

Chapter 1 : Journal of American History - Volume 89, No. 1 (June)

Beyond Empire: The New Woman at he clearly shows women as intruders in a male preserve. Mary W. Blanchard's "The Manly New Woman" explores the anti-New Woman.

Griselda Pollock, Janet Wolff, and other feminist writers point to the origins of late nineteenth-century modernism as the experience of men in public-with women divorced from high art and, in the words of one French critic, "retained for the interior. In popular iconology, too, historians find that the template of the ideal Victorian body followed a gendered separation: Women who wore aesthetic dress circulated, like the flâneur, in the urban and rural marketplace, creating and wearing garments perceived by them and by taste makers as the "high" art of the male painter. Never a dominant group, aesthetic individuals were nonetheless a visible and important subculture of the Gilded Age akin to the historically acknowledged subcultures of commerce and politics. It was the unusual conjunction of an artistic interlude in the s and s between two periods of militarization, the Civil War and the rise of imperialism in the s, that allowed the legitimacy and scope for the theatricality in personal presentation that extended the aesthetic range of both men and women. I am grateful to T. Jackson Lears, John R. Gillis, James Livingston, Katherine C. Verbrugge, Shelly Foote, Pamela S. Haag, and the editors and readers of the AHR for their helpful comments on this article and on earlier versions of this material. And Other Essays New York, Pollock, Vision and Difference, MENT witnessed the emergence of shifting gender boundaries. At this time, some women used their bodies and their dress as public art forms not only to defy the moral implications of domesticity but to assume cultural agency in their society at large. By creating herself as both performing public self and individual work of art, the aesthetic woman changed traditional concepts of the female as artistic object to the female as artistic subject. Aestheticism has generally been seen as a "sensitivity," as a frame of mind dating back to the eighteenth-century "man of feeling" if not to earlier antecedents. In the nineteenth century, aestheticism was manifest as a reform movement for both art and society. It originated in England in the s and s as a reaction to Victorian urbanization and industrialization. Influenced by the philosophies of John Ruskin and William Morris, and then by the Henry Cole circle involved with the English exhibition tradition at the South Kensington museums more specifically-, by the exhibits of British handicrafts at the Centennial Exposition , this impetus for reform was labeled the Aesthetic Movement and heralded by critics in the United States as a new American art raze. Documented by amateur photographers who presented views of "artistic" parlors and dominated by the mantra "artistic," which saturated the literature on middle-class decorating, this resurgence suggests that aestheticism in its popularized form became a general tendency. Cott, The Bonds of Womanhood: Ryan, The Cradle of the Middle Class: On abolitionists, temperance, and suffrage leaders with a moral interpretation , see, for example, Estelle Freedman. Jackson Idears, Fabb of Abundance: Rosenberg, The Darkening Glass: Romantic to Revolutionary ; Stanford, Calif. Willicim Morris, the s, and the Art and Crafts Princeton, N. Gombrich, The Sense of Order: Art education for women, communal workshops and studios, the artistic salons of women such as Helena de Kay, and commercial artistic ventures spearheaded by women exemplify the importance of the Aesthetic Movement for American women, both domestically and professionally. Consistent with this enthusiasm for the decorative arts and for personal creativity was a conscious effort by some Victorian American women to create "aesthetic" dress as an individual work of art, analogous to painting a picture. Writers on artistic dress, in contrast, used the analogy of costume to "high" art, suggesting personal creation and non-didactic intentions. To these taste makers, aesthetic costume was not an anti-fashion statement, as was dress reform at mid-century, but was perceived as an individual expression of art and beauty. Fashion, for instance, was seen as "being. But the elevation of dress to "high" art and the perception of both producer and wearer as "artists" in this more formal sense were unique to the Aesthetic Movement and Boston. See photographs also in Cynthia A. For an example of one interior that ignores the aesthetic vogue, see Ellerl R. Rosenthal, "The Interior View: Photographs of Wyck, " M. Dressing the Part Washington, D. The Theory of the Shifting Erogenous Zone the shifting preoccupation with specific female body parts-bosom, buttocks, legs, etc. A Concise History London, Females had a less visible tradition of public ritual and gender bonding,

Kimmel believes, and, indeed, women have been denied the widespread latitude for experimentation historians find in the male sphere. As Lewis Perry has argued, however, as early as the antebellum years, the Victorian American self both male and female was not a bounded entity but a persona of changing roles and multiple voices. In the 1830s and 1840s, aesthetic fashion added an important new dimension to the construction of female gender identity through self-expression and social drama. Aesthetic dress was compiled from a variety of sources and was not a careful replica of a past model with historically correct data. Contemporaries were aware of the eclectic and symbiotic nature of dress and decor. They are assisting the artist who colored and gilded the walls and hung the draperies and composed the assemble of the drawing-room. On parallels between decoration and costume, see H. New York, 1980, p. 100. Kathy Peiss has described a new public culture of leisure and entertainment for middle and lower-class women. Its tableaux vivants were set rituals with set costumes, dramatic charades, and group performance, carried on only in the domestic sphere. The aesthetic woman by-passed these mid-century conventions and created herself as a public theatrical and artistic subject. Aesthetic dress veered dangerously near a public display of intimate wear. The aesthetic dress was derived from the wrapper, an earlier form of garment that was usually worn indoors, also known as the dressing gown or peignoir. The wrapper was a one-piece dress, adjustable and loose down the front, with many variations. By the 1850s, the tea gown emerged as the most closely fitted form of the wrapper. Generally worn in the afternoon, the tea gown was made of formal, elaborate materials and skimmed the uncorseted body. On the role-playing rituals of middle-class life, see John R. Rosenfeld and Timothy G. Grier, *Culture and Comfort: Blanchard wrapper*, with a yoke of gathered material that fell to the floor. Because of their lack of corsets, wrappers and tea gowns suggested intimacy and indeed were designated for the rituals of the private domestic world. Traditionally, such loose, one-piece costumes had been associated with the female worlds of sickness, maternity, or old age. By the 1850s, these forms had evolved into fashion statements but only within the confines of the Victorian parlor. In contrast, the public styles of the 1850s and 1860s were two or three-piece garments consisting of a tight, boned bodice with skirt and overskirt. Sometimes, the bodice was cut in one piece with the overskirt, but, in all cases, the bodice fit very tightly over the corset. These public dresses often ornamented demanded tight corseting to accentuate the small waistline prescribed by current fashion. Tight sleeves from shoulder to cuff and a conventional bustle completed the public style see Figure 1. 17 The aesthetic dress was an offshoot of the uncorseted wrapper, often with a puffed shoulder and loose sleeve that made use of elaborate fabrics in aesthetic colors sage and Venetian green, brick red, blue-green, yellow, and dove gray. Medieval and Renaissance motifs such as a cuff, long train, or high collar marked each garment as individual, a melange of historical detail Figure 2. The aesthetic dress was not in any specific category, nor were there patterns available in the fashion press for women to purchase for home sewing. In the 1850s, luxurious lingerie would become fashionable, but these garments would still be worn in private. I am also indebted to Claudia B. Cunningham for their help with interpreting aesthetic dress. Earlier in the century, in the 1830s Wrappers were always designated as "morning" dresses to be worn before dinner. Dinner, however, could be served as late as 3 p. Since a woman always "dressed for dinner," she would discard the elaborate morning wrapper at the appropriate time. On the rules and regimentation of conventional public garments, see John H. Young, *Our Department* Detroit, Mich. Kidwell and Margaret C. In defiance, prostitutes announced their intention to found their own defense league to appeal any fines. In many cases, women were making a personal political statement, for artistic dress was more than a symbolic rejection of domestic confinement. Women who wore aesthetic dress were often iconoclasts within the female world. Elizabeth Crocker Lawrence Clarke was one active and spirited woman of the 1850s who had her portrait painted wearing an aesthetic dress Figure 6. She was a student at Smith College, where she won its first tennis tournament, held in 1852. After graduating from Smith in 1854, she studied at Radcliffe and at the Boston Society of Natural History; she received an M. In addition to teaching at Williams College, she was, for eleven years, secretary-treasurer of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae fore-runner of the American Association of University Women and, for twenty-one years, treasurer of the Association to Aid Scientific Research by Women. She spoke of the frivolity of her society and trumpeted her individuality. I answer, the power of good women. My special thanks to Pamela Toma, executive director, Lynne Bassett, curator of collections, and Terrie Korpita, administrative assistant, of the Northampton Historical Society for

their help in analyzing the Lawrence costume. From the evidence available, it was not confined to the artistic circles of urban society but permeated every class in America. Judith Ann Fuller, who has researched aesthetic dress from Wisconsin collections, discovered that women in upstate rural villages were making and wearing artistic dresses in the s. One example survives from , an unboned, one-piece dress of wool, velvet, and cotton with a medieval belt in front, worn by Annie Crank Richards Figure 8 , whose father, H. Richards, had settled in the rural town of Oregon, Wisconsin, in the s and built a small homestead. Annie was in her teens at the time of the move and presumably wore her aesthetic dress in her early twenties. Hohlfeld was married to a distinguished young German scholar who taught at the University of Wisconsin and traveled frequently with his wife to Europe during the s. Similarly sophisticated aesthetic dresses are found in costume collections in New York City and San Francisco, in Cincinnati and Cleveland. An Autobiography ; rpt.

Chapter 2 : Oscar Wilde's America: Counterculture in the Gilded Age

But as three new critical studies on the New Woman demonstrate, the New Woman's genesis had, in fact, more complicated underpinnings and more diverse expressions depending largely on historical.

Counterculture in the Gilded Age New Haven: Yale University Press , Each of these women richly deserves study, and Blanchard has made a substantial contribution in giving them commanding roles in the American aesthetic movement. Undermining masculine cultural authority, they and Wilde exacerbated the male identity crisis that had been brewing since the end of the Civil War. Wilde, suggests Blanchard, invested authority on women as creative and productive artists. At the same time, he introduced a threatening style of feminized and homoerotic masculinity just when the decline of the manly soldier-hero ideal left a void into which such new and to many subversive alternatives could thrive. Blanchard pairs Wheeler with Thaxter, who wrote a poem in celebration of this new national emblem. Both exemplified the cultural tensions central to the lives of strong aesthetic women: Hazard, and for the last nineteen years of her life refused to leave the house or climb stairs. Her writings on ceramic craft were highly colored, transforming the pedestrian stuff of chemical formulas into occult, alchemical mysteries. Seeking converts, she developed a rhetoric resonant with ecclesiastical overtones and championed the development of an exotic, sensuous aesthetic to counter the repressive legacy of Puritanism. Like the other women Blanchard studies, Van Rensselaer faltered in the face of reemergent masculine hegemony. Around these figures, Blanchard weaves a rich and consistently interesting tapestry of detail. In discussing the aesthetic interior, she covers ground previously explored, for example, by Roger Stein in the Metropolitan Museum of Art exhibition catalogue, *In Pursuit of Beauty: Americans and the Aesthetic Movement* , figuring the beautified domestic realm as a therapeutic, stylized, theatrical stage set for exotic intrigue and seductive escape. More provocatively, Blanchard figures the aesthetic interior as the site of a middle-class drug culture, reading the soothing effects of aesthetic decor as the material symbol of actual consumption of opiates, tobacco, and other soporific substances. One of the most original chapters deals with the function of female aesthetic dress. Using wonderful, rare photographs of young women in aesthetic costume and surviving examples of aesthetic gowns, Blanchard argues that such dress, flowing and unstructured, enabled women to devise new, self-expressive public images that connoted artistic taste and bohemian freedom. She documents several occasions on which women were arrested for appearing in public in these uncorseted gowns. Blanchard points out that like other aesthetic forms, these fashions at the same time gradually seeped into popular middle-class culture. Once commodified, they were assimilated and normalized, in a process of accommodation to mainstream, modernizing culture. This is the overall pattern Blanchard detects in the rise and fall of the aesthetic movement. Blanchard is at her best when dealing directly with solid material evidence. Her interdisciplinary scope is ambitious, encompassing art, literature, social history, issues of gender and sexuality, fashion, architecture, consumer culture, and popular culture. The book is rich in images: First, for all the weight of the evidence, Blanchard fails to make the case that Wilde was as dynamic or widely influential a catalyst of aestheticism as she claims. Second, it is not clear whether the aesthetic movement was as vigorous a counterculture as Blanchard would like it to be. Clearly, it offered viable alternatives to select groups of such elite bohemians as the Boston pictorialist Fred Holland Day and his circle. For the larger middle class, however, aesthetic style was a modish masquerade, affording space for theatrical posturing and the consumption of exotic luxuries. Indeed, so rapidly did aestheticism become a commodity that its moment of radicalism was fleeting. Her attempts to summarize trends in nineteenth-century American art are grossly oversimplified if not wholly inaccurate. This account elides the mainstream native landscapes of the Hudson River School, as well as the self-consciously nationalistic agenda of such important genre painters as William Sidney Mount. In addition, the book is marred by factual and typographical errors. There is a great deal of fine grain here, but unfortunately a considerable amount of chaff. Nonetheless, Blanchard deserves a full measure of credit for her bold revision, which opens many new perspectives on a period still in need of much further study. Reviews and essays are licensed to the public under a Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.

Chapter 3 : Project MUSE - Beyond Empire: The New Woman at Home and Abroad

Mary W. Blanchard's "The Manly New Woman" explores the anti-New Woman stereotype of the masculine woman, the bloomer-wearing, cigar-smoking, boss-of-the-house.

The prize winner is announced at the annual meeting of the American Studies Association. The award honors two scholars who both wrote foundational essays on the importance of American studies as an intellectual field and as an institutional movement. A Cultural and Institutional History of the Movement. Warren Susman was a cultural historian who published an influential collection of essays in entitled, Culture as History: Susman taught at many institutions, including Cornell University and Northwestern University, before settling in as a professor of American history at Rutgers University. Eligibility Requirements and Application Procedures Who is eligible: Student members of the American Studies Association who have had papers accepted for the annual meeting may compete for this award. The winning author must be a current member of the association and registered for the annual meeting. The winning paper may deal with any aspect of American history, literature, or culture, but should reflect the breadth, the critical imagination, the intellectual boldness, and the cross-disciplinary perspective so strongly a part of the scholarship of both Gene Wise and Warren Susman. The paper must represent original work not previously presented. Students can apply directly, or self-nominate. How to submit an application: Assemble the materials required for consideration. Unedited dissertation chapters or seminar-length papers are not acceptable. Late applications will not be accepted. When is the deadline: Race Making" Past Winners Visualizing Energy and Empire in U. Government-Sponsored Film, " Prisons as the Emblem of America" Cayetano and its Legal Progeny" Shock as Symbolic Violence and Subcultural Signifier" Art in Japanese American Concentration Camps" Nineteenth-Century Postmortem Daguerreotypes of Children" Hula Circuits Through the American Empire" Elliott, Columbia University, "Telling the Difference: The Social Construction of Adoption in the Delineator, " Black Politics in Minneapolis, " Scientific Racism and the Emergence of the Homosexual Body" Candace Wheeler and Her American Vision" Europe and the Utopias of Gronlund, Bellamy, and Donnelly" Black Emancipation and the Civil War Monument" The Politics of Early Minstrelsy"

Chapter 4 : Gene Wise – Warren Susman Prize | ASA

This Mary is an individual named Mary D Blanchard, 82 years old, related to Ambr Blanchard, Ambrose J Blanchard, Kenneth A Blanchard, and Donna Marie Landry. We found Mary in Jeanerette, LA, We found Mary in Jeanerette, LA,

Chapter 5 : Catalog Record: The last man | Hathi Trust Digital Library

Mary Blanchard is on Facebook. Join Facebook to connect with Mary Blanchard and others you may know. Facebook gives people the power to share and makes.

Chapter 6 : PBS: Out Of The Past

Mary W. Blanchard vote, hold public office or belong to political parties (or, presume most historians, venture outside of her "separate sphere"), Wheeler was a.