in some instances, surprising. It was gratifying and stimulating to realize that records and artifacts to support the study did exist and were being made available to the researcher.

On the basis of records and other materials examined during the study, the researcher believes that other documents do exist which would be pertinent to the study, but for various reasons were not available. The researcher hopes that one of the effects or products of the present study will be to cause additional records to be brought to light regarding the pattern industry and its development.

The objectives of the study were accomplished. Through available documents and artifacts, the researcher was able to trace and document the history of the pattern industry and to identify related social, economic and technological events. The internal and external, vertical and horizontal growth of individual companies was examined and reported in the study. In summary, the following paragraphs of the present chapter will capsulize the history of the pattern industry chronologically and call attention to some of the important events in industry history.
The earliest records of patterns used in making clothing date from over eight centuries ago. The first patterns, made by cloistered monks, consisted of only two pieces, a sleeve and a piece from which identical front and back pieces were cut. Those 12th century patterns, made of slate, were in one size and were used for all people.

In the 13th century, French master tailor Charles Daillac began making his patterns out of thin pieces of wood. Later in the 13th century, Marcel Tassin, tailor to the French king, Jean Le Bon, made his patterns for the king's clothing from cardboard. French tailoring guilds accepted the new cardboard patterns and by the end of the 14th century dressmakers and tailors had sets of patterns. The use of the cardboard patterns had improved the art of dressmaking and tailoring.

In the late 14th and early 15th centuries, fashion journals began to appear illustrating and describing the increasingly complex fashions of the times. Patterns and pattern designs continued to be refined. Patterns became so important to garment makers that they were referred to in England as "Gods." Patterns were mentioned in wills as a legacy to sons. However, as the number and types of tailors' and dressmakers' pattern shapes increased and became more available than they had been in the past, the importance of garment makers' trade secrets diminished.
As clothing became increasingly complex, the garment maker's job became increasingly complex. The garment maker's skills were needed to form the pieces of a garment and then to join the pieces properly. In the 19th century an increasing number of people, the emerging middle class, wanted the sophisticated clothing worn by the upper classes.

Pressure existed to keep prices down so that a growing American population could afford to purchase the newest fashions. New tools and techniques were developed to improve garment making efficiency and to keep costs down. The inch-tape measure was developed, and in the early to mid-19th century, the sewing machine was invented.

Various types of drafting systems were developed. Proportional drafting systems and direct measure drafting systems appeared in the early 19th century and were followed by a combination of the two systems which resulted in a complex system called the hybrid drafting system. The principles upon which the aforementioned drafting systems were based, and the drafting systems themselves, later became the basis for sized and graded patterns. Additionally, drafting tools which were developed were useful in the drafting of graded and sized patterns.

Various types of unsized patterns appeared in the 19th century. Miniature pattern diagrams appeared in some of the leading fashion magazines in the early part
of the century. In the mid-1800s, full scale patterns appeared, but these, too, had to be traced and fitted to the wearer. Patterns were made in one size only. Full size or unsized patterns and various drafting systems existed together throughout the early to middle 1800s.

Ellen and William Jennings Demorest were among the business people manufacturing and distributing unsized, full-scale patterns in the mid-19th century. The Demorests may have been the first to introduce full-scale, unsized patterns in America. Several researchers have alluded to the possibility that the Demorests developed and introduced graded and sized patterns in America. This researcher has found no conclusive evidence that Ellen and William Demorest were the first to introduce graded and sized patterns in the United States.

The invention and introduction of graded and sized patterns in America was left to Ebenezer Butterick. Butterick was a tailor by training and trade and no doubt was familiar with the patterns drafted and used by tailors. In 1863, after two unsuccessful attempts to establish tailoring businesses, Butterick, with his wife's help, placed his first graded and sized pattern on the market. The first sized Butterick pattern was for a set of men's shirts and was cut from stiff brown paper. The second pattern was for a Garibaldi suit for young boys. Soon patterns were cut from tissue, to be easily
folded by the producer and then unfolded by the purchaser. Patterns were sold door-to-door and later by the box to retailers. Ebenezer soon moved his business from the Sterling/Fitchburg, Massachusetts, area to New York City. With fabric and ready-to-wear clothes scarce during the Civil War, Butterick pattern sales rose.

In 1867, Ebenezer Butterick and two boyhood friends, Jones W. Wilder and Abner W. Pollard, became partners in E. Butterick and Company. The pattern business grew rapidly and the Butterick company began printing several publications including a magazine, Metropolitan Monthly, to advertise its products. Butterick's graded and sized patterns were highly successful.

About 1870, James McCall, a Scottish immigrant and a tailor, began producing and selling graded and sized patterns. In 1871, McCall began publishing the Catalogue of Bazar Paper Patterns. In 1873, the first issue of Mr. McCall's magazine, The Queen, appeared.

James McCall's business prospered through the Panic of 1873. The Butterick company was not so fortunate. Butterick had over extended itself and in 1875 the business failed. The Butterick company paid its creditors 50 cents on the dollar and by the mid-1880s was prospering once again. Meanwhile, Butterick encountered additional competition when the Domestic Sewing Machine Company (DSMC) began selling patterns in the middle to late 1870s.
By the mid to late 1800s, several pattern manufacturers or distributors were established. Most flourished only briefly. Women's magazines and family magazines sold patterns by mail order. Pattern companies began to furnish retailers with counter catalogs (counter-logs) for customers to use in the stores. Advertisements for patterns increased nationwide, and many advertisements were printed by the pattern companies. By the beginning of the 20th century pattern companies had become printing houses as well as pattern manufacturers.

By the turn of the century, probably a dozen pattern manufacturers existed. Women obviously liked the mass produced, graded and sized patterns. Through the use of patterns, fashion could be had by many and class differences were further broken down.

The sharp economic upturn seen in the early 1900s offered reassurances to business. Mergers and trust formations were common until government regulations slowed the activity. Mergers among the pattern companies were not uncommon later in the 20th century. The emergence of strong businesses, increased production and new technology, modes of transportation and communications brought about the existence of a world market in the early 1900s.

Two important pattern interests were formed at the turn of the 20th century--the Pictorial Review
Company in 1899, and the Vogue pattern department of Vogue magazine in 1905. Vogue patterns provided the market with high fashion pattern styles. Both Pictorial Review and Vogue developed publications specifically for the promotion of their pattern products.

In 1900 and 1902, respectively, the Standard Fashion Company and the New Idea Pattern Company were purchased by Butterick. For a number of years the three entities within the Butterick company operated independently except that the expense of securing fashion information was shared and costs were, therefore, reduced. The magazines of the three companies, the Delineator, the Designer and the Woman's Magazine, became known as "The Butterick Trio."

In 1914, with the passage of the Clayton Antitrust Act, the pattern companies were forced to stop making tying contracts with retailers in unfair restraint of trade. Many retailers were able, for the first time, to carry more than one line of patterns in their stock. Competition for customers increased and many pattern companies did not survive.

Pattern instructions for layout, construction and finishing of garments improved in the 20th century. Separate instruction sheets tailored to individual patterns were included in each pattern envelope. In 1919, the McCall company obtained patents for printing
the outlines of pattern pieces and the construction details on patterns instead of cutting and perforating them. The idea of printing patterns and the use of the idea revolutionized the pattern industry.

The Great Depression and then World War II actually did more to stabilize the pattern industry than any other events in industry history. During the Depression women sewed to save money. During World War II ready-to-wear was sometimes scarce and usually expensive and women sewed to alleviate both problems.

Meanwhile, in 1927, the Simplicity Pattern Company, Incorporated, was established and was an immediate success. Simplicity introduced new marketing techniques and promotions. Other existing pattern companies were forced to become more creative and innovative in their approach to retailers and customers than they had been before Simplicity was organized. By 1976, Simplicity claimed a larger share of the market than any of the other existing pattern companies.

Selecting a correct pattern size was a continuing problem for customers and the pattern companies through the early 1900s. In 1930, new measurements and sizing standards were adopted by the pattern industry and the ready-to-wear industry. Greater uniformity in sizing standards helped alleviate fitting problems for women relative to the products of both industries.
Throughout the 1940s, '50s and '60s, pattern sales rose sharply and almost continuously. An increasing number of "designer" patterns were introduced by the pattern companies. Through the use of designer patterns the high fashion look could be brought to the budget wardrobe. The existing pattern companies expanded and grew.

In the 1960s and '70s, some important pattern company mergers or acquisitions took place. Simplicity had already acquired the Pictorial Review and Excella pattern companies from the Hearst organization in the late 1930s. In 1961, Vogue patterns became a part of the Butterick Company, Incorporated. In 1968, Vogue/Butterick was purchased by a conglomerate, American Can Company. Also in 1968, the McCall Company combined with Canada Dry and Hunt-Wesson Food to become a conglomerate known as Norton Simon, Incorporated. The various mergers and combinations over the years left Simplicity as the only independently owned and managed pattern company in 1976.

The early 1970s began a period of declining sales in the pattern industry, despite innovative attempts by the pattern companies to stimulate sales. In 1976, the short term outlook for the industry was questionable. In a society where change in social, economic and political climates was increasingly rapid and volatile,
predictions with regard to business outlooks was difficult. Women continued to be the primary users of patterns into 1976. These women, many of them working outside the home, keeping house and nurturing families, undoubtedly found less and less time for sewing. On the other hand, sewing was a creative pursuit and numbers of women sewed in their leisure time.

Throughout its long history, spanning over 100 years, the pattern industry has survived numerous national and international social, political and economic changes. The researcher believes that the existing pattern companies have shown an increasing amount of sensitivity to change in social, political and economic conditions, and have shown an increasing amount of adaptability to those changes. The survival of people and of institutions hinges on their ability to cope with change and in this regard the prognosis for the survival of the pattern industry is good.

On the other hand, the pattern companies which have survived to 1976 were formed and operated by men and women of vision who not only wanted to make a profit in business, but who also wished to deliver a service and create a useful and well designed product. The men and women who molded the pattern industry believed the production and sale of patterns was an honorable means to a profitable end. Successful pattern makers analyzed the market, analyzed needs and desires of potential consumers
and created a product to fulfill the needs and desires. A useful and fashionable product coupled with good marketing techniques, an efficient corporate organization and good consumer relations created an almost innately successful formula for financial success. Historically, all ingredients in the formula were required to be present in order for a pattern company to be successful. Based on the researcher's studies of the pattern companies, it is believed that one or more of those important ingredients in the success formula is presently missing and may be contributing to the decline of industry sales in the 1970s.

It appears that management people in the individual pattern companies, in the 1970s, have been more concerned with the figures on a company balance sheet than with the service and product they deliver to consumers. Conglomerates may not have realized yet that patterns may not respond to the same types of promotions as cosmetics or rental cars. In the case of garment patterns, informing the public of new pattern availability is not sufficient. Sewing is an applied science and people must be taught basic skills and how to use new patterns. If potential home sewers are not taught basic skills, they will believe sewing to be beyond their abilities, will not buy patterns and other home sewing related items and pattern industry sales will continue to decline. According to
recent articles regarding pattern industry sales (Advertising Age, April 17, 1975: Advertising Age, August 23, 1971) hundreds of thousands of patterns industry dollars have been spent in print and television advertising; however, money for direct help to schools, clubs and other teaching facilities has been cut. Despite the fact that Earl Angstadt, President of McCall Pattern Company, reported that test market advertising indicated that "...consumers were made responsive to an informative, educational approach than the traditional fashion-oriented advertising pitch" (Advertising Age, January 5, 1976), pattern companies continue to pour large amounts of money into fashion oriented advertising rather than into educating home sewers.

The decline of pattern sales in the 1970s has been attributed to all of the following: a sudden popularity in casual sportswear, confusion among women regarding dress lengths and styles, increased demands on women's disposable income, and women working outside the home giving them decreased amounts of time for home sewing. Market analysts have often failed to note that piece goods (fabric) prices have risen more dramatically than apparel prices (Commercial and Financial Chronicle, June 17, 1974) in recent years, making home sewing less economically attractive.
What will bring about a turnaround in declining pattern company sales? The thesis that American women, faced with hard economic times, would make an increasing number of clothes at home, thus using more patterns has proved false in the 1970s. The home sewing industry, long thought of as inflation-and-recession-proof, has been hurt by the economic climate of the 1970s as well as social change. Though pattern sales will probably not soon reach the heights of economic growth that they did in the 1960s, the researcher believes that management within individual pattern companies must look inward for solutions to declining sales—to the product which they offer and the manner in which it is offered to the consumer. Money spent in sophisticated promotion and advertising might be better spent in making increased personal contact with the consumer through support of programs that emphasize basic and advanced sewing skills. The pattern industry must find ways to appeal to the consumer in a market climate which features rapidly increasing prices in piece goods versus less accelerated price increases in ready-to-wear. Basic sewing skills must be taught to home sewers so that home sewing will be seen as a relaxing and creative leisure time activity.
CHRONOLOGY OF IMPORTANT EVENTS IN THE HISTORY OF GARMENT PATTERNS

12th century..................Patterns made of slate were used in making clothing, according to records found in Roman Catacombs.

13th century..................Garment patterns made of wood, for use by professional garment makers.

14th through 18th century.....Patterns made of heavy cardboard and later of paper, for use for professional garment makers.

Early 1800s....................Development of various drafting systems and drafting tools.

Mid-1800s......................One size paper patterns included in fashion publications and sold by a few merchants including Ellen Demorest.

1863..............................Ebenezer Butterick developed and sold the first graded and sized pattern in the United States.

1867..............................Jones W. Wilder, Abner W. Pollar and Ebenezer Butterick become partners in E. Butterick and Company to manufacture and sell graded and sized paper garment patterns.

1868..............................Butterick company fashion magazine, the Metropolitan Monthly, began publication.
1870-1873.........................James McCall began manufacturing and selling graded and sized patterns.

1871-1874.........................Domestic Sewing Machine Company (DSMC) began manufacturing and selling patterns.

1872.............................Butterick began publication of its quarterly (later, monthly) women's magazine, the Delineator.

1875.............................E. Butterick and Company failed, reorganized, and paid creditors 50 cents on the dollar.

1881.............................Universal Fashion Company organized.

1887.............................Standard Fashion Company organized.

1894.............................New Idea Pattern Company organized.

1899-1903.........................Pictorial Review magazine began producing and selling patterns.

1900.............................The Butterick company purchased the Standard Fashion Company.

1902.............................The Butterick company purchased the New Idea Pattern Company.

1905.............................Vogue magazine began to produce and sell patterns.

Late 1800s to early 1900s......Patterns were placed in envelopes for the first time.

1919.............................Butterick patented its printed instruction sheet "The Deltor." McCall obtained patent for first printed patterns.
1927..............................Simplicity Pattern Company organized.

1930..............................New measurements and sizing standards went into effect for ready-to-wear and patterns.

1932..............................Advance Pattern Company organized.

1935..............................Butterick files for bankruptcy and then is reorganized.

1961..............................Butterick acquired Vogue pattern interests.

1966..............................Advance Pattern Company purchased by Puritan Fashions, Incorporated; shortly after, Advance patterns disappear from the market.

1968..............................McCall Pattern Company became part of the conglomerate, Norton Simon, Incorporated. Vogue/Butterick patterns joins the conglomerate, American Can Company.

1976..............................Major pattern companies in existence: Vogue/Butterick, McCall, Simplicity.
DEFINITIONS OF THE PAPER
GARMENT PATTERN INDUSTRY*

August 11, 1933

The term 'Industry', as used herein is defined
to mean the manufacturers of Paper Dress Patterns,
created, manufactured and distributed by them at
regular intervals, prompted by seasons and mode
of fashion, and the creation and publication of
catalogues, books of fashion and such other publi­
cations as are necessary for the conduct of their
business.

The definition of the industry as revised April 9, 1934

The term 'Industry' as used herin is defined
to mean the manufacture and/or original distri­
bution of Paper Dress Patterns, the original distri­
bution of transfer patterns for home needlework, and
the creation of catalogues, books of fashion and
such other publications as are incident to the sale
of such Patterns.

*Washington, D. C. The National Archives. National
Recovery Administration. "History of the Proposed Code for
PATTERN COMPANIES IN BUSINESS IN 1934

Pictorial Review Pattern Company
Home Pattern Company
Hollywood Pattern Company
The McCall Corporation
Vogue Pattern Service
The Butterick Company
Simplicity Pattern Company
Advance Pattern Company
Paris Pattern Company
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