L = 24

"Hearts Uplifted and Minds Refreshed": *The Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Production of Pure Culture in the United States, 1880–1930*

Alison M. Parker

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union's (WCTU) Department for the Promotion of Purity in Literature and Art, established in 1883, worked for legal censorship, but also created a "pure" literary, artistic, and popular culture. This WCTU program blurs the distinctions some historians have made between producers of culture and their audience(s) or, alternatively, between repressive censors and creative artists. This article documents the WCTU's publication of its own children's magazine, distribution of cheap reproductions of famous paintings, and promotion and production of educational pro-temperance movies. Moral transformation of youth, activists argued, could only occur through the positive influence of a pure culture. As WCTU women pursued a strategy of supporting and producing culture, they made crucial contributions to shaping the public arena in the United States. Asserting their right to be the arbiters of culture themselves, women reformers insisted upon a tie between art and morals.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union's (WCTU) participation in debates about "pure" culture and the pro-censorship movement, from the 1880s to the 1930s, provides an interesting historical parallel to today's culture wars.[1] Christian fundamentalists and other right-wing activists attack art and media that does not uphold their narrow notion of family values, but instead uses complex, challenging, or disturbing techniques and images to explore such controversial subject matters as sexual identity, race, class, and sexism.[2] The notion of purity and its role in raising children and reforming society was and is widely contested. Past and present activists embrace the dual roles of cultural producer and censor. WCTU reformers, for instance, supported censorship of impure culture and tried to rework the available cultural media by creating their own pure art, which they conceived of as morally upstanding, wholesome culture designed to provide moral uplift and character development for youth. Similarly, even as New Right Christian evangelicals attack Hollywood and mainstream media today, they simultaneously produce numerous cable television programs, videos, and rock music, as well as publish their own literature explicitly designed to replace immoral cultural forms.

© 1999 Journal of Women's History, Vol. 11 No. 2 (Summer)

This article focuses on the WCTU's Department for the Promotion of Purity in Literature and Art, established in 1883, which supported the creation of a pure literary, artistic, and leisure culture, as well as legal censorship.[3] The work of the WCTU blurs the distinctions some historians have made between producers of culture and their audience(s) or, alternatively, between repressive censors and creative artists, writers, and movie directors.[4] Moral transformation of youth, activists argued, could only occur through the positive influence of a wholesome culture. The union's determination to publish its own children's magazine, distribute cheap reproductions of famous paintings, and show educational pro-temperance movies demonstrates the extent of women's commitment to the production of purity. Asserting their right to be arbiters of culture themselves, WCTU women insisted upon a tie between art and morals.[5]

During the antebellum period, middle-class Protestants played a role in the production of culture, claiming the middle as their own. Historian Lori D. Ginzberg argues that Protestant women asserted the superiority of middle-class values as a means of class formation as well as cultural creation.[6] Half a century later, middle-class women of the WCTU continued to undertake the creation of a pure culture, using many of the same values as those held earlier. This is significant, in light of some historians' arguments that women and other middle-class consumers became increasingly excluded from the center of cultural production.[7] Cultural historian Lawrence Levine enters a major debate in the history of U.S. culture over the role of the middle class in the popular reception of "high" and "low" culture. He suggests that high culture was imposed on the middle class. By 1900, a newly formed cultural elite had claimed and defined high art—consisting of European avant-garde painting, realism and naturalism in literature, the ballet, and symphony orchestras—for itself. In contrast, he states, a low or popular culture—identified as amusement parks, crime story papers, dance halls, and movies—functioned outside of high art for working women and men.[8] WCTU members actively resisted the imposition of a cultural hierarchy based on a distinction between high and low art. Significant numbers of middle-class women were positioned between these two standards which were promoted (but certainly not established) at the turn of the century. The WCTU exemplifies the ambiguous, sometimes resistant, position of the middle class vis-à-vis Levine's sacralization of culture into high art, for it simultaneously fought against such elite forms as nude sculptures, the ballet, and literary realism on the one hand, and boxing and dime novels on the other.[9]

The WCTU rejected cultural heterogeneity, believing instead that there ought to be a commonly shared, homogeneous, and pure middle culture which its members would have a role in creating. Historian Joan Shelley

Rubin argues that an identifiable "middlebrow" culture emerged in the United States in the 1920s; her definition of middlebrow culture fits the pure culture the WCTU produced a few decades earlier. Middlebrow culture, Rubin explains, had several key characteristics. At least ideally, it was to be a culture that all Americans could share, and was designed to reinforce and valorize a Protestant-based morality that privileged purity, social responsibility, and piety. It had to be accessible to average people, not just to elites or the lower classes. Stylistically, it had to be realistic, in the sense of not engaging the imagination in fantasy, but also not as realistic as works dealing with prostitution or "fallen women" by such novelists as Theodore Dreiser or Thomas Hardy.[10] Rubin's definition of middlebrow culture stresses the persistence in the twentieth century of a Victorian genteel tradition, while acknowledging the new dominance of commercial entertainment and the avant-garde. This tradition is characterized as a privileging of personal moral character and public spirit, an interest in self-improvement and education, a general knowledge of literature and art (in the face of specialization and professionalization and a burgeoning of cultural production), and a popularization of high culture to a wide public. Union members similarly insisted upon a tie between culture and morals, whereby that "which was not morally sound could not be aesthetically pleasing."[11] The WCTU's production of its own pure children's magazines, for instance, indicates that there was an identifiable middlebrow culture in the 1880s, and corroborates the tensions surrounding expertise that Rubin has ascribed to the quiz shows, "great books" seminars, and "outline" books of the 1920s and 1930s.

WCTU activities and programs reveal the typical goals and values of its middle-class female membership. The largest women's organization of the nineteenth century, it had an adult membership of approximately 150,000 in 1892, with 50,000 youths in its auxiliary programs.[12] By 1921, just after the successful passage of national Prohibition, dues-paying adult membership in the WCTU reached an impressively high level of 344,292. The group added another ten thousand new members in the next decade, and then began to decline after 1933, when the Eighteenth Amendment was repealed.[13] From the 1880s through 1933, the organization reached children of WCTU members, as well as other school and immigrant children who encountered its traveling libraries, children's magazines, art reproductions, and temperance films.

The good morals of youth, the WTCU argued, could be directly affected by the cultural products they consumed. Visual images and the written word could fundamentally alter a person's character either for better or worse.[14] The Department for the Promotion of Purity in Literature and Art defined a cultural hierarchy that prioritized morality as a

crucial component of aesthetics, and then created those cultural products it deemed superior according to this standard of purity. The WCTU's middle culture did not guarantee or depend upon originality, for its members used reproductions of certain famous paintings as well as formulaic melodramatic plots for their children's stories. At stake was not the originality of their vision, but issues of cultural, class, and religious dominance. In most cases, the source of contention was the message, not the medium. Denouncing artists who placed cultural perfection above accessibility, morality, or public responsibility, the organization rejected the notion that unique art objects created by a "genius" were inherently superior to mass-produced forms.[15] What follows are analyses of three types of middlebrow culture—children's literature, art, and movies—that the WCTU created or promoted.[16]

Through their production of children's fiction, WCTU members began "to produce their own texts of civic and class identity."[17] Union members produced a middlebrow canon of acceptable children's literature through their monthly magazines, such as the *Young Crusader*, published from 1887 through the 1930s, a periodical historians have not previously examined.[18] An investigation offers the chance to analyze women reformers' alternative to sensational children's literature and explore middle-class aesthetic tastes and moral standards. Not content to wait for professional children's authors to write clean literature, the WCTU created its own version of appropriate reading choices for boys and girls.

The WCTU reached a substantial number of young readers through its publications. The *Young Crusader* was aimed primarily at children aged six to twelve, but each month a variety of articles also addressed youth in their late teens and early twenties.[19] By 1891, the magazine had thirty-four thousand subscribers, many of whom were probably the children of union members. Beginning in 1887, the group published another periodical called the *Oak and Ivy Leaf* which was directed at women under twenty-five who were active in the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union (YWCTU). Within two years, the *Oak and Ivy Leaf* reported the YWCTU as having thirty thousand members, with ten thousand subscriptions to the magazine.[20] These circulation figures suggest that the union sold over forty-four thousand subscriptions to its youth magazines. Furthermore, local WCTU youth groups, such as the Loyal Temperance Legion, purchased one subscription and shared the magazine among all their members; we may safely assume that some children shared their personal subscriptions with siblings and friends. A middlebrow culture was thus a feature of the lives of significant numbers of young people—the WCTU's intended audience. This is not to suggest that these same children read only pure lit-

erature—many of them probably also read the sensational dime novels and crime story papers against which union members fought. These figures are simply meant to provide an estimate of the size and scope of WCTU's youth magazines' audience.

I limit my review of *Young Crusader* fiction to a discussion of one serialized story from 1911 entitled "The Little Captain" by Lynde Palmer. I have chosen this particular story because it illustrates the incorporation of prescriptive advice into fictional form and provides a parallel to my later discussion of the pro-temperance movies the WCTU supported. Gender issues figured in the following story in a subtle way; the story both challenged and reinstituted convention in new contexts.

"The Little Captain" was a temperance melodrama, creating an interplay between the WCTU's substantive positions on morality and temperance, and aesthetic considerations. It focused most exclusively on the social and familial effects of alcohol by explicitly detailing family violence. WCTU editors expected its unrelentingly miserable content to be so unappealing to youth that it could act only as a deterrent.[21] The "fallen" character in the melodrama, James Grey, was a father of four young children who was ruined by alcohol and destroyed his family in the process. An early chapter focused on the necessity of the temperance pledge to secure abstinent behavior. Awakening from a drunken stupor with a "blinding headache," James, ashamed and temporarily repentant, declared, "'I shall bring no more misery into this pleasant home. . . . I shall never drink again.'" His wife, Margaret Grey, immediately asked him to sign a pledge promising to be an abstainer, but he rejected it with disdain, saying that to sign would be a "positive disgrace" and would put him in a "strait jacket." James wanted to retain his masculine prerogative to continue to "take a social glass now and then." According to the WCTU, in contrast, real manliness lay in keeping promises and following one's written commitment. On New Year's Eve, James participated in the "wild orgies" of the saloon, where he gambled away all his pay and lost his job in the process. He returned home less than a man—a "beast," and a "pitiable object."[22] Margaret's plea that he sign the pledge had gone unheeded, an action that doomed him to continued alcoholism. One must sign the formal pledge in order to become a true abstainer; in no piece of fiction published in the *Young Crusader* did someone sign the abstinence pledge and subsequently break it. This was not a possibility, for the power of the pledge was predicated upon reformers' will to believe the bourgeois ideal that a written contract is inviolable.[23]

This story also offered to readers an unusual boy hero whose saintly, "feminine" qualities dominated. Ignoring, or perhaps rejecting, the era's cult of manliness, the author presented Jamie, James's son (aged about

seven), as spiritually and morally strong, but physically weak.[24] With James consigned to the role of a doomed alcoholic, the story shifts its focus to his son.[25] Young Jamie responded to the crisis by becoming a nonviolent temperance crusader, modeling his behavior on female WCTU members.

The plot is melodramatic, in the sense that it contains sensational incidents appealing to the emotions.[26] It is structured on a series of family tragedies caused by James's alcoholism and relies upon new tragedies to maintain its momentum. Although in other contexts the WCTU fought against literary sensationalism, Palmer wrote in vivid, almost sensationalist prose. If melodramatic tragedies could mobilize readers to moral action and reform, then WCTU editors and parents were willing to expose children (properly armed) to the negative aspects of cities and alcoholism, such as saloons, poverty, and death. As with the WCTU's favorite industry-produced movie, *Ten Nights in a Barroom*, the worst effects of alcohol could be represented, had to be represented, in order to effectively deter youths from drinking.[27] The WCTU stylistically represented its cause by balancing realism—the horrors of an impure life—with piety and a sense of high drama. Realism was acceptable if the portrayal of immoral activities served as a warning to the reader.

In a voluptuous scene replete with violence and pathos, James returned home to find that Margaret had sold the clock—their last "nice" possession and symbol of middle-class respectability—to feed her starving children. Ignoring their plight, James demanded the money. When his wife refused, he violently threatened her: "'Then I'll kill you.' Mrs. Grey stood fearlessly before him; the brutal arm was raised; but Jamie, with a wild cry, threw himself between, and the ill-directed blow fell heavily upon his upturned head. The child dropped as if he had been shot, and there was a moment of death-like silence. Then, with a wail whose horror thrilled every nerve of the wretched father, Mrs. Grey cried, slowly. 'You have killed him—your little son! killed Jamie—our little Jamie!' she repeated, with a wild tenderness, lifting the helpless child in her arms."[28] Wife abuse, murder, and uncontrolled anger were vividly and unrelentingly recounted for young readers. Dwelling on the scene's pathos, Jamie did not die immediately, but instead suffered "unconscious ravings" full of "revelations of sufferings" that forced his father to recognize the extent of his wrongdoings. After exhorting that "'no drunkard can inherit the Kingdom of God,'" Jamie finally "raised his beautiful eyes, full of a wonderful light," and died.[29] The chapter's title, "The Captain's Promotion," refers to Jamie's "promotion" from earth to heaven, a term that the WCTU used in their official journal, the *Union Signal*, to announce the deaths of its members. His death, although tragic, confirmed his "angelic" nature and was designed to steel the resolve of the story's readers to resist the temptations of alcohol.[30]

"The Little Captain" is structurally similar to what historian Judith Walkowitz describes as a "transformed melodrama, complete with stereotyped characters, extreme states of being and danger, rapid action, and the vindication of virtue over vice."[31] Melodrama, however, usually features a female victim/heroine, but in this case, Jamie was the story's principal victim/hero. This is a reversal of conventional gender roles; a boy, not a girl, was the religious saintly reformer, a moral "feminine" hero rather than a hero who performed acts of physical prowess. The role of the saintly child was typically reserved for female protagonists, such as little Eva in Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.[32]

Those readers who interpreted the death of the virtuous hero as a signal of defeat for pro-temperance forces could find some reassurance in the final chapters. Jamie's providential death set the stage for moral action and regeneration, thereby justifying his martyrdom. James's guilt and suffering led to permanent change in his behavior. This transformation began the day of Jamie's funeral, as the father endured and overcame "that fearful disease—delirium tremens."[33] Two years later, James entered their old cottage with a "manly tread," home from a temperance meeting he attended with his surviving son, Harry. Telling Margaret of the many city people from their former tenement building and the surrounding saloons who had been saved by Jamie's death, he concluded, "'Well, Maggie, God has brought good out of the evil. Our little Jamie began a great work in that wretched lane, and now, many a poor creature, whom the world regarded as utterly lost, is bravely struggling back to life and hope.'" Margaret, holding their newborn baby in her arms, had the last words, "'He that overcometh shall inherit all things.'"[34]

Overall, *Young Crusader* stories reflect WCTU notions of how literature works, or, more simply, how people respond to what they read. Concluding that "fiction is too powerful a weapon to be left in careless hands," the union engaged in its own pure publishing. Its belief that producers of culture determine the meaning of texts, especially for youth, increased the need for creative control at the preproduction level: "He who would influence public opinion must control the production of the songs or ballards [*sic*] or whatever form of literature appeals to the emotional side. . . . [People] give the novel the same transient attention . . . and are alike at the mercy of the man who entertains them." WCTU members borrowed from other sources that they found to be compatible with their life view. They argued that they could influence popular culture most directly by offering the public pure literature of their own creation, rather than simply by monitoring and censoring cultural forms others produced. "We will control public opinion," they asserted, "in about the same measure that we *control the production* of the people's chosen literature" (emphasis added).[35]

Union members did not reject the notion of a popular "people's chosen literature," but did decide to produce it themselves, so that its morality would be ensured.

The WCTU's Department for the Promotion of Purity in Literature and Art engaged in a spirited public debate with contemporary American artists. Throughout its arguments in favor of a middlebrow culture, the group positioned itself as antielitist. In 1900, the department's superintendent, Emilie D. Martin, of New York City, used a democratic argument against the claims of the main professional organization for artists, the Society of American Artists. She asserted that all great artists come from the people, rather than the elite, and that "of all the muses, there is none so truly democratic as that of art." Yet only her ideal artists-of-the-people, it seems, could be trusted to give more thought to the moral and social consequences of their work. Martin, therefore, emphasized the importance of "public sentiment" in creating a change, whereby those less ideal, undemocratic artists would see that they had been wrong and selfish and would voluntarily reform.[36]

Not surprisingly, the Society of American Artists disagreed with WCTU arguments. In 1908, it responded directly by insisting that "cultural perfection" was more important than virtue, accessibility, or public responsibility. Society members argued that the artist, rather than the moralist, should be in charge of "questions of taste." As New York Superintendent Harriet S. Pritchard put it, "the Society of Artists blame [*sic*] us for trying to circumscribe art by morals."[37] Modern and avant-garde artists insisted that formal beauty be the artists' goal rather than art with a prescribed standard of rectitude.[38] They refused to be beholden to the tastes of the public. Determined to follow their individual inspiration, they would not cater to their audience's ideals, but rather would educate them to appreciate the final product. Pritchard retorted that the law was on the side of the common person rather than the artist, whom she called an "unregenerate genius." She cited as proof *Commonwealth v. Noedler*, a New York Court of Appeals decision, that: "It does not require an expert in art or literature to determine whether a picture is obscene, or whether printed words are offensive to decency and good morals. These are matters which fall within the range of ordinary intelligence."[39]

Defying the artists' challenges to its authority, the WCTU tried to deemphasize its attempts to censor fine art. Instead, it highlighted the positive, productive nature of its goals—the promotion of purity. By 1899, Martin's Department for the Promotion of Purity and Literature in Art responded to the increasing importance of visual images—such as paintings, woodcuts, photographs, prints, and the first kinetoscope images—

over the influence of the written word, and started a new program for art education. This "gospel of pictures" was based on the same premise that had inspired its creation of the *Young Crusader*; good behavior would be actively inspired, in this case, by viewing fine reproductions of pure paintings. Martin's associate national superintendent, Carolyn Leech, developed a detailed plan of action. Advances in technology made high quality facsimiles of paintings readily available, Leech argued, so that the images could work their purifying effect on a broad spectrum of American society, ranging from adult prisoners to middle-class families, not just wealthy elites who could afford to collect original works of art.

Saul E. Zalesch recently has documented the popularity of "millions of inexpensive, mass-produced oil paintings" in the 1880s. His speculation that consumer interest in cheap oil paintings can be attributed to a middle-class desire to attain "gentility" and "cultural standing" is only part of the story. These purchasers had to flout elite assertions that the only high quality paintings were originals created by well-known or respected artists. The paintings Zalesch described, in contrast, were produced by work teams in factories or poor women churning out paintings at home for piecework wages.[40] The distribution and popularity of these paintings is similar to the WCTU's promotion of inexpensive reproductions of famous works of art. By ignoring elite prescriptions on the purchase and appreciation of fine art, those who ordered cheap paintings and prints through the mail helped to create a separate middlebrow culture, while also asserting their own respectability.

The art education campaign encouraged families to purchase, mount, and frame reproductions of inspiring paintings for display in their homes. The department selected prints and sold them at a low cost through advertisements and informational articles in its publications. Jeanhette M. Dougherty's article entitled "Art Education in the Home" notes that in earlier eras people could only see paintings by visiting the private residences of the wealthy. Changes even more radical than the establishment of public museums had since occurred as "the present day brings us choice reproductions of the world's great paintings. . . . There is no longer [an] excuse for any home being without art representation." This was not simply an attempt to emulate the tastes of the wealthy, for Dougherty insisted that "the day is past when anything will do to hang upon the wall, simply to fill space. We now demand pictures that mean something."[41] That meaning was to be primarily moral and religious. Technological innovations that made high quality reproductions widely available could be used to help spread moral messages. The department recommended, for instance, that a reproduction of Johann Hofmann's painting of the *Head of Christ* be hung in living rooms in order to influence family members to emulate Christ's piety and righteous behavior.[42]

The art education program was multifaceted, and reached out to adults and children. Leech believed that the reproductions would inspire moral behavior, even in condemned criminals. Local unions distributed hundreds of prints, donating reproductions of paintings of Christ to hang in every room in jails, hospitals, and other government institutions. Union leaders admired their work, exclaiming that "the Christ pictures mounted on gray cardboard for the State Prison and others are really so beautiful that it is hard to believe them prints."[43] For those in public schools and young people's clubs, including the approximately fifty thousand youths in WCTU affiliates, the department provided "picture libraries" with twenty-five reproductions of "different subjects," ranging from "copies of famous paintings . . . [and] pictures of historical scenes, [to] portraits of authors and their homes, artists and musicians and views of noted buildings in various countries." The images could assist students in their studies of history and foreign cultures and facilitate their overall academic development, while also ensuring that they would acquire proper morally based aesthetic standards.[44]

Different reproductions were selected for boys and girls. For example, in its traveling picture libraries, paintings of the Virgin Mary, birds, animals, and landscapes were expected to appeal to girls, who could be introduced through these carefully chosen visual images to an appreciation of religion, natural science, proper behavior, and role models. WCTU activists offered copies of a painting of Sir Galahad by Isaac Watt to boys because they believed that viewing it could inspire "manly" and chivalric behavior. They chose a representation of Galahad that portrayed the moral image they most wanted to convey. Galahad's pose represented a combination of piety and dedication that the WCTU valued; they interpreted the standing hero as "half praying and half studying" beside his white steed. Department leaders reasoned that when each boy had his own picture of the saintly and gallant knight hung above his bed, he would inevitably be influenced by Galahad's "clean and pure" life. Galahad had led the "fight against evil" and so was a perfect role model for young temperance "crusaders," who could join the organization's main youth group, appropriately called the Loyal Temperance Legion. This choice of metaphor was not arbitrary, for medieval metaphors appealed to a variety of organizations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The WCTU, the antituberculosis public health movement, and the Ku Klux Klan, among others, mobilized medieval metaphors in order to stress the need for individual, heroic action on behalf of various causes.[45] The irony of choosing the medieval Galahad as a role model in an age of technological reproducibility is striking. Yet Galahad is a good representation of turn-of-the-century America's cultural fascination with the chivalric

Middle Ages. The medieval Galahad was idealized as an individual hero who dared all for his king and Christianity, or—translated into the WCTU's contemporary language—for the state and morality. He was no selfish renegade, but rather a citizen activist in knightly garb.[46] The department's goal of hanging wholesome and inspiring prints in both jails and children's rooms reflects its interest in promoting good citizenship. A good citizen was someone who not only obeyed all laws, but who worked politically to create new laws as part of a reformist impulse.

The department approached its program of art education from the perspective of a group trying to educate and uplift the masses, including its own middle class. By bringing moralistic and religious art to the majority of American citizens, the WCTU hoped to create social order out of cultural chaos. It asserted, "Art brings into the home a refining and elevating influence that molds character, and the demand for good pictures in the home is one of the delightful phases of modern culture."[47] The fact that union members promoted a "gospel of pictures" does not, however, signal their conversion into the cultural elite. The department's middlebrow art education program did not adopt elites' exclusive vision that accepted only the high art of painting and ballet, nor did it reject all low art of popular illustrations and magazines. Most tellingly, the WCTU persistently denounced the celebration of aesthetics represented by French impressionism and other avant-garde European art movements in favor of upholding morality as the ultimate critical and aesthetic standard.

There was not an impassable dividing line between those who produced culture and those who alternatively critiqued and consumed it at the turn of the century. Union members were committed to endorsing, producing, and/or censoring virtually all cultural products. Their responses to impure culture lay in public, political campaigns to ward off these negative influences, as well as in determined attempts to promote pure children's magazines, art, and movies. WCTU laywomen embraced a multiplicity of roles without a sense that they were doing anything extraordinary. Their comfort with these roles suggests that the history of culture, and its reception and production at this time, cannot be described as a contest between those who responded to culture and those who created it.

Reflecting changes over time in popular and high culture by the 1910s and 1920s, the department's focus turned to the dangers as well as the positive potential of films, now the most popular form of entertainment in the United States. The WCTU supported and developed wholesome movies in response to changes in public consumption and popular media. This shift toward movie consumption suggested to the WCTU that it

needed to address new audiences in different ways. Fusing faith in science and technology with Christian reform goals, the organization embraced the new technology of motion pictures and dedicated itself to promoting and producing pure movies to be used for education and moral reform.[48] Most of the films the group supported were nonfiction educational movies that articulated antialcohol and antitobacco positions from a scientific perspective. Other pure educational films may have been fictional melodramas that hoped to convince youth to resist alcohol and cigarettes by showing them the tragic impact of substance abuse, especially on families. Unfortunately, most of these films have not survived, nor have I discovered detailed descriptions of them.[49] In any event, similar to its children's literature, the movies the group supported (including dramas) were conceived of as educational because they were intended to teach moral lessons and change behavior. Its efforts did not translate into a boycott of movie industry products, but rather coexisted with the understanding that people would also watch mainstream commercial movies.

In the 1880s, the WCTU successfully advanced a legally mandated antialcohol education program called Scientific Temperance Instruction (STI) under the leadership of Mary Hunt. STI passed into law as a mandatory part of every state's public school curriculum by 1903. Although all public schools required STI, the amount of time devoted to it varied dramatically depending upon the sympathies of individual teachers. STI persisted for many years at the local level and reached most school-aged children through literature assigned in classrooms. Union members soon envisioned STI as providing an immediate forum and legal rationale for showing antialcohol movies in schools.[50] By the late 1920s, many state and local unions had donated temperance films to high schools and then sponsored school-wide movie screenings.

The WCTU began to think seriously about creating and sponsoring films in 1910, when the *Union Signal* reported talks between Thomas Edison (a fellow abstainer from alcohol) and union members. Meeting with their Committee on Moving Picture Films, Edison spoke of his plan to develop films for public schools on such topics as science, nature, and history.[51] The committee was impressed with this educational approach, and requested that Edison make movies that would compliment STI programs in public schools. It suggested that Edison's movies show "the preparation of grain until it is manufactured into pure food," as well as "the evils arising from the use of alcohol and tobacco." Heartening union members, he agreed to their request: "Mr. Edison intends to show the evil effects of alcohol and tobacco on the human system, even on the blood corpuscles and the various organs of the body, nerves, etc. Every phase of what we now stand for and teach in scientific temperance is to be fully dealt with."[52]

A *Union Signal* article predicted that Edison's educational films would win children away from the movie industry's popular productions: "With such an attractive and carefully censored exhibit in schools, the glaring and cheap looking shows that are a disgrace to our city streets will lose most of their charm for children."[53] Harriet Pritchard rhapsodized, "We should praise God for this wonderful advance in educational methods, and for the splendid prospect held forth that scientific temperance will be regularly taught in such an attractive and practical way to every child in the United States."[54] Edison released over one hundred silent educational films in 1913—none dealing with temperance. The WCTU then doubted whether Edison would ever make temperance films, yet its leaders magnanimously offered a resolution at the national convention praising him for "his magnificent work for children."[55]

Not content to wait for further action from Edison, the organization noted religious societies' use of "the motion picture to demonstrate Scripture and moral truths." Religious, social, and reform groups were promoting films with moral messages that might counteract the influence of mainstream for-profit productions. By 1914, the WCTU decided to take similar actions and sponsored showings of melodramas and educational films that supported its temperance and purity goals.[56] Union members did not oppose all Hollywood films or motion pictures as a genre. They continued to attend those movie industry productions that seemed likely to uphold their values. Although movies and Hollywood were rife with drugs, sex, and scandal from the 1910s on, the WCTU did not consistently condemn the Hollywood community. This may be because it recognized the power and popularity of Hollywood films, and felt that it was, in some part, dependent upon the industry to make wholesome films.[57]

WCTU members hypothesized that the impact of a motion picture must be stronger and more immediate than a book because its images are so realistic: "The pupils [of the eye] absorb the meaning of what they see while they might get exceedingly little out of a book or discussion. . . . The vividness of impression is important. What seems to be real and life-like will be remembered longer because it is more convincing."[58] The group argued that the showing of wholesome educational movies in schools could increase students' interest in learning. In 1922, a *Union Signal* article, for instance, made a point to announce that Yale University Press had launched an important film project on U.S. history called *Chronicles of America* to be used in schools.[59] Temperance films, in particular, would present scientific knowledge so powerfully that "unrealistic" dramatic films the movie industry produced would be rendered less dangerous. The same page in the *Union Signal* prominently featured an advertisement for a film the National WCTU sponsored: "'Safeguarding the Nation,' a five-reel mo-

tion picture showing the effects of alcohol upon the body by means of the laboratory process, is a picture such as educators advocate."[60] Promoting pure movies made union members proud of their efforts. It seemed possible that even a few movies of excellent quality might counteract the effect of the worst sensational films produced in Hollywood.[61]

The WCTU regularly worked with public schools and teachers to show antialcohol and antitobacco films mainly produced by doctors and health care professionals. These educational films of the 1920s and 1930s are the immediate precursors of those currently shown as part of the health education curriculum in schools. National director of the Motion Picture Department, Maude M. Aldrich, recommended that local unions buy and donate copies of *Safeguarding the Nation* and the *Tobacco Plague* to the departments of visual education in their public schools, so that the movies could then be shown to local high school students and other interested community groups.[62] Administrators could often be persuaded to show temperance movies to groups of students by offers of organizational or financial help from concerned pro-temperance parents or other community activists. The *Tobacco Plague* was an anticigarette film produced by Dr. John Harvey Kellogg, superintendent of the popular health resort Battle Creek Sanitorium. When promoting the movie, the union referred to the fact that Kellogg was a doctor by training, implying that he could, therefore, be trusted to have made an impartial and scientific film. The WCTU worked with other groups to try to give Kellogg's film a mandatory place "in the regular course on Hygiene" for both normal schools and single-sex religious schools.[63] This law passed in Kentucky in 1927 and inspired the Massachusetts WCTU to fight for the same legislation.[64] As a result, temperance and abstinence would be taught as health issues. The group's promotions for another movie, *Deliverance*, also focused on the creator's professional credentials: "We appeal to every county . . . to show 'Deliverance' a picture based on the book, *Prohibition at its Worst* . . . by Prof. Irving Fisher of Yale University. He declares Prohibition the best method yet tried of dealing with the liquor traffic."[65] The Pennsylvania WCTU arranged for twenty-two showings of *Deliverance* throughout the state to a total of seven thousand people in 1929. This data suggests that an average WCTU showing could reach approximately three hundred people.[66]

The WCTU's promotion and production of motion pictures—the very medium of which it was so afraid—is a fascinating indication of the profound influence of Progressivism's faith in technology as a symbol of progress and a tool for reformers. In addition to promoting films made by others, the union contemplated independently producing its own films. The Department of Purity in Literature and Art produced and distributed leaflets, such as "Making Our Own Motion Pictures," as early as 1919.[67]

Any new inventions that made amateur filmmaking easier were welcomed. Access to motion picture cameras meant that the organization would have a way to assert its own vision of social morality, without having to convince the resistant movie industry of the soundness of its demands. For this reason, the department announced "One of the most marvelous developments noted is that of the movette, a large camera capable of taking pictures of either still or moving subjects with a projector that can be used in any sized hall or church. By this means our temperance hosts are made independent of the film people. A complete outfit costs but $100."[68] Producing alternative films was, however, still a great deal costlier and technically more difficult than publishing periodical literature. This helps explain why the WCTU did not have any of its own educational films to show in schools until the mid- to late 1930s. Nonetheless, its ambitions point to some important goals.[69] The union offered the general public pure films and tailored them toward the education of impressionable children, rather than focusing upon either aesthetics or profit. It conceived of educational films as a means to help parents rest assured that their children could attend movies—the most popular form of cultural entertainment—without putting their moral development in peril. Its efforts at film production further demonstrate that the organization was committed to the championing of a middlebrow culture.

To advance pure movies, the Department of Motion Pictures appropriated knowledge and language from the natural and social sciences. It cited academically respectable studies that reaffirmed its insistence that child viewers are particularly impressionable: "The investigation by educators, psychologists and sociologists under the Payne Fund, now being published in ten volumes, brings to the study of the motion picture question authoritative facts never before available."[70] During the 1920s and 1930s, WCTU members often went beyond citing experts, and readily claimed the roles of scientific researcher and movie critic. Wanting to unite scientific and artistic expertise with democratic sentiment, they used "scorecards" to evaluate movies. Scorecards were ostensibly scientific but could be filled out by any interested laywoman, not just by movie critics or researchers. The union made an effort to provide the public with more "objective" reviewing of movies. Illinois's Department of Motion Pictures, for example, distributed 260 scorecards "among the various churches, clubs, and organizations in the county to secure an opinion as to the need of local censorship."[71] Scorecards proved most useful as "a good way to tabulate their [the local union's] findings."[72] In a struggle for expertise, laywomen reformers adopted the seemingly objective information-gathering methodology that gained popularity with the rise of the social sciences.[73] WCTU members adopted numeracy as a means of substantiating their

claims, enhancing their credibility, and following in the footsteps of Progressive Era reformers who believed that obtaining the "facts" of a situation was the first step toward its solution.

WCTU members also appropriated scientific techniques associated with academic and professional research. The Department of Motion Pictures, for example, praised the members of one local union for conducting their research on movies as if they were sociologists or psychologists who were "most alert to the necessity of finding out what our children see at the movies and how they re-act to what they see."[74] Claiming, moreover, that reformers' ideas about the impact of movies were "in line with the most advanced ideas in the educational world," the group explained that "Educators concede the 'Eye Gate' as the most important factor in training of mind and pattern of conduct. 87% of our impressions come through our sense of sight."[75] The phrase "educators concede" implies that science was conveniently confirming and lending its prestige to the reformers' intuitively held suppositions about the need for pure middlebrow movies.

WCTU enthusiasm for and fears of the impact of new technologies allowed it to promote pure educational movies as well as legal censorship, and suggests its complex relationship to cultural change. As social actors and cultural propagandists, union members had a subtle grasp of the connections between their moral vision and the culture of the commercial market. Middle-class women did not wholly or willingly become passive audiences, instead they asserted their right to be the arbiters of movies themselves. They rejected any idea that the market relations that generated such images should be considered immune from moral distinctions or restraint. That middle-class women saw such arenas as amenable to moral distinctions and cultural improvement is at the core of the complexities of late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century cultural production.

WCTU members emphasized and expanded the need for a female-led engagement in cultural production, criticism, and censorship through a subtle but important redefinition of the task at hand. Their job, they insisted, was not simply to supervise culture, but rather to make children's lives wholesome. Literature and art were conceived of primarily as a means to increase women's personal control over children's developing characters.[76] Union members were explicit about what they desired, openly calling it "power"; their goal was, ultimately, to have other cultural producers comply readily with any "demand" of the "white-ribboned army."[77] The organization grasped that popular culture was based on mass reproduction, and so utilized as many popular tastes and styles as possible while

highlighting its own moral message. The group's middlebrow culture was counterpoised to and offered as a positive alternative to both high and low art. As laypersons, they intervened in cultural production while simultaneously agitating for and claiming expert authority. Their role as critics and producers suggests that middle-class Americans were working to create and support a middlebrow culture at the turn of the century. Union activists tried to produce, distribute, and advertise their educational movies and their own children's literature precisely because they saw that power and influence was located at the sites of cultural production.

We can draw insights from the past to help us explore contemporary Christian notions of cultural purity and its meaning in our own society. Earlier censorship efforts resonate with current debates over the capacity of public discourse to locate political and economic relations that shape and skew moral categories and over the standards by which our students should be educated. Significantly, today's pro-censorship campaign is not solely the domain of conservatives aiming to restrict the variability of cultural forms to that which is most banal or uncontroversial. It is also the domain of antipornography feminists whose concern for the physical and psychological safety of women mandates, from their perspective, the restriction of violent pornographic images of women. Responding to today's antipornography feminists, free speech feminists, such as Judith Butler, aptly suggest that a morality-based pro-censorship position, like that of earlier women moral reformers, should be rejected because "it is important to risk losing control of the ways in which the categories of women and homosexuality are represented, even in legal terms, to safeguard the uncontrollability of the signified." Butler further suggests that "it is in the very proliferation and deregulation of such representations . . . that the authority and prevalence of the reductive and violent imagery . . . will lose . . . the power to define and restrict the terms of political identity."[78] The de facto alliance of conservative and feminist factions today is more comprehensible when viewed in conjunction with a history of the WCTU and its Department for the Promotion of Purity in Literature and Art.

Turn-of-the-century debates about culture and censorship help us to better understand the powerful, but problematic, logic that pro-regulatory positions—especially those based on protecting children—still hold today. The New Right is currently putting forth moralized or pure images similar to those WCTU activists mobilized. They are not, however, accompanied by an explicit focus on the social relations of production, consumption, and culture that the WCTU tried to import into the public sphere. Instead, the similarity lies in the focus on protecting children. At the turn of the century and today, censorship advocates have appealed to the public and found their most common ideological ground on the subject of the

vulnerability of youth. Currently, only child pornography is outlawed, and all other pornography is restricted to adults over eighteen years of age. Like earlier reformers, many Americans in the 1990s argue that censorship is necessary to safeguard children and family values. What is left unexamined is how and whether governmental regulation takes away from or bolsters the parental authority they desire. If progressive political activists or academics want to change or shift the terms of the debate, they need to expose the problems of focusing rhetorically upon shielding and defending youth. Freedom of speech may not be adequately protected if the public continues to view censorship and regulation of cultural forms as the seemingly unproblematic goal of "protecting" youth.

NOTES

I would like to thank Ronald G. Walters, Toby Ditz, and Lori Ginzberg for their careful critiques of this article.

[1] I put the word "pure" in quotation marks here in order to remind readers that the moral judgments of WCTU members described throughout this article do not necessarily correspond to my own. The issues raised here, as well as women's pro-censorship activism, are explored in greater depth in Alison M. Parker, *Purifying America: Women, Cultural Reform, and Pro-Censorship Activism, 1873–1933* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997).

[2] For recent perspectives on culture wars, see Richard Bolton, ed., *Culture Wars: Documents from the Recent Controversies in the Arts* (New York: New Press, 1992); James Nolan, *The American Culture Wars: Current Contests and Future Prospects* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1996); and Philip Devine, *Human Diversity and the Culture Wars: A Philosophical Perspective on Contemporary Cultural Conflict* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1996).

[3] For critiques of censorship, see Robert W. Haney, *Comstockery in America: Patterns of Censorship and Control* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1960); James Jackson Kilpatrick, *The Smut Peddlers* (New York: Avon Books, 1960); John D'Emilio and Estelle B. Freedman, *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America* (New York: Perennial Library, 1988); Walter Kendrick, *The Secret Museum: Pornography in Modern Culture* (New York: Viking, 1987), esp. chap. 5; Edward De Grazia, *Girls Lean Back Everywhere: The Law of Obscenity and the Assault on Genius* (New York: Vintage, 1992); and Richard H. Kuh, *Foolish Figleaves? Pornography In—and Out of—Court* (New York: Macmillan, 1967). For a post–World War II focus, see Paul Blanshard, *The Right to Read: The Battle against Censorship* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955).

[4] For brief mentions of WCTU censorship work, see Barbara L. Epstein, *The Politics of Domesticity: Women, Evangelism, and Temperance in Nineteenth-Century America* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1981), 129, 145; Paul S. Boyer, *Purity in Print: The Vice-Society Movement and Book Censorship in America*

(New York: Scribner, 1968), 12; and David J. Pivar, *Purity Crusade: Sexual Morality and Social Control, 1868–1900* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1973), 182–84, 232–33. Also see Nicola Kay Beisel, *Imperiled Innocents: Anthony Comstock and Family Reproduction in Victorian America* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997); Ruth Bordin, *Woman and Temperance: The Quest for Power and Liberty, 1873–1900* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981); and D'Emilio and Freedman, *Intimate Matters*.

[5]For information on the pro-censorship activities of laywomen in the WCTU and professionals in the American Library Association, see Parker, *Purifying America*.

[6]Lori D. Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the Nineteenth-Century United States* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1990).

[7]See Marshall McLuhan, *Culture Is Our Business* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1970); John Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1989); Roland Marchand, *Advertising the American Dream: Making Way for Modernity, 1920–1940* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985); and Richard Wightman Fox and T. J. Jackson Lears, eds, *The Culture of Consumption: Critical Essays in American History, 1880–1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1983). I would like to thank Kathryn Oberdeck for her helpful comments.

[8]Lawrence Levine, *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988), 195, 239. For information on amusement parks and dancing styles as twentieth-century working-class leisure activities, see Kathy Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986), chaps. 4, 5; and John F. Kasson, *Amusing the Million: Coney Island at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1978).

[9]Levine, *Highbrow/Lowbrow*, chap. 3 and 176, 228. For a class analysis of WCTU members at local, state, and national levels, see Bordin, *Woman and Temperance*, app. For a discussion of elites and popular culture, see T. J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880–1920* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981).

[10]Joan Shelley Rubin, *The Making of Middle/Brow Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), xi–xx.

[11]Ibid. 27. See Douglas Wilson, ed., *The Genteel Tradition: Nine Essays* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967); Henry May, *End of American Innocence: A Study of the First Years of Our Own Time, 1912–1927* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959); and Robert Dawidoff, *The Genteel Tradition and the Sacred Rage: High Culture vs. Democracy in Adams, James, and Santayana* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992).

[12]Peggy Pascoe claims that, taken together, women's missionary societies were larger than the WCTU. Peggy Pascoe, *Relations of Rescue: The Search for Female Moral Authority in the American West, 1874–1939* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), xviii.

[13] See Bordin, *Woman and Temperance*, 3–4; and Joseph R. Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963), 162.

[14] All WCTU primary source materials used here are located at the WCTU's Frances E. Willard Memorial Library, Evanston, Ill. (hereafter WML). Harriet S. Pritchard, "Purity in Literature and Art," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of New York, 1898*, 190, WML. For a discussion of the development of the "imitation-suggestion theory," see Ruth Leys, "Mead's Voices: Imitation as Foundation, or, The Struggle against Mimesis," *Critical Inquiry* 19 (winter 1993): 277–307, esp. 280. Also see Daniel Czitrom, *Media and the American Mind: From Morse to McLuhan* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982); Ellis Oberholtzer, *Morals of the Movies, Moving Pictures: Their Impact on Society* (1922; reprint, Philadelphia: The Penn Publishing Company, 1971); and John O'Donnell, *The Origins of Behaviorism: American Psychology, 1870–1920* (New York: New York University Press, 1985).

[15] This argument is more fully developed in Parker, *Purifying America*, chap. 4.

[16] Alternative pure culture was linked to genteel Victorian ideas regarding acceptable and morally elevating art. See Rubin, *Making of Middle/Brow Culture*.

[17] Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "Domesticating 'Virtue': Coquettes and Revolutionaries in Young America," in *Literature and the Body: Essays on Populations and Persons*, ed., Elaine Scarry (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), 160–84, quotation on 166.

[18] In a modified form, the WCTU still publishes the *Young Crusader* today.

[19] In its first year, it was published twice a month, and for a time it was called the *Monthly Crusader*. Also see Herbert C. Shattuck, "How to Interest Young Men in the Senior Legion," *Young Crusader*, May 1904, 15; "The Front Cover Contest," *Young Crusader*, July 1931, 15; editor Ada Melville Shaw, "The Cocaine Enemy," *Young Crusader*, April 1907, 13; and Anna A. Gordon, Editor-in-Chief and Ella W. Brown, Managing Editor, "Our 'Twenty-Five Thousand' Celebration," *Young Crusader*, January 1908, 12.

[20] Editorial, *Oak and Ivy Leaf*, June 1889, 2.

[21] Both the author and *Young Crusader* editors viewed this story as a mobilizer, inspiring readers to become Loyal Temperance Legion members, along with almost 250,000 other children.

[22] Lynde Palmer, "The Little Captain," chap. 4, *Young Crusader*, April 1911, 2, 13.

[23] For the basis of such beliefs, see Jean-Christophe Agnew, *World's Apart: The Market and the Theater in Anglo-American Thought, 1550–1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

[24] J. A. Mangan and James Walvin, eds., *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800–1940* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987).

[25] Palmer, "Little Captain," chap. 5, *Young Crusader*, May 1911, 3.

[26] See Judith Walkowitz, "Patrolling the Borders," *Radical History Review*, no. 43 (winter 1989): 25–31, and Judith Walkowitz, "Science and the Seance," *Representations*, no. 22 (spring 1988): 3–29.

[27] Lucy A. McClintic, "Motion Pictures," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of Northern California, 1932*, 89, WML; Maude M. Aldrich, "Motion Pictures," *Minutes of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1931*, 116, WML; and Alison M. Parker, "Mothering the Movies: Women Reformers and Popular Culture," in *Movie Censorship and American Culture*, ed. Francis G. Couvares (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute Press, 1996), 73–96.

[28] Palmer, "Little Captain," chap. 8, *Young Crusader*, November 1911, 2.

[29] Ibid., 14.

[30] Palmer, "Little Captain," chap. 8, *Young Crusader*, October 1911, 2.

[31] Judith Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delights: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 91.

[32] Harriet Beecher Stowe, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1851; reprint, New York: Bantam, 1981). See Barbara Sicherman, "Reading and Ambition: M. Carey Thomas and Female Heroism," *American Quarterly* 45, no. 1 (March 1993): 73–103; and Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Doubleday, 1977).

[33] Palmer, "Little Captain," chap. 9, *Young Crusader*, December 1911, 2.

[34] Palmer, "Little Captain," chap. 10, *Young Crusader*, January 1912, 14.

[35] Jean McArthur Hyde, "Immoral Tendency of Modern Fiction: A Paper Read before the National WCTU Convention, Philadelphia, PA, November 30, 1904," *Union Signal*, 12 January 1905, 5, 6.

[36] Emilie D. Martin, "Power of Literature and Art," *Union Signal*, 6 September 1900, 4.

[37] Harriet S. Pritchard, "Purity in Literature and Art," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of New York, 1908*, 207, WML.

[38] Roger Shattuck, *The Banquet Years: The Origins of the Avant-Garde in France, 1885 to World War I* (New York: Anchor Books, 1958). For a discussion of the Society of American Artists, see Keith L. Bryant, Jr., *William Merritt Chase: A Genteel Bohemian* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991).

[39] Pritchard, "Purity in Literature and Art," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of New York, 1908*, 207, WML; Agnew, *World's Apart*, chap. 3; and Jonas A. Barish, *The Antitheatrical Prejudice* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).

[40] Saul E. Zalesch, "What the Four Million Bought: Cheap Oil Paintings of the 1880s," *American Quarterly* 48, no. 1 (March 1996): 77–109, esp. 77, 78, 80.

[41] Jeanhette M. Dougherty, "Art Education in the Home," *Union Signal*, 31 October 1901, 6; and Emilie D. Martin, "The Spirit of Purity in Literature and Art," *Union Signal*, 6 October 1910, 4.

[42] For a reproduction of the *Head of Christ*, see the cover page of the *Young Crusader*, December 1901.

[43] Emilie D. Martin, "Promotion of Purity in Literature and Art," *Minutes of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1899*, 282, WML.

[44] Emilie D. Martin, "Work for the Promotion of Purity in Literature and Art," *Union Signal*, 6 July 1899, 14; and Sue M. D. Fry, "Corresponding Secretary's Notes," *Union Signal*, 16 January 1902, 10.

[45] For discussions of medievalism in the United States, see Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade*; David Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990); Mark Caldwell, *The Last Crusade: The War on Consumption, 1862–1954* (New York: Atheneum, 1988); John Fraser, *America and Patterns of Chivalry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); and JoAnne Brown, "Tuberculosis: A Romance" (paper presented at the Berkshire Conference on the History of Women, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y., June 1993). See also Anne Scott MacLeod, *American Childhood: Essays on Children's Literature of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994), 118–19.

[46] Also see Lears, *No Place of Grace*; and Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade*.

[47] Dougherty, "Art Education in the Home," 6. See Levine, *Highbrow/Lowbrow*, 176–77, 200; and Rubin, *Making of Middle/Brow Culture*.

[48] The activities of the WCTU offer a corrective to scholarship that sees the battle for censorship of movies as simply a matter of modern versus antimodern sensibilities. See Robert Sklar, *Movie-Made America: A Social History of American Movies* (New York: Vintage Books, 1976), chap. 2; Edward De Grazia, *Banned Films: Movies, Censors, and the First Amendment* (New York: Bowker, 1982); Murray Schumach, *The Face on the Cutting Room Floor: The Story of Movie and Television Censorship* (New York: Morrow, 1964); and Leonard J. Leff and Jerold L. Simmons, *The Dame in the Kimono: Hollywood, Censorship, and the Production Code from the 1920s to the 1960s* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1990).

[49] Two or three films from the 1930s and early 1940 were discovered at the WCTU National Headquarters in Evanston, Illinois. Attempts are now being made by the Library of Congress to see if these highly flammable nitrate films can somehow be restored.

[50] See Jonathan Zimmerman, "'The Queen of the Lobby': Mary Hunt, Scientific Temperance, and the Dilemma of Democratic Education in America, 1879–1906," *History of Education Quarterly* 32, no. 1 (1992): 1–30, see esp. 2; Bordin, *Woman and Temperance*, 135–38; and Philip J. Pauly, "The Struggle for Ignorance about Alcohol: American Physiologists, Wilbur Olin Atwater, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 64 (1990): 366–92.

[51] Harriet S. Pritchard, "A Visit to Mr. Thomas A. Edison," *Union Signal*, 6 June 1912, 2. Also see Larry L. May, *Screening Out the Past: The Birth of Mass Culture and the Motion Picture Industry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 24–25.

[52] Harriet S. Pritchard, "Purity in Literature and Art," *Minutes of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1912*, 328, WML; Harriet S. Pritchard, "Purity in Literature and Art," *Minutes of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1913*, 340, WML; "Motion Pictures an Ally of Temperance Teaching," *Union Signal*, 6 June 1912, 8; and Harriet S. Pritchard, "Moving Pictures as Educators," Literature and Art Leaflet, no. 5, 1911, WML.

[53] Pritchard, "A Visit to Mr. Thomas A. Edison," 2.

[54] Pritchard, "Moving Pictures as Educators," 7–8; and Mary M. Coman, "Y. P. B. 'Movies' for Midsummer Nights," *Union Signal*, 14 August 1913, 11.

[55] Pritchard, "Purity in Literature and Art," *Minutes of the NWCTU, 1913*, 340, WML.

[56] Pritchard, "Purity in Literature and Art," *Minutes of the NWCTU, 1912*, 329, WML. See Kathryn Fuller, "Shadowland: American Audiences and the Movie-Going Experience in the Silent Film Era" (Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1992), 80, 97, 141, 164.

[57] For a discussion of the venality of Hollywood culture during this period, see Jill Jonnes, *Hep Cats, Narcs, and Pipe Dreams: America's Romance with Illicit Drugs* (New York: Scribner, 1996), 59–71.

[58] See advertisement, "Safeguarding the Nation," *Union Signal*, 23 March 1922, 13. For primary and secondary sources on the "new psychology" behind WCTU ideas about children and learning, see John Dewey, *The School and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1915); *Historical Encyclopedia of School Psychology* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1996); Michael Sokal, *An Education in Psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); and Andrew Feffer, *The Chicago Pragmatists and American Progressivism* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993).

[59] Ruth M. Whitfield, "Educators Advocate Motion Pictures," *Union Signal*, 23 March 1922, 13.

[60] See advertisement, "Safeguarding the Nation," 13.

[61] See Annette Kuhn, *Cinema, Censorship, and Sexuality, 1909–1925* (New York: Routledge, 1988). Maude M. Aldrich, "Motion Pictures," *Minutes of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1928*, 156–59, WML. See also Fuller, "Shadowland," 185; Richard de Cordova, "Ethnography and Exhibition: The Child Audience, the Hays Office, and Saturday Matinees," *Camera Obscura* 23 (1990): 91–107, esp. 101; and Francis G. Couvares, "Hollywood, Main Street, and the Church: Trying to Censor the Movies before the Production Code," *American Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (December 1992): 584–616.

[62] Maude M. Aldrich, "Visual Education in Kentucky and Iowa," *Union Signal*, 7 May 1927, 10.

[63] Cora B. McGregor, "Motion Pictures," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of Kentucky, 1927*, 78, WML.

[64] Garth Jowett, *Film: The Democratic Art* (Boston: Little Brown, 1976), 150.

See Jessie L. Leonard, "Motion Picture Department," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of Massachusetts, 1927*, 77, WML.

[65] Mary Sayers, "Department of Motion Pictures," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of Pennsylvania, 1928*, 128–29, WML.

[66] Mary Sayers, "Department of Motion Pictures," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of Pennsylvania, 1929*, 103, WML.

[67] Harriet S. Pritchard, "Purity in Literature and Art," *Minutes of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1919*, 190, WML.

[68] Ibid., 189–90.

[69] Two WCTU films I have identified were entitled *The Beneficent Reprobate* and *Pay-Off*. See, for instance, the discussion in "Motion Pictures," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of Pennsylvania, 1938*, 99, WML.

[70] Maude M. Aldrich, "Motion Pictures," *Minutes of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1933*, 174, Maude M. Aldrich, "Motion Pictures," *Minutes of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1934*, 172; and Lucy A. McClintic, "Motion Pictures," *Annual Report of the WCTU of Northern California, 1932*, 88, all in WML.

[71] Lulu Freeman Larry, "Motion Pictures," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of Illinois, 1929*, 74, WML.

[72] Helen Andruss Miller, "Motion Pictures," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of New York, 1926*, 162, WML.

[73] See Christopher Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged* (New York: Basic Books, 1977); Jacques Danzelot, *The Policing of Families* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1979); Thomas L. Haskell, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1979); and Burton J. Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America* (New York: Norton, 1978).

[74] Jessie L. Leonard, "Moving Pictures," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of Massachusetts, 1925*, 85, WML.

[75] "Motion Pictures," *Annual Report of the WCTU of the State of Pennsylvania, 1938*, 99, WML.

[76] Molly Ladd-Taylor, *Mother-Work: Women, Child Welfare, and the State, 1890–1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994).

[77] Emilie D. Martin, "Purity in Literature and Art," *Minutes of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1893*, 395, WML.

[78] Judith Butler, "The Force of Fantasy: Feminism, Mapplethorpe, and Discursive Excess," *Differences* 2, no. 2 (1990): 105–25, esp. 121.