The purpose of this study was to explore the possible relationship among fashion media, the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society, and the use of birds in millinery in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Both the content analysis method and the historic method were used to gain an increased understanding of the debate on bird protection and fashionable millinery. Through content analysis, the fashion magazine, Harper’s Bazar was used to discover what type of birds and feathers were presented in fashionable millinery styles aiding in an increased understanding of how the millinery trimmings changed. Using the historic method, and examination of a variety of sources that included Audubon Society records, fashion and women’s magazines, and additional periodicals were studied to understand how the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society affected the use of birds and feathers in fashionable millinery. Additionally, fashion and women’s magazines were examined to understand the editorial position of fashion media on the plumage debate.
The Audubon Society can be credited with the decline in the use of birds and feathers in millinery as well as a change in the type of bird mentioned in fashionable millinery in *Harper’s Bazar* in the first few years of the twentieth century. Members of the Audubon Society assisted in the passing of legislation to protect birds affecting the materials that were available to be used in fashionable millinery. This achievement was reached by conducting a successful grassroots campaign from parlor lectures and petitions to letters to local and state political representatives in support of bird protection.

*Harper’s Bazar, Vogue, Ladies’ Home Journal, and Godey’s Lady’s Book* provided general fashion commentary that included the presentation of fashionable millinery that used birds and feathers throughout the years studied, 1886 to 1923. The editors of *Vogue* and *Godey’s Lady’s Book* did not provide socially responsible commentary on the bird debate. Editors of both *Ladies’ Home Journal* and *Harper’s Bazar* provided commentary on the bird issue that can be considered socially responsible. Comments from the editorial staff in the *Ladies’ Home Journal* were proactive in the discussion of bird protection and provided alternatives to donning real birds. *Harper’s Bazar* contained editorial information that sympathized with the bird debate, but the editors also presented the latest fashions even when they were contradictory to the editorial content. In *Harper Bazar’s* defense, it was discovered through a content analysis that most of the birds and feathers presented in *Harper’s Bazar* were not illegal to use in millinery. *Harper’s Bazar* still maintained its commitment to present fashionable styles while also changing the type of bird and
plumage trimmings presented that often reflected changes in bird legislation in the United States.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 2008, the fashion trend-setting female characters of the hit television series, “Sex in the City,” made their way to the movie screen. Press about the movie was in every form of media, and fashion periodicals presented their fair share of coverage. There was, in *Vogue* magazine, an eighteen-page fashion layout with the actress, Sarah Jessica Parker, who plays the series’ protagonist, Carrie Bradshaw. The layout was similar to the drama depicted in the movie. In the movie Carrie models various wedding dresses in a *Vogue* photo shoot and in the *Vogue* layout Sarah Jessica Parker models different designer apparel in settings indicative of the television series and the movie. The fashionable styles of the movie were discussed well before and after the movie debuted, and there was much anticipation over which wedding dress Carrie would choose. Although her dress, designed by Vivienne Westwood, was breathtaking what also garnered attention was her chosen hair accessory, a bird. The fashion icon had chosen not just a feather or several plumes but an iridescent teal and sapphire bird.

Previous to Carrie’s donning of a bird, I had observed that there had already been an increase in the use of birds as motifs in apparel and interiors and home furnishings through wallpaper, pillows, curtains, and personal accessories such as stationary. Editorial layouts in fashion magazines showed actresses in dresses constructed of feathers and models displaying aigrettes and bird’s wings as hair accessories. Spring 2008 fashion trends included an increase in the use of hair
accessories similar to 1920s hair accessories, and there was an influx of feathered barrettes and general hair accessories that continued into the Fall 2008 season. Popular television shows, such as the fashion oriented “Project Runway,” depicted contestants wearing feathered hair accessories. This fashion trend of feathers and bird motifs and the fashion media’s blasé presentation of it seemed ironic to me when there is a simultaneous trend in popular media of conservation and environmentalism, more popularly known as the green movement.

Today there is much discussion and scholarly activity regarding social responsibility and apparel and other designed objects. As a scholar interested in understanding cultural and historic trends in design and using these lessons to educate future designers and merchandisers, I could not help but think about a similar, but definitely more detrimental, trend of the use of birds in millinery in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. During that period women wore hats and other hair accessories with, not just feathers, but also wings, heads, and whole birds as ornamentation. With the development and spread of the conservation movement and the popularity of women’s clubs, the use of birds in millinery became a hot topic. While there was much discussion of this phenomenon in women’s clubs and among conversationalists, what commentary did the fashion media promoting these fashion trends express to their readers? Is it possible that fashion theories can be used to explain changes in the use of birds in millinery?

It has been well documented that social responsibility agendas of the women’s club movement contributed to reform in American society.¹ There has also been

discussion on bird conservation and legislation to stop the loss and decline of birds.2

There were movements towards various dress reform that promoted similar themes supported by the women’s club agendas, such as gender equality and health.

Researchers have even analyzed the women’s club movement, avian conservation, and fashionable millinery.3 Scholars claim that it was the club movement, particularly the Audubon Society, which ended the use of birds in millinery. But what role did the fashion media promoting fashion play in this debate?

Fashion magazines and women’s magazines were used as an avenue to present information regarding social responsibility issues,4 and in this study I explored the issue of how bird conservation was discussed in both fashion and women’s magazines. Were women encouraged to support bird conservation either through a socially responsible agenda or through their choices in dress? The negative impact that the millinery trade had on North American bird populations was discussed in contemporary popular culture magazines,5 but how or did the editors in fashion and women’s magazines discuss this issue? Did they advise women to stop using plumage

---

4 Doughty, Feathered Fashions and Bird Preservation.
as decorative additions to their hat, or did they ignore the notorious subject by providing no commentary?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore a possible relationship among fashion media, the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society, and the use of birds in millinery in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the United States. My research questions were:

1. How did the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society affect the use of birds in fashionable millinery?
2. What editorial position did women’s fashion magazines actually have on the topic of the use of birds in millinery?

**Definition of Terms**

*Accessories* are defined as components added to apparel that accentuate the apparel, such as shoes, millinery, jewelry, belts, scarves and bags.

*Aigrette* is defined as long feather. The name derived from the bird, egret. There are several variations of the spellings and include aigret, aigrette, aigrett, to name a few.

*Apparel* is defined as clothing.

*Barnyard fowl* is a millinery industry term used to describe birds from the farm; often edible fowl. Barnyard fowl included in this study were chicken, cock, and goose.
Conservation is defined as the preservation and protection of the natural environment, including wildlife.

Domestic Fowl is a millinery industry term used to describe birds that are indigenous to a geographical area. For this study, domestic fowl included birds found in the United States and included pheasants, terns, blackbirds, bluebirds, owls, seagulls, and heron. For the content analysis, heron was calculated separately due its importance in the bird debate.

Fashion is “a style of consumer product or way of behaving that is temporarily adopted by a discernable proportion of members of a social group because that chosen style or behavior is perceived to be socially appropriate for the time and situation.” For this study, the term fashion is applied to social appropriate apparel and accessories in women’s dress.

Fashion media in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries included magazines that were marketed towards women and presented the latest fashions as well as literature and domestic and social etiquette advice.

Fashion magazines in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries included magazines that presented the latest women’s fashionable styles. Fashionable styles for children and men could also be included, but the magazines were intended for female readership, so the children and men’s section were written towards mothers and wives. These magazines sometimes included patterns to be copied by dressmakers. The magazines often contained articles for their female readership and domestic advice.

---

**Imported Birds** are birds that are brought into a country. They are not indigenous to that geographical country. For this study, imported birds are those imported into the United States and included: parrot, peacock, gourah, lyre, and bird of paradise. For the content analysis, the bird of paradise was discussed separately due its importance in plumage legislation.

**Millinery** refers to women’s head accessories.

**Plume** is another name for feather. Usually plumes are soft and full. Ostrich feathers are often described as ostrich plumes.

**Quill** is a feather that is stiff. The quill can be short or long. Quills usually come from the wing or the tail of the bird.

**Social Responsibility** is defined as the “desire for outcomes that positively affect, or do very little harm to, the world and its people.”

Women’s magazines in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were very similar to fashion magazines with a presentation of fashionable styles, but included more literature and information regarding domestic advice.

---

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter contains an overview of scholarly literature on the topic of interest to this study. I begin with a broad overview of social responsibility and apparel and textile research examining social responsibility issues. I continue with a focus on the social responsibility agenda of the women’s club movement of the time period of this study, the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the United States. A discussion of the relationships among social responsibility, women, and dress follows; included also is a more focused look at the camaraderie of conservation and women’s clubs. I conclude with a discussion of the importance of women’s popular media in promoting social responsibility.

Social Responsibility

The term social responsibility is difficult to define because of the vast subjects and areas that it includes. In trying to define the term “social responsibility” Dickson and Eckman\(^8\) conducted a survey of members of the International Textile and Apparel Association in an effort to gain a better understanding of how the concept is used in the apparel and textile field. Finding that many themes fell under the larger umbrella of social responsibility, three definitions were created. These definitions are used in this study to describe social responsibility research conducted by scholars and the social responsibility agenda that was used by women’s clubs in the late nineteenth and

---

8 Dickson and Eckman, “Social Responsibility.”
early twentieth centuries to condemn the use of birds in women’s fashionable millinery.

- An orientation encompassing the environment, its people, the apparel/textile products made and consumed, and the systematic impact that production, marketing, and consumption of these products and their component parts has on multiple stakeholders and the environment.
- A philosophy that balances ethics/morality with profitability, which is achieved through accountability-based business decisions and strategies.
- A desire for outcomes that positively affect, or do very little harm to, the world and its people.9

A large majority of the researchers that openly discuss the term social responsibility conduct business studies and examine corporate responsibility in business practices.10

In defining the term from a business point of view of social responsibility, Park and Lennon state, “a company’s stance on social responsibility is evaluated in terms of four broad categories of criteria: (a) the environment, (b) workplace issues, (c) product safety and impact, (d) international operations and human rights.”11 Research has largely been conducted regarding consumer behavior and a socially responsible intent to purchase based on demographics and sociopsychological characteristics,12 a socially responsible intent to purchase and socioeconomic and personality characteristics,13 and a socially responsible intent to purchase and racial variations14 that possibly assist in forming an environmentally conscious consumer.

9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
Although not always using the term “social responsibility” to describe their research, many clothing and textile scholars have examined issues that fall under the Dickson and Eckman\textsuperscript{15} social responsibility definitions. Under these definitions of social responsibility there is active discussion of contemporary issues regarding social responsibility in the apparel and textiles field. Clothing and textiles scholars have examined social responsibility issues as they relate to body image\textsuperscript{16} and body image as a result of media.\textsuperscript{17} Also research has been conducted in the apparel field regarding social responsibility and buying and sourcing decisions\textsuperscript{18} and child labor issues.\textsuperscript{19} Research has been published regarding consumer behavior and intent to purchase from social responsibility businesses in the apparel industry\textsuperscript{20} with regards to labor practices\textsuperscript{21} and environmental concerns\textsuperscript{22} as well as marketing apparel and textile

\textsuperscript{15} Dickson and Eckman, “Social Responsibility,” 188.
products that are produced and sold using fair trade labor practices.\textsuperscript{23} Research within the apparel and textiles field that has been conducted involving social responsibility issues and the environment has involved the examination of textile products,\textsuperscript{24} clothing disposal practices,\textsuperscript{25} the environment and apparel consumption,\textsuperscript{26} social responsibility though energy conservation in laundry practices,\textsuperscript{27} and recycled and repurposed clothing and textiles.\textsuperscript{28}

With regard to historic studies in apparel, there are also some emerging themes that are related to the definition of social responsibility. Marcketti and Parsons\textsuperscript{29} discussed business ethics in their study of design piracy in the American apparel industry in the United States from 1932 to 1941. Researchers in historic studies and textiles and apparel have examined women and reform issues especially as it relates to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
dress reform,\textsuperscript{30} self-improvement through textiles and clothing trades,\textsuperscript{31} and resourcefulness.\textsuperscript{32}

**The Women’s Club Movement in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries**

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries one of the paradigms of the time regarding women’s roles in American society was the idea that a woman should be nurturing, moral, pious, and pure.\textsuperscript{33} This worldview was strongly applied to a woman’s home and her family, but women also applied this attitude and these concepts towards taking care of society, which allowed women to participate in the public forum. These ideals and actions helped form what we understand today to be social responsibility ideals and actions.

During this time, various types of women’s clubs were being formed in America. These ranged from art and literature clubs to various charities focused on social responsibility. It was through these clubs that women used these moral ideals to improve society. The social responsibility agendas of these clubs concentrated on many different issues and varied from raising money for orphanages, fostering children, urban sanitation, labor reform, prohibition of alcohol and temperance, gender equality including suffrage, education, health reform, dress reform, and conservation.


\textsuperscript{32} Connolly, “Recycling Feed Sacks and Flour Bags,” 17-36; Tandberg, "Confederate Bonnets,” 14-26.

While there were a variety of causes that these women’s clubs championed, through conservation efforts, the environment was also on their social responsibility agenda.34 Civic committees focused on establishing public gardens and parks and working for sewage and garbage collection, while conservation or forestry committees supervised tree-planting, protested women wearing feathers on their hats because of the toll it took on bird life, and worked for the preservation of natural areas.35

By the end of the nineteenth century, nearly every town had at least one women’s club, and women often belonged to several of these clubs. These women were mostly upper-class and middle-class women who had the time, financial means, and visibility that aided in promoting their causes.36 Social events that helped communicate and support their causes included fundraisers, such as costume balls. While their well-connected husbands could be a positive avenue for promoting their causes, women had to be careful not to embarrass their husbands due to delicate social mores.

By the turn of the century, clubs had spread to various class levels and geographical locations in the United States. Small-town and rural women often spread the word regarding their social causes through church suppers, quilting bees, and lectures at local schools.37 Also, granges and other agricultural organizations encouraged farmwomen to educate themselves and their children38 and were another forum for farmwomen to discuss causes important to their families and communities.

34 Binkley, “‘No Better Heritage Than Living Trees;’” Knight, “The Environmentalism of Edward Bok,”154-165; Price, Flight Maps, 57-109; Schneider and Schneider, American Women in the Progressive Era 1900-1920, 12.
36 Ibid; Price, Flight Maps, 57-109; Schneider and Schneider, American Women in the Progressive Era 1900-1920, 98.
37 (Schneider & Schneider, American Women in the Progressive Era 1900-1920, 97.
38 Ibid.
The social causes even reached the ears of women living in urban tenement housing due to their being “lured to club meetings and parties at a settlement house.”

As a result of the rapid growth of women’s clubs, The General Federation of Women’s Clubs began in 1890 to help support and guide women to be active in their causes. The Federation circulated several publications to help guide women in their social responsibility activities and provided agendas for meetings. Club women organized and attended lectures from various speakers advocating various social responsibility causes. Women followed the advice given in clubs and supported causes that fit their own personal opinion of the issues. Prominent founder of the women’s club movement and editorial contributor to the women’s magazine *Demorest’s Monthly Magazine*, Jane Cunningham Croly often advised her followers and readers to use caution when choosing social causes so negative publicity that might hinder the agenda of the women’s club movement would be avoided.

Due to the prescribed worldview related to gender spheres, “club women were ideologically predisposed to promote municipal beautification, wildlife protection, and nature preservation.” Club publications and lectures aimed at environmental preservation rallied for women to stop wearing millinery with birds and asked them to support the Audubon Society causes. Arguing for the ban of birds in millinery supported both the conservation effort and also tackled the issue of woman’s morality and womanhood. “What these early conservation advocates all agreed on, really, was

---

39 Ibid, 44.
41 Binkley, “‘No Better Heritage Than Living Trees,’” 3; Nelson, “Listening to Jane Cunningham Croly’s ‘Talks With Women,’ 128-139. Croly provided this advice in the late nineteenth century.
42 Binkley, “‘No Better Heritage Than Living Trees,’” 3.
43 Knight, “The Environmentalism of Edward Bok,” 154-165.
that it was wrong for higher-class women of superior morals to let lower-class men kill mother egrets…especially if the baby birds were left to starve” all for the sake of wearing fashionable millinery.

**Social Responsibility and Dress Reform**

The majority of women’s club agendas focused on social responsibility causes that affected the community both physically and morally and did not focus on dress or fashion. However, woman’s rights activists that were members of clubs often voiced their opinion regarding how dress and fashion affected women through a discussion of dress reform to promote gender equality. Activists were also concerned that the physically restricting fashions not only were a health concern but also symbolized restrictions placed on women. Supporters discussed how dress reform would improve women’s health and symbolized women’s emancipation from gender ideals of the time period. “The notion of healthy, sensible dress was a central concern particularly within women’s organizations that espoused multiple foci in terms of women’s emancipation.” Reform issues related to dress were devoted to the view that adhering to the laws of fashion “weakened” the female because she did not remain in control of her choices because she submitted to the peer pressure of following fashion trends. In her lectures and writings well known women’s rights activist, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, often asked women to stop following fashion and wear apparel that was more practical and allowed for more mobility and therefore increased health.

---

Although some women might agree that changing one’s dress could promote gender equality or might be better for your health, this also often meant not adhering to the fashions of the day. This, in turn, was a concern for some women because wearing fashionable attire was also an important part of a female’s obligation in life as through her dress women could visibly uphold the morals of her family.\(^ {47}\) In this era, there were many rules and standards of etiquette, and upper class women often changed clothes several times a day in order to wear the appropriately prescribed clothing for the social situation, including millinery. To wear the wrong item in the wrong situation was a disgrace to the family, especially to the husband. So, even if a woman agreed with the dress reform issues, she had to weigh the careful balance between change and the shame she might bring to her family.\(^ {48}\)

The majority of the dress reform literature begins in the 1850s and 1860s, when heavy crinolines, petticoats, and tight-laced corsets were used to create the fashionable silhouettes. These underpinnings were physically damaging to the female body due to their weight and pressure. Information regarding these dangers was spread by women who wrote and lectured about the health concerns of women’s dress.\(^ {49}\) In addition to their objection to the restricting corsets, tight bodices, heavy underpinnings, and skirts, they also objected because dress restricted a woman’s mobility and hindered physical activity, especially exercise. Several of these women

\(^ {47}\) Plante, Women at Home in Victorian America, 103.
\(^ {48}\) “Throughout the Victorian era a middle-class woman’s conduct and appearance allowed-or denied-her entry into desirable social circles. Knowledge of proper etiquette and deportment was essential to the achievement of social rank and reflected positively or negatively on her husband and children” Plante, Women at Home in Victorian America, 103.
and their supporters adopted a style of dress that allowed for more freedom of movement. One well-known outfit was called the Bloomer Costume, introduced in 1851, and consisted of a tunic or knee length dress over a full-bifurcated garment (Turkish-style trousers). In addition to the Bloomer Costume, some women chose to wear more slender trousers that were similar to those worn by males or simply chose to dress completely in menswear. The idea of wearing men’s clothing never caught on with most of the women supporting dress reform, and the popularity of the Bloomer Costume was short lived due to the negative reaction by the public. The style was abandoned by those supporting dress reform and other social responsibility causes because they did not want their dress to overshadow or damage their causes as a result of the ridicule received by clothing that went against the norms of society.

When the fashionable silhouette and the underpinnings changed in the 1870s, concerns of the dress reform movement did not change for the corsets, tight bodices, and heavy skirts remained. The new undergarment, a bustle, was added and placed on the derriere to add fullness and created more weight on the body. Skirt trains remained in fashion until the mid 1880s, when the hemlengths were shortened. This allowed for an increase in physical mobility for women and reduced the amount of dirt from the city streets coming into the home, which was also a concern for reformers. Some women modified their dress to aid health concerns raised by the dress reformers but just enough to still remain fashionable. These modifications included wearing a dress
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51 Ibid, 245-268.
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or bodice that was looser than the very tight-fitting fashionable dresses or choosing not to wear the heavy underpinnings.\footnote{Wrisley, “‘Fashion I Despised,’” 97-110.}

In the 1890s, the bustle disappeared all together, and the fashionable silhouette consisted of an hourglass shape created by a full, circular skirt, high-banded collar, and large sleeves. Cycling became a popular activity for both men and women, but it was difficult for women to ride a bicycle in the fashionable full skirt of the period. To aid in mobility when cycling rationales, full-bifurcated garments worn on the lower body, and other similar designs became popular but daring choices. Although worn with other fashionable components of the period, such as a bodice, jacket, hat, boots, and gaiters, bicycling apparel received its share of satirical commentary. The bicycling costumes were still not accepted fashionable styles by all, and some women felt self conscious about wearing them in public for fear of embarrassment.\footnote{Sally Helvenston Gray and Mihaela C. Peteu, “Invention, the Angel of the Nineteenth Century.” Dress 32 (2005): 27-42; Strange and Brown, “The Bicycle, Women's Rights, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton,” 609-626.} Elizabeth Cady Stanton actually lectured on the liberation that the bicycle provided for women due to the symbolic freedom that it provided women who choose to wear apparel that was comfortable and to participate in the activity regardless of the negative commentary.\footnote{Strange and Brown, "The Bicycle, Women's Rights, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton," 609-626.}

Bicycling emancipated women from strict Victorian rules regarding “proper” behavior,\footnote{Collins, American’s women, 280.} and this sentiment was echoed in the individuality and choices that women made regarding dress and life in the new century. While fashion was still constricting with its S-shaped silhouette created by underpinnings that thrust the torso forward and...
pushed the derriere further backwards, women found variations in dress more socially acceptable,\textsuperscript{58} and “from 1900 to 1911, a ‘season of silence’ ensued” in regards to medical support for dress reform regarding women’s brassieres.\textsuperscript{59}

Another choice for comfortable clothing was the loose, flowing gowns first adopted by artists and dancers in the late nineteenth century. Because the Aesthetic and Pre-Raphaelite artists of the late nineteenth century wanted their models to wear classical dress so that their paintings would not be dated they supported the loose, flowing styles for that reason; they were also supporters of dress reform because it freed women from the corset.\textsuperscript{60} In the early twentieth century the popularity of this fashionable style grew with dancers, actresses, and other women who brazenly embraced growing changes in social roles. Designer Mariano Fortuny created the Delphos gown in 1907 that was very similar to the Greek chiton and the loose gowns. Not meant to be worn with a corset, the Delphos was worn by free spirited women who were fashionable but also wanted to be comfortable and embrace their individuality.

In 1908, the silhouette began to change from the confining S-shape silhouette to a looser, tubular silhouette lasting until 1914. While most women continued to wear a corset, the design of the corset changed to a more natural shape than what the previous fashion period had offered. However, mobility was still restricted due to a fashionably narrow hem circumference, called the hobble skirt. Paul Poiret, a French


\textsuperscript{59} Farell-Beck, Paff, and Moon, "Brasieres and Women's Health," 111.

haute couture designer, was credited with creating this look. Although the slender, tubular silhouette was the fashion silhouette of the period, women interested in fashion had various choices that they could make to allow for more comfortable and less restrictive clothing, while still remaining in fashion. One choice that was created by Poiret was a bifurcated garment known as “harem pants” due to their similarity to Turkish trousers. They were worn with a long tunic called a “lampshade tunic” because it resembled an upside down lampshade. This look was quite similar to the Bloomer Costume but possibly more accepted due to the sixty years that had passed between the two designs, changing social roles of women, and Poiret’s high status in fashion. During World War I, to allow for increased mobility due to women entering the workforce, hemlines shortened and clothes became more practical. By the 1920s, women’s emancipation from heavy underpinnings was finally displayed in popular fashion through the loose, straight silhouette and short hemlines of the period.

**Millinery and Nature**

In previous eras and during the Victorian period, the ideal woman had a milky white complexion that indicated she did not participate in outdoor labor or other strenuous work, therefore hats were worn to protect the face and back of the neck from the sun. Hats were a very fashionable accessory, and it was morally appropriate and imperative to wear a hat. There were appropriate hats for every occasion and for every season. Hats were worn in various shapes and styles during the late nineteenth century.

---

For centuries women have used feathers as hair accessories and have worn hats, but the usage of hats and objects attached to the hat in the late nineteenth century was greater than the preceding style periods.\textsuperscript{64} Due to the growth of industrialization and urban populations there was a growing interest in nature and finding ways to be close to nature. Gardening was a popular pastime for women\textsuperscript{65} and “became a way for the Victorians to bring something of the natural world into their domestic spheres, a way to bring something of the country into the towns and the cities.”\textsuperscript{66} Also popular were craft projects utilizing natural materials such as flowers and adding decorations and ornamentation to home goods and accessories.\textsuperscript{67} When hats grew increasingly larger, it must have seemed natural, due to the trend, for women and milliners to add items from nature, and in the late nineteenth century hats were piled high with everything from flowers and fruit to fur and small animals, including birds.

\textbf{Millinery, Social Responsibility, and the Women’s Club Movement}

In the late nineteenth century, there was a growing interest in animal behavior and the interaction between animals and humans. This interest in animal science was


\textsuperscript{65} Plante, \textit{Women at Home in Victorian America}, 176.

\textsuperscript{66} Joanna T. Pierce, "From Garden To Gardener: The Cultivation of Little Girls In Carroll’s Alice Books and Ruskin’s Of Queens' Gardens," \textit{Women's Studies} 29, no. 6 (2000), 743.

\textsuperscript{67} Plante, \textit{Women at Home in Victorian America}, 165.
related to Charles Darwin’s publications, especially the 1872 book _The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals_.

During this period several anti-vivisection organizations were formed to advocate against the use of the animals for laboratory testing. In addition to the growing concern regarding the animal rights, an additional social responsibility movement was forming that focused on conserving the environment. There was much discussion of the destruction that was occurring to America’s natural resources and a growing interest in preserving the United States through national parks.

The growing interest in conservation was ignited by the “recognized decline of bird populations linked to massive habitat loss, the millinery trade, and overhunting.” Because feathers and other anatomical parts of birds were in fashion for use in millinery, birds up and down the East coast were being killed for their feathers and for their bodies. Some birds, such as the seagull and kittiwake, were even captured and their wings cut off and then flung into the sea to helplessly die.

One particularly disturbing decimation was that of the snowy white egret whose feathers were only white during the breeding season. Their breeding habits made them easy targets because both the male and female egrets stayed at the nest to protect their offspring.

---
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71 Jackson and Jackson, “Once Upon a Time in American Ornithology,” 768.


period on how the feather trade, particularly millinery, was destroying North America’s bird populations of tern, heron, gull, and egret.

When this information reached Mrs. Augustus Hemenway, a prominent Boston socialite, she was outraged and contacted her cousin to discuss the tragedy that they were supporting through their fashionable millinery. They called on fashionable Boston society women and gathered them together for tea and a lecture on the decline of the bird populations and millinery’s role. In 1896, they formed the Audubon Society of Massachusetts and helped spread their mission through lectures and printed material. The first Audubon Society for the Protection of Birds was formed ten years earlier in New York state in 1886. However, the crusade of the Boston women to spread the word regarding the decimation of birds due to millinery ignited a renewed interest in the protection of birds and assisted in forming new Audubon Societies. The mission of the Massachusetts club was to prevent the purchase and donning of birds and feathers for decorative purposes. Shortly after the forming of the Massachusetts club, there was an Audubon Society in nearly every state in the United States, and many members agreed through a pledge and their signature not to harm any bird. The club had both male and female members, but “a great majority of the founders and members of the Audubon Society were women.” In England, clubs or societies against the use of plumage for the feather trade were also highly supported by women, and some branches of the Society for the Protection of Birds were founded by
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women.\textsuperscript{81} This was also the case in the United States for many of the female founding members of Audubon Societies were also founding members of women’s clubs in which they tackled other social causes.\textsuperscript{82}

The Society for the Protection of Birds in the United Kingdom attempted to persuade fashionable women not to wear feathers,\textsuperscript{83} as did the Audubon Society. Some men and women argued that women were intellectually inferior and followed fashion’s whims without consideration or thought to their actions. This type of argument was exactly the platform that dress reformers in both the United States and Great Britain used to persuade women to stop participating in fashion, and this perspective persisted in the plumage debate in the United States.

The hat issue was particularly difficult for clubwomen who sought to uphold the morals of society. Wearing a hat was imperative for a woman of class and morals, and wearing fashionable dress was important in signifying one’s social status. If it was a woman’s duty to take care of her home and society, how could she possibly support the destruction of nature, particularly avian mothers and their children? What a conundrum to have the fashionably appropriate attire also be a signal of low morals. Wearing millinery accessorized with a dead bird could signify that you were heartless and uncaring, not virtues that coincided with the prescribed ideal of womanhood. “Woman came to realize that birds were defenseless creatures, and bird slaughter constituted a poor example for youth that was contrary to Christian values.”\textsuperscript{84} Using this angle as part of their platform and through the networking of clubwomen, the
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responsibility of stopping the destruction of bird populations mostly focused on women because it was their fashion. Women were also the consumers, and if they stopped purchasing the product, then hunters, traders, milliners, and merchants would have to amend their actions, too.

The Audubon Society was trying to stop the decline of birds related to millinery purchases made by women by promoting the idea of a socially conscious consumer, one who takes into account the societal and environmental consequences in purchasing products. To reach women, the Audubon Society promoted their social responsibility agenda through public lectures on the killing of birds for fashion, the distributing of pamphlets, traveling libraries filled with bird information, sharing a “white list” of milliners who did not use birds or feathers, and fashion shows offering hats with no birds or feathers. There was pressure in magazines, lectures, and society; and wearing a bird on your hat became a sign of a woman’s low morals and therefore a threat to her womanhood. The American Ornithologists Union “had been battling the feather trade since the 1880s but would make little progress until they joined forces with the women-led societies.” How long after the bird crusade started, did it take to spread the gospel and for feathers to fall out of fashion? How did the use of plumage change in millinery during this period? And what did fashion and women’s magazines have to say about this issue?

One of the first environmental protection laws passed during this time was a result of the conservation movement and the increased attention the Audubon Society gave to the bird situation. In 1900, the U.S. Congress passed the Lacey Act which

86 Bird-Lore, August 1901, 150; Price, Flight Maps, 57-109.  
87 Price, Flight Maps, 100.
banned the interstate shipping of game that was killed illegally according to the state laws.\textsuperscript{88} After garnering attention by conservationists due to the destruction of its birds for millinery, Pelican Island in Florida became the first bird refuge to be protected by the federal government in 1903.\textsuperscript{89} Due to the difficulty of enforcing the Lacey Act, the United States Congress passed the Weeks-McLean Law in 1913 that was aimed at protecting migratory birds from commercial hunting and shipping.\textsuperscript{90} The weakness of enforcement provided by the previous bills was abolished by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act passed in 1918 in which the nests, eggs, feathers, and parts of migratory birds in the United States, Canada, Russia, and Mexico were protected.\textsuperscript{91} Although legislation was also passed in Great Britain in the late nineteenth century to protect its indigenous birds from the plumage trade,\textsuperscript{92} “the legislation did nothing to halt the carnage and pillage for millinery purposes, of tropical and sub-tropical birds”\textsuperscript{93} in Great Britain. This statement can also be applied to the United States because birds that were not indigenous to North America could still be used in American fashionable millinery, as well, because the laws passed in the United States only protected migratory birds that passed through the United States. In 1922, an amendment to the American avian legislation was passed in order to protect the imported bird of paradise.\textsuperscript{94}
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Research has been conducted regarding the decline of bird populations in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. Jackson and Jackson\textsuperscript{95} and Price\textsuperscript{96} examined the relationship between the extinction of the passenger pigeon in early twentieth century America and human behavior. Research associated directly with millinery and the decline of bird populations has also been conducted. Both Haynes\textsuperscript{97} and Moore-Colyer\textsuperscript{98} examined ethical reasons behind the persistence of the plumage trade in England of tropical bird species discussing commerce, trade, ecology, politics, and millinery that led to the Plumage Act of 1921 in England. This bill banned all plumage into England except those from farm-raised bird feathers that were extracted with no harm to the animal.\textsuperscript{99} Doughty examined bird preservation and millinery from an environmental scholar’s viewpoint concluding that due to legislation and public sentiment the use of birds and plumage fell out of fashion by the 1920s and would probably remain a style of the past.\textsuperscript{100} Price\textsuperscript{101} examined the relationship between the women’s club movement, conservation of birds, and millinery from a gender studies and environmental scholar’s perspective. Price’s study seems to conclude that shortly after the women’s club movement joined the bird protection debate that birds and feathers were no longer fashionable. Neither of these scholars, however, examined this cultural happening through the lens of fashion or the fashion media.
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Magazines, Women, and Social Responsibility

Reading was a popular pastime for Victorian women who had free time, and “proper” women were encouraged to read. Popular choices were novels, educational material, and poetry. Magazines became very popular for they often included short stories, educational advice, poetry, domestic advice, and the latest fashion trends. Popular choices were Harper’s Bazar, Demorest’s Monthly Magazine, Godey’s Lady’s Book, Ladies’ Home Journal, Peterson’s Magazine, and Vogue. To increase sales, Demorest’s Monthly Magazine added a pattern in each monthly issue. By reading magazines, women could keep abreast with current advice and new trends in literature and stage.

Women’s magazines also defined roles and behaviors for the female reader, and the printed word often encouraged, if not demanded that women should take up social responsibility causes. Due to the popularity of reading magazines, these words of encouragement and proper behavior reached many women. Although information regarding the mission of the club or additional social causes was dispersed at women’s group meetings through lectures, pamphlets, and club periodicals, women’s magazines provided an additional forum for promoting social responsibility. Though not as radical as specialized periodicals that circulated among supporters,
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women’s magazines did present reform issues related to dress in an approachable manner. “However, ideas and opinions regarding change in women’s dress also appear embedded within women’s magazines created to appeal to a more broadly defined female readership.”

Editors often supplied their opinion either through commentary, fashion illustrations, or both. For example, the editor of *Godey’s Lady’s Book* did not agree with the radical dress of the Bloomer Costume while *Peterson’s Magazine* actually included it in their fashion illustrations in 1851. In general, though, dress reform was not openly discussed in the popular media for fear of being ostracized as too extreme. Well known women’s club organizer, Jane Cunningham Croly did write a monthly editorial for *Demorest’s Monthly Magazine* regarding “the rights and responsibilities of women in American society.”

It has been widely reported that women’s magazines were used as an avenue to present information regarding social responsibility issues. Edward Bok, editor of *Ladies’ Home Journal*, was not very supportive of club women and advised that joining more than one club would distract women from their first priority, their home. However, realizing that the large majority of his readers were clubwomen and supported environmental causes, Bok increased environmental coverage in his magazine from 1901 to 1909, although it was mainly aesthetic in content more than a

---
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discussion of environmental protection. Considering himself an environmentalist, Bok used his magazine as a platform for editorial coverage for his main causes, which were the beautification of America through the protection of Niagara Falls, cleaning up urban areas, and banning the use of outdoor billboards. However, he did praise the work of the Audubon Society in a column called “The World and His Wife.”

Knight, in a study on the environmental coverage provided in *Ladies’ Home Journal*, found that editorial commentary was provided in some issues during 1907 and 1908 regarding the inhuman use of animals for the sake of fashion. This included some photographs of slaughtered birds and their dying young for their use as fashionable plumage.

**Summary**

While the Audubon Society and clubwomen discussed the importance of supporting the bird conservation cause through choices regarding fashionable millinery, in this study I seek to examine how the presentation of millinery adorned with birds changed in fashion magazines. Most of the secondary sources written on the subject of the use of birds in millinery are written from a conservation viewpoint.

Price discussed the connection between the women’s club movement and the proposed ban of the use of birds in fashionable millinery suggesting that it stopped due to the Audubon Society and the work of the women’s club movement. Coverage of the

119 Knight, “The Environmentalism of Edward Bok,” 154-165.
slaughter of birds for millinery purposes was discussed in the *Ladies’ Home Journal* in 1908 as Knight reported.\footnote{Knight, “The Environmentalism of Edward Bok,” 154-165. I confirmed this in my data collection, *Ladies’ Home Journal*, November 1908, 25.} The literature indicates that even though the anti-plumage campaign had been continuous for nearly ten years and legislation was passed to protect the birds, the use of birds in millinery was still an issue. In this study, I examined how long the use of birds in fashionable millinery persisted after the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society focused on millinery to assist in bird conservation and after legislation was passed to protect the birds. I examined the position fashion magazines editors held on the topic of the use of birds in millinery. The negative impact that the millinery trade had on North American bird populations was discussed in contemporary popular culture magazines, but how did fashion and women’s magazine editors discuss this issue? Did they advise women to stop using plumage as decorative additions to their millinery or did they ignore the notorious subject by providing no commentary? Through this study, I gained a better understanding of the relationship among the fashion media, the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society, and the use of birds in millinery in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the United States.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to explore the possible relationship among fashion media, the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society, and the use of birds in millinery in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The research questions were as follows:

1. How did the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society affect the use of birds in fashionable millinery?
2. What editorial position did women’s fashion magazines actually have on the topic of the use of birds in millinery?

Overview of the Study

I worked under an interpretive social science inquiry paradigm in which social life and behaviors are examined in order to explain and understand society. I examined the relationship among the fashion media, the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society, and the use of birds in millinery to examine the cultural issue of bird conservation within American society during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A content analysis of the fashion magazine, Harper’s Bazar was used to determine if and how a change in the presentation of birds in millinery occurred in this well-known fashion source. I also examined Harper’s Bazar and additional fashion and women’s magazines using the historic method to aid in the

---

In the time period studied, fashion magazines were the fashion media and the main source for the dissemination of fashion information. Fashion magazines reported on the French fashions because the majority of American women and the American fashion industry followed French fashion trends.
assessment of the editorial presentation and position of fashion magazines on the controversial subject of the use of birds in millinery. Both methods are explained below but, in brief, the difference between the two methods is that in using content analysis I collected quantitative data. I counted the frequency of the use of birds in fashionable millinery. Use of the historic method allowed for a broader view. With this method, qualitative data, particularly primary sources, were collected and analyzed. Using this method I was able to explain the use of birds in fashionable millinery. Additional primary sources examined were millinery trade journals, popular culture periodicals, newspapers, a periodical produced by the Audubon Society, and letters written by Audubon Society members. The historic method allowed for an inductive approach to research to discover themes and concepts to assist in answering the research questions and expanding the knowledge of fashion and social responsibility during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

I examined the years 1886 to 1923 to better understand the cultural phenomenon of using birds as ornamentation in fashionable millinery in that era. The beginning year of this study, 1886, was chosen because it was the year that the first state chapter of the Audubon Society in America was formed and 10 years before the Audubon Society of Massachusetts was formed. This allowed me to examine the fashion magazines’ editorial presentation of millinery ten years prior to the establishment of the Audubon Society of the state of Massachusetts. This state Audubon Society was formed with a primary mission of banning the use of birds in millinery. Data collection stopped with the year 1923 because this is one year after an amendment to previous bird conservation legislation was passed in the United States.
The New Tariff Act in 1922 continued the American government’s trend to support legislation to protect birds by including the bird of paradise as a protected bird. Examining fashion periodicals one year after the amendment was passed allowed time for fashion editorials to provide some commentary on the changes in trimmings used in fashionable millinery.

**Content Analysis**

Methods used in research regarding social responsibility have often included surveys, but content analysis has also been used. Quantitative content analyses are used to extract measurable data from written and/or visible sources. With this method researchers can examine information from various social communication sources in an organized and measurable manner. Wolfe and Dickson applied the content analysis method to the text of a United States Department of Labor document regarding the apparel industry and codes of conduct related to child labor. Nelson used a content analysis of the nineteenth century magazine *Demorest’s Monthly Magazine* to examine how editors of women’s magazines encouraged dress reform.
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and other changes in nineteenth century women’s roles in relationship to dress. A content analysis was also used to study the editorial commentary of the *Ladies’ Home Journal* regarding social responsibility issues, particularly environmental presentation at the turn of the twentieth century.¹³⁰

Content analysis has been used in a wide variety of disciplines¹³¹ including clothing and textiles.¹³² In particular, many clothing and textiles scholars have used the method of content analysis to study fashion change. A content analysis is often the method employed to record quantitative data that is utilized in historical continuity models¹³³ and examination of cultural influences in fashion.¹³⁴ Many studies using

content analysis as a method have used periodicals, and within fashion studies some of the periodicals used have been *Vogue, Harper’s Bazaar, Mademoiselle, Ladies’ Home Journal, and Demorest Monthly Magazine.* Fashion magazines are most often used for documentation. American *Vogue* and American *Harper’s Bazaar* are the most commonly analyzed sources for fashion change and have also been used as primary sources in clothing and textile research.

To answer the research question, “How did the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society affect the use of birds in fashionable millinery?,” a content analysis of *Harper’s Bazar* from 1886 through 1923 was used to document how the use of birds in fashion changed in the late nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries. I chose *Harper’s Bazar* due to its repeated use in clothing and textiles research and because the fashion periodical provided continuous coverage of the time period selected in this study. *Harper’s Bazar* was targeted toward middle-class and upper middle-class white women, regularly contained fashion illustrations, and [was] widely circulated during the time period in question.

A quantitative content analysis includes either or both manifest and latent information. Manifest information includes sources that are actually in the text or
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visuals, while latent information is inferred meanings found in the text or visuals. For this study, I examined manifest information found in the visuals and text that accompanied the visuals. Every fashion editorial section in every issue of *Harper’s Bazar* from January 1886 through December 1923 was examined for manifest content applying to feathers or birds to look for editorial commentary regarding the use of birds and feathers in women’s millinery. Millinery refers to women’s head accessories. It was important in this study that I examined each issue of Harper’s Bazar rather than seasonal issues or one issue each year because I wanted to note how the presentation of millinery adorned with birds changed over time and analyzing each issue allowed for a discovery of that change.

Only fashion editorial pages that were identified in the Table of Contents were analyzed, not advertisements, so that a clear perception of what the editors of *Harper’s Bazar* promoted as fashionable millinery could be examined. Fashion editorial pages are dedicated by the magazine editorial staff for the showing and the discussing of the latest fashions. The majority of the fashions are shown through fashion illustrations. Some of these pages present and discuss apparel only while others feature discussions of apparel and accessories. In addition, a few of the editorial pages are dedicated solely to the discussion of millinery. Every editorial fashion page including pages of apparel and accessories as well as pages only featuring millinery were examined. The content of illustrations of millinery with feathers and/or anatomical parts of birds or illustrations and accompanying text describing the use of feathers and/or anatomical parts of birds in millinery were examined. The two questions that helped direct my analysis on the data collected from the content analysis
in order to answer the first research question, “How did the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society affect the use of birds in fashionable millinery,” were:

1. Did the fashion presentation of birds in millinery change in 1896 once the topic became a primary mission of the Audubon Society? And if so, how did it change?

2. How long after the topic of birds in millinery became part of the primary mission of the Audubon Society in 1896 did the use of birds in fashionable millinery persist?

To determine the answer to these questions, I counted the number of millinery examples shown, the number of millinery examples that used feathers and not anatomical parts of birds for ornamentation, and the number of millinery examples that used anatomical parts of birds as ornamentation that may or may not also have used feathers as additional ornamentation. If a millinery example did not include feathers or anatomical parts of birds, then the example was counted as millinery without feathers or anatomical parts of birds but no further information regarding the example was recorded. For the millinery featuring feathers and/or anatomical parts of birds, if the type of bird was mentioned it was noted and counted. I also noted and counted when the bird origination was mentioned. In the data collection, an illustration accompanied by text sometimes included captions under the illustration or written description of the millinery in a paragraph. If an example included both, it was only counted once. The unit of analysis for the study is each instance of an illustration of millinery only or each instance of an illustration of millinery that is accompanied by a written text describing the illustrated millinery. Each issue of Harper’s Bazar that I
examined had one or more separate data collection recording sheets. In each issue I counted: the number of millinery examples illustrated or described in the text, the number of millinery examples illustrated or described that used feathers and not anatomical parts of birds as ornamentation, the number of millinery examples illustrated or described that used anatomical parts of birds as ornamentation that may or may not also have used feathers as additional ornamentation, and the number of millinery examples illustrated or described that did not use feathers or anatomical parts of birds as ornamentation.

In the text I looked for the words: feathers, plumes, wings, birds, quills, aigrette, and egret as indicators of bird usage. These terms were identified through a literature review of secondary sources describing millinery of the period, terms used in the millinery trade to describe the use of birds in millinery, and terms used by ornithology and conservation literature to describe the use of birds in millinery. I made note of other bird terms when I found them in the primary sources. I also looked for text that described body parts of birds, type of birds used in millinery, and the geographical origin of the bird. If the gathered data mentioned the type of bird used, I researched the geographic origin of the bird to identify if this type of bird was indigenous to North America or was possibly an imported bird. Identifying this information lead to an increased understanding of how the use of birds changed in millinery. See the Appendix for a copy of my data collection instrument.

Before conducting the data collection for the years 1886 to 1923, a pilot study was conducted using the October issue in 1885. I chose this year because the issue for

---

this year is similar in editorial layout and content to the first issue used in the study. I intended to also examine an issue that was published after the last issue of the study, but issues of Harper’s Bazar in the 1910s and 1920s are rare in most library holdings, and I did not have access to them until I traveled to the University of North Carolina at Greensboro to conduct research. This research trip occurred one month after I began collecting data. Since I was the only researcher collecting the data, the issue of consistency among researchers regarding collecting the data due to personal interpretation was null. However, it was important to determine the reliability of the data collection sheet and my data recording abilities to consistently follow the procedures in order to be certain that the correct information was being collected and that the collection recording can provide consistent results. This provided measurement reliability “which means that the numerical results produced by an indicator do not vary because of characteristics of the measurement process or measurement instrument itself.” Measurement reliability is measured by observing the consistency with which the same methods of data ‘collection’ produce the same results therefore, the selected issue was examined once by me and once by another individual from the clothing and textile field to be sure that what I was examining and how I examined it provided confident and reliable results. Initially I had decided to read the text for descriptions of millinery that were not illustrated and count them as examples. After the pilot study, I realized that the collection of this particular data was different between the two researchers, and this data collection seemed unreliable due

---

to the results of the pilot study. The October 1885 issue of Harper’s Bazar was re-analyzed omitting the collection of examples that were not illustrated resulting in 94.8% percent accuracy, therefore I began to collect the data for the years 1886 to 1923.

Annual frequencies were calculated for the manifest instances for each individual category above. Then each year was placed in a set of five years, except for the last set of years which was a set of three years. This was done so that the changes over time could be observed more easily in the charts and the data would be more manageable. Also, having the data divided into equal sets allowed me to fairly compare one set of years to another. A grouping of five years was used so that I could observe the presentation of fashionable millinery for ten years prior to the change in the Audubon Society’s mission in 1896 to focus on the plumage debate. The sets were: 1886 to 1890, 1891 to 1895, 1896 to 1900, 1901 to 1905, 1906 to 1910, 1911 to 1915, 1916 to 1920, and 1921 to 1923. The last set was only three years which allowed me to observe what happened in the 1920s, after the addition of the bird of paradise to bird protection legislation in 1922. Due to the uneven set of years at the end of the study, three year moving averages were also completed to provide additional data analysis calculations. Moving averages allow for the removal “of some

---

142 Because illustrations with text counted as one instance, often the text and illustrations were on separate pages creating confusion regarding what was an instance of text only and what was an instance of an illustration accompanied by text; therefore in the first pilot study some instances were counted twice. For the next pilot study and the data collection instances of “text only” were not counted.
143 I do not think that the decision to omit the collection of examples that were not illustrated affected the data collection. Only a few issues in the early years had a minor number of examples that were not illustrated. These examples were noted and compared to the results for those years to be certain that their omission did affect the conclusion.
144 Putting the data in ten-year increments made it difficult to examine if there was a change within those ten years. Calculating the data in five-year increments made it easier to determine change in the data analysis.
145 This was an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1913 that added the bird of paradise to the list of protected birds that were protected from legally being imported into the United States.
of the small, year-to-year, irregular variations which exist in addition to cyclical and trend variations.”

Charts were created so that I could discover any possible changes in the use of birds in millinery and discover how long after the issue of the use of birds in fashionable millinery became part of the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society the use of birds persisted in fashionable millinery. The trimmings used in millinery and the type of bird used were counted and plotted on a graph with the time period on the x-axis and the percentages placed on the y-axis. Counting the frequencies and presenting them on a graph made the analysis of the data easier to interpret.

**Historic Method**

To support and add to the data collected in the content analysis regarding the first research question, “How did the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society affect the use of birds in millinery?” and to answer the second research question, “What editorial position did women’s fashion magazines actually have on the topic of the use of birds in millinery?,” I used the historic method. The historic method was appropriate to my study because the historic method usually starts with a focus or a research question, and the researcher uses primary sources to seek answers to the question. The historic method is often used in historical dress studies.

---

including studies of dress in the late nineteenth\textsuperscript{148} and early twentieth centuries.\textsuperscript{149} It has been used to discuss social responsibility agendas of women in the late nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{150} Tandberg\textsuperscript{151} used the historic method in describing the resourcefulness of southern women to recycle, reuse, and be creative in their materials to make headwear during the Civil War, while Connolly\textsuperscript{152} used it in a study involving the construction of apparel from recycled flour sacks in the mid-twentieth century.

Scholars using the historic method attempt to reconstruct the events of the past by seeking, and possibly linking, concepts discovered in primary sources. These linked concepts might explain past events or behaviors. In these qualitative studies, exact replication of the method is difficult, and not generally expected, because the personal interaction with the data and how the data is collected changes the experience from one researcher to another. However, interpretation and a deeper understanding of a topic is more likely with this approach than with most quantitative approaches. I kept a log of my data collection process so that this process could be fully described, if needed.
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questions and that multiple sources are found that may provide consistency to support the findings. Additionally, to provide well supported historical arguments, the data collected must come from logical and valid sources. Through explanation of what the sources are or who the authors are, I can provide a rationale for my use of sources for the study. Also, by my use of additional and different data sources to Harper’s Bazar I can be more confident that I have not overlooked information, which will increase the validity of the study. Ladies’ Home Journal, Godey’s Lady’s Book, and Vogue were among the primary source materials that were analyzed. Examining the editorial commentary in the fashion and women’s magazines was a logical choice for the study because these fashion and women’s magazines are well known sources for fashion information and are often used as a primary sources in clothing and textiles studies. In conjunction with content analysis, using the historic method allowed me to gain an increased understanding of the socio-cultural issue of the use of birds in millinery in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In addition to fashion and women’s magazines, primary sources used in this study included letters from the Audubon Society archives, Millinery Trade Review, the Audubon Society publication titled Bird-Lore, contemporary newspapers, and additional contemporary periodicals. Each primary source was examined to determine if it contained information useful to answering the research question. Some of the primary sources were obtained from the Oregon State University Library and the Oregon State University Library electronic databases, particularly the American Periodicals Series Database which provided access to fashion and women magazines including Harper’s Bazar, Ladies’ Home Journal, and Godey’s Lady’s Book. Access

---

153 Forest and Stream, 7 January 1886, 465; Friends’ Intelligencer, 27 April 1901, 261.
to newspapers, conservation periodicals, and additional popular culture periodicals were obtained from Oregon State University, The University of Georgia, Auburn University, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and the New York City Public Library. *Bird-Lore* and additional issues of *Harper’s Bazar* and *Ladies Home Journal* were obtained from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. I was able to review the correspondence of the presidents and members of the National Audubon Society in the National Audubon Society Records housed in the Rare Books and Manuscript holdings at the New York City Public Library. Also, I had access to the *Millinery Trade Review*, newspapers, and early issues of *Vogue* that are housed in the New York City Public Library.

With qualitative data collection, including the historic method, “concept formation is an integral part of data analysis and begins during the data collection” process.154 In my examination and analysis of primary sources, I organized the data collected into categories that related to my research questions. I organized the information from the fashion and women’s magazines into categories related to social responsibility commentary regarding bird conservation, commentary regarding the use of birds in millinery, commentary regarding conservation laws, commentary regarding social responsibility agendas of various clubs and their impact on fashion, and commentary that is not socially responsible regarding the use of birds in millinery. In millinery trade journals, I looked for commentary regarding conservation laws that put restrictions on the use of birds in millinery. In the Audubon Society documents, I looked for commentary written to the millinery trade regarding the use of feathers and birds as ornamentation, comments regarding activism, and comments regarding

---

legislation. I also looked for documents regarding various activities that were used by the Audubon Society, women’s clubs, and the general public regarding the use of birds in millinery. In newspapers and popular culture periodicals, I examined commentary written regarding the use of birds in fashionable millinery, the Audubon Society and women’s clubs stance on the use of birds in millinery, and the commentary regarding the perception of fashion magazines on the use and presentation of birds in millinery. After the initial examination of the data and in the axial coding process, I looked at the categories and attempted to make connections between the categories. After categories and themes were established, connections were made between the categories to support an argument.

**Chapter Summary**

The use of both the content analysis method and the historic method was useful in gaining an increased understanding of the debate on the use of birds and plumage in fashionable millinery in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. Examination of Harper’s Bazar using the content analysis method enabled me to learn what birds and feathers were presented in fashionable styles during this period. This aided in an understanding of how the work of Audubon Society affected the use of birds and plumage in millinery. Using the historic method I was able to analyze primary sources to understand what activities the Audubon Society used to increase awareness of bird protection. Additionally, I was able to examine fashion and women’s magazines to understand socially responsible commentary that may have been provided by the editorial staff on the plumage debate. Examination of a variety of
sources allowed information to be garnered regarding different views of the events and various arguments as to why the phenomenon occurred which increased my understanding and enhanced my interpretation.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the possible relationship among fashion media, the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society, and the use of birds in millinery in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The research questions were as follows:

1. How did the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society affect the use of birds in fashionable millinery?
2. What editorial position did fashion and women’s magazines actually have on the topic of the use of birds in fashionable millinery?

The years 1886 through 1923 were examined to better understand the cultural phenomenon of using birds as ornamentation in fashion millinery. The beginning year of this study, 1886, was chosen because it was the year that the first state Audubon Society in America was formed. The study ends in 1923 because this is one year after an amendment to previous bird conservation legislation was passed in the United States. Extending the study one year after the amendment was passed allowed time for editorial in fashion and women’s magazines to possibly provide commentary and for the fashions in millinery to change.

A content analysis of Harper’s Bazar was used to determine if and how a change in the presentation of birds in millinery occurred in this well-known fashion source. In addition to examining Harper’s Bazar through content analysis, I also used
the historic method to examine *Harper’s Bazar, Ladies’ Home Journal, Godey’s Lady’s Book,* and *Vogue* to aid in the examination of the editorial presentation and position of fashion and women’s magazines on the controversial subject of birds in millinery. In addition to fashion and women’s magazines, primary sources used included Audubon Society documents, the official Audubon Society magazine titled *Bird-Lore,* popular cultural periodicals, a millinery trade journal, and newspapers. These sources were obtained from Oregon State University, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, the New York Public Library, The University of Georgia, and Auburn University.

**Research Question One**

In an attempt to answer the first research question, “How did the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society affect the use of birds in fashionable millinery?” both the historic method and the content analysis method were utilized. Through the historic method, I focused on the actions taken by the Audubon Society that might have affected fashionable millinery. To note changes in the fashionable millinery through content analysis, I focused on if and how the use of feathers and birds presented in fashionable millinery changed in *Harper’s Bazar* once the topic became part of the primary mission statement of the Audubon Society in 1896.

A content analysis of *Harper’s Bazar* from 1886 through 1923 was used to document how the use of birds in fashionable millinery changed in the late nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries. I examined manifest information found in the visuals and text accompanying the visuals. Every fashion editorial page in every issue of
*Harper’s Bazar* from January 1886 through December 1923 was examined for manifest content that applied to feathers or birds to look for editorial commentary regarding the use of birds and feathers in women’s fashionable millinery. No advertisements were examined in order to obtain a clear perception of what *Harper’s Bazar* promoted as fashionable millinery.

I counted the total number of millinery illustrations shown, the number of millinery illustrations that used feathers and not anatomical parts of birds for ornamentation, the number of millinery illustrations shown that used anatomical parts of birds as ornamentation that may or may not also have used feathers as additional ornamentation, and the number of millinery illustrations that did not include feathers or anatomical parts of birds. If the type of bird was mentioned it was noted and counted. Although I was also prepared to note and count when the bird origination was mentioned, this never occurred.

Figure 1 is a line graph that illustrates the type of trimmings used in the presentation of fashionable millinery in *Harper’s Bazar* calculated by percentages of the total number of millinery illustrations. Each dot represents a set of years. Three categories are shown: (1) millinery that used feathers as trimmings, (2) millinery that used birds and/or feathers as trimmings, and (3) millinery that did not use feathers and/or birds. While birds continued to be presented in *Harper’s Bazar*, the type of bird changed through the years studied.

Figure 2 is a line graph of the same findings using a three-year moving average of frequency counts. Reporting moving averages allows for an additional view of the findings. Moving averages calculations allows one “to remove some of the small,
Fig. 1. Percentage of trimmings used in fashionable millinery in *Harper’s Bazar* from 1886 to 1923.

Fig. 2. A three-year moving average of frequency count of trimmings used in fashionable millinery in *Harper’s Bazar* from 1886 to 1923.
year-to-year, irregular variations which exist in addition to cyclical and trend variations.  

Categories for types of birds used are depicted in figure 3. To determine the percentages for the birds cited in Harper’s Bazar in fashionable millinery, the total number of birds cited as being used in millinery trimming for each set of years was determined. Then from the origination of the birds cited six categories were determined. These included imported birds, domestic birds, barnyard fowl, heron, ostrich, and bird of paradise. Imported birds included parrot, gourah, numidi, lyre, and peacock. Domestic birds included pheasant, owl, blackbird, bluebird, seagull, and vulture. Barnyard fowl included cock, chicken and goose. Heron, bird of paradise, and

Fig. 3. Percentage of birds cited in description of millinery in Harper’s Bazar from 1886 to 1923.

---

ostrich were singled out due to their importance in the bird and plumage debate as described in the discussion of the findings. The category for heron included both heron and osprey because the terms were often used interchangeably. For every set of years studied, the birds were placed into their respective categories, and percentages were determined based on the total number of birds cited per set of years. Figure 4 is a line graph of the same findings using a three-year moving average of the frequency counts.

Fig. 4. A three-year moving average of frequency count of birds cited in the description of millinery in Harper’s Bazar from 1886 to 1923.

156 In the book The Audubon Ark: A History of the National Audubon Society by Frank Graham, Jr. the following quote from William Dutcher, chairman of the Audubon Society, was recorded “‘Herons’ plumes are often sold as ‘ospreys’; that is simply another trade name used to disguise the fact that they are Heron’s plumes. The Osprey of science is the Fish Hawk, which produces no plumes of any kind.’” Frank Graham, Jr., The Audubon Ark: A History of the National Audubon Society (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1990), 26; It should be noted that in reality heron and osprey are different types of birds. In a discussion of plumage transaction, the use of the term osprey instead of heron is noted: “In the catalog of their sale occur the following items: Osprey feathers (white heron aigrette),” New York Times, “Urgent Plea for Birds,” December 3, 1897, 12. Egret was also used interchangeably but Harper’s Bazar did not use the term egret in the years studied.

157 The differences between the two graphs are related to the differences in how the years are presented. The moving averages graph displays more detail for each year illustrating the changes from year to year. The graph displaying five-year percentages groups the years together displaying the average percentage for each set of years (five or three).
To aid in the discussion of the findings of the content analysis, the years studied are divided into headings based on changes found in fashionable millinery in the data. This allowed for a better understanding of the possible effect that the Audubon Society had on fashionable millinery. Charts with the results of the content analysis are found in figures 1, 2, 3, and 4.

1886 to 1895

To establish if there was a change in fashionable millinery presented in *Harper’s Bazar* once the use of birds in millinery became an integral part of the mission statement for the Audubon Society in 1896, it is important to understand the presentation of the trimmings used in fashionable millinery before 1896. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the percentages and three-year moving averages, respectively, of millinery presented in *Harper’s Bazar* that used trimmings with birds and feathers, trimmings with feathers, and trimmings that did not include birds or feathers. In the years 1886 to 1890 the presentation of millinery with feathers was thirty percent of the total number of millinery presented, and this increased to forty-three percent in the years 1891 to 1895. Figure 2, the three-year moving averages chart, shows that the use of feathers in trimmings increased, the use of feathers and birds in trimmings increased, and the use of trimmings that did not use birds or feathers decreased. The use of birds as trimmings in fashionable millinery remained somewhat consistent at

---

158 At an Audubon Society meeting it was “pointed out the object of the Audubon Society, which was to solicit public sentiment to prevent the wholesale slaughter of the wild birds whose plumage was used for ornamental purposes. The subject was not new for ten years ago an Audubon Society had been formed, and has been passed out of existence after performing excellent work. But the growing custom of wearing birds’ plumage now showed that a new crusade was necessary or the birds would be utterly annihilated.” *New York Times*, “Urgent Plea for Birds,” December 3, 1897, 12.
six percent in 1886 to 1890 and five percent in 1890 to 1895. During this later period the presentation of millinery with no feathers or birds actually decreased by fourteen percent.\textsuperscript{159} As seen in figure 3 and figure 4 in the years before 1896, though ostriches were dominant, there were a large variety of birds presented as trimmings for millinery in \textit{Harper’s Bazar}. From the beginning of this study to the early 1890s, a variety of North American birds and feathers were used including owl, bluebirds, blackbirds, doves, quail, and heron. These findings in \textit{Harper’s Bazar} support the literature review findings that stated that the use of feathers and birds in millinery was a growing concern.

![Fashion Illustration](image)

\textbf{Fig. 5.} \textit{Harper’s Bazar} fashion illustration from 1886 that used a whole bird for millinery ornamentation. \textit{Harper’s Bazar}, 16 January 1886, 53. PD.

\textbf{1896 to 1900}

In this study, I was interested in discovering if there was a change in 1896 in the presentation of fashionable millinery shown with birds and/or feathers in fashion

\textsuperscript{159} Millinery presented without trimmings was fifty-three percent in 1886 to 1890 and thirty-nine percent in 1891 to 1895.
magazines due to the publicity and debate created by the Audubon Society and their supporters. Through a content analysis method, I discovered that there was actually a slight increase by two percent\textsuperscript{160} in the presentation of birds in millinery in the years 1896 to 1900 from the previous set of years 1891 to 1895. In addition, there was slight increase in the use of feathers in millinery by five percent in the same years.\textsuperscript{161} Correspondingly, the presentation of millinery without the use of plumage or birds decreased by nine percent.\textsuperscript{162} Figure 2 mirrors these findings with an increase in the use of feathers and birds as trimmings and a decrease after 1899 in millinery that did not use birds or feathers.

Fig. 6. Fashionable millinery illustration from an 1899 issue of Harper’s Bazar. Harper’s Bazar, 7 October 1899, 839. PD.

Milliners reported that their demand for birds, especially terns and seagulls, surpassed their supply, and New York plumage brokers were requesting increased

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{160} Millinery presented with birds as trimmings was five percent in 1891 to 1895 and seven percent in 1896 to 1900.
\textsuperscript{161} Millinery presented with feathers as trimmings was forty-three percent in 1891 to 1895 and increased to forty-eight percent in 1896 to 1900.
\textsuperscript{162} Millinery presented without trimmings was thirty-nine percent in 1891 to 1895 and thirty percent in 1896 to 1900.
\end{flushleft}
supplies from hunters to meet the milliners’ needs.\textsuperscript{163} When milliners needed supplies, they would pay hunters that lived in the coastal areas substantial monetary payments for the bird skins. Killing birds was a lucrative business for the plume hunters and trying to stop them proved difficult. While reasoning with the hunters was not easy, the Audubon Society decided to protect the breeding grounds of the birds by employing game wardens in the area.\textsuperscript{164} At first the Audubon Society paid the men through funds raised by the organization. Eventually they were able to secure government funding to protect the birds.\textsuperscript{165} The job of a game warden was dangerous, and one Audubon employee, Guy M. Bradley, was murdered in Florida by plume hunters while trying to protect egrets.\textsuperscript{166}

Even though there was an increase in the presentation of birds and feathers in millinery, the type of birds used changed in this period. While the use of birds increased, it was observed that the majority of feathers presented and cited in \textit{Harper’s Bazar}, throughout the study, were ostrich plumes. At first ostrich feathers were imported, but domestic sales soon rivaled imports due to the fact that ostrich farms

\\[\textsuperscript{163}\text{From the Audubon Society publication \textit{Bird-Lore}, the reporter stated, “Before me is a circular issued by a New York feather dealer, asking for ‘large quantities’ of ‘Sea Gulls, Wilson’s Turns (sic), Laughing Gulls, Royal Gulls,’ etc., and this is only one instance among hundreds. In fact, the feather merchants themselves state the demand for Terns and Gulls exceed supply.” \textit{Bird-Lore}, December 1899, 206.}\]

\\[\textsuperscript{164}\text{In a letter to Mrs. K. Marrs in Saxonville, Massachusetts on May 20, 1902 Chairman Dutcher of the Audubon Society wrote, “Dear Madam: I am glad to inform you that I have this day engaged Mr. Guy M. Bradley as our warden in the southern potion of Florida, and I have sent him full instructions as to his duty.” Dutcher, 1902, Box 9, National Audubon Society Records, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, New York City Public Library; Graham, The Audubon Ark: A History of the Audubon Society, 55-59;}\]

\\[\textsuperscript{165}\text{Graham, The Audubon Ark: A History of the Audubon Society, 65.}\]

\\[\textsuperscript{166}\text{Graham, The Audubon Ark: A History of the Audubon Society, 55-59; “The National Association of Audubon Societies contributes half of the pay of wardens on the Federal reserves, but the association asserts that in spite of every effort the colonies are raided and wardens have been killed while opposing bird hunters in their efforts to obtain aigrettes.” \textit{New York Times}, “Aigrettes Smuggled Here,” July 26, 1915, 11.}\]
popped up all over the United States supplying milliners with plumage.\textsuperscript{167} The consistent presentation and citation of ostrich as plumage used for trimmings throughout the years studied is most likely related to the approval of the use ostrich by those supporting bird protection, including the Audubon Society.\textsuperscript{168} When trying to persuade women to use ostrich as a viable substitute for the plumage of wild birds, the Audubon Society compared the removal of feathers to the shearing of sheep.\textsuperscript{169} Frank Chapman of the American Natural History Museum, described his visit to, “the largest ostrich farm in this country [the United States], in Jacksonville, Fla. [Florida]. The feathers are clipped from the birds every eight months, a simple and painless process. The quill, from which they are cut then dies, and later is removed.”\textsuperscript{170} Milliners could cite that their millinery used ostrich without opposition from bird protectionists.\textsuperscript{171}

\textsuperscript{168} In an article written about a public lecture given by the Audubon Society, the reporter observed the female audience and stated, “About 1,000 came to be instructed; a few of them wore the prohibited ‘aigrettes’ in their bonnets, and they received severe glances from their neighbors, who had ostrich feathers in theirs.” \textit{New York Times}, “Urgent Plea for Birds,” December 3, 1897, 12.; In addition, “The women who listened to the talk of Frank M. Chapman on ‘Birds of Fashion’ at the fourth annual meeting of the State Audubon Society at the Natural history Museum yesterday afternoon, went home vowing that never again would they wear anything but the feathers of the ostrich on their hats.” \textit{New York Times}, “Pleading for the Birds,” June 3, 1900, 12; \textit{Bird-Lore}, August 1900, 129.
\textsuperscript{169} “Officials of the National Audubon Association of Audubon Societies, incorporated in 1905, reassured women with humanitarian qualms that ostrich feathers were trimmings proper and fitting to animal lovers. ‘Their use does not entail the sacrifice of life…taking plumes from an Ostrich is no more painful to the bird than shearing is to a sheep,’ remarked William Dutcher, a leading militant bird-preservationist. Heading the Audubon movement which originated as an antiplumage league in 1886 to combat feather fever, Dutcher and his colleague T. Gilbert Pearson objected vehemently to headgear sporting the plumage of wild birds, and included ostrich material when it was mixed with that of wild-bird species. They were critical of cruel and destructive methods associated with the fancy-feather industry. Pearson, however, wrote a glowing account of the Jacksonville, Florida, farm on which ‘happy’ birds cavorted. He perceived that exhibition place as a means of saving wild-bird populations from decimation at the hands of plume hunters by supplying the demands of the feathers trade with farmed ostrich material.” Doughty, “Ostrich Farming American Style,” 143.
\textsuperscript{170} \textit{New York Times}, “Pleading for the Birds,” June 3, 1900, 12.
\textsuperscript{171} A New York City milliner’s advertisement in the \textit{Millinery Trade Review} declared, “Paris Aigrettes,” “Fashion Demands Them,” “No Law to Interfere with Their Sale,” “We are headquarters for Aigrettes and Paradise and Ostrich Plumes and Pompons [sic] in Newest Shades,” \textit{Millinery Trade Review}, January 1904, 4; Another advertisement advertised “Ostrich Feathers and Fancy Feathers” and included a photograph of ostriches, \textit{Millinery Trade Review}, January 1911, 29.
Harper’s Bazar consistently presented millinery with ostrich feathers and promised readers that ostrich plumes were obtained without harming the birds.\(^{172}\)

Perhaps the decline in the presentation of domestic birds after 1895 might be related to the increased attention created by the Audubon Society regarding the protection of North American birds. The bird that garnered the most attention in the early years of the Audubon Society crusade was the snowy white egret, also known as the heron and osprey.\(^{173}\) The breeding habits of the egret, whose feathers were white only during breeding season, made them easy targets due to both the male and female remaining at the nest to protect their young.\(^{174}\) Information regarding how the white feathers were obtained caused a stir among women, especially those that followed fashion’s mandate.

Some shorebirds were shot for the millinery trade, especially the long-billed species whose prepared heads added a bizarre touch to a hat but generally their drab rock-and-sand grays and browns were not in demand. And, among the more flamboyant colors, the pinks and carmine of, for instance, the roseate spoonbills tended to fade rather quickly. White remained fashion’s preference. The birds most eagerly sought by the millinery gunners in the United States were the two white egrets (sometimes called herons)-the great egret and the snowy egret. The latter provided the highly prized ‘aigrettes,’ or long plumes, that grow only in the breeding season from between the shoulders and extend to or beyond the tail. When the snowy egret’s plumes are in good condition, they are gracefully recurved at the tips.\(^{175}\)

---

\(^{172}\) “One is in regard to wearing of ostrich plumes and certain other feathers which are obtained without costing the life of their original owners, and, indeed, so we are assured, without causing them any great discomfort.” \textit{Harper’s Bazar}, 22 April 1899, 330.


\(^{174}\) “The birds are shot, their beautiful plumage torn from them, and their bodies thrown away. But the death of one heron means the loss of the entire brood. For the aigrette plumes constitute the wedding dress of the heron and are worn only during the nesting season. When the parent birds are killed the nestlings die from starvation.” \textit{New York Times}, “Urgent Plea for Birds,” December 3, 1897, 12.


In fact, the discussion of the snowy white egret was the main cause for the formation of the Audubon Society in the state of Massachusetts led by prominent Bostonian women who ignited a renewed interest in the protection of birds from being used in fashionable millinery. In 1899, a *Harper’s Bazar* writer falsely reported that the snowy white egret was not harmed when hunters obtained the feathers due to newly established egret farms. The Audubon Society discovered this was not true and asked the *Harper’s Bazar* editorial staff to write a rebuttal. Although the retraction was not published, the *Harper’s Bazar* writer had informed readers that the egret was a bird that symbolized wealth. “But now the most tendered-hearted lady (provided she can afford the luxury) may wear this beautiful ornament with a clear conscience.”

Aware of the fervent discussions among clubwomen and in printed media, milliners tried to hide the origination of the white feathers. They often dishonestly claimed that the feathers were artificial and rarely stated that the feathers were egret plumes. In a report in the *New York Times* about the discussion of the deception by the milliners in regards to the use of egret plumes at an Audubon Society meeting, it was announced that “The milliners may tell you that the aigrettes are taken from live birds without pain or that they come off in molting. This is not the case.” In the years included in this study, it was never reported in *Harper’s Bazar* that feather trimmings were egret. Instead, the fashion magazine stated that the feathers were heron, another

---


177 *Harper’s Bazar*, 18 November 1899, 974; The *New York Times* also discussed the false report published in *Harper’s Bazar*. “Pleading for the Birds,” *New York Times*, June 3, 1900, 12. I assume that the bird symbolized wealth due to the limited time (during breeding season) that the feathers were white and due to the difficulty and controversy of how the white feathers are obtained.

name for egret,\textsuperscript{179} in 1886, 1888, and in 1892. The magazine editors continued to be deceptive, purposely or not, in 1913, 1914, 1919, 1922, and 1923 by citing them as osprey feathers.\textsuperscript{180}

There was also an increased usage of barnyard fowl, particularly cock feathers that began in the 1890s. This trend continued throughout the years of this study. It is possible that this substitution for the use of protected birds might be related to the media attention created by the Audubon Society towards bird protection, their work with game wardens, and their assistance in passing legislation. According to the \textit{New York Times}, “Scarcity has already driven the milliners to the use of the feathers of domestic fowls, colored in all the hues of the rainbow.”\textsuperscript{181} When reporting on the use of cock feathers in fashionable millinery, \textit{Harper’s Bazar} often used the French spelling coq perhaps because it provided the trimmings with a tone of French fashion authority. \textit{Harper’s Bazar} would continue to use the French spelling superseded periodically with the English spelling of cock.

1901 to 1905

The Audubon Society members realized that to protect North American birds they would not only have to protect their habitat with game wardens and inform women of the connection between millinery and the decline in bird populations, but they would also have to fight for legislation that prohibited the use of birds in millinery. The Audubon Society members knew that as long as fashion dictated the

\textsuperscript{179} “The birds most eagerly sought by the millinery gunners in the United States were the two white egrets (sometimes called herons).” Graham, The Audubon Ark: A History of the Audubon Society, 25.

\textsuperscript{180} The frequency of the presentation of millinery that cited the use of osprey in \textit{Harper’s Bazar} in 1913, 1919, 1922, and 1923 was 3, 2, 3, and 3, respectively.

\textsuperscript{181} \textit{New York Times}, March 18, 1896, 8.
use of birds in millinery, they would have to strengthen their plan. One result of this was the passing of the Lacey Act in 1900 in the United States Congress. The law banned the interstate shipping of game that was killed illegally according to individual state laws. 182 New York Audubon Society members wrote letters to their local government representatives, appeared in legislative sessions before the New York State House of Representatives to present statistics, met numerous times with the New York state governor, and even shipped boxes of the stuffed heads of skylarks to the state capital for visual evidence before an important legislative vote on the bird issue. 183 Covert operations also took place between Audubon Society members posing as both milliners or liaisons between milliners and plume hunters to gain inside information that resulted in arrests and fines. 184

By the first few years of the twentieth century the crusade of the Audubon Society had grown, and, as a result of more clubs being formed, outreach expanded and the number of people who became aware of the Audubon Society mission multiplied. By 1899 the Audubon Society of Rhode Island had 350 members, and at a

182 Graham, The Audubon Ark: A History of the Audubon Society, 31; In a letter to Mrs. F.W. Batchelder in Manchester, New Hampshire on April 28, 1902 Chairman Dutcher of the Audubon Society wrote, “The Lacey Act is doing good and has stopped much illegal traffic in game and birds. Its moral influence is very good.” Dutcher, 1902, Box 10, National Audubon Society Records, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, New York City Public Library.

183 In a letter written to the editor of the Syracuse Post-Standard on April 23, 1902 requesting a retraction to an article in the newspaper regarding game laws, Chairman Dutcher of the Audubon Society wrote, “Under Section 33 of the game law, the only birds that are not protected in the State of New York, and that can be killed or taken, are the English sparrow, crow, all hawks, the crow-blackbird, the snowy and great horned owls.” He was providing clarification to the newspaper on the specifics of the New York state law. Dutcher, 1902, Box 10, National Audubon Society Records, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, New York City Public Library; “Dead Birds Appeal Senators Shown need to guard state crops” Report from New York State Legislation on April 15, 1910, Box 178, National Audubon Society Records, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, New York City Public Library.

184 In a letter to C.A. Dewey, M.D. in Rochester, New York on December 7, 1901 Chairman Dutcher of the Audubon Society wrote, “If you have the time you will aid us very materially in our protection work if you will watch the markets in your city to see that no non-game birds are offered for sale.” Dutcher, 1901, Box 10, National Audubon Society Records, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, New York City Public Library.
recent campaign had distributed 5,000 pamphlets. The Audubon Society of Pennsylvania had reached 5,000 members by 1899.\textsuperscript{185} It was “evident that the principles of the society are becoming well known and are exerting an influence, even in that difficult branch of Audubon work, the millinery crusade.”\textsuperscript{186}

Periodicals and newspapers regularly reported on the plumage debate, women’s role in stopping it by not participating in the fashion, and the work of the Audubon Society.\textsuperscript{187} Not only were reporters freely writing about the millinery debate, Audubon Society members conducted their own public relations. Several state Audubon Societies created lectures that were accompanied by slides that could be shown using an oil lantern for parlor lectures and a slide projector for larger rooms. If members wanted to utilize the materials for possible meetings and recruitment it was necessary to order the information in advance. The Audubon Society made it clear that under no circumstance were admission fees to be charged at these functions in hopes of gaining wider audiences.\textsuperscript{188} Additionally, the Audubon Society focused on youth education in ornithology offering various programs including lectures, clubs, contests, and circulating libraries that increased the interest and participation of the younger generation in bird protection.\textsuperscript{189} The Audubon Society also provided information to teachers as well as educational materials from funds provided by charity events for this specific educational cause.\textsuperscript{190}

\textsuperscript{185} \textit{Bird-Lore}, December 1899, 102.
\textsuperscript{186} \textit{Bird-Lore}, February 1899, 30.
\textsuperscript{188} \textit{Bird-Lore}, February 1899, 31.
\textsuperscript{189} \textit{Bird-Lore}, December 1899, 205; \textit{Bird-Lore}, August 1900, 130.
\textsuperscript{190} At an Audubon Society public lecture, the Assistant Superintendent of Schools in New York City “spoke of the bird as a means of education, in a influence with children; a debt which the children could
The Audubon Society of Rhode Island held a successful millinery exhibit in a Providence parlor that included 150 hats that were not trimmed with the plumage of birds in hopes of showing that millinery could be still be fashionable without the use of birds. Reporting on the exhibit, a writer from the Providence News stated “The result proved conclusively that the plumage of wild birds can be easily discarded without violating the laws of fashion.”191 The newspaper writer also commented that although birds in millinery was forecasted to be quite fashionable in the coming season the millinery exhibition by the Audubon Society demonstrated that the milliners “who oppose the sentiment of the Audubons will at no early day be compelled to reform or go out of business.”192 These Audubon Society Rhode Island fashion shows became common affairs,193 and hats without the use of plumage and birds were nicknamed Audubonnets.194

Although there were millinery companies that sympathized with the mission of the Audubon Society, there was a still an unsuccessful attempt by the Audubon Society to create a large “white list” of milliners that either did not use bird trimmings in any of their millinery or at least would promise to be able to create hats at customer’s requests that they did not use birds or feathers.195 The Audubon Society made a small “white list,” and sporadic issues of Bird-Lore would publish the information for milliners who desired to be added to the list. The February 1901 issue of Bird-Lore praised the Audubon Society of Massachusetts for securing the name of a

---

191 Bird-Lore, December 1899, 204. I was unable to locate the original quote in the Providence News.  
192 Ibid.  
193 Ibid; Bird-Lore, August 1901, 150.  
194 Bird-Lore, August 1901, 150.  
195 Ibid.
Boston milliner to add to the “white list” while also reprimanding women in other states for not securing names for the list. *Bird-Lore* asked women to place pressure on their milliners for they must know them well considering that the purchasing of millinery was a ritualistic expenditure for women.196 The Audubon Society headquarters kept their state societies focused on the millinery mission; for only a year after receiving praise for supplying additions to the “white list,” in a letter to an Audubon Society of Massachusetts member, Audubon Society Chairman William Dutcher scolded the Audubon Society of Massachusetts for not taking on the milliners as diligently as both Illinois and New York state societies had done. He wrote, “Both of these societies are keeping the milliners stirred up all the time.”197 In a response to a letter from the lawyers of Lehman Brothers that accused the Audubon Society of reporting to their retail clients’ customers that the retailers were “dealing in the plumage and birds which have been in imported from foreign countries and that they are violating the laws of [New York] state,”198 Chairman Dutcher replied that he had made no statement “as far as I know, as I am not aware who are their customers.” While he had the lawyers’ attention, Dutcher provided clarification that “The notification that has been served upon the retail milliners visited” was an attempt to explain the state plumage laws.199

196 *Bird-Lore*, February 1901, 40.
197 Letter to R. Hoffman in Belmont, Massachusetts on October 28, 1902, Dutcher (1902), Box 9, National Audubon Society Records, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, New York City Public Library.
199 In a reply to the lawyers on October 18, 1901, Chairman Dutcher wrote, “The notification that has been served upon the retail milliners visited is to the effort that it is unlawful for them to use the plumage of any wild North American birds with the following exception: crow, hawk, crane, raven,
The Audubon Society did not completely chastise milliners who continued to create and sell millinery that used plumage of birds that were not illegal. It was understood that the milliners were only practicing good business sense by providing consumers with products that were in demand and opposing legislation that protected their business interests. The Audubon Society was diplomatic in their interaction with the millinery associations in attempts to promote bird protection. In a reminder to milliners, the *Millinery Trade Review* published an announcement in their trade journal about the illegal “buying and selling or having in their possession gulls, terns, grebes, humming birds or part thereof – as a violation of law, and the agreement entered between The Millinery Merchants’ Protective Association, The Audubon Society and the American Ornithologists’ Union.”

The Audubon Society encouraged milliners to continue creating millinery that followed fashion but to use ostrich plumage and barnyard fowl that were both acceptable substitutes for wild birds. In hopes of halting the descent of additional North American birds and feathers into American milliner shops when Paris continued to declare fashion’s use of crow-blackbird, common blackbird, kingfisher, and game birds.” Dutcher (1901), Box 10, National Audubon Society Records, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, New York City Public Library.

“Charles W. Farmer of the Millinery Trade Review, Secretary and Treasurer of The Millinery Merchants’ Protective Association, called an informal meeting at his office” with Audubon Society officers. “An insight was given them into the importation and manufacture of fancy feathers,’ said Mr. Farmer yesterday ’and they were taken through different trade establishments, where they inspected the goods for the coming Winter season, both samples of those imported and domestic goods made from the feathers of barnyard fowls. They saw the handiwork of thousands of employees in the various factories.’ As a result of the conference the Millinery Merchants’ Association had drawn up a resolution in which it agrees not to use the plumage of any birds except domestic fowls and game birds killed for food in season, after the present stock is exhausted. They will use no other North American birds or those of a similar species in other civilized countries. This, however, will allow them to use the birds of China, Japan, India, Africa, all parts of Asia, and the islands where not white men except hunter penetrate. *New York Times*, “Plumage of Birds on Hats,” May 4, 1900, 8.

*Millinery Trade Review*, January 1904, 62.

plumes and birds, Audubon Societies in many states wrote letters to milliners reiterating state laws and punishments if the milliners imported illegal materials.\textsuperscript{203} It seemed that the intense campaign led by the Audubon Society, especially its female members, was a growing success; \textit{Bird-Lore} credited both legislation and women for the decline of birds used in millinery in the first few years of the 1900s.\textsuperscript{204} The \textit{New York Times} published several letters written by women urging those women who wore birds and plumage in their millinery to halt the practice.\textsuperscript{205} The Audubon Society of Wisconsin reported that the millinery campaign seemed to be working for although a local milliner placed hats trimmed with seagulls and bird of paradise in the windows, sales of these were low, and additionally, women did not trust milliners’ claims that trimmings of wings were artificial.\textsuperscript{206}

\textsuperscript{203} \textit{Bird-Lore}, October 1900, 170; President Ruthven Deane and Secretary Mary Drummond of the Audubon Society of the state of Illinois wrote a letter to a millinery company. In the letter, they stated, “The Illinois Audubon Society for the protection of birds desires to call your attention to the following extract from the Illinois Game Law, which has been in force in this state since April, 1899: ‘Sec. 3rd. Any person who shall within the State, kill or catch or have in his or her possession, living or dead any wild bird other than a game bird, English sparrow, crow, crow blackbird, or chicken hawk, or shall purchase, offer or expose for sale any such wild bird after it had been killed or caught, shall, for each offense, be subject to a fine if five dollars for each bird killed or cause or had in possession living or dead, or imprisonment for ten days or both, at the discretion of the court...’ Public sentiment, as evidence by the action of both State and National governments, no longer warrants the use of wild birds for millinery purpose, many States beside Illinois no longer permitting their sale.” Ruthven Deane and Mary Drummond (1902), Box 9, National Audubon Society Records, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, New York City Public Library.

\textsuperscript{204} “Let us credit it to the law and the lady, and hope that the two are standing with locked hands, as they exchange New Year’s greetings and form a twentieth century alliance in the cause of Bird Protection, as they have so often done in other things that elevate the race.” \textit{Bird-Lore}, February 1901, 41.

\textsuperscript{205} “Can it be pleasing to a merciful God to see the little creatures he has made to beautify and enliven our weary earth slaughtered by thousands, I may say millions, that the daughters of Eve may adorn themselves with the plumage?” Louisa Jay Bruen, \textit{New York Times}, “Letter to the Editor,” March 1, 1897, 7; “What can we expect of men and boys while women set such an example of brutality? Some may say this is too harsh a term, but no other word can express the truth. Woman is brutal which she wears such adornment. If women deserve such censure, they must take the consequences. To think that a delicate bird must be caught by rough hands, and while living, have its wings ruthlessly torn from its tender body, and then be thrown on the ground, still alive, to suffer untold agony until it dies, in order that a woman’s bonnet may be beautiful – Oh, shame to every woman that wears a wing!” Annie H. Nutty, \textit{New York Times}, “Letter to the Editor,” July 20, 1897, 6.

\textsuperscript{206} \textit{Bird-Lore}, December 1899, 205.
While donning plumage was not exactly a fashion faux pas it seems that perhaps wearing the socially correct feathers and/or bird on your hat was a delicate fashion nuance, and navigation of the correct plumage could inform others about your background and character. This coincided with both the campaign by the Audubon Society to reach fashionable ladies\textsuperscript{207} and the decline in Harper’s Bazar of the discussion of the use of domestic birds that were singled out for protection including tern, heron, and seagulls. The snowy white egret or heron had been a status symbol in the previous decade. Due to the difficulty and controversial possession of the snowy white egret plumes, after 1896 most often it was older women who appeared in public donning these birds while adhering to their passed fashions and signs of wealth. A writer for Bird-Lore reported on the millinery observed at a theater opening.

The headgear of a fashionable audience, gathered at the first night of a new play, was another encouraging sign. Those who arrived without bonnets wore in their hair a single flower, a filet of ribbon or some flexible metal, or lace choux. I only recognized half a dozen Egrets among them, and these were worn by women of the dubious age and complexion that may be excused from the shock of abandoning time-honored customs.\textsuperscript{208}

No egrets or herons were discussed in the pages of Harper’s Bazar from 1887 to 1911 nor were terns, an additional bird that was a highly prioritized by the Audubon Society. In the February 1901 issue of Bird-Lore it was reported that while plumage and birds were still being worn as trimmings on hats, there had been a decline in tern sightings on respectful and classy women. The writer stated that either female servants

\textsuperscript{207}“The large lecture room of the American Museum of Natural History in Central Park was filled yesterday afternoon by an audience chiefly made up of women and school girls – members and friends of the Audubon Society of the State of New York. They were there to listen to and to mediate on the reason advanced by the Audubon Society showing why it was wrong for women to eke out their personal beauty by dint of dead birds, worn in their hats or bonnets.” New York Times, “Urgent Plea for Birds,” December 3, 1897, 12.

\textsuperscript{208}Bird-Lore, February 1901, 41.
who wore the used clothing and accessories of their mistresses or women who dressed in flashy clothing, gaudy accessories, and consumed questionable drinks continued to wear whole birds on their hats.

Terns seem, by common consent, to be relegated either to the wearer of the molted garments of her mistress or to the ‘real loidy,’ who, in winter, with hat cocked over one eye, pink tie, scarlet waist, sagging automobile coat, rickety Louis heels, and rings instead of gloves, haunts the cheaper shops, lunching on either beer or soda water, and in summer rides a man’s wheel, chews gum, and expectorates with seeming relish.  

Support for the welfare of North American birds coincided with a growing interest in conservation in the United States. Noted for the preservation of natural resources in the United States through the organization of several national parks, President Theodore Roosevelt also was on the side of the Audubon Society campaign to protect birds. After garnering attention by conservationists due to the destruction of its birds for millinery, Pelican Island in Florida became the first bird refuge to be protected by the federal government in 1903 thanks to the collaboration of the Audubon Society and President Roosevelt. In addition to the President’s support, The New York Tribune reported “President Roosevelt had already assured William Dutcher, president of the [Audubon] Association, that Mrs. Roosevelt is even more desirous than he to support the movement.”

209 Bird-Lore, February 1901, 40-41.
210 As Governor of New York, Roosevelt signed into law the Hallock bill “amending game laws by providing that it shall be unlawful to posses the plumage or skins of wild and song bids for commercial purposes.” New York Times, “Bird Protection Bill Signed,” May 3, 1900, 6; The New York Times also commented on Roosevelt’s praise of the Audubon Society, “a letter was read from him speaking of his pleasure in signing the Hallcock bill for the protection of birds which recently passed the Legislature, and, complimenting the society upon its valuable educational work.” New York Times, “Pleading for the Birds,” June 3, 1900, 12.
211 Graham Jr., The Audubon Ark; Jensen, “Coming of Age at 100.”
212 New York Tribune, March 27, 1907 from the No. 14 Box 178, National Audubon Society Records, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, New York City Public Library.
In the years 1901 to 1905 there was a decrease from the previous set of years of 1896 to 1900 in both the presentation of birds in millinery by three percent and feathers in millinery by eleven percent in the pages of Harper’s Bazar.\textsuperscript{213} There was also an increase in the presentation of millinery with no bird or feather trimmings during this period by eleven percent.\textsuperscript{214} The three-year moving averages shown in figure 2 concur with the findings in figure 1. This decrease seems to be result of the efforts of the Audubon Society as described above.

1906 to 1910

The Audubon Society was successful in garnering attention for the protection of birds. In addition to being supported by the women’s club movement,\textsuperscript{215} the organization also became popular with American society who supported conservation.\textsuperscript{216} Due to this trend in popular thought, one would assume that the use of birds and feathers in millinery would continue to decline. However, studying the data in the content analysis reveals that from 1906 to 1910 there was actually an increase by five percent in the use of both feathers and birds in millinery presented in Harper’s Bazar, and there was a corresponding decrease by four percent in the presentation of millinery that did not use feathers or birds as trimmings. This was also one of the highest peaks for the use of birds in millinery presented in Harper’s Bazar in the years

\textsuperscript{213} Birds presented in millinery were seven percent in 1896 to 1900 and four percent in 1901 to 1905 while feathers in millinery were forty-eight percent in 1896-1900 to thirty-seven percent in 1901 to 1905. See Figure 1.
\textsuperscript{214} Millinery presented without trimmings rose from thirty percent in 1896 to 1900 to forty one percent in 1900 to 1905.
\textsuperscript{215} Price, \textit{Flight Maps}.
\textsuperscript{216} Knight, “The Environmentalism of Edward Bok”; Price, \textit{Flight Maps}; Graham Jr., \textit{The Audubon Ark}; Doughty, \textit{Feathered Fashions and Bird Preservation}.
studied. Figure 2 illustrates similar findings through three-year moving averages. At first glance, it seemed that the Audubon Society efforts had failed.

The Audubon Society realized that in addition to the members and the public tiring of the millinery crusade, that the Audubon Society’s attention would have to be split with a focus on additional ornithological missions before the public grew annoyed and blasé with the organization.

After we had preached and talked this for several years, some of us began to feel that an impression had been made once and for all, and that it was no longer necessary to dwell so forcibly upon this phase of the work; people were getting bored, and we heard on all sides that the really nice people were at least giving up the wearing of egrets and the plumage of our native birds. We therefore flattered ourselves that what the ‘really nice’ elect to do, must sooner or later be followed by hoi polloi, and turned our attention to the educational side of bird protection, i.e. teaching the masses to identify birds, to know their habits and economic value, and so, logically, come to desire of their own volition to give birds the complete protection that is the end and aim of our work.

Not to bore people and to render the pledge suitable for the sterner sex, we said less and less about birds on bonnets and appealed more to the love of outdoor life to gain our ends.

As direct result, laws have been passed in many states curbing and stopping the traffic in native birds and, carried by the Abbot Thayer fund, the cry of ‘Save the Gulls and Terns’ had echoed along the entire Atlantic coast.

Perhaps this was one of the reasons that there was an increase in the presentation of birds and feathers in Harper’s Bazar; however, the success of the work conducted by the Audubon Society was revealed in this time period, not in use of plumage and birds, but in the type of birds utilized. The Audubon Society had succeeded in protecting a majority of the North American heron, gull, tern, and other

---

217 Birds presented in millinery were four percent in 1901 to 1905 and nine percent in 1906 to 1910 while feathers in millinery were thirty-seven percent in 1901 to 1905 and forty-two percent in 1906 to 1910. See figure 1.

218 Bird-Lore, October 1902, 168-169.
coastal birds. Studying the content analysis data reveals that *Harper’s Bazar* rarely cited the use of these birds in their millinery descriptions after 1896 and through the end of this study.

1911 to 1923

While the use and presentation of feathers slightly increased by one percent in 1911 to 1915, the presentation dramatically decreased by twenty-one percent in 1916 to 1920 and remained consistent through the end of study in 1923. With the use of birds and feathers as trim presented in *Harper’s Bazar* decreasing, the presentation of millinery without feathers and trim rose drastically to seventy-one percent of all millinery presented in 1916 to 1920 from forty-six percent in 1911 to 1915 to remain consistent with previous years at seventy-one percent in 1920 to 1923. Figure 2 findings, three-year moving averages, concur with the percentages shown in figure 1.

From 1911 to 1923 there was once again an increased attention drawn to the use of birds and feathers in millinery through the Audubon Society and media as well as changes in legislation. Due to the difficulty of enforcing the Lacey Act of 1900, the United States passed additional laws in 1913 and 1918 to increase protection of migratory birds that passed through the United States. The Tariff Act in 1913 “prohibits the importation of feathers of any wild birds into the United States for commercial purposes. This is the law that is ‘flagrantly being violated.’” As a result

219 Feathers in millinery in *Harper’s Bazar* was forty-two percent in 1906 to 1910, forty-three percent in 1911 to 1915, twenty-two percent in 1916 to 2025, and twenty-four percent in 1920-1923. See figure 1. 220 *Bird-Lore*, May/June 1921, 167.
of its violation, birds that were not indigenous to North America were still used in American fashionable millinery until the early 1920s.221

Although the use of plumage continued to be shown in Harper’s Bazar, the type of bird discussed continued to reflect the Audubon Society’s efforts in protecting North American birds. The use of some imported birds were discussed in Harper’s Bazar before 1896, but after this date their presentation and discussion increased. Imported birds cited as being used in trimmings for millinery in Harper’s Bazar included tropical and sub-tropical birds such as the bird of paradise, parrots, lyre, numidi, and gourah. In the New York Times, a writer reported on current fashionable millinery commenting on the use of imported feathers.222

The Audubon Society recognized that milliners were going to use birds and feathers as trimmings as long as fashion dictated their presence. Therefore, in the first decade of the 1900s the Audubon Society decided that in order to save North American birds they must not rally too hard to protect all birds, meaning that they were prepared to sacrifice imported birds for the protection of North American birds. In a letter addressing an Audubon Society member who was concerned about the staggering number of birds imported from Trinidad and suggested legislation to raise custom duties on imported birds, Audubon Society Chairman Dutcher replied, “If we draw the line too tight we are jeopardizing our native birds.”223

221 Ibid; Graham, Jr., The Audubon Ark.
222 “Gourah and paradise feathers–alas for bird lovers–continue to be used. Appeal to the feminine sense of humanity seem to have as little deterring effect as do the climbing prices, which range from $75 to $250 for a trimmed with these feathers.” New York Times, “The Day of the Spring Hat is Here–Small and Medium Shapes and Gay Trimmings Prevail,” March 23, 1913.
223 Letter to Mrs. Kinghill Marrs December 5, 1902 from Chairman William Dutcher. Dutcher (1902) Box 9, National Audubon Society Records, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, New York City Public Library.
The imported bird most often cited in Harper’s Bazar as being used in millinery trimmings was the bird of paradise. Harper Bazar's shopping service in the September 1913 issue included a hat of bird of paradise feathers for thirty-five dollars. This was quite expensive compared to a hat with plain wings for seven dollars and a hat with rose trimmings for five dollars.\(^{224}\) It is possible that the bird of paradise replaced the snowy white egret once the egret became illegal to own due to the price of the plumes. There was a growing controversy surrounding the use of the bird of paradise\(^{225}\) that could have contributed to its exclusivity, which could have increased the price. The Tariff Act of 1913 outlawed the importation of feathers of wild birds into the United States, but it did not prohibit the sale of the feathers if they were acquired before the law came into effect. It was not until 1922 that the bird of paradise was added to the protection legislation. The bird of paradise continued to be shown in Harper’s Bazar from 1911 to 1923. However, there was a marked decrease in Harper Bazar’s presentation of the bird of paradise in 1923, after legislation was passed in the United States a year later to protect the bird. With the assistance of the Audubon Society efforts, legislation was passed that prohibited the sale of the bird of paradise feathers or other illegal feathers unless it could be shown that the seller was in possession of the feathers before the Tariff Act was passed in 1913.\(^{226}\)

After 1913 the fashion continued for using feathers and parts of birds, and fashionable ladies followed the mandate. The writer of the Harper’s Bazar monthly

\(^{224}\) Harper’s Bazar, 1913, 41.

\(^{225}\) In 1897, Mr. Frank Chapman of the American Museum of Natural History reported on the bird of paradise at an Audubon Society lecture. “Mr. Chapman described the way the native hunters of the eastern islands pursued the birds of paradise with blunt arrows, so as to not injure the plumage. In closing he declared, ‘This beautiful bird is now almost extinct. The species fashion selects is doomed. It lies in the power of women to remedy a great evil.’ New York Times, “Urgent Plea for Birds,” December 3, 1897, 12.

\(^{226}\) Bird-Lore, May/June, 1921, 167-168.
column that observed the fashions of New York’s socialites stated, “Is there mental
telepathy among the socially as well as physically elect? Or how do you explain why
all the women, as if by pre-arranged plan, will array their heads to rival an Indian
chieftain.”227 The columnist’s observation poked fun at the ladies who were copying
the various styles of millinery that used from a couple of quills or wings to a full head
of aigrettes. Well-known celebrities followed the trends; for example, the famous
dancer Irene Castle graced the pages of Harper’s Bazar in a hat from her own label
that was trimmed with feathers.228 A variety of hat styles of various shapes were
observed, but the use of feathers and “wide spreading wings…which shoot off at right
angles”229 united the styles from 1911 to 1923. Even seagulls, protected in the United
States, were presented and discussed in Harper’s Bazar. One caption under a hat
featuring seagulls read, “All gold country hat with two militant seagulls fighting for
first place.”230

The increase in the usage of birds and feathers in millinery continued to still be
a concern for clubwomen. In the June 1913 Harper’s Bazar column “Home Study and
Club Topics” one reader requested a “list of periodicals which will aid me in writing a
club paper on ‘How to Save from Extermination the Birds which are used for
Millinery and Adornment.’” Harper’s Bazar staff writer E. B. Cutting kindly replied
with a list of periodicals and a recommendation to read the Audubon’s Society’s
annual reports.231 However, it seems that the use of imported birds in millinery was
acceptable even to those women who had fought to protect their indigenous birds.

227 Harper’s Bazar, January 1915, 41.
228 Ibid.
229 Harper’s Bazar, February 1915, 49
Possibly it was due to either the amount of time that had passed and it was a new generation of women donning feathers, or many of the Audubon Society members felt that they could not fight fashion and it was best to protect native birds as indicated in the Audubon Society Chairman William Dutcher’s 1902 letter. The use of birds that were either known to be imported or were assumed to be imported were discussed openly in fashion magazines. This included items such as the Reboux hat that “upholds a bird of multicolored feathers and a purple bill.”

Enforcements of the bird protection laws protecting North American birds had tightened in the United States resulting in an increase in convictions. A large amount of the convictions were in New Jersey and New York mostly for possession of protected birds. This is not a surprise considering that a majority of the milliners held central offices or manufacturing workshops in these two states. In addition, the Audubon Society targeted the milliners in New York City, the center of the millinery trade in the United States. The Audubon Society felt that they needed to focus on where the most millinery with plumage was being produced and sold. One New York

---

232 It had been fifteen to twenty years since the millinery campaign started.
233 Letter to Mrs. Kinghill Marrs December 5, 1902 from Chairman William Dutcher. Dutcher (1902) Box 9, National Audubon Society Records, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, New York City Public Library.
234 Reboux was well-known fashionable milliner.
235 Vogue, 1 March 1923, 43.
236 “Mr. Nelson was found guilty and fined fifty dollars and costs, about eighty dollars in all. Mr. Nelson was charged with having in his possession and exposing for sale three dead wild birds. The testimony offered by the State showed that Mr. Nelson had for the sale the plumage of a black tern.” Millinery Trade Review, January 1904, 62; George Silva, Managing Director and Secretary-Treasurer of Sciaima & Co., importer of feathers of 57 East Eighth Street, a branch of the Société Anonyme Blumenfeld-Sciaima of Paris, pleaded guilty to five indictments in the Federal District Court before Judge Hough yesterday.” New York Times, “Importer Admits Frauds,” December 16, 1915; “Twenty seizures of aigrettes have been made in this city within the last thirty days, and the last one revolved about a dramatic raid by Inspectors of the State Conservation Commission last week upon a loft of a prominent plumage firm of West Thirty-second Street. Locked up in a safe was a box of filmy aigrettes. The charge was made against the firm that it had been selling these ornaments contrary to the State statute known as the Audubon Law.” New York Times, “Court May Decide White Heron Home,” December 19, 1915; New York Times, “For Customs Fraud,” Dec 21, 1915.
237 Ibid; Bird-Lore, March/April 1914, 152.
City milliner retaliated by moving manufacturing operations to Philadelphia where Pennsylvania state laws were less restrictive, while keeping their shops and headquarters in New York City.

Owing to a law of the State of New York which took effect on the 1st inst. and prohibits the sale in that State of numerous kinds of feathers, including aigrettes, this Company has opened a place of business at the foregoing address, for the manufacture and sale of aigrettes.

An office will be maintained at No. 621 Broadway, Cable Building, New York City, to which orders may be forwarded for transmission to our place of business in Philadelphia, for acceptance there. This company will carry no aigrettes in the State of New York for sale, and all sales of such merchandise will be made strictly in compliance with the laws of that State.\(^\text{238}\)

In general, the increased legislation and enforcement of the laws made the importation of birds and plumage more appealing to milliners because of decreased government and public opposition. The pressure on some milliners to follow the law seemed to have worked. For example, the \textit{Millinery Trade Review} published a letter written to the Conservation Commission and Forest, Fish and Game Commission of the State of New York requesting information for what bird plumage can be legally sold in the state. “The millinery trade desires to conform to the law in every particular and there is no way in which it can do so without having information from those authorized to put the law into execution.”\(^\text{239}\) After receiving the list of bird plumage that could be legally sold, the \textit{Millinery Trade Review} published the list with the following, “From the above list importers, manufactures and jobbers are showing an

\(^{238}\) The Universal Feather Company included the statement in the July issue of the \textit{Millinery Trade Review}, \textit{Millinery Trade Review}, July 1911, 41.\(^{239}\) \textit{Millinery Trade Review}, September 1911, 95.
assortment of patterns of fancy feathers that meet all the requirements of fashion as well as satisfying the conscience of the most scrupulous.”

Not only was the millinery industry penalized for illegal plumage, those who wore the plumage were also asked to uphold the law. A writer for the *New York Times* reported the following story.

In enforcing the regulations prohibiting the importation of the plumage of wild birds, the Customs officials on the piers have had difficulty in distinguishing the women who arrive in the steamships from their friends that come to meet them.

When the Cunarder *Lusitania* arrived yesterday from Liverpool a dozen women wearing aigrets were standing on the pier. Later an Inspector ascertained that a woman who had worn a costly plume had been a passenger on the *Lusitania*. She left the pier for the Hotel Vanderbilt. The Inspector was told by his superior to go to the hotel and get the feather.

Mrs. Henry M. Blackmer of Denver, who arrived on the Cunarder with her husband, was in her sitting room when the Customs Inspector arrived at the hotel.

‘Madam,’ the official said to her, ‘will you kindly remove the feather from your hat, as it is forbidden to bring it into the country?’

‘How absurd,’ Mrs. Blackmer replied. ‘But if Uncle Sam really wants my feather he can have it. I paid only $8 for it in Chicago before I went abroad.’ Then she clipped the stitches that attached it to the hat and gave the plume to the Inspector, who carried it away to the Appraisers’ Stores.”

In the pages of the *New York Times* additional incidents were recorded regarding the illegal transport of plumage included in the Tariff Act of 1913.

---

240 Ibid.
242 ‘Five hats valued at $500 belonging to Mrs. William Gilchrist, who lives at the Hotel Plaza, were held by the custom officials when she arrived yesterday with her husband from Bermuda on the Royal Mail steam packet *Arcadian*. Mrs. Gilchrist was told by the Acting Deputy Surveyor in charge that the hats could be passed if she would remove the wild bird plumage with which they were adorned. Mrs. Gilchrist said she bought the hats in the United States and took them to Bermuda with her a few weeks ago. ‘I did not know that Bermuda was out of the United States,’ said Mrs. Gilchrist, ‘and that I should have to re-enter the country as if I was returning from a trip to Europe.’” *New York Times*, “Hold Up Five Hats,” January 9, 1914, 1; An additional story included the following report. “Miss Bonita, a vaudeville dancer, arrive here on the *Lusitania* yesterday from Liverpool dressed in black and white divided skirt costume. In her hat were two aigretts which the merciless customs officials told her would have to be removed, as importation of the feathers were forbidden. In the dancer’s trunks the Inspectors
explained, efforts were made by the government to assist upholding the bird protection laws. Additionally, the Audubon Society continued to observe and act diligently on behalf of bird protection.

Dr. T. Gilbert Pearson of New York, Secretary of the National Association of Audubon Societies has asked the Attorney General to ascertain whether the postal laws are being violated through the smuggling of aigrettes in parcel post packages. In explaining his request Dr. Pearson said:

‘The large number of aigrettes worn by New York society women and the abundance of this millinery plumage would indicate that aigrettes are being smuggled into New York in large quantities. They are sent from several parts of Florida and are send out mostly through the parcel post. Sometimes they are concealed in shipments of alligator hides. Many are sold direct to tourists in Florida. We area staring a rigid investigation.’

Dr. Pearson had just returned from Florida, where he gathered evidence in regard to the alleged smuggling. He visited Washington on his return to report to the Federal authorities. 

Conclusion for Research Question One

Overall the Audubon Society was successful in protecting endangered North American birds from being used in fashionable millinery. After the millinery crusade began, the type of bird used in millinery changed with a decline in the citation of endangered North American birds and an increase in the citation of the use of imported birds and barnyard fowl in the fashion magazine, Harper’s Bazar. The Audubon Society realized that the use of plumage and birds would not fade as long as Paris promoted it as fashion; therefore, in addition to its public relations activities the

---


organization sought to protect birds through legislation. The availability of particular types of birds used for fashionable millinery trimmings in the United States did change in the time period studied. It is most likely that this change was due to the efforts of the Audubon Society to legislate changes and initiate the physical protection of birds by Audubon Society appointed game wardens. The visual presentation of birds and feathers in fashionable millinery in Harper’s Bazar reflected the majority of these changes visible in the percentage of types of millinery presented that used plumage and birds.

**Research Question Two**

To answer the second research question “What editorial position did women’s fashion magazines actually have on the topic of the use of birds in millinery?” the historical method was used. Fashion and women’s magazines as well as Bird-Lore, Audubon Society Records, and contemporary periodicals were studied. Fashion and women’s magazines examined in this study included Harper’s Bazar, Vogue, Ladies’ Home Journal, and Godey’s Lady’s Book between the years 1886 to 1923. The majority of the commentary discussed in this chapter focuses on Harper’s Bazar due to the intensity with which the magazine was examined as a result of its use in the content analysis. Ladies’ Home Journal also provided substantial information regarding the research question. After a thorough examination of issues of Vogue and Godey’s Lady’s Book little was found that discussed the debate on the use of birds in millinery, but the pages of both magazines were filled with fashionable millinery employing birds and plumage as trimmings.
Discussion of Fashionable Millinery

Throughout the years studied, 1886 to 1923, fashionable millinery utilizing birds and plumage was presented within the pages of all four of the women’s and fashion magazines even amid the plumage issue in the United States.244 When asked by a reader why Harper’s Bazar continued to show fashionable millinery trimmed with birds and feathers when the topic was a growing debate, the editor replied,

> While we sincerely regret the destruction of birds for millinery purposes, we cannot stultify ourselves by refusing to tell our readers that they are still worn when the shops and streets are full of them. The Bazar does not undertake to set the fashions, but only to chronicle them truthfully. When ladies stop wearing birds and plumage, it will be glad to say so.245

In this statement the policy of Harper’s Bazar was made clear. The purpose of the magazine was to provide the latest fashions regardless of any socially responsible ideals that were held by the editorial staff. The fashion magazine was supposed to be the messenger no matter what the news. The staff of Harper’s Bazar adhered to this presentation style whether it was regarding the plumage debate or the excessive trimmings on hats. This is demonstrated in a 1901 article regarding the large hats and trimmings worn by women inside a venue. The excessive plumage and floral trimmings that hindered theatre views are excused due to their attractiveness and adherence to fashion.246 This approach continued with other fashion editorials in

---

244 Of the magazines examined for this study, only two were continuously published during this time, Harper’s Bazar and The Ladies’ Home Journal.
245 “Answers to Correspondents” Harper’s Bazar, 13 November 1886, 751.
246 “The rule of taking off the hat in the theatre has never been introduced in the Astoria ballroom and although it is almost impossible – as all the seats are on a level – to see over the heads covered with big hats, still it is an accepted nuisance and women have delighted in wearing large hats, in which they have looked very attractive. Many of the hats down on the face have been worn with the aggressive aigrette or soft plume, or, better still a clump of violets sticking straight up in the from. Looking at the collection of hats together the effect of color is very charming, and perhaps that is the reason why there has not been more fault found with the obstruction of vision.” Harper’s Bazar, April 1901, 272.
Harper’s Bazar, and most millinery reports were on the new styles for the season and how to wear them. The use of birds is stated bluntly. “These are trimmed… with white pigeons – the entire bird put on, the claws and beak a bright color, and the head of the bird thrust through a collar of rhinestones.”

Fig. 7. “There are pink birds on the black milan hat.”

Vogue was often straight to the point in the presentation of fashionable millinery styles using plumage and birds with repeated announcements such as “There are pink birds on the black milan hat” as illustrated in figure 7. What to expect in the new fall season when “foliage and flowers are exchanged for wings and plumes” was coveted information. A lot of the fashion magazine commentary in the four magazines studied informed readers of the proper placement of trimmings. A Vogue

---

248 Figure 5 is a Vogue illustration from 1917 with accompanied text that read, “There are pink birds on the black milan hat.” Vogue, 15 February 1917, 45. PD
249 Vogue, 15 February 1917, 45.
250 Ladies’ Home Journal, September 1889, 12.
writer stated, a “bow of velvet with two white wings against a raised brim at left
towards back.”

Fig. 8. “Sweep of red wings at the topmost point of the hat”

In describing an autumn hat, a *Godey’s Lady’s Book* writer mentioned that
“round the crown is a plume of black feathers rising a little to the left of the front”
while *Vogue* and *Harper’s Bazar* writers reported that there was a “sweep of red
wings at the topmost point of the hat” and “A row of small fancy feathers, with velvet
loops between them…and mounted birds are disposed here and there among the folds
of the felt,” respectively. To adorn the new style in millinery, the cloche, *Harper’s
Bazar* advised in 1923 that “breasts of birds and tiny feathers” were to be “applied
flat.” It was quite important for fashion devotees to have the perfect placement of
the trimmings. For example, when describing a hat one *Vogue* writer declared that “an

---

251 *Vogue*, 25 April 1901, xi.
252 *Vogue*, 15 February 1917, 31. PD.
253 *Godey’s Lady’s Book*, September 1892, 275; *Vogue*, 15 February 1917, 31; *Harper’s Bazar*, 16
January 1886, 53. See figure 8 for the illustration that accompanied the description of millinery in a
*Vogue* fashion page. The caption read, “sweep of red wings at the topmost point of this hat of fine red
254 *Harper’s Bazar* October 1923, 76.
outspread brown bird” was placed “at exactly the right angle. These angles are so
smart, – and so difficult to attain.”

Sometimes the readers were informed of the price of millinery; the Harper’s Bazar shopping service for the September 1913 issue included a hat of bird of paradise feathers for thirty-five dollars, and in Vogue readers were told that a hat “trimmed with a scarf and wing” was “the small amount of $1.75” in 1899. Often the readers were told how, where, and when to wear the millinery. For example, in Vogue it was suggested for evening to wear a black velvet headband with long plumes at the nape of the neck to balance the plunging neckline. In addition, it was reported in Harper’s Bazar that a large, picture hat “laden with sweeping black plumes” would complete “an ideal restaurant costume.”

“The birds upon the new season’s toques are intended to be worn with tailored costumes,” was reported in Ladies’ Home Journal reported. Of course, the fashion magazine editors persuaded women to try the millinery trends. When discussing the ornamentation of “a modest little black aigret” on a hat a Vogue writer asked, “who wouldn’t look innocent in that?”

Harper’s Bazar editors covered suitable plumage and bird use in millinery for mourning. While it was appropriate for the claws and beak to be bright in most millinery, it was, however, inappropriate for the claws to be colored for mourning.

---

255 *Vogue*, 15 February 1917, 30.
256 *Harper’s Bazar*, September 1913; “one can try a smart little straw, like the sketch, trimmed with a scarf and wing for the small amount of $1.75,” *Vogue*, March 1899, 139.
257 “Black velvet binds the brow of Mme. de Vilmorin and releases long uncurled plumes which serve the purpose of modifying an extreme décolletage” design by “Reboux,” *Vogue*, 1 March 1923, 45.
258 *Harper’s Bazar*, February 1920, 66.
260 *Vogue*, 15 February 1917, 44.
attire. No matter how absurd the trimmings were Harper’s Bazar editors redeemed it appropriate, even for mourning, if created by a fashionable milliner. “A curious effect was seen the other day in one of these hats, made of crêpe and trimmed with white birds. It was certainly very startling, and had not the hat received the mark of approval of a fashionable milliner, would have been considered grotesquely inappropriate.”

Editors of the fashion magazines also were sure to educate their readers in proper care and cleaning of their millinery. Godey’s Magazine263 editors went as far as explaining to readers how to dye feathers and wings264 but never mentioned how their care and reuse might save their avian cousins and siblings from a similar end. Neither did Harper’s Bazar writer Harriet Edwards when she discussed how to dust the birds, steam the wings and tails back into their original millinery settings, re-curl feathers, and how to replace a lost bird’s eye with the head of a pin and sealing-wax. She was respectful to the bird movement, though, by her apology to the Audubon Society for her address of the subject. In the end, she advised readers to spend money on quality feathers so that they maintained their curl and affect and such maintenance services would not need to be performed.265

261 “The color given by the bright claws and beak relieve the dove-color, but for mourning the claws are not colored.” “Paris Millinery for Autumn and Winter,” Harper’s Bazar, 7 October 1899, 839.
262 Ibid.
263 The title of the publication changed from Godey’s Lady’s Book to Godey’s Magazine in 1892.
The Plumage Debate, Women’s Clubs, and Magazines

Previous researchers have indicated that women’s magazines provided information that promoted social responsibility to its readers. Information to support this claim was found in this study in the pages of Harper’s Bazar, Ladies’ Home Journal, Godey’s Lady’s Book, and Vogue. Godey’s Lady’s Book and Vogue reported on charitable social events that raised money and awareness of social responsible issues such as education of the poor and fundraisers for hospitals. Godey’s Magazine also provided commentary about women’s dress reform and the writers discussed the possible adoption of bloomers for bicycling. Ladies’ Home Journal writers discussed socially responsible activities, but Ladies’ Home Journal editor, Edward Bok, did not support women’s clubs because it took women away from their duties at home.

Commentary in an article written by Janet M. Ward for Ladies’ Home Journal reinforced the editor’s perspective in her discussion of the negative

---


268 “English and American women were the first to emancipate themselves from the thraldom of conventional dress, although the greater proportion of the fashionable set still fondly cling to its traditions. The principles of physical cultures, so widely disseminated in the colleges have done so much toward this reform, and the younger generation of women are being reared by new standards.” “The Chic of American Women,” Godey’s Magazine, June 1896, 659.

269 “Bloomers are pronounced the correct costume for women cyclists by Zimmerman, the crack cyclist, who declares that more freedom of movement is attainable with bloomers than skirts; if we are doomed to wear the bloomer, it is to be hoped that some genius will invent one of less hideous proportions than those now in vogue.” “As in a Looking Glass,” Godey’s Magazine, June 1896, 659.


271 In a study of the environmental platform of women’s clubs and environmental commentary provided in Ladies Home Journal Jan Knight stated, “the editor strongly opposed women’s clubs.” Jan Knight, “The Environmentalism of Edward Bok: The Ladies’ Home Journal, the General Federation of Women’s Clubs, and the Environment, 1901-09,” Journalism History 29, no. 4 (2004): 154-165
results on children that are neglected at home particularly due to busy mothers. She stated, “‘What America needs is mothers,’ says I. Not politicians, nor reformers, nor club preachers, nor teachers – just plain mothers.”

Even though the editorial staff at *Ladies Home Journal* was not supportive of women’s clubs, credit was given to the work of women’s clubs in drawing attention to child labor.

*Harper’s Bazar* writers, to some extent, supported both social responsibility issues and women’s clubs through various columns titled “Club Women and Club Work,” “Home Study and Club Topics,” and “News of Women’s Clubs.” The connection between women’s clubs and the Audubon Society was well known, and these *Harper’s Bazar* columns reinforced the relationship. In “Home Study and Club Topics,” *Harper’s Bazar* writer E.B. Cutting provided advice for recommended readings for club studies regarding bird protection and referred readers to Audubon Society reports. A *Harper’s Bazar* reporter commented in 1897 on the work of the Massachusetts’s Women’s Club in its mission to protect the birds from being killed for millinery purposes. She stated,
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273 “The movement to stop the working of children in factories had brought important results; and much is due to the good influence of Women’s Clubs.” *The World and His Wife*, *The Ladies’ Home Journal*, May 1903, 16.
276 When asked by a reader for recommendations for a club meeting regarding bird protection, *Harper’s Bazar* columnist E.B. Cutting replied, “If you have access to a library and can look up the reports of the Audubon Society you will find much valuable information.” E.B. Cutting, “Home Study and Club Topics,” *Harper’s Bazar*, 12 September 1912, 468.
The action of the Massachusetts Federation of Clubs at its annual meeting in Great Barrington, ten days ago reining to the use of birds in millinery, is a significant outcome of the recent agitation among State clubs in the matter. Several of the most influential clubs in the federation have taken up the defense of the birds in an earnest and practical way, and undoubtedly the leaven has worked and will extend.  

A *Harper’s Bazar* writer reported on the importance of a lecture given by the New Jersey chair of the Audubon Society regarding bird protection at the 1898 spring meeting for the New Jersey State Federation of Women’s Clubs. One of the most compelling commentaries regarding the connection between women’s clubs and the Audubon Society was published in *Harper’s Bazar* in which it was reported that two of the most influential state federations for women’s clubs, Illinois and Massachusetts, were quite active in voicing concern regarding the use of birds in millinery. Both state federations worked closely with the Audubon Society. At one club meeting “a set of resolutions was drawn up embodying the voice of the club against the reckless slaughter of birds, and pledging the organization to a protesting stand” and “in some cases aigrettes were taken from bonnets by their aroused owners before quitting the room.” These *Harper’s Bazar* reports on women’s clubs provided the majority of the editorial commentary in the pages of *Harper’s Bazar* that supported the halting of the use of birds in millinery. “A great bulwark for the birds will be raised if the
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278 “A valuable paper presented was a plea for the birds, which was contributed by Henry M. Maxson, chairman of the New Jersey Audubon Society.” Margaret Hamilton Welch, “Club Women and Club Work” *Harper’s Bazar*, 28 May 1898, 466; Additionally, Welch reported on a lecture on bird protection at the Evansville Federation of Women’s Clubs in Evansville, Indiana. Margaret Hamilton Welch, “News of Women’s Clubs,” *Harper’s Bazar*, May 1901, A91.
women’s clubs throughout the land should take this matter up, and act in concerted stand against women’s inhumanity to their feather friends.”

The Audubon Society and Legislation in Harper’s Bazar

Although Harper’s Bazar writers reported on women’s clubs work associated with the Audubon Society and provided recommended readings, the editorial staff continued to present fashionable millinery trimmed with birds and feathers. This coincided with the magazine’s adherence to its stated policy to present the fashionable styles. Acknowledging that some of their readers might be members of the Audubon Society one Harper’s Bazar writer stated, “Hats of all breasts of birds and trimmed with their wings are beautiful provided one is not a member of the Audubon Society.”

Harper’s Bazar writers referred to the devotion of Audubon Society members to their bird protection mission in a comment made regarding a female character in a comical short story regarding social etiquette. The character was holding a dead bird that had been torn from a hat by a dog and the author wrote, “From the sternness of her expression one might have assumed that she belonged to the Audubon Society, and was carrying this poor victim of disaster out to decent burial.” An article appeared in Harper’s Bazar on the publication of information by the Audubon Society about the economic value of birds due to their insectivorous nature. This information was often used by the Audubon Society to promote the protection of birds.
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280 Ibid.
281 “Fashion Notes,” Harper’s Bazar, 3 November 1900, 1706.
282 Beatrice Hanscom, “The Sole Sociability of San Michel,” Harper’s Bazar, August 1905, 720. The story ended in the destruction of forty female guests’ hats by the hostess’s fox-terrier who ate not only chiffon and flowers but also the trimmings, included wings, feathers, breasts, and heads of birds.
283 “The lecture room was then darkened and Mr. Chapman talked on the economic value of birds and their aids to agriculture, in preventing the undue increase of insects, in devouring small rodents, in
author of the *Harper’s Bazar* article did not mention the role of fashionable millinery but rather exhibited annoyance at the Audubon Society for providing the information that placed an economic value on birds and surprise that the New York *Evening Post* actually published the Audubon Society findings.

Alas! It has come to this— we are instructed in the economic value of birds. The Audubon Society has prepared statistics which such an intellectual medium as the New York *Evening Post* is circulating, demonstrating that birds render to be a profitable service in preventing the undue increase of insects, in devouring small rodents, in destroying the sea of harmful plants— in a word, by acting as scavengers... The time is ripe now for science to demonstrate the economic value of moonbeams and rainbows.  

While reporting on the mission of the Audubon Society, the work of women’s clubs in support of bird protection, and the fashionable styles in millinery that utilized birds and feathers, a writer of the women’s club columns in *Harper’s Bazar* recognized that the only way to stop the use of birds in fashionable styles was by making their use illegal. In 1897, Margaret Hamilton Welch wrote,

A number of women’s clubs are now considering the question of taking action to suppress bird-wearing, and, as a sequence, bird-killing for millinery purposes. A recent pamphlet sent out by the Smithsonian Institution calls attention to the extermination of many species and the growing rarity of others, due entirely to the insatiate demands of fashion for the plumage of birds. The Chicago Woman’s Club has taken up the matter – a statement that means much, for what that club undertakes it is apt to carry through. The original and practical action of the Civitas Club of Brooklyn, New York, also noted for its successful energy, has already been reported in the Bazar. This is an exhibition of smart millinery without birds, designed as an object—
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lesson. But it is not the creating of sentiment, but legislation, which will finally remove the evil. Women’s clubs can help bring the right pressure to secure that.\footnote{Margaret Hamilton Welch, “Notes from Various Clubs,” Harper’s Bazar, 10 April 1897, 298.}

*Harper’s Bazar* writers did provide additional commentary on the bird debate and the Audubon Society through a discussion of bird protection legislation. “If American wild birds are not protected, it will not be for lack of legislation and agitation\footnote{“Personal,” Harper’s Bazar, 7 August 1897, 663.} the author of one editorial published in 1897 stated. The author continued with a mockery of the bird protection legislation passed in Massachusetts ignited by the Massachusetts Audubon Society that was formed in 1896 with a primary mission of halting the use of birds in millinery. The author wrote the “pathetic petition” was signed by “thirty-seven feathered citizens” and “it is this petition that has the credit of securing the law, recently enacted in Massachusetts, prohibiting the wearing of song and insectivorous birds on women’s hats.”\footnote{“Perhaps the report of Professor Frank M. Chapman, of the New York Museum of Natural History, to the effect that he counted forty varieties of birds on women’s hats during the course of two afternoon walks in this city, may startle the wearers into a sense the they are consenting to cruelty, even more than the public work of the Audubon Society, or the pathetic petition the Legislature of Massachusetts, written by Senator Hoar in the names of the birds of that commonwealth, appealing for protection the well-known people of the State, and signed with the names of thirty-seven feathered citizens. It is this petition that has the credit of securing the law, recently enacted in Massachusetts, prohibiting the wearing of song and insectivorous birds on women’s hats.” “Personal” Harper’s Bazar, 7 August 1897, 663.} An article in an 1899 *Harper’s Bazar* issue contained comments on the passing of bird protection legislation in Arkansas as a result of the support of the cause of Audubon Society. The law stated that anyone in possession of plumage, skins, or parts of birds would receive a monetary fine. The author did not reveal whether the magazine supported the legislation but did express concern for the milliners and hoped that all questions raised by the legislation would
be answered before the other states adopted such laws.\textsuperscript{288} The writer commented, “Summer millinery is not so ornithological as that of winter, and for this the milliners are doubtless thankful.”\textsuperscript{289} The findings from the content analysis of \textit{Harper’s Bazar} confirm the writer’s thoughts concerning seasonable trimmings, and luckily for the milliners the law was passed during the warmer seasons when fashionable millinery used less plumage.\textsuperscript{290}

\textbf{Satirical Commentary in \textit{Harper’s Bazar}}

In 1886, \textit{Harper’s Bazar} editors confessed to the readers that it was the magazine’s duty to report the fashions and not to promote an opinion on the plumage debate. However, the magazine published satirical cartoons in its pages that provided editorial commentary on the fashionable style of using birds in millinery. One of the most telling cartoons was published in 1886 a couple months before \textit{Harper’s Bazar} stated that it would continue to provide the fashions regardless of the editorial staff’s opinion. The illustration, figure 9, revealed a woman with a bird protruding from the top of her head. In another cartoon, figure 10, titled “This Will Put an End to Bird Trimnings,” a woman wearing a hat trimmed with flowers faces a bird hunter in a field. Although the main point of the cartoon is to poke fun at the large amount of

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{288} “Several questions arise in connection with the bill as it is passed, and it is to be hoped they will be cleared up before any other States follow the Arkansas example.” \textit{Harper’s Bazar}, 22 April 1899, 330. \\
\textsuperscript{289} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{290} Although the trend of using more plumage in the autumn and winter seasons continued throughout the years studied, it was clear in the early years of the study, when this commentary was written, that plumage and birds were considered autumn and winter trimmings where as spring and summer hats were trimmed in florals and foliage. This information was garnered through a content analysis of \textit{Harper’s Bazar}.
\end{footnotesize}
Fig. 9. “Slaughter of the Innocent Birds, Fashion demands the sacrifice from the ostrich to the humming-bird.” Harper’s Bazar, 3 April 1886, 232. PD.
floral and foliage millinery trimmings that are substituted for plumage, the cartoon also revealed the general public’s opinion of the plume hunter by illustrating him as a hillbilly with a large jug of moonshine with the words “lunch” written across it.

Fig. 10. “This Will Put an End to Bird Trimmings,” Harper’s Bazar, 8 May 1886, 312. PD.
Additional commentary, painted the bird hunters as poor and unintelligent was published in an 1888 issue. Another cartoon poked fun at a house cat’s excitement when the cat tackled a bird perched atop a female visitor’s hat, figure 11.

![Fig. 11. “The Cat and the Stuffed Bird,” Harper’s Bazar, 10 April 1886, 248. PD](image)

The Audubon Society was not left out of the commentary for one cartoon, figure 12, depicted an elderly woman annoyed with her verbally repetitive pet parrot. The caption reads, “The ungrateful beast! I’ll resign from the Audubon Society at once, and trim my bonnet with parrot wings!”

---

Most of the satirical cartoons that commented on birds usage in millinery examined during this study were in the late 1880s. However, a 1913 cartoon displayed three chickens that were all donning hats, but one chicken only had only one plume in her hat. The two chickens with the most feathers on their hats were talking to one another about the third chicken. One of the chickens said, “She looks rather plaine
[sic] does she not?” and the second chicken replied, “Well, those are her own feathers. She can’t afford anything artificial.”²⁹²

Throughout the late nineteenth century in issues of Harper’s Bazar it was common for the magazine to include satirical cartoons that commented on women’s fashionable styles.²⁹³ Remarks regarding the bird issue are not surprising. However, it was through these satirical cartoons²⁹⁴ and the comments regarding women’s clubs that Harper’s Bazar provided socially responsible commentary that supported bird protection. The magazine editors did not, as mentioned, engage in the bird debate in its editorial writings or in its presentation of millinery.

Discussion of the Bird Debate in Ladies’ Home Journal

Ladies’ Home Journal’s perspective on the bird and millinery debate was supportive of North American bird protection. The writer of the editorial column “The World and His Wife” praised the work of the Audubon Society in securing legislation and awareness for the protection of birds through legislation and public education programs.

A better time is coming for the birds in the United States than they have had since the land was fairly settled by white men. Audubon Societies, which work for the protection of non-game birds, have been organized, 60,000 strong, in thirty States; and they have already secured a bird protective law in seventeen or more…By the process of public education bird protective laws have been passed…Under the protection of this great working organization the birds seem likely at last be as safe as they are useful and beautiful.²⁹⁵

²⁹² Harper’s Bazar, January 1913, 50.
²⁹⁴ Maybe this support was inadvertent and a consequence of poking fun at the fashionable styles.
In addition to finding praise of the work of Audubon Society, *Ladies’ Home Journal* published a full-page article with gruesome photos of slaughtered birds and their dying young. The birds were killed to be used as trimmings in fashionable millinery. The article was titled “What Women are Heedlessly Doing” with photographs taken by members of the Oregon Audubon Society.\(^{296}\) The additional destruction of bird populations due to the natural hunting abilities of cats was the focus of one full-page article. The author, a member of the Massachusetts Audubon Society, raised the question that if people can be convicted and fined by the United States Government for killing birds, why can’t cats? The author suggested a yearly cat registration license to assist in raising funds to humanely kill cats that were not registered.\(^{297}\) Even though the magazine presented fashionable millinery with the use of birds and feathers, discussion on some of the fashion pages included alternatives to the use of feathers. In a fashion page dedicated to millinery, the reporter discussed the possibility of using artificial birds covered with feathers from barnyard fowl. She also stated, “I have purposely avoided showing any hats adorned with real birds, Paradise plumes or aigrettes.”\(^{298}\) Overall supportive of saving birds, *Ladies’ Home Journal* writers did not hesitate to comment on the use of imported birds in millinery feeling that it was perfectly fine to kill “other” birds for the sake of fashion. One writer stated, “The bright-colored feathers – such as those of the parrots – are all imported from
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countries where it is not considered wrong to kill these birds as they multiply so fast they become a nuisance.” This demonstrates a very business oriented and Eurocentric attitude to have regarding the wildlife from other countries.

Advice on Acceptable Plumage and Birds

While the Audubon Society was often mentioned in the early years of this study in *Harper’s Bazar* and *Ladies’ Home Journal*, comments regarding the debate on plumage and birds were mentioned throughout the two magazines in the years studied. In *Harper’s Bazar*, these comments were often to reassure readers of the origins of the plumage used in millinery, reports on women’s club activities, discussion of legislation, and satirical commentary. *Harper’s Bazar* promoted the use of imported birds in fashionable millinery through the presentation of their use, but a writer in *Ladies’ Home Journal* actually commented on the reasonable use of imported birds, as stated above.  

In *Ladies’ Home Journal* it was stated that women should understand and receive unambiguous information regarding what feathers and birds were used in their millinery.

With the ever-growing sentiment against the uses of birds as ornaments on our hats, a little clearer information should be the possession of every woman as to just what comprises in a large measure the feathers which go towards making many of our prettiest trimmings.

Apparently, the editors at *Harper’s Bazar* did not agree that information needed to be unambiguous for they, as discussed earlier, used the term osprey to denote the use of  
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300 Ibid.
301 Ibid.
the egret or heron feathers. The use of plumes from the egret or heron for millinery trimmings was a well-known example used by bird protectionists of the decline of birds for the sake of fashion.

A few times the *Harper’s Bazar* staff reassured readers that some feathers were humanely obtained and therefore could be worn with good conscious. In 1899 a *Harper’s Bazar* writer stated that the, “wearing of ostrich plumes and certain other feathers … are obtained without costing the life of their original owners, and, indeed, so we are assured without causing them any great discomfort.”\(^{302}\) In studying the data from the content analysis of *Harper’s Bazar*, I discovered that ostrich feathers were featured consistently in millinery presented in the pages of *Harper’s Bazar.\(^{303}\) *Ladies’ Home Journal* also promoted the use of ostrich feathers as socially responsible trimmings.\(^{304}\) Additionally, the suggestion was given to use burnt cock feathers to substitute for the plumes of the bird of paradise for the same aesthetic effect.\(^{305}\)

A writer in *Harper’s Bazar* reported on the Autumn Hats of 1902 that

Some feather effects are made up for these hats, and, since nowadays the milliners claim that because of the protests of the Audubon Society nearly all their choicest wings and breasts and other feather ornaments are made up in the shop from un-tabooed materials, not even the most tender-hearted woman need object to wearing a feather-trimmed hat. Stiff quills, soft, fluffy pompoms, and smart flat wings are the most fashionable trimmings, with draperies and crowns of velvet.\(^{306}\)

---

\(^{302}\) *Harper’s Bazar*, 22 April 1899, 330.

\(^{303}\) See figure 2


\(^{305}\) Milliners had learned to burn the cock feathers to achieve the same aesthetic look as the bird of paradise feathers; “A good substitute for the aigrette and bird of paradise is made also from the common coque, and is called burnt coque. The flume of the feather is eaten off with acids, and when the process is completed nothing but the skeleton of the natural feather remains, which so resembles that of the birds of paradise that any but an expert might be deceived.” Ibid.

The report was intended to reassure women that they should not feel guilty about wearing the fashionable bird and feather trimmings for milliners claimed they were not from protected birds. An examination of the data collected in the content analysis in Harper’s Bazar in the years surrounding the publication of this article revealed the presentation of millinery that used domestic and barnyard fowl. This supports the claim by the Harper’s Bazar writer that the milliners were presenting options for women concerned about the type of bird that was used in their hats.

Whether the intention was to deceive or in good faith, Harper’s Bazar editors did not always completely present the truth and perhaps stated what readers and fashion participants wanted to hear regarding bird protection. Commentary in a November 1899 Harper’s Bazar issue stated that women should no longer feel remorse for wearing the plumage of the snowy white egret because the birds were no longer killed for their use in millinery.

The tender-hearted women who have refused to wear egrets on their hats and bonnets, on account of the poor mother-birds, will be glad to learn that they are not killed for the purpose of obtaining these lovely ornaments. As a matter of fact, the hunters, without powder or shot, go around (in South America or India) during the right season to the breeding or roosting grounds and collect the plumes which are cast by the male birds every year.

In Venezuela the natives are beginning to farm the birds, as they are easily domesticated; as the egrets grow again each year, the enterprise should be very profitable.

It has long been considered a very cruel thing to wear an egret, as it was supposed that a mother-bird was killed to obtain it. We have heard harrowing descriptions of nests of young birds left unprotected while the mother-birds lay mangled on the ground—all for the adornment of heathen woman-kind. But now the most tenderhearted lady (provided she can afford the luxury) may wear this beautiful ornament with a clear conscience.\textsuperscript{307}

This claim seemed dubious to the supporters of bird protection, and after exploration into the matter, the editors of the Audubon Society magazine, *Bird-Lore*, provided the following commentary:

In ‘Harper’s Bazar’ for November 18, 1899, there appeared an editorial paragraph to the effect that as Herons are no longer killed for their plumes, which are now gathered from the ground and plucked from captive birds there was no longer any reason why these feathers should not be worn by the most humane-minded woman.

Inquiry developed the fact that this paragraph was written by Mrs. Isabel Strong and was based on information furnished her by Mrs. Robert Louis Stevenson, who in turn had received it from a missionary to India.  

The Audubon Society members felt that the *Harper’s Bazar* publication of these false statements would convince many female readers, who trusted the magazine, to purchase and request plumage of the iconic bird who had become a symbol of bird protection. After repeated requests by the Audubon Society for a rebuttal from *Harper’s Bazar*, the magazine editor only replied with a private letter to the Audubon Society headquarters admitting that the number of feathers that could be collected from the birds was quite small.

Requests for a correction of this erroneous and misleading article resulted in as admission from the editor of the magazine in question that ‘unquestionably…a comparatively small proportion of those egrets used are found upon the ground.’ Nevertheless, he has made no further reference in his pages to Mrs. Strong’s paragraph, which led the reader to believe that all the plumes used were either picked up from the ground or plucked from birds captive in so-called ‘Egret farms.’ Concerning these ‘farms’ the editor of the ‘Bazaar’ is silent, an in every case where investigation has been possible the ‘farm’ has proved to be a myth. One was described in great detail by a newspaper correspondent, who made the mistake of locating it in Yuma, Arizona, the home of Mr. Herbert Brown, a well-known ornithologist and member of Bird-Lore’s Advisory Council. Inquiry of
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308 *Bird-Lore*, February 1900, 32.
Mr. Brown develops the amusing fact that the ‘farm’ consists of one little white Egret kept as a pet at the Southern Pacific Hotel.

Admitting the possibility of picking plumes from the ground, it is absurd to suppose that the plume hunters would adopt this method to the exclusion of shooting, when one well-directed shot would yield more and better plumes than they might find in a week’s search.\(^{309}\)

Seemingly contradictory to the promotion of birds for use in fashionable millinery, in several articles in *Harper’s Bazar* there was a discussion of how to attract birds to your garden and how to enjoy the birds on a walk through the country.\(^{310}\) Additionally, identification guides including illustrations for approximately sixty-five British birds were provided in an article titled, “British Birds.”\(^{311}\) Olive Thorne Miller, a contributor to *Bird-Lore*, provided educational and nutritional advice for the care of caged birds in an issue of *Harper’s Bazar*.\(^{312}\) Some of the birds mentioned in the article were also used in millinery and included bluebirds and parrots. Additionally, a 1913 issue of *Harper’s Bazar* contained an illustration of woman with her pet parrot.\(^{313}\) Ironically the *Harper’s Bazar* presentation of parrots in millinery increased the following year.

**Conclusion for Research Question Two**

In conclusion, it seems that the editorial position for *Harper’s Bazar* on the debate of birds in millinery was generally supportive of the plumage debate, but the magazine retained its mission to report on fashionable styles. Most of the positive commentary concerning the work of the Audubon Society and support for the
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309 Ibid.
313 *Harper’s Bazar*, July 1913, 23.
protection of birds in *Harper’s Bazar* was provided in reports regarding the connections with the women’s club movement. However, commitment to provide the current fashionable styles remained forefront, albeit with reports on the affects of legislation. *Harper’s Bazar* wanted to convince its readers that it was possible to participate in the fashion of plumage while still retaining their conscious. Even though *Ladies’ Home Journal* was socially responsible in their editorial commentary regarding the plumage debate, feathers and fashionable millinery were still presented in their fashion pages. While presenting details on the latest fashionable styles which included the use of birds and feathers, in neither *Vogue* nor *Godey’s Lady’s Book* was their commentary, socially responsible or otherwise, on the debate of bird use in millinery.

**Chapter Four Summary**

It is possible to credit the Audubon Society for the decline in the use of birds and feathers in millinery as well as a change in the type of bird mentioned in fashionable millinery in *Harper’s Bazar* in the first few years of the twentieth century. The Audubon Society assisted in the passing of legislation to protect birds affecting the materials that were available to be used in fashionable millinery. The Audubon Society reached this achievement by conducting a successful grassroots campaign from parlor lectures and petitions to letters to local and state political representatives in support of bird protection.

---

All four of the fashion magazines examined provided general fashion commentary reports that included the presentation of fashionable millinery that used birds and feathers throughout the years studied. The editors of *Vogue* and *Godey’s Lady’s Book* did not provide socially responsible commentary on the bird debate. Editors of both *Ladies’ Home Journal* and *Harper’s Bazar* provided commentary on the bird issue that can be considered socially responsible. Comments in the *Ladies’ Home Journal* were proactive in the discussion of bird protection and provided alternatives to donning real birds. This coincided with previous studies about the socially responsible content in *Ladies’ Home Journal*.

*Harper’s Bazar* contained editorial information that sympathized with the bird debate, but the editors also presented the latest fashions even if they were contradictory to the editorial content. In *Harper Bazar’s* defense, it was discovered through a content analysis that most of the birds and feathers presented in *Harper’s Bazar* were not illegal to use in millinery.\(^{315}\) *Harper’s Bazar* still maintained its commitment to present fashionable styles while also changing the type of bird and plumage trimmings presented that often reflected changes in North American bird legislation.

\(^{315}\) Rarely did *Harper’s Bazar* present birds that were protected by legislation in the United States, but those presented included seagulls in 1916 and osprey in 1913, 1914, 1919, 1922, and 1923. As mentioned osprey was a term often used in the millinery industry instead of the term “heron.” This could be an innocent use of the term “osprey” by writers at *Harper’s Bazar* or intentional.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION

The purpose of the study was to explore the possible relationship among fashion media, the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society, and the use of birds in millinery in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The research questions were as follows:

1. How did the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society affect the use of birds in fashionable millinery?

2. What editorial position did women’s fashion magazines actually have on the topic of the use of birds in fashionable millinery?

The first question explored how the members of the Audubon Society affected fashionable millinery in the United States by raising public awareness of the issue of the use of birds and feathers in millinery. This was achieved by a strong cohesiveness between the state societies and the national offices, collaboration with women’s clubs, educational programs for schools and the general public, political activism, and additional public relations. Through the Audubon Society efforts, supporters were able to achieve cooperation with the United States government that resulted in legislation that affected the bird and feather trimmings used in the United States. Evidence to support this statement was garnered by using the historic method to examine Audubon Society documents, Audubon Society periodicals, and newspapers. Additionally, a content analysis of the fashion magazine Harper’s Bazar resulted in documentation of
the discussion and presentation of birds and feathers used in fashionable millinery between the years 1886 to 1923. Through my findings regarding the Audubon Society’s social responsibility agenda, I can confidently state that the Audubon Society did have an affect on fashionable millinery through the materials that were available to be used in fashionable millinery trimmings.

My second research question related to the editorial commentary in fashion and women’s magazines regarding the plumage debate and fashionable millinery. Two of the fashion and women’s magazines, Vogue and Godey’s Lady’s Book, contained general fashion commentary reports that included the presentation of fashionable millinery that used birds and feathers. These reports consisted of information on the forecasted trends in millinery, how to position the birds or plumage on your millinery, appropriate plumage and bird choices for various occasions, and how to care and maintain your plumage investment. The only possible socially responsible commentary found might be the cleaning and caring for your plumage and birds because care of currently owned feathers and birds could promote sustainability though reuse.316

Ladies’ Home Journal and Harper’s Bazar both contained similar commentary regarding the fashion trends in millinery which included the continued use of birds and feathers. Additionally, both of these magazines provided socially responsible content on the bird issue. Ladies’ Home Journal included commentary from Audubon Society members and even published shocking photographs of birds killed for their use in fashionable millinery. This was not a surprise, for it has been reported that Ladies’ Home Journal often was proactive in their socially responsible commentary, including

316 This was in Godey’s Lady’s Book, not Vogue.
environmental issues.\textsuperscript{317} Editor Edward Bok wrote and published an article in \textit{Ladies’ Home Journal} that both praised the work of the Audubon Society and complimented women that chose not to wear plumage.\textsuperscript{318} He and his editorial staff also permitted commentary in their fashion pages that discussed fashionable millinery that was purposely presented without the use of birds or protected plumage.\textsuperscript{319}

\textit{Harper’s Bazar} also provided socially responsible editorial comments that supported the notion that the use of birds and feathers in fashionable millinery was adversely affecting bird populations. This was mostly achieved through comments concerning the achievements to bird protection made through women’s clubs and their connection to the Audubon Society. Satirical cartoons also provided commentary in support of the decline of the use of birds in millinery. Even though the editors included socially responsible comments regarding the plumage debate, more important for the magazine was the presentation of fashion trends. The editorial staff of \textit{Harper’s Bazar} was forthright with their position and stated that the mission was to present the fashionable styles; and as long as the use of birds and feathers were a fashion trend, they would be included in the magazine’s fashion pages.\textsuperscript{320}

\textit{Ladies’ Home Journal} and \textit{Harper’s Bazar} promoted the use of imported birds in fashionable millinery, and a writer for \textit{Ladies Home Journal} actually made a

\textsuperscript{317} Knight, “The Environmentalism of Edward Bok,” 154-165.
\textsuperscript{319} Mrs. Ralston stated, “I have purposely avoided showing any hats adorned with real birds, Paradise, plumes or aigrettes.” Mrs. Ralston, “Hats as I see Them Abroad,” \textit{Ladies Home Journal}, August 1906.
\textsuperscript{320} “While we sincerely regret the destruction of bids for millinery purpose, we cannot stultify ourselves by refusing to tell our readers that they are still worn, when the shops and streets are full of them. The \textit{Bazar} does not undertake to set the fashions, but only to chronicle them truthfully. When ladies stop wearing birds and plumage, it will be glad to say so.” “Answers to Correspondents,” \textit{Harper’s Bazar}, 13 November 1886, 751.
statement that reflected this perspective. The opinion mirrored that of the early Audubon Society. The Audubon Society chose to sacrifice imported birds in order to protect North American birds in the late nineteenth century and early years of the twentieth century. Once legislation was passed and enforced that protected North American birds the Audubon Society supported the protection of imported birds. In this study, evidence was not discovered that suggested that either Ladies’ Home Journal or Harper’s Bazar changed their opinion to reflect that of the Audubon Society regarding imported bird use. In addition to the promotion of birds in fashionable millinery, Ladies’ Home Journal also openly promoted millinery that used faux birds created by milliners that used barnyard fowl for feathers as an alternative for real birds and plumage of wild birds.

**Fashion**

While the Audubon Society, social responsibility agendas, and legislation were all large factors to consider in the influence and presentation of fashionable millinery in the plumage debate, the overall influence that admittedly could not be defeated was the nature of fashion. The Audubon Society recognized countless times that it could not change what fashion dictates nor how fashion is ritually followed. Therefore the Audubon Society sought to change what materials could be used in fashionable millinery in the United States through legislation. Additionally, they aimed to educate
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321 Writer Elizabeth Katz wrote in an article in *Ladies Home Journal*, “The bright-colored feathers—such as those of the parrots—are all imported from countries where it is not considered wrong to kill these birds as they multiply so fast they become a nuisance.” Elizabeth Katz, “The Feathers on Women’s Hats,” *Ladies Home Journal*, May 1910, 91.
the public on the bird issue in hopes that women would change their fashionable millinery trimmings and this new fashionable style would be adopted.

Since Paris was the capital of fashion during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the majority of American women and the American fashion industry followed French fashion trends. If editors of American fashion and women’s magazines wanted to present the latest fashion trends, then they presented the French fashions which included the use of birds and plumage. All the magazines studied, *Harper’s Bazar*, *Ladies’ Home Journal*, *Vogue*, and *Godey’s Lady’s Book*, presented fashionable millinery that used birds and plumage. How they chose to present the fashionable millinery seems to be connected with how strong the socially responsible content was in the magazine. *Vogue* and *Godey’s Lady’s Book* presented a few socially responsible comments, but most of these were related to charity events and dress reform.322 *Ladies’ Home Journal* and *Harper’s Bazar* provided editorial commentary that was socially responsible in regards to the plumage debate. Even though the editors of *Ladies’ Home Journal* presented birds and feathers in fashionable millinery, alternative choices were discussed among their fashion trend pages. This coincided with the socially responsible agenda that was presented in *Ladies’ Home Journal*.323 The editors of *Harper’s Bazar* provided socially responsible commentary about the plumage debate while continuing to present fashionable millinery that utilized birds and plumage throughout the years studied. It was discovered through a content analysis that most of the birds and feathers presented

322 Charity events were found in both *Vogue* and *Godey’s Lady’s Book*. *Godey’s Lady’s Book* contained information discussing dress reform.

323 Knight, “The Environmentalism of Edward Bok.”
in Harper’s Bazar were not illegal to use in millinery.\footnote{324} While maintaining its commitment to present fashionable trends, throughout the years studied, the editors of Harper’s Bazar changed the type of bird and plumage trimmings presented that reflected changes in American bird protection legislation.\footnote{325}

**Application of Fashion Theories**

Fashion theories seek to explain and predict fashions.\footnote{326} By evaluation of the variations in the trimmings used in fashionable millinery, several fashion theories can explain how fashionable millinery changed during the time period studied. While the use of birds and plumage in fashionable millinery persisted throughout this study, 1886 to 1923, the type of plumage and birds utilized did fall in and out of fashion.

The bird debate began to grow in popularity with the media attention given to the demise of the snowy white egret for its use in fashionable millinery. Due to how the bird was killed for its white plumage,\footnote{327} wearing the bird fell out of fashion in the early 1890s.\footnote{328} *Bird-Lore* did mention that older women still wore the egret.\footnote{329}

\footnote{324} The exception to this would be their presentation of osprey.
\footnote{325} While the editors of Harper’s Bazar changed the type of bird and plumage that they presented which also reflected American legislation, this could also be an indication of what the milliners created. The millinery presented in Harper’s Bazar was usually by French milliners, not American. Therefore, this could be a result of the work of the French fashions or it could be a reflection of American legislation. Either way, what Harper’s Bazar presented was usually similar to what was legally available to be used in American millinery.
\footnote{326} Fashion is defined as “as style of consumer product or way of behaving that is temporarily adopted by a discernable proportion of members of a social group because that chosen style or behavior is perceived to be socially appropriate for the time and situation,” Sproles and Burns, *Changing Appearances*, 4.
\footnote{327} The snowy white egret, also known as the heron or the osprey, was killed during the breeding season when its plumage was white.
\footnote{328} Footnote: Harper’s Bazar did not show the egret from until 1892 but the bird was cited again in. Harper’s Bazar as the osprey in the 1913, 1914, 1919, 1922, and 1923.
\footnote{329} *Bird-Lore*, February 1901, 41.
Public attention towards protection and legislation to ban the use of heron in millinery took place about the same time that millinery using the bird was presented less often in *Harper’s Bazar*. This coincided with the report in *Bird-Lore* in observation of who was still wearing the fashion. While the legislation instigated by the Audubon Society played a part, so did the nature of fashion. This does not mean that the Audubon Society did not affect fashionable millinery. In fact, the Audubon Society made an impact through what materials were available and by understanding how a new fashionable style might be adopted.330

The Audubon Society recognized that a new fashionable style of not wearing North American birds in your millinery could be adopted if the upper class adopted it first. This can be explained by a fashion adoption theory known as the innovation-diffusion theory.331 The innovation-diffusion theory explains how a fashion is adopted in a social group and how the fashion moves from one social group to another social group. To be able to apply this fashion theory an understanding of the context of the social group is important.

Most of the women that were social activists and members of women’s clubs were also of the wealthier upper class because they had the time, financial means, and visibility to support socially responsible causes. These women were often the social group that the Audubon Society aimed to reach due to their participation in their
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331 In their application of Everett Rogers 1995 innovation diffusion theory, Kim K. P. Johnson, Sharron J. Lennon, Cynthia Jasper, Mary Lynn Damhorst, and Hilda Bucky Lakner state, “According to Rogers, innovations are any objects, ideas, or practices that individuals perceive as being new. Diffusion is a process indicating how innovations are communicated to individuals within a society over time and how consumers adopt or reject the innovations.” Kim K. P. Johnson, Sharron J. Lennon, Cynthia Jasper, Mary Lynn Damhorst, and Hilda Bucky Lakner, “An Application of Rogers’ Innovation Model: Use of the Internet to Purchase Apparel, Food, and Home Furnishing Products by Small Community Consumers,” *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 21, no. 4 (2003): 185-196.
communities. The Audubon Society knew that these women might support the bird protection mission since many of them already supported other socially responsible causes. If women who were highly visible in the community decided to stop wearing the birds and plumage in need of protection in their hats, this could cause others to adopt millinery trimmings that mirrored the new fashionable styles in millinery. The adherence to new fashionable millinery trimmings that either did not harm any birds or did not harm North American birds might spread and diffuse among the social groups; this would be an example of the innovation-diffusion theory.

There are several steps in the innovation and diffusion of an idea or product. Understanding that there is an advantage to the adoption of a new fashionable style is necessary. The choice to not trim millinery with a protected bird could visually indicate that a woman supported the bird protection mission. This visual cue could then signal that she was a member of a women’s club and/or the Audubon Society, which could indicate that she was a member of the upper class due to her availability of leisure time to join and support various causes. In addition, it could also be a signal that she was morally upright because she protected “God’s loveliest creatures.”

Another step in the innovation-diffusion theory is that the fashion must work with one’s needs and values. By not wearing a protected bird on her hat, a woman was fulfilling her duty and social responsibility. For a fashion trend to be adopted, it
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332 Annie H. Nutty wrote a letter to the editor of the *New York Times* in hopes of persuading women to stop wearing the plumage of birds. She wrote, “It is certainly a reproach to womanhood that hundreds of thousands of God’s loveliest creatures should be destroyed every year to adorn women’s heads!” *New York Times*, “To the Editor of the New York Times, July 20, 1897, 6. There were similar letters to this in the *New York Times* and other newspapers and periodicals.

333 “And the societies’ activists were wealthier urban Americans who hewed to a powerful and comprehensive gender code, which they used to define morality. Why did the bird hat issue erupt? Not surprisingly, the one conservation issue that they united around happened to be the sole issue in which women were the most visible players. The definition of Woman as the keeper of morality made this one
cannot be too complex to adopt. While some women still wore feathers and birds in their millinery, legislation and public sentiment ignited by the Audubon Society made the purchase and the wearing of protected birds difficult. Another step in the innovation and diffusion process is the ease of trying the new fashion. After the Lacey Act in 1900, women could still buy millinery with plumage, but to do so legally the plumage needed to be either from unprotected domestic birds, barnyard fowl, or imported birds.\textsuperscript{334}

One of the most important components in the application of the innovation-diffusion theory to explain fashion adoption is the communication of information on the fashionable style. The adoption of millinery that did not use protected birds was achieved through social visibility of women involved in Audubon Societies and women’s clubs in their community. In addition to visibility, the adoption of a fashionable style was also achieved through communication garnered through Audubon Society sponsored lectures, newspapers, and the discussion of the issue in \textit{Harper’s Bazar} and \textit{Ladies’ Home Journal}.

The Audubon Society aimed to educate the elite in hopes that the message to save the birds would trickle down to the masses.\textsuperscript{335} They were correct to assume that this would happen. An examination of Georg Simmel’s 1904 imitation differentiation issue resonate at a higher moral volume than any other. What more perfect catalyst? At a time when many Americans were ready to embrace conservation as a moral issue, the women’s bird hats acquired broad moral overtones far more efficiently than game hunting or water pollution. Would mass devastation of bird populations to decorate men’s hats have triggered such outrage? The hats entangled exquisitely in the fervid middle- and upper-class beliefs in what made men men and women."

\textsuperscript{334} The ease of trying a new fashion could also be applied at other dates in the millinery debate when legislation changed to protect additional birds.

\textsuperscript{335} \textit{Bird-Lore}, October, 1902, 168-169.
fashion theory, also known as the trickle down theory, can be applied.\footnote{Georg Simmel, “Fashion,” in Fashion Marketing, ed. Gordon Wills and David Midgley (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1973), 171-191.} In the time period examined in this study, 1886 to 1923, the elite classes set fashion trends. The lower classes would copy or imitate the fashionable styles of the upper class. Not wanting to wear the same clothing as their subordinates and/or subordinate class, the upper classes would differentiate their dress. This perpetuated the fashion cycle.

In an observation about the donning of the tern in millinery, a bird that was publicized as high priority for the Audubon Society to protect, a reporter remarked about the character of women who continued to wear the tern. These women were women of low morals or were house servants that wore clothing and accessories that were handed down to them by their mistresses;\footnote{From \textit{Bird-Lore}, February 1901, 41.} indicating that wearing a tern on your hat was no longer a fashionable style worn by the upper class.

The Audubon Society knew that it could not change fashion. By understanding how a fashionable style might be adopted, though, the Audubon Society was able to make the fashion process work for their purposes. It appears that a writer of an 1896 \textit{New York Times} article had it right, “Only the change of fashion, which is inevitable, will save the birds that are yet left us from utter extinction.”\footnote{\textit{New York Times}, March 18, 1896, 8.}

\section*{Limitations in this Study}

All historians hope to discover and read everything that pertains to their research questions. This is not always feasible. There are additional primary sources, beyond those used for this study that may contain information pertinent to my research.
questions. I conducted research in the “Correspondence of the Presidents and other Officers of the National Audubon Society” files and the “Publicity Files of the Audubon Society” that are housed in the Rare Books and Manuscripts Division at the New York City Public Library. It might be beneficial for study in the future to also examine the “Corporate Minutes” of the Audubon Society that are also housed in the Audubon Society Records at the New York City Public Library. I do not think that my conclusion regarding the socially responsible agenda of the Audubon Society in the plumage debate would have been different had I been able to review additional Audubon Society primary sources.

In the future, an examination of the Federation of Women’s Clubs’ documents housed in Washington, D.C. may be beneficial. It is possible that information regarding their activism in the plumage debate could be located. However, I believe that an examination of the women’s club records would not have changed my conclusion. The socially responsible agenda of women’s clubs has been previously analyzed, including work to support the plumage debate.339

More of a disappointment than a limitation, after conducting research in the government documents section at the University of Georgia, I learned that the specific government documents that I needed for my study had been destroyed in a fire a couple of years ago at the University of Georgia Library.340 Therefore, I relied mostly

---

339 “In an effort to identify the environmental concerns that prevailed among progressive middle-class women” Jan Knight examined The General Federation of Women’s Clubs Publications The Club Women from 1897 to 1904 and The Federation Bulletin from 1904 to 1920. The years that she studied are similar to the years used in this study, 1886 to 1923. She did mention the plumage debate as part of the socially responsible agenda of the women’s clubs. Jennifer Price studied the plumage debate and the relationship with women’s clubs in a chapter in her book titled When Women Wore Hats in her book Flight Maps: Adventures With Nature In Modern America, 57-109.

340 The fire was concentrated in the government documents department and holdings. The fire occurred July 23, 2003.
on secondary sources for information on the United States laws regarding bird protection. Fortunately, this area has been well studied, and I was able to cite sources that ranged from environmental and Audubon Society scholars to primary sources from the Audubon Society files at the New York City Public Library.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

In this study I focused on how the social responsibility agenda of the Audubon Society affected fashionable millinery. Additionally, I examined the editorial position of fashion and women’s magazines on the debate of the use of birds in fashionable millinery. It may be useful in future research to determine if additional fashion theories aid in explaining this phenomenon.

Throughout the study, I observed commentary on socialites, actresses, and other fashion leaders that might lead to further understanding of the phenomenon using fashion adoption theories. It is even possible that the recent reoccurrence of hair accessories using plumage can be explained by fashion theory; particularly the historical continuity model that examines the repetitive nature of fashion. While fashion magazines only promote fashions, an additional study on the plumage topic could be conducted that utilizes the historic method to examine photographs, diaries, and extant hats\(^{341}\) to explore what American women were actually wearing in regards to plumage and birds in fashionable millinery. Additionally, it would be interesting to learn more about various milliners’ actions to avoid legal restrictions, to explore millinery practices in the design and creation of artificial feathers and birds, to focus

---

\(^{341}\) Studying a collection that included a number of extant hats of prominent women might provide data to add to a possible explanation of a fashion adoption theory.
on the exclusivity of certain species of birds such as the egret and the bird of paradise, and to examine French customs and laws regarding imports and exports that could have directly affected what Paris mandated as fashion.

As I collected data, I made a note of the presented fashionable millinery and millinery advertisements in the fashion magazines. Most often advertisements were not from the same label or designer. In *Harper’s Bazar* European, particularly French, milliners’ hats were presented. Companies, department stores, or designers in the United States where the presented fashions could be purchased were rarely mentioned. The majority of the advertisements suggested that the advertised millinery were styles that were “straight from Paris” or “the new French models.” Therefore, I do not think that the advertisers carried much influence over what was presented as fashionable millinery. However, a future study could be conducted that explores the possible relationship between proposed fashions and fashion advertisements.

After examining the effect that the Audubon Society had on fashionable millinery, an additional study could explore if and what actions were taken by other animal right activists to promote their social responsibility agendas in apparel and accessories in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Also, further research could be conducted to explore other socially responsible issues that were promoted in fashion and women’s magazines in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It may be useful to examine *Demorest’s Monthly Magazine* because Jane Cunningham Croly, an important figurehead of the women’s club movement, wrote regular editorial pieces for the periodical.342

---

342 An in-depth study of Jane Cunningham Croly’s column in *Demorest’s Monthly Magazine* examined “how popular women’s magazines promoted change in women’s roles and reform in dress in the
As mentioned, I conducted research at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. I discovered that T. Gilbert Pearson, chairman of the Audubon Society from 1910 to 1934, was a professor at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro when it was a women’s college named State Normal and Industrial College. During his time in North Carolina he was very active in the protection of birds through the protection of North Carolina coastal areas, state legislation, customs enforcement, and the state Audubon Society. A study could be conducted to learn what type, if any, of activism took place among the female college students in regards to plumage issue when he was a professor at the college.

Chapter Summary

The study of history not only helps us understand the past, but it also can be used to understand the present. With the return of the use of plumage to fashion, what can be learned? We cannot stop the fashion process, but we can make socially responsible decisions in the adoption of fashion trends that could affect the future. As a merchandiser, designer, or consumer it is important to educate oneself on where products originate and how their use affects the physical environment, animals, and other human beings. As stated in Ladies’ Home Journal in 1910, “a little clearer information should be the possession of every woman as to just what nineteen century.” Nelson, “Listen to Jane Cunningham Croly’s ‘Talks With Women’: Issues of Gender, Dress, and Reform in Demorest’s Monthly Magazine. The article does not mention that there was commentary on the plumage debate. Nelson, “Listen to Jane Cunningham Croly’s ‘Talks With Women’: Issues of Gender, Dress, and Reform in Demorest’s Monthly Magazine.
comprises...many of our prettiest trimmings.” One can still follow fashion trends, but it is important to take responsibility for products you use, promote, and design.

---
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Number of fashion editorial pages in issue:
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Number of illustrations of apparel in issue:
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