Ripley, Georgina. "'Gladdening the hearts of warriors': The relationship between Lucile's romantic fashions and morale in the First World War." *Fashion, Society, and the First World War: International Perspectives*. Ed. Maude Bass-Krueger, Hayley Edwards-Dujardin and Sophie Kurkdjian. London: Bloomsbury Visual Arts, 2021. 46–58. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350119895.ch-003>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 09:02 UTC.

Copyright © Selection, editorial matter, Introduction Maude Bass-Krueger, Hayley Edwards-Dujardin, and Sophie Kurkdjian and Individual chapters their Authors 2021. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

3

“Gladdening the hearts of warriors”

The relationship between Lucile’s romantic fashions and morale in the First World War

Georgina Ripley

The first London-based *couturière* to achieve international success, Lucile’s pioneering spirit helped engineer designs that exemplified luxury and liberation for women at the turn of the twentieth century. In her own words, she “loosed upon a startled London, a London of flannel underclothes, woollen stockings and voluminous petticoats, a cascade of chiffons, of draperies as lovely as those of ancient Greece.”¹ Hers was a romantic style, suited to the Edwardian age of opulence, but which successfully bridged the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Lucile navigated between high society and the *demi-monde*, the artistry of the fashion designer and the personality of the client. Lucile, born Lucy Christiana (1863–1935), was among the first to develop the mannequin parade, the forerunner of the modern catwalk show, and to cultivate a social element to shopping; her contributions to haute couture, merchandising, and fashion-industry public relations helped to pave the way for the birth of modern fashion as we know it today.²

Such was her success that Lady Duff Gordon—as she became by marriage in 1900—went on to establish branches of Lucile Ltd in New York in 1910, Paris in 1911, and Chicago in 1915. Thus, just as war had descended on Europe and many male couturiers such as Paul Poiret and Jean Patou were called to the war effort, Lucile’s star continued to rise and she gathered a prestigious clientele. Among

them were royalty, high society ladies, Ziegfeld showgirls, the reigning stars of Hollywood's flourishing silent cinema, and three of the most beguiling fashion icons of the day—Mary Pickford, Lily Elsie, and Irene Castle.

The relationship between fashion and society is dependent upon a number of factors, which include the political and economic situation, cultural expectations, moral imperatives, class, and personal taste. Inevitably the impact of each of these on dress is heightened during wartime and as such, the fashion system arguably mirrors the greater political, economic, social and cultural impact of war on society as a whole. Prewar fashionable clothing was dictated by a strong sense of etiquette ensuring that women were *à la mode* for every occasion, but this set of rules did not allow for the incidence of war and the changing landscape in which dressing began to play less of a part in social life than it had before.³ The fashion journals and consumers disagreed over whether economy in clothing was more, or less, patriotic. The fashion designer's response to this of course varied, but the complexity of the sartorial situation at this time can be considered in the context of Lucile's surviving body of work across fashion collections in Europe and America. Sensitive to the new demands on women's daytime clothing, she necessarily designed sensible suits in practical darker shades, but largely refused to compromise her eveningwear designs to suit the mood of war.

The “Lucile look”

Materialized in romantic and theatrically named creations such as “The Sighing Sound of Lips Unsatisfied” and “When Life's Young Pleasures Woo” the “Lucile look” was rendered in cascades of diaphanous chiffon, gossamer light wisps of lace, and shimmering silks in delicate color combinations. She believed that “dresses, if they are to give any pleasure to their wearer, must become a part of the personality” and called these ethereal evening dresses “gowns of emotion,” honoring each one with a unique poetic name evocative of a mood, color, composition or her client's personality.⁴ She also took inspiration from literature and popular culture. Often inspired by the prettiness and femininity of the late Rococo manner of Jean-Honoré Fragonard, and no doubt also by what Aileen Ribeiro refers to as the “eroticism and succulence which can best be seen in portraits by [François] Boucher in the 1740s,” Lucile's handwriting was in the scalloped hemlines, obi-like sashes, *passementerie* comprised of the finest silk ribbon rosettes, and embroidery of almost incredible delicacy.⁵

A blue silk chiffon dress acquired by the Victoria & Albert Museum in 2007, dating from 1905 and corresponding to a fashion sketch also in their collection, encapsulates what came to be her signature look (Figure 3.1). Its subtly shifting color palette, complexity of design and decorative devices—metallic embroidery, lace trimming, silk ribbon flowers and self fabric ruffles—are all quintessentially Lucile, coming together to give an air of “indefinable shimmer.”⁶ Alongside its sketch, it is possible to

Figure 3.1 “Carresaute,” Lucile evening dress. Blue silk chiffon, lace, and metallic embroidery, London, 1905
© Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

tell that the garment is now missing its centre front corsage of silk flowers, as well as a trailing silver and white tissue sash with oval buckle and tasselled ends, but retains its feminine trimmings of ecru tape lace and pink silk ribbon rosebuds. The bodice is cut horizontally without the use of side seams, and is structured with nine internal bones; vertical shirred bands of silk chiffon and tiered flounces of shirred and accordion pleated silk on the sleeves create definition and texture, sculpting the female figure. The romance of the garment is also inherent to its structure, bearing as it does a rustle frill of pinked and scalloped taffeta at the hemline, which made an alluring rustling sound as the wearer walked and was thus an important seductive feature of dress of this era.⁷

These picture dresses, so called for their popularity with society ladies having their portraits painted, were Duff Gordon’s favourites, and hence why she credited herself with being “the first dressmaker to bring joy and romance into clothes.”⁸ The mystique surrounding her designs was perpetuated by the calibre of the women who modeled them—handpicked for their combination of magnetism, charisma and compelling personal style, as their celebrity soared, so, too, did Lucile’s reputation.

Lucile's romantic fashions and their American clientele

A Lucile gown promoted an idealized image of womanhood, and it is this which also appears to inform her outlook on wartime fashions. At a Pittsburgh press club anniversary dinner, Lady Duff Gordon was invited to follow a speech by Herbert Hoover on economy in food in wartime with one on dress, at which time she instead declared she did not believe in economy in dress at any time, least of all in wartime, suggesting it was the duty of every wife, sweetheart and mother to spend as much as they could possibly afford in order to make the best of themselves for the sake of the men in the trenches. Writing in her memoirs, she postured: "After all the men don't want to come back to frumps do they? And just think how fascinating the French women are. You simply can't afford to neglect your appearance."⁹ As frivolous as this might be, her observations suggest Lucile saw clothes as a necessary weapon in social armoury and believed that women had a very personal relationship with their dress. Reflecting on the period 1914–18, she wrote:

even the War could not make women forget the fashions, at least not altogether . . . Women, always personal in their outlook on everything, had translated the world's crisis in their own way. Their men were going to fight for them; they wanted themselves to represent everything feminine. So they put on frills and laces and big hats with ribbon bows to gladden the hearts of the returned warriors.¹⁰

However, when considering Lucile's design ethos during wartime, it is important to make the distinction of place, since fashion is an expression of the social and economic situation in which it flourishes.

Shortly after the outbreak of war, Duff Gordon closed her Paris branch and moved to New York, which had not been marked by war in the same way as Europe. Her former assistant designer in Chicago, Howard Greer, looked back on the period before America joined the war in 1917 in his memoirs: "The war, as I had brushed up against it in New York, was little more than a burst of wonton gaiety and spending. Everyone had money, and everyone was giving parties. Everyone who was anyone in my phony world rushed to Her Ladyship for a thousand dollar costume to wear to the latest charity ball."¹¹

Even after America entered into conflict, there did not appear to be a wave of reduced spending as had been experienced in London and Paris. It is notable that the bulk of the romantic evening gowns that survive from the period between 1914 and 1918 tend to be the output of the Chicago or New York branches and thus remain today in American museums. It is not of course to say there are not good examples of her work in Europe; she is well represented in the collections of the Bowes Museum, the Museum of London, Brighton Museum and Art Gallery, the Fashion Museum, National Museums Scotland, and the Victoria & Albert Museum. However, many of these garments are daytime fashions

dating from before or after the war period, and in the collection of the Musée des Arts Décoratifs in Paris there is only one garment, an evening coat currently dated to 1915–20.

The need for greater functionality in dress in Europe popularized simpler modes of fashion and the wearing, for the first time, of a sort of uniform for women. Influenced by men's tailoring, they tended to be costumes described as "wholly without sex appeal," based on real uniforms "worn indifferently by both sexes."¹² Lucile's designs, in contrast, were concerned wholeheartedly with retaining the gender distinction and clothed an intimated vulnerability; the historian Susan Glenn felt she, in fact, explored the relationship between "clothes as eroticized commodities and women as sexualized objects."¹³

Lucile gowns certainly emphasized the very feminine graces of their wearer and these styles fit what has been observed as "a natural heightening of sex appeal" as fashions became increasingly romantic at the beginning of war.¹⁴ Thus, while tailor-mades in subdued tones and a looser cut and fit became the main order of the day in Paris and London—where it was said that even the most fashionable wore either black, or last season's purchases—there developed a marked contrast with the extravagant frills and laces of old.¹⁵ We are therefore led to believe that the *décolletages*, transparencies, pastel shades and near-nudity of her evening dresses were reserved for the American market.

However, to reduce the global fashion system to this simple distinction would be naïve, and it is important to consider both the differences and similarities in the political and economic situation of an independent America, alongside that of a war-ravaged Europe. On the Continent there was never to be official rationing and utilitarian clothing of the kind that was to follow in 1941, but propaganda materials distributed by the National Organising Committee for War Savings promoted austerity measures, admonishing those who appeared to make little or no difference to their habits. A British propaganda poster from 1916 in the collection at the Imperial War Museum, simply states: "To dress extravagantly in war time is worse than bad form it is unpatriotic."¹⁶ Mrs. Jack May of the British magazine *The Queen* wrote in 1915: "When the history of this wartime dress comes to be written, there will certainly be pointed out . . . that the dress designs emanating from Paris . . . are of the very simplest and most restrained order."¹⁷

Seemingly innocuous plain wool afternoon suits were produced by even the most exclusive Parisian couture houses and perfectly captured the patriotic mood: simple, functional, and practical for the new working woman. Subdued tones were also suggested to be patriotic, and certainly by 1916, "French grey," in reference to the blue-gray of the French military uniform, was a fashionable choice in London.¹⁸ However, this was by no means a universal code of dress, as illustrated by an eye-catching purple silk satin and navy chiffon walking-suit with a day bodice in contrasting rich ochre chiffon and embroidered silk panels from c. 1916–19, in the National Museums Scotland's collection.¹⁹

Color choices more often than not owed much to practicality—as Mrs. Jack May again observed in June 1916, “the craze for delicate grey” was perhaps down to the “trying condition of the dye industry,” as opposed to any concerted effort to align fashionable clothing with that of the Allied soldiers.²⁰ Certainly neutral shades were deemed practical, as suggested by *The Gentlewoman* in February of 1917 in an article entitled “Beige suits and black hats for spring,” but the fashion journals also did not shy away from colorful reports where such garments were available.²¹ An article in the same journal in May of that year describes a riot of color and richness in the new summer tea gowns, offered “in the choice of purple *crêpe de chine* overhung by purple, gold and silver woven brocade, pink and silver or mauve with orange lined with tinsel brocaded ninon, emerald with blue and white with silver.”²² The sources paint a more nuanced picture than an assumed blanket relinquishing of fashion and its superfluities.

For the most part, however, war had imprinted itself on fashion, be it superficially with ephemeral military-inspired trends, such as the decorative application of buttons or popularity of khaki, or through forced economic necessity. Even though women were encouraged to keep up their appearances by the fashion press, economy was still “the keynote of the moment.”²³ Lucile herself subdued her designs for her European clients, and even in America introduced the “Ideal Office Gown” as advertised in *The New York Times* in 1916. She understood the fact that women attempted to present their new independence, patriotism and strength through tailored, military-influenced clothing and was clearly adept at adapting to consumer demand.

A wool gabardine tailor-made costume from c. 1915 in the Victoria & Albert Museum’s collection is of course daywear, but it is more than that which puts it in stark contrast to the luxurious evening dresses clothing her American clients.²⁴ It clearly shows the influence of the First World War on fashion. The large pockets, belted waist and buttoned cuffs all nod to military style, while the straight cut, loose-fitting jacket and shorter, pleated skirt demonstrate the increasingly practical nature of women’s clothing that allowed for greater freedom of movement. Change was not necessarily unwelcome either—fashion magazines of the time complimented the greater mobility and practicality in women’s clothing: “what about the war-time pockets of our frocks and our coats; was ever fashion more glamorously amiable and helpful?”²⁵

The extant examples of fashionable wartime daywear suggest overall that there was little place for romance in the European landscape, but to assume Paris’s importance as the centre of fashion production diminished would be misleading. After the outbreak of war, the Parisian fashion industry certainly faced a number of challenges: some textile mills had closed making it difficult to procure materials; with irregular shipping and prohibitively high insurance premiums transportation was brought to a standstill and there was a shortage of mannequins for the August openings as many of the women had signed up for war work. As the individual consumption of fashion was quickly considered unseemly, trade relations with America became even more important in the absence of a home market.

Thus, in October 1914, Callot Sœurs staged a fashion show with approximately 250 models “going about showing gowns in the same light-hearted way which marks their activities when there is no war.”²⁶ Others did not initially fare so well—at Paquin, for example, there were only twenty-five models and no mannequins to show them on.²⁷ However, by the time of the spring openings of 1915, *Harper’s Bazaar* was reporting to American readers that “Mannikins parade in the salons, always with a smile on their faces though their hearts may be breaking . . . and all the signs of a busy session are in evidence.”²⁷ This, coupled with the renewed romantic attitude of fashion encapsulated in the fuller, shorter silhouette known as the war crinoline, must surely have been a boost for morale.

To see new designs by some of the great couturiers circulating in the *Gazette du bon ton* in 1915 suggested a return to business as usual and an encouragement to the Parisian consumer to resume spending in the face of moral and economic restriction.²⁹ A more cynical view was expressed in the wartime diary of Helen Pearl Adam, who looked upon the new styles as an attempt to countermand the wave of economy—by decreeing “a change from narrow clothes to wide, [couturiers] knew they were making sure of their turnover for the Spring of 1915 . . . we were new to war in those days and had no experience of profiteers.”³⁰ Her observations, nonetheless, suggest that women were buying these fashions and certainly extant garments from the period show that luxurious fabrics and fanciful trimmings still found their way into the designs of the most exclusive Parisian houses such as Worth and Callot Sœurs.

Examples in the collection at The Metropolitan Museum of Art in neutral shades of oyster silk and sand-colored silk velvet, nonetheless exhibit metallic lace and seed pearl embroidery, floating tulle panels and luxurious fur trim.³¹ Although they were probably made for the American market, they are interesting on two counts: first, they reiterate the significance of trade between Paris and America and, second, they evidence the fact that despite shortages, irregular shipping, and the struggling dye industry, Paris was still capable of producing romantic, extravagant fashions for the wealthy.

However, war brought about an inevitable change in lifestyle and the introduction of a new mood and modes which Lucile was less willing to countenance. A further distinction of class needs to be observed in relation to the Lucile client; she was designing for society’s finest, described by her sister, the author Elinor Glynn, as “the fairy ring within which danced a circle of families entitled to enjoy its privileges on account of birth and tradition.”³² However, although this clientele was presumably less affected by wartime austerity and the society season did not altogether stop, American buyers in Paris reported a deserted city, devoid of the atmosphere of old. Lady Angela Forbes, a Lucile client, wrote in her memoirs that London was “overborne with a new sense of grave happenings, people ceased to concern themselves with changing their clothes. The hotel grill-rooms were crowded, but to dress for dinner became banal, almost an outrage.”³³

Fashion and morale

If Britain and France were out of sorts with the old theatre of dressing, then Lucile's picture dresses, which belonged to the grand ballrooms of the *Belle Époque*, were better suited to the wealthier American market. A pale blue silk chiffon dress in the collection of Philadelphia Museum is one of her wartime styles that most overtly hark back to the nostalgic romance of her Edwardian fashions, with the Rococo-inspired scalloped line of shirred silk taffeta around the midpoint of the skirt, and decorative silk rosebuds.³⁴ Named "Happiness," its color was no accident: Lucile imbued color with psychological importance and in her mind "blue stands for purity . . . for homely love, and peaceful, happy things. It is a color all men love, and they will generally prefer a simple little homemade dress in blue to a model from one of the great houses in another color."³⁵ Far from a simple homemade dress, this evening gown was explicitly marketed to its American consumer; presumably the moniker of "Happiness" would not have sat well with a dispirited war-ravaged Europe and by this time Henri Bendel was reporting in *Harper's Bazaar* that evening gowns "were created solely for the American buyer—as French women wore only *tailleurs* (tailored suits)."³⁶

Another garment that hints at a connection in Lucile's mind between fashion and morale in wartime is an evening dress of bright leaf green and red shot silk, trimmed with gold embroidered net, satin binding and silk flowers on display at the National Museum of Scotland (Figure 3.2). It bears the Paris label and is dated to around 1918, however as photocopies of Lucile designs and swatches were sent to Paris from America, we cannot be sure whether this is originally a Paris fashion, or a copy of an American design. Nevertheless, given that it was war's end that proved most disruptive to patterns of taste and consumption, as the general malaise prompted a definitive movement towards the discarding of old traditions and the shortages were felt most strongly, this dress is particularly interesting. It reflects the new, simpler silhouette and shorter skirt, the fewer layers and flounces, but it is nonetheless enriched with Lucile's handwriting, and is pertinent in comparison with a watercolor sketch in the Victoria & Albert Museum's collection dating from 1905 (Figure 3.3).

With a similar combination and choice of fabric colors and trimmings to create an overall emerald and gold effect, the later dress design bears the mark of a *couturière* lusting after the old standards of extravagant dressing in a rapidly modernising landscape and as such its color is most pertinent. Although often at the root of many a superstition for its unlucky connotations, for Lucile green signified hope and was "God's choice for a world that needed rest, it is the color of renewing, of re-birth"—a hint, perhaps, that her design ethos was intrinsically linked with both economic and social wartime morale.³⁷ Its Paris label is perhaps significant, for Duff Gordon's memoirs note that in France green has always been used as a symbol of hope, citing the example of the green caps of the unmarried Catherinettes on the Feast of Saint Catherine, where the color instead represents wisdom.³⁸ It is a color that she has revisited time and again but its romantic connotations are most

Figure 3.2 Woman's evening dress of shot silk, with gold embroidered net and passementerie, by Lucile Ltd, Paris, France, 1918. © National Museums Scotland. A.1986.127.

Figure 3.3 Page from Lucile sample album book of fashion designs of women's clothes, Great Britain, 1905. © Victoria and Albert Museum, London. T.89A-1986.

implicit in its use in wartime and immediately post-war garments. Surviving examples include an evening coat of taffeta and semi-transparent silk in the collection of National Museums Scotland,³⁹ made in Paris and dated 1914–19 and a silk and cotton evening dress trimmed with ecru lace and silk ribbon rosebuds from Chicago, now in The Metropolitan Museum of Art's collection,⁴⁰ dating from 1919.

Conclusion

Lucile was a shrewd businesswoman—she diversified her fashions, entered new markets, licensed her name, endorsed products and was one of the earliest of the *haute* couturiers to branch out into a ready-to-wear line through deals that she made with Sears in 1917. Her connection between fashion and morale could equally have been a judicious, profiteering move to encourage consumer demand for her romantic evening wear. Yet, it is important to reiterate that Lucile made her addresses dismissing economy in dress in America, where her “delicious blending of filmy fabrics” were still being praised with a hyperbole no longer suited to the malaise in Europe.⁴¹ In March 1917, *Vogue* described a Lucile dress:

[which] surely must be literally blown together or cunningly cajoled into having an appearance, as its little puffs seem full of air, and the silver flower flounces just float in space around its fortunate wearer. To think that this has been cut and stitched together is an anomaly which passes the imagination of the uninitiated.”⁴²

It is certainly true that fashion was capable of acting as a distraction and a means of lifting feminine spirits; Lucile herself staged two charity spectacles in the vaudeville style in New York in 1916 and 1917 to raise money for war charities, turning to fashion as a means of uniting women in a common cause. In her memoirs, she placed a heavy importance on this aspect of the female personality:

No man can possibly realise how women are influenced by the clothes they wear. Put even the plainest woman into a beautiful dress and unconsciously she will try to live up to it. It is as if for her the designer has created a new personality, her every movement reflects an increased self-confidence, a new joy of living.⁴³

She was also not alone in harnessing fashion with the power “to gladden the hearts of the returned warriors.”⁴⁴ In 1918, London magazine *The Queen* attacked the proposed National Standard Dress on grounds of individuality, patriotism and good taste, somewhat echoing Lucile's appraisal of the uniquely feminine charms of fashion, with the words “How [the men] would resent it if they found their women, whom they left clad in individuality and daintiness, all gowned in Government clothes

like one huge orphan asylum!”⁴⁵ However, while in America, Lucile’s evening dresses were flying out of the fitting rooms, in Europe there was perhaps little connection between her romantic fashions and morale, given that there was little market for romance—the very catalyst, perhaps, for the design of the hopeful green dress. In the end, it was, to quote Duff Gordon, “this passing of so much of the romance which made the world a very pleasant place” and the advent of what she rues as an era of “practical dressing” which diminished Lucile’s place in the fashion market.⁴⁶

Notes

- 1 Lucile Duff Gordon, *A Woman of Temperament* (London: Attica Books, 2012 [1932]), 54–5.
- 2 Quote: “to her we owe the first conception of a dressmaker’s shop as a *salon*, the social meeting place for a genuine aristocratic and artistic clientele. In many ways the advent of Lucile [*sic*] was a landmark in the history of modern beauty,” Hon. Mrs C. W. Forester, *This Age of Beauty* (London: Methuen & Co., 1935) cited in Valerie D. Mendes and Amy de la Haye, *Lucile Ltd: London, Paris, New York and Chicago, 1890s–1930* (London: V&A Publishing, 2009).
- 3 Duff Gordon, *A Woman of Temperament*, 68.
- 4 *Ibid.*, 54. In the *New York Examiner* in 1910, Lucile wrote: “there is only one real fashion, and that is different with every woman. It is the outward draping of the soul, her individuality, her physical ensemble; it’s the thing that interprets and harmonises with her,” Mendes and de la Haye, *Lucile Ltd.*; Duff Gordon, *A Woman of Temperament*, 68.
- 5 Aileen Ribeiro, *Dress in Eighteenth-Century Europe 1715–1789* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1984), 98.
- 6 Mendes and de la Haye, *Lucile Ltd.*; and Cecil Beaton wrote in *The Glass of Fashion* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1954), 32:

Lucile worked with soft materials, delicately sprinkling them with bead or sequin embroidery, with cobweb lace insertions, true lovers’ knots, and garlands of minute roses. Her color sense was so subtle that the delicacy of detail could scarcely be seen at a distance, though the effect she created was of an indefinable shimmer. Sometimes, however, she introduced rainbow effects into a sash and would incorporate quite vivid mauves and greens, perhaps even a touch of shrimp-pink or orange.
- 7 Mendes and de la Haye, *Lucile Ltd.*
- 8 Duff Gordon, *A Woman of Temperament*, 54.
- 9 *Ibid.*, 212.
- 10 *Ibid.*, 250.
- 11 Howard Greer, *Designing Male* (London: Thomas Allen, 1952), 47.
- 12 *Ibid.*; and Cecil Willet Cunnington, *English Women’s Clothing in the Present Century* (London: Faber and Faber, 1952), 127.
- 13 Susan Glenn, *Female Spectacle: The Theatrical Roots of Modern Feminism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 163.

- 14 Cunnington, *English Women's Clothing*, 126.
- 15 Caroline Evans, *The Mechanical Smile: Modernism and the First Fashion Shows in France and America, 1900–1929* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013), 108.
- 16 Imperial War Museum (IWM), IWM ART.PST 10122.
- 17 May Jack, "Fashion's forecast," *The Queen*, July 24, 1915, 162.
- 18 Ibid., "Fashion's forecast," *The Queen*, May 20, 1916, 734.
- 19 National Museums Scotland, A.1922.227 A–C.
- 20 Jack, "Fashion's forecast," *The Queen*, June 10, 1916, 834.
- 21 Quote: "there isn't any doubt now about beige being the most insistent proposition for Spring. It is for rolls of beige gabardine the tailors are sharpening their shears just now and we are going to be shown practical darker shades of it as well," from Juno, "Beige suits and black hats for spring," *The Gentlewoman*, February 10, 1917.
- 22 "New summer gowns," *The Gentlewoman*, May 19, 1917.
- 23 "Dress and fashion," *The Queen*, August 28, 1915, 399.
- 24 Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A), T.27&A–1960.
- 25 "Fashion and the economic life of the nation," *The Gentlewoman*, February 17, 1917, 156.
- 26 Evans, *The Mechanical Smile*, 103.
- 27 Ibid.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 National Museums Scotland, H.RHI 90.21.
- 30 Helen Pearl Adam, *Paris Sees it Through: A Diary, 1914–1919* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919), 48.
- 31 Silk evening dress with metallic thread and glass embroidery, House of Worth, Paris, 1914–16, 1976.217.2; silk, tulle and lace evening dress, Callot Sœurs, Paris, Autumn/Winter 1915/16, 2009.300.3160; silk velvet evening coat, trimmed with fur, Callot Sœurs, Paris, 1916–17, C.I.51.97.6.
- 32 Mendes and de la Haye, *Lucile Ltd.*
- 33 Lady Angela Forbes, *Memories and Base Details*, 2nd edn (London, 1922), 151.
- 34 Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1962–190–1.
- 35 Duff Gordon, *A Woman of Temperament*, 215.
- 36 *Harper's Bazaar*, London, June 1916, 64–5.
- 37 Duff Gordon, *A Woman of Temperament*, 214.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 National Museums Scotland, A.1977.799.
- 40 The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1979–569.4.
- 41 Mendes and de la Haye, *Lucile Ltd.*
- 42 *Vogue*, March 1917.

43 Duff Gordon, *A Woman of Temperament*, 58.

44 Ibid., 250.

45 Jack, "Fashion's forecast," *The Queen*, September 14, 1918, 224. Amidst the peak of shortages in 1918, the government attempted to introduce a "National Standard Dress," generally considered to have been the inspiration for the Utility Scheme of the Second World War. Its purpose was to introduce one garment that could be worn for a number of occasions, which would abolish the need for different changes of dress throughout the day.

46 Ibid., 68; Duff Gordon, *A Woman of Temperament*, 252.

References

- Adam, Helen Pearl. *Paris Sees it Through: A Diary, 1914–1919*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919.
- Beaton, Cecil. *The Glass of Fashion*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1954.
- Cunnington, Cecil Willet. *English Women's Clothing in the Present Century*. London: Faber and Faber, 1952.
- "Dress and Fashion." *The Queen*, August 28, 1915.
- Duff Gordon, Lucile. *A Woman of Temperament*. 1932. Repr., London: Attica Books, 2012.
- Evans, Caroline. *The Mechanical Smile: Modernism and the First Fashion Shows in France and America, 1900–1929*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.
- "Fashion and the economic life of the nation." *The Gentlewoman*, February 17, 1917.
- "Fashion's forecast." *The Queen*, September 14, 1918.
- Forbes, Lady Angela. *Memories and Base Details*, 2nd edn. London, 1922.
- Glenn, Susan. *Female Spectacle: The theatrical Roots of Modern Feminism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Greer, Howard. *Designing Male*. London: Thomas Allen, 1952.
- Harper's Bazaar*, London, June 1916.
- Jack, May. "Fashion's forecast." *The Queen*, July 24, 1915.
- Jack, May. "Fashion's forecast." *The Queen*, May 20, 1916.
- Jack, May. "Fashion's forecast." *The Queen*, June 10, 1916.
- Juno. "Beige suits and black hats for spring." *The Gentlewoman*, February 10, 1917.
- Mendes, Valerie D. and Amy De La Haye. *Lucile Ltd: London, Paris, New York and Chicago, 1890s–1930s*. London: V&A Publishing, 2009.
- "New Summer Gowns." *The Gentlewoman*, May 19, 1917.
- Ribeiro, Aileen. *Dress in Eighteenth-Century Europe 1715–1789*. London: B. T. Batsford, 1984.
- Vogue*, London, March 1917.