SHOPPING THE LOOK:

HOLLYWOOD COSTUME PRODUCTION AND

AMERICAN FASHION CONSUMPTION, 1960-1969

by

Julie Nakama

Bachelor of Arts, Portland State University, 2009

Master of Arts, University of Pittsburgh, 2014

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the

Kenneth P. Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2017

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

DIETRICH SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

This dissertation was presented

by

Julie Nakama

It was defended on

July 14, 2017

and approved by

Jane Feuer, Professor, Department of English

Mark Lynn Anderson, Associate Professor, Department of English

Brenton J. Malin, Associate Professor, Department of Communication

Dissertation Advisor: Neepa Majumdar, Associate Professor, Department of English

SHOPPING THE LOOK: HOLLYWOOD COSTUME PRODUCTION AND AMERICAN FASHION CONSUMPTION, 1960-1969

Julie Nakama, PhD

University of Pittsburgh, 2017

"Shopping the Look" is a cultural, historical, industrial analysis of the production and consumption practices around film costume and consumer fashion during the 1960s. This work identifies a fundamental shift in costuming practices in the post-studio era and demonstrates how changing methods of costume production altered the relationship between female filmgoers and fashion marketing that had been established in the studio era. Through an analysis of archival documents like studio wardrobe records, production memos, and budget breakdowns, this project creates a history of changing production cultures within wardrobe departments. Concurrent with this story of production, "Shopping the Look" tells a story of consumption by examining the cultural landscape of film promotion and fashion advertising aimed at white, middle-class women in the 1960s. Through an analysis of studio marketing materials, film reviews, fashion show programs, and advertising in women's magazines, this project shows that locations of consumption became diffused and diverse during the period, further displacing the cinema as a site of marketing address for female consumers.

Methodologically, this project engages archival research, textual analysis, and media industries analysis. It is further situated within several frameworks that include: industrial histories of film costume, studies of post-studio American film, production culture & media industry studies, gender and consumption studies, cultural histories of the 1960s, and fashion & design cultures of the 1960s. Working among these intersections, "Shopping the Look" brings together a range of discourses to think more deeply about the ways in which costume functions

both onscreen and off, and to think about the complicated relationships among women, the cinema, and consumer culture during a period characterized industrially by massive studio reorganization and culturally by shifting attitudes about gender, the family, and the home. The goal of this project is to provide a heretofore untold history of post-studio costume departments that reaches past existing paradigms about gender and consumption to reconsider the means, and sites, through which the cinema addressed women. Ultimately, "Shopping the Look" is interested in the ways that women negotiated questions of consumerism, stardom, ideological positioning, and constructions of femininity through costume and fashion in the 1960s.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

I am deeply grateful to my committee, Jane Feuer, Mark Lynn Anderson, and Brent Malin, who have been a joy to work with and whose guidance and feedback have shaped this dissertation in fundamental ways. My unreserved gratitude to my chair, Neepa Majumdar, who is irreplaceable. I could not have asked for a more challenging, rigorous, supportive, engaged reader. She has been a gift. My enduring thanks to colleagues, friends, and family who have offered kind words and good advice. And I offer my fondest appreciation to Jeff Crump, who makes the whole thing worthwhile.

1.0   INTRODUCTION

This project began as a mystery of sorts — the case of the missing costumes — in which female film stars of the studio era, and the marvelously bespoke costumes which had helped shape the aesthetic contours of the period, seemed to have vanished from the screen by the mid-1960s.[1] In their absence, costumes design quietly slipped into the background along with many of the roles written for female actors. Stardom itself had changed during the decade as emerging female stars were without the industrial scaffolding, such as costume departments, that had once helped launch and sustain the careers of screen divas like Marlene Dietrich and Joan Crawford. For the feminist film critic Molly Haskell, this left a profoundly empty space for women both onscreen and off. She laments that "the ideal white woman of the sixties and seventies was not a woman at all, but a girl, an ingenue, a mail-order cover girl…not only less than we might have expected and hoped for, but less than ever before" (329). While this absence had bleak repercussions for women in the industry, it also mattered to women who went to the cinema. Who did they see when they went to the movies? And just as importantly, what were they wearing? Part of the pleasure of going to the cinema had been in seeing the stars costumed by famous designers like Adrian and Orry-Kelly, but the collapse of the studio system in the previous decade, which had

---

[1] Other stars like Julie Christie, and Mia Farrow emerged, but stardom in the post-studio era was constructed differently than it had been during the studio era. For a discussion of stardom in the 1960s, see Pamela Robertson Wojcik, ed., *New Constellations: Movie Stars of the 1960s*.

witnessed deep cuts to wardrobe departments, altered the dynamic between star, costume, and fan. As the costume designer and film historian Deborah Nadoolman Landis puts it, in the 1960s, "costume departments went on life support" (244). The loss of talent, facilities, and budget meant more than just the reduction of a few sequins and sables. The disappearance of female stars and studio costume departments were entwined phenomena that had lasting implications for constructions of femininity beyond the screen. The relationships among female star, screen costume, and female filmgoer, which had once been well-established, changed in the post-studio era as each of these elements had become destabilized. In the wake of this shift, what happened to wardrobe departments in the post-studio industry of the 1960s? What did women onscreen wear, and what did it mean to female filmgoers who had once gone to the movies to see their favorite stars in spectacular costumes? Moreover, how did changes within the production practices of costume departments affect the films themselves? This is the case that I set out to investigate.

"Shopping the Look" is a cultural, historical, industrial analysis of the production and consumption practices around film costume and consumer fashion during the 1960s. In it, I demonstrate how changing methods of costume production altered the relationship between female filmgoers and fashion marketing that had been established in the studio era. Through an analysis of archival documents like studio wardrobe records, production memos, and budget breakdowns, I create a history of changing production cultures within wardrobe departments, specifically at MGM, during the post-studio era. Concurrent with this story of production, I tell a story of consumption by examining the cultural landscape of film promotion and fashion advertising aimed at white, middle-class women in the 1960s. Through an analysis of studio marketing materials, film reviews, fashion show programs, and advertising in women's

2

magazines, I show that that locations of consumption became diffused and diverse during the period, further displacing the cinema as a primary site of consumer address for female consumers. In doing this research, I have found that modes of production and consumption are deeply entwined, and that tracing the histories of material objects is a messy, never-ending quest, but clear shapes have emerged. I have identified a fundamental shift in the relationship between onscreen costume and retail fashion during this period. With the winnowing of costume departments, designers could no longer wholly produce costumes in-house as they had since the early 1920s; They turned instead to retail outlets and other sources for film wardrobes. This shift led to an increased intersection between film costume and everyday fashion. This, in turn, significantly altered the established relationship between film marketing and female consumption. I argue that new modes of marketing resulted in an expansion of performative spaces such that retail venues like department stores became themselves spaces of performance, extending the influence of film advertising and promotion across a range of diversified markets. While industrial practices during the studio era have been characterized by their vertical integration, my project argues that post-studio industrial practices are characterized by their horizontal spread across locations of production and sites of consumption. No study exists to theorize these changing practices as they occurred at the level of wardrobe production. The goal of this dissertation is to provide one that offers a history of post-studio costume departments that moves among different registers of meaning — from the micro to the macro, from the individual film to the industrial structure, from the wardrobe room to the magazine advertisement, and from the screen to the filmgoer and back again. While histories of screen costume during the studio era have tended to propose models of consumption based on hierarchical, emulative relationships between screen stars and film fans, in which the fan wishes to be like the star through an

imitation of dress, I propose a different model based on a more collaborative relationship in which female filmgoers are both consumers and agents of production, and in which fashion moves beyond clothing into technological gadgets, home décor, and lifestyle marketing.

Methodologically, my project engages archival research, cultural analysis, textual analysis, and media industries analysis. The project is largely built on original archival research conducted at the microfilm reading room of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh and the special collections reading room of the Margaret Herrick Library, which is the archive for the Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences, in Los Angeles. At the Carnegie Library, I combed through issues of *McCall's* magazine from 1960-1969 to build a collection of consumer electronics advertising which I then analyzed in relation to fashion, technology, and gender. This analysis addresses some of the cultural shifts that occurred during the sixties and helps construct a more nuanced depiction of middle-class female consumers during the decade. At the Herrick Library, I made my way through hundreds of special collection and core collection files to compile my own archive of resources related to costuming practices, particularly at MGM, during the 1960s, including costume plots, budget breakdowns, studio-issued publicity materials, in-house production memos, and sketches from costume designers. Working with these materials, I developed a model that traces changing practices in costume design and wardrobe sourcing, as well as the nascent relationship between the film industry and the Southern California apparel industry. This model is based on analyses of specific films, their costume records, and their promotional materials. In establishing a circuit from production to distribution to exhibition, I challenge existing theories about the relationship among costume, fashion, and modes of female consumption to establish a new paradigm for theories of costume production in the post-studio era. Within this paradigm, I argue that the fashion industry played a key role in

costuming practices at the level of production and exhibition, rather than strictly the level exhibition. This idea pushes on existing theories which argue that partnerships between the film and fashion industries occurred primarily at the exhibition stage, at least during the studio era. To support this theory and situate my analysis within a larger framework, the following section offers a review and critique of the existing literature on practices of production and consumption that have informed my arguments.

1.1   PRACTICES OF PRODUCTION

While detailed studies on costume departments and fashion marketing during the studio era exist from scholars like Michelle Finamore and Sarah Berry, very little work has been done on the functioning of these departments in the period immediately following it. I have sought to fill this void by writing a history of post-studio costume production that takes a two-pronged approach to production studies. First, I am interested in production practices at the local level of individual films. Second, I am interested in production at the inter-industrial level between the film and fashion industries. To the first point, writing on costume departments in the post-studio era tends to be survey-like, such as Deborah Landis's excellent but broad Dressed: A Century of Hollywood Costume Design, or written for practitioners, like Richard La Motte's Costume Design 101: The Art and Business of Costume Design for Film and Television. Both have been helpful guides, and in particular La Motte's work has answered practical questions about the duties of the costume supervisors when costume departments moved off-the-lot.[2] Yet this work

---

[2] La Motte describes "off-the-lot" costume departments that were constructed quickly and functioned independently of the studios. Such departments were mobile and operated by independent costumers.

does not give a full picture of costume departments in the 1960s, a decade which is often overlooked because it is considered a fallow period for both American studio film production and, subsequently, for studio costume design.[3] "Shopping the Look" fits into the wide spaces between this existing scholarship and I have reconstructed the work of costume designers and studio costumers based on the working documents they have left behind. There have been gaps in the archival materials, which I have filled, for example, by tracing the genealogy of a dress or a fur coat. One such case appears in the chapter on Edith Head's fashion shows in which I trace the circulation of a dress that Head supposedly designed for Carole Lombard, and that appeared in her fashion shows through the late-1970s, to demonstrate that it was in fact a dress she designed for Jill Clayburgh playing Carole Lombard in Gable and Lombard (1976). The dress took on added meaning after its role in the film and gained an afterlife that was perhaps more interesting than its original story. There are other examples where the history of costume intersects with other forces. The most obvious of these is the intersection between the film and fashion industries, which I have identified in multiple instances throughout this project. Despite the historical and ongoing ubiquity of this relationship, the field of film studies has yet to fully consider these two industries in partnership. I argue that it should, and that doing so would open spaces of inquiry that have been previously ignored such as the role of this partnership in relation to media constructions of femininity, performative spaces, and questions regarding the production, circulation, and adoption of material objects. Because the structure and function of the fashion industry differs from that of the film industry, a more complete consideration of these two industrial structures together would offer new insights.

---

[3] The emergence of New Hollywood in 1967/68 marked a turning point for both studios and costume production, though costume departments were still largely run by independently contracted designers.

The subfield of media industry studies (MIS) and production studies offers a framework through which to consider the fashion industry. The driving question here is how a consideration of the fashion industry might function in relation to an MIS approach. Analyses of fashion and consumption during the studio era from scholars like Charles Eckert, Jane Gaines, and Sarah Berry have approached the fashion industry largely as a tie-in to the film industry insofar as tie-ins enhanced star images or promoted a film. Other scholars like Kathy Peiss and Sumiko Higashi have considered fashion as part of a wider cultural landscape in which women participated as both consumers and producers. While this scholarship is foundational, it does not take into account the significance of the fashion industry in the post-studio era in which garment manufacturers, fashion designers, and retail outlets played a much more vital role in the film industry, sometimes operating in full partnership with costume departments. Film studies generally, and media industry studies specifically, have largely disregarded the impact of the fashion industry on the film industry, an oversight that ignores a significant element of both costume production and film promotion. This exclusion is problematic and I argue that a consideration of the fashion industry is vital to any thorough consideration of film costume because it recognizes that another side of the story exists and should be interrogated. The following section briefly lays out the contours of the field of MIS to open a space from which to consider costume and fashion as industrial objects.

Michele Hilmes parses MIS as both a subfield concerned with the conceptual, critical, and legal aspects of media industries as well as one interested in a set of orienting frameworks.[4] In general, she sees industry studies as falling roughly into two main camps. One is concerned with conceptions of the nation, and the other is invested in modes of industrial production and

---

[4] See Hilmes 21-33 on the difficulties of writing media industry historiographies.

structuring paradigms. I am interested in the latter. In terms of industrial production, Hilmes locates the emergence of what she calls "traditional media analysis" in scholarship from the 1930s and 40s that sketched overviews of filmmakers and studio production.[5] Early work like Horkheimer and Adorno's critique of the culture industry was important in identifying the media industry as an object of study and critique. Work contemporary to theirs centered on historical locations of production and specifically identified diverse sites of study such as film studios, radio stations, television networks, and recording labels. This work laid the foundation for later scholarship in the 1970s and 80s that combined economic analysis with the emergence of film as an expressive medium. Scholars like Janet Wasko, Thomas Schatz, Douglas Gomery, Anthony Slide, Robert Sklar, David Bordwell, and Janet Staiger were among those whose social, cultural, and aesthetic histories of American film were built on an understanding of industry studies that integrated a critique of the industry with new methods of cultural analysis that considered associated objects such as movie theaters and fan magazines as sites of meaning. The work of these scholars created opportunities for locating industrial practice in sites other than the filmmaking industry. It is within this framework, then, that we might consider the fashion industry in relation to MIS through expanded sites of meaning. For example, in 2011 the clothing retailer Banana Republic began selling a limited edition capsule collection called *Mad Men*, based on the television show of the same name. An MIS analysis of this collection might investigate retail spaces as cinematic sites. Whereas scholars like Anne Friedberg have written about the relationship between window shopping and cinema, I am suggesting that an analysis that goes beyond the window into the retail space to explore the relationships between film and fashion would be productive.

---

[5] Hilmes cites Benjamin Hampton *A History of the Movies* (1931), Howard T. Lewis *The Motion Picture Industry* (1944), Mae Huettig *Economic Control of the Motion Picture Industry* (1944).

In "Shopping the Look," I begin to consider apparel manufacturers and marketers in partnership with studio production, but there is much work left to be done in this area. One of the challenges of this work has been in identifying fashion itself as an analytical object. Within the industrial paradigm, the object tends to be technologically determined with media such as film, television, or radio often serving as the primary object. This project, however, considers fashion and costume as media objects because of their capacity to serve as communicative texts that broadcast ideas. How, then, do we then consider the fashion industry alongside the film industry? As Henry Jenkins has argued, media industries converge on both the level of production and consumption, and thus it can be difficult to define the boundaries of objects like costume and fashion. It is an important distinction if only because, arguably, one belongs to the real world while the other lives a fictional life. However, the blurring of these lines is interesting at the levels of industry, culture, and history as fashion and costume accrue meaning over time. Part of this accrual occurs over different industrial structures that are sometimes entwined. Here Philip Napoli's theorization of the "dual product marketplace" is useful.

Napoli suggests that media scholars must have a basic grasp of the economics of media industries in order to craft an argument about industry at all. Such an understanding should be different from the kinds of political economy arguments, which mainly center on media's complicity with corporate interests, which have dominated conversations about media economics in recent years. Instead Napoli suggests that media scholars explore different models of economic analysis. He proposes an approach that considers media products as "dual product marketplaces," or places that sell two different products to two different sets of consumers. For example, in the film industry, studios market both content to audiences and the opportunity for product placement to advertisers. In this dual address, the film becomes a complex site of

9

economic exchange engaging in two separate markets, or perhaps even more. Extrapolating from Napoli, one could consider a marketplace multiplied across various producers and manufacturers. The notion of the multiplied marketplace is more significant in combination with Janet Wasko's more conventional approach to the political economy of film, the definition of which she borrows from Vincent Mosco's *The Political Economy of Communication,* "the study of the social relations, particularly power relations, that mutually constitute the production, distribution and consumption of resources" (7). A political economy approach, according to Mosco, is premised on an exploration of economic systems in relation to political, social, historical, and cultural factors with an emphasis on social change and questions of justice and public good. As opposed to other models that focus on economic analysis, this approach is concerned with power, influence, and ideological effects. Such a political economy approach is interested in the film industry in relation to other media industries and in terms of concentrations of wealth and power in a way that often critiques industrial practices. With Napoli and Wasko in mind, I wish to consider the sets of exchanges that occur among film, fashion, and filmgoer as the spectator is positioned between competing interests – the film and its costumes in relation to fashion. In the post-studio era, the line between costume and fashion had become hazier than it had been in the studio era and the stakes of this project lie within the blurring of these boundaries. I am interested in the ways that female filmgoers negotiated questions of stardom, consumerism, power relations, ideological positioning, and models of femininity through costume and fashion.

Finally, Thomas Schatz suggests that we may consider the mode of production, or the "machinery" of filmmaking, from the macro-level to the micro-level. For example, in the postwar era Hollywood films were transformed on the macro-level as the stability of the classical

era gave way to the turbulence of the post-studio era in which social, economic, and industrial forces redefined modes of production on the micro-level (46). The stakes of this, Schatz argues, are that we might investigate what David Bordwell terms the "historical poetics" of cinema. That is, we can look at the finished film as a result of the process of its construction and examine how that process changes over time (51). For scholars like Schatz and Bordwell, the film itself makes available the historical process of construction that underlies it.[6] My project seeks, in part, to enact the process that Bordwell describes. Borrowing Schatz's notion of the macro and the micro, and extending the framework that Hilmes lays out, I employ an MIS approach to costume and the fashion industry that analyzes multiple registers of industrial production to consider expanded sites of meaning and multiple marketplaces in conjunction with an awareness of the ideological implications that exist within spaces of economic exchange.

1.2   PRACTICES OF CONSUMPTION

Considering practices of consumption has been a trickier enterprise than I expected. When I began this dissertation, I set out to demonstrate that in the studio era, onscreen costume design influenced offscreen fashion, and this is partially true. I suspected that conditions in the post-studio era reversed this dynamic such that offscreen fashions then influenced onscreen costumes, and this is also partially true. I stood firmly with the costume designer and historian Deborah Landis in her argument that costume is fundamentally different from fashion, but this is no longer true at all for me. What I found in doing this work is that these relationships are not so

---

[6] I will return to a discussion of Bordwell's poetics of cinema later. See David Bordwell, "Historical poetics of cinema" in *The Cinematic Text: Methods and Approaches,* edited by R. Barton Palmer.

clear-cut and that the relationship between costume and fashion, onscreen and off, and what we see versus what we want is not clear at all. In thinking about practices of consumption, there are the further complications of imagining the consumer herself and all of the intricacies that comprise her needs and desires. As I have moved through this project, I have thought deeply about a figure that has been both always present and yet somewhat hazily defined. She is the female filmgoer who has also been in the mind of others almost since the emergence of cinema itself. She is the girl that Charles Eckert satirically describes as living in the imagination of advertisers, one that is "Out there, working as a clerk in a store and living in an apartment with a friend, one girl — single, nineteen years old, Anglo-Saxon, somewhat favoring Janet Gaynor" (109). She is the caricature that Shelly Stamp investigates, and who she describes as existing in the imagination of film promoters of the early teens, the "'movie-struck girl,' caught between her fascination with stories on screen and a narcissistic absorption in her own image" (8). Jane Gaines writes about her as well, though figures her more abstractly. She writes, "I propose to locate her here hypothetically — as part of a triangle — between the designer and the consumer culture, both of which we have studied with more success" (Gaines, "Wanting" 137). Jackie Stacey has figured her in multiplicity, more empirically and, through her ethnographic research, with a greater eye toward historical and national specificity (14). While these scholars write about the figure of the female filmgoer differently, there is consensus that she is a bit of an abstraction. Within this project I have figured her like Eckert, as I believe advertisers of the media that I analyze have imagined her. She is surely white and middle-class. She varies in age from a young teenager who gets excited about *Gidget* films to a suburban wife and mother who is caught between the domestically confining ethos of 1950s and the burgeoning women's rights movement of the mid-1960s. She is what we would consider "All-American." She is probably

not very much like me, except that we both like costume and fashion, and so maybe that is a good enough place to start.

One of the ways I have thought about consumption in this project is through costume and fashion. It is therefore worth spending some time here on the definitions of these two things as they are generally considered within film studies.[7] Stella Bruzzi and Pamela Church Gibson give a wide allowance to the term "fashion." They write, "'Fashion' as a term has several connotations, some specific, others far wider" (1). They go on to call special attention to fashion in early Hollywood as an enticement to women to watch films that promoted what we might now call "lifestyle." Fashion could be considered an attraction rather than a specific style of clothing or brand, a marketing lure rather than a set of rules. In her germinal work on fashion and modernity, *Adorned in Dreams,* Elizabeth Wilson writes that fashion is more specifically related to clothing. Wilson writes, "Fashion is dress in which the key feature is rapid and continual changing of styles. Fashion, in a sense *is* change, and in modern western societies no clothes are outside of fashion; fashion sets the terms of *all* sartorial behavior" (3). This description captures many of the beliefs that have been expressed in writings on fashion since the end of the nineteenth century. Fashion is a modern, industrial phenomenon that embodies change through clothing. Dress historian Valerie Steele agrees, writing, "The concept of fashion implies a process of style change." Steele's comment implicitly points to one of the many dualities embodied by fashion in that it is both an object and a concept. It is both a material item and a manifestation of change, and thus it can be considered what fashion theorist Malcolm Barnard calls "both cultural and communicative." Barnard writes that fashion comprises "modern, western, meaningful and communicative bodily adornments, or dress." It is also profoundly

---

[7] There is an enormous body of work on fashion history and theory that exists outside of film studies. See Riello *The Fashion History Reader*, Purdy *The Rise of Fashion*, and Hollander *Seeing Through Clothes* as starting points.

cultural. For Barnard, fashion is dress that communicates something about a particular culture. Very often that communication pertains to the construction of femininity within a culture as fashion is regularly considered a female pursuit. Sarah-Grace Heller notes that although the medieval periods in Europe are significant to the development of Western fashion, the birth of modern fashion can be linked to the industrial revolution along with the rise of the department store and print advertising (23). Fashion is therefore related to modern modes of female consumption that privilege the visual both in terms of how women see and are seen. In her introduction to the anthology *Fabrications: Costume and the Female Body,* Jane Gaines writes, "In popular discourse, there is often no distinction made between a woman and her attire" (1). Thus, fashion can also be considered a cultural phenomenon that speaks to the ways in which the female subject constructs her world and is concomitantly constructed by it.

In part, fashion resists easy definition because it is a peculiar mechanism that must find existence in its own demise. For a style to find itself at the height of fashion today can only mean that it must be outmoded tomorrow. As a means of expression, fashion operates in a hazy space between the past and the future in which the beautiful and the ugly may oscillate without any rationale except that of change itself. Wilson writes that fashion parodies itself while at the same time offering itself as a genuine expression of individual desires and aspirations, and this tendency to be both ironic and earnest marks it as a phenomenon open to multiple readings, particularly camp readings, which I discuss later in relation to costume and décor. As spectacle, fashion is often taken as a surface frivolity in an attempt to deemphasize its seriousness, which signals perhaps a sneaking discomfort with dress and the sense that it reveals more than it conceals (Gaines 11).

The difficulty of defining fashion extends to the study of fashion. Barnard suggests that no single conceptual framework exists that may be used to analyze and explain fashion, but rather there are theories that range across disciplines and approaches. Similarly, Wilson writes that fashion must be approached through a variety of lenses as it is a double-edged cultural phenomenon that resists a singular meaning. Yet Wilson does not necessarily see fashion as a constellation of multiple meanings, rather she views fashion as that which stitches together the fragmented self into an image of unity. For Wilson, fashion is essential in modernity because it helps define the individual as a cohesive entity in relation to the crowd. Wilson writes that fashion is "a kind of connective tissue" that helps link disparate cultural bodies and beliefs (12). Thus fashion is a product of individual expression that can only exist in relation to a larger whole. In this way fashion extends beyond any specific body to become a reflection of, and reaction to, larger cultural phenomenon. Adapting these theories, I define fashion as dress that is both the abstract notion of change and the material evidence of change. It is a modern, industrial mode of representation that is communicative and meaningful and functions to define or reinforce individual identity in relation to culture more broadly. The concept of fashion is important to notions of consumption, but also to considerations of the inter-industrial relationships that exist between the film and fashion industries, which I argue have been long overlooked in film studies.

As opposed to the abstractions of fashion, costume tends to be more materially defined, even if abstract theorizations build up around it. Commonly, fashion is regarded as clothing worn offscreen while costume is clothing worn onscreen. I find this distinction to be misleading, but Deborah Landis is more emphatic about maintaining the boundary. Landis writes that costume is "the outward expression of inner experience, the concrete manifestation of the character's self-

15

image. These qualities have less to do with clothes, style, or glamour than with truthful on-screen portrayals of real people" (xviii). For Landis, costume is always in the service of character or narrative. She argues that costumes do not simply appear onscreen, but are manipulated to enhance the character, regardless of where the garments originated. As a costume designer herself, it is perhaps within Landis' personal interest to draw strict boundaries between costume and fashion and while I agree that costumes are different than everyday fashion, I find the division to be less clear, at least in the post-studio era.

One of the most trenchant and foundational scholars of classic Hollywood costume is Jane Gaines. I reference her work throughout "Shopping the Look," sometimes in agreement and sometimes not. As an introductory move, I would like to discuss her essay "Costume and Narrative: How Dress Tells the Woman's Story" because it lays the groundwork of much of what is to come. Gaines considers costume somewhat differently than Landis. She argues that the relationship between costume and narrative is more fraught than one rooted in deferential service. Gaines considers the antithetical relationship between costume and narrative by suggesting that costume in the early sound era was muted in comparison to costumes from the silent era which, like facial expressions and physical gestures, were exaggerated to communicate narrative or emotion. In the move to sound, although costumes were still expected to concisely tell a character's story in a parallel costume plot, they were toned down as not to appear distracting.[8] Gaines writes that excess costuming was a threat to both narrative coherence and the artistic integrity of the film if the film was to stand apart from the crudeness of commerce (198). She argues that costume extravagance spilled over to the star image so that a star might enjoy an opulent offscreen image while not completely overshadowing her onscreen character. Gaines

---

[8] Note here that Gaines uses the term "costume plot" to mean the onscreen succession of costume changes rather than the paper documentation, which was Hollywood's term for the documents I discuss in chapter one.

suggests, however, that film melodramas of the 1940s foregrounded costume in a way that challenged this logic. Gaines writes:

> The costume plot organizes an idiolect with its own motifs, variations, surprises, anticipations, and resolutions which unfold in a temporality which does not correspond with narrative developments, whose climaxes occur in alternation with key dramatic scenes, in the undramatic moments. (205)

Gaines suggests that in melodrama costume operates according to its own plot and rhythm. The camera finds a narrative reason to linger on an elaborate costume and thus the relationship between the costume and narrative is inverted as the costume determines the shot.[9] For Gaines, this "mark of 'style'" is both "startling and deviant," in part because the excess of costume, and its potential meaning, is managed by the film itself. Costume is thus contained by the genre and its ability to manage extravagance.

Two provocative points emerge from Gaines's argument. The first is the assertion that the costume plot operates in alternation with the narrative. Costume may exist to the side of one narrative only to participate in a different one, suggesting that costume can be narrativized in ways that call for a different kind of spectatorship. What is significant here is that the costume plot can be different from the film's plot and can provide its own pleasures and meaning independent from the film itself. It might reroute the film and spectatorial experience according to a different kind of organization that privileges, or at least sets on par, the visual and the narrative. Such a use of costume might therefore deepen a character by acting as a cue to her interior world, but it might also remove the spectator from the confines of narrative. As Gaines points out, the moment it takes to linger on a costume, to see and understand it, is a moment spent outside of the narrative. In film melodrama, then, costume can be seen to operate both

---

[9] I find resonance with Gaines' argument about the role of costume within melodrama in my discussion of costume and gadgetry within spy spoofs, which I discuss in chapter three.

inside and outside of narrative. It might, as Gaines puts it, tell the "woman's story," but it can also establish a separate relationship between the spectator and the screen image wherein fashion becomes the arena of exchange. In this way, I argue, a female moviegoer might enjoy the clothes of female characters according to a set of pleasures, judgments, and desires different from that which the film proposes. In other words, a film does not need to be ideologically consonant with the values of its audience in order for the fashions to function as attractions. Gaines' formulation is pertinent to thinking about ways in which the costumes in spy spoof films of the 1960s upset the relationship between narrative and costume such that a spectator might establish a relationship with the clothes primarily and the film secondarily. I argue that this indeed occurs with the spy spoof films and further extend Gaines' argument to include objects beyond clothes, like gadgetry and mise-en-scène.

In addition to narrative, Gaines is concerned with issues of space and mobility as she draws attention to the lingering camera. Gaines writes that in the moments that the costume determines the shot, the costume detail is quite literally "trapped in the frame" (209). Gaines illustrates ways in which the female figure is confined both literally by the camera frame and metaphorically by convention. Costume detail becomes a static display that traps and isolates the body inside the clothes, or fragments the body through close-ups. While the costumes that Gaines considers remain visual feasts, her essay suggests a lingering frustration that they cannot have more impact but instead remain obediently tethered to the edges of the frame. This predicament speaks to the way that fashions circulated culturally in the late 1940s. In the post-studio world of the 1960s, however, I argue that costume broke free of the cinematic frame through an explosion of design consciousness and diversified promotional strategies that

18

mobilized film aesthetics into retail and domestic spaces more than ever before.[10] The following chapters on costume production, fashion shows, consumer electronics, and Doris Day each demonstrate this dynamic in different ways.

1.3   THE CHAPTER BREAKDOWN

The logic of the chapter arrangement can be read in multiple ways. I have organized the chapters as a movement from modes of production to models of consumption. This arrangement suggests a trajectory that moves away from cinematic spaces and toward offscreen venues, which does occur within my discussion; however, the flow of the argument also moves back into specific films as the last two chapters offer textual analysis to support my larger arguments. Thus, the chapters are designed to move between onscreen and offscreen spaces in a way that suggests the larger complications of trying to forge distinct separations between the two. One of my main arguments is that filmmaking and film promotion in the post-studio era saw the diversification of cinematic sites outside of movie theaters and I have therefore intended the chapters as a palimpsestic set of inquiries that returns to select films throughout the overall argument rather than a linear narrative with unidirectional momentum in either way.

Chapter one, "All Wardrobe Personal: Costume Plots and the Production Culture of Wardrobe Departments, 1951-1977" begins with a discussion of production culture as it is formulated by John Caldwell. I argue that Caldwell's conception of production cultures often marginalizes gendered craft labor, like costume and make-up departments, in favor of more

---

[10] It is also perhaps not a coincidence that fashion and costume of the 1960s also broke free of the bodily constraints that had defined women's clothes in the 1940s and 50s. The tight skirts and restrictive bodices of the 1950s, for example, gave way to free form trapeze dresses and miniskirts in the sixties.

technical trade specialties like camerawork and special effects. Caldwell suggests that the study of production cultures should be "rhizomatic" and I argue that until gendered labor is fully represented in production studies, it cannot grow in the organic directions he describes. I suggest that a consideration of costume and fashion within production studies offers the field an opportunity to incorporate cultural studies methodologies as recognition that sites of production occur across multiple industries and diverse instances. To more clearly articulate this argument, the chapter moves into a short history of costume departments in Hollywood before turning toward an analysis of the production culture of costume departments in the post-studio era through a close reading of costume plots. Costume plots are records of costume description and continuity kept during the production of a film. In the pre-digital era, these were kept by hand on standard sized sheets of paper that were then bound into a single volume for each character. These documents offer a wealth of information about costume sourcing and construction, such as the type of fabric used for a particular gown or the number of buttons on a set of gloves. As such, they reveal details about the processes of costuming that are not found anywhere else. This chapter offers the first analysis of these documents within the existing scholarship on film costume. Through an examination of costume plots at MGM from 1951-1977 I have traced changing wardrobing practices as they occurred at the level of daily practice. Costume plots went from cataloguing meticulously designed costumes for female stars in the 1950s to plots that simply read "all wardrobe personal" or "all wardrobe purchased." I argue that this represents a definitive shift in the production culture of wardrobe departments. During this period, the lavish costume production of the studio era gave way to practices in which actors wore everyday clothes as costume, often supplying their own clothing for a role. I suggest several reasons for this shift. The consent decrees of 1948 altered the studio structure, which ultimately resulted in

smaller wardrobe departments with fewer resources. Established designers of the studio era retired from the industry leaving studios without a signature style or associated designers. Unknown female stars did not rely on costume as part of their star image, as the stars of the studio era once had. Historical dramas and costume films ceased to be popular with audiences while contemporary dramas were costumed with contemporary clothes. The general shift toward a more realist aesthetic did not embrace spectacular costume, and, finally, location shooting demanded smaller wardrobe departments. These factors resulted in costume departments that were dispersed, international, and inter-industrial. This analysis of production then sets up an extended analysis of practices around costume and fashion consumption.

Chapter two, "'Star in Crepe': Golden Age Hollywood Costumes, Junior Leagues, and Department Store Fashion Shows," considers the effects of changing costuming practices for both the film industry and for constructions of femininity offscreen through an examination of the costume designer Edith Head's fashion shows during the 1960s and 1970s. Beginning in the late 1950s, Edith Head began to exhibit her costume designs in fashion shows mounted nationally at various civic and commercial venues. These fashion shows were often staged as part of larger promotional tours. This chapter looks at Edith Head's fashion shows to determine how Head negotiated the intersection between Hollywood costume and contemporary fashion. I determine that Head's fashion shows served three main functions: a commercial function that promoted her own career in conjunction with Golden Age Hollywood; a civic function that was premised on charitable giving and social networking; and a pedagogical function that focused on public performativity. Using the fashion show as a framework, I investigate changing conceptions of performance in relation to the surface and the subterranean, and the oscillation between the two. This chapter considers these elements in relation to marketing techniques to

determine whether the classical Hollywood marketing schemas described by Charles Eckert in his germinal essay "The Carole Lombard in Macy's Window," were still relevant in the post-studio era of Head's fashion shows. I argue that while the tie-in was still an established marketing tool, corporate tie-ins replaced designer tie-ins at the production level in a way that relied on the alternate marketing schema of overt association, a method by which the relationship between film object and consumer was made both more transparent and more tenuous. This is an adaptation of Eckert's argument that studio era marketing relied on promotional strategies that sought to covertly insert products into production design such that spectators would not be overwhelmed by branded products. I theorize that this new schema of *overt* association was grounded in expanding notions of public performativity and performative spaces rather than marketing strategies based on nostalgia or stardom alone. To consider the expansion of these spaces, I employ theories of production design from the scholar Charles Tashiro who defines levels of meaning relative to mise-en-scène. Tashiro essentially argues that the production design of a film trains us how to read it as we watch it. Building on Tashiro's theory and moving it into the realm of consumer address, I argue that film, and specifically production design, also trained moviegoers-as-consumers to seek out spaces of design and performativity. In film, elements of production design established patterns from which moviegoers-as-consumers could then develop their own personal mise-en-scène. This ushered a move into home design that then opened a market for lifestyle design and the expansion of fashion into the domestic realm beyond clothing. This theory then lays the foundation for the next chapter which moves beyond film costume and fashion into advertising and women's magazines. In an analysis of these media, I explore the ways in which the readership for *McCall's* magazine was imagined as increasingly savvy about

technology and interested in moving away from conventional modes of femininity rooted in notions of the domestic and into deeper considerations of themselves as individuals in the world.

Chapter three, "The Girl and the Gadget: Fashioning Technology in Women's Magazine Advertising and Spy Films of the 1960s" takes a two-part approach to an analysis of gender, consumption, and technology in *McCall's* magazine and a set of spy spoof films of the mid-sixties. I base this analysis on the idea that design is paramount for consumer technologies like household gadgets, just as it is for fashion. Because I have circumscribed a wider space for fashion beyond clothing, this chapter considers manufactured consumer electronics as elements of fashionable home décor that were becoming increasingly marketed in the post-war era. The questions that drive this chapter are about the constellation of technology, gender, and consumption. I first consider discourses around women's magazines from sources contemporary to the publication of the magazines in the 1960s like Betty Friedan and Sheila Silver. I then explore how media like magazines, advertising, and film imagined the goods that might define a modern woman. How did these media incorporate the rhetoric of technology into their own products during the period? What attitudes about technology did these media assume? In my research on home electronics advertising, I found that marketing in the early part of the decade seemed designed to initiate women into the idea of bringing technology into their lives. By the end of the decade, women were the target of advertising for a myriad of electronic and technological devices that included hair dryers, electric shoe polishers, and refrigerators of all sorts. Advertisers strove to move women away from a fear of technology into an embrace of it, a goal that was often achieved through the language of design, such as references to colors or shapes. The push to integrate technology into women's daily lives is interesting in the way it imagines spatial relations differently, particularly regarding gendered spaces like the kitchen.

This was especially true in a series of ads from the Bell Telephone Company, which I analyze in the chapter. The Bell ads illustrate the ways in which attitudes about gender and technology were expressed unevenly during the decade as they pushed on boundaries related to domesticity, intimacy, and personal communication.

I extend the framework of this argument into an analysis of two series of spy spoof films from the 1960s. The first featured James Coburn as a spy named Derek Flint and the second starred Dean Martin as a spy named Matt Helm. The Flint and Helm movies are replete with guns, girls, and gadgets. Because of this, the prevailing attitude is that spy spoof films were produced to appeal to male audiences through their emphasis on elaborate gadgetry and scantily-clad women. I demonstrate, however, that because of their focus on design and fashion, these films also appealed to female audiences who were equally apt to desire commodified technologies and eroticized consumer fashions. The Flint and Helm films speak to several main themes that define the chapter. These relate to anxieties about technology, the erotization of technology, automation, telecommunication, transportation and capitalism.

The fourth and final chapter, "Doris Day: A Case Study of Costume and Fashion in *Caprice* and *The Glass Bottom Boat,*" draws together the arguments I have made about costume production, fashion, technology, and consumption to analyze two of Day's late career films. The main argument of the chapter is built on the business strategy of diversification, which has informed the whole project and here comes into clear focus. I found a brief mention of the concept in a *Variety* magazine article on Hollywood's sluggish adoption of the "modern business methods" that were dominating the world of American business with the rise of the corporation. I traced the phrase to the theory of diversification first articulated by Igor Ansoff in a in a 1957 article in *The Harvard Business Review.* Ansoff developed a matrix that visualized corporate

strategies for growth. The Ansoff Matrix, still discussed in corporate management circles, divides corporate growth into four distinct areas based on markets, products, and risks. The matrix is based on notions of vertical and horizontal growth and was the first such theory to introduce the idea of diversification, or expanding into new markets and new products. Working with this paradigm, I analyze the two Day films and their promotional materials to demonstrate how diversification provides a structure through which to situation fashion tie-ins, stardom, and modes of female consumption in the broadening post-studio production culture of costume departments and film promotion. As a component of this argument, the chapter also positions Day as a case study of female stardom during the shift between the studio and post-studio eras to analyze the role of costume within her declining popularity.

"Shopping the Look" is a history that moves among film text, industry, and culture to think about the ways in which female filmgoers negotiated media culture, constructions of femininity, and the demands of the consumer market in the 1960s. Writing it has been an exercise in following disparate leads that have come together in sometimes neat, but often messy, ways. It has also been a very pleasurable journey through an era of American culture that is rife with contradictions. Perhaps the joyful optimism and fretful anxiety of the period resonate with many other historical moments, but I have been fortunate enough to see those impulses articulated in the fashions, costumes, and gadgets that mark the era as one whose material objects tell a complex and fascinating story.

2.0 ALL WARDROBE PERSONAL: COSTUME PLOTS AND THE PRODUCTION CULTURE OF WARDROBE DEPARTMENTS 1951-1977

2.1 A SHIFT IN COSTUMING PRACTICES

To begin this analysis of costume departments in the post-studio era, please consider the following three examples of costumes for films produced at MGM during the period ranging from 1951-1977 as they illustrate certain shifts in wardrobing practices. In the first example, the costumes for MGM's literary period drama *The Great Sinner* (1949) were designed by the head of the studio's wardrobe department Irene Lentz, who designed under the name Irene. Irene's gowns for the character Pauline, played by Ava Gardner, were opulent confections of black velvet, gold brocade, white satin, soufflé skirts, and taffeta silk parasols.[11] They were manufactured in-house with the tremendous force of MGM's costume department behind their creation. The studio on Gardner's star power in combination with Irene's sumptuous designs to court audiences into theaters. The black taffeta gown from the film has since become iconic and is prominently displayed at the Ava Gardner Museum in Smithfield, North Carolina. It is one of the museum's most elaborate costumes and its pride of place stands as a testament to the craft and artistry of the gown's construction.

---

[11] See the costume plot for *The Great Sinner* from the MGM Wardrobe Department Records.

Next consider Elizabeth Taylor's costumes in the cautionary tale *BUtterfield 8* (1960). Taylor played Gloria Wandrous, a woman whose appetites are only quashed by a latent moral streak. Taylor's costumes were designed by Helen Rose, who would later establish a fashion house following her design career at MGM. In a memo from Rose to the film's producer, Pandro Berman, Rose suggests that the production should get "Maxmilian or someone else to make a coat for publicity purposes." The inclusion of their coat in the film would have been a boon for both the production and the furrier. In the end, the New York company Reiss & Fabrizio provided the furs for the production. As payment, the furrier's label received a dedicated screen shot in the film that serves no function other than product promotion. Rose partnered the worlds of fashion and costume for mutual benefit and she used this strategy repeatedly during her final years at MGM to promote her own retail lines of women's clothing.[12]

Finally consider the wardrobe for the stock market hijinks comedy *The Wheeler Dealers* (1963). Lee Remick plays a single career girl. Her wardrobe reflects both her position as stock analyst and her modern professional attitude. The film had no costume designer, rather Remick's wardrobe was entirely provided by the fashion designer Norman Norell. Secondary characters provided their own clothes as costume for the film. Wardrobe records for the actresses Pat Crowley and Joan Tompkins, for example, indicate "all wardrobe personal," meaning that the whole lot of costumes for the film was either purchased or supplied personally.[13] In this case, no costumes were designed in-house but were rather obtained from sources ancillary to the film industry, primarily from the fashion industry. Costume design was displaced from the studio to

---

[12] See the memo from Helen Rose to Pandro Berman, dated Jan. 08, 1960, from the MGM Wardrobe Department Records.
[13] See the costume plot for *The Wheeler Dealers* from the MGM Wardrobe Department.

the world of fashion where the designer Norman Norell and the actresses themselves were costume curators.

These three examples demonstrate how costuming practices at MGM shifted from the studio era to the post-studio era in very material ways. During the former, costumes were manufactured in-house by well-established designers who worked with generous budgets. During the latter, wardrobes were gathered from endorsement deals, shopping malls, thrift stores, and actors' own personal closets. This shift impacted not only the workings of costume departments and their staff members, but also the ways in which women were imagined both onscreen and off. This chapter explores these changes with two distinct goals in mind. First, the chapter sets out to explore the shifting circumstances of production in costume departments from the studio era to the immediate post-studio era. Secondly, this chapter is concerned with the relationship between the production culture of wardrobe departments and the production of cultural objects that they produced. Foundational texts in cultural studies have suggested methodologies in which the circulation of objects is one way to examine the production of cultural meaning.[14] These propose that the production of meaning and culture are reliant upon circulation, signification, and reception. Studies of production cultures, on the other hand, suggest that the conditions of production affect what is produced. This chapter is concerned with what happens when these two approaches are drawn together. How might shifts within production practices affect how objects are received and circulated? How do production practices relate to modes of consumption? What is the impact of production cultures on the cultural objects produced?

---

[14] See du Gay, *Doing Cultural Studies The Story of the Sony Walkman* and Bennett and Woolacott, *Bond and Beyond: The Political Career of a Popular Hero.*

To address these questions, I first situate this study in relation to production culture, drawing specifically on John Caldwell's formulation of the concept in *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television.* In terms of the production of culture, I draw on foundational cultural studies texts like Bennett and Woollacott's *Bond and Beyond: The Political Career of a Popular Hero* and du Gay, et al.'s *Doing Cultural Studies The Story of the Sony Walkman* to think about the significance of cultural circulation. The chapter then moves into a brief overview of the history of costume departments from their inception in the early 1920s through their unsteady periods of growth and recession over the next hundred years to generate a larger context for this study. Next I analyze archival materials from MGM's wardrobe department from the 1950s through the mid-1970s to suggest specific factors that contributed to the shift in post-studio production practices. Lastly, I consider these practices in relation to promotional activities and female consumer address to get at the question of cultural production.

2.2   MEDIA INDUSTRY STUDIES AND PRODUCTION CULTURES

Within the larger framework of media industry studies, John Caldwell's work on production culture is particularly relevant to my analysis. In his foundational text Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television, Caldwell investigates the film and video industry in Los Angeles both as an object and as a cultural activity. Drawing on interviews, documents, economic data, and observation Caldwell studies aspects of the industry mainly related to the labor of below-the-line workers, or crew and craftspeople whose production labor is monetized differently from actors, producers, writers, and directors. Caldwell focuses on

this labor force to analyze how the industry understands itself. He draws special attention to the ways in which political economy and cultural studies are intertwined. He writes, "[T]he 'cultural turn' in economics and management theory has been underway for more than a decade, even as CMS [cinema and media studies] has witnessed a general move in the other direction, away from culture as a master framework in its 'industrial turn'" ("Para-Industry 157-164). Caldwell argues that these two impulses should not remain so distinct. He reevaluates the recent industrial turn in cinema and media studies with the intention of rescuing some of the hallmarks of film studies that the industrial turn appears to have jettisoned. To that end Caldwell suggests ten propositions that "underscore the need to keep culture and aesthetics as fundaments in new media industries research" ("Para-Industry" 157). Among them, Caldwell suggests that researchers regard industry as racialized, gendered, affective, rhizomatic, texualized and messy. That is, we might treat industry itself as an ever-changing entity or set of entities that influence, and are influenced by, external factors and that are open to multiple readings.

Caldwell further proposes that researchers should combine varied approaches to analyzing industry because the complexities of the systems require a multi-pronged approach. He turns specifically to Clifford Geertz and Bruno Latour to think about industry. From Latour, Caldwell argues that knowledge is produced and mediated through networks rather than an industry-versus-agency binary. From Geertz, Caldwell adapts the notion that fieldwork is always a mediated experience and that cultures represent themselves to themselves. From these two theorists Caldwell invests industry study with the notions of mediation and self-reflexivity. He is interested in the ways that the media industry represents the products and processes of labor to itself in forms like behind-the-scenes documentaries, trade shows, and trade literature because these signal how workers within the industry contextualize their labor.

30

In his urge to foreground the rhizomatic nature of industry, Caldwell asks that production studies scholarship keep the "textualized and messy" nature of the industry at hand when analyzing industrial production cultures. In following this imperative, he is hopeful that scholarship will recognizes that the industry is racialized and gendered in particular ways. I argue, however, that studies of production cultures do not often recognize the industry as gendered. Scholars that engaged with production studies often neglect craft labor that has been historically considered gendered feminine, like costume and makeup design, in favor of more seemingly-technological work like camera operation, video production, post-production, and special effects production. *Production Culture*, for example, considers the work of technicians like camera operators, editors, mixers, grips, and cinematographers in relation to demo tapes and trade images. Caldwell suggests that demos produced by these crews help "brand" production units because they demonstrate how well individual components work together synergistically (121). While I do not want to suggest that women are not technicians in these fields, I would argue that the self-reflexive imagery regarding this work is gendered in ways that doesn't acknowledge active female contribution to the field. Within these demos and trade images, Caldwell writes that figures of women have appeared in promotional imagery in stylized ways generally designed to either visualize technical capabilities or to act as seductive elements for advertising the product. Caldwell writes, "Feminism appears to have made few inroads in the gender consciousness of those who design for the digital practitioner trades" (137). Similarly, Caldwell's discussion of trade machines and mechanical gear acknowledges the industry's gendered approach to labor in its imaginings of itself. Demo tapes that exhibit gear and techniques "regularly create pictures of alienated, male trauma" and celebrate the notion of the tortured, male (167). While Caldwell specifically refers to digital practitioner trades, the larger

field of production culture similarly often fails to recognize craftwork that is traditionally gendered female. As a corrective to the lopsided consideration of gender within production culture studies, I have undertaken the following study of costume departments during the immediate post-studio era to create a historical narrative about costume production. This analysis aims to shine a light on labor within the industry that is often neglected, I argue, because it is considered less technically demanding. To that end, this chapter uses a methodological approach that investigates costume studies through a production studies framework. This approach opens both subfields to new modes of inquiry in ways that recognize Caldwell's impulse to view production studies as "rhizomatic," or open to multiple entry points and driven by a non-hierarchical logic. In this chapter I argue that the fashion industry is an ancillary media industry whose economic and ideological entanglements with the film industry are historical, substantial, and in need of more sustained investigation. By considering the fashion industry as an entry point through which to further analysis of costume departments, this study takes up Caldwell's charge and expands production culture studies into what has been conventionally considered gendered craftwork.

Just as production studies might benefit from a more thorough consideration of costume departments, and of the ancillary fashion industry, scholarship in costume studies might benefit from a critical lens oriented in production studies. Thus, this chapter also works with Caldwell's notion of "industrial reflexivity" to open new sites of meaning for costume studies. While the existing scholarship on costume within film studies analyzes costume as a textual product, it does not often analyze costuming as an industrial process. With a few important exceptions, little attention has been paid to how the production culture of costume departments affects the ways in which costume objects circulate and produce meaning. How does the construction of a costume

affect meaning? How does that meaning transform in different contexts? How do these objects continue to make meaning after their initial function? By situating the study of costume departments within a production studies framework, we can begin to address some of these issues. The essential question at stake is how a study of production culture affects the cultural production of meaning. Two foundational cultural studies texts, *Bond and Beyond,* by Tony Bennett and Janet Woollacott, and *Doing Cultural Studies: The Story of the Sony Walkman*, by Paul du Gay, et al., are helpful in addressing this question.

In *Bond and Beyond*, Bennett and Woollacott examine the Bond phenomenon through novels, films, merchandise, and other cultural texts to analyze James Bond as an ideological figure and a site through which meaning is produced. They identify Bond as shifting cultural signifier that engages with notions of gender, class, and nation. Bond is a "mobile signifier" understood through intersections and exchanges. Bennett and Woollacott do not read Bond in discreet texts, but as part of shifting cultural terrains. They are interested in the "texts of Bond" as they are socially organized, circulated, and negotiated. They write that the texts of Bond "constitute sites around which the re-eminently social affair of the struggle for the production of meaning is conducted" through negotiated reading practices. For Bennett and Woollacott, there is no "immovable frame" that separates the extra-textual from the intra-textual and thus the pair suggests that to analyze a text, it is necessary to examine where and how the reader is positioned in relation to it (60). Bennett and Woollacott argue that the Bond phenomenon is formed around both cinematic and extra-cinematic texts of Bond in ways that function to reform a series of dominant ideologies. They write that the Bond films, "operated both to shift and stabilize subject identities at a time when existing ideological constructions had been placed in doubt and jeopardy" (280-81). The fictional figure of Bond provided a floating set of texts around which

ideologies about gender and nation could converge during an historical period that was ideologically unstable. Because Bond proved to be such a mobile and adaptable signifier, the character offered ballast when situated in different contexts; thus, the production of the Bond films played an important role in determining the qualities of Bond, who could then be situated meaningfully in varieties of texts, advertising, and merchandising (275). Phrased more broadly, Bennett and Wollocott argue that the conditions of production affected the subsequent production of cultural meaning when the object was redeployed.

Jane Gaines takes up this argument in relation to costume in her article on tie-ins and the 1934 MGM film *Queen Christina*. Gaines points to the relationship between early cinema, the development of department stores with their window displays, and the cultivation of the middle-class consumer. She argues that early in the twentieth century window displays moved through a variety of styles, at first approximating a realist aesthetic wherein goods were displayed to suggest how they might be used in everyday life. Windows then adopted a more eye-catching modernist aesthetic in which goods were displayed to be attention-getting, stylish, and desirable. The impulse to present goods in a life-like manner became less necessary as it was acknowledged that displayed goods acted as stand-ins for something else. Displayed goods took on a representational quality. This quality worked well in both the store window and on the screen and the 1930s saw the "heyday of motion picture commodity tie-ups" (Gaines, "Queen Christina" 38). One of the most lucrative of these was the fashion tie-up. Gaines notes that the association between star and star style worked equally well for both the film and fashion industries. Garment manufactures and apparel designers traded on star styles to bring added value to ready-to-wear clothing lines. Conversely, the motion picture frame displayed clothing and other commodities more gloriously than any shop window could. In thinking about the

34

fashion tie-up and the analogy between screen and display widow, Gaines is interested in "the dissemination of a visual aesthetic" and how it moves from screen to window and from bold design into something else (38).

Ultimately Gaines writes, "My final question is about the status of the sign as it shifts from context to context. What, for instance, happens to the meaning of the *Queen Christina* costumes when they cease to be mise-en-scène and find another existence as window dressing in hopes of having still another existence as everyday clothing?" To answer this question, Gaines turns to Bennett and Woollacott's formulation of the mobile signifier (55). Gaines argues that the show window and the store window multiplies the number of possible contexts for an image, a body, a fashion, and a star. Commodification through the commercial tie-up, Gaines argues, facilitates multiple readings of objects as they are placed in different contexts and seen by different viewers. In this scenario, the costume itself becomes part of the mobile signifier as it accrues meaning in the film and beyond the screen. As the costume becomes fashion, it enters a different process of consumption for female spectator-consumers. Gaines has somewhat ambivalent feelings about the tie-in, arguing that it can lead to both misogynistic visual forms, as in the dismembered mannequin in the shop window and catalog spread, or alternately empowering camp readings of supposedly mainstream objects. Taking a more definitive stance, the historian Victoria de Grazia argues instead that the consumptive practices of women be considered in light of the complex political and social formations that give them context. De Grazia impels us to consider "the ways in which different consumption regimes are produced by, support, and even undermine varying political systems…acts of consumption need to be related to definitions of the rights and obligations of citizenship under particular regimes of power" (279). For de Grazia, production and consumption are related to articulations of power wherein

female consumers exercise agency through spending choices, which may themselves be free or constricted. For Gaines and de Grazia, the relationship between production and consumption is contextual wherein concrete decisions may be grounded in potentially abstract constructions. If we consider costume itself to occupy the space of a mobile signifier, the conditions of production take on particular significance because they are also related to the framing of consumption.

In addition to production, the circulation of an object is an important component in the process of meaning-making. Paul du Gay, et al. take up a consideration of this in *Doing Cultural Studies The Story of the Sony Walkman*. Using the object of the Sony Walkman, the authors identify five cultural processes which they designate as representation, identity, production, consumption, and regulation. These processes form a "cultural circuit" through which any object can been culturally analyzed. The authors consider advertising, audience, and manufacturing as part of these processes. One of their determinations is that a unique "culture of production" within a company informs inter-organizational practices, but also the "perceptions of outside observers" (43). These perceptions then influence how the object is considered culturally by different publics. This has a determining effect on how the object is used and circulated through global cultures. The policies and practices of production therefore have some determining effect on the object produced. The implication is that we can perhaps read the industry through the product. This notion calls to mind Caldwell's figuration of industry as self-reflexive and thus *Doing Cultural Studies* provides the groundwork for later conceptions of production cultures by signaling that the orientations of the producer and audience determine the circulation of an object. For this study of costume departments, I extend Caldwell's notion of the industry to include a range of sites from which costumes were sourced after the post-studio dismantling of costume departments. These sites include spaces like retail venues, fashion designer collections,

thrift stores, and the personal closets of actors. A study of the production culture of costume departments in the post-studio era must necessarily be elastic enough to include these disparate sites as part of a consideration of industry because they are also then related to disparate sites of consumption.

My methodology in this chapter, then, is to situation myself in relation to Caldwell's conception of production culture in order to analyze the shifting circumstances of production within costume departments in Hollywood during the 1960s and 70s. I draw on Thomas Schatz's relationship between the macro and the micro, as well as Vicki Mayer's argument that we might put the micro in relation to the macro in order to "ground social theories" and resist making grand claims about the relationship between media and society (Mayer 15). I do this by contextualizing an examination of costuming practices within a larger history of costume departments. Working within a cultural studies methodological framework established by scholars like Bennett and Wollacott and du Gay, et al., I consider elements of the filmic and extra-filmic costume texts as objects that make meaning through cultural circuitry. While some MIS approaches jettison the text or relocate it as industry itself, I am additionally interested in maintaining the narrative and aesthetic elements of a particular film as important elements of meaning-making. Following Bordwell's notion of the poetics of cinema, the methods of construction used to make a film remain important to analyzing the film as the circumstances of production reveal themselves in the aesthetic of the finished film. The industrial object produced, which is costume in this case, remains further open to shifting meanings as the object circulates among changing cultural and historical terrains. In the case of costume objects, rather than analyze the function of the fashion industry separately, as Angela McRobbie does, it is more productive to investigate the inter-industrial relationships between the film and fashion

industries.[15] Recognizing costume departments as production cultures that constantly reinvent and re-conceptualize themselves in relation to the fashion industry makes it possible to recognize the objects produced by these departments as having culturally significant value beyond their onscreen manifestations, which in turn allows us to approach film history from a new perspective.

2.3   THE MACRO: A SHORT HISTORY OF COSTUME DEPARTMENTS IN HOLLYWOOD 1920S-1990S

The following section will provide a short history of Hollywood wardrobe departments with special attention paid to the early years of costuming. This period is significant because while the Golden Age of Hollywood costume, the 1930s and into the 1940s, has received much popular and scholarly attention, the eras that bookend this period have received much less consideration. This is unfortunate because the emergence of the costume department during the early formation of the studio system and the emergence of the post-studio costume department share certain traits. One such commonality is that during both periods actors often supplied their own clothing as film costume. While this may seem trivial, it provides a material example of the ways in which teleological conceptions of film history can be troubled. Costume departments did not continue to get bigger and better, but rather their history is marked by moments of growth, grandeur, dispersal, and re-development. Costume departments outside of the studio era are messy places often geographically spread out and open to multiple commercial impulses. They

---

[15] McRobbie has written extensively on labor and the fashion industry. See *British Fashion Design: Rag Trade or Image Industry?*

are important places because wherever a female star appears, so too do discourses about her fashion and costume. These discourses have cultural impact and are themselves affected by changes in the circumstances of wardrobe production.

The birth and development of the Hollywood costume department has been traced by scholars like Elizabeth Nielsen, Deborah Landis, and Michelle Finamore. During the earliest days of film production, actors often provided their own clothing to serve as the costume for a film. This practice began to change, however, as producers and audiences started to pay attention to the clothing that actors wore onscreen. In her thorough history of costuming practices in early cinema, Michelle Finamore notes that one of the earliest mentions of film costume appeared in a 1910 article in *The Moving Picture World* titled "Dress and the Picture" (188). The article makes a comparison between the "talking play" and the "silent play," suggesting that women were drawn to stage plays by the promise of seeing the latest fashions both onstage and among the crowd of well turned-out theatergoers. The writer proposes that this tactic might also work to draw women to the cinema, proclaiming "We have little doubt that with the march of progress that is going on in the moving picture, this question of the up-to-date dress of the feminine characters will be found of vital importance by the producers. Women will go to see those dresses as well as the play."[16] The article asserts that smartly worn clothes function as a "vital part in the battle of life," and it was therefore of spiritual and moral importance to see finely-dressed individuals (73-4). Moreover, because refined clothing onscreen might attract a refined audience to the theater, the writer theorizes that actors had something of a responsibility to demonstrate how to properly wear clothes, for the "plain people" in the audience. While these claims are strong, the article reflects attitudes about the role of fashion and costume in the

---

[16] For the entire article, see "Dress and the Picture," *Moving Picture World* 9 July 1910, 73-4.

promotion of early cinema. It was clear by the mid-1910s that wardrobe could contribute to the quality of a picture and thereby the size, composition, and quality of its audience.

Fashion, cinema, and advertising were also important components of female participation in the public sphere during the early twentieth century. Sarah Berry discusses the movement in advertising of the early 1900s to encourage women to find their "type." This changed the way that women imagined themselves from beings defined by morality to "types" defined by personalities. This shift allowed a woman to then craft a public persona based on whatever personality type she identified with and wanted to project. Berry notes that the role of cinema was significant because of the way "fashion types were linked to Hollywood stars and their representation of social identity as a conscious construction" (10). As a result, the film costume was becoming as important in constructing American female social types as it was in establishing a fictional character.

By the 1910s costumes were increasingly custom made or rented from prop houses and by 1912, a few studios had established wardrobe departments to address the needs of character and period films. [17] The establishment of a wardrobe department was, in part, a cost-cutting measure so that studios could retain custom garments, amass costume stock, and rely less on costume rental (Finamore 227, 196). It is not coincidental, however, that the emergence of the wardrobe department occurred contemporaneously with the founding of the largest costume rental company in Hollywood, Western Costume Company. Costume rental companies did not compete with studios to produce costumes, but rather functioned as another source for costuming that helped the studios run more efficiently. Still in operation, Western Costume is the oldest costume supply company in the United States. Its origin dates to 1912 when the Native American

---

[17] For films with contemporary settings, most actors supplied their own wardrobe through the 1910s. The practiced extended into the 1920s for secondary actors.

trader L.L. Burns and his partner Harry Revier set up a small shop in Los Angeles. They intended to supply the burgeoning film industry with anything that a filmmaker may need, from film equipment to props and costumes. When Burns met the director William S. Hart, whose directorial reputation was built on westerns, he made an important friend in the industry. From there Burns used his business acumen and industry contacts to build the costume house that supplied much of Hollywood through the late 1920s. During the 30s and 40s the company's fortunes waxed and waned and in 1947 several of the major studios purchased controlling shares of the company, essentially running the business as a joint costume storage and production resource. By 1950 a new management team ran the company, which preceded a series of ownership changes over the next few decades. The costume designer Richard La Motte has noted that in the 1950s costume rental facilities like Western Costume began to run as independent businesses that charged rent and focused on profit (90). While Western Costume continued to work closely with the studios, but by the 70s the rise of independent productions and ever-shrinking studio departments lead to the rise of a different kind of production practice. Costume designers began to develop their own off-the-lot departments and enterprising costume designers established their own privately-run, mobile costume departments, a practice still in place today.

While rental companies played an important role in costuming, wardrobe staff and departments themselves were becoming more established by the late 1910s. In 1917, the names of studio costume designers began to appear in trade magazines (Finamore 210). Just as the film industry grew and other components of production became organized and professionalized, so too did costume departments. By the end of the 1920s most studios had developed their own wardrobe departments. In 1920 the American Association of Costume Design was founded and by 1929 the first motion picture costumers union was formed (Nielsen 174). Michelle Finamore

notes that as early as 1923, fashion designers were beginning to form relationships with producers who might promote their designs onscreen. The film *Potash and Perlmutter* (1923), for example, advances a narrative about two partners in a clothing business. The film features a fashion show showcasing designs from a number of New York designer salons including Madame Frances, Madame Stein, Madame Blaine, and Evelyn McHorter (240).

By the 1930s costume departments were well established and had grown into small factories themselves, generating hundreds of costumes per year (LaVine 27). Wardrobe departments sketched, sewed, embroidered, buckled, and beaded costumes in staggering quantities and studios began to develop unique house styles. During this period studios also began to strengthen their appeal to female filmgoers as both spectators and consumers and thus it became important for stars to market their look as unique. The era saw the rise of the star designer: Travis Banton at Paramount, Adrian at MGM, and Walter Plunkett at RKO (Landis 72-74). The 1930s marked the Golden Age of film costume both in terms of production facilities and the spectacle and glamor of female costume. Offscreen, Hollywood stars attended lavish dinner parties hosted by one another, swathed in satins, furs, and jewels. Hollywood hostess de rigueur Ouida Rathbone, wife of Basil, was quoted as saying, "We dressed to the teeth for everything" (qtd. in LaVine 43).

Just as the 1940s saw the growth of a more somber kind of filmmaking, costumes became more buttoned down. On a practical level, wartime restrictions on fabric necessitated costumes that were more restrained. There were exceptions to the rule, like Rita Hayworth's costumes in *Gilda* (1946) or Ginger Rogers' gowns in *Lady in the Dark* (1944), but for the most part costume budgets would never again reach the heights they had seen in the 30s. Despite this, costume design continued to be an important element of filmmaking. In 1948 the Motion Picture

Academy presented the first Oscar for costume design to Barbara Karinska for *Joan of Arc* (1948). Of course, that year also saw the Paramount Decree in which the Supreme Court ruled that studios were in violation of United States antitrust laws. The ruling changed the way that studios operated, which had lasting effects costume departments.

In postwar years of the 1950s, of a different kind of femininity, and concomitant fashion style, emerged that was grounded in compliance and conformance. The costume designer Robert La Vine visualizes these qualities as such:

> Postwar fans opened their hearts to the sort of girl one could find in a station wagon parked at a suburban railroad station waiting for the 6:22 to bring home her tennis-tanned junior-executive husband. Neatly dressed to complement her Brooks Brothers-garbed mate, her hair naturally coiffed and her face only lightly touched with makeup, this cool, well-mannered woman who mothered nearly perfect children had the secure charm of a Bryn Mawr alumna. (120)

While there were certainly more complications to white, middle-class femininity in the 1950s, La Vine's snapshot resonates with images that were presented onscreen. Actresses like Grace Kelly, Audrey Hepburn, Julie Andrews, and Doris Day all radiated demure femininity and were often costumed accordingly. This would remain the dominant gender norm until well into the 1960s when skeletal production budgets, location shooting, a rising youth culture, and an increased emphasis on realism would dramatically alter film costume.

The next section will analyze wardrobing practices in the 1960s in greater detail. One of the main characteristics of costume during the decade was its paradoxical disappearance. Deborah Nadoolman Landis traces this movement in one of the most comprehensive surveys of film costume history, *Dressed: A Century of Hollywood Costume Design.*[18] Landis, who was a well-known costume designer before becoming a film historian, notes that during the 1960s and

---

[18] Landis designed costumes for many Hollywood films, including *The Blues Brothers* (1980), *Raiders of the Lost Ark* (1981), and *Coming to America* (1988), before earning a doctorate in the history of design from the Royal College of Art in London.

70s shoestring budgets and a changing filmmaking aesthetic resulted in actors increasingly being asked to provide their own clothes as costumes, as was the practice in the nascent days of Hollywood (309). Contemporary films called for subdued costumes that would recede behind characterization, rather than offer a pronouncement of character, in a kind of invisible costume style. When costume designers were hired, they were tasked with the ironic job of creating costumes that looked natural enough to efface the labor of the costume designer. Though costumes still mattered in terms of design within the mise-en-scène, the costumes themselves often looked like ordinary clothes. Indeed, in cases where actors provided their own wardrobe, the costumes were ordinary clothes.

With this de-emphasis on costume, it seemed that the notion of Hollywood glamour was a thing of the past. As glorious gowns created for stars like Rita Hayworth and Bette Davis gathered dust in storerooms and stock houses, a costuming era had ended. One result of this shift in the style of film and film costume was that actors had to distinguish themselves offscreen if they could not do so onscreen. Thus, the red carpet emerged in the 1960s and 70s and with it changing conceptions of stardom and celebrity. And yet, all was not lost. By the mid-late 1970s as new American filmmaking emerged costume departments were somewhat resuscitated. Films like *Chinatown* (1974), *Barry Lyndon* (1975), and *Star Wars* (1977) were elaborate productions that required full scale costume design. By the 1980s costume departments had regained some status as part of the production process, though costume budgets remained one of the smallest elements of a film (369). Landis discusses the relationship between costume and fashion that was strengthened through licensing deals and product placement arrangements in the 1980s. Working with small budgets, costume designers were encouraged to arrange partnerships with fashion labels wherein the labels would exchange clothes for exposure in a film. As a result, costume

designers shared screen credit with fashion designers (372). Landis writes that this practice flourished in the late 80s, however the practice dates to a much earlier time as Finamore has shown with *Potash and Perlmutter* (1923) and I have shown with *Gidget Goes Hawaiian* (1961).[19]

In the 1990s the prominence of Hollywood filmmaking was challenged by the rise of independent filmmaking produced by directors, casts, and crews outside of the major studios, although major studios would quickly create divisions dedicated to independent film development. In costume departments, this meant more tightening of costume budgets. As international co-productions often spread production crews to distant locations, the costume department became a mobile unit wherein the designer had to be resourceful and creative to gather the materials and personnel required to mount a production. Landis writes that in the 1990s partnerships with fashion designers increased, much to the vexation of costume designers who saw them as two distinct jobs. However, as film stars shared the spotlight with media celebrities and other such famous "personalities," the fashion designer and the celebrity stylist began to eclipse the costume designer. A 1998 *Vogue* article about "the emergence of the movie star as red-carpet retailer" muddied the line between star and character, fashion and costume. Landis further laments that "Heartland favorites" like *People* magazine and *Entertainment Weekly* endorsed celebrity culture and lauded stars' fashion choices while devoting little page space to their onscreen costumes. For Landis, the distinction between onscreen costume and offscreen fashion is one that should always be maintained. As an advocate for skilled craftspeople, she argues that for costume design to be done properly, clothes cannot simply be shopped. Rather care must go into making, selecting, altering, dying, aging, or otherwise

---

[19] See my discussion of the costumes for *Gidget Goes Hawaiian* in chapter 2.

manipulating fabric to create a costume that supports both the character and narrative. This happens in both historical, period films and contemporary films. As Landis writes, "Every picture…[is] a costume picture" (414).

Landis's position celebrates the craft and profession of costume design, the importance of which is irrefutable. She very distinctly claims that fashion is not costume, nor is costume fashion, because the two are produced for different circumstances by differently skilled artists. The distinction is important to Landis who, as a practitioner and theorist of the profession, is also a gatekeeper for it. This position is understandable, and yet it fails to recognize how the fashion and film industries are often imbricated. As the following section will demonstrate, the emergence of fashion as costume during the 1960s is also undeniable and significant. The lines Landis draws between costume and fashion, character and star, audience and film are not so distinct, nor should they be. Isolating craft as a specialized realm distinct from the more prosaic act of offscreen dressing in fact ignores the ways in which costume and fashion mingle in the production of culture and the construction of feminine identities. Both the fashion and film industries enact different kinds of advertising pressures on women that can act through collusion or contradiction. It is only through tracing the ways in which fashion and costume interact that we can come to understand how they function as widely consumed cultural objects.

2.4   THE MICRO: COSTUME PLOTS AND COSTUMING PRACTICES AT MGM 1951-1977

The following section analyzes the work of three designers, Walter Plunkett, Helen Rose, and Ruth Morley, to explore specific changes in wardrobing practices at the dawn of the post-studio

era and into the 1970s. Working with archival materials, specifically a collection of professional documents known as costume plots, this section demonstrates that wardrobing practices became decentralized and dispersed following the dismantling of the studios after the Paramount Decree of 1948. This dispersal opened new sites of industrial self-reflexivity as costume components were sourced from outside the studio. The traces of a costume that disappear when it becomes part of the film onscreen are important to retain because their circulation contributes to the production of meaning of the final costume. Additionally, after the costume has served its purpose onscreen, its offscreen manifestations tell us much about the continual circulation of extra-filmic texts. Particularly in the 1960s, the displacement of the female costume onscreen does signal the displacement of the female herself from the screen. It therefore becomes important to understand the genealogy of a costume to analyze how the cinema continued to address female consumers beyond the screen.

This chapter draws mainly on a survey of costume plots from MGM during the 1950s-1970s. A costume plot, also known as a wardrobe plot or costume breakdown, is an inventory of each item that every actor wears during a production. They are used in theater, opera, and film productions and include information about costume changes and instructions on how specific costumes should be worn. The more detailed the costume plot, the more the final wardrobe is likely to adhere to the vision of the costume designer. The costume plot is vital for collaboration between a costume designer and the wardrobe department, but it is also an important document for budgeting purposes because it is used for sourcing, bidding, and renting costumes for a production (Merz 277, 161). The earliest costume plot on record at the Margaret Herrick Library is for a film called *Experimental Marriage*, which was produced by Select Pictures in 1919 and

47

starred Constance Talmadge. Costume plots have been in use ever since and are now recorded digitally through commercially available software programs like CPlotPro and CostumePro.

The costume plots I looked at represent industrial costuming practices at MGM during the 1950s-1970s. During the period I surveyed, all costume information was recorded by hand on 8.5x11-inch photocopied costume breakdown sheets. Those sheets were then collected into individual plotbooks for each of the main characters. Primary stars generally received their own dedicated plotbook while secondary characters were usually grouped into volumes for men's wardrobe and women's wardrobe. The length of each plotbook depended on the number of costume changes for the character and could range from a few pages to over a hundred. Each page documents a scene, character, and description of the wardrobe down to minute details such as whether a blouse should be tucked into a skirt or if the sleeves of a sweater should be pushed up. The plotbooks may contain other documentation like wardrobe still photographs, fabric swatches, notes on designers, or other related ephemera. They generally list the costume designer, if there is one, and the costumer. In my survey, I found that many plotbooks, if not most, did not list a primary costume designer. Many listed a costumer, which is a position that is related but different in duties, status, and compensation. The costumer assists as directed and may coordinate costuming, but not design it. The position is lower on the pay scale than a costume designer.

Many plotbooks during the survey period noted that costumes for supporting characters were "personal," or "H.O.", which I deduce to mean "her own." Some plotbooks note "all wardrobe personal" to designate that all garments were provided by the actor.[20] This practice recalls the earliest days of film production in which actors supplied their own clothes for a film

---

[20] See the plotbook for *The Carey Treatment* (1972) and *Pretty Maids All in a Row* (1971) for examples of this practice.

production. The plotbooks also documented costumes that had been sourced from local retail outlets, thrift stores, or costume rental houses. Few garments were manufactured in-house and only very rarely were costumes for an entire production manufactured in-house. The plotbooks also reveal that men's costumes far outnumbered women's costumes. The plotbooks for *The Moonshine War* (1970) are telling in this case. The book for men's clothing is triple the size of the one for women's clothing, indicating that there were three times as many male actors in the film as female. This resonates with Molly Haskell's claim that "From a woman's point of view, the ten years from, say, 1962 or 1963 to 1973 have been the most disheartening in screen history" (323). Though I am less inclined than Haskell to condemn the whole decade, I take her point and want to suggest that the decline of costume is linked to the decline of female visibility during the era. Even when women did appear onscreen, their costumes were dictated by the narrative and often disappeared into the background. Costumes in the immediate post-studio era were different in construction, appearance, and importance than they had been during the studio era. A close reading of the work of Plunkett, Rose, and Morely demonstrates this shift in wardrobing practices.

Walter Plunkett designed some of the earliest costume plots that I surveyed from the early 1950s, when the costume department at MGM was still essentially in full operation. Plunkett was associated with RKO early in his career where he defined the elegant look of Fred Astaire and Ginger Rogers. His well-crafted garments helped give Astaire and Rogers the strong lines that enhanced the visual appeal of their dancing onscreen. His most well-known films, however, were made at MGM, where he worked from 1947-1966, retiring that year (Turim 227). Unlike high couture designers like Adrian or Travis Banton, Plunkett was known for the period designs that he crafted with an emphasis on veracity and historical integrity (Lee 680). His

attention to detail and craftsmanship set him apart from other designers and his best-known film at MGM was *Gone with the Wind* (1939). He experienced major success in the 1950s with *Singin' in the Rain* (1952) and *An American in Paris* (1951), though he may well have contributed in name only.

Plunkett continued to design period films into the 1950s. In 1951 he worked on *Across the Wide Missouri*, a frontier adventure film starring Clark Gable. The costume plot for the film is typical of the kind of costume plots produced for films during the studio era at MGM. The entry for each character is further broken down into scene, set, and description. For example, the costumes for the character Kimiah, played by Maria Marquez, are described in great detail. The first wardrobe change for Kimiah lists her costume as follows: "Tan leather fringed Indian costume, turquoise & white sash, brown suede Dress, 1 row of beading – boots – Blue Bead necklace – Belt – Bag on right side. Red head scarf."[21] The plotbook also instructs that an identical costume be made for Marquez's double. The descriptions of the costumes are accompanied by photo stills of the actress in costumes for the film as well as notes about when the clothes were made, fitted, and tested. These procedures were standard during the studio era and would disappear later when costumes largely ceased to be made in-house, particularly for actors who were not stars. Costumes produced for stars during the 1950s continued to be elaborate and this was especially the case for period films.

Plunkett's costuming for the 1956 film *Diane*, a historical drama about the French aristocrat Diane de Poitiers starring Lana Turner, demonstrates how films made as star vehicles during the end of the studio era were still deeply researched and methodically costumed. The costuming documents for the film contain detailed notes made by the wardrobe staff as part of

---

[21] See the costume plot for *Across the Wide Missouri.*

50

the research for Plunkett's designs. The notes contain historical descriptions of sixteenth century dressing customs related to clothing, jewelry, hairstyles, makeup, and perfumes for both men and women. The notes were culled from sources on costume and fashion history by Jackson Norris and R. Turner Wilcox and include details about customary dress as well as specific characteristics of dress related to Diane de Pointiers. For example, de Pointiers habitually dressed in black and white fabrics to both mark her status as a widow, but also to reflect what she considered to be her dual nature of light and dark. The costumes for the film maintain this style. A trailer for the film promotes the screenplay by Christopher Isherwood and the film's Cinemascope production. An effort was made to sell the story as a love triangle between historical figures while promoting a "new and electric quality" to Turner's portrayal of Diana.[22] In reality, *Diane* was the last film Turner made for MGM under contract and thus itself represents a kind of shift in the industry as actor contracts were quickly becoming outmoded. She next made *Peyton Place* (1957) at Twentieth Century-Fox, for which she was nominated for an Academy Award for best actress. *Diane* generated a tepid response both critically and commercially. An early review in *Variety* magazine called the film an "old-fashioned costume drama" that drew laughs at "unintended places" (Whit). The review, however, did offer special praise to the costumes by Plunkett. Early in its run the film produced similarly lukewarm box office receipts, doing only "fairish" at Loew's Penn Theater in downtown Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania ("Pictures: Diane). Thus *Diane* represents a lesson for the studio that historical costume dramas were on the wane with audiences.

Nevertheless, Plunkett again worked on the costumes for another period film called *The Barretts of Wimpole Street* (1957). The British costume designer Elizabeth Haffenden is credited

---

[22] The original theatrical trailer can be viewed on www.Youtube.com, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l6BV464ieqI, accessed Jan. 04, 2016.

as the film's costume designer, however the costume plot attributes the costumes for the main character, Elizabeth Browning, to Plunkett. The biopic about Elizabeth and Robert Browning, which is not currently available for viewing, is a remake of a 1934 MGM film of the same name that was costumed by Adrian. Pages from the 1957 costume plot feature handwritten notes about the location and sourcing of the costumes. For example, the front page reads "Clothes at Marie's and fur room." Two other notations list the location of the furs used in the film. On the whole, the costume plot is very specific in its description, often describing the color and fabric of each piece of clothing. For example, the first costume change for Elizabeth, played by Jennifer Jones, describes a dress made of ecru lace over an ecru rayon lining. The petticoat had an attached corset and satin shoes were made to match the dress. Elizabeth's next costume change featured a brown velvet robe with rayon lining, mink fur trim, and periwinkle chiffon. Such luxury extended to all of Elizabeth's costumes and notes about them are meticulously detailed.

The fabric swatches attached to the descriptions give an indication of the kinds of materials used in the production of the costumes. The plotbook lists in similar detail nine costume changes for Elizabeth, all of which seem to have been made in-house. A budget breakdown for Elizabeth's entire wardrobe alone puts the total cost at $3,410.[23] On the average, each costume cost $379, with some being more elaborate than others.[24] Notes indicate that some pieces were never made, which suggests that other components of the costumes had been made at the studio as no outside sourcing documents are included in the budget breakdown. Elizabeth's costumes for the production were made of silk, linen, velvet, lace, fur, sealskin, and other such sumptuous materials. The petticoats were hand-trimmed in horsehair and ribbons and the gloves

---

[23] The equivalence of $29,817 in 2016. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, CPI Inflation Calculator, calculated 01 Dec. 2015.
[24] The equivalence of $3,314 in 2016.

were made of kid leather. Such attention to detail and the richness of fabrics suggests that the producers were leveraging the costumes as a draw for audiences craving a well-crafted costume drama.

The gamble, however, did not pay off. Like the previous year's *Diane*, the film failed to resonate with audiences. It did not perform well upon its release in New York and grossed only a "mild" amount during the first week of its run in Cleveland, earning under $1200 ("Pictures Grosses Cinermra").[25] According to *Variety* magazine's "Picture Grosses" page, the film never earned more than a modest amount at the box office ("Bedrooms"). While the film's production was generally deemed adequate, the historical themes and content were old-fashioned and contributed to the lack of enthusiasm and poor box office that accompanied the film's release. A reviewer from *Variety* captured the problem succinctly, writing "To members of the hotrod, drag strip and youthful freedom set, the Victorian atmosphere and the paternal restrictions of the plot will likely seem no more than a quaint, old-fashioned, boy-meets-girl drama..." (Brog). While the film may have been aimed at an older demographic, they did not turn out at theaters and younger teenagers had no interest in seeing a biopic about nineteenth-century courtship. Thus MGM's investment in a Victorian costume drama did not pay off and it seems likely that this failure affected costuming budgets in subsequent films. Plunkett went on to design for another seventeen productions, including period and genre films, though like his studio-era compatriots, his career highs were behind him.

During Plunkett's tenure at MGM, he often worked with Helen Rose, who was another major designer at the studio from 1949-66 (Turim 227). One of Rose's most famous designs came out of the wardrobe she designed with Plunkett for the film *The Merry Widow* (1953).

---

[25] The equivalence of $10,157 in 2016.

Plunkett designed the men's wardrobe while Rose designed the women's. Among the garments she created was a strapless corslet, later called the "merry widow," that went on to become a 1950s lingerie phenomenon when it was reproduced by the lingerie company Warner's. The garment was in keeping with the classic, feminine style for which she became widely known. Rose began her career designing vaudeville chorus girl costumes for the Lester Costume Company sometime in the late 1910s before moving to the Ernie Young costume house, where she gained a strong reputation for designing theatrical costumes. At these theatrical costume houses Rose mastered the difficult art of chiffon design, which she would put to extensive use during her years as a film costume designer. In 1929 Rose moved to Los Angeles and began a brief assignment at Fox studios before moving on to design costumes for the Ice Follies. She held that position for fourteen years until MGM courted her with an offer to replace their star designer Adrian. Rose accepted the offer and worked alongside Irene, who was briefly a designer at MGM from 1942-1949. A professional rivalry caused Irene to leave the studio and Rose assumed the position of head designer, where she remained until her retirement in 1966. The hallmarks of Rose's designs include a strong focus on silhouette and structure. Her designs are elegant, understated, and restrained as befitting the 1950s upper-middle-class suburban women that aspired to dress like her. Following the public clamor for the white chiffon gown she designed for Elizabeth Taylor in *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (1958), Rose decided to enter the retail clothing industry, where she had a successful career.

Maureen Turim suggests that Rose was pivotal in establishing a dress that functioned as a template for the transition from girlhood to mature womanhood in the 1950s. The wedding dress that Rose designed for Elizabeth Taylor's character in *Father of the Bride* (1950) was an example of just such a dress in that it transformed Taylor's character "from bobby soxer in blue

jeans to a glorious rendition of nuptial splendor" (220). The sweetheart line of the dress became a traditional element of wedding dresses long after the style disappeared from contemporary fashions. Thus the dress and its neckline came to signal a social and sexual transition for women in the post-war years. Rose's influence on fashion did not end with Taylor's bridal gown. During her career at MGM, she designed and sold expensive ready-to-wear clothing through exclusive department stores and specialty shops. After she left MGM she continued to market upscale fashion through her retail label (Lee 733-35). During her film career, Rose had a talent for creating onscreen costumes that could function equally as offscreen fashion. In doing so, Rose seemed to have anticipated that fashion inspiration for women would move away from the screen and into designer label showrooms. This is reflected in her film work. For the 1957 film *Designing Woman*, Rose is credited with the film's story suggestion, which is about a fashion designer named Marilla (Lauren Bacall) who falls in love with a sports reporter named Mike (Gregory Peck). The plot revolves around Marilla's career and offers Rose the opportunity to showcase her own designs both through Marilla's wardrobe and the clothing her character creates in the film. While Rose designed all of the costumes, her creations for Marilla most capture both Rose's own design sensibilities and the style of the era. For one costume, Bacall wears a beige suit. The notion of the beige suit captures the sartorial zeitgeist for certain women during the late 1950s and early 60s and Rose's designs were widely copied offscreen. This capacity to integrate film costume with the fashion industry demonstrates both textual and industrial self-reflexivity. In John Caldwell's sense, industrial reflexivity manifests in extra-filmic texts, yet in *Designing Women* Rose clearly takes the opportunity to represent the process and product of fashion design within the narrative itself. This dual mode of reflexivity exists in other films that Rose designed.

The narrative in *BUtterfield 8* (1960) again draws on a character associated with the fashion industry.[26] Though a costume plot does not exist for the film, wardrobe memos demonstrate Rose's technique of blending the film and fashion industries. In the film, Elizabeth Taylor plays Gloria Wandrous, a woman who models dresses at various venues around town. She can be reached through her telephone extension, *BUtterfield 8*, which provides the unusual capitalization of the film's title. One evening Gloria spends the night with Weston Ligget (Laurence Harvey). The next morning she wakes to find that Ligget has left the apartment. Alone, she languidly makes her way through the bedroom, pours herself a whiskey, and runs her hand over the posh furnishings. She goes to put her clothes on and finds that her dress is torn; she also finds a note left by Ligget and $250. Immediately outraged, she scrawls "No Sale" in lipstick on the mirror and then ironically leaves with a mink coat that she finds in the closet. In the next scene, Gloria hangs the mink in a closet at her friend's house and the film cuts to a close-up of the fur's label. It clearly reads "Reiss & Fabrizio." The shot serves no narrative purpose and thus can only be read as product placement. Within the film's narrative the fur occupies a symbolic space; As product placement, the furrier's label occupies a very material space. The story behind this close-up exemplifies the integration between the film and fashion industries at the level of the shot.

In a memo to the film's producer, Pandro Berman, Rose suggests that the production should get "Maxmilian or some one (sic) else to make a coat for publicity purposes."[27] Rose writes that the publicity department had already indicated that a fur company in New York had committed themselves to making a coat for the film. She said that she and Elizabeth Taylor would be in New York later in the month and could select materials for the coat. In 1960

---

[26] The equivalence of $3385 today in 2016.
[27] See the memo from Helen Rose to Pandro Berman.

Maximilian Furs was one of the premier custom and couture furriers in New York City, winning the prestigious Coty Award in 1948 and 1965 for making fur fashionable.[28] In the end, the New York furrier Reiss & Fabrizio, rather than Maxmilian, provided the furs for the production and thus Rose's memo that several furriers were willing to provide furs in exchange for screen credit bears out. In the film, the coat symbolizes Gloria's shame, sickness, lust, vanity, sensuality, and excess and is charged with the animal magnetism that was then also ascribed to Elizabeth Taylor publicly. As an item so closely associated with the character and actress, the partnership would have been profitable for Reiss & Fabrizio, particularly because in 1960 Taylor was frequently in the press. She had just married Eddie Fisher and was fresh off the success of *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (1958) and *Suddenly, Last Summer* (1959). Taylor remained a steady fixture in fan magazines through the late sixties when fans began to tire of the theatrics that surrounded her personal life, but until then she was often featured on the cover of magazines like *Modern Screen* and *Photoplay.*

In 1962, Rose designed the costumes for *The Courtship of Eddie's Father* (1963), another film that features a character involved with the fashion industry. The designs in the film are interesting because they again offer Rose the opportunity to showcase her designs within the film as potential women's retail fashions. The costume plot for the film is complete with descriptions of wardrobe, costume stills, and fabric swatches for the main three female characters. In the film Shirley Jones plays Elizabeth Marten, an attractive, young divorcée that lives across the hall from Eddie's father, Tom Corbett (Glenn Ford). Elizabeth is a nurse and her character is defined by her caring, maternal domesticity and patient resolve in awaiting Tom's affections. These traits are established early through costume. The film introduces Elizabeth wearing a nurse's uniform

---

[28] About Maximilian Furs, see http://maximilian.com/about.shtml. Accessed 07 Dec 2015.

of a white blouse, apron, and petticoat. It is the only occasion in which Elizabeth is associated either visually or narratively with a career outside the home. For her second scene, she is dressed in a pink silk pajama set featuring a robe made of coordinated pink silk shantung, according to the costume plot, along with matching pink satin bedroom slippers. The costume is demurely luxurious and suggests a hint of sensuality through the fabric, Shantung, which is a type of silk that derives its name from the Chinese province from which it originated. The material is created from cultivated caterpillars that produce an uneven silk that results in a textured, also called "slubby," feel and look. Imitation shantung is manufactured using cotton, rayon, and other synthetic materials (Jerde 199). The fabric was popular in the 1950s and 60s for its texture and sheen. While the silk may offer a hint of sexuality, the costume is governed by a kind of structured, domestic formality and the metaphorical implications of imitation silk suggest something decidedly practical. In one other scene Elizabeth wears another similar pajama set and these sets seem designed for a public notion of the bedroom. They are, for example, different from the slip and fur coat that Gloria wears as her bedroom costume in *BUtterfield 8*. For that film, the combination of the undergarment and the outer garment conveys a sense of the private hidden away under the public in a dangerously tenuous way. The pajama sets that Elizabeth wears in *The Courtship of Eddie's Father*, however, suggest a kind of bedroom armor wherein the bedroom is a public place that requires yet another clothing change that is equally designed for decency. The coordinated effort resists the spontaneous messiness of intimacy. Elizabeth's bedroom wear is similar to her day costumes which consist of structured, tailored dresses with moderately full skirts in neutral colors. Her jewelry is understated. She often wears pearl earrings along with a single strand of pearls at the neck. The presentation is deeply constructed, composed, careful, and ladylike. It is an appeal to conservative feminine deportment and

58

presentation carried over from the 1950s and suggests the highly curated nature of feminine appearance during the early part of the 1960s. These elements are very much in keeping with the kinds of designs Rose was known for. The fabrics and details described in the costume plot could work equally as well in a fashion catalogue description from the same period.

In contrast to Elizabeth, Dina Merrill plays the other female lead, Rita Behrens. She is the sophisticated career girl whom Eddie's father courts. Like Rose's other fashion characters, Rita is a fashion consultant and her wardrobe is fittingly chic and modern. It is a mixture of tasteful beige woolens for day and pale chiffons and velvet brocades for evening. Rita's costumes are more sophisticated and offered Rose the opportunity to showcase another aspect of her fashion collection. The cut of Rita's costume flatters the actress's tall, slender frame by further elongating the lines of her arms and legs. Most of her costumes are knee-length sheath dresses or gowns modeled on Dior's New Look, two silhouettes carried over from 1950s couture.[29] By way of example, Rita's first costume is a brown and beige tweed sheath dress with a matching three-quarter length coat and custom beret. The details of her costume are laid out in the plotbook for her character. The fur is brown sable, her shoes are brown alligator, and her gloves are eight-button, bone, kid leather. Throughout the film Rita wears outfits of equal refinement and unrelenting good taste, and always with the spectator's knowledge that the character is a fashion consultant. Thus the film authorizes her costumes as those possessed and worn by a woman in the know. Just as Rita gracefully wears the costumes, the actress Dina Merrill equally seemed to endorse the Helen Rose designs and the association between Dina Merrill and Helen Rose would have been a boon to Rose's retail endeavors.

---

[29] Dior's "New Look" emerged in 1947 and is characterized by a silhouette with a tight bodice and waist and a full, calf-length skirt. The look became closely identified with women's fashions of the 1950s.

In the 1950s and early 60s Merrill was positioned to become the next Grace Kelly following Kelly's departure from Hollywood and marriage to Prince Rainier III of Monaco in 1956. Merrill was herself a socialite and heiress. She was the only daughter of Post Cereals heiress Marjorie Merriweather Post and was once married to Stanley Rumbough, heir to the Colgate-Palmolive fortune. In 1959 *The New York Times* declared Merrill "Hollywood's new Grace Kelly" (Klein). and Merrill indeed carried herself as an American aristocrat. Her onscreen comportment and her fluid, unbroken carriage conveyed affluence by gesturing toward the unhurried way with which she was able to glide through the world. Because Merrill was being groomed to inherit Kelly's position, it was important that she look a certain way. Rose's costume design reflected this. The fabric swatches for Rita's costumes are beautiful in color and texture. The fabric for a brocade coat is indeed brocade. The material for Rita's evening gown is sumptuous velvet on brocade. In the plotbook for the film, the descriptions are much more about fabric and color than narrative description.[30] The Rita-Behrens-Dina Merrill-Helen Rose association through costume is another site of industrial self-reflexivity in which the film provided a glimpse into the process of fashion consultation for both character and designer. The film gave Rose an exhibition space through which to show her designs and associate them with particular female types, which was important to 1960s fashion merchandising. Female spectators could choose to be an Elizabeth or a Rita and then dress accordingly. The film therefore provided a marketing strategy for Rose that was different from what Charlotte Herzog describes as "powder puff" marketing in which the onscreen fashion show provides an advertising space. In *The Courtship of Eddie's Father*, narrative functions as a marketing backdrop as the characters create and endorse fashion identities. The artificiality of the fashion show is dropped as the entire

---

[30] See the costume plot for *The Courtship of Eddie's Father* from the MGM Wardrobe Department Records.

film becomes a fashion show. This mode of industrial self-reflexivity allowed Rose to create both costume and fashion in such a way that appealed to the narrative demands of the film and the retail demands of her own offscreen design career.

While Rose designed the costumes for the two main leads, other actresses were left on their own. Such was the case for Roberta Sherwood, who played the housekeeper and nanny Mrs. Livingston. According to the plotbook for her character, Sherwood provided some of her own clothes for her role - three of her own dresses and some of her own jewelry. This was in keeping with shifting wardrobing practices in the post-studio era. Often, actors in smaller supporting roles were asked to provide their own clothes for a film's production. While this was most certainly due to cuts to costume budgets, it also suggests that costumes were designed with something less than diligent support of character and narrative in mind. As Jane Gaines and Deborah Landis have argued, costume is foremost designed to reinforce character and narrative. However, in cases where costumes were specifically designed for only the primary female leads, other costumes would have come from contemporary fashions. Therefore, in order to establish continuity with other wardrobe elements, the custom-made costumes would have to have looked like contemporary fashions. The line between screen costume and offscreen fashion would have been deliberately obscured. This particularly benefitted a designer like Rose who also had a retail venture offscreen. This duality of interests demonstrates that during the 1960s the importance of women's costumes shifted from the screen into retail spaces where studio designers began to find an outlet for their creative work.[31]

One more plotbook exists for costumes Helen Rose designed in the sixties. Toward the end of her career at MGM Rose designed the wardrobe for *Made in Paris* (1966). The film stars

---

[31] I follow this line of inquiry in the next chapter on Edith Head's department store fashion shows.

Ann-Margret as Maggie Scott, an assistant fashion buyer at a department store. Some of Maggie's costumes are marked as "M.O." which I take to mean "made-to-order" in the plotbook and Rose indeed did design several original pieces for a fashion show within the film. Other costumes are notated as "Pur" which I take to mean purchased. Many of the lesser roles list "H. Rose" as the designer on the photograph wardrobe stills, though Rose's role is questionable. One in particular lists Rose as the designer, but notes that the actress provided all her own clothes. Thus it is unclear whether or not Rose designed all the costumes, or whether she is simply listed as the designer for all. In either case, many of the costumes were influenced by the styles coming out of London at the time. These styles clearly didn't fit with Rose's design sensibility and as a result, some of the costumes for *Made in Paris* are woefully misbegotten. Rose showcased enormous helmet-styled hats and capes with fur cuffs and matching bodysuits that were fashionable at the time, but this look is misplaced in the stiff formality of the fashion show in the film. In contrast with *The Courtship of Eddie's Father* in which Rose's designs were naturalized within the narrative of the film, *Made in Paris* uses the fashion show as a device to shoehorn in fashions that didn't necessarily make sense narratively. The general awkwardness of the costumes also demonstrates the ways in which veteran Hollywood designers were out of step with the youth fashion that was emerging out of London and that would later burst forth in the United States in 1966-67. It is little surprise that the two-year period also marked the retirement of a number of well-known studio designers, including Rose. *Made in Paris* signaled the end of the period in Rose's career during which she skillfully blended fashion into costume.

The final example of this chapter focuses on Ruth Morely but points more broadly to a shifting design ethos that resonated throughout wardrobe departments in the late 1960s and into the 1970s. Before I turn to Morely, let me first sketch a brief picture of costume operations

following the exodus of veteran designers during the late 1960s when costume design became even more decentralized and dispersed. Many films produced at MGM from the mid-60s well into the 1970s do not designate a costume designer at all in their plotbooks. Rather they often credit a costumer or wardrobe staff who might source, fit, or document costumes, but not design them. The names of the costumers Florence Hackett, Rikki Roberts, and Elva Martien appear frequently on the covers of plotbooks, suggesting that these individuals supervised the wardrobe for a number of MGM productions during the latter part of the decade. Costumers were, and remain, important figures within the world of costume departments, and some had a long history in the field. Rikki Roberts, for example, came from a family with roots in the industry. Her mother, Kitty Mager, was once the head of women's wardrobe at MGM. Another costumer at the studio during the 1960s named Eddie Marks would later go on to become the president of Western Costume Company (Shiber 12). Costumers served a vital role in the production process and yet their labor has been largely undocumented. As a corrective, the following list includes films costumed by wardrobe staff whose names appear on plotbooks, but who are rarely acknowledge in a film's production credits:

Get Yourself a College Girl (1964), aka *The Go-Go Set* and *Watusi-A-Go-Go*
        Costumers: Florence Hackett (women) and Norman Burza (men)

Point Blank (1967)
        Costumers: Margo Weintz (women) and Lambert Marks (men)

The Power (1967)
        Costumer: Elva Martien

Where Were You When the Lights Went Out? (1968)
        Costume designer for Doris Day: Glenn Connelly
        Wardrobe staff: Anne Laune

Alex in Wonderland (1970)
        Costume designer for Ellen Burstyn: Moss Mabry
        Costumer: Rikki Roberts

Pretty Maids in a Row (1971)
        Costume designer: Bill Theiss
        Costumer: Elva Martien.
        note: Even though this film has a costume designer, many of the female characters still
        provided elements of their own costume. The note "All wardrobe personal" appears
        frequently throughout the plotbook.

One is a Lonely Number (1972)
        Wardrobe mistress: Dina Joseph

Westworld (1973)
        Wardrobe supervisor: Richard Bruno
        Women's wardrobe: Betsy Cox

Norman...Is that You? (1976)
        Costume designer: Michael Travis
        Costumers: Oda Broulard (women) and Jed Clark (men)

Coma (1977)
        Costumers: Yvonne Kubis (women) and Eddie Marks (men)

The plotbook for the 1972 thriller *The Carey Treatment* is representative of the changes

in wardrobing practices during this period. Jack Bear designed the costumes, some of which

came from the actors' own personal closets. The first two costume changes for Elizabeth Allen,

who plays Evelyn Randall in the film, were provided by the actress herself. For the second

change, the costume plot details a blue and white two-piece suit made of wool and tweed worn

with a blouse attached to the skirt. The plot also describes in detail the character's shoes,

pantyhose and jewelry with the notation "Entire outfit personal including jewelry." The shift here

regards the movement from creation to documentation, from fantasy to reality. Whereas on-the-

lot studio costume departments meticulously crafted and produced costumes, the emphasis in the

post-studio era of the sixties and seventies was on documentation and reality in which the

costume itself carried material traces of the real person behind the character. The reasons for this

are partially budgetary, but it also reflects a broader trend toward realist cinema of the 1970s.

Costume serves as a material manifestation of this shifting aesthetic. During the studio era, Janes Gaines writes that "costume tells the woman's story."[32] Gaines argues that the construction, detailing, and complexity of women's costumes could convey meaning about character that was not necessarily made explicit through the narrative. Costume excess negotiated narrative excess as beads, feathers, and velvety folds conveyed visual meaning that was a source of pleasure and communication for female spectators outside of the straight narrative action. By contrast, post-studio costuming practices did not allow for such visual pleasure and communication because thin narratives and weak female characters could not support costume excess. The character might collapse under the weight of the costume, if such a costume were possible in the first place. In the post-studio era, then, costume and character still operated hand-in-hand. As costuming became increasingly de-prioritized, so too did the importance of female characters. This relationship was correlative, however, and not causal as examples of well-costumed films could still produce poorly-crafted characters. Likewise, interesting female characters could appear in fairly simple costumes. This is evidenced through the work of the costume designer Ruth Morely, whose work is representative of the kind of costuming practices that emerged in the post-studio era.

Morley is unique both in the way she worked and the detailed records that exist of her work. Her papers are housed at the Margaret Herrick Library and consist overwhelmingly of loose sketches, cash register receipts, hand-written budget breakdowns, fabric swatches, small notebooks with production ideas, notes on continuity, and correspondence. Morley began her career with stage costuming before moving to the film world. Her first film was *Never Love a Stranger* in 1958 and her last was *The Prince of Tides* in 1991, the same year she died. She is

[32] See Gaines, "Costume and Narrative: How Dress Tells the Woman's Story" for a developed discussion of the role costume plays beyond the narrative.

perhaps most well-known for costuming Diane Keaton in *Annie Hall* (1977). Her first major film was *The Hustler* (1961). The film was directed by Robert Rossen and produced by his production company in conjunction with Twentieth Century-Fox. Despite being new to the world of film, memos between Morley and John Graham, the unit production manager, reveal that she was unafraid to challenge dictates from the producers. Apparently Graham had suggested that Morely store some costumes for the film at her apartment after some confusion as to whether or not Morley had access to the storage facilities at 20th Century-Fox. Morley replied unequivocally, "My closet is not available unless you want to shoot the whole film in my apartment."[33] This tone of confidence and self-possession runs through Morely's papers and it is clear she worked according to her own methods. Incidentally, the approximate costume budget for *The Hustler* was $2,000 – a far cry from the small fortune spent on *The Greatest Story Ever Told* – a clear indication of the ways that smaller scale productions could have a more lasting impact than grand spectacles (Morley, "Approximate").

The records for *Child's Play* (1972) exemplify Morley's working methods. The film was produced by Paramount and directed by Sidney Lumet. Her work on this film echoes her working method on both *Lilith* (1964) and Shirley Clarke's independent film *The Connection* (1962), among Morley's other films.[34] Morley was paid the flat rate of $600 per week for her work on *Child's Play* (Morley, "Deal"). Records for the film include petty cash forms, handwritten descriptions of expenses, and costs for supplies for the wardrobe department, including something as basic as sewing machine needles. The following is a sample listing of Morley's expenses:

Macy's - 1 pr. slacks - Leopold $7.80

---

[33] See the memo from Ruth Morley to John Graham.
[34] See Morley, "Production notes" for both films.

Thrift shop - socks, sweaters, (boys) $14.98
Sewing Machine needles, Macys $.31
Arthaus - Vyella skirts - tan, heavy $84.76
Style Uniform - uniform, shoes, stockings Mrs. C - $26.70[35]

This is very typical of the kinds of records Morley kept for both herself and for reimbursement from the production budget. Unlike other costume plots that were bound and uniform, Morley's plotbooks are comprised of notes on loose leaf paper, costume sketches on the backs of scrap paper, and notes on manila folders.[36] These notes tell us how she costumed films. She purchased clothes from local department stores, thrift stores, and uniform shops in order to alter them for a particular costume. She gathered supplies for the department herself and handwrote her budgets and expense reports. Morley's working method characterizes the ways in which costume departments had shifted in the post-studio era. The difference between Walter Plunkett's plotbook for *The Barretts of Wimpole Street* and Morley's notes for *Child's Play* represent the movement from a centralized space of production to a more diffuse expanse of locales through which one might procure materials for a costume. Whereas Plunkett had an extensive department, budget, and studio facilities at his disposal, Morely functioned as a one-woman crew. Her approach to costuming brings renewed significance to the phrase "all wardrobe personal" as Morley, and costume designers after her, found themselves reinventing the circumstances of production within the craft. As the many plotbooks, production notes, and costume budgets by Morely and others demonstrate, the period ranging from the late 1950s into the 1970s was a time in which sourcing materials and gathering costumes could be piecemeal work. Costume designers went from being creative directors of their own mini production factories to working on a much smaller scale, or alternately working outside of the industry

---

[35] See Morley, "Production notes for *Child's Play*," specifically budget forms and receipts.
[36] Ibid.

altogether. Costumers were tasked with the job of putting together a wardrobe with limited resources and lagging industrial support. This shift in costuming practices was the result of a constellation of factors: The consent decree of 1948 altered the studio structure, which ultimately resulted in smaller wardrobe departments; established designers of the studio era were retiring from the industry in the face of changing tastes in fashion; unknown female stars did not rely on costume as part of their image; historical dramas and costume films were becoming less popular with audiences and led to high production costs with limited returns; the general shift toward a more realist aesthetic did not embrace spectacular costume; location shooting demanded smaller, more dispersed wardrobe departments. These factors resulted in definitive shifts in the production practices in costume departments, which ultimately impacted the look of female characters onscreen.

2.5   INCREASED DISPERSAL AND INTERNATIONAL CO-PRODUCTIONS

During this period there were, of course, still large-scale productions. Increasingly often, these films were co-financed by American and international production companies. As a way to consider the full scope of studio costuming practices, this section will briefly examine the costume plots for two such productions. Interestingly, gender arises as a point of contention in surprising ways. Gender is an issue both in terms of production labor and in relation to the costumes produced insofar as the number of men's costumes far outnumbered those designed for women. This clearly indicates that the number of roles for men outnumbered those for women, which again supports the significance of the correlation between costume and onscreen representation. Two examples, *The Greatest Story Ever Told* (1965) and *Day of the Jackal*

(1973), demonstrate this phenomenon and illustrate the unique wardrobing challenges presented by international co-productions. Documents from these films show that it was difficult to manage and coordinate crews in different locations. Piecing these documents into a narrative also reveals the specific gender and labor issues that arose during each film's production process.

The Greatest Story Ever Told, was directed by George Stevens and produced by his company, George Stevens Productions, with distributed by United Artists. The film was an epic costume drama about the life of Jesus and was shot in various locations across the U.S. southwest. It was a bloated production whose cost overruns were legendary. The costumes for the film were by designed by Vittorio Nino Novarese in collaboration with former Warner Bros. designer Marjorie Best. Novarese was an Italian costume designer who had relocated to Hollywood in the late 1940s. Just prior to arriving for production on *The Greatest Story*, Novarese had costumed *Cleopatra* (1963), Twentieth Century-Fox's infamous budget buster starring Elizabeth Taylor. Written memos between the producers and wardrobe staff for *The Greatest Story* reveal budget details about the production process. Novarese was put on the payroll as costume designer at the end of December 1962 with the salary of $1000 per week. A "wardrobe man" was also hired to assist Novarese at the cost of $350 per week. As a point of reference, several other crew were hired around the same time. Ray Gosnell was hired as the first assistant director at $450 per week. William Mellor was hired as a cameraman at $1500 per week and an unnamed set director was to be hired at $500 per week (Andre).

Early in the production, Novarese made an inquiry to Giuseppi Peruzzi of the Italian costume rental company Costume d'Arte about the cost of renting military uniforms.[37] In

---

[37] Costume d'Arte is an Italian costume house founded in 1815 by the Napoleonic soldier Angelo Pignotti. Pignotti began the company by lending military uniforms to Italian painters who sought realism in their depictions of subject matter. The company has lasted through several generations and changing media and is still in operation today.

addition to servicing the Italian film industry, Costume d'Arte had helped costume several large-scale Hollywood co-productions in the 1960s such as *Spartacus* (1960) and *The Leopard* (1963). Novarese corresponded with Peruzzi over several months in 1962 regarding the cost and logistics of securing Italian costumes for the production. Peruzzi sent a quote for costume rental to Novarese noting the cost of clothing rental and the increase in costs if made-to-order clothing was necessary. Peruzzi wrote: "We can make new costumes if necessary, and in this case the prices would increase 50%...If desired, we can make new costumes for you at a price increase of between 60% to 80% for High Class category, and 25% for the Crowd category" (Peruzzi). The memo quotes prices for six months of rental per costumes. The uniform for a heavy infantry solider was $81.61; $72.58 for light infantry; $133.07 for a dress officer, and so on. With made-to-order wardrobe costing half again as much, it is easy to see how the production budget swelled. The next month the production team met with Novarese and David Berman, from the costume supplier Max Berman & Sons, to discuss the logistics of shipping costumes from Italy. Notes from the meeting mention the staff having talked to Norman Deming, the production manager on *Spartacus*, about union issues and the logistics of shipping the *Cleopatra* wardrobe. The following excerpt from the meeting notes dictated by Frank Davis details the concerns about shipping costumes internationally:

> [Frank] Davis to speak to Lou Barnett of Barnett International (Customs Brokers) to determine how they successfully brought '*Spartacus*' costumes in under bond. Andre to check cost of shipment and time required to ship costumes here. Andre also to talk to Gil Kurland with respect to how costumes were handled on '*Taras Bulba*.' Were there union problems, customs levies, etc.
>
> Berman estimated if there are no customs levies he can manufacture costumes in London and deliver them to us approximately 25% cheaper than having them manufactured here. (Berman has already manufactured Roman military costumes for '*Cleopatra*'.) Berman estimated six weeks to manufacture and approximately eight to ten weeks in the aggregate to deliver them here. Even if it is required to pay duty he estimates the

possibility of saving approximately 10% by having them manufactured in London rather than here.

Alternatively, Berman suggested making the hard goods here and the rest of the costume in London, which would save substantial shipping costs. (Deming reported shipping charges on '*Spartacus*' of approximately $5,000, which he estimated was comprised of $2,000 for costumes and $3,000 for props.

Andre check with Deming or Golitzen to see if Universal brought in costumes themselves or through local costume house and whether this has any effect on the union situation.[38]

A subsequent memo from George Stevens to executive producer Frank Davis notes that David Berman planned to purchase the military wardrobe from *Cleopatra* in order to import the costumes and rent them to *The Greatest Story* production. The memo goes on to compare the cost of renting these costumes through Berman, Western, or Peruzzi. Other memos then describe the problems with having the costumes made in the U.S., local labor unions, and problems with importing (Stevens). What is clear from these memos is that sourcing costumes for an epic production was a costly and complicated affair involving negotiations with domestic and international costume rental houses, other productions, and labor unions. Because *Cleopatra* had been such a drain on Twentieth Century-Fox very recently, Stevens must have been sensitive to cost overruns. As it turns out, he was.

Marjorie Best, a well-known studio designer, was brought onto the project in July of 1962 (Newman). The costume designer Renie, who had worked on *Cleopatra* and was an authority on period design, was also considered for hire but is not credited as a member of the production.[39] With so many designers involved, the production ran into problems. In March of 1963 Novarese quit the production due to a dispute with Stevens over the costume for the character Pilate. Stevens wanted Pilate in a military costume while Novarese argued that it

---

[38] Copy of notes on a meeting with David Berman, Novarese, Tom Andre, Ray Gosnell, and Vellani. CC'd to George Stevens. Notes dictated by Frank Davis, dated Feb. 08, 1962.
[39] Western Union telegram, dated Aug. 15, 1962, George Stevens Papers.

wasn't historically accurate (Novarese). By February of 1963, just before Novarese's exit, a partial list of the rented, purchased, and manufactured costumes quotes the cost at $25,620 ("Costume Report"). This was exorbitant at a time when wardrobe departments were on shoestring budgets. Other problems plagued the shoot and eventually costuming credit went to Novarese and Best, who were nominated for an Academy Award for costume design in the color category. This example demonstrates that costume design was still an important part of creating a massive feature film designed to draw audiences, however it is equally significant that the production was fraught with difficulties in the same way that other period films like *Cleopatra* were. These difficulties surely made studios more hesitant to invest in such spectacles.

Day of the Jackal (1973) is the second example of the ways in which a dispersed costume department led to production difficulties. The film is the sort of international co-production that had become increasingly typical in Hollywood in the post-studio era. The film was directed by Fred Zinnemann, an American émigré director originally from Poland. It was produced by the British studio Warwick Film Productions, Ltd. and Universal Productions France. The film was shot in England and France and featured an exclusively English and French cast including the film's British star Edward Fox. During filming one of the film's French co-producers, Julien Derode, sent Zinnemann a memo regarding wardrobing for the film. Apparently Zinnemann had expressed the desire to have two female English costume designers on the crew. Derode replied that although he trusted Zinnemann's opinion on the matter, the film was first and foremost a "men's film," a fact that seemed to cause Derode concern as to whether female designers could handle the number of French military costumes. Derode further noted that union requirements dictated that a French wardrobe crew member had to be hired. Derode said that he would have the connections and suppliers they would need to produce a film in France. As a final indication

that Derode had little faith in, or patience for, the English costume designers, he denied the women the use of the company car. Derode wrote, "it would not be advisable…that the personal car of the wardrobe man be used for the two ladies to go round the shops and other places they have to go. That means that we would have our three wardrobe people stuck to do the work of one just to save the use of a car." He concluded the memo by apologizing to Zinnemann before noting that the production should still "manage to benefit as much as possible" from their presence on the crew (Derode).

Zinnemann hired two British costume designers nonetheless, Elizabeth Haffenden and Joan Bridge, who were well-known and established within the British film industry. Existing wardrobe memos from the production indicate that Haffenden and Bridge had to justify costuming choices to the producers on at least two further separate occasions. In one such memo the two answer several production questions such as why a particular number of shirts were made, by whom they were made, and the reasoning behind the fabrics with which they were made (Haffenden). One of the major costuming issues was about where Edward Fox's shirts were be made. Haffenden and Bridge had placed an order for twenty-two custom shirts through Fox's own shirt-maker Harborow's, which was a family business that had subsequently been bought by Sulka, a luxury men's haberdashery. This seemed excessive to producers and thus the costume designers were forced to defend their choices in a memo to Zinnemann, who in turn defended their work to the film's producers.

The same day that Zinnemann received Haffenden and Bridge's memo, he sent another memo to David Deutsch, the film's co-producer alongside Derode, regarding the wardrobe for Edward Fox. Zinnemann reiterated the rationale for the designers' choices and noted that although the details on the costuming process were "well-known to every good Second Assistant

director, let alone his superiors," he felt it necessary to put the requests and justifications for Fox's wardrobe on the record. The director concluded the memo by writing, "it would be poor policy indeed if my instructions were counter-manded by anyone else without prior discussion with me" (Zinnemann). The tone and the wording of Zinnemann's memo indicate that he trusted the choices Haffenden and Bridge had made and that further questioning their decisions would only result in production delays and subsequent budget overruns. Zinnemann's impatience with the producers' questioning was warranted. Haffenden had a long career in the industry and had worked with Zinnemann previously on *A Man for All Seasons* (1966), *Behold a Pale Horse* (1964), and *The Sundowners* (1960). The need for Haffenden and Bridge to defend their work was certainly partially owed to Derode's ignorance of their reputations. While their decisions may have been scrutinized in their native England, this example demonstrates the kinds of issues that were particular to films co-produced among several international studios and to the gender politics that female designers faced in the industry.

2.6   ADAPTING CALDWELL WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF COSTUME AND FASHION

There are two ways of looking at the shift in working methods of costume departments during the 1960s and 70s. One way is to examine the production processes from the perspective of industry and the kinds of production cultures initiated by these shifts. The second approach is to explore how these shifts impacted the cultural activity produced through costume and fashion during the era. To the first issue, Caldwell suggests that industry represents itself to itself. He writes that scholars have historically explained film and television in terms of categories like

genre, narrative, and audience. Caldwell argues, however, that "the social performance of show making itself must also be considered to fully understand film and television form" (Caldwell, *Production* 81). Adapting Caldwell's notion to the realm of costume and fashion, one of the most visible ways that film does this is through the onscreen fashion show. I discuss the offscreen fashion show in detail in the next chapter, and scholars like Charlotte Herzog and Caroline Evans have written about the onscreen fashion show as an example of fashion promotion within film. I have shown that costume departments were undergoing tremendous changes as everyday fashion became more prominent in wardrobe departments. It is therefore interesting to note the number of films in my survey that deal explicitly with the fashion industry. In *Designing Woman* (1957) Lauren Bacall plays a fashion designer. In *BUtterfield 8* (1960) Elizabeth Taylor plays a model. In *The Courtship of Eddie's Father* (1963) Dina Merrill plays a fashion buyer, and in *Made in Paris* (1968) Ann-Margaret plays an assistant fashion buyer. The list continues of films concerned with the production and exhibition of women's fashion within film.

This practice is significant as an example of the sort of industrial self-reflexivity that Caldwell theorizes. For him, this reflexivity occurs in trade shows and insider literature through which the industry defines itself to itself. In these examples of costume, however, the onscreen fashion show becomes a site through which the work of wardrobe departments and costume designers promoted fashion, but also reflected the work of designers to the film industry itself through explicit visual displays unmotivated by narrative. The representations of the fashion industry through female characters that worked within it further speaks to the ways in which these films were aware of the relationship among costume and fashion and created depictions that can be read as modes of self-reflexivity that considered two audiences, the filmgoers and the fashion industry itself. This speaks to Philip Napoli's notion of the dual marketplace in which

media operates with two consumer audiences in mind. This would seem to suggest a reflexive partnership between the film and fashion industries that production studies scholarship might recognize. As I have argued, however, production studies scholarship tends to ignore the fashion industry altogether. Scholars within the larger field of media studies, like Malcolm Barnard and Djurdja Bartlett, do recognize the importance of fashion, the fashion industry, and fashion media, which is an emerging field and one also overlooked by production studies scholars, but their work tends to be considered outside of film studies. Yet since Loie Fuller's *Serpentine Dance* in 1896, women have been linked to fashion and film and thus these industries are what Thomas Schatz might describe as "adjacent," though he likely didn't have fashion in mind when considering the term. Schatz describes adjacent industries as those that, after the decline of the film industry in the post-war era, have been "brought into the same corporate realm" (Schatz 47). Adjacent industries might be content providers or might offer alternate forms of distribution and exhibition and Schatz cites the example of the DVD. Its development introduced two adjacent industries, consumer electronics and personal computers, into the home entertainment sector. The three industries together helped boost the profits of one another. While fashion fits less neatly into the industrial sphere of the DVD, the two industries are nevertheless linked. The promotion of fashion through film, and film through fashion, situates fashion as an ancillary industry to film. Thus fashion operates as adjacent/ancillary to the film industry. This is significant because this recognition allows film to be considered in the multiple and diffuse sites in which fashion also functions. Linking film and fashion industrially opens possibilities for analyzing these media across different platforms, channels of distribution, modes of exhibition, and arenas of promotion. This, then, allows a consideration of costume-as-fashion that moves between the two industries. Opening this channel allows a fuller analysis of the way that fashion

functions as costume so that it becomes significant when an actress wears her own clothes onscreen because it draws in a different set of industrial, cultural, aesthetic factors.

In conclusion, within wardrobe departments, the female figure of the studio era gave way to more individualized, though paradoxically less visible, female figures of the post-studio era. As spectacular costume ceded its pride-of-place to more "personal" wardrobe, formations of female identity began to multiply and become more intimate. Collective action was reconfigured into individual effort. The velvet cape Walter Plunkett designed for Jennifer Jones in *The Barretts of Wimpole Street* represents the time and work of many hands. Ruth Morley's shirt dress for Piper Laurie in *The Hustler*, however, represents a singular effort that somewhat effaces the labor behind producing the dress initially. Yet Morley's dress is more accessible than Plunkett's cape and there is a far greater chance that the dress saw more circulation as a mobile signifier than the cape. In these ways costuming practices of the 1960s and 70s blur the lines between production and consumption practices. While this chapter has focused on the production elements of costume design, it is clear that what is needed now is a study of the film, fashion, costume, and consumption during the same period.

3.0 "STAR IN CREPE":GOLDEN AGE HOLLYWOOD COSTUMES, JUNIOR LEAGUES, AND DEPARTMENT STORE FASHION SHOWS

3.1 EDITH HEAD AND "THE MOST FAMOUS DRESS IN HOLLYWOOD"

On the afternoon of May 8, 1978 Edith Head appeared at Horne's department store at the corner of Penn Avenue and Stanwix Street in downtown Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The regional department store was the oldest department store in Pittsburgh, and one of the oldest in the country, opening in 1849 ("Store Planned"). However, by the late 1970s the store was struggling as retail outlets had long begun their move into suburban malls and larger national conglomerates had begun to acquire smaller regional outlets. Head's appearance at the downtown store marked not only the final chapter of Head's celebrated career, but also the end of a particular kind of shopping experience rooted in urban spaces and perhaps still dimly associated with the sensual pleasures of shopping at department store palaces during the turn of the century. Head appeared with a collection of her movie costumes, which she staged as a fashion show on a makeshift runway between the bedding and drapery departments at Horne's. Head showed gowns she designed for Dorothy Lamour, Ava Gardner, Rosalind Russell, and Carole Lombard, among others. The gowns were worn by models made up to look like the stars who wore the originals. As they paraded down the runway Head narrated the event with insider tidbits on the gowns and the actresses who made them famous. Photographs of the event show spectators seated in folding

chairs, lining the runway and applauding with their eyes cast upwards at models such as the ersatz Carole Lombard. This Lombard wore what Head called the "oldest and most famous" of her creations, a white satin dress with a white fur-trimmed cape. Head claimed that Lombard wore the gown at a cocktail party where she famously met Clark Gable.[40]

Sketches exist of the Lombard gown Head showed that day, and the gown still appears from time to time at costume exhibitions. Recently an auction house in Beverly Hills exhibited a sketch of the gown alongside a still of Lombard wearing a similar gown in one of her films, though pointedly it was not the same gown.[41] In fact, the provenance of the gown is somewhat muddled. It is unclear if Head actually designed the gown for Lombard to wear in a film or for Lombard's own personal wardrobe. Was the gown that Head showed at Horne's department store really Lombard's, or was it something else? What is certain is that in 1976 Head designed the wardrobe for a biopic titled *Gable and Lombard*. In the film Jill Clayburgh plays Lombard and indeed wears the gown that Head exhibited that afternoon at Horne's. When the gown appears in exhibitions of Head's work, it is at times attributed to Carole Lombard and other times attributed to Jill Clayburgh playing Carole Lombard. Despite this ambiguity, the gown gained such an afterlife and association with Lombard that in 1998 it appeared as part of a line of porcelain dolls the Head estate commissioned from the doll artist Robert Tonner. The dolls were crafted in the images of actresses wearing Head creations. The Lombard doll wears the dress that Head designed for *Gable and Lombard*, if not for Lombard herself (Guerin). The Tonner doll again strengthened the association between Head, the dress, and Lombard, even if this association was particularly tenuous. Amid all these iterations, the gown that Head called "the

---

[40] See "Horne's photographs," which appeared in *The Daily News,* McKeesport, PA. Tues., May 9, 1978.
[41] The sketch sold for $1800 in 2009, Julien's Auctions, Beverly Hills, CA. 2009. http://www.liveauctioneers.com/item/6458914.

most famous" dress in Hollywood was actually a recreation of a Lombard dress designed for an actress playing Lombard and reiterated enough over time to become a Lombard dress again, if it ever was to begin with. The life of this particular Lombard dress, then, illustrates the complex circuit among fashion, costume, star, market, and public that characterizes film and fashion in the post-studio era.

This version of the Lombard dress would seem a far cry from what Charles Eckert describes in his essay, "The Carole Lombard in Macy's Window." In that essay, to which I will return later, Eckert describes a gown that Lombard wore in *Rumba* (1935). That gown, designed by Travis Banton, was copied for resale in shops shortly after the film's release. Eckert describes a relationship between film and filmgoer in which an idealized female spectator sees a dress she likes on-screen and wants to buy it for herself. Eckert imagines a fairly direct circuit between film, spectator, and object. In the following chapter, however, I would like to argue that this relationship was perhaps never so simple and by the time of Head's fashion show at Horne's department store, this relationship involved not only spectator and object, but a more complex network of social, affective, and moral impulses.

Before turning to a more thorough examination of Head's fashion shows in the 1960s, it is worth considering a very brief history of the fashion show in relation to film. Caroline Evans claims, "Fashion shows and films came into being almost simultaneously" (110). Scholars like Evans, and Catherine Hindson have pointed to the ways that early film took fashion in movement as its subject.[42] Hindson charts the development of the serpentine dance, perhaps most famously performed by Loïe Fuller, as an exhibition of fashion, film, and movement. Lucy Fischer draws a connection between costume, fashion shows, and the filmed revue in the 1920s and 30s. Fischer

---

[42] See Catherine Hindson "Dancing on Top of the World: A Serpentine through Late Nineteenth-Century Entertainment, Fashion and Film," *Birds of Paradise: Costume as Cinematic Spectacle*.

notes that the early intersections between the musical revue and the fashion show established a template for a particular kind of "fashion walk" in which both sexual display and bodily regimentation were mapped onto the female figure.[43] These scholars all assert that the fashion show had particular affinities with the "cinema of attractions" and Evans suggests that long after film developed the narrative patterns that would move it away from spectacle and into plot-driven storytelling, fashion shows continued to function along the lines of attraction and spectacle (110).

As the early film industry developed, so too did the relationship between fashion and film as a means to sell fashion commodities, but also as a way to draw "respectable" middle-class women into movie theaters. Michelle Finamore details the history of the fashion featurette and the fashion newsreel and their inclusion in programs during the early 1910s. For Finamore, fashion shorts and filmed fashion shows worked to attract female spectators to movie theaters (132-186). Because they were often associated with Parisian couture, high-end department stores, and sophisticated European designers like Paul Poiret, these fashion shows legitimated cinema-going as a middle-class pastime that could even be pedagogical in its pleasures. Moving into the 1930s, 40s, and 50s, fashion shows continued as a means to display couture goods off-screen. On-screen they served a similar purpose. Charlotte Herzog argues that the filmed fashion show "translated luxuriant mise-en-scène into hats, gloves, purses, shoes, lingerie, coats, and dresses, and even directed women to the stores where affordable equivalents could be purchased" (136). Herzog terms this "powder puff" promotion, or a technique whereby the sales pitch is buried in the medium's tremendous capacity to attract and entertain. Like Charles Eckert, Herzog

---

[43] See Lucy Fischer, "Poetry in Motion: Costume, Choreography and the Showgirl Revue in American Cinema in the 1920s – 40s," *Birds of Paradise: Costume as Cinematic Spectacle.*

sees the circuit between spectator, screen, and store as fairly direct. The movies train women what to wear, how to wear it, and where to buy it.

3.2   FROM ADRIAN AND LETTY LYNTON TO BOBBIE BROOKS, INC. AND

GIDGET

In the immediate post-studio era of the 1960s, the relationship between fashion shows and film morphed into something less focused on the seeing-buying paradigm and more concerned with the promotion of less tangible qualities and ideas. During this period a number of factors came together to reshape the seeing-buying model. The decline of the studio system resulted in a number of economic cutbacks, including the dismantling of costume departments, which I have written about in the previous chapter. As a result, the position of the costume designer and costume itself was compromised. The famous 1970 MGM auction testifies to the losses costume departments sustained during the period. In three days the studio auctioned off 350,000 costumes to liquidate stock and make room on MGM's lot. Among the auctioned items, which also included props and set pieces, were Dorothy's ruby slippers.[44] Concomitant with the attrition suffered by costume departments, there was a rather sudden changing of the guards in terms of female stardom. Stars that had been popular during the end of the 1950s and early 1960s like Doris Day, Audrey Hepburn, and Julie Andrews found themselves without much fan support by the middle of the decade. Audiences rather opted for younger, perhaps somewhat less formidable

---

[44] See Julien's Auctions, http://www.juliensauctions.com/collectors-guide/entertainment-memorabilia.html. Accessed 2/27/2015.

female figures like Julie Christie, Mia Farrow, and Edie Sedgwick.[45] These shifts destabilized what had once been two bedrocks of the studio system, glamorous stars and their extravagant wardrobes. With this particular institutional mindset humming in the background, it is illustrative to consider three examples that trace the contours of this transitional period. The first two are brief considerations: Joan Crawford in her move from fashion icon to department store fashion show commentator, and the designer Marjorie Best and her early partnership with the Southern California apparel industry. The third is a more sustained case study of Edith Head during the second phase of her career as an itinerant fashion booster through her traveling fashion shows.

One of the most often cited examples of a film costume that inspired a wave of reproduction is a dress that Joan Crawford wore in *Letty Lynton* (1932). The white cotton organdy gown was designed by Adrian and featured ruffled, puffy sleeves that set off a fury of demand for the gown. Macy's department store manufactured a copy of the dress and sold approximately half a million replicas. Jane Gaines has elaborated on the significance of the gown in terms of the narrative of the film, the development of the woman's story on-screen, and the economic implications of the success of the Macy's version. The popularity of the dress helped establish Crawford as a fashionable clotheshorse, although the delicacy of the fabric and softness of the cut in the *Letty Lynton* gown are not usually associated with Crawford. She is much more often aligned with a silhouette that Adrian created for her at MGM in the 1940s, which remains important to her star image. The iconic Crawford image features her in strong-shouldered suits with narrow skirts, a kind of inverted V-shape that signals power and command, qualities important to Crawford's persona. By the late 1960s, however, Crawford was acting in William

---

[45] For a discussion of stardom in the 1960s, see Pamela Robertson Wojcik, *New Constellations: Movie Stars of the 1960s*.

Castle B-movies and making the occasional television appearance. Though her film roles had become scarce, she maintained a rigorous schedule, doing promotional work for Pepsi-Cola and making public appearances at events like fashion shows. Her collected correspondence from 1963-1970 attests to Crawford's famously driven work ethic. In a series of letters to Jill-Melody Gauron, a fan with whom Crawford carried on an extensive correspondence from 1963-1970, Crawford describes her work schedule. She writes:

> Just flew in last night from Detroit, where I did the Fashion Show at J.L. Hudson's. Will Be doing a show at John Wanamaker's, Philadelphia, September 16, at Kaufman's in Pittsburgh on September 25, at Woodard & Lothrop in Washington, D.C. on October 2, at H.&S. Pogue in Cincinnati on October 10, and at Best's in New York on October 23."[46]

Crawford's role in these events would have been as a narrator and celebrity presence rather than model, but her participation underscores the importance of fashion to all phases of Crawford's career. In the 1930s Crawford performed in films like *The Bride Wore Red* (1937) and *The Women* (1939), films that she said were really just "fashion shows," indistinguishable and without plot (Quirk 87). These films showcased spectacular costumes from the Golden Age of costume design, and Crawford was adept at wearing clothes. Indeed her association with fashion became an asset and in the final years of her career, as Crawford toured with fashion shows, she provided a voice from Hollywood's past that lent authority to the clothes. Crawford's late career engagement with fashion shows suggests the opportunities that were available to actresses who had emerged and developed during the studio era. She was a symbol of "old Hollywood" and an actress not often regarded for her performances, but rather for her image. Her presence at Wanamaker's and Kaufman's department stores seems discordant, and yet

---

[46] See correspondence from Joan Crawford to Jill-Melody Gauron, which contains: 59 letters or telegrams from Crawford to Gauron covering the period from September 15, 1963 through October 31, 1970. The file includes one where Crawford mentions Christina, June 22, 1966, and one where she gives the schedule of her fashion shows, September 11, 1968, and one from the set of TROG, August 14, 1969.

Crawford was merely exploiting a familiar relationship between film and fashion that she had relied upon for her entire career. However, one wonders whether her presence at these department store fashion shows relied on a kind of camp appeal. Certainly her last few films, including *Strait-Jacket* (1964), *Berserk* (1967), and *Trog* (1970), are now regarded as minor camp masterpieces. Those films were made during the time she participated in the department store fashion shows. The question of camp and performance has durably attended Crawford's career. Richard Dyer has discussed Crawford in relation to the manufacture of appearance, writing "The processes of manufacturing an appearance are often thought to be more real than the appearance itself – appearance is mere illusion, is surface" (Dyer 1). For Dyer, Crawford is constructed through multiple lenses that always seek to reveal and obscure the "real" Crawford. Surface appearance becomes the thing that must be overturned to discover the "real." These notions of camp, surface, and appearance will figure into a discussion of performativity and the public self later in this chapter.

The second example of a film figure that crossed over to the retail fashion world is Marjorie Best. Best spent most of her career at Warner Bros. where her first major film was *Life with Father* (1947). She stayed with the studio through 1960, earning four Academy Award nominations and one award. She designed for many different stars and genres of film, although she is best known for her work on period films and Westerns like *Giant* (1956) and *Rio Bravo* (1959). After Best left Warner Bros., she worked as an independent designer on just five more films. In 1965 she retired from the business following her last Academy Award nomination for *The Greatest Story Ever Told* (1965). Best's collected papers reveal that she was very active in the film costume community in Los Angeles. Correspondence between Best and members of the Fashion Industries Club for Mount Saini Hospital, the Costume Designers Guild of Hollywood,

the Motion Pictures Designers Guild, and The Fashion Club all document Best's appearance at benefit functions or her contributions for film fashion shows.[47] Best's involvement with both the film and fashion communities speaks to her interest in both film costuming and fashion design. One such letter particularly demonstrates the ways that Best seemed to have a different kind of design strategy in mind. As opposed to Golden Age designers like Travis Banton and Jean-Louis, Best seemed interested in creating accessible designs in lieu of one-of-a-kind couture gowns. On January 13, 1950, Best appeared at a meeting of the California Apparel Designers (CAD) in Los Angeles. She spoke to the assembled group of apparel manufactures about the potentially lucrative relationship between costume design and fashion design. Best proposed that fashion designers should keep in mind the importance of designing wearable costumes that could also serve as models for every day clothing lines for women. As opposed to designing gowns that were spectacles in themselves, as designers had done during the 1930s and 40s, Best urged for more practical designs and worked to convince the assembled group of the potential of this kind of design. The following day CAD president Jack Handford sent Best a thank you note praising her insights. Handford wrote, "Screen credits and the chances of winning an Oscar are very nice, but there is something to be said for turning out an acceptable dress for $10.75 that will sell by the hundreds." Handford's note anticipates the shifting dynamic between costume and fashion during the 1960s in which costume and fashion became ever more intertwined. Perhaps even more significantly, Best's notion that costume should beget affordable fashion brings into question the meaning of the knock-off. If Joan Crawford's Banton-designed gown inspired knock-offs at Macy's, what might a knock-off of Best's $10.75 dress look like? And who might afford it?

---

[47] See letters from Jack Handford, Harry Roth, and Gladys Mensh in Marjorie Best Papers at the Margaret Herrick Library.

Best's comments at the meeting were prescient in other ways. During the studio era, costumes like the *Letty Lynton* gown influenced fashion. Reproductions were available at department stores as well as a chain of stores called Cinema Fashion Shops (Eckert 107). These shops sold high-end replicas of gowns worn by stars on-screen. As the example with Best illustrates, however, in the post-studio era this paradigm shifted. Instead, fashion began to influence costume design as collaborations between studios and apparel manufacturers occurred at both the production and distribution phases, rather than merely the distribution phase. As a result, ready-to-wear fashions superseded extravagant costumes on-screen as marketing opportunities affected costume design at the production phase. This marks a new paradigm within the practices of costume departments and within it, stylists and fashion consultants began to rival costume designers, significantly altering the production culture of costume departments. At the distribution phase, clothing manufacturers teamed with studios to promote film fashions through magazine layouts, department store fashion shows, in-person star appearances, and the development of star-inspired fashion lines. Through these variously mediated promotions, consumers were encouraged to experience film fashions via the film as well as alternate narratives imagined in magazines and fashion shows. Thus, the shifting relationship between fashion and costume had a lasting effect on both the culture of costume production and the ways in which studios imagined and addressed female consumers.

One such example of a collaboration at the production stage between a film and the apparel industry is demonstrated through the film *Gidget Goes Hawaiian* (1961). Correspondence between Eve Barber, a "stylist-fashion consultant" at Bobbie Brooks, Inc. and the producers of the film reveals the ways that corporate entities began to supplant the role of the costume designer. Bobbie Brooks manufactured sports and leisure wear for women. The

87

company contacted the producers for *Gidget Goes Hawaiian* and offered to provide the wardrobe for Sandra Dee and the other female cast members free of charge. They also offered to introduce a "Sandra Dee" line of clothing, and promote both the film and the clothing in national advertising campaigns in magazines like *Seventeen* and *Mademoiselle.* In exchange, the company asked that Dee wear Bobbie Brooks clothes in the film and appear at publicity functions. In inter-office memos producers of the film agreed that the Bobbie Brooks tie-in "could result in one of the most important apparel merchandising promotions ever developed for one of our films" (Flinn). Indeed Bobbie Brooks and the *Gidget* franchise were both ahead of the curve in their appeal to adolescent and teenage girls.

Best seemed to understand this dynamic between the film and fashion industries and was active in promoting her costumes and fashion through events held by fashion clubs like The Fashion Group and the Fashion Industries Club for Mount Sinai Hospital.[48] These events were organized by members of the Motion Pictures Designers Guild or board members of the respective fashion club, which were often civic groups whose board members were also local business boosters. The fashion shows for these events served two purposes. First they showcased and promoted fashions by designers like Best and Edith Head for contemporary films such as *Funny Face* (1957) and *Buffalo Grass* (1956). These fashion shows displayed costume as fashion and allowed Best to cross over into the fashion industry in Southern California. Secondly, these shows often functioned as charity events to raise funds or awareness for a particular cause. The Fashion Industries Club or Mount Sinai, for example, worked to raise funds for its free medical services community program. Thus the fashion shows benefited particular studio designers, the

---

[48] See correspondence from the Marjorie Best Papers, Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections for more description of these fashion shows.

fashion industry in Los Angeles, and community charities. The examples of Best and Crawford show that the fashion show could be used as a means to extend a career as well as crossover into a neighboring industry.

3.3   PAYING HOMAGE: THE COMMERCIAL AND CIVIC FUNCTION OF FASHION SHOWS

One of the questions that emerges from this shift in the dynamic between costume and fashion concerns the role of the fashion show, and in particular the fashion show featuring Hollywood costumes. Fashion itself experienced seismic shifts during the 1960s. Diana Vreeland's enduring portmanteau, "youthquake," attests to the fact that youth culture had erupted in the middle of the decade.[49] Youth culture defined fashion trends and the fashion show underwent changes for certain fashion cultures. For example, a London fashion show in the mid-sixties might feature models dancing to rock and roll music while wearing the latest in hip Carnaby Street fashions, the location that served as the fashion center of swinging London. A fashion newsreel from 1967 features models in futuristic fashions "suitable for the best dressed ladies in the year 2000." The clothes are space age designs made of transparent plastics and geometric prints. At the end of the fashion show, the women get into a space ship to visit their friends in the "outer space suburbs" ("Vintage"). These kinds of fashion shows highlighted the forward-looking energy of youth fashion movements in Europe. However, in malls, department stores, and ladies' lunches in the United States, the fashion show remained a stable showcase for accessible fashions for middle-

---

[49] Vreeland coined the term in the Jan. 01, 1965 issue of *Vogue*, a magazine for which she was the editor-in-chief from 1963-1971.

class women. In Hollywood, Edith Head used the fashion show to display and circulate her own creations.

Of the studio designers of the period, perhaps Head was the most masterful in using the fashion show as a means to promote her own brand and maintain relevancy during a period in which costume designers were becoming less crucial within the world of film production. Edith Head began her career at Paramount Studios in 1924 where she was famously hired despite not having any background in costume design. In 1938 she was named Costume Design Supervisor and remained at that post until 1967 (Turim 227). Following her tenure at Paramount, Head went to Universal where she remained until her death in 1981. By the time she went to Universal, Head's film work had lessened substantially and she was often a nominal presence at the studio. Instead she concentrated on work for television, as many film costume designers did, and curating her fashion shows. Her fashion show and attendant work might be considered a secondary phase of her career. Head hosted fashion shows from the early 1960s through March of the year she died, 1981 (Head, "Programs"). In addition to the fashion shows, Head wrote two instructional books on dressing, designed patterns for Vogue, designed military uniforms for the Coast Guard, and relentlessly promoted Hollywood glamour. The following section examines Head's 1960s fashion shows in detail in order to analyze the network of meaning Head mobilized in her promotion of Hollywood costume, and herself, in the second phase of her career during which she focused on fashion instruction rather than fashion design.

On a Tuesday evening in November, 1960 The Fashion Industries Club for Mount Sinai Hospital and Clinic of Los Angeles (FIC) hosted a fashion festival and charity ball titled "A

Night to Remember."[50] The event was intended to serve two interwoven purposes. First, the fashion festival was to pay homage to "our American beauties." Secondly, the show was held as a charity function. To the first point, the American beauties in this case were named by the Fashion Industries Club and were selected as symbols of "the image of American women present to the entire world." Specifically, these women were the actresses Cyd Charisse, Mitzi Gaynor, Natalie Wood, Merle Oberon, and Julie London. These actresses were chosen to represent "women everywhere" who had, according to the program for the event, "graciously accepted Southern California's leadership in the world of fashion and design." While this claim may seem somewhat encompassing, the reason behind it is entirely practical. 1960 marked FIC's fifth annual fashion festival and ball, suggesting that by the mid-1950s the organization was already established and functioning as a charitable club devoted to both the promotion of the Southern California apparel industry and fund-raising for Mount Sinai Hospital. This is significant because by the mid-1950s Paris was still considered the leader of the fashion world and Dior's full-skirted "New Look" of 1947 still dominated runways and designs for film costumes. Thus the language that FIC used in its event program speaks to the aspirational nature of Southern California's still burgeoning apparel industry. The language reflects the industry's knack for self-promotion as well as its efforts to associate itself with charitable good works and old-fashioned Hollywood glamour. This intersection among the fashion, film, and health care industries in Southern California forged an odd alliance which served to legitimize the two former industries though an association with the latter one.

The fashion festival was designed and staged by Don Loper (fig. 01). Loper was himself a costume and fashion designer known for his classic, feminine 1950s cocktail dresses as well as

[50] See the program in Head's Papers, fashion show programs 1960-1965, in Special Collections at the Margaret Herrick Library.

his line of men's neckties. Loper, who began his career as a dancer, had worked as an assistant to MGM musicals producer Arthur Freed and was rumored to have introduced Judy Garland to her future husband Vincent Minnelli. He appeared onscreen as well; Loper played himself in an episode of the *I Love Lucy Show* called "The Fashion Show." In the episode Lucy schemes to get a Loper original dress and appears in a fashion show in Loper's Hollywood salon during which she unwittingly lampoons the mannerisms of fashion models (Marling 38).[51] Loper was also a figure associated with lavish musicals and intimate insider lore, and was therefore ideally suited to the task of evoking Golden Age Hollywood. And, of course, it was all for a good cause as the second purpose of the evening was the charity ball, designed to raise funds for Mount Sinai's free medical service for the sick and needy. This legitimizing move would be repeated throughout the decade as fashion shows evoking "old Hollywood glamour" would be staged as charitable functions or within the setting of civic clubs. Often fashion shows were staged at men's civic club conventions. They were offered as entertainment for the wives while the husbands attended convention activities. These fashion shows offered women an important venue in which to network and form social connections of their own while their husbands did the same at club functions.[52]

The evocation of Hollywood glamor raises the question of just what mode of Hollywood was being evoked. What version of Hollywood did Cyd Charisse, Mitzi Gaynor, Natalie Wood, Merle Oberon, and Julie London conjure? Charisse had starred in musicals during the 1950s, but by the end of the decade her career was beginning to wane. Gaynor only made two films in the

---

[51] The *I Love Lucy* episode was originally broadcast on Feb. 28, 1955.

[52] FIC continues to function as a booster club. It is now known as the Fashion Industries Guild of Cedars Sinai and is comprised of fashion manufacturers, buyers, sales representatives, and fashion publicity organizations. To date it has raised $23 million for the hospital.

60s and her final film performance was in *For Love or Money* (1963). Merle Oberon's career was at its peak in the 30s and 40s and thus Oberon was perhaps most reminiscent of Hollywood's past. Julie London's career was just beginning, as was another phase of Natalie Wood's career. This seemingly motley collection of actresses summoned to evoke Hollywood suggests a lack of census over just what "Hollywood" might be. The selection seems aimed at covering a range of decades rather than capturing any one particular ideal. The notion that these five women might represent "women everywhere" also speaks to the rather myopic vision of the show's producers. However, Head's costume fashion shows throughout the decade shared a similar mission, which was ostensibly charitable. Interestingly, as Head's fashion shows developed, they seemed to gradually solidify a particular ideal of old Hollywood, or at least of its costumes.

One of Head's early fashion shows signals the ways that the relationship between the screen spectator and fashion consumer was becoming increasingly complex, if only because it began to involve a greater range of participants. Whereas the seeing-buying model that has characterized discussions of marketing and promotion during the studio era involved the costume designer and female spectator/shopper, the promotional circuit in the post-studio era widened to include a number of different players. On June 07, 1961, the Celanese Fibers Company, a division of Celanese Corporation of American, headquartered in New York City, issued a press release promoting a recent fashion show the company had staged. The press release promoted it as "A salute to the genius of Hollywood's great designers of the Thirties and to the fabric in which many of their trend-setting glamour gowns were created was made yesterday in STAR IN CREPE, a fashion show and breakfast given by the Celanese Fibers company at the Plaza Hotel." With this, Celanese launched their crepe promotion. The press release further states:

The audience consisted of the New York press and representatives from department stores throughout the country. The presentation of a color motion picture, in which the fashion firsts created by two late, great Hollywood designers – Adrian and Travis Banton – and by seven-times Academy winner Edith Head were shown side by side with a group of up-to-the-minute designer dresses inspired by the Hollywood classics was the highlight of the morning's events. All the gowns were carried out in Celanese acetate and rayon crepe.[53] (Celanese)

These few paragraphs speak to the intersection of classic Hollywood designers, the Celanese Fibers company, the department store, reproductions of the classic Hollywood costumes, and Edith Head. It is a junction of Hollywood nostalgia, modern synthetic fibers, consumer culture, and Edith Head both as a representative of old Hollywood and its convergence with modern consumer culture. The models in the fashion show were "coiffed and made up to resemble" various stars for whom the original gowns were designed – Clara Bow, Claudette Colbert, Joan Crawford, Marlene Dietrich, Greta Garbo, Carole Lombard, Barbara Stanwyck, Rosalind Russell, and Loretta Young. This conjuring of Hollywood's Golden Age in acetate crepe speaks to the kind of mass reproduction of their images in a way in which the synthetic nature of the copy is a cause for celebration. The Celanese production had a coherent sense of Hollywood glamour because it drew on names and images recognizably from classic era Hollywood. Thus the company targeted an association between established conceptions of glamour and modern fibers that could promote and distribute an approximate notion of glamor on a mass scale. While these designs and their materials were promoted as modern, the strategy behind their marketing reaches back to the origins of mass consumer fashion at the dawn of the twentieth century.

In her work on the French dress designer Paul Poiret, Nancy Troy argues that Poiret's success hinged on his ability to "project an aura of originality" (455). Poiret opened his first

---

[53]See the press release in Edith Head papers,programs 1960-1965.

fashion house in 1903 and his original dress designs were so popular and influential that they spawned copies from less celebrated designers. These copies and their mass appeal undermined Poiret's aspirations to associate his name with the cultural elite. His solution to this problem was to create a line of "genuine reproductions," thereby erasing "the distinction between originality and reproduction" and momentarily reconciling the contradiction between art and industry (Troy 457). Poiret's notion of the genuine reproduction complicates the ways in which Walter Benjamin, for example, positions the aura in relation to the authentic. While Benjamin argues that the aura resides in the original, Poiret's genuine reproductions suggest that the original may be reproduced iteratively, though in varying degrees of value, in a way that reinforces rather than diminishes the authority of the creator. In seeking to brand his reproductions, Poiret established a secondary market for his designs that still relied on his name to sell its product. That the dresses were reproductions didn't seem to matter to customers in his secondary market because they still bore his name. This marketing strategy would be repeated throughout the twentieth century. Indeed, the designs showcased at the Celanese fashion show followed this strategy, but with a twist. Unlike the "Night to Remember" fashion show, the Celanese production had a more coherent sense of Hollywood glamour because it drew on names and images recognizably from the Golden Age of Hollywood. Thus the company targeted an association between established conceptions of glamour and modern fibers that might approximate that glamour, though through iteration and interpretation.

Head brought eleven gowns to be shown. Among them was a poppy red flounced gown designed by Travis Banton for Clara Bow to wear in *It* (1927) as well as a Banton-designed beaded pink dress for Carole Lombard to wear in *No Man of Her Own* (1932). The costume show was then followed by interpretations of film costumes by modern designers who recast the

costumes into wearable fashions. The idea of the genuine reproduction morphed into the concept of the genuine interpreted reproduction. The gowns carried the weight of the Head name but were updated by emerging designers to suit contemporary tastes. The fashion designer Wilson Folmar, for example, interpreted a dress worn by Carole Lombard in a fabric called Onondage "Barga" crepe. Following this exhibition, the show was given over to original designs in crepe, creating a seamless transition between the "one-of-a-kind" Hollywood gown in luxurious fabrics and the mass produced gown in synthetic materials for every woman, for every occasion. The Celanese clothes, therefore, accrued fashion capital because of their association with both Golden Age Hollywood and with contemporary fashion designers.

With a number of ideas and items on display that day ranging from Hollywood itself to the reinterpreted fashions to the Celanese fabric, it remains somewhat vague what was actually on sale. The clothes themselves signaled movement between the authentic and the original, the organic and the synthetic, and the old and the new. This ambiguity disturbs the seeing-buying model as a form of consumer address because the relationship between the on-screen gown and the consumer was mediated by a number of factors. The event did not take place in a movie theater nor did it emphasize any particular film; the gowns on display were themselves reinterpreted by different designers; the entire event was manufactured to essentially promote synthetic fibers. In thinking about how this promotional event worked, it is helpful to consider the business model of diversification in which a corporation hopes to increase its assets by reaching into new markets with new products. The strategy of diversification was itself gaining

momentum in the business world of the 1950s, though Celanese had experimented with diversification earlier in its history.[54]

The Celanese Corporation of America was, and remains, an industrial chemicals manufacturer. The role of the Celanese Fibers Company, a division of Celanese Corporation of America, within the fashion show speaks to the intersection between Hollywood, industrial chemical manufacturing, and the promotion of Hollywood glamor within a retail setting. While this may seem like a very modern relationship, the Celanese Corporation in fact had a long-standing history with both filmmaking and fashion. In 1913 the Swiss brothers Henri and Camille Dreyfus founded the company, then called Cellonit, with the aim of developing new materials to act as alternatives to the flammable cellulose nitrate then used as the base for celluloid film. One of their first research sponsors in this endeavor was the French film company Pathé. In 1916 Cellonit relocated, by invitation, to Britain where the company helped develop new airplane paint and other chemical products designed to aid the British in the First World War. Following the war and subsequent declining need for military-grade supplies, the company redirected their energies into the development and manufacture of acetate yarn. In the late twenties, the company again relocated to the United States and diversified into plastics and chemicals while still maintaining their investment in fibers. They changed their name to Celanese Corporation of America and soon became one of the largest chemical manufacturers in the country. While the company would continue to expand its involvement in chemicals, its fibers division remained important to its long-term financial success.[55]

---

[54] I undertake a sustained discussion of diversification as a business strategy in chapter four. For the original theorization of the model, see Ansoff, "Strategies for Diversification," 1957.

[55] See the company's website https://www.celanese.com/About-Us/History.aspx. Accessed Apr. 06, 2016.

Because of their investment in fibers, the Celanese Corporation was also engaged in fashion promotion. As early as 1930 the company sponsored four models at a fashion show hosted by the Garment Retailers of America ("Celanese Fashion Exhibit"). In 1946 the company purchased a daytime fashion show for radio. The show, which was to be emceed by the "Celanese fashion expert" Marie Woodward, was to be programmed for stations in the south at the approximate cost of $1000 per week ("Celanese Testing Fashion"). The Celanese Corporation's involvement in fashion was particularly impacted by both world wars. Because the company had developed new materials for each of the war efforts, they were left with surplus technologies and products following the end of each war. They channeled these efforts into manufacturing fibers to meet the demand for soft goods following the end of the WWII in particular. In the fifties and sixties, the company developed acetate fibers before diversifying further into other synthetic fibers. Their involvement with the "Star in Crepe" fashion show, then, brings into focus the intersections among the post-war consumer boom, consumer uses of wartime technologies, and changing fashion aesthetics related to the production of cheap goods manufactured on a mass scale.

The difference in materials used for the Head gowns and the Celanese gowns speaks to the ways in which the literal materiality of everyday life was shifting in the post-war era. While Head's gowns most certainly would have been originally made in organic fabrics like silk and cotton, the reproduction of these gowns in synthetic crepe acetate illustrates the ways in which Hollywood glamor became diffused and mass produced in the 1950s and 60s. In the move from the studio system to a post-studio system, notions of individualized glamor gave way to the reproducibility of goods for a mass, consuming culture. The fabric itself functions as a metaphor for this shift. Though acetate has the lustrous look of silk, it does not have the durability. It is not

a particularly resilient fiber and is seldom used for clothing that has to take hard wear because it breaks down (Jerde 1). While it might be tempting to extend the metaphor to the production of stardom in the studio and post-studio eras, as an equation between organic and manufactured stardom, it would be false. As scholars like Jeanine Basinger have shown, the studio era produced stars that were the products of complex manufacturing processes. Paradoxically, stardom in the post-studio era was perhaps more "organic" in that audiences gravitated toward actors that seemed more natural and spontaneous. The metaphor can, however, be extended into conceptions of durability and surface value. Stardom in the 1960s was not a particularly durable space for female actors in American film. Many well-known actresses from the studio era did not survive the shift into the post-studio era and the contours of stardom itself were changing. The design critic Eric Larrabee writes, "Once something becomes easier to make than it is to sell, its style assumes a paramount importance" (97).[56] The style of stardom became more significant than the durability of female star brands. Here the production of reproducible and disposable fashion runs headlong into the diminution of the female stardom.

The odd intersections between the Celanese Corporation and Hollywood fashions point to new means of consumer address that characterized promotional events. They speak to the ways in which the conception of "Hollywood" bolstered sales of tangentially related products. In effect, Hollywood itself functioned as the tie-in for products sold off-screen. This reverses the classic marketing strategy that featured products on-screen to boost sales in stores. In the Celanese fashion show, Hollywood glamour was the product placed in-situ to naturalize and legitimize the fashions manufactured by the fibers company. The fashion show, however, served

---

[56] Eric Larrabee, "Autos and Americans: The Great Love Affair," *Industrial Design*, Aug. 1955: 97. I came upon this quote in Karal Ann Marling, *As Seen on TV The Visual Culture of Everyday Life in the1950s,* Harvard University Press, 1994, pp. 263.

more than one function. For Head, the fashion show served a pedagogical function still related to commerce, but also related to Head's more encompassing project of educating women on the power of dressing. She largely enacted this project through her two books *The Dress Doctor* (1959) and *How to Dress for Success* (1967), which she often promoted through civic club fashion shows.

In 1963 Head participated in at least two fashion shows for civic clubs. She was the special guest at a spring luncheon and fashion show for the Blessed Sacrament Mothers' Club. The event was called "Springtime Fantasies" and was held at the Blossom Room of the Roosevelt Hotel in Hollywood. In July of that year she in San Francisco at the Serra International Convention to present "The Hollywood Story," a fashion show featuring her film costumes from Paramount Studio. The event was preceded by a light lunch of California tomato soup, salad, petits fours and coffee. Head was billed as the star and she narrated the show with tidbits about the gowns. When Head toured with her costumes, she often treated the fashion shows as an opportunity to promote her book, which she frequently provided for the attendees. As well as narrating, she might also give a short talk on how to dress for occasions, thus the fashion shows began to take on a pedagogical function in the vein of her books. The shows often consisted of a display of costumes described in the language of nostalgia. The gowns evoked old Hollywood but also served as evidence of Head's success in the industry. With eight Academy Awards and forty years of experience behind her, Head used the costumes as proof of her expertise as a designer. She then parlayed her knowledge of proper wardrobing conventions into book sales.

Many of Head's fashion shows were mounted as benefits for particular civic clubs. For example, on April 3, 1962 Head brought her "Fashions of the Stars" show to a luncheon held to benefit the Hollywood Studio Club. The club was founded by the National Board of the YWCA

and its mission was to offer young women that came to Los Angeles seeking work affordable and supervised living accommodations. The club's management committee was staffed by women and Head sat on the advisory board for the club alongside a number of other "Hollywood citizens," including Mary Pickford. Since 1916 the Club had provided housing and services to approximately 10,000 young Hollywood hopefuls who had arrived from all over the world. The luncheon on the afternoon of April 3rd was intended to raise funds for maintenance of the club's aging housing facilities. The next month, Head presided as toast mistress over the afternoon program "A Dream Garden of Beautiful Fashions." The event, held in the Shire Auditorium in Los Angeles for the 53rd annual Rotary International Convention, as arranged as entertainment for the wives who had accompanied their husbands to the convention. Fashions from the collections of Charles le Maire, Don Loper, Helen Rose, and Oscar of Beverly Hills, among many other designers, were shown fully accessorized with furs, hats, and jewelry.

On July 14, 1964 Head narrated a fashion show of her original costume designs for Paramount called "Glamour on Parade." The show was presented by the California Convention Host Committee and held at the Grand Ballroom of the Fairmont Hotel in San Francisco. Head brought thirty-nine costumes representing her career at Paramount, which she would leave just three years later for Universal. The fashion show at the Fairmont Hotel was more extravagant than the usual affairs. In addition to Head's gowns, models were adorned in jewels by Tiffany & Co., wigs by Max Factor, and "Réplique" perfume courtesy of Saks Fifth Avenue. The name of the perfume was no small irony as the afternoon, like so many other afternoon fashion shows curated by Head, was given over to replicating the glamour of a past version of Hollywood. The perfume was manufactured by Raphael and the French spelling "Réplique" is significant for two reasons. First, it signals the fashion industry's reliance on Paris as a center for sophisticated

fashion even into the early 1960s. With the growth of leisure wear in the 1960s, the geographical center for American fashion would shift from Europe to the United States, particularly New York and Southern California. Secondly, the name suggests the slightly altered relationship that Hollywood of the mid-sixties had with Hollywood of the studio era. The way that Hollywood represented itself to itself, and to the wider world, was slightly off register. Costumes were replicated into fashions that did not repeat the original, but through which the original could be traced. Like the "Stars in Crepe" fashions, Hollywood was reproduced through reinterpretation into something slightly less durable, slightly more mass produced, and something slightly more concerned with surface value.

Head's version of Hollywood history was, however, still told in tulle and silk. The show featured gowns worn by Clara Bow in *Red Hair* (1928), Mae West in *She Done Him Wrong* (1933), and Carole Lombard in *Hands Across the Table* (1935). More recent work by Head was also on display. She showed costumes worn by Grace Kelly in *To Catch a Thief* (1955), Natalie Wood in *Sex and the Single Girl* (1964), and Lana Turner in *Where Love has Gone* (1964). Head's selection of costumes reflected the hallmarks of her work at Paramount and her talent for refined, precise designs that aimed for both aesthetic and dramatic panache. As with most of her appearances during the year, Head also provided copies of *The Dress Doctor*. The book is Head's autobiographical account of her early education in film costuming. She recounts personal stories of working with the actresses whose gowns she later included in her fashion shows. She recalls designing for Mae West in *She Done Him Wrong,* and says that West taught her everything she needed to know about sex, clothes-wise (52). She goes on to reminisce that Clara Bow taught her about servicing the story, that Hedy Lamarr was as "relaxed and boneless as a Persian cat," and about an afternoon outing with Doris Day at Biff's lunch counter during which

the two ate cheeseburgers with everything and malted milks (58, 93, 139). *The Dress Doctor* provided the narrative to Head's fashion shows just as much as her fashion shows provided the visual accompaniment to her book. What Head sent down the runway during the 1960s was thusly very much her own personal history of working in Hollywood during the Golden Age of costume design. The nostalgia infused in her book is not for an era passed, but for a career full of personal memories and tremendous successes. It would be inaccurate to say that her fashion shows presented a version of Hollywood forever lost. Instead, Head curated shows that promoted her own personal brand through material examples of her work. Head deployed her costumes as a means of inscribing her own legacy within Hollywood history but also as a means to establish herself within the current marketplace. For as nostalgic as Head's fashion shows appeared, she was still very invested in how women presented themselves in the contemporary mid-century moment.

3.4 PERFORMATIVITY IN THE EVERYDAY

In 1967 Head published *How to Dress for Success*, which she also promoted alongside her fashion shows. *How to Dress* is essentially an instruction manual for the presentation of the self in various situations and with particular goals in mind. In this way, her premise is not entirely different from Simone de Beauvoir in *The Second Sex* (1953) or Helen Gurley Brown in the pages of *Cosmopolitan* magazine. Head's advice is practical and entirely centered on creating an impression for another person. Unlike de Beauvoir or Brown, however, one senses that the goal of fashion and clothes for Head is not personal pleasure, but to dominate situations and relationships through the deployment of relentlessly appropriate dress. Head relied on her

fashion shows to testify to her ability to create glamorous and, above all, situationally-correct outfits. This is perhaps not surprising as Head spent her career using clothes rhetorically to craft characters in relation to a particular set of circumstances. For Head, the key to dressing is being able to first accurately identify the situation. In the chapter titled "How to Dress to Get a Man…and Keep Him," Head advises women to first identify what sort of man she is dealing with. She writes about the intellectual in the following way:

> Type Number Four – The Far-Out Intellectual. What would be the shy man's chloroform is this man's meat. He's a long-hair and doesn't mind if you wear yours down your back. Avant-garde ideas and art nouveau are a delight to his eye – so if he's in your picture, let yourself go on exciting modern prints, exotic color combinations, unusual handmade jewelry and anything that might be called 'artistic' or offbeat. Conservatism in any form is just plain corn to him, so don't be square enough to wear conventional-looking costumes for his sake. (35)

The book continues on in similar detail through stylistic treatments of everything conventionally in the purview of a woman's world, including the husband, the family, and the self. Success generally meant looking younger, slimmer, and more attractive. Head's sartorial prescriptions seem outmoded now; however, her writing astutely identifies the significance of crafting a public self capable of navigating the social world. Her advice is firmly didactic because Head felt that fashion was a language that could be learned and, furthermore, could be extremely beneficial to any adherent willing to take the time to acquire it. In this way Head's fashion instruction becomes a kind of moral imperative for enjoying a "successful" life. This is very much echoed in her fashion shows, which were often set among civic clubs and charity events. Head's books and fashion shows, then, offer an intersection between the fantasy and nostalgia of Hollywood costume, the milieu of civic duty, and moral imperative of dressing successfully during a period in which there was great interest in parsing the personal and private selves.

Head wasn't the only one thinking about the moral implications inherent in crafting the public self. In 1959 the sociologist Erving Goffman published *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Influenced by the writings of Georg Simmel, Goffman argued that the presentation of the self is connected to a kind of moral imperative that occurs when an individual presents herself to others. She presents herself via an array of signifying social characteristics that convey who she is. By entering into this "information game," as Goffman terms it, she also enters into a social contract with others whereby she is indeed who she claims to be. By upholding her end of the contract, she puts a moral obligation on others to value and treat her "in the manner that persons of [her] kind have a right to expect" (13). Goffman further argues that when two people meet each other, for example, both participants are invested in understanding one another correctly and this occurs exactly by each participant presenting themselves accurately. Furthermore, both participants use defensive and protective practices, like tact, to safeguard the impressions they wish to present. That is, both parties are dedicated to preserving the impressions they both give and receive as a means to understand the social interaction. Performance, therefore, occurs equally on both sides of the interaction.

For Goffman, performance is defined by influence. Goffman writes, "'performance' may be defined as all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence in any way any of the other participants" (15). Performances are given for audiences, observers, or co-participants and are used rhetorically to influence some thought, action, or outcome. For Goffman there are essentially two poles of performance, cynicism and sincerity. The cynic recognizes the value of performance but does not adhere to its rules, and may furthermore take pleasure in knowing that others are morally obligated to do so. The sincere performer, on the other hand, faithfully observes the social contract and believes in his or her performance with full

faith that others will as well. Thus we may say that the cynic delights in unmasking while the sincere performer dutifully wears the mask in order to preserve social bonds. It should be noted that Goffman subtly aligns sincerity with middle-class values and the strong desire to leave social feathers unruffled.

With Goffman's concept of performance in mind, Head's fashion shows raise the question of what kind of influence Head wished to affect, and for whom. With such an impressive command of fashion during a time of fantastic changes, why did Head remain within the safe confines of the costume fashion show? One of the reasons may be that Head still regarded the primacy of fashion and the power of the gown precisely during this period that was beginning to question these values. It is possible to consider the milieu of Head's fashion shows – civic organizations and charity events – as sincere environments. Head promenaded her costumes through years of ladies' lunches at hotels and convention centers. These lunches were by definition social events in which reputations were important and therefore masks were firmly in place. The fashion lunches were designed with philanthropy in mind and the audience, generally the wives of local businessmen, was considered in this light as well. With this setting in mind, it is possible to speculate on the potentially cynical capacity of the costumes within the fashion shows for the gathered audience.

Goffman notes that the cynic understands the rules of performance but refuses to adhere to them. Here consider Head's fashion shows and their ability to unmask performance as they delivered a thoroughly mobilized experience. The fashion show was comprised of moving pieces in more than one way. The costumes were unmoored from their settings within films and the attendees watched the shows in places characterized by their transitory natures, hotels and convention centers. This temporal and spatial displacement allowed spectators to view the

106

costumes from a different vantage point, a place of fantasy in which the gowns and the spectators' affective responses governed the rules of engagement. This setting established a space in which the gown-as-performer become "highly sacred" and shifted the focus of the social engagement from something interpersonal to something between subject and object (Goffman 22). The spectator need not perform in this context because performance shifted to the object. Furthermore, the counterpart to the performance became the narrator, in this case Head. Goffman refers to the "profane" peddler who must move the performance from place to place. Thus the setting and objects become highly sacred while the peddler becomes profane. In her fashion shows Head exhibited a kind of profanity in her twin desires to engender particular moral responses (giving to charity) and to peddle her own book and image. In this split between the sacred and profane we can also identify a split between sincerity and cynicism wherein the spectators take pleasure in the unmasking of performance and willingly support it through their charitable responses.

What Goffman describes in these two dichotomies can also be described as a fascination with surface and performativity as well as a keen interest in slippages of those things. At the same time that Head hosted her mid-60s fashion shows, underground art, fashion, and music scenes also flourished. Bob Dylan's 1965 song "Subterranean Homesick Blues" along with D.A. Pennebaker's documentary about Dylan, *Don't Look Back*, capture this fascination with performance. At one moment in the film the song plays while Dylan holds a stack of cue cards. Words from the song lyrics are handwritten on the cards and as the song plays Dylan runs through the stack of cards, letting each one drop to the ground as he moves through the song. The cards seem to reveal something about the lyrics. Depending on the speed with which Dylan runs through them, the cards anticipate, repeat, or reinforce the words in the song. The gesture silently

comments on the song as it plays, drawing attention to the performance of the song and to Dylan's proximity and distance from the aural elements as he performs visually for the camera. The cards are ungainly and Dylan struggles with them as he stands in an alley, with Allen Ginsberg standing left of center. The clip was used to promote the film, with the following tag line: "Surfacing here soon/ Bob Dylan in/ *Don't Look Back* by D.A. Pennebaker." The song and film clip illustrate a certain fascination with the duality of the surface and the subterranean, and the ways in which distinctions between the two were blurred and often articulated through performance.

In the world of underground and avant-garde film, two filmmakers in particular played with Hollywood costume and the spectacle of the fashion show in ways that seemed counter to the values and goals of Head's fashion shows. In 1963 Jack Smith directed *Normal Love*. The film is a lushly sensual collage of vignettes that recall various moments of Western painting, adventure films, and pop art. It is without dialogue and set to a vaguely orientalist musical soundtrack. One of the stars of the film is Mario Montez, a figure in the queer underground film scene of the 1960s who was also associated with Andy Warhol. Montez crafted himself in the image of Maria Montez, the glamorous star of several Universal adventure films in the 1940s including *Cobra Woman* (1944). Montez often designed his own costumes and did so for *Normal Love*. Ronald Gregg notes that Montez established his own costume house, Montez-Creations, and crafted his elaborate costumes from thrift store finds. Drawing from the imagery of Hollywood, Montez reimagined and reworked scavenged materials into glittery, sequined, glamorous gowns that he wore in both films and onstage with The Ridiculous Theater Company. Donning the gowns and makeup became part of the pleasure of mounting productions and this joy can be seen in the way Smith, for example, allows his camera to revel with the characters in

the delight of costume, makeup, and imagination. The performances in *Normal Love* convey genuine adoration for the glamour and excess of classic Hollywood costumes as spectacles. The visibility of their construction brings attention to the equally constructed nature of the costumes that Head showcased in her fashion shows. If there is a difference between the two sets of work, it is perhaps only a matter of material, not spirit.

Somewhat similar to Smith, the photographer and filmmaker William Klein made a number of films during the 1960s that worked through notions of irony. His 1966 film *Who Are You, Polly Maggoo?* (1966) cast a satirical eye toward the fashion industry. Klein himself was a well-regarded fashion photographer whose photo essays for *Vogue* were early forays into what would become known as street photography. *Who Are You, Polly Maggoo?* tells the story of a young French model who is followed by a television crew and interviewer. The interviewer tries time and again to get to the "real" Polly behind the model. He is without success and the film is ultimately a send up of the vacuity of the fashion industry, replete with a Diana Vreeland-esque figure whose snobbery is unmatched. The opening scene of the film features a fashion show set in a cave. The spectators watch, stacked on scaffolding erected against the walls of the cave, and the models appear in absurd creations made of sheet metal. While the narrative seems to indict the fashion industry, it is still a stylishly-made film that can now be considered alongside other films of the French New Wave. Thus the film slips from satire to something of genuine concern and works on multiple levels of appreciation and contempt.

These two films from Smith and Klein seem at odds with Head's fashion projects, and yet, Head's deployment of, and enthusiasm for, the costume fashion show somehow plays nicely with Smith's contortion of film costume and Klein's commentary on the fashion show. All three seem aware of the possibility for costume to doubly articulate sincerity and cynicism and to

dwell on the surface and the subterranean. All three also treat the ideas of performance, work, and play as intertwined concepts. Head's treatment of the fashion show as both a business opportunity and charity event combine notions of work, leisure, and responsibility. Similarly, Smith's treatment of the costume as a place of fantasy and play is undergirded by the amount of work that Montez undertook to create extravagant costumes out of second-hand materials. And Klein's satire of the fashion industry relies on the idea that fashion and fashion modeling are not legitimate forms of work, but rather leisure time pursuits.

This fascination with performance and its link to conceptions of labor, play, and consumption are significant factors in the formation of 1960s culture. Here it is productive to return to Goffman. Following Sartre, Goffman suggests that individuals "often find themselves with the dilemma of expression versus action" (33). Goffman relates this to the dramatization of work and making visible work such that labor, and its attendant costs, cannot be questioned. According to this line of thought, a person may well expend all of her energy executing a task that she has no residual energy left to fully perform her execution of that task. On the other hand, a person may perform the execution of a task well without the energy or ability to actually execute the task. Sartre uses as an example the student who performs attentive listening at the cost of actually listening attentively. Here we might think back to Head's fashion shows in which models were dressed to replicate the actresses that originally wore the costumes. Thus the models were performing as performers while the audience perhaps only vaguely registered their performance because all eyes were on the gowns. Appreciation for the gowns, however, was dependent on their role within a charity event as a frame for legitimizing what might be considered a frivolous pastime. This frivolity, however, concealed deeper forms of pleasure that might be brought to the fore.

Goffman offers a notion of "secret consumption" (42). This notion is based on what Goffman calls "sign equipment" and what Barthes might call signifiers, visible markers that signal meaning. In American culture, those signs can be diffused among different strata of society. The American dream rests on the idea of social mobility and sign equipment. Goffman's concept of secret consumption rests on the idea that individuals deploy signs as a means of presenting a public self, one that doesn't always resonate with the private self. For example, a housewife may leave out a copy of the *Saturday Evening Post* on the coffee table, but has a copy of *True Romance* by her bedside. She presents one image of her taste in reading material while secretly consuming what she really wants to read. And we may think of the fashion show too as a public display, perhaps of private fantasy. Head's fashion shows were generally staged as part of a civic event and this framing allowed for an afternoon of fashion indulgence. The spectator's secret consumption was rational and even generous. Further, Head assumed a pedagogical function in both her fashion shows and her writing. The fashion show revealed something to the audience about the constructed nature of moviemaking. It was a kind of behind-the-scenes look at how films create illusion with Head as the tour guide, both creator and mediator of the fashion fantasy. In some ways, the formality of the event and the connotations of the gowns provided another kind of fantasy, one that was still invested in glamour, construction, and social codes. The shows provided a milieu in which a gown worn by Clara Bow was among the most fascinating things in the room. In this setting, Golden Age Hollywood still somehow existed, although for Head, much more was at stake. Her future was very much invested in the past and her prolongation of the Hollywood dream made sense to her financial future.

These afternoons harkened back to a different era at a time in which the cultural and social landscape began to shift from 1950s formality and organization to a period defined by

leisure, casual consumption, and youthful questioning of established norms. Much of what Goffman describes is a kind of 1950s mindset that puts forward a good face when doing something more private secretly behind the scenes. However, this blending of 1950s performance still has very much to do with the cultural shift in the mid-1960s that sought to perhaps erase the spaces between the public and the private in particular ways. Youth in the 1960s revealed themselves in different ways, though perhaps were not necessarily transparent. Rather, there is a different kind of public performance going on, one that is now aware of performance and seeks to use it more artfully than social constructions during the 1950s. Thus the erasure of differences between public and private is itself a kind of performance, one that relies on notions of "realism" as honesty. Goffman suggests that there are essentially two models on which we formulate our conceptions of behavior. One is based on "real, sincere, or honest performance," while the other is based on what we deem as false or fabricated. Goffman writes:

> We tend to see real performances as something not purposely put together at all, being an unintentional product of the individual's unself-conscious response to the facts in his situation. And contrived performances we tend to see as something painstakingly pasted together, one false item on another, since there is no reality to which the items of behavior could be a direct response." (70)

While Goffman argues that these two models stand in opposition, I would argue that they are rather imbricated in one another. The new mode of performance during the 1960s reflected a shift in attitudes about performativity that regarded construction as passé and spontaneity as de rigueur. However, as Goffman argues, performance is about influence and thus different modes of performativity can be considered as different ways of exercising influence rather than different ways of presenting the self. That is to say, performance is rhetorical and in the 1960s, rhetoric was primarily concerned with selling consumable products and fantasies to a set of

publics with money to spend. Thus it is productive to think about performance in terms of economics.

In writing about stardom during the decade, Pamela Wojcik notes that although the sixties has been thought of as a decade of the counterculture, mainstream culture and the rise of corporate culture and advertising existed alongside the counterculture, and even came to co-opt counterculture as a marketing tool. She argues that the counterculture in fact became the cultural dominant as the business world embraced notions of hipness as a marketing tool. Wojcik looks to Raymond Willams and his notion of dominant, residual, and emerging cultures as a way to think about the sixties and the multiplicity of cultures — counterculture, Pop, Mod, and commercial cultures — that co-existed. Wojcik argues that we might apply Williams' notion to the film industry as well. The film industry in the sixties experienced changes, some lasting and some transitory, that effected how movies were made, distributed, and exhibited. Wojcik is interested in viewing the changes in the industry as they embodied both old and new practices. She works through a number of different conceptions of stars and actors in 1960s Hollywood and suggests a category of star that was simply old-fashioned and reminiscent of an older model of Hollywood, like Julie Andrews. Here we may also consider Edith Head and the parade of stars her fashion shows conjured. While a few of her costumes were drawn from contemporary films, the majority were meant to represent classical Hollywood. However, their presence, and the popularity of Head's fashion shows and published books, does suggest an interest in these stars as something more than nostalgia. Certainly figures that Head celebrated like Mae West and Joan Crawford can now be considered camp figures. So it is perhaps not coincidental that in 1964 Susan Sontag published her essay "Notes on Camp," which was quickly adopted by the mainstream as a means of thinking about particular modes of performativity and the public self. Alongside these notions

and the consumer ethos of the 1960s, camp can also be seen as a mechanism by which women's fashion migrated from the screen to domestic spaces, which in turn transformed domestic spaces into performative spaces.

In her essay, Sontag writes that camp is a "sensibility." It is distinct from an idea and is "almost, but not quite, ineffable." For Sontag, the sensibility of an era is its most decisive, but most perishable, aspect. It cannot be captured, but must instead be tentatively and nimbly "snared." To engage in an analysis of camp sensibility is to enter into a realm of contrasts that Sontag describes as a state of both sympathy and revulsion. To put one's finger on it is to miss the point entirely. Sontag draws several such relationships rooted in dualities: beauty and artifice, style and content, the mainstream and the marginalized, high and low culture. As Sontag writes, camp sensibility is "alive to a double sense in which some things can be taken." Camp has to do with valuing the object and putting the experience of the object on par with human interaction. It is concerned with interacting with objects just as one might interact with another person. It involves consumption and the sensual pleasure of surfaces that speak to a person in a particular way. Camp is concerned with the strategic and tactical uses of things. This is why Head's fashion shows can be read as camp because they celebrate the pleasures of objects in a way that is sentimental and performative, but always sincere. During the zest for conspicuous consumption and consumer culture that has come to define the 1960s, it is no surprise that camp sensibility became an important way to both participate in consumption, but with a sense of the tactical about it. Camp sensibility engages the conflicting notions of the performance of the self that Goffman articulated, but as phenomena that occur simultaneously rather than distinctly. The camp sensibility that Sontag identifies unites the surface and the subterranean. It mobilizes in tandem sincerity and performativity, as well as the natural and the artificial, in order to present a

public mode of secret consumption that authorizes private pleasure. In Goffman's terms, camp sensibility allows the housewife to put her copy of *True Romance* on the coffee table.

Sontag's sense of camp is significant to thinking about clothing during the era precisely because stable categories that once defined the function of costume as distinct from the function of fashion had eroded. This erosion was due to the dismantling of costume departments in the post-studio era. As these departments shrunk, their personnel were either forced out of the industry entirely or forced into tangential industries. Thus Head began her decades-long roadshow and along the way generated products related to her brand, among them publications on fashion advice and a line of home-sewing patterns. Costume designers began to shop for wardrobes at department stores and other similar outlets. As a result, the fabulous costumes from Head's era disappeared on-screen and in their place were familiar clothes that seemed more "realistic" on-screen and fit the late 1960s Hollywood shift toward realism more generally. However, it is important to note here that female stars were still associated with fashion and that modes of marketing toward female spectators were not altered significantly. I would argue that what did change was the space of performance and display. Because costume and glamour no longer had a place on-screen, they shifted to an off-screen space. Red carpets, fashion shows, street fashion, and social spaces all became venues for the kind of fashion display that also engaged in notions of costuming. In a sense, during the 1960s costume-as-fashion was forced off-screen and it instead emerged in multiple venues that either implicitly or explicitly acknowledged the notions of performativity that Goffman and Sontag describe. Thus while much mainstream Hollywood film costuming sought to be "authentic" out of both material necessity and narrative demands, off-screen spaces became important arenas for actresses to differentiate themselves and for fashion to expand its meaning beyond clothing. Performative

spaces also migrated from the screen to other environments and thereby broadened the reach and influence of Hollywood.

3.5   SPACES OF PERFORMATIVITY AND PRODUCTION DESIGN

Sontag identifies the importance of fashion and furniture to camp sensibility. She writes, "Camp taste has an affinity for certain arts rather than others. Clothes, furniture, all the elements of visual décor, for instance, make up a large part of Camp" (278). Here I again want to return to Head's "most famous dress in Hollywood," and the fashion show that began this chapter, the 1978 fashion show at Horne's department store in Pittsburgh. Situated within a camp sensibility, an ersatz Carole Lombard promenading between the bedding and drapery departments makes perfect sense. This image testifies to camp's tendency to view all objects as possessing equal potential for meaning. It also speaks to camp's insistence on kindness, generosity, sincerity, and thirst for the zany. In photographs published in newspaper coverage of the event, women in the audience at Horne's that day wear transfixed expressions on their faces. They are invested in the fake Carole Lombard, even with the gown of dubious origin and despite the fact that no element of Head's fashion story about the dress may have been true. What mattered instead was the performance that day, which speaks to the changing spaces of performance and the significance of fashion in mapping out those spaces.

In addition to thinking about fashion as a phenomenon enabled through material objects that engage with sign systems, it is productive to also draw from a sociologically-based definition of fashion. This is productive because sociologists of fashion tend to focus on the

phenomenon and use value over visual appeal or semiotic meaning of clothing and fashion. The sociologists Aspers and Godart are useful here. They write:

> [F]ashion is public, and some form of space is needed for its diffusion. For fashion to exist, the object, practice, or representation in question must be observable by most or by all, for example on the internet or in a mall...how is it possible to speak of both fashion in management styles, which may change only every other decade, and fashion in lipstick colors, shoe styles, or drinks, which change so often? To do this we must see both order and change in relation to time. Something can be in flux only if there is a relatively more stable background of order than what is changing. In other words, though nothing is inherently stable, some of the social constructions, like styles, institutions, habits, and so on, are more stable than others, and as such they may provide the background that makes people perceive certain fashion changes. In sum, the phenomenological perceptions of order and change are the conditions of how long a fashion is to exist and of whether we shall speak of fashion at all. (171)

Aspers and Godart describe fashion as a phenomenon that is both necessarily public and that takes place against a backdrop of order. Fashion changes are only noticeable if they occur within an environment that is relatively stable. That is, we can only recognize and identify change if it is contrasted with something that is unchanging. Aspers and Godart's notion of fashion as a mechanism of order and change is significant because it recasts the ways in which we might think about the rapid oscillations of fashion. Simmel, for example, noted that the more anxious an era, the more rapid its fashion changes. Aspers and Godart seem to indicate just the opposite. The more anxious an era, the less we might notice fashion changes because it is difficult to recognize patters of change when they are posed next to other patterns of change. There are too many moving parts to isolate any one in particular. It follows that the inverse of this rule should be valid as well. The more anxious a time is the more static its fashions changes are likely to be. This principle can be extended to the realm of film production and fashion. In the 1960s the film industry was in flux and correspondingly film fashions remained rather static. Film costumes, such as they were, deviated little from everyday clothing. In contrast, the world of fashion was a rich and shifting terrain. Therefore we can surmise that fashion consumption

117

and production emerged from a relatively stable place. That stability, in turn, fostered growth and an environment in which fashion consumers might be willing to experiment with fashion beyond the usual dictates. That is, fashion consumers might be willing to extend notions of fashion beyond clothing. This speculation resonates with the business model of diversification that sought to expand consumers' reach into new products and new markets.

While the sociologically-based conception of fashion goes far to explain why consumers might be willing to experiment with objects, and camp conceptions of objects explains how consumers might use objects tactically as forms of expression, the role of film within these formulations remains a question. I want to suggest that film, and specifically production design, essentially trained moviegoers-as-consumers to seek out spaces of design and performativity. In film, elements of production design established patterns from which moviegoers-as-consumers could then develop their own personal mise-en-scène. This ushered a move into home design that then opened a market for lifestyle design and the expansion of fashion into the domestic realm beyond clothing. As Head's fashion shows demonstrate, performativity, stardom, costume, and fashion are related in the consumer space of the fashion show and the department store. These spaces offer alternate venues in which to experience film stars through costuming. Insofar as this was the case, these spaces allowed female consumers to enter into the world of film and stardom outside of a movie theater but in relation to something more three dimensional than fan magazines. As the costume designer Deborah Landis has noted, one of the main differences between costume and fashion is that the latter is three dimensional whereas the former is always two dimensional, owing to the film image itself. Of course, when the costume comes off the screen it then becomes three dimensional. Here it becomes interesting to think about the material world of costumes as objects in relation to consumer spaces. We might think of the consumer

space of mise-en-scène and the mise-en-scène of a consumer space. In order to do this, I turn to C.S. Tashiro.

In his work on production design C.S. Tashiro points out that the script and story are central to the role of design in the film. Tashiro suggests, however, that the production designer occupies the space between the image and the material and design elements that comprise the image. Production, including costuming, is an industrial process, but it has an important effect on the creation of the image. Tashiro suggests, "The production designer sits at this conjunction between the world outside the story and the story's needs." Tashiro cites Charles and Jona Affrons' well-known taxonomy of set design, which describes the role of set design in determining narrative effect.[57] The Affrons create five categories to describe this effect. These categories "rank" the set in terms of determining narrative reality. The Affrons argue that "some designs are more apparent than others." The upshot is that some sets contribute to the "reality effect" in their design while the purpose of other sets is something else entirely. Elaborating on this, Tashiro uses the examples of *The Maltese Falcon* and *Blade Runner* arguing that the former features unobtrusive sets in the service of narrative while the latter privileges visual pleasure.

However, Tashiro suggests that there are problems in this approach. The first problem is related to production design's role in servicing the story. In this case the description of set design overvalues the intention of the set designer and undervalues the role of spectator reception. Tashiro argues that the spectator brings more to the reading of design than the set designer might assume. The second problem is related to limiting "design" to set design, a situation that ignores the other elements that influence how design affects the spectator. Tashiro is interested in this idea of "service to the story" and how much design can really follow this imperative. Following

---

[57] I undertake a more detailed discussion of the Affrons and set design in chapter three.

Leon Barsacq's ideas on the history of set design, Tashiro suggests that Barsacq runs into a never-resolved dilemma on the tension between following the "rules" of design and the arbitrary nature of these rules.[58] This tension goes hand in hand with the contradiction of trying to recreate reality on the set of a film wherein a number of set designers claim reality itself to be the best guide for designing reality. The question is related to what sort of reality the film is after as the tension lies in the relationship between reality and stylization. The contradiction in design, Tashiro argues, is fidelity to the script and the impulse to create something visually distinctive.

Tashiro wonders whether set design should disappear or should it stand out? He ultimately argues that "no narrative film can offer completely hermetic design" because the ways that a spectator sees a particular design is dependent on what kind of cultural knowledge he or she bring to the film. Therefore, insisting that design only serves the story and doesn't account for other kinds of possible meanings. Instead Tashiro argues that we must, "try to understand the totality of the image and recognize the relationship between stories and the outside world as one of constant, mutual exchange and interaction" (9). Tashiro's imperative has some resonance with what Jane Gaines has argued in relation to the role of costume as it "tells the woman's story." Gaines argues that excesses in costuming move beyond narrative purposes and communicate unspoken information about the character that is not otherwise provided in the story of the film. Gaines and Tashiro both seem to assert that production design, and costume more specifically, does not exist in a kind of hermetic state inside the film, but rather that a spectator's reading of design is subject to extra-filmic influences.

The issue of how costume speaks to female spectators is worth thinking about in terms of the suggestion that female spectators bring to design a set of expectations and knowledge that

[58] See Leon Barsacq, *Caligari's Cabinet and Other Grand Illusions: a History of Film Design*, NY Graphic Society, 1976.

120

supply a kind of extra-filmic consciousness that shapes their experience of production design. This experience isn't solely limited to costume. Tashiro argues that design is the totality of the image and other designers like Milena Canonero and Deborah Landis argue that costume design must always necessarily include hair and make-up, and something possibly beyond. In the case of a film like Jacques Tati's *Playtime* (1967), costumes are so intricately woven into the entire visual language of the film that they cannot possibly be considered separately from it. Arguably all costume design does this. Thus a question about the reach of costume design is also a question about spatial relations. This is made more complex if we think about how costumes influence fashion and the spatial relation of the film and spectator become more intimate but also more tenuous as the film's costumes are interpreted and diffused, as happened in one particular Head fashion show in which Head's costumes were interpreted by a variety of different fashion designers.

In order to negotiate the various elements of production design in a way that doesn't flatten all of the elements into one image, Tashiro develops three levels of meaning that may be derived from the arrangement of the mise-en-scène. These levels may at times conflict when the narrative is unclear or when the demands of one character conflict with the demands of another character. Such a collision may result in objects that seem unexplained or autonomous, which is problematic. This can lead to an inability to produce a dominant reading of the scene. Tashiro concludes that this conflict of stated meaning leads to the possibility of figurative or symbolic meaning that might be derived from material objects. This figurative meaning is likely to be unanticipated by the filmmakers even when there exist associations implicit in the image. This multitude of meaning creates formal irony in which design can function within a reading other than the dominant one. Tashiro writes, "It is not so much a question of things not being as they

appear, but because they appear that they are not what they seem. It is not surface yielding depth, but surface playing to surface and in the process obscuring what seemed perfectly straightforward" (16). This figuration aligns with Sontag's description of camp in that it requires a reading of things and objects as imbued with meanings that are not stable, but constructed according to different readings. It also allows for a separation of elements within the visual field such that each element can be charged in different ways. Again, recall Sontag's point that camp is attracted to some art forms over others, namely fashion and furniture. For Tashiro, the significance of these objects and the charge in their meaning is related to the body and is primarily affective.

Based on the architect Christian Norberg-Schulz's notion of five basic categorical circles, Tashiro draws another set of schematized meanings. He argues that costuming "is the first circle of cinema's affective space...costume, makeup, and jewelry are therefore the first, fundamental steps in anthropocentric design." At the very basic level of awareness, spectators recognize clothes because they wear them themselves. Tashiro argues that costume brings us closer to the character because we affectively understand that they are wearing clothes and we are wearing clothes, but as we realize that their clothes are different from ours a disjuncture occurs where we recognize our difference from the character on-screen. Thus there is a line where we understand sameness and difference when looking at costumed characters on-screen. For Tashiro, this process of recognition creates an "exchange value based on these contradictory, simultaneous experiences of emotional identification and objectivity" (19). This system of exchange also establishes the basic parameters necessary for fashion to flourish as similarity and difference can also be defined as a system of order and change. Thus wanting to wear film fashion is not necessarily about wanting to wear the clothes on the screen, but rather wanting to wear

122

something different than you are currently wearing. This model can then extend to notions of fashion further away from the body by stages.

For Tashiro, the next circle is objects, or the graspable. Tashiro argues that because the spectator cannot touch what is actually on the screen, in some cases the object is given heightened visual attention as a way to compensate for our inability to touch it. Objects can then be as infused with meaning as characters and this threatens both deviancy and the potential for the visual to be on par with the narrative in terms of relative importance (19-24). Following the graspable Tashiro turns to the next circle, which he identifies as furniture. Furniture becomes important not just in terms of its materiality, but also as a constructed object that carries with it social associations. Meaning is not limited to the narrative, but extends beyond the narrative to something associational. For Tashiro, a set is never hermetic and never merely serves the purpose of the narrative. It is always doing something else and is always open to other interpretations. In his identification of furniture, Tashiro's reading turns back again to Sontag's camp sensibility but also opens a channel in which to think about surrealist notions of décor, as with Louis Aragon's essay "On Décor," and Modernist thinking on fabric and furniture, as with Benjamin's analysis of velvet linings in 19th century domestic interiors.[59]

With an expanded sense of costume and fashion, I would like to return to the Carole Lombard dress in Edith Head's fashion show at Horne's and also return to notions of marketing in the classical and post-studio period. In "Carole Lombard in Macy's Window" Charles Eckert describes the American film industry in relation to the post-WWI boom in consumable goods. Eckert writes that the story of "Hollywood's plunge into the American marketplace" involves two distinct histories: that of the cinema as display window and that of the industrial tie-in. To

---

[59] See Louis Aragon, "On Décor," *The Shadow and Its Shadow: Surrealist Writings on the Cinema,* edited by Paul Hammond. See also Freyja Hartzell, "The Velvet Touch: Fashion, Furniture, and the Fabric of the Interior."

the former point, Eckert cites DeMille's opulent productions during the 1920s and their capacity to increase consumer demand for women's fashions as well as furniture and home décor items. As evidence of this phenomenon Eckert gives numbers. Between the turn of the century and 1937, the number of apparel and furniture manufacturers in Los Angeles increased by over one hundred and thirty percent. During this period, film costumes heavily influenced fashion lines. Certain film costumes were directly copied for the consumer market, the most famous case being the *Letty Lynton* dress. Additionally, stars like Bette Davis, Claudette Colbert, and Norma Shearer modeled clothes from their upcoming films in fan magazines like *Photoplay* and *Modern Screen*.

Eckert describes the singular American female consumer imagined by fashion and cosmetics companies of the 1930s as "single, nineteen years old, Anglo-Saxon, somewhat favoring Janet Gaynor." Eckert vividly describes the young woman and her Saturday morning routine in which she dabs and dusts herself with a full arsenal of products endorsed by the stars like Lux soap, Jergens lotion, Lady Esther face powder, and Mum deodorant. Eckert imagines she does this before an afternoon of window shopping and cinema-going in which she spots a gown worn by Carole Lombard in *Rumba* (1935) that she simply must have, and can have, thanks to the Cinema Fashions Shop at Macy's. More precisely, she can have a copy of it for forty dollars. What Eckert describes, then, is the cycle in which costume becomes fashion.

The second history of Hollywood and consumption practices that Eckert describes involves the tie-in. By the 1930s Hollywood found a way to insert brand name merchandise into films without inundating audiences with the names of those brands. Producers, directors, and screenwriters merely inserted the product into the film and product manufacturers then advertised the tie-in in magazines and newspapers. The arrangement boosted sales of the product

and increased advertising revenues in print media. Most importantly, however, filmgoers didn't feel as though the product placement compromised the integrity of the film, even as they were exposed to a myriad of product tie-ins. Eckert argues that the cultivation of these relationships between Hollywood and consumer goods industries ultimately affected the kinds of films that were produced during the period. Once Hollywood recognized the female filmgoer as also the primary consumer spender on domestic goods, it catered to her in terms of not only advertising, but of the kinds of films that were made. The rise of the "women's film" and melodrama coincides with this period as does the preference for "modern films" over historical dramas, with their attendant capacity for product tie-ins. Thus, Eckert argues, "Hollywood had cooperated in a massive effort to sell products employing a sales method that was essentially covert, associational, and linked to the deeply gratifying and habituating experiences that films provided."

While Eckert's analysis provides an essential way to begin thinking about marketing and promotion in the post-studio era, and while the tie-in still remains a vital component of film marketing, it is possible to build on Eckert's notion of associational marketing. Whereas Eckert describes associational marketing as essentially covert, Head's department store fashion shows work to remove shadings of the covert. Instead what I have found in the post-studio era is that *overt* associational meanings came to dominate film and fashion marketing for female spectators. This is the result of two primary causes. First, costume and fashion moved off-screen and into various civic and commercial venues. This move opened an off-screen space in which notions of fashion could expand beyond clothing and into the domestic realm. Secondly, attitudes about performance and performative spaces shifted from considerations of distinct realms of the public and private to more complex formations of the private within the public. This shift allowed for

125

more experimentation with fashion choices beyond clothing and beyond the space of the movie theater. Thus, whereas for Eckert the Carole Lombard dress existed in a fairly direct relationship between film and filmgoer during the studio era within a seeing-buying paradigm, the Head-Lombard example points to the complicated circuit between film and fashion in the post-studio era. Whereas the Lombard gown that Eckert describes seemed to move effortlessly between the screen and the shop, this example is far less direct. The gown that Head called "the most famous" dress in Hollywood was perhaps actually a recreation of a Lombard dress, designed for an actress playing Lombard, and reiterated enough over time to become a Lombard dress again, if it ever was to begin with. Head's Lombard dress functioned as a replica of a gown perhaps *not-quite-worn* by Lombard. Or was it a gown worn by a perhaps *not-quite-Lombard*? Even if we take Lombard's dress as the real thing, another question remains: what exactly was being promoted at Horne's that day? It certainly wasn't the gown. It may have been a line of Head's home-sewing patterns, or the abstract idea of glamorous fashion. On the other hand, it may have been the bedding, or the drapery. The complications of these questions point to the need to more thoroughly examine the relationship between film costume and fashion in the post-studio era where previously established paradigms falter in the face of shifting production practices and expanding venues for consumer address.

4.0   THE GIRL AND THE GADGET: FASHIONING TECHNOLOGY IN WOMEN'S MAGAZINE ADVERTISING AND SPY FILMS OF THE 1960S

4.1   THE KITCHEN DEBATE

In 1959, then Vice President Richard Nixon met Nikita Khrushchev at the American Exhibition in Moscow where an American model home had been erected. Nixon extolled the virtues of the affordable, well-equipped suburban house, telling Khrushchev that it was well within the reach of millions of American wage earners. In the so-called "Kitchen Debate," Nixon equated democracy with consumer goods and pointed to affordable consumer technologies as evidence of America's supremacy over the Soviet Union (May 145). For Nixon, kitchen gadgets represented American ingenuity in the service of upward mobility. Elaine Tyler May notes that while Nixon had to concede the space race to the Soviets, he argued instead that "domestic consumer goods were the most meaningful measure of American superiority over the Soviet Union" (146). The postwar push to produce and consume electronic gadgets carried with it notions of American prosperity and aspiration, intertwined ideas of the domesticity and patriotism, a full-blown faith in the power of consumerism to morally elevate, and a fascination with shiny, modern things. The color television, for example, came to signify an American way of life. With Nixon's vision of patriotism through consumer goods firmly in mind, this chapter is concerned with attitudes about gender, technology, and consumer goods within models of domesticity. As the United

127

States moved into its second decade of consumer abundance in the 1960s, attitudes about consumption were arguably shifting. In her book on fan magazines and modes of female consumption during the postwar era, Sumiko Higashi counters Nixon's laudatory attitude toward consumer goods. She argues that economic and governmental policies during the period emphasized suburbanization, middle-class growth, consumer spending, and the belief in an American dream based on material goods and the cultivation of a particular lifestyle during the 1950s. These factors combined to produce suburban communities that were insular, racially homogenous, and that sought community through commodities. Higashi writes, "Withdrawal into individual daydreams, family togetherness, and suburban homogeneity signified not only postwar prosperity but also a lack of social cohesion" (11). Thus, while American mass culture of the 1950s promised belonging and better living through the acquisition of goods, it also delivered isolation and alienation as those goods failed to address social anxieties that were simmering under the surface of suburban life.

With Higashi also in mind, this chapter seeks to analyze representations of technology in women's magazine advertising and in film during the 1960s to investigate shifting attitudes about consumption, technology, and gender. I consider domestic gadgets and consumer electronics to be extensions of fashion since design elements were paramount to both in the modes of consumer address aimed at white, middle-class women. I take as my case studies *McCall's* magazine and a set of spy films starring James Coburn called *Our Man Flint* (1966) and *In Like Flint* (1967). While these may seem like disparate objects, together they tell a story about the ways in which women were addressed as consumers of technology in print media and through the film industry. Histories of the 1960s routinely announce the importance of technology as a defining characteristic of the era. Wartime technologies developed by the

military bled into consumer markets while a strengthened national infrastructure and the postwar consumer boom drove Americans to purchase more goods produced by these technologies. The questions that motivate this chapter are about this nexus of technology, gender, and consumption. How did technology and electronics manufacturers address homemakers? How did the media affect conceptions of what goods might define a modern woman? How did the film industry incorporate the rhetoric of technology into their own products during the period? Because female audiences are not a monolithic group, and because the sixties are equally defined by the power of youth, it is also worth asking how media addressed different age groups. How did the consumer address in *McCall's* magazine target a different generation of women than the *Flint* films, which on the surface didn't seem to speak to female audiences at all? *McCall's* magazine and the *Flint* films demonstrate that media discourses concerning technology spoke to largely white, middle-class mothers differently than they spoke to their daughters, and yet each emphasized notions of interconnectedness, intimacy, and mobility through materially commodified technologies. This rhetoric functioned to connect women of both generations to others as a strategy for navigating the isolation of suburban living. To explore these ideas, this chapter will first discuss the twin discourses of technology and fashion in advertising in *McCall's* magazine before moving into a discussion of these concepts in the *Flint* films.

4.2   THE CONTESTED TERRAIN OF WOMEN'S MAGAZINES

One of the most popular women's magazines during the 1950s and 1960s was *McCall's* magazine. Its circulation peaked in the early 1960s, but the magazine had a long publishing history. Its first issue was published in April 1876. It was then called *The Queen, Illustrated*

Magazine of Fashion and advertised fashions produced by James McCall and Company. McCall's sewing patterns offered American women the opportunity to produce their own versions of European haute couture. In 1894 the magazine began to publish fiction and would continue this practice for much of its publication history with the fiction being mostly sentimental or mildly sensational. In 1954 the magazine began a "togetherness" campaign to brand itself as a family-oriented periodical rather than one geared mainly towards women's interests, though the two were conflated. The "togetherness" campaign reflected a broader American ideology in the 1950s that valued organization, conformity, and group unity over individuality. This campaign ran through the early 1960s and by the time the magazine reached its peak readership of 8.5 million, it had rebranded itself as the "First Magazine for Women." In the 1970s it again revised its brand as "The Magazine for Suburban Women," reflecting the dominance of its suburban readership (Silver 16). In 2001 the magazine was renamed *Rosie* after its new editor, the actress Rosie O'Donnell. *Rosie* ceased publication in 2002.

In the mid-sixties, *McCall's* readers were largely married women over the age of 35. About a third of its readers were employed and about half had at least a high school education (Silver 17). The magazine itself had a large format, measuring 11" x 14" and often running longer than 200 pages. In her comparative analysis of the magazine, Sheila Silver observes that "decorating, food and beauty tips all share[d] the same argot." Everything was "exciting," "romantic," or "deliciously different" (19). Yet during the 1960s, social changes initiated by the Kennedy-Johnson administration were in the national consciousness and *McCall's* observed these shifts with articles on more serious social issues like education or poverty. While the magazine still privileged the homemaker's domestic reality, and while it rarely depicted women – or men – in the working world, it was aware of wider societal phenomena.

In her study of women's magazines during the midcentury, Nancy Walker similarly considers who and what was included, and excluded, from the readerships of such magazines. She wonders to what extent the most popular women's magazines like *McCall's*, *Redbook*, *Good Housekeeping,* and *Ladies Home Journal* responded to political and social shifts during the 1940s-1950s, and how they conceived of women's primary responsibilities. Walker suggests that these magazines reflected a larger shift from a reliance on centralized cultural authority figures, like Robert Frost, to a reliance on various experts within specialized fields concerned with everyday life. Expertise was disseminated as figures of high culture lost their primacy. And yet, this shift was uneven. The October 1961 issue of *McCall's*, for example, contained a feature that wondered if women have the "right" to work outside the home, and one that worried about the "decline of the male sex" in the U.S. These articles suggest an uneasiness with emerging cultural trends that threatened the perceived stability of the male-dominated family. At the same time, regular features written by Eleanor Roosevelt and Wallis Simpson offered mild challenges to traditional attitudes about domesticity while also basically aligning themselves with the ideologically conservative viewpoint of the magazine. The two columnists carried the cultural cachet of figures from high culture, yet at the same time they spoke to the concerns of middle-class housewives. These articles and features certainly didn't present startling contradictions to one another; however, it is worth noting that they do point to a more negotiated terrain along the lines of what Nancy Walker suggests.

By the 1960s, the content of *McCall's* magazine, in particular, had shifted away from its heavy focus on fiction and toward considerations of women's domestic life and labor. This shift was double-edged as notions of domesticity had become tied to conceptions of social mobility. Walker writes that "complaints about homemaking standards can also be read as anxieties about

social-class identification." Homemaking and the home were tied to capitalism, patriotism, and Americanness in complex ways and magazines occupied a contested space within this matrix (16). Amid these contradictions, then, magazine content and advertising contained multiple meanings. Thus rather than read women's magazines through the lenses of coercion or subversion, or the ways that female readers might engage with the magazines through complicity or resistance, Walker argues that it is more productive to view the magazines as cultural artifacts that negotiate some of the concerns and tensions present in women's lives at the midcentury. As artifacts of everyday life, magazine content and advertising represent one of the primary meeting spaces where women mingled with corporate strategies, consumer desires, ideological positioning, household labor, and material culture.

Critics of women's magazines have viewed their place in women's lives with greater suspicion than Walker. In *The Feminine Mystique* (1963), Betty Friedan took aim at women's magazines by arguing that their intended purpose was to train women to be better mothers and housewives, thereby abandoning any notion of the self-sufficient women. Friedan analyzed *McCall's*, *Good Housekeeping*, *Ladies' Home Journal*, and *Women's Home Companion* and reported similarly grim results across the board. These magazines presented an image of women sequestered in the home, apolitical, uninformed, and uninterested in life beyond cooking and cleaning. Walker argues that Friedan's analysis ignores "dramatic changes in the American economy, in American political rhetoric, in technology and industry, and in advertising practices and patterns of consumption" that influenced the production of women's magazines and made the proliferation of such magazines available to different demographic segments of women (11). Indeed other segments of the market for women's magazines were already undergoing dramatic shifts. Although Helen Gurley Brown had not yet assumed the helm at *Cosmopolitan*, it is hard

132

to imagine that the cultural currents that led Brown to reshape *Cosmo* as the magazine for the single girl in 1965 were not already in the atmosphere by the time of Friedan's analysis. Contrary to Friedan, Walker suggests that women's magazines like *McCall's* were not sending monolithic messages to its readers and that its readers were not consuming the magazine uncritically. Rather Walker finds space within the often-contradictory messages conveyed by these magazines to read the domestic as a "contested and negotiated concept rather than a proscribed and stable one" (vii).

In her examination of *McCall's*, which she presented at a journalism conference at the University of Maryland in 1976, Sheila Silver performed a content analysis on two years of *McCall's* magazine, 1964 and 1974. She determined that by 1974 *McCall's* encouraged the reader to be her own woman, apart from her roles as wife and mother (28). The magazine didn't fully embrace the more militant aspects of the women's liberation movement, but it did encourage its readers to move "out of the kitchen" and engage with the wider world. Through content and advertising, the magazine provided middle-class suburban women with information on the women's movement and changing mores about female domesticity. For example, content centered less on the nuances of housekeeping and child-rearing and more on issue-oriented pieces about a woman's working life or debates about abortion. Thus, the magazine was affected by changing cultural attitudes about women to a greater extent than Freidan proposes.

Silver chose *McCall's* because it was a general interest magazine aimed at a largely white, middle-class readership. As a "middle-of-the-road" publication, it offered the ideal text by which to determine whether ideas regarding "female consciousness-raising" had been diffused throughout mainstream mass media. Silver hypothesized that though the magazine would have kept pace with changing conceptions of femininity, it would not have taken a position on "more

militant ideas advocated by feminists." Silver further hypothesized that advertisements and editorial copy would have hedged full endorsement of feminist ideals by promoting fuller female self-expression, though within the confines of traditional female roles (4-5). Silver notes that in the 1940s and 1950s, the "geographical center" for *Ladies Home Journal* readers was the kitchen. Women's concerns orbited the kitchen, whether they were practical or emotional. By 1973, a United Nations report asserted that women's magazines had finally moved "out of the kitchen" as women were granted more expansive psychological and professional universes (13). Silver suggests, however, that women's liberation from the kitchen was far from complete. Silver's comparative analysis is instructive in pointing to the movement between the kitchen and a wider feminine geography; yet her study stops short of analyzing just how this movement occurred across the period between 1964-1974. In this chapter, then, I aim to build on Silver's hypothesis, with an eye toward Walker's methodology, to analyze just how women moved "out of the kitchen." To accomplish this, I turn to advertising in *McCall's* with a specific focus on advertising for domestic technologies.

In women's magazines, advertising often explicitly drew connections between the acquisition of goods, patriotism, and social-class status. By the postwar era, women were already clearly defined as the chief purchasers of household goods and their purchasing habits were thought to reflect more largely on the taste and class of the family. Women's magazines published guides on shopping that instructed women how to purchase quality goods at good prices. New technologies like hand mixers, improved washing machines, and garbage disposals were touted as labor-saving devices that were also and the smart choice for discerning housewives who educated themselves on home economics. The magazines also offered introductions to the array of new convenience foods that had entered the market in the postwar

134

years. Advertising and content worked hand-in-hand to introduce and instruct women about new goods and products that they might use to distinguish themselves.

Advertisements in women's magazines in the 1920 and 30s had stressed individual choice and agency. For example, women were pictured as the purchasers and drivers of cars. An April 1934 ad for Oldsmobile shows a woman behind the wheel as her friends look on admiringly (Walker 7). But by the midcentury, automobile ads were virtually absent from women's magazines. Where they did exist, the purchasers were men. Ads for automobiles did not appear again in *McCall's* until the mid-late 1960s with a famous campaign for Volkswagen.[60] The disappearance and reemergence of automobile advertising in *McCall's* captures attitudes about women and mobility that are not immediately evident in the magazine's content. Walker argues that because editors have little control over advertising images and text, ads become one of the sites that reflect cultural change. Whereas articles and columns in women's magazines tend to prescribe some change, ads reflect current cultural attitudes. Ads convey markers of taste, the emergence of fads, and evolving popular interests and thus serve as artifacts of cultural history.

For this study, I analyzed 40 issues of *McCall's*: the April, July, October, and December issues for the years 1960-1969. These issues provided a sampling of content that represented seasonal variations throughout the year and was consistent from year to year. Within these issues, I tallied the number of ads that marketed a technology. While there are many ways to define technology, I chose to define it in terms of gadgetry and appliances. If an ad promoted a

---

[60] The Volkswagen campaign featured a number of memorable ads. Of them, two have had the most lasting cultural cachet. The first featured a VW Beetle against a bare background with the words, "Think small." The second featured a shiny new VW Beatle with the word "Lemon" printed boldly underneath it. The copy read, "We pluck the lemons; you get the plums," suggesting that VW was so rigorous in its inspection processes that consumers could trust any VW automobile that made it to the lot. In the television show *Mad Men*, season 1, episode 3, Don Draper discusses the effectiveness of the Lemon ad.

product with a cord or a battery, it became part of my study. I then further divided these ads into the types of technologies they promoted, which I defined as being either for the home — appliances like washing machines, refrigerators, and electric furniture polishers — or for personal use — appliances like electric hair dryers, electric razors, and sewing machines. I then based my analysis on these numbers and divisions. I found that in general, ads for home appliances decreased over the decade while ads for personal appliances increased. I will discuss these finding in much greater detail in the following section in which I analyze these ads in the context of mobility and technology.

4.3   THE UN-DOMESTICATION OF TECHNOLOGY IN MCCALL'S MAGAZINE

The 1960s was a period of rapid technological growth. New technologies were often advertised through the lens of fashion in women's magazines. For young women in the mid-sixties, this was seen in Mod fashion advertising that emphasized youth and speed. In her article on the moped in advertising, Becky Conekin connects the model Twiggy with speed, mobility, and technology though advertisements in UK *Vogue* that featured Twiggy riding a moped through the streets of "swinging" London as she modeled the latest Mod fashions. Conekin suggests that Twiggy's association with the moped recalls earlier advertising of women and bicycles during the 1890s in Victorian London. In both cases, the bicycle carries with it connotations of female sexuality as it was believed that straddling the vehicle might orient the rider in such a way as to produce sexual stimulation. This fear was mapped onto notions of speed and mobility, thereby linking gender, technology, and sexuality to fear and threat. Such an association lingers, in different configurations, in advertising for domestic technologies in *McCall's* during the 1960s. A curious

136

ad for the Polaroid 10-second Automatic Land Camera exhibits this combination of fear and technology.

The ad features an overhead view of the camera with its film loading door ajar. Emerging from the camera is a picture of a smiling baby. The copy reads, "Go ahead, lady. It won't bite." The implication is that the camera is safe enough to capture and hold the baby. It assumes some fear on the part of the "lady" towards the camera. The ad begins: "Most cameras look a little scary. Maybe ours does, too. But don't be afraid. It likes people."[61] The move to personify the camera as something capable of affection for people replicates other marketing rhetoric that seeks to humanize technology as an advertising strategy. The language of automation also proliferates, particularly in advertising during the early-mid 1960s. The Polaroid ad encourages female consumers to try the camera, which automatically focuses, adjusts for light, and signals when a flash should be used. The user needs no specialized knowledge or technical skill at all. She only needs to be brave enough to pick up the camera. The ad ends by saying, "So don't be camera-shy anymore. This one's on your side." The ad works to forge an alliance between the user and the technology, establishing a friendly relationship wherein the user can trust the technology not to frighten or frustrate her. This ad began a Polaroid campaign that would extend for several issues and thus served as an introduction to the new camera that was designed to assuage the fear of technology that advertisers perceived women harbored.

Many of the ads for electronic or technological gadgets in the early 1960s were for ovens and washing machines; however, another ad from the October 1961 issue stands out in its coupling of beauty with technology. The ad is for a personalized beauty plan on LP record by the cosmetic company Du Barry. It features a woman seated on the floor next to her record player,

---

[61] *McCall's*, October 1961, pp. 9.

presumably listening to her Du Barry personalized beauty plan. It assumes familiarity with not only cosmetics, but the technology of the record player. While the two elements don't seem like natural partners, the idea represents Du Barry's attempt to bring the experience of the cosmetics counter into the home via recorded media. The ad "personalizes" the technology in two ways. First, the LP is custom-made for the user. Secondly, it is designed to be listened in a very personal space while the user is thinking about herself and her appearance. These two factors create an intimacy between user and technology in a subtle and effective way.

Domestic appliances were represented in the content of the magazine as well through advice columns and other articles. These articles were used as pedagogical tools to instruct users on the technologies advertised within the pages. *McCall's* was divided into sections, each representing different departments such as Features, Fashions, Decorating, or Food. A department called "Equipment" was dedicated to promoting and discussing new household appliances. The December 1961 Equipment section featured a spread called "Gala Gifts of Gadgetry." The article introduced readers to new gadgets that might serve as Christmas gifts. They included an electric gridle, electric shoe polisher, electric shish-kebaber, electric freezer, a toaster-broiler, an electric food warmer, a dry iron, an electric coffeemaker, and a telephone. Like many of the advertisements during the early 1960s, the Equipment section was keen to emphasize the automatic nature of new technologies. Examples abound. The Polaroid Land Camera automatically focused and adjusted to different light levels. The Singer "Slant-o-matic" sewing machine allowed the user to turn a dial to select the type of stitch she wanted. After setting the dial, the machine would automatically replicate the stitch, granting greater ease and speed in sewing. The Caloric Heritage gas oven featured a "Burner-with-a-Brain," a heat-controlled gridle that adjusted itself to avoid burning food. While these products promised

different things, the majority wanted to ensure the user a customized experience guided by convenience and without the hassle of having to acquire new skills to operate the equipment. This further reinforced the gendered ideology of women being unable or afraid to operate complex gadgets. Advertisers and manufactures sought to make the operation of these devices as simple as possible. In the ads, fingertips pushed buttons and magic happened. Furthermore, this magic was tailored to the individual. The customizable qualities of these new gadgets signaled a move from the "togetherness" rhetoric of *McCall's* in the 1950s toward more individualized notions of the self and others that was beginning to mark cultural shifts of the 1960s. While these gadgets are examples of objects that endorsed the rhetoric of individuality, they also signaled the larger commercial and civic systems required for their operation. Advertising rhetoric suggested that users could move away from the fear of technology and toward an embrace of it, perhaps even into an intimate relationship with technology. Based on these ideas, the appliances speak to Nixon's vision of American superiority-though-gadgetry, though by paradoxically moving away from notions of togetherness within the comfort of the home, and toward the notion that technology could be used in the service of an individual's needs rather than purely for the benefit of the family. This subtle shift toward the un-domestication of technology followed in the wake of an overwhelming push to get Americans to consume more electricity and electronic gadgets. Before I continue with the advertising in *McCall's*, a slight digression exploring the foundations of consumer electronics is useful to more fully understand the movement away from domesticated technologies.

For the suburban readers of *McCall's*, the increased manufacture and marketing of home appliances that occurred during the postwar years were impacted by two historical conditions. First, the American manufacturing infrastructure was in place to mass produce such electronic

goods as electric ranges and washing machines, both of which had profuse advertisements in the *McCall's*. Plants that once generated wartime provisions were converted to manufacture peacetime goods as industrial technologies developed during World War II were put to commercial uses. The postwar push to produce and consume electronic gadgets carried with it ideas about how to be American through purchasing power. In such a world, a General Electric refrigerator was a public badge of patriotism. Second, the public utility infrastructure was in place to support the operation of these goods. James Williams writes that as access to home electricity grew from the 1910s to the 1930s, utility firms began to market home appliances to boost household electricity consumption. As most people used electricity during the evening for lighting, the power load generated during daytime hours was underused. Because there was no way to store excess electricity at the time, power companies, and the Southern California Edison Company in particular, sought new ways to increase energy consumption during the day. The catch was that this use could not overwhelm the existing grid designed to carry electricity from generating plants to residential power users. The ideal appliance would therefore need to use the same small-load electric socket that was used during the evening for indoor lighting. Power companies began to aggressively market small household appliances like electric irons, percolators, and toasters that could be used regularly throughout the day. The SCE company sent door-to-door salesmen to homes to market these "lamp-socket" appliances. Once they understood that the housewife was the main purchaser and user of these goods, utility companies began to gender their advertising campaigns to more effectively target the imagined female consumer. The legacy of those campaigns was still very apparent in the 1950s and 1960s. Ads for domestic appliances featured women in hoop skirts and high heels posing next to their ranges and washing machines. In the most extreme cases, women were dressed in sophisticated evening

gowns as they stood before their open refrigerators. These ads clearly betray a lack of familiarity with the grubbiness and labor of actual housework as they more clearly imagine housework as a pleasure akin to dressing up. The ads that I found in *McCall's* for domestic kitchen gadgets therefore aligned with my expectations for gendered representations of domestic labor.

However, as the decade wore on, and against my expectations, both the number and content of electronics advertising steadily shifted. In general, throughout the decade advertising for technology exhibited a decreasing trend, aside from 1966, which was an anomalous year. Within that trend, advertisements for home electronics, including refrigerators, percolators, and irons decreased. Advertisements for personal electronics, including hair dryers, electric razors, and sewing machines, slightly increased. In the early part of the decade, home electronics advertising dominated over personal electronics, while in the mid to late part of the decade, they were roughly equivalent with personal use electronics occasionally dominating. Based on these trends, I argue that advertising for consumer electronic goods shifted away from a focus on the woman-as-homemaker and toward a focus on the woman-as-personal consumer. This trend is evident in the move to make electronics more personal, customizable, and automatic. Advertising reflected a growing interest that women had in tending to their own needs as well as those of the family, which was itself a fundament shift from the 1950s emphasis on togetherness. This shift has implications concerning not only nation and family, but also boundaries of female geography and notions of female intimacy.

One ad campaign in particular was prescient in observing, and perhaps galvanizing, this shift. It was a campaign designed by the Bell Telephone System.[62] Ads for Bell telephones appeared in an overwhelming majority of the magazine issues that I looked at for my study,

---

[62] See Marvin, particularly the chapter "Locating the Body in Electrical Space and Time" for a discussion of the body as a communicative medium.

making it a more ubiquitous technology than nearly any other and therefore worthy of consideration. The telephone held a unique place in terms of both production and consumption. *McCall's* advertised for telephone sales staff in its magazine. In an ad headlined "Housewives: Earn Extra Money by Phone," the magazine offered women the opportunity to earn extra money by selling *McCall's* subscriptions from home over the phone. This small opportunity offered women a way to earn an income while also circumventing the problem of working outside the home. Thus, the telephone provided a quasi-professional break from the drudgery of housework. The Bell Telephone System provided the sole telephone advertising in *McCall's* and the ad campaign worked hard to expand the functions of the telephone. For example, a half page advertisement in the December 1964 issue features a telephone wearing a red Santa hat. The copy reads, "From candy canes to stocking fillers, why not get the little shopping chores done by *telephone* this season?" The ad suggests that when the busy holiday puts the kibosh on a shopping trip, the shopping is still only a phone call away. During the 1960s, the telephone was one of the most significant social technologies advertised in the magazine.

4.4   THE BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

The telephone was not a new technology in the sixties, indeed it was nearly a century old, but it was one whose uses were undergoing transformation. The social history of the telephone has been a neglected area of study. While the television has been the subject of much scholarship, the telephone has not been the object of similar investigation. Yet women provided much of the labor that drove the American telephone system during the first century of its being. Brenda Maddox writes that telephone switchboards offered women an entry point to white collar work

that was preferable to factory or retail work. The first female operator, Emma Nutt, was hired by the Telephone Dispatch Company in 1878 and within the next five years, women largely replaced men at the switchboard (266). Women were deemed more polite and dexterous, but they could also be hired at a fraction of men's wages. The position was regarded as appropriate for single girls only with the expectation that a woman would resign once she married. The job was also grueling. Operators were expected to maintain rigid standards of decorum and to adhere to rote scripts. In the words of one switchboard supervisor, the girls were to present themselves as "a kind of human machine" (Maddox 270). This level of professionalism extended to dress. Operators dressed professionally for their positions, forging a link between the telephone and the presentation of the self. New jobs required new attire and with the emergence of the female professional workforce came new garments like the shirtwaist and the blouse (Boettinger 202). While the gendered labor of early telephone systems is a rich area, I am more interested in the telephone as a social technology.[63] Women remain closely linked to the social history of the telephone, and thus women's relationship to the telephone deserves some attention.

In 1963 the Bell Telephone System introduced touchtone dialing, replacing the old rotary dial. While this development would have long-lasting effects, the changing social uses of the telephone are more germane to this discussion. These shifts are evidenced by the publication of three texts on the sociology of the telephone that remain foundational in discourse about the telephone as a social technology. These texts are Donald Ball's "Toward a Sociology of Telephones and Telephoners" (1968), Sydney Aronson's "The Sociology of the Telephone"

---

[63] The telephone girl was a recurrent figure in early Hollywood films like *The Voice at the Phone* (1914), *The Telephone Girl* (1927), and *Telephone Operator* (1937). Often the narrative involved the rise of a young woman through the social ranks with the telephone as a tool for romance.

(1971), and Ithiel de Sola Pool's edited volume, *The Social Impact of the Telephone* (1977).[64]

Ball's article is helpful in outlining the importance of the telephone as a tool of communication and a potentially democratizing tool in navigating the professional world. Ball establishes that "social reality occurs through conversational exchange," however mundane or significant, and therefore argues that the study of telephone conversations is an important part of understanding how social realities are constructed and maintained over phone lines. Ball is interested in forms of "telephonic conversation" as well as the telephone itself as a medium. By the publication of Ball's paper, telephones were pervasive in the United States and indeed viewed as a necessity of daily life. The telephone offered direct access to its owner and demanded their attention. To ignore a ringing phone was beyond decency and could even be considered a violation of proper social conduct. To answer the phone was to enter into a conversational contract in which telephone etiquette was an extension of the self. The rules were clearly defined: answer promptly, engage actively, and wait for the caller to suggest an end to the conversation. To violate these rules was to challenge one's conception of oneself, which was always defined socially and internalized privately.

Ball argues that the ringing telephone exhibited an "equalitarian intensity." The identity of the caller was generally unknown and unidentifiable along markers of class or gender; therefore, each call was treated with equal attention. That is, one answered the phone and later sorted out how much courtesy should be paid the caller. For Ball, the phone call offered access to persons normally inaccessible because of social class conventions. Efforts to evade unwanted phone calls, though answering machines, personal secretaries, or unlisted numbers, were viewed with suspicion. Alternately, the telephone might be used strategically to call attention to one's

---

[64] I have cited selections from Pool's edited volume earlier in the chapter. The entire volume is an insightful resource for the cultural history of the telephone.

presence and importance. Ball asks us to consider the celebrity who is publicly called to the telephone in a crowded restaurant. The image recalls Tony Robert's character Rob in *Annie Hall* (1977). Throughout the film, Rob contacts his secretary every time he changes location. He loudly instructs her to forward his calls as a way of signaling his importance to everybody within earshot.

For Ball, though the telephone required various adaptations to the rules of social conduct, its main revolutionary function was as a technology that decentralized relationships. The proliferation of telephones enabled families to geographically separate from one another because they could remain linked via phone lines. Professionally, telephones decentralized organizations and contributed to the "erosion of formal, bureaucratic structures of administration and control" (68). Ball argued that the telephone allowed for the subversion of hierarchies because it allowed for direct access. Such an argument is curiously dependent on adherence to telephone etiquette – namely that one must always answer the phone and that the caller should be the one to terminate the call. Yet Ball describes a model organized in nets or nodes, rather than a top-down hierarchy, made possible by the level-jumping possibilities of the telephone. Ball's model is prescient in anticipating the development of the internet, but also idealistic in its notion that the path to direct access might always be clear, and that the rules of social conduct might always be observed. Further, as anyone who has navigated the menu of a customer support number nowadays knows, automated telephone services have created impenetrable boundaries between the caller and the target of the call. However, in 1968 Ball claimed that the "telephone provides a new web" (70). Ball notes that the telephone, in 1968, was a strictly aural medium absent of any visual cues, which allowed for a degree of subterfuge. In spy and spy spoof films of the 1960s, the telephone allowed the caller to mask his or her identity and therefore offered an ideal tool for espionage.

On film, the visualized relationship between the caller and called was fertile ground for playing with obscured identities. Ball is also interested in the potential illicit uses of the telephone, like telephone fraud schemes, to dupe the person who answers. He notes that the telephone gave rise to the "call girl." In a pedagogical ad in 1966, Bell System also shows evidence of recognizing the potentially dubious uses of the telephone and published an ad that instructed women how to respond in the event of "obscene, harassing or threatening phone calls."[65]

While Ball is concerned with the telephone on an interpersonal level, his contemporary, the sociologist Sidney Aronson, is concerned with the telephone in relation to modernization. Aronson ties the telephone, as "both cause and effect," to modernization in the Western world, particularly the United States. He suggests that the telephone provides an easy, affordable means of communication, and that communication itself is the "fundamental social process" that enables both society and the individual self to exist. Aronson goes so far as to suggest that the differences between a society with a developed telephone system and one without may be as great as the differences between a literate culture and a non-literate one. For Aronson, the telephone lies at the bedrock of modern society.

In a sentiment that resonates even more so today, Aronson critically notes that the ringing telephone takes primacy over face-to-face interaction. On an individual level, the development of the telephone system sped communication and the pace of everyday life. It helped bridge distances and reoriented geographies both personal and physical. On a larger scale, the telephone has been integral to the development of mass production, mass communication, and mass consumption. Aronson links its rapid spread from 1870s to the 1910s to the rise of corporations and trusts in the post-Civil War era. Like Ball, Aronson is also interested in the illicit uses of the

telephone. He conjectures that gambling, prostitution, and the drug trade have all benefited from the telephone as much as more legitimate businesses. Aronson suggests that deviance is the "Janus face of privacy." The privacy that the telephone allows also carries with it the threat that deviant ideas may be similarly communicated over private telephone lines. This threat, however, does not mitigate the importance of the telephone to the spread of cultures. Aronson notes that the telephone changed the structure of urban and suburban areas by allowing both connection and dispersal. He suggests that its spread enabled a greater "psychological neighborhood" for its users and therefore reduced feelings of loneliness, isolation, and anxiety. In its capacity to expand the borders of communication, Aronson argues that the telephone "paved the way, both technologically and psychologically, for the thematically twentieth century media of communication: radio and television" (166). As a tool of mass communication, the spread and diversifying uses of the telephone during the 1960s is significant. In *McCall's* magazine, the telephone ads can be categorized into three different tropes: convenience, mobility, and intimacy.

To the first point of convenience, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the family telephone could often be found in the hallway or kitchen where all family members had access, though not privacy (Lacohée). In the first scene of the first episode of the *Dick Van Dyke Show* (1961), Laura Petrie answers a ringing telephone in the kitchen and the entire episode relies on the telephone as a connecting device.[66] Ads in *McCall's* similarly promote the telephone as a convenience, though introduce the idea that the telephone might provide a way to connect to different areas within the home. Through what Bell South called the "Interphone" you could speak to someone in a different room or answer the front door via a speaker mounted near the doorbell. These ads suggest an expansion of the female sphere from the kitchen to other parts of

---

[66] "The Sick Boy and the Sitter," originally aired October 3, 1961.

the house through remote technology.[67] At the same time, Bell South also appealed to female consumers to increase the number of extensions in the household. An ad for the princess telephone from Bell Telephone System appeared in the October 1961 issue of *McCall's.* The tagline reads, "To Each her Own Princess." The ad suggests that Princess telephones appear in the most tasteful bedrooms of the nicest homes in town. It depicts three generations of women, each using her own telephone in her own bedroom. A young mother is shown sitting at her desk with the telephone in reach as she attends to her daily business. A second image pictures an older woman in bed using a Princess telephone that features a light-up dial to ensure maximum ease-of-use and safety. The last image shows a teenage girl on a Princess telephone in the privacy of her bedroom, the distance of which gives "peace and quiet for her parents." The set of images appeals to women of different ages and even suggests that the Princess telephone might accompany a woman through her journey from adolescence to maturity. The ad is careful to depict only the older woman in bed, just hinting at the presence of a bed in the other two images, which chastely park the telephone user at her desk. Such an arrangement avoids any lewd connections between the bedroom telephone and sex, instead suggesting that the phone offers convenience, sociality, functionality, and safety. We might even imagine that the women are talking to each other, further reinforcing the sense of female community that telephones might provide. Implicit in these advertisements is the idea that women might achieve a sense of mobility without needing to become physically mobile. The concept of nonphysical mobility permeates Bell Systems advertising throughout the 1960s.

In 1968 Ball claimed that the "telephone provides a new web" (70). For the Bell Telephone company, this mobile web manifested in ads about telephone shopping. The new web

---

[67] See the ad, "Spring's a-Ringin,'" *McCall's,* April 1962.

connected suburban housewives to shopping venues and, more significantly, to each other, in new ways. Ads for telephone shopping suggest that one might avoid traffic headaches by shopping by phone. One ad from the October 1963 issue shows cars sitting at a traffic light, their errands thwarted by city traffic. The urban milieu is interesting because *McCall's* was aimed at suburban women, but the setting adds a level of sophistication to the task by visualizing the suburban housewife within an urban milieu, though it does this by suggesting that she need not be there at all. She can experience the bustle of the city from the counter of her kitchen. Another ad pictures a housewife in her kitchen making a telephone call. The copy reads, "How to save yourself 76 miles of walking per year."[68] The ad goes on to suggest that a busy mother might save steps by calling in her shopping rather than going to the store. In its exchange of the telephone for a physical presence, the ad suggests a relationship between the technology and the body that implies that the phone functions as proxy for the body: Rather than walk, make a call. Save yourself seventy-six miles per year. Nonphysical mobility becomes a function of efficiency. In a further visualization of this proxied relationship, an ad from October 1964 pictures an overhead image of three unpaired women's shoes. Rather than placing a foot in the shoe, the ad superimposes three distinct models of telephone over each shoe as a replacement for the foot. The copy reads, "Three beautiful ways to save steps." Here the telephone is a complete substitution for the mobile body. The design of the shoes also hints at issues of taste and class, again associating a level of sophistication with telephone shopping. The shoes are delicately-heeled and made to be slipped into. They suggest an elegant afternoon rather than a day spent doing household chores.

---

[68] See the ad, "How to save yourself…," *McCall's,* October 1965.

In addition to Bell System, the Yellow Pages also advertised in *McCall's* and the company also emphasized the telephone as a tool of nonphysical mobility. In one Yellow Pages ad, the fingers become substitutes for both the body and the technology. The ad shows a woman's hand with her fingers posed as if to resemble legs in motion.[69] Her hand throws a shadow against the white background. Rather than cast an identical image however, the shadow is refigured as the silhouette of a woman's full body in stride. The copy proposes the now-familiar slogan, "Let your fingers do the walking!" In this substitution, fingers-as-digits meet telephone digits to prefigure a "digital" world in which fingertips guide users through ever more expanding realms of time and space. In the context of the ad, the reduction of the body to the hand suggests a level of control over the environment, but also a physical confinement to that environment. Movement exists in the suggestion of shadows, a distortion of reality that perhaps recalls the Allegory of the Cave. The social reality constructed via this mode of shopping is one of isolation. The shopping adventure that summoned women from their homes at the turn of the twentieth century, with its attendant pleasures rooted in sensorial experiences and engagements with the public sphere, is here diminished and replaced with telephone shopping, which instead asks women to again retreat into the isolation of the private home. The potential for mobility is therefore double-edged. The telephone is of tool of socialization as explicitly stated by the ads, which portray smiling housewives happily chatting while they accomplish their tasks. Yet implicitly it is also a symbol of loneliness and isolation that removes the incidental pleasures of mobility, such as running into a friend or seeing something new or unexpected. Telephone shopping eliminated the contingent possibilities that made shopping more than a weekly duty.

---

[69] See the ad, "Let your fingers do the walking!," *McCall's,* April 1962.

The final advertising trope is related to intimacy. An ad for long-distance calling shows a woman in bed with the blanket pulled snugly around her as she speaks into the telephone. This ad campaign is different from one that sought as much distance between the caller and the bed as possible. Rather here the inference is that it is nighttime and the woman is speaking to someone she knows well.[70] The ad phrases intimacy in two ways: as way to keep in touch with distant family and, as something more ambiguous. Again, this trope carries with it sometimes contradictory meanings. B. Ruby Rich explores these contradictions as she discusses her relationship with the telephone as an instrument of community. She writes that as a teenager in the early 1960s, it was one weapon in her "meager arsenal" that allowed her to reach out and to be reached herself. She delights in the notion of the "phone as killer," referencing the folktale that warns of the dangers of answering the phone during a severe thunderstorm lest a fatal lightning bolt travel straight through the telephone line to the caller's ear and then, woefully, their brain. Intimacy for Rich is imagined as something fraught with danger. Similarly, Suzanne Keller recalls one of the last images of Marilyn Monroe with her hand on the receiver of a telephone, as Keller puts it, "reaching for life while withdrawing from it" (282). The intertwined imagining of the telephone as a tool of both desire and danger recalls the earlier advertising for the moped in which speed and mobility were equated with fear and threat. This association was present in Bell's advertising campaign for the telephone.

During the early to mid-1960s, the Bell Company ran a series of ads that imagined telephone intimacy as something also tinged with mystery. An ad from 1962 echoes earlier rhetoric about the convenience of a bedside extension, and then adds that this extension is "a pleasure to use." The ad shows a woman seated on a living room sofa. A telephone rests on the

---

[70] See the ad, "How can something so sensible…," *McCall's,* July 1962.

back of the sofa and she is turned, her hand resting on the telephone as though she has just ended the conversation, to look out the window in reverie. We see a look of pleasure in the woman's satisfied smile but are left to wonder about the circumstances.[71] Another ad explicitly states that the pleasure "lingers" long after the call has ended. A woman is seated with her hand on the receiver and a dreamy expression on her face. We get the sense that this is a daytime phone call as there seems to be light from a window. The implicit message is that the phone call has taken her away from her daily household routine and transported her to a space of pleasure and reverie. The shift in domestic geography is not only a physical separation from the kitchen to the living room, but an emotional shift as well. This ad again evokes lingering pleasure, and again deepens the message, promising that the phone call and the voice on the other end will make her "feel so good all over."[72] Certainly, there is erotic innuendo here, but there is also a reinforcement of the equation between technology and the body. The phone on her lap and her hand on the phone create a physical circuit that B. Ruby Rich described as "killer" and here is imagined as profound, lingering, bodily pleasure. The ad demonstrates a rhetoric about gender and technology that explores a visceral, emotional female experience.

The last ad in this series is dark both visually and in terms of content. It is again nighttime and the object of the call is pictured behind a set of half-closed curtains. The ad imagines the caller as voyeur. The image is taken from the perspective of someone standing outside a window looking in. A woman is on the telephone inside the house, having presumably answered the phone. The ad asks, "When you wish you were with folks you miss, why not pick up the phone and call them? It's a pleasure any time. Any time at all."[73] As I read it, the caller is

---

[71] See the ad, "There's a pleasure that lingers…," *McCall's,* October 1962.
[72] See the ad, "There's a pleasure that lingers…," *McCall's,* April 1964.
[73] See the ad, "Long distance is the next best thing…," *McCall's,* April 1965.

outside of the window frame looking in on the person he wishes to call. He imagines them answering the phone and visualizes them on the other end. The tagline reads, somewhat ambiguously, "Long Distance is the next best thing to being there." This was the last ad in my sample that explored pleasure as a marketing strategy and it seems as though the campaign had veered into territory that was perhaps too darkly suggestive for suburban women. Future ads pull back from this theme.

The Bell ads are instructive in thinking through the ways in which attitudes about gender and technology were expressed unevenly during the decade. These ads ran concurrently with other ads for kitchen gadgets. Thinking back to the ads for electric ranges and automatic washers, in which housewives dressed in kitten heels proudly announce their new appliances, it is undeniable that Bell's ad campaign works on a different register. Telephone technology is private rather than public. It privileges pleasure over labor. It is decidedly un-domestic. It is personal, maybe even secret. The ads allow room for female interiority, and open spaces for fantasy and reflection. There is suggestion, innuendo, and perhaps a flirtation with the illicit. The Bell ads offered a means by which women could imagine alternative spaces, even within a medium that was relatively stagnant, ideologically.[74] The ads suggest a move away from the notion of "togetherness" that McCall's promoted in the 1950s and toward a more individualized concept of the person as separate from the family.

---

[74] Shelia Silver identifies the kitchen as the "geographical center" for female readers of *Ladies' Home Journal*.

4.5   THE USES OF THE TELEPHONE AND TELEPHONIC GADGETS ON FILM

Several films made around this time explicitly reference the telephone. *BUtterfield 8* (1960) starring Elizabeth Taylor, derives its name from the telephone exchange for the Upper East Side of Manhattan. In it, Taylor explores the illicit uses of the telephone in her job as a call girl, which alludes to the potential uses of the telephone that the Bell ads only imply. In the film Taylor is indeed a manifestation of the call girl that Ball imagined in his early writing on the telephone, though one who is ultimately punished for her behavior. In *Pillow Talk* (1959), Rock Hudson and Doris Day offer a more comic take on party lines in the bedroom. Their party line hijinks ends in romance after a great deal of confusion over identities once masked by the telephone. The telephone and telephonic gadgets, however, were most on display in the cycle of spy and spy spoof films that were produced during the mid-1960s and that centralized the uses of technology including the telephone. In these films gadgetry is related to technology, but also to capitalism and consumer growth in the United States and Europe. Like fashion, gadgetry in these films offers a set of material objects through which to consider more abstract ideas about gender and consumerism. On a formal level, these props organize spaces and often function as motivating devices for the narrative. This section will consider the thematic and formal aspects of technology in spy and spy spoof films of the 1960s.

The spy spoof category emerged in 1964 with the television program *The Man from U.N.C.L.E.* Other similar television shows emerged rapidly including *I Spy*, *Get Smart*, *The Wild, Wild West,* and *Honey West.*[75] Anthony Enns writes that television viewers were fatigued by

---

[75] The first James Bond film, *Dr. No* (1962), ushered in the spy genre's popularity in the United States and an enormous number of spy films were produced in the US and Europe thereafter, many as co-productions. Films like *Casino Royale* (1967) and *Agent 8 ¾* (1964) bridged the gap between spy and spy spoof films and the two categories

topical programming and political coverage and instead wanted light, escapist entertainment that offered a different perspective on the heavy political climate (125). Part of the pleasure of the programs lay in the slick presentation of spycraft. In his study of the promotion of spy spoof entertainment during the period, Enns writes that the public was fascinated not with the political intricacies of espionage, but rather with the "fashion and fetishization of spy culture" (128). Enns suggests that part of the allure of spy culture was the belief that the characters and their gadgets could be real. Enns terms this as a belief "beyond-the-script" and it is significant for my argument in thinking about why gadgets held such a powerful place within the imagination. Following the success of *The Man from U.N.C.L.E.,* Twentieth-Century Fox distributed a run of spy thrillers in the mid-1960s including *Modesty Blaise*, *Fathom*, *Caprice*, and the Flint films *Our Man Flint* (1966) and *In Like Flint* (1967). The first three films on the list are interesting because they all feature female leads in the role of the spy, and I discuss *Caprice* at length in the next chapter. *Modesty Blaise* and *Fathom* are good genre examples, yet they focus more generally on fashion rather than technology. The gendering of the two ideas is a tendency of the genre and the reason this chapter focuses on *Our Man Flint* (1966) and its sequel *In Like Flint* (1967) is because the films offer an interesting take on both fashion and technology.

In the previous section I drew out tropes related to intimacy, illicit desire, automation, the body as technology, mobility, and telecommunication. Those tropes come into play in discussing the spy spoof films as well because this set of films draws heavily on these notions as it plays with the possibilities of technology. Technology in these films is treated with hushed solemnity on one hand, and with a sort of camp delight on the other and this leads to questions regarding

---

of film were essentially concurrent. Spies also appeared in art house films like *The 1000 Eyes of Dr. Mabuse* (1960) and *Alphaville* (1965). Spy television shows like *The Avengers* (1961-69), *The Prisoner* (1968), and *Misson: Impossible* (1966-73) were also immensely popular.

cultural attitudes about technology during the period. What is the relationship between technology, fashion, and design? How do fantasies about gadgetry relate to the examples of household gadgets advertised in *McCall's* magazine? What is the relationship between technology and gender, and is the discourse of fear still implicit in treatments of technology in spy spoof films? If so, what exactly is the threat? I argue that these films negotiate some of these issues through an emphasis on design and mise-en-scène over narrative and character to commodify technology. As I will demonstrate later in the chapter, mise-en-scène becomes a significant means to visualize abstract notions like communication and mobility. Before making that argument, however, I will begin with an analysis of the gadgetry in the Flint and Matt Helm films.

Our Man Flint (1966) opens with a running gag with a telephone. It is a visual gag that relies on the recurring appearance of a bright red telephone that links the main character Derek Flint, played by James Coburn, to the government bureaucracy he strives to avoid. The joke is that the telephone functions like a leash and is inescapable, even in the most unlikely places, which parodies the message of the Bell ads that the telephone frees one for increased mobility. In both this film and its sequel, Flint is an ex-agent for the organization Z.O.W.I.E. (Zonal Organization for World Intelligence and Espionage) who is reluctantly lured out of retirement by threats to his life and the lives of his quartet of international girlfriends. The acronymic name of the organization appears alongside other appurtenances of the genre such as international locales, sophisticated forms of transportation, harems of exotic women, campy gadgets, hidden evil lairs, and comically sinister villains. The Flint films are interesting for the ways in which they straddle the line between earnestness and parody. If the Bond films established the template from which other spy and spy spoof films were born, the Flint films align themselves as partners with Bond.

Allusions in the films to Bond are not tongue-in-cheek but rather seem crafted to forge a connection with the Bond franchise. The Flint films do not spoof the spy genre as much as they enter a different version of the product into the genre pool. Later films like the Matt Helm series starring Dean Martin, which were distributed through Columbia from 1966-1969, sought to directly parody the Bond films as a way to differentiate themselves and compete within the marketplace when their leading man was not as marketable as either Sean Connery or James Coburn. There are four Matt Helm films: *The Silencers* (1966), *Murders' Row* (1966), *The Ambushers* (1967), and *The Wrecking Crew* (1969). These films rely on camp to sell an over-the-hill Martin in the lead role. Helm is a languorous lothario who wisecracks his way to women and alcohol and the films contain long sequences of light striptease dances. In contrast, the Flint films play it somewhat straight. The characters, plot, and production design are all treated relatively seriously and Coburn steadfastly refrains from winking at the audience. Flint is dedicated to the work of spycraft and while the telephone gag is played for laughs, other treatments of technology are quite serious. One such scene from *Our Man Flint* illustrates the faith in technology that underpins the film's ideology.

One evening in a nightclub, an assassination attempt is made on Flint's life via a poisoned dart. Flint avoids the dart and later analyzes it to find trace amounts of bouillabaisse soup inadvertently left on the weapon. Based on the specific ingredients, he determines that his would-be assassin is headquartered in Marseilles and travels to France to sample various bowls of bouillabaisse before locating the specific recipe in the assassin's den, a burlesque nightclub. At the nightclub, Flint gets into a brawl with another agent, 008, as a cover to exchange information. He learns that a secret agency called GALAXY, which is "bigger than SPECTRE" — the evil agency in the Bond films — is manufacturing and distributing narcotics under the

cover of a cosmetics company. After the fight with 008, Flint thwarts another assassination attempt when he is confronted in a bathroom stall. Before leaving the bathroom, he disguises himself as an Eastern foreigner by wrapping a towel around his head and turning his tuxedo jacket inside out to resemble the style of a Nehru jacket. It is worth noting here that Flint's disguise underscores some of the problematic features of the spy genre. Before continuing with my discussion on technology, it is worth flagging the ideological problems concerning representation that often accompany discussions about these films.

Toby Miller writes that the Bond films "are routinely held up as significant contributors to, and symptoms of, imperialism, sexism, Orientalism, class hierarchy, and jingoism" (122). The same can be said for the *Flint* films. However, Miller also writes that while the films are "guilty as charged – [they do so] frequently in a chaotic manner that is more complex and contradictory" than it initially seems. I take Miller's position to argue that within the Flint films there are moments of contradiction that open spaces of interrogation into larger cultural phenomena. The Nehru jacket is a good example. It was a trend in men's fashion during the mid-to-late 1960s and worn by both Mod scenesters and pop culture figures like the Beatles. The jacket was roughly adapted from a garment popularized internationally by Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India from 1947-1967, and signaled a trend in 1960s Western fashion that appropriated Eastern styles. Several of the Bond villains, including Dr. No and Blofeld, sport Nehru-style jackets. The use of the Nehru jacket and Flint's disguise as a broadly foreign Easterner demonstrates the genre's use of crude stereotypes to shorthand villainy and exoticism. East and South Asian cultures are barely distinguished from each other with little further distinction beyond that. The films certainly adopt a colonial gaze and within the diegesis international travel treats the world as a playground for American and European sophisticates.

158

The genre's essentialist tendencies are further gendered with villainy coded as masculine and exoticism coded as both feminine and desirable. In *Our Man Flint* the cosmetics company that functions as a front for the narcotics trade is called Exotica Beauty Factory and GALAXY headquarters is located in a utopian tropical paradise. These practices are offensive now, but during the 1960s exoticizing otherness was nearly a badge of honor. It meant that one had the financial and cultural wherewithal to adopt an international lifestyle, even if it was at the level of a jacket or cosmetics. This cultural position is hard to stomach now, particularly because traces of these attitudes have lingered well beyond the sixties cycle of spy films.

Returning to the scene, after Flint emerges in his disguise, the climax of the scene requires Flint to use several gadgets to move the plot forward. Earlier in the film Flint introduced his personalized lighter with eighty-three secret functions. Here he uses his lighter as a bomb detector to find an explosive device hidden in a jar of Exotica cold cream. He detonates the device and then uses a microscope attachment on his watch to analyze a piece of detritus from the bomb, which he tracks to the Exotica factory. Flint transmits this information back to ZOWIE headquarters via the code-sending device in his lighter. In this scene and others throughout the film, Flint interacts mainly with gadgetry. Spaces are marked by various incarnations of technology. His house contains remote-controlled cameras and mechanized artwork. ZOWIE headquarters is introduced with shots of punch card computers while the soundtrack punctuates messages delivered via the thwack of a pneumatic-tube conveyor system. Outside of the home or office, Flint carries gadgets with him or encounters the gadgets of the enemy. Gadgets become the focus and motivation for whole scenes. They are relentlessly ingenious, highly specific yet optimal for the given situation, and almost always hidden in plain sight. Very often gadgets are used to transmit messages.

The telecommunication potential of the gadgets is visualized through international travel and an emphasis on forms of transportation including airplanes, trains, fast cars, and speed boats. David Trotter writes about the reliance on "interconnected transport systems" that made international travel possible in spy fiction of the 1930s and further suggests that spy novels of the 1930s constituted a kind of travel writing in which agents were sent to remote outposts to report on their findings there. In this interconnectedness, Trotter points to the relationship among transportation, telecommunication, and capitalism, suggesting that the three have been linked in the cause of eroding spatial distinctions and making the exchange of people and capital increasingly possible (13). And yet Trotter suggests that transport and telecommunication exist together in a contested relationship. While they function to increase the flow of goods and ideas, the telegraph and other subsequent forms of telecommunication have also dematerialized information flows. Senders and receivers no longer rely on messages sent via letter and courier and instead exchange information more rapidly, and less visibly, over communication networks. Thus, in an era of sophisticated telecommunications systems, the movement of material goods and people provides the motivation for and, importantly for cinema, the visual representation of information flows and interconnectedness. Trotter writes that the spy becomes the embodiment of information itself, which he terms "the message masquerading as a person" (14). It becomes possible to figure the spy as the physical manifestation of information exchange within a global network. Extending Trotter's suggestion, we can understand gadgets as material symbols of communication which have themselves been dematerialized through technology. More so than the spy figures, gadgets are fetishized commodities that visually reinforce the link between transportation, telecommunication, and capitalism. Further, they are eroticized through their

association with spy figures like Flint, an international sex symbol, and the women with whom he surrounds himself.

Promotional materials for the Bond, Flint, and Matt Helm films all lean heavily on the imagery of girls, guns, and gadgets. The women are dressed in either outfits from the height of sixties fashions or in campy costumes that suggest an identity in broad strokes. For example, in *Our Man Flint,* Flint's female companions are differentiated through their international costumes. Leslie (Shelby Grant) is often costumed in the colors of the French flag; Sakito (Helen Funai) wears kimono-inspired styles. These costumes signify identity by using the same rudimentary shorthand that marks most characters other than the main protagonists. Other costumes are designed to simply showcase the body, like the many versions of bikinis that proliferate in spy films. In the case of the Matt Helm films, women are costumed as gadgets themselves. *The Wrecking Crew* (1968), the last of the Helm films, opens with a dream sequence in which Helm is in a grassy field opposite a group of women dressed in outlandish costumes. Among them is a woman dressed in a bikini adorned with a telephone. Helm sings in voiceover, "They named you long distance, cause your switchboard's the best." The song and image conflate technology and sexuality via the telephone along the same lines as the Bell ads in *McCall's*. The telephone-styled bikini also literalizes the notion of the "call girl" by attaching the telephone to the body. The innuendo of Helm's song lyrics further strengthens the association. The erotic suggestion of the scene is also reinforced by Martin's camera and the model's inviting pose. The model stands with her arms opened wide as if to invite Martin to handle the telephone. In the costume, the telephone receiver is positioned over the top of the bikini while the dial base is attached to the bottom of the swimsuit. The two pieces are joined by a cord and the costume explicitly equates the telephone with the female body and sex. However, because this sequence

occurs during a dream for Helm, the connection between sexuality and technology is put at a safe

remove within the realm of male fantasy.

At first glance, the always-present harems of women in both the Flint and Matt Helm

films seem custom made for a teen male audience. However, the films complicate this reading in

their presentation of costume and makeup, which are vital elements of the films. The costumes

are pure confections reminiscent of costuming during the Golden Age of the studio era. Ray

Aghayan designed the costumes for the Flint films and would later go on to work with Doris Day

in *Caprice* (1966). While Aghayan's swinging sixties costumes for Day were stiff and

unconvincing, the costumes for the female characters in the Flint films are fun, sexy, young, and

abundant. Each scene requires a costume change for each character and the sheer number of

women in the films means a wealth of costumes for viewers to enjoy. The love of fashion and

costume in these films is evidenced by the spontaneous fashion shows that occur unmotivated by

narrative demands. For example, the opening sequence of *The Wrecking Crew* serves as more

than simply a male fantasy about eroticized technology, it is also a fashion show that features

delightfully inventive costumes. These two appeals seem to target different markets, and it is

easy to assume that the gadgetry is on display for men and the costumes for women. However, as

the *McCall's* ads for consumer gadgetry demonstrate, the marketing of technology also spoke to

women, often in the language of fashion. Thus, it is possible here to read the opening sequence

of *The Wrecking Crew* as more than simply pandering to a male audience. It may well have been

pandering to a female one as well. Similarly, in the film *In Like Flint*, Flint goes up against a

group of female operatives whose cover is a spa called Fabulous Face. Scenes at the spa lavish

attention on costumes and set design in a way that foregrounds design over narrative and

underscores that element as the central connection between costume and technology. For

example, a scene at the spa showcases both the costumes, which are based on the leisurewear that was becoming popular in the 1960s, and the gadgetry associated with beauty rituals such as those advertised in *McCall's*, like the hairdryer. In fact, both the Flint and Helm movies devote so much energy to costume that it is tempting to rank their costume designers, Ray Aghayan and Moss Mabry respectively, in the pantheon of studio era designers like Travis Banton and Adrian. The spy films of the sixties were one of the few spaces where costume designers could be as extravagant, if not materially then creatively, as their counterparts in the heyday of costume design during the thirties and forties.

Our Man Flint, like *Caprice*, features a caper that centers around cold cream and women's cosmetics. In both films, jars of cold cream disguise nefarious goods and each film features a cosmetics factory that doubles as a headquarters for the enemy organization. This emphasis on costumes and cosmetics suggests an appeal to female audiences that is not initially apparent as the genre seemed geared toward male audiences, based simply on the number of women in bikinis that proliferated. However, the films' fashioning of gadgets and the elaborate costumes challenge this assumption and point to a conscious effort to attract female audiences. This seems like an odd appeal, particularly in light of attitudes about spectatorship following Laura Mulvey's 1975 essay "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," and yet scholars like Jane Gaines and Jackie Stacey have suggested that the promise of fashion motivates women to go to the movies. Writing about the Bond films, Bennett and Wollacott argue that female viewers might derive some pleasure in viewing the Bond girls as women that enacted a version of sexual liberation (213). In addition to these pleasures, gadgets and costumes offered audiences the joys of seeing potential consumer technologies onscreen before versions of them appeared in the marketplace. Thus, spy and spy spoof films offered female viewers pleasure on different levels.

Viewers could enjoy watching sexually liberated women in elaborate costumes unabashedly participate in the consumer excesses of the postwar period. Furthermore, the implicit suggestion that fashion and cosmetics could be weaponized was certainly not lost on female viewers.[76]

Gadgets and fashion functioned interdependently as promotional devices and as material manifestations of the relationship among transportation, telecommunications, and capitalism. The Flint films have fun with fashion, but they take their gadgetry quite seriously. For example, he has a remote control located in his bed that allows him to open the iris of a video camera trained on his front doorbell. With the remote control, he can also raise a video screen to see who is ringing his bell. He can also change all of the artwork in his house, which is automatically retractable, with the push of a button. By far his most valuable gadget is his cigarette lighter whose multi-functionality rescues him several times. Flint's gadgets are tangible, futuristic objects whose performance relies on ingenuity. His gadgets anticipate his needs before he does. They are tailored to the individual user for a very specific purpose and their level of customization promises a certain exclusivity.[77] It is as though the user can shape the industrial world to suit his own needs, regardless of how extravagant or irrational those needs may be. Flint's gadgets offer the promise of better living through technology and his seamless deployment of gadgetry elevates him as a master of both industry and technology, just as the United States imagined itself nationally in the postwar era.

The gadgets in the Matt Helm series of films, however, function differently. For Helm, gadgets are not expressions of ingenuity or American engineering, but rather they help make his

[76] Anthony Enns argues that fashion and cosmetics themselves acted as gadgetry of sorts. Enns cites an article that appeared in the June 1965 issue of *Glamour* magazine promoting both a television spy show and a perfume called Black Narcissus. Enns writes, "The perfume becomes a sort of gadget that the woman wields to incapacitate men" (131).
[77] This level of customization for the user recalls costume departments during the studio era in which garments were designed specifically for one person to wear.

life more pleasurable. This is a key distinction between the two series. For Helm, gadgets are toys rather than tools. For example, Helm has also an automatic bed with a built-in control panel that activates a video monitor linked to a camera at the front door. Rather than simply revealing the identity of visitor, however, the remote control becomes part of a larger gag. With the push of a button, the bed also moves along a track to a giant bathtub where it is tilted by a hydraulic lift to dump the occupants of the bed into the bathtub. This gag is used several times in each of the films. Helm also has an automated whiskey dispenser that he visits every morning, cigarettes filled with laughing gas, a trick camera that explodes, and a belt that turns into a sword. These devices parody real technological innovations. The camping of technology suggests that the films are aware of the excesses of postwar consumerism and are perhaps playing with everyday engagements with automation. The camp devices may also be a response to anxieties about the spread of telecommunication networks and the threat of surveillance in our everyday lives. On another level, the devices exploit the possibilities of technology to enhance sensual pleasures. The Helm films bring gadgetry close to the body to explore the connections between machine and body in a way that is reminiscent of the Bell ads that substituted the telephone for the foot. In their parodying of technology, the Helm films fetishize spycraft as they negotiate the real potential of technology to impact political and cultural life.

While the fashioning of gadgets serves thematic and ideological purposes, they also function as production design elements within the mise-en-scène that help drive the narrative forward. These films celebrate props and production design in the ways that they position set design as an integral part of both the aesthetic and narrative qualities of the film. This approach to set design has been discussed by Charles Affron and Mirella Jona Affron in their foundational text on art direction, *Sets in Motion*. The Affrons are interested in "the theorization of décor as an

element of narrative" (35). Whereas other studies of art direction are invested in parsing the ontological differences between set design and other visual arts like painting and architecture, the Affrons set out to understand art direction and set design in relation to narrative movement. To that end they suggest a taxonomy based on what they term "design intensities." There are five levels of design intensities ranging from décor that carries "a low level of narrative weight" to décor that comprises a single location for the entire film and therefore becomes imbricated in the narrative. The Affrons describe these levels as: denotation, punctuation, embellishment, artifice, and narrative. At the lowest level, design is at its most inconspicuous, generic, and transparent. It doesn't draw attention to itself nor does it distinguish itself in any significant way. As the levels increase so too does the amount of attention demanded by the design. The scale moves from undistinguished verisimilitude to narrative dominance. The Affrons write, "these films establish and proclaim a privileged relationship to the narrative" (40). They cite as their examples the room in *Rope*, the attic in *The Diary of Anne Frank,* and the hotel in *Grand Hotel.*

In the Flint films, the design intensity is at times set to a low level near verisimilitude and at times somewhere near the fourth level, "set as artifice." The props are more than simply decorative elements and in many scenes gadgetry is used to advance the narrative. The integration of narrative and mise-en-scène is a hallmark of the classical Hollywood style wherein all formal elements function in the service of the narrative. Jack Martin Smith worked as part of the art direction team on both Flint films as well as *Caprice*.[78] Smith had a long, successful career in Hollywood which began with *As Good as Married* (1937) and ended with *Pete's Dragon* (1977). The 1960s were a particularly fruitful time for Smith as he was nominated for six Academy Awards during the decade, winning three for *Cleopatra* (1963), *Fantastic Voyage*

---

[78] Fred Harpman and Jack Martin Smith served as art directors on *Our Man Flint.* Jack Martin Smith and Dale Hennesy served as art directors on *In Like Flint.*

(1966), and *Hello, Dolly!* (1969). Thus, when Smith worked on the Flint films, he was arguably at the height of his career. The set design for *In Like Flint* is interesting because the film is divided into two gendered realms that oscillate between reality and artifice, the former masculine and the latter feminine. The masculine spaces are those occupied by Flint early in the film. They are his apartment, a golf course, and the military compound that houses Z.O.W.I.E. These spaces tend to look "real" as their design does not announce anything fantastic about the spaces. Lighting is naturalistic and the colors are subdued. Even Flint's apartment, which was a whimsical space in the first film, is here restrained. Flint's wardrobe also comes from the realm of the real. While the women's costumes were created by the costume designer Ray Aghayan, Flint's wardrobe was provided by the clothier Martin of California. This distinction further ties Flint to masculine "real" spaces and objects. By contrast, the female spaces are highly stylized realms whose design conveys kinetic energy through the use of color, texture, and movement. Their level of artifice distinguishes the contrasting set designs of the film and helps establish one of the film's thematic conflicts as, in the parlance of the day, a war of the sexes.

In the second Flint film, *Our Man Flint,* the president has been kidnapped by an all-female secret society who use a beauty resort located in the Virgin Islands called Fabulous Face as a front for their organization. It is an international group of women whose goal is world domination. They brainwash ladies who visit the resort into slowly adopting the group's ideological project. When the Fabulous Face cabal kidnaps Flint's harem of girlfriends, he travels to the resort to rescue them, as well as the president, and a nuclear device to save the world. As in the first film, Flint uses his arsenal of gadgets to negotiate situations. As opposed to the first film, however, in which gadgets were often situated within a male-gendered realm, here fashion and gadgetry runs throughout both worlds. The Fabulous Face women have their own

167

stock of gadgets and their headquarters is a treasure trove of set and costume design. After Flint

infiltrates the organization and is discovered by a Fabulous Face agent named Lisa, she gives

him a tour of the facility, which includes a sauna room lit entirely in red, a suspended animation

chamber in cool blue tones, and the central office. The office is outfitted with state-of-the-art

technologies including computers, recording devices, video monitors, microphones, and

telephones. Women dressed in saris, tunics, cheongsams, military-inspired uniforms, and skirt

suits work at the machines, plotting their global takeover. Flint says that he recognizes the

group's leaders from their work in "fashions, cosmetics, communications, and publications." He

further deduces that the women at this "summit conference of brains and beauty" are in control

of a nuclear weapon and will soon control the world. He questions how this might unfold on a

practical level and Lisa unveils their tool of domination, a hairdryer that doubles as a

brainwasher. The group's leader, Miss Elizabeth, tells Flint that each time a woman enters a

beauty salon, she leaves a little bit more discontented at living in a man's world. Miss Elizabeth

promises that after the women take over the world, "The contented housewife will be a thing of

the past."

In this scene, the mise-en-scène announces its artifice through the stylized nature of the

costumes and décor. The Affrons write that these types of set designs have the "privilege to

create new realities" in pursuit of the "fiction effect" (39). The tension between character and

environment tips toward décor as the eye is drawn to the fictional world created within the

diegesis of the film (129). I would argue, however, that this tension is more than just a slight

tipping toward one element. Rather, designs that emphasize artifice do so at the cost of character

because they elevate things and settings over character. Things become more significant than

people. Gadgets and fashions are more compelling than character and as a result viewer

interaction with design elements supersedes character development in driving the narrative forward. In the Flint films, this is a double-edged sword. In spaces gendered masculine, which are essentially spaces that define Flint's world, set design is at the level of denotation. The setting is defined just enough to establish genre and the overall purpose is geared toward what the Affrons describe as the "reality effect"; It is believable as a real space (40). In scenes where Flint interacts with gadgets, our attention is unchallenged by other props, characters, or dialogue. These scenes feature Flint silently solving problems alone and we are convinced that he could be a real person and that his gadgets could exist in the real world. This is what Anthony Enns describes as believing "beyond-the-script" – belief in a fiction that seems to possess some underlying element of truth (127). By grounding Flint's world in reality through set design, the film authenticates belief in Flint as a real person thereby legitimizing his thoughts and actions. In contrast, the feminized realms in the Flint movies are built on artifice. These scenes privilege objects over character to construct new realities in the service of the fiction effect. While they are delightful to look at, we are reminded that they can only exist in the world of the film. Working with this formulation, we can read the office scene as a suggestion that female world domination is a fantasy as artificial as the set design itself. A world governed by females is as unlikely as a brainwashing hairdryer. The female characters and setting are delegitimized through the fiction effect and the idea that the world might be rid of unhappy housewives is not a belief that we can harbor beyond the script.

And yet, if the film itself shuts down the real-world possibility of women's liberation, it also makes the fantasy visible and therefore imaginable to filmgoers through set design and mise-en-scène. James Tweedie argues that the concept of mise-en-scène developed by the filmmakers and critics associated with *Cahiers du Cinèma* was the "single most important

legacy" of the French new wave (25). Whereas we have come to associate new wave filmmakers with jump cuts and experimental narrative, Tweedie suggests that they spent much more time considering mise-en-scène. Filmmakers like Godard, Truffaut, Agnès Varda, and Alain Resnais explored the organization of objects in space and the movement of bodies as they negotiated that spatiality (26). For Tweedie, these ruminations on objects have to do with the larger preoccupation in postwar France with material objects and consumer goods that arose from the privations of WWII. Working through Baudrillard, Tweedie links the status of objects to shifting conditions of modernity, suggesting that the proliferation and abundance of material objects in the postwar era destabilized the very conception of the object itself from something concrete to a thing more fluid and abstract. Tweedie writes that the object "has undergone a fundamental transformation into the momentary crystallization of a society in flux" (28). The object rises to the level of the actor in the "theatrical space of the modern city" (28). Person and thing equally share the capacity to express the cultural fluidity of the postwar era. Tweedie argues that the material that best captures this malleability is plastic, writing "Plastic facilitates innovation and flexibility, a constant flow of new products, at the expense of other social and aesthetic values. It also portends the supermodern environments…spaces where the pervasive newness results in a nonspace devoid of contradiction" (28). Within spaces constantly reborn, contradiction can be avoided through simply replacing the quarrelsome object, the one that does not find agreement with the rest. Tweedie suggest that this is problematic because contradiction opens spaces for discourse. He argues that some new wave filmmakers like Resnais and Jacques Tati found ways to situate objects within "scenes of contradiction" in order to uncover the problematic spaces within modernity that exist under the smoothness of the surface. In doing so, these filmmakers elevated mise-en-scène to the level of discourse. The relationship between objects and spaces of

contradiction is evident in the Flint films. On one hand, fabrics and textiles often offer spaces of friction, particularly in relation to gadgets, which are generally made of smooth plastics or metals. Textiles like leopard print rugs, shag carpeting, fringed upholstery, and sequined dresses arrest the eye, and often someone's hand. Their materiality is associated with the human body or domestic spaces whereas gadgets work to smooth out human failings and fill in the gaps that humanity has left open.

The Flint films conceive of objects as things that disarm any resistance to movement through space. The automated, pneumatic world of devices strives to elide contradiction and instead deliver the message that new gadgets liberate rather than restrain. During a scene in *Our Man Flint*, Flint has been fooled into entering a small building that really turns out to be a container on a cargo truck. With the push of a button from the evil agents of GALAXY, the container is driven away by the cargo truck and the "building" is replaced by a small café that rises out of the ground. The space is completely transformed and furnished with diners and musicians. Flint is stolen away to enemy headquarters with no one the wiser. It is a scene within a scene as the space is altered for the diegetic and extra-diegetic audiences. The diegetic audience, the diners and musicians, play along while the extra-diegetic audience knows that GALAXY has the capacity to make the world change, at least at the level of appearance. The level of threat presented by malleable objects is here elevated. The press of one button has the capacity to completely transform space and erase its inhabitants. The allusion to nuclear threat seems explicit and yet the frictionless ease with which the disappearance occurs is celebrated in the film as enemy ingenuity. Following Tweedie, however, perhaps we can read this as a space of contradiction in which the argument is staged through the mise-en-scène. While on the truck, GALAXY agents believe that they have finally assassinated Flint, who stages his death and

impersonates a GALAXY agent to infiltrate their headquarters. Flint enters the object container from one world and emerges into another, reborn as a different person. As the objects around him change, so too does his orientation to the world. The world that he emerges into is a different space, one defined by a lack of manmade objects. It is a tropical paradise of women, greenery, and water. In the Affrons' terminology, the design intensity of the new world is as artificial as the old but here nature acquires the sheen of artifice as our assimilation into the world of objects has affected even our grasp of the natural world. The film ultimately seems to suggest that gadgets and technology have pervaded our world so thoroughly that even the natural seems artificial. The film makes this argument through mise-en-scène.

4.6   HEDONIC TECHNOLOGY AND THE HOME

By way of conclusion, I would like to return to the question of the telephone that began this chapter. In *The Glass Bottom Boat*, another spy spoof that I discuss at length in the next chapter, Doris Day plays Jennifer Nelson, a tour guide at a NASA aerospace research facility.[79] There she falls in love with the scientist Bruce Templeton, played by Rod Taylor. Jennifer goes to his house to make her famous banana cream cake. Bruce has a kitchen-of-the-future – every device is push-button automatic and retractable, of the sort described in *McCall's*. Jennifer can't figure it out at all. She burns the cake, wrestles with the automatic vacuum cleaner, and upsets a table. Jennifer does not understand the new kitchen technology; however, she is adept with the telephone. Not only do she and Bruce exchange intimacies over the phone, but the phone

---

[79] *Caprice* and *The Glass Bottom Boat* are the subject of Chapter 5 in this dissertation.

172

provides the means by which Jennifer learns a secret that unravels the real spy plot and restores her true identity and stability.

Her facility with the telephone triumphs over her confusion in the kitchen. Could we read this as a rebuke to the Nixonian vision of America in which kitchen gadgets evidence domesticity, democracy, and therefore national superiority? Here the telephone – with its feminine associations - rescues the Americans in peril. The film does lampoon the paranoid excesses of the space race, but it also leaves open the question of technology as both a tool of intimacy and one of intrusion.

In the introduction to *Art Direction and Production Design,* Lucy Fischer notes that art direction, like fashion in film, "has had a broad influence, offscreen, on the appearance of the American home" (8). As mid-century kitchens-of-the-future once anticipated, it is becoming increasingly common now to experience technologies that are seamlessly integrated into our daily domestic lives in what is now termed the "Internet of Things." Smart appliances like the GeniCan, a smart trash can that adds items to your grocery list as you throw them away, sound like gadgets out of a 60s spy spoof film; and yet, they are part of a lived domestic reality for tech-savvy Americans. The Better Business Bureau's recent warning that smart appliances might provide access to foreign surveillance sounds equally to have come from a spy spoof, yet again, it is a real threat linked to these products. Like smart appliances, wearable technologies are now gaining a foothold in new markets for smart accessories. Headphones, smart watches, fitness monitors, and, of course, mobile telephones allow the user to access technology from and through the body. The user herself becomes a component within the Internet of Things. These devices have been marketed for their convenience, but they are also advertised as components in a fun, modern lifestyle. Slogans like the one for Apple Watch, "The perfect partner for a healthy

life" underscore the social and pleasurable aspects of these kinds of wearable technologies. The device is elevated to the status of a partner and the promise of a "healthy lifestyle" invokes the body and implies that the device might indeed promote life itself.

In his 2004 essay on such technologies, information analyst Hans van der Heijden terms devices used for pleasure "hedonic technologies."[80] Van der Heijden writes, "Hedonic systems aim to provide self-fulfilling value to the user, in contrast to utilitarian systems, which aim to provide instrumental value to the user" (696). In opposing devices whose uses are mainly hedonic to those whose uses are utilitarian, van der Heiijden draws a distinction in both use value and user motivation. Utilitarian technologies are used to increase productivity and efficiency; their usage is task-oriented. Hedonic technologies, on the other hand, serve a purpose in themselves and their users are driven by the promise of having fun. Such devices generally appeal to sensorial or aesthetic pleasures and the goal of the device is to encourage continual or prolonged use (696). It is clear in the Bell Telephone ads that the company sought to shift the perception of the technology by reasserting the telephone as a hedonic device rather than a utilitarian one. Such a move would encourage consistent and prolonged usage of both the telephone and the line service. One element of this marketing campaign relied on rebranding the telephone as a domestic technology. Van der Heijden notes that "the home environment is the natural habitat of hedonic systems" and thus marketing the telephone as a domestic device required rebranding the essential nature of the technology (697). The ads suggest that the technology is domesticated while it paradoxically frees the user from the constraints of domesticity. The telephone offers intimacy and promises to collapse the distance between loved

---

[80] Van der Heijden's theory of perceived enjoyment in relation to technology is an extension of F.D. Davis' "technology acceptance model," which suggests that user acceptance is based on "perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use." See F.D. Davis, "Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology," *MIS Quarterly* (13:3), September 1989, 319-340.

ones. It hints at reverie, fantasy, and secrecy and makes a gendered appeal rooted in traditionally romantic notions of femininity. The set design of the advertisements in *McCall's* magazine work according to a design intensity that the Affrons might describe as narrative. Because the entire narrative and mood within print advertising is captured in a single frame, the set design is elevated to the status of narrative itself. It must stand alone to tell the story of desire and consumption. The Bell Telephone ads do this and so underscore the hedonic qualities of the devices. For younger audiences whose ties to domestic traditions were rapidly shifting, gadgetry provided another way to think about technology within lived spaces. Coded as essentially fun and hedonistic, gadgets and devices within spy films also embodied discourses about telecommunication, transportation, and capitalism in an increasingly global world. Camping these devices may have assuaged anxieties about the world, but such a strategy risked ignoring the real ways that technology was becoming an increasing component of everyday life.

5.0   DORIS DAY: A CASE STUDY OF COSTUME AND FASHION IN CAPRICE

AND THE GLASS BOTTOM BOAT

In 1965 Twentieth Century-Fox sponsored an international "Doris for a Day" contest. Movie fans could enter the contest to win five luxurious all-wool ensembles from Bardley Country Clothes ("20th-Fox"). The clothes were similar to the costumes Day had worn in her latest feature *Do Not Disturb* (1965) and the contest generated thousands of entries, testifying to Day's enormous popularity at mid-decade. Just two years later, however, Day's popularity was in steep decline and instead of wanting to dress like the star in her latest film *Caprice* (1967), movie fans established their distance. Rather than rallying around Day, critics harshly dismissed the star as "an aging transvestite" (McGee 145).[81] The rancorous criticism of Day had a little bit to do with the film, but a lot more to do with her costumes in it, which were designed by Ray Aghayan, who had also designed Day's wardrobe for *Do Not Disturb*. While the star and designer had remained the same, the industrial landscapes of both the film and fashion industries were rapidly shifting such that in just two short years, Day — who had been an enormously popular film star for the previous twenty years — was hopelessly square. Her star image had been built on her own brand of healthy gumption, but in 1966-67 audiences were allergic to Day's earnest can-do spirit. She

---

[81] Judith Crist reportedly said this on the *Today* show in her review of the film. See McKnight's review on the blog *The Films of Doris Day*. Comments from Crist's review are also included in one of Day's biographies. See McGee.

was too much of the wrong thing and the attempt to shift her image through costume in *Caprice*, one of the last films she made, was disastrous.

This chapter will examine Doris Day as a case study of the ways in which the relationship between costume production and fashion consumption was articulated in the post-studio era. Working with two of Day's late-career films, *The Glass Bottom Boat* (1966) and *Caprice* (1967), which were spy spoofs, I will look closely at the linkages between costume and fashion, and examine the role of technology in relation to gender. As I have demonstrated, costume and fashion are not interchangeable terms, but they are inextricably linked historically, industrially, and culturally. Scholars like Jane Gaines, Charles Eckert, Maureen Turim, Gaylyn Studlar, Stella Bruzzi, and Pamela Church Gibson have explored the relationship between the two in relation to female consumers and, within the Hollywood studio context, the narrative of this relationship relies on costume's impact on fashion and the ways in which female filmgoers have incorporated iterations of film costumes into their own fashion lives. This chapter sets out to challenge this narrative at a particular moment of instability within both the film and fashion industries. The set of questions structuring this inquiry relates to the changing relationships among costume, stardom, and modes of female consumer address during this period. How did changes in costuming practices during the 1960s impact the relationship female consumers had with stars and fashion? What did the decreasing role of the costume designer mean in constructions of female stardom? In what ways was the relationship between costume, fashion, and female consumers reoriented in the post-studio era? Specific to this analysis, how did the changing costuming practices and shifts within the American fashion scene affect Doris Day's image? This chapter demonstrates the ways in which the relationship between costume and fashion was functionally inverted. Everyday fashion figured prominently in film costuming practices,

displacing the primacy of star designers and ushering in new modes of female stardom. As a result, the relationship between female filmgoers and fashion consumption shifted from one that was emulative to one that was associative, from one that relied on "being just like" to one premised on "being kind of like." What was once unique to film costumes during the studio era was diffused and diversified in the period following it such that fashion extended from costume to gadgetry to home décor as a kind of feeling for the filmic rather than an imitation of it. To support this assertion, I begin with an examination of Jane Gaines' model of studio era costume, stardom, and modes of female consumption. I then move into my two case studies focused on Doris Day in the spy capers *Caprice* (1967) and *The Glass Bottom Boat* (1966) to investigate how changing costuming practices affected Day's popularity and star persona through an examination of textual as well as extra-textual materials, including archival costume records, studio publicity kits, and published critical reception of the films. Following that I analyze the effect of costuming practices on modes of consumer address. I conclude by resituating Gaines' theses about female filmgoers-as-fashion consumers in the post-studio era to formulate a historically specific theory of 1960s female filmgoers.

5.1   EXTENDING GAINES INTO THE POST-STUDIO ERA

Jane Gaines has written extensively on the relations between female costume, stardom, and narrative.[82] In her essay on the relationship among star designer, star, and female spectator, Jane Gaines develops a historically-rooted theory of female spectatorship related to Adrian's costume

---

[82] See Gaines "Costume and Narrative: How Dress Tells the Woman's Story," which I also briefly summarized in the Introduction.

design at MGM during the 1930s. Gaines considers what she terms the "wearability conundrum" in relation to a dress Adrian designed for Cecil B. DeMille's 1930 film *Madam Satan*. The conundrum was often posed by fan magazines and revolved around whether female spectators should, or could, wear designs inspired by film costumes in their daily lives. The example from *Madam Satan* is apt because in a film teeming with fantastic, art deco-inspired designs, the titular costume is a particularly raucous creation of sequins, bugle beads, black silk and nude soufflé. It is a gown designed to seduce and as such it conjures wicked sexuality. The black silk cutouts of the dress seem to lick the wearer in a delightful play on the imagery of hell. As Gaines writes, the film "presents us with a costume that consumes our seeing" (Gaines, "On Wearing" 159). The licking flames, the visual metaphor of heat, and the sensual feel of fabric as it is seen on screen all support Gaines' theory of a synesthetic aesthetic. This aesthetic is a theorization of what it might mean to want to wear costumes inspired by a film insofar as the viewer might synesthetically experience the pleasures of vision through the imagined tactility of wearing.

Gaines builds on Vivian Sobchack's work on the phenomenology of spectatorship to suggest that the excessiveness of Adrian's gown results in a sensorial profusion in which the senses become overwhelmed and confused. The viewing body becomes "wrapped up in seeing and viewed in touching" (147-50). That is, the film itself becomes a kind of separate body that overwhelms the spectator with an excess of visual information. As the viewing body meets the filmic body in the form of the gown-on-film, an aesthetic is produced that that Gaines calls "much too much." The fabric is too much, the narrative meaning of the costume is too much, and the signifying meaning of the gown is too much. This leaves the viewer and her capacity to absorb visual input somewhat exhausted as she seeks out another way to experience the image. Gaines writes, "When you run out of extreme signs in one semiotic system you draw from

179

another" (148). This spillover effect results in a calling forth of the other senses wherein viewing mingles with touching, tasting, and hearing. Inside this synesthetic aesthetic the gown does more than spark a desire to wear the dress, rather Adrian's designs "(A)spire to the condition of the film itself; they are designs that, even today in retrospective viewing, produce the effect of wanting to wear the film" (147).

This effect of "wanting to wear the film" feeds back into the wearability conundrum insofar as it raises the question of what it might mean to participate in the world of the film as an active spectator, yet not one engaged in fantasy, but rather as a viewer that participates in a mode of sensorial information management. In the case of *Madam Satan*, how might we imagine the distance that separates a working-class female filmgoer of the 1940s and the Adrian gowns that she might see on screen? For Gaines, this relationship is hierarchical and based on engulfment. Gaines argues that the film seeks to engulf the spectator by wrapping her in its own embodiment. It envelops her affectively through its rush to overwhelm her senses. Beyond the sensorial realm, Gaines further argues, the goal of the studios was also to envelop the female spectator through commodity immersion (147). After all, part of the wearability conundrum was not simply whether one should wear film fashions, but how? In her discussion of engulfment and envelopment, Gaines turns to Foucault and his notion of emulation. Gaines suggests that we might employ Foucault's notion to invite more broad-based conceptions of the emulative. Working with Foucault's theorization of a "scale of mirroring" in which "envelopes" may fold and unfold continually within one another, Gaines introduces the concept of diffusion into the notion of emulation ("Wanting to Wear" 139). In this case diffusion seems to refer to the ways in which things are distributed into the world, but in relation to one another. Some connection exists in which these things function to answer and mirror one another. That is, what is

introduced into and through the world of the film is not lost, but exists in some emulation of the original. The set of relations among costume designer, fashion industry, and the female spectator frames the network in which this circulation occurs. The embodied costume within the embodied film addresses the embodied viewer in a way that allows her to "want to wear" the film as a means of expressing her participation in this network of circulation. In other words, to want to wear the film is to want to see beyond simply wearing the dress.

Gaines' theorization of female spectatorship in the 1930s and 40s is based on specific spatial relationships premised on verticality. The idea of emulation implies a hierarchical relationship in which the star designer and star are looked up to by filmgoers. Equally, descriptions of engulfment and envelopment situate the female filmgoer as enveloped by the filmic experience. This is perhaps no surprise as studio era Hollywood is defined by its model of vertical integration in which a connecting line ran from production down through exhibition. After the court rulings in 1948 declared this model monopolistic, however, verticality gave way to a different set of spatial relations in the post-studio era. Extending Gaines into this era, I want to suggest that the set of relations among costume, consumer industries, and the female spectator became oriented along a more horizontal structure. Rather than costume as emulation, consumers were interested in accessibility and wearability. The "wearability conundrum" ceased to function as such because female spectator-consumers had many avenues through which to access costume in the post-studio era. This is partly because while costumes became more simplified and unburdened by semiotic excess, commodity immersion became far more sophisticated as studios and fashion producers sought to make the link between costume and fashion explicit in department stores and advertising. Before pursuing this thought more fully, however, I would like to explore the ways in which production conditions in the post-studio era test the limits of

181

Gaines' model in order to establish why a new model is necessary at all. I will first turn to Doris

Day in *Caprice* to illustrate how the relationship between star and star designer could no longer

function in terms of emulation in the post-studio era.

5.2   WHAT NOT TO WEAR: *CAPRICE* (1967)

Caprice is among the last in Day's long film career, which spanned twenty years, and marks a

definitive critical and popular turn against the actress. The turn against Day was not necessarily

unique to the actress, but was symptomatic of a wider shift among critics and audiences away

from stars of "old" Hollywood and toward younger actors who tended to embody traits that

would come to characterize New Hollywood, a movement that embraced youth culture, realistic

depictions of violence, and increasingly graphic sexuality. I would like to examine this period

from the perspective of costume departments as an analysis of these departments during this

period speaks equally to changes in cultures of production as well cultures of consumption.

Caprice is a spy caper in which Day plays Patricia Foster, an industrial designer who

goes undercover to bust an international narcotics ring. The film marks the third collaboration

between Day, the costume designer Ray Aghayan, and the director Frank Tashlin. The three had

previously made the films *Do Not Disturb* (1965) and *The Glass Bottom Boat* (1966). *Caprice*

was their last and least successful outing together. The negative critical reception of the film was

frequently aimed at Day's appearance in often surprisingly hostile reviews. The critic George

Morris offered the following summary of Day's first appearance in the film:

> *Caprice* is a grotesque exaggeration of her mid-sixties image. She lowers the newspaper
> she is reading to reveal a platinum-haired mannequin with enormous dark glasses where
> her eyes should be. She is a walking advertisement for vinyl in her black and white

checkered coat, gold dress and hat…Day's wax-like makeup completes the image of an artifact exhumed for public display.

Morris's unforgiving review is characteristic of the ways in which critical hostility was aimed directly at Day's body, makeup and costuming. *New York Times* critic Bosley Crowther maligned the masculine physicality of Day's performance. After expressing his irritation at the gender reversals he perceived in the film, Crowther ended his review by declaring that Day's costumes and physical performance could not "conceal the fact that she is no longer a boy" (52). The comment seems directed at Day's early film roles in which she played tomboy figures, but it also hints at a deeper discomfort with Day's age and gender performance. Popular film critic Judith Crist jumped on the bandwagon and declared that Day looked like "an aging transvestite" (McGee 145). Finally, a review in *Variety* claimed: "It is getting more difficult with each pic to see much of Miss Day; she is far too invisible via exaggerated hair styles, concealing hats and wardrobe." The review ended with the following sentiment: "As a word, 'Caprice' means a whim or freak; so it seems" (Murf 6).[83]

The amount of vitriol heaped on the film and on Day's screen presence marked the end of Day's long-standing critical and popular success. Day had been an established big band singer before her film career and was able to lucratively transition to Hollywood as a popular figure in the late 1940s. In the mid-fifties Day experienced a second wave of popularity that lasted into the early to mid-sixties.[84] Popularity polls conducted throughout the decade mark the trajectory of Day's commercial stardom. In 1965 Gilbert Youth Research, Inc. conducted an annual poll of over 1,000 teenagers. In it Day was voted runner-up as favorite female star, second only to

---

[83] See also the review in *Film Quarterly* in which Raymond Banacki notes that Day's performance had begun to move away from her sweet screen image and "manages glints of hardness and bitchiness that inspire interest from time to time," although he ultimately declared the film a failure.

[84] Tamar Jeffers McDonald refers to this period as Day's "mature virgin period." See McDonald, *Hollywood Catwalk : Exploring Costume and Transformation in American Film*.

Debbie Reynolds (Gilbert). In 1968 the All-American Screen Favorites Poll conducted by *BoxOffice* magazine ranked Day in fourth place among the top twelve female stars. Day had made the list for 18 years, which was no small feat as the annual trade poll was quite comprehensive in its reach ("Popularity Winners"). By 1969, however, Day had fallen to the tenth spot, and by 1970 she didn't appear on the list at all - and didn't appear among the 32 actresses on the runners-up list ("Popularity All-American"). Based on these polls, Day was near the height of her popularity in 1965 and near the bottom in 1968-69. This period aligns, perhaps not coincidentally, with a tremendous shift in the fashion landscape in the United States as European influences began to affect American styles.

Because so much criticism was lodged against Day's costumes and appearance, I argue that the disconnect between her onscreen costumes and the kinds of progressive fashions that had begun to appear in American fashion magazines and on the backs of American teenagers played an important role in the precipitous decline in her popularity. This is significant because costume and fashion had always been important components of Day's star persona. During her long onscreen career Day worked with many of the industry's major designers including Jean-Louis in *Pillow Talk*, Irene in *Lover Come Back*, and Edith Head in *The Man Who Knew Too Much*.[85] In many cases Day's onscreen costumes did not vary tremendously from her offscreen fashion image. As an example, Day arranged to purchase items designed by Edith Head for her role in *The Man Who Knew Too Much* to add to her own personal wardrobe after the film wrapped. This attests to the harmony between Day's onscreen costumes, her offscreen fashions, and her star persona. Day's costumes and fashions were important elements through which her fans could

---

[85] Jean-Louis costumed Day in *Pillow Talk* (1959), *Thrill of it All* (1963), and *Send me No Flowers* (1964). Irene costumed *Midnight Lace* (1960) and *Lover Come Back* (1961). Marjorie Best costumed *On Moonlight Bay* and *I'll See you in My Dreams* (1951). Edith Head costumed *The Man Who Knew Too Much* (1956) and *Teacher's Pet* (1958)

connect to her. Jackie Stacey has shown how female spectators of the 1940s and 1950s in Britain appreciated Day's costumes and emulated her look (192). They especially appreciated her naturalness and her "up-to-date" clothing (197). More recently Tamar Jeffers McDonald has explored the role of costume textually within Day's films as well as the role of fashion in fan magazines as part of the construction of different phases of Day's star persona.[86] As McDonald has shown, fashion and costume served to reinforce tropes associated with Day's persona, like energy, naturalness, clothes, All-Americanness, and perceptions of her girl-next-door/virginal quality. By the mid-1960s, however, these tropes failed to resonate as widely and just as Day had been constructed as an exemplar of feminine comportment for the 1940s and 1950s, in the 1960s she was just who no young girl wanted to be.

The comments about Day as an "aging transvestite" and discomfort about her masculine performance are related to questions of gender performance that Day encountered early in her career, particularly surrounding "tomboy" performances in which Day negotiated questions of gender roles. Crowther's statement that Day was "no longer a boy" becomes significant here because it points to criticisms of both gender and age. Indeed, Day requested to take the role of the spy protagonist in *Caprice,* which was originally scripted for a male actor. Her character was therefore more active and investigating than that of her co-star Richard Harris, who played a supporting role, and one can't help wondering whether Crowther was equally chaffed by Harris's feminized character. In 1967 Crowther himself was on his way out of the film business. That year he retired from a twenty-seven-year career as a film critic at *The New York Times* and his dismissal of Day seems oddly coincidental with the ending of both of their film careers. Crowther's criticisms of the film seem distinct from the popular reaction, which was more or less

---

[86] McDonald has written extensively on Day. For a list of tropes associated with Day's persona, see *Doris Day Confidential*, pp. 61.

indifferent, in that Crowther's maligning of the film had a touch of personal affront to it. It was as if Crowther was offended by the state of the American film industry itself, and the lows to which it had stooped, embodied by Day in *Caprice*. That other critics also commented on the Day's gender performance and age, however, points to a larger set of confusions within the film industry of the late-1960s. Returning to Gaines and the sense that Day's costumes were too much of the wrong things may have resulted in a kind of semiotic overload in which the signs that had once stabilized Day became jumbled. According to critics, she was no longer a boy, yet not a woman. She was an artifact and a freak, but also barely visible. The contradictions within these criticisms indicate problems with the act of reading itself. It was as if Day had become illegible. The wearability conundrum that Gaines described here becomes a legibility conundrum in which critics seemed unable to navigate the familiar tropes once associated with Day.

My reading of Crowther and other critical reaction is premised on the notion that Day had accrued a catalogue of complex, yet rather consistent, gender markers throughout her career. Mandy Merck has substantively explored Day's identity as it was constructed in her "tomboy" roles in *Calamity Jane* (1953), *It Happened to Jane* (1959), and *The Ballad of Josie* (1968). Merck argues that Day's "tomboyness" allowed her to negotiate the divide between femininity and masculinity and places her somewhere in a heterosexual mode, rather than homosexual or celibate (4). This is significant because Day's reputation as a virgin has been extraordinarily durable, despite an array of onscreen - and offscreen - husbands and children. For Merck, the contradictions that accumulate around Day's star image are related to conflicts are between "natural" and "unnatural" and between masculine and feminine traits. Merck tests Dyer's theory that an actor's "personality" can triumph over the plot to allow her to remain independent in order to see how the cinema might construct a tomboy figure, like those embodied by Day, as

186

essentially still feminine. Merck determines that ultimately personality does not triumph over plot and thus particularity is required in determining the signifiers of a star's various roles and, in Day's case, whether she survives as an "independent" figure. Merck, like McDonald, argues that the tropes associated with Day must necessarily be in place to ensure a correct reading of Day.

In contrast to Merck, however, I want to suggest that through costume Day experiments with different modes of femininity to keep alive the tension between masculinity and femininity and between the natural and unnatural. These tensions could equally be read as abstract tropes that enhance her image and work in conjunction with the more concrete tropes that McDonald identifies. Whiles Day's characters often return to a conventionally feminine appearance, she does remain an independent figure despite the exigencies of various plots because she returns to an essential Doris Day-ness. She does this through costume and an extraordinarily consistent sense of the dynamic between star, costume, and fashion. When this dynamic breaks down, as it does in *Caprice,* a rupture occurs in the star image that opens space for critique. The determining conflict, then, is not between personality and plot, but between persona, costume, and fashion. The clash of signifiers between Day and the costumes for Caprice attest to this: American vs. European, natural vs. synthetic, traditional vs. modern, past vs. future. Day cannot surface above these dissonances. She is eclipsed by the costumes and thus the critical comment that she is "invisible" behind hairstyles, hats, and wardrobe seems particularly resonant.

A fundamental aspect of the problems with Day's *Caprice* wardrobe has to do not only with changing fashion climates, but with changing practices among costume departments during the 1960s. The costume budget for *Caprice* was generous at $150,000, one of the largest costume budgets for films produced that year (Campbell 5). Perhaps as a result of the healthy budget, the mod costumes were overly-articulated versions of their street fashion counterparts. Day's

187

costumes were read as overly performative and artificial at a time when wardrobes and wardrobing practices were turning to something more realistic out of economic necessity and shifting aesthetics in Hollywood filmmaking. This shift can be read in the costumes of films that won Academy Awards for costume design during 1965-66. In 1965 the designer Julie Harris won an Academy Award for costume design in *Darling*, a British drama starring the fashionable, young Julie Christie. In 1966 designer Irene Sharaff won for *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?,* a drama with a realist aesthetic.[87] These films suggest a preference for low-key costumes in a realist mode that rejected overt constructions in favor of more natural looks. Although *Caprice* was a genre film, and a spoof at that, the costumes still registered as too much and Day found herself unable to strike a balance between the natural and the constructed.

Here we can turn to a consideration of the costuming practices for *Caprice.* Ray Aghayan redesigned the wardrobe for *Caprice* three separate times at Day's behest. This request was not due to Day's fickleness in deciding what to wear, but rather the difficulty of trying to sketch a wardrobe that could address the rapidly shifting currents in fashion as well as handle the demands of the character. Aghayan noted that a "tremendous change" occurred in fashion during the period 1965-1967. He said that he was not "into the change" and that Day was "unaware" of the shift in fashion altogether. The relationship between costume and fashion became far more fraught in *Caprice* as the clothes failed to reinforce Day's star image. Instead they underscored the ways in which she could no longer negotiate the changing fashion landscape and no longer appeared "up-to-date." Thus what emerged from their collaboration was a set of costumes designed for what Aghayan has referred to as "paper dolls." In an interview Aghayan complained that contemporary fashion was cartoonish and didn't seem look like "real clothes"

---

[87] In 1965 the award for costume design in a color film went to Phyllis Dalton for *Doctor Zhivago.* In 1966 the award for color film went to Elizabeth Haffenden for *A Man for All Seasons.*

(Aghayan, "*Caprice*") This was a problem for Day, particularly because she was unaware of the shift in fashion, an important oversight for a star so closely associated with modern fashions. Consider Day's fashion problem in relation to Gaines' wearability-unwearability problematic. Here the problem is not that female filmgoers could not wear the outrageous film costumes, but rather that Day could not wear the outrageous fashions as film costume. The reversal of this dynamic shifts the relationship between star, designer, and filmgoer in a way that grants greater evaluative power to the filmgoer. In this case costume does not dictate fashion, but fashion dictates costume, another shift to which Day seemed unaware.

The *Caprice* wardrobe called for Day to be clothed in contemporary mod fashions including mini-skirted dresses made from synthetic fibers, vinyl overcoats, and bold graphic prints. These costumes were heavily influenced by mod fashions emerging from London and Paris like those designed by Mary Quant, André Courrèges, Pierre Cardin, and Paco Rabanne. The period 1965-1967 marks the emergence of the British mod subculture into mainstream American culture. The subculture did not flourish in the U.S. as it did in Britain, and its fashions were adopted into America just as the movement was dying out in Britain. Thus this period marks the very short emergence and death of mod culture in America characterized by playful androgyny, fascination with technology and speed, and a design aesthetic focused on futurity (Feldman). This is the "tremendous change" to which Aghayan referred and to which Day was unaware. Critics picked up on this and noted that in the attempt to "swing," Day fell flat. Indeed there was a disconnect between Day's star image and the mod costumes in *Caprice*. The dissonance opened a space into which critics seemed eager to deposit cultural anxieties about potential threats to American dominance, shifting gender roles, and the post-war future. These anxieties were mapped onto criticism of Day's costumes and appearance.

189

Part of the criticism of Day's costumes had to do with their "synthetic" nature. Popular contemporary fashions called for new materials. Textile historian Giorgio Riello notes that with the rise of synthetic materials in the twentieth century, the long economic domination of cotton industries began to decrease.[88] As an expression of technology and futurity, mod fashions were often made using vinyl, leather, metal, and plastic, often in conjunction with other more traditional fabrics like wool. In color and design, mod fashions signaled tropes of mobility and technology. Suzanne Baldaia has shown how text and photographs in *Harper's Bazaar* worked to conflate fashion, modernity, and the space age in fashion spreads of the mid-late 1960s. While Americans were certainly preoccupied with space flight, mod fashions signaled futurity and technology in a distinctly European way primarily because many of the most influential designers were British or French. Thus criticism of mod fashions carried with it implicit criticism of a specifically European aesthetic located in British subcultural practices and French and British fashion. The disjuncture between Day and her costumes was then also a clash between signifiers of Day's essential "Americanness" and mod culture's Euro-centeredness.

Thus what emerges from this example is a further complication to the wearability problematic, that of reproducibility. In the inverted relationship wherein fashion dictates costume, uniqueness becomes a liability rather than an asset because it signals a distance between spectator and star that is too great to overcome. Whereas films and costume design of the studio era sought to elevate and differentiate the star designer, post-studio costume design sought to produce film costumes that seemed more "authentic" and grounded in contemporary trends. A star could seem to be relatable through reproducible costumes. The strange tone of Day's costumes in *Caprice,* however, precluded this brand of reproducible authenticity. This

---

[88] For an extensive discussion about the cotton industry, see Riello, *The Spinning World A Global History of Cotton Textiles, 1200-1850.*

complication can be seen on screen in a particular scene in which Day fails to register a mirrored image.

In the scene, Patricia has just been hired by the May Fortune Company. She meets Christopher White, who is played by Richard Harris. Christopher's task is to show Patricia around during her first day on the job and he takes her to a television studio where May Fortune is filming two commercials. The studio is filled with models in costume, cameras, lighting kits and the hustle and bustle of a production. The scene plays like a backstage musical in which we have behind-the-scenes access to the commercial shoot. It is reminiscent of director Tashlin's exuberant 1950s films in that it revels in choreography, color, and fashion while at the same time the backstage element allows the film to engage in moments of self-reflexivity through Patricia, who is new to this kind of spectacle and to whom everything must be explained.

Patricia and Christopher step onto the sound stage where a commercial for May Fortune Dusting Powder is being filmed. The film cuts to the top of a spiral staircase and frames a model wearing a graphic print black and white dress as she dances to jazzy music. A long take follows the sweep of the staircase down to the ground, along the way pausing to frame women in matching dresses as they shake their hips to the music. The camera comes to rest at the bottom of the stairs on a medium shot of Patricia and Christopher. As it stops, two of the commercial's crew members move an extremely oversized, mobile, tilting mirror into position behind Patricia and Christopher. The two stand between the commercial set and the giant mirror. Patricia's back is to the mirror and while the models appear as duplicates of one another and are duplicated in the mirror, Patricia alone fails to be reproduced as a multiplied image.

The motif of the commercial is women bathing. The models wear short black and white checked dresses that are designed to resemble bath towels wrapped around their bodies. They

also wear matching turbans that also mimic wrapped towels. Patricia, too, wears a black and white outfit, although hers is a decidedly more formal polka-dotted blouse with a white skirt and red belt. She combines it with a white blazer that has a matching polka dotted collar. The outfit is topped with a white bowler hat that has a matching polka dot brim. As with all of her other outfits, she also carries gloves and a handbag. Patricia's outfit looks matronly and bulky next to the dancing girls. One of the girls brushes past Patricia to give Christopher a welcoming kiss. Nudged aside, Patricia responds by squaring her shoulders and adjusting her blazer in a move that both resets her posture and hints at her own sartorial self-consciousness. Patricia stands just outside of the mirror's frame and we see twinned imaged of everyone but Patricia. Her character has but one image and we cannot see her in a different dimension or via a different angle. Patricia acts as a kind of axis around which we can see alternate angles of the commercial production, but she herself does not look into the mirror or acknowledge its strange presence. For Patricia, vision is singular and direct as she stands outside of the main action. Like the real Doris Day, Patricia has an antagonistic relationship with the commercial world, which fails to register her. She is, as the *Variety* critic noted, invisible. However, this invisibility is complicated.

This scene demonstrates that in contrast to the models, who are engaged in a different kind of physical work here, Patricia is a stable figure who cannot be reproduced in multiple images as a commodity. The film offers this as a particular irony. Patricia represents a new kind of singular female subjectivity while the more desirable younger models reproduce traditional modes of feminine identity. A problematic relationship exists between Patricia and the models because as an industrial designer Patricia's career is to produce commodities, which in turn reproduce the girls. A division exists between production and consumption and Patricia is unable to look into the mirror or register the women as commodities. The paradox is that Patricia, who

produces the consumables, is unable or unwilling to see the models who consume them. They are invisible to her just as the reverse is true as well, the models are blind to Patricia's presence. There is a gap between production and consumption in which social and economic relations can be manipulated and exploited. As Patricia turns her back on the women as commodities, she tacitly consents to the reproduction of women as objects for consumer culture while she also extricates herself from the same condition.

This textual moment reinforces the problem with Day's costumes in the film. During a period in which costume designers worked to produce relatable clothes as costume, Day's singularity posed a dilemma. Both Patricia and Day were seemingly unaware of the particular cultural shift in which women were employing consumer culture to reimagine themselves through consumer goods. Day was certainly not anti-consumerist in her film roles, and in films like *The Thrill of it All* (1963) and *Pillow Talk* (1959) her characters actively occupied spaces within consumer-driven industries. However, a democratization of fashion occurred in the 1960s with the emergence of ready-to-wear lines and with it the idea that women could use fashion to invent and reinvent themselves as a means to play with multiple identities. Women no longer wanted to dress like their mothers, and in the case of Hollywood, it meant that new costuming practices were emerging that favored looks that were more spontaneous, varied, and seemingly less constructed. Day and Aghayan, however, seemed to miss the ideological implications of the emerging Mod looks and the costumes were drained of the energy that animated the clothes as they were worn by young women who saw them as a rejection of many of the tropes associated with Day.

5.3 DIVERSIFICATION AND CHANGING COSTUMING PRACTICES

During the 1960s costume departments were largely dismantled as part of budget-cutting measures. Studio executives allowed in-house costume design for historical spectacles like *Cleopatra* (1963) and *Camelot* (1967), some genre films like *Planet of the Apes* (1967), and the lingering musical like *Doctor Dolittle* (1967), but for the most part management believed that films set in the contemporary moment could be costumed from clothing already available in studio stock, department stores, costume companies, or elsewhere. In short, producers believed that costumers could simply shop for a wardrobe for a contemporary film rather than spend the money to create one. In this production environment, the costuming practices and promotion for both *Caprice* and *The Glass Bottom Boat* seemed to belong to a different era in comparison with the practices used on other films contemporaneous with them. For example, for the film *Lilith* (1964), the costume designer Ruth Morley kept loose but somewhat systematized notes for wardrobe expenses and bills.[89] Her records list the sources and prices for particular items of costumes for a number of the film's characters. Morely lists among the sources: Woolworth, Bergdorf's, Salvation Army, Saks, L&T, Woody's, Penney's and Bloomingdale's. The list reads like an inventory of New York retail outlets in the 1960s. Morely provides a rather detailed and fascinating invoice of the clothing items and their associated costs for the film. She also accounts for her time spent gathering these far flung items, billing the production for "shopping trips to New York." Morley's notes suggest that while shopping the look may have been more cost effective, it was also labor intensive and time consuming for the costume designer. The costume design for *Lilith* also provides a composite of 1960s everyday retail fashion. Unlike *Caprice*, in

---

[89] See the wardrobe record for the film from The Ruth Morley Papers.

which the costumes were overly performative, *Lilith* captures the more restrained costuming aesthetic of 1960s Hollywood. This mode of costuming had reaching effects on not just the production of the film, but also on the production of female stardom.

The costume designer has historically played a significant role in constructions of female stardom through his or her ability to establish a cohesive and consistent narrative about the star, costume, and fashion that is faithful to the star's image rather than individual film narratives. As Paul McDonald has suggested, the star plays an active role in maintaining this narrative; however, as the internal structure of costume departments broke down, so too did the star's ability to maintain the cohesion between costume and fashion. As the fashion world itself became destabilized during the mid-1960s, the tendency was for costume to retreat. The translation from costume to fashion has always been a lucrative but tricky process, dependent on the irrationality of fashion trends and markets, but also dependent on the full weight of studio promotion to fuel a craze for particular trends based on popular films. As costume departments were dismantled female stars lost a driving force in the creation and maintenance of their star personas. The power of Hollywood to promote costume as fashion declined and as the system fell out of balance offscreen fashion began to become more prominent. It is not surprising that the decade saw the nascent beginning of fashion agencies and the birth of fashion stars like Jean Shrimpton, Twiggy, and Edie Sedgwick. This expansion of fashion into the entertainment industry was consistent with industrial shifts in film production and geographic expansion in film exhibition that promoted horizontal, rather than vertical, growth. By 1960 two-thirds of features produced in the U.S. were produced by independent film companies, although exhibition was still largely arranged by major studios. Exhibition locations, however, were changing themselves. Three years after Stanley H. Durwood opened his first cinema in a shopping center

in 1963, which later became AMC Entertainment, *The Hollywood Reporter* counted the construction of over 500 new multiplex cinemas (Monaco 48). Multiplex theaters offered filmgoers the new experience of watching a film and shopping for clothes under the same roof. The two great temples to consumer culture, the department store and the movie theater, were united and the ways in which they joined to promote fashion was at times both nostalgic and forward-thinking.[90] One such marriage was the costume fashion show, which I have discussed earlier.

Fashion shows promoting filmed costumes and fashion shows within films have had a long-standing presence in both industries. The lingering prevalence of film fashion shows in the 1960s attests to the side-by-side promotion of film and fashion, though not necessarily fashion based on film costume. In August of 1962, for example, Edith Head participated in a fashion show co-sponsored by the May Company Department Store and The Center Circle of the Art Center in Los Angeles (Head "May"). The show staged both Hollywood costumes from the history of film and emerging designers like Oleg Cassini and Anne Klein, mainly known for their sportswear (Head, "Lee"). This kind of fashion show was common and it raises questions about Hollywood's positioning of the female consumer at the same time that is raises questions about the fashion industry's positioning of Hollywood. As the numerous fashion shows presided over by Edith Head suggest, Hollywood glamor circulated more offscreen that it did onscreen. One imagines that the women at a Shriners convention, where Head staged a huge fashion show in November 1966, did not look to Hollywood costumes from the 1920s and 30s for fashion

---

[90] In "Wanting to Wear Seeing," Gaines notes that the department store and cinema are the two great temples of consumer culture that emerged at the turn of the twentieth century.

inspiration. [91] Similarly we might imagine that the audience at a fashion show presided over by Joan Crawford didn't look to Crawford as a model for how to dress in the 1960s. Instead it seems that fashion shows featuring costumes and figures from Hollywood history sought to evoke notions of nostalgia, glamour, and fantasy conjured by luxurious one-of-a-kind gowns worn by Gloria Swanson or Carol Lombard.

The costumes themselves were entertainment during a period in which fashion forecasters imagined women might be more apt to desire a $10.75 dress over a silk and bead gown (Handford). In a sense, there were multiple audiences for Hollywood costumes during the 1960s. One audience gathered for fashion luncheons and watched a parade of costumes from Hollywood's Golden Era. Another audience gathered in movie theaters and looked at everyday fashion as it appeared onscreen as film costume. While it is possible to envision these two audiences separately, they do not necessarily need to remain discreet. It is more likely that audiences at the time shifted between various forms of entertainment. The feature film, the fashion show, and television all constructed different modes of consumer address to the female spectators by relying on diverse forms of advertising and promotion to stretch across multiple audiences. The marketing strategy of diversification is useful in thinking about simultaneous and multiple modes of consumer address to multiple audience formations across diverse media.

One of the major reasons often cited for the fracturing of the film industry during the 1960s was the acquisition of Paramount by Gulf + Western. The move eventually ushered in an era of studio mergers within larger corporations. An article in *Variety* from 1966 warns about the dangers of enveloping film studios within larger conglomerations. It is quoted here at length because the copy captures a certain attitude about the film industry and Wall Street:

---

[91] This is in a memo from Edith Head to "Lee," which Head wrote regarding a fashion show she was giving for the Shriners where she also wanted to promote her book, *How to Dress for Success.*

Wall Street's recent renewal of interest in the film industry, especially plans to acquire or merge film production companies, is increasingly seen as related to residual (from tv) income. This mightily charms the imagination of corporate manipulators, who like the 'flexibility' aspect…Aside from gold-grab motives, though, the film production industry is being subjected to other somewhat less 'flattering' scrutiny by the Street. While admitting to some 'naiveté' about the film biz and bafflement by, as it was said by Joseph P. Kennedy when he took over RKO in the thirties, 'assets which put their hats on at five o'clock and go home,' the financial wizards see the picture business as one of the few remaining relatively undeveloped frontiers of American industry. In short, they don't feel that the film business has been sufficiently 'updated' to what the Harvard Business Review terms 'modern business methods.'"[92]

I have identified the phrase "modern business methods" as originating with the work of the mathematician and business manager Igor Ansoff in the late 1950s. Ansoff first presented the idea in a 1957 article in *The Harvard Business Review* before he further developed the theory and presented it again in *Corporate Strategy: An Analytic Approach to Business Policy for Growth and Expansion*, published in 1965 by McGraw-Hill. Ansoff developed a matrix that visualized corporate strategies for growth. The Ansoff Matrix divides corporate growth into four distinct areas based on markets, products, and risks. The matrix is based on notions of vertical and horizontal growth and was the first such theory to introduce the idea of diversification, or expanding into new markets and new products. Here one might imagine a horizontal expanse such that marketable cinematic space may extend into offscreen arenas like the department store floor or a Shriner's convention hall through an affective connection between glamorous film costume and modern fashion consumables, even if the fashions in question are not based on contemporary film costumes, or costumes at all.

The article suggests that the film industry had been "relatively underdeveloped" in terms of American industrial history. While this may seem contrary to scholarship that has found links

---

[92] See the full article in "Pictures: Non-Showman Think all that TV Gravy would do More' for their Complexes" from *Variety* magazine, 02 November 1966.

between cinema and consumption from the very beginning of the medium, it might also be said that cinema exploited some opportunities for marketing, but left many more untouched. If the link between film and objects of female consumption had been well-established, then it would seem one way to enlarge the market of available goods would be to enlarge the pool of what might be considered objects of female consumption. Thus marketing measures might seek to broaden the umbrella of what might be considered fashion to include not only hats and skirts, but also refrigerators, sofas, transistor radios, lawn furniture, and other populuxe goods, to borrow Thomas Hine's term. This expansion of consumables might be possible by employing what the article terms "modern business methods." Using Ansoff's theories, it would be possible to link any number of consumable items to the film industry through fashion, which was an already established connection between the cinema and female cinemagoers. This one tenuous link could open entirely new worlds of marketing possibilities. The notion of diversification challenged the idea of what it meant to consume a film and to identify with a particular star. In the conventional narrative about star, costume, and fashion, female moviegoers went to the movies to see what their favorite stars are wearing and then attempted to dress like them. However, as the geography of film consumption became diverse and multiplied, that relationship moved in surprising directions. As a means of exploring how diversification functions in relation to fashion, costume, and marketing in the post-studio era, I would like turn to a second Doris Day film, one that actually came directly before *Caprice*, called *The Glass Bottom Boat.*

5.4   DISCOTHEQUES, HOBBY SHOPS, AND THE AIR FORCE: MARKETING THE

GLASS BOTTOM BOAT

In 1966 MGM released *The Glass Bottom Boat* starring Day and Rod Taylor. Like *Caprice*, it was directed by Frank Tashlin, who was a cartoonist-turned-director most known for the satires *The Girl Can't Help It* (1956) and *Will Success Spoil Rock Hunter?* (1957), as well as a long-standing collaboration with Jerry Lewis in several films from the mid-fifties into the mid-sixties. *The Glass Bottom Boat* was a romantic comedy that veered into the spy caper genre. Day played Jennifer Nelson, a widow whose work as a tour director at an aerospace research laboratory leads to her a romantic entanglement with a scientist at the lab named Bruce Templeton, played by Rod Taylor. The plot turns into an eventual case of mistaken identity in which Jennifer is confused for a Russian spy. *The Glass Bottom Boat* was commercially successful and undoubtedly its success partially explains *Caprice*. While the success of the former did not guarantee that of the latter for the reasons I have enumerated, *The Glass Bottom Boat* provides an instructive case study for the ways in which Day's mid-sixties image could work both in a spy film and in conjunction with various promotional materials. In this section I argue that studio advertisers adopted a business strategy called "diversification" to sell the film to markets only tangentially related to the film itself or cinema more broadly. The number of potential marketing opportunities proves that studio marketers had adopted the model of diversification, which I will discuss at length later, to reach audiences far beyond traditional filmgoers. This mode of consumer address was tied to other aesthetic and industrial changes in the film industry. To begin analyzing those changes, I will begin with a discussion of the film's costumes.

The costumes for the film were once again designed by Ray Aghayan. By the time Aghayan had arrived at his three-film collaboration with Day, he was still relatively new to the

film industry, having come from a background in costuming for television musical variety shows and theater. In a 1965 interview with the columnist Hedda Hopper, Aghayan described his work in film, particularly his relationship with Doris Day. At the time of the interview, Aghayan had just finished costuming *Do Not Disturb*. Pre-production work for that film ran from September 1964 to January 1965 and included at least 20 costume designs. It was one of the most extensive projects that Aghayan had worked on and through it the designer developed a friendly professional relationship with Day that lasted through *Caprice*, despite the poor reception of the film. In her first question of the interview, Hopper pointedly asked the designer how much he earned per film. Aghayan replied, "Well, Jean Louis gets $20,000 per film – but I don't make that much…I get a $7,500 guarantee" (Hopper, "Interview"). Hopper admonished the designer for asking so little and insisted that after his work on *The Judy Garland Show* (1963-1964), in which he made the aging Garland "look like a fashion plate," he should demand more in fees. Aghayan politely shifted the discussion to the friendship he had established with Day, but his later comments in the interview suggest that Aghayan viewed himself as a dying breed in an industry that undervalued the work of costume designers altogether. Aghayan remarked that Jean Louis only costumed the lead while he preferred to work in the tradition of the designers Adrian and Travis Banton, who "saw that everyone in a picture was properly dressed." In many ways Aghayan was a throwback to an earlier era of costume design. He oversaw the design process for an entire film and considered the work of the costume designer to be more akin to methods of set design or art direction. The costume gave meaning to, and was given meaning by, the narrative and the mise-en-scène; it had to work in conjunction with the rest of the film, which meant that it had to be designed for the film rather than arriving readymade on the set. Aghayan wanted to make the star look good, but his costumes always worked in the service of the narrative and star

to equal degrees. This attention to star and narrative was characteristic of costume design in earlier decades with the industry's most celebrated costume designers. By the mid-sixties, however, many of these designers had either retired or left the film industry to pursue opportunities in fashion design. Aghayan found himself in the middle of an industry whose production practices were shifting in many different ways. At the same time, stars could still demand a wardrobe budget and the amount of time and money Aghayan was able to invest in the wardrobe for *Do Not Disturb, The Glass Bottom Boat,* and *Caprice* was a direct result of the films' star, Doris Day.

The MGM wardrobe plot book for *The Glass Bottom Boat* reveals the detailed costuming practices for the film. It contains 15 pages of very precise costume description and continuity, plus wardrobe stills for all of Day's costume changes. Costume change 9A provides an example of Day's costumes for the film:

Blue shirt – Oxford cloth button
Down collar, collar button open
Sleeves rolled 3 times
Wh. Sharkskin Pants – Elvis Presley
Japanese Straw & Blk. Velvet Thongs
     M. Plecher Personal
Wh. Panties
Wh. Bra
Wh. Bone Bracelet #9
Own Gold W.R.

The reference to Elvis Presley is interesting as Elvis was nearing the end of a very popular run of films in the late-1960s.[93] His influence on Day's wardrobe suggests that Aghayan attempted to infuse sex appeal into Day's wardrobe through a subtle play on gender. The Elvis

---

[93] Elvis's films during this period include: *Harum Scarum* (1965), *Girl Happy* (1965), *Clambake* (1967), and *Speedway* (1968).

allusion also links Day to the American youth market, which was echoed later in several of the promotional strategies for the film. On the whole, Day's costumes were characteristic of period sportswear and indeed the studio sought to create national fashion tie-ins with the film. An item in *Variety* magazine made the marketing behind the film explicit: "Going on the assumption that 'the clothes make the picture,' MGM has tied in with a number of fashion mags, clothing associations and manufacturers in connection with *The Glass Bottom Boat*" ("Fashion"). In fact MGM suggested more than fashion tie-ins. The studio exhibitor's campaign book lists a bevy of potential tie-in opportunities. They include contests to guess the number of jewels in Day's Mata Hari costume, contests to locate a wandering d.j. dispatched to broadcast from various hidden locations near the movie theater, usherettes dressed in bikinis, underwater billboards, recipes for "The Glass Bottom Boat salad," and tie-ins with sport shops, discotheques, music stores, marine stores, hobby shops, and Air Force organizations. These promotions illustrate the ways in which studio marketing was becoming more diverse in its attempts to reach multiple audiences ("Come Aboard"). The marketing department at MGM seemed to have finally adopted Ansoff's "modern business methods" and extended their promotional campaigns well-beyond the theater space.

Shelley Stamp describes the ways in which female filmgoers were invited into movie theaters during the 1910s, sometimes literally through invitations, our coupons that were sent to the homes of potential filmgoers. Stamp writes that this promotional technique "bridged the distance between commercial entertainment culture and the familial sphere" in ways that beckoned respectable women to the movie theater (11). During the 1960s, as exhibitors worked hard to appeal to teen audiences, such publicity ploys were necessary to attract viewers whose attentions were split among television and other increasingly popular leisure-time activities. For *The Glass Bottom Boat*, the studio and exhibitors waged an all-out war to recruit a wide

spectrum of filmgoers. The *Hollywood Reporter* noted that five different trailers were made for the film targeted at separate demographic groups, which they identified as teenagers, young married couples, mature age groups, general audience, and pop-music lovers ("5 Appeal Trailers"). Broad appeals were matched by more specific, niche promotional activities. In a merchandising coup, an actual glass bottom boat was introduced nationally into the watercraft market in time to coincide with the release of the film. An example of the boat, called "The Grasshopper," was displayed outside of theaters showing the film, and conversely, advertisements for the film were displayed wherever the boat was sold ("Here and There"). In yet another gambit of cross-promotion, music shops were advised to display lobby pictures of Day in "her trench coat spy outfit and her sexy mermaid Mata Hari costumes" alongside a collection of her record albums ("Exploitips"). Arthur Godfry, who played Day's father in the film and was himself a radio favorite, also appeared on morning shows and made TV appearances to promote the film to his own fan following. These marketing activities attest to the ways in which studios hustled to expand the consumer address of particular films across a diverse field of products. The consumer address of the film reached into new markets and across several demographic spans to capture the attention of even the most tangentially interested filmgoer. By far the greatest advertising effort, however, was invested in the film's fashions.

The *Boat* fashions, as they were called in some press materials, made their debut on February 19, 1966 with a gala fashion show held at the Hotel Pierre in New York City. In May of that same year *Harper's Bazaar* ran the photo spread with the Sylvia De Gay *Boat* fashions. The film began its national release in the summer of 1966 ("Boat"). The timing of the releases of various publicity materials suggests that the film producers, Aghayan, and Robert Sloan Sports collaborated before the release of the film to craft mainstream fashions that could be tied-in with

the film costumes. [94] By analyzing the timeline of these materials in relation to the film's production timeline, I have determined that marketing relationships were formed at the production stage rather than the distribution or exhibition stage. This stands in contradistinction to the relationship Jane Gaines has described between costume designers and the fashion industries during the studio era. Gaines writes that "it is best to see the collaboration between Hollywood and Seventh Avenue as a publicist's vision, a reality at the distribution, not the production, end" (Gaines, "Costume and Narrative" 198). This is indeed not the case in the post-studio era and at this point it is possible to see divergence between Gaines' assessment of the relationship between fashion and film industries during the studio era and my own analysis of the period immediately succeeding the studio era.

Following the dismantling of costume departments, it became both a necessity and an opportunity for studios and independent producers to form alliances with fashion retailers in the production *and* distribution phases. Further, the partnership was not between studios and haute couture designers like Schiaparelli, Chanel, or Erté, who had all designed for Hollywood during the studio era. Rather relationships were formed with retailers like Robert Sloan Sports, the May Company, or Bobbie Brooks. [95] As well as being lucrative, these partnerships offered a way out of the narrative vs. style-consciousness bind that costume historically had to navigate. As retail style became the costume, it invited style-consciousness rather than eschewed it. In other words, onscreen costumes became less concerned with servicing the narrative as they increasingly became sources for financing and promotion in themselves. The emphasis was indeed on style over substance. This sentiment was reflected in an article in *Variety* magazine by Army Archer

---

[94] In April 1965 Aghayan discussed beginning work on costuming the film. See the Hedda Hopper interview with Ray Aghayan from the Hedda Hopper Papers.
[95] Bobbie Brooks, Inc. offered to provide the clothing for Sandra Dee to wear in *Gidget* (1959). See the letter from Eve Barber to John C. Flim of Columbia Pictures.

205

in which he commented the new trend in filmmaking that he noticed beginning with the 1960s

spy films:

> Don't tell us this bizness isn't changing - Doris Day was to have stripped down to a brief
> bikini and also to have been gold-painted, a la "Goldfinger's" girl for "The Glass Bottom
> Boat"... Further, the audience will get the idea, sans doubt, that Miss Day is stripped of
> her mermaid costume by angler costar Rod Taylor." [...] "And that filmmaker Melcher,
> among many, agree the bizness has been affected by recent pix like "Goldfinger",
> "Pussycat", "Tom Jones", etc. "The camera is the important thing these days," he
> admitted, "the script is secondary." To which has co-producer (and "Boat" scripter)
> Everett Freeman quickly noted, "You can bet what the camera does -- is written for it to
> do in the script!" (Archer)

Quoting Marty Melcher, Day's husband and business manager, Archer notes that the

"camera is the important thing these days." The quote goes on to say that the camera was

becoming more important than the script, meaning that an emphasis on image was superseding

the long-standing superiority of the narrative drive. There are implications in this statement not

only for the aesthetics of American filmmaking, which other film theorists have discussed, but

also for the status of costume design for women onscreen. As Gaines has shown, during the

studio era, costume told the woman's story. Excesses in costuming conveyed information about

character that was often elided in the onscreen narrative. Female filmgoers were also savvy

viewers who could gather information about characters through a kind of secret sartorial

language and Gaines proposes that this was one of the pleasures of filmgoing. In the absence of

sartorial excess or substantive narrative, however, costume seemed to become a marketing tool

rather than a semiotic system. This, not coincidentally, worked well in a cinema where the

camera had usurped the script. And yet, within the new regime of the visual, signs still mattered

in terms of advertising, even if they mattered less in terms of narrative or character development.

Towards the end of Day's film career, studios were finally beginning to play with Day's image,

particularly in relation to sexuality.

While *The Glass Bottom Boat* wanted to create fashion tie-ins through the advertisement and promotion of sportswear lines, it also hoped to capitalize on Day's body by promoting a different, sexualized image of the star. As Archer had commented, this was a new day in the film industry and even Doris Day was ripe for a makeover. The film features a fantasy sequence in which Day is costumed in several provocative outfits, including an elaborate Mata Hari costume in which Day bares her bejeweled navel. Despite its brief appearance in the film, the costume became one of the central images of the film's publicity campaign. It marked an opportunity to play with Day's sexuality from the safe distance of fantasy and with the promised return to chastity. As an indication of the desire to market Day's sexuality, the film was called *The Spy in Lace Panties* in early promotional material. Thankfully, the name didn't stick ("oh-oh").[96] The marketing material, however, did rely on promoting Day in ways that seemed to offer the public a break from the discourse of virginity that had accompanied the actress for nearly her entire career. For example, a review from the June 1966 issue of *Cosmopolitan* remarked, "[W]hat a relief -- Doris plays a widow who seems to have a perfectly normal response to the very nice romantic overtures of attractive Rod Taylor, so we are spared spurious comedy bedroom chases after synthetic cinema virginity." The review further approved of Day's "adorable haircut and kicky South California-type clothes." Hollis Alpert published similar sentiments in a June issue of the *Saturday Review*, writing: "Mr. Tashlin has done something else that is, perhaps, more remarkable. He has come close to unfreezing Doris Day. Instead of a slightly over-age virgin preserving her cinematic purity to the bitter premarital end, she is this time seen as a youngish widow, with quite normal sensual yearnings for Rod Taylor." A June 1966 review from *Time*

---

[96] Undated promotional art for the film titled *The Spy in Lace Panties* uses the slogan "Underwater / Undercover / Under any circumstances you must see the new Day as the Oh-Oh-Sex girl!" This is an attempt to promote the film as part of the extremely popular spy genre. Materials included two small posters and a lobby card.

magazine further added to the chorus of voices relieved that Day had finally been granted some sexual agency. The reviewer wrote, "Doris, having graduated from unimpeachable virginity to semi-approachable young widowhood with every girlish giggle intact, embodies outdoorsy allure as a scatterbrain who dotes on talking birds and tropical fish" ("Space Chase"). And finally, Richard Gertner from *The Motion Picture Herald* exclaimed, "Imagine Doris Day, the movies' most potent purveyor of All-American wholesomeness, suspected of being a Mata Hari attempting to steal U.S. spacecraft secrets to give them to the Russian!...It's a good change of pace for Miss Day and one that should pay off in spades at the box office when the film begins its engagement this summer."

These reviews comment on the shift in Day's persona from her previous virginal quality to something slightly less so, and even suggest that allowing Day's "synthetic cinematic virginity" to slip rendered the star more "normal" than her previous persona implied. This reflects a change in the public discourse as film critics began to express their impatience with the cinema's inability to let Day behave like a "normal" adult woman. By 1966, Day was in her mid-forties and the idea that she moved from being a virgin to being a widow created a curious absence in the star's onscreen life that reproduced the larger tendency of American cinema of the 1950s to ignore sex for nice, middle-class girls. While the critics appreciated the "unfreezing" of Day, they also began to comment on her age with descriptions like "youngish" and "girlish" in which the "ish" heavily modified that which came before it. They seemed to suggest that Day could mature sexually, but not in terms of age, introducing a contradiction that would become evident in reviews for her next film. *The Glass Bottom Boat* was released a year before *Caprice* and though it was a success, the critical consensus was beginning to turn against Day as attempts to sexualize and update the star were met with suspicion.

In addition to the erotic angle, marketing for the film also relied on a more faithful strategy to exploit her wholesome reputation though fashion merchandising. The studio teamed with the National Cotton Council to promote a tour by the 1966 Maid of Cotton, Nancy Bernard. Bernard toured the country wearing clothes inspired by Day's costumes and designed by the New York based clothing manufacturer Robert Sloan Sports ("Fashion Promos"). The Sloan fashions were designed by award-winning fashion designer Sylvia De Gay and were worn by Bernard as the focus of major fashion promotions in ninety-eight cities across the country ("Boat Fashion"). MGM promoted Bernard's tour through a 15-minute filmed color fashion featurette which was syndicated in two hundred and fifty television stations. *Harper's Bazaar* carried a six-page photo spread devoted to Bernard in *'Boat'* fashions. The photos were shot by the fashion photographer Christa Zinner and set on the film's shooting locations, which captured the era's excitement for the space program. The association between Day and the National Cotton Council reinforced aspects of her star image that spanned her entire career, particularly a trope that Tamar Jeffers McDonald has identified as the "clean/natural" trope (*Confidential* 59). Day's association with cotton worked to reinforce the clean/natural trope in ways that emphasized the materiality and cultural history of the fabric.

Historian Giorgio Riello notes that cotton became so immensely and globally popular because, in part, it held color and was washable. Unlike worsteds and woolen textiles, which had been popular in Europe in the fifteenth century, cotton textiles maintained their color through laundering. This characteristic changed notions of cleanliness as both undergarments and over-garments could now be laundered. Cotton also became popular because it mimicked the qualities of silk without the expensive price tag. Thus women could afford cotton textiles that looked more fashionable and luxurious than lower quality coarse fabrics like woolens. Riello writes that

cotton became a "populuxe" good, a type of commodity associated with both popularity and luxury (266). As early as the seventeenth century, cotton was linked to notions of cleanliness and affordable luxury, qualities that Day also embodied. The cleanliness/naturalness trope that accrued around Day had a long-standing appeal within the marketplace of commercial textiles. While the connotations of cotton were harmonious with Day's persona and historical notions of fashion, the term "populuxe" introduced a further nuance situated in the mid-twentieth century.

Thomas Hine has used the term "populuxe" with a somewhat more particular valence than Riello. Hine defines the term as referring to a period of tremendous consumer activity in the United States dating 1954-1964. He argues that populuxe refers to a sense of populism, popularity, and popular luxury that eschewed European models of good taste and embraced the American past and future to develop an aesthetic based on novelty, convenience, pop art, and post-war affluence. Hine suggests that the populuxe aesthetic connotes a period when America went on a no-holds-barred spending spree to pursue the good life. Populuxe goods are defined by their pop colors, excessive embellishments, and unique shapeliness. They are sexy material objects that want to be looked at and touched. The aesthetic and consumerist glee that Hine describes is evident in many of Day's mid-sixties films including *That Touch of Mink* (1962), *The Thrill of it All* (1963), and *Move Over Darling* (1963). Within the films, populuxe goods are most often on display as prop elements within the mise-en-scène. For example, *The Glass Bottom Boat* features a scene in which Day's character, Jenny, encounters a populuxe kitchen outfitted with a host of modern gadgets.

The scene takes place in Bruce's kitchen, which he has designed to be state-of-the-art. Jenny wants to bake her famous banana cream cake for Bruce and so he gives her a tour of the kitchen. It includes a central push button panel that operates an infrared baking station which

heats up to one thousand degrees Fahrenheit, should such a temperature be necessary. It also features a garbage disposal powered by a photoelectric cell, an automatic egg-beater, and a floor cleaner called "the bug." The bug is an automatic vacuum cleaner that responds whenever something is spilled on the floor. It is designed to look like a dog and is housed in a little cubby in the kitchen. The bug is a play on both the domestication of technology and its capacity to mimic something not quite human. It is also perhaps a sly allusion to the listening devices in the house and the trope of surveillance in the film, particularly because Bruce says that one day every house in the country will have a bug. Jenny dislikes the device and protests that her house will not have one, thereby also rejecting Bruce's modern conveniences in favor of her own traditional methods. Bruce finishes the tour and leaves to take a phone call while Jenny proceeds with her cake baking. She is, however, flummoxed by the hi-tech oven and burns the cake, which the oven then ejects onto the floor – a reverse rejection in which the kitchen refuses Jenny just as she had refused it earlier. This startles her and as she decides what to do about the cake, the bug speeds out of its cubby to clean up the mess. Jenny is startled again and this time upends the baking table, sending everything onto the floor. The bug goes haywire as it tries to clean up the mess and inadvertently tries to eat Jenny's shoe. She wrestles it free and the bug returns to its cubby as Jenny marvels at the chaos caused by Bruce's kitchen gadgets.

The scene demonstrates the ways in which gadgetry can unsettle boundaries. As I have discussed earlier, the kitchen has long been gendered a feminine space while the world of gadgetry in spy spoof films has oscillated between masculine and feminine realms. The space here is gendered in complex ways that challenge gender boundaries once again. One the one hand, the kitchen is filled with what Laura Scott Holliday calls "masculine-gadgety-ness" (108). The gadgets, which have been developed by Bruce, function as examples of mechanical

211

ingenuity, just as the devices do in the Matt Helm and Flint movies that I have previously discussed. The main difference here, however, is that the Helm and Flint movies do not contain any scenes set in a kitchen. In those films, the primary function of the domestic space is seduction while in *The Glass Bottom Boat,* the kitchen functions as a domestic space, albeit one devoted to Bruce's interest in design and efficiency rather than domesticity. As he tells Jenny, he has designed it so that it "doesn't need a woman," even though his live-in housekeeper Anna is a woman and indeed does all the cooking. A generous reading might suggest that what Bruce really means is that he doesn't need a sexual partner who spends all her time in the kitchen. To that point, Bruce has mastered the kitchen gadgets in ways that Jenny has not, and we might infer that Bruce would take on household duties were to two to live together. There are two potential implications of the scene. The first is that the film offers a progressive take on gender roles and domestic labor by freeing Jenny from the kitchen through technological innovation. The second is that the film dismisses technology in favor of the traditional methods that Jenny favors, presumably the ones she used to bake the first cake. The film leaves the point open, perhaps as a gesture toward progressive gender politics that also allows room for a celebration of the traditional. This ambivalence, incidentally, could be read as part of a larger discourse in which the magazine-reading public debated whether Day was for or against feminism. In either case, the use of gadgetry in the scene complicates gendered spaces both onscreen and off as the gadgets also played a role in the marketing strategy for the film.

The exhibition book distributed to cinemas suggested that promoters use the film to "tie-in with model kitchens, homes, and household gadget retailers, and run a story for your woman's page."[97] The consumer address here combines the markets of film, consumer technologies and

---

[97] See the Exhibition Press Book for the film

home décor in a single address to young women. This example demonstrates that one of the tangential effects of diversification was the disruption of previously gendered spaces such that "masculinized" technology could be conflated with the "feminized" world of fashion and model kitchens. As I have argued in the previous chapter, gadgets, like fashion, emphasize design and style and are fetishistic objects of consumer desire that signify status. Unlike fashion, however, they were generally associated with more masculine, mechanical realms, at least in the 1950s and prior, and thus here their appearance alongside fashion destabilizes traditionally gendered sites, like the kitchen. The film seizes on opportunities to promote gadgets related thematically to the space race, such as the infrared oven and photocell garbage disposal, as well as the technologized home. As with the Flint and Helm films, gadgets and fashion function interdependently as material manifestations of the relationship among transportation, telecommunication, and capitalism through their association with Bruce and his aerospace career. The devices in his home represent the domestication of space age technologies at the same time that advertisements in *McCall's* magazine were moving female readers toward consumer electronics that were made for more personal uses. It is worth noting here that in *The Glass Bottom Boat*, Jenny relies heavily on the telephone to connect with her pets, and her father.[98] It is also through the telephone that she overhears the spy plot and eventually resolves the central conflict of the plot. Again, however, Jenny's use of technology is fraught as she essentially misuses the phone. She calls her pets while she is at work because her dog Vladimir likes to hear the phone ring. This one-way use of the telephone is repeated when she uses the phone to overhear the spy plot, thereby listening without speaking. These misuses of the technology work as a narrative strategy that allows the audience and Jenny to have a shared secret of which other characters are not

---

[98] See my discussion of the telephone in chapter three.

aware. Jenny has been mistaken for a spy because she phones "Vladimir" daily, though we know it is her dog and not a Russian spy. This knowledge assuages any anxieties the film may have engendered about the spread of telecommunication networks and the threat of surveillance because the audience knows that the threat is really based on a misunderstanding. As opposed to the Flint and Matt Helm films, *The Glass Bottom Boat* features a protagonist who is incompetent with technological gadgetry. Like those films, however, the fashioning of technology and the aesthetics of modern spaces at points supersedes the narrative and draws attention to the design of the mise-en-scène and the materiality of things.

5.5   AN OFFSCREEN FEELING FOR THE FILMIC

As with the Flint films, worlds of *The Glass Bottom Boat* can be divided into two gendered realms that oscillate between reality and artifice. In the *Flint* films, the masculine world was real and the feminine world was based in artifice. Here those distinctions are again complicated. Bruce occupies the world of fantasy, gadgetry, technology, and design while Jenny is grounded in the real world built around her traditional kitchen, domestic pets, and family ties. In fact, Jenny seems to get lost in Bruce's mechanized world. When given the opportunity to navigate it, she becomes enveloped by the gadgetry. In the kitchen scene, and in Jenny's dream sequence during which she is dressed as the Mata Hari, there is a clear elevation of design over character, a notion that chimes with Army Archer's assertion that the camera is more important than the script. This demonstrates a trend in American mainstream filmmaking to emphasize elements of art design. While James Tweedie has argued that the concept of mise-en-scène, developed by the filmmakers and critics associated with *Cahiers du Cinèma*, was the "single most important

legacy" of the French new wave, it is apparent here that American filmmaking was also preoccupied with the idea.[99]

The emphasis placed on material goods in the film is in line with its marketing scheme, which sought to advertise as many tangentially-related things to as many people as possible. This interplay demonstrates a relationship between the process of filmmaking and the aesthetics of the film made. In this case, marketing occupied an influential space within the production of the film. Drawing together Hine's notion of populuxe and Riello's history of cotton, it is possible to view the many product tie-ins for *The Glass Bottom Boat,* and in particular the sportswear produced by the Robert Sloan manufacturing company, as populuxe goods that conjured notions of cleanliness, affluence and populism in a particularly American aesthetic that was essentially the object of the film's promotional strategy. The emotional and aesthetic associations between Day and these ideas were woven into the costumes, fashions, and Day's star image as they reinforced tropes surrounding her in the American marketplace of the mid-1960s. In the costumes and promotional material for *The Glass Bottom Boat*, Day became associated with the kind of zeal for consumption that was uniquely American in its sheer capaciousness. The film, and Day by extension, endorsed the booming national spirit manifested in sportswear, hobby shops, marine stores, discotheques, salad recipes, and even the Air Force itself. Indeed, as Vincent Canby put it in his review of the film, to dislike Day was "almost too terrifying – too anti-American – to contemplate" (53). To reject Day and the commodified world of consumer goods that the film sought to represent and promote was unthinkable.

---

[99] See Tweedie, *The Age of New Waves: Art Cinema and the Staging of Globalization*, pp. 25. I have also discussed Tweedie in relation to mise-en-scène in chapter three.

This ravenous model of consumption changed the ways in which women interacted with stars onscreen. By way of conclusion, I would like to return to Jane Gaines and suggest that the cases of *Caprice* and *The Glass Bottom Boat* provide examples for a model for filmgoing and consumption in the post-studio era. Building on Gaines' theory I propose that female moviegoers of the 1960s formulated a relationship between onscreen costume and their own fashion lives based on association, or a sense of the film offscreen acquired by surrounding themselves with material goods associated with the film. In contrast to Adrian's unique and identifiable gown for *Madam Satan*, for example, costumes for films in the 1960s were more quotidian and reproducible. There were exceptions, mainly for genre and historical films, but to a great extent the period had a leveling effect on film costume. The notion of emulation cannot apply here because it implies a kind of hierarchical relationship between film and spectator. One must want to be part of the world of the film and to be like the star. As the sportswear reproductions for *The Glass Bottom Boat* suggest, however, in the 1960s one might experience the film outside of a movie theater and inside, perhaps, the misses section of a J.C. Penny's. Once there, a woman might associate with Day by purchasing something from the line of Robert Sloan fashions, themselves an approximation of designs in the film, or from any number of different departments within the store.

What I am suggesting is that the fashion-as-costume mode of wardrobe design in the 1960s disabled a hierarchical emulative relationship with a particular costume or female star and enabled the female spectator to more broadly reproduce the film as part of a lifestyle, as part of a feeling for the filmic that emphasized design and mise-en-scène as commodifiable elements of the film. The lack of spectacular costumes opened the circuit between costume and fashion and invited the spectator to participate in design in a wider sense. That is, it offered her the

216

opportunity to become her own designer because design itself was accessible and profuse. Models of diversification broadened the pool of objects one might consume so that a woman was invited to extend notions of costuming beyond the body and into her home décor. As movie theaters moved into shopping malls, the opportunity to make film fantasy a material reality would have existed just a few doors down. Rather than engulf or envelop, then, films and marketing of the period turned the spectator out and away such that the relationship was not about emulation but association. This move opened a space where films, film stars, and costumes might be reproduced in iterations and versions not purely related to clothing alone. Association and diversification then offered female moviegoers the opportunity to slip out of the role of spectator-consumer and into the role of consumer-producer in order to design and inhabit a particular feeling of the filmic within their own lives. This shift opened much broader avenues for film and fashion marketing moving into the 1970s, and would be especially significant when the blockbuster began to dominate American film marketing later in the decade.

6.0   CONCLUSION

This project set out to demonstrate how the relationships among film, fashion, and costume were complicated in the post-studio era of the 1960s. In the course of this dissertation, I have illustrated that ways that female filmgoers negotiated questions of stardom, consumerism, ideological positioning, and models of femininity through costume and fashion. In my discussion of industrial practices, fashion shows, consumer electronics, and the films of Doris Day, I have demonstrated how these negotiations manifested on a practical level. In this conclusion, I would like to think about the place that "Shopping the Look" occupies within the field of film studies now, as well as places that future projects born of it might explore. It is my hope that this project has opened new spaces of inquiry in its engagements. I have primarily staged my arguments to challenge and expand three research areas including the study of costume departments in general, the limits of production studies as a methodology, and the intersections of gender and consumption, particularly in relation to histories of technology.

To the first point, this project offers a history of costume departments within Hollywood studios during the 1960s that does not currently exist. One of my most emphatic points has been that the breakdown of costume departments resulted in the breakdown of costumes themselves. Just as they had before the emergence of the studio system, actors often provided their own clothing for a role in the post-studio moment of my study. This is significant for a number of reasons. First, the recurrence of this practice challenges teleological conceptions of film history

218

that often conflate chronological time with progression. The ebb and flow of costume departments demonstrates that the industry itself moves between instances of expansion and contraction that defy any notion of linear progress. Second, the restraint of costume departments in the 1960s meant that actors had to distinguish themselves offscreen to establish themselves as individualized products in the marketplace. This resulted in the birth of the red carpet and the eventual emergence of mediators like fashion stylists and personal shoppers who sought to create star narratives offscreen that rivaled, and perhaps eventually superseded, those created onscreen. Third, the appearance of onscreen realistic costumes occurred in tandem with the emergence of a more realist production aesthetic in American film. This, in turn, affected conceptions of femininity as it was modeled in the media. Finally, the sustained convergence between film costume and everyday fashion emphasizes the intersections between the film and fashion industries. While my work has investigated moments of change and loss within studio departments, there is much work left to do regarding costuming practices in the 1960s. In some ways I have structured this project through absence, but other factors emerged that were outside of the scope of this project. For example, the end of the studio system abutted the rise of the independents and this provides an untouched area of investigation. A history of independent costume designers would enrich the field immensely, particularly if it considered the practice of costume design in relation to aesthetic and industrial factors. Such a study would go far in filling in some of the gaps that I have encountered.

I have argued that production culture studies and media industry studies possess certain blind spots regarding labor that is traditionally gendered feminine. While these fields are attentive to technical or mechanical craftwork, they are often oblivious to technicians and specialists who work in costume and make-up. Despite this, costume departments have long

represented themselves to themselves, and others, through the reflexive fashion-show-in-film. Designers have used this device to represent their work to filmgoers, the film industry, and the fashion industry, thus enacting a strategy to gain visibility in an industry that still fails to completely recognize their work. The exhibition of fashion within film opens another industrial paradigm through which to consider film production. I hope that this project has demonstrated the need to incorporate considerations of the fashion industry as an ancillary production partner to the film industry. If production culture studies and media industry studies were to undertake a full-throated adoption of the fashion industry, a whole new world of objects would emerge regarding fashion in relation to celebrity, the rise of celebrity stylists, and analyses of fashion media as it occurs across different platforms like fashion magazines, fashion photography, fashion blogs, and fashion merchandising. The dynamic among fashion, consumption, and social media is particularly interesting with the rise of social media "influencers" who are social media celebrities with an enormous number of followers, which translates into marketing power. Recently some of these influencers have blurred the lines between enthusiasm for a product and an endorsement of it, which has resulted in their followers questioning their "authenticity." This situation recalls the distinction between covert and overt merchandising that marked the studio and post-studio eras and the problems of authenticity that have always attended the intersections of stars and promotional activities. While these fashion media objects are concrete, there is also room to theorize film aesthetics in relation to fashion on a more abstract level by considering fashion as a structuring paradigm built on the abstract phenomena of change. How might introducing fashion as a structing paradigm affect how we consider film aesthetics and the relationships between film movements?

Finally, in this project I have considered the relationships among gender, technology, and advertising to suggest that electronics marketing in women's magazines during the 1960s challenged the boundaries of gendered spaces and notions of domesticity and intimacy. Building on this framework, I argue that spy spoof films of the era determined the electronic gadget as a device that metaphorized transportation, telecommunication, and the efficiencies of capitalism. This work establishes that the world of the gadget was not strictly a masculine one as gadgets came to embody multiple meanings. Following this, future work in the field might consider marketing for technology in relation to both gender and race. For example, what might advertising for consumer electronics look like in *Jet* magazine, the weekly magazine geared toward African-American readers first published in 1951? How might those marketing discourses relate to the uses and aesthetics of technology in films made for African-American audiences? Or more generally to other American films of the period? A study of the relationships among technology, gender, and race during the 1960s is needed because it would open a new way to consider both the historical period and figurations of race during it, as well as formulations of race and fashion during the era. The room for continuing scholarship on costume, film, and fashion is vast and I hope this project has both fruitfully contributed to the body of work that exists and has created new spaces for that which is to come.

As I draw "Shopping the Look" to a close, I would like to briefly reflect on the process of writing this dissertation. I realize that I have written much about the process of film costuming, and the meaning of costumes within certain films, but I have not written about costumes themselves, as I have seen them in person, often peering through glass cases at buttons and necklines, for films both within this period and outside of it. Those costumes deserve a little attention, which I would like to give them here. It is no surprise that I have found costumes and

fashion in places that I have sought them out. This dissertation has taken me to the back rooms of the Fashion Institute of Design and Merchandising (FIDM) in Los Angeles, where I looked at iconic sixties fashions from the Rudi Gernreich fashion archive, and to the institute's museum. I stood next to a tuxedo worn by Fred Astaire (it was tiny!) and toured the museum's exhibition, "The Outstanding Art of Television Costume Design."[100] At that exhibit I first truly noticed the dimensionality of costumes that I had only previously seen flattened into screen images. Standing next to them in the real world gave me a topographical appreciation of film costumes that documents and images had not. Lingering among the costumes, I had a sense of both the artifice and craftsmanship inherent in costume production. Other exhibits have been equally as illuminating. The costumes at the Hollywood Museum, a tourist attraction housed in the historic Max Factor Building in Los Angeles, has objects ranging from baby Jean Harlow's diaper pins to a reconstruction of Roddy McDowall's famous powder room. These objects revealed the eccentric habits of Hollywood personalities, and the equally eccentric tastes of those who collect their memorabilia.[101] At the more restrained Ava Gardner Museum in Smithfield, North Carolina I looked at Gardner's costumes, letters, jewelry, and movie mementos that had been curated by her family. This collection is unique in that ways it navigates the line between public personality and intimate family member. Gardner's archive reminded me of the reality that ultimately really does exist behind movie artifice. And finally, the buttoned-down exhibit of historical crinolines at the Museum of Historical Costume and Lace in Brussels, Belgium, "Crinolines & Cie: The Bourgeois on Display," provided insight into European fashions that affluent American women sought out in the nineteenth century. The dresses on display there could have been historical

---

[100] The FIDM Museum has mounted exhibits honoring award-nominated costume design from television and film for the last 10 years. I saw the "7th Annual Outstanding Art of Television Costume Design" exhibit in October 2013.
[101] McDowall's powder room was famous for the range of celebrity-autographed photographs that hang on the wall.

models for so many other costumes that I have seen, and this further reinforced my thinking that fashion and costume cross into each other's territory unendingly.

In addition to these wonderfully curated museum spaces, I have run into costumes at places that I didn't expect. The movie rental store, Movie Madness in Portland, Oregon, has a room devoted to an idiosyncratic collection of props and costumes that includes lingerie worn by Barbara Streisand in *The Owl and the Pussycat* (1970) and James Cagney's tap shoes from *Yankee Doodle Dandy* (1943).[102] During my earliest days in Pittsburgh, imagine my delight in finding the Monroeville Zombies Museum in the Monroeville Mall, located just outside of Pittsburgh. The museum displayed costumes and props related to the film *Dawn of the Dead* (1979), which was shot on location inside the mall.[103] These informal sites of costume archive have equally inspired me and I the more I look, the more I find examples of film costumes in unexpected spaces. Sometimes it is just a single garment, framed and hung on a wall, as proof of an engagement with stardom, or celebrity, or something else that I can't quite reconcile. These examples testify to the ways that material object matter as imaginative portals to experience. Beyond these physical sites, I have found costume through memories, and not just my own. One of the pleasures of working on this project has been the response I have gotten from others. When I shared some of this work with a general audience during a talk on Edith Head, a few of the women in the audience, who had remembered seeing Head's costumes in films at the theater, reminisced about how the gowns had left a mark in their memories. When I have mentioned this project to others in casual conversation, they often share what Francisco Galarte calls a "style memory" – a recollected snippet, or a deeply-felt memory, attached to a dress or a sweater, or to

---

[102] Movie Madness still exists as a video rental store. It's museum is called the Movie Madness Museum.

[103] The Monroeville Zombies Museum has since relocated to The Living Dead Museum & Gift Shop in Evans City, PA.

the act of trying to craft a style itself, of materializing an identity. I have collected these style memories, in addition to all of my production documents and budget breakdown sheets, as evidence that costumes also live in recalled images and fond recollections.

Memory and materiality come together in such striking, visceral ways. Their points of convergence give us objects through which to write histories, but each of these little junctions also produces questions about the sorts of histories that we should write. In her essay on Cecil B. Demille's excavated City of the Pharaoh, Vivian Sobchack thinks about film history's impulse to scavenge among the ruins for moments, artifacts, lingering traces of that which might be "authentic" to tell a "thrice-told tale" about things and events through the lens of a present historical consciousness. Sobchack argues that the temporal distance between the past and the present has been foreshortened in the media landscape of the twenty-first century, which flattens the real and the represented in historically reflexive re-tellings of events, people, and objects. In a proposition that has now been widely accepted, Sobchack suggests that we consider the ruin as a site of historical investigation.[104] Rereading Sobchack's essay and her thoughts on Demille's city, I considered my own relationship to the material objects of costume and costume departments that I have spent so much time arranging and rearranging. Have I thought of this as a rescue mission to breathe life back into the reputations of costume departments in the 1960s? Has this been a project of excavation? Have I been working in ruins? No, I don't think so. Certainly, the language has appeared here and there, in the genealogy of a dress or the palimpsestic layering of events, yet still I think the answer is no. More than the ruin, I am interested in the afterlives of these costume objects. How do they find new instantiations through reuse and recirculation? What do they become after they have already been? This may seem like

---

[104] Sobchack, Vivian. "What is Film History? Or the Riddle of the Sphinxes." *Spectator - the University of Southern California Journal of Film and Television*, vol. 20, no. 1, 1999, pp. 8-22

simply a tweaking of Sobchack's ideas, but the language is different, and I think the spirit is different. Whereas Sobchack is suspicious of empiricism, I have reveled in it. I want to move from deconstruction and decay to something else that reflects contemporary cultural attitudes about notions of recirculation, reusability, preservation, and sustainability. While the concept of the ruin is intended to evade teleological thinking, it doesn't quite because it implies something that has fallen into terminal disuse. Its value is as a site of meditation, or mediation, though which we can ruminate on a past which has itself collapsed into the present. The notion of the afterlife implies a cycle of beginning and ending as well, but isn't it invigorating to focus on that which could be rather than that which was?

The study of material objects and their afterlives is more than simply a naïve celebration of renewal, however; it is also about what the historian Victoria Kelley calls the "assiduous habits of upkeep" that prevent objects like textiles, for example, from deteriorating. These practices range from simple cleaning to more technical restitution and repair, which are practices often overlooked as mere maintenance regimens. Thinking about Kelley, my questions shift from how objects and settings have been ruined, to how they have been maintained. What does it mean for a film costume to hang in a museum? For a whole exhibition of them to hang in not just one museum, but to travel to many museums, internationally, with huge crowds in attendance?[105] What does it mean to tend to these objects as historical artifacts, and to view them as such from an audience perspective? Kelley sees routines of maintenance as acts of resistance that combat notions of decay and ruin and I take Kelley's point in thinking about archival work itself as an act of resistance. Metaphorically, these habits of upkeep are also about the research itself, where

---

[105] I am referring to the exhibition "Hollywood Costume," sponsored by the Victoria and Albert Museum in London and exhibited by the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, among other cities in the U.S. Deborah Nadoolman Landis curated the exhibition.

the quotidian job of tending to the archive generally lacks the romantic mystique of fumbling about the ruins. The two are perhaps more related that I am indicating here, but this project has been as much about culling through materials as it has been about theorizing the structural significance of absence. The notion of upkeep has been an important part of this process and thinking about the afterlife of objects has led me to thinking about the archive that I have built and how I might now tend to it. What will I do with this little world that I have ordered and classified? These are the questions that I will explore as I move beyond this project.

This discussion would not be complete without a word about shopping. The title of my dissertation, "Shopping the Look," refers to the ways in which post-studio costumers and costume designers shopped retail spaces for costumes rather than rely on in-house manufacturing, which costume designers had been able to do in the studio era. This has often been shaded pejoratively, as in a costume designer "just" had to go shopping to put together a look. The act of shopping in general tends to inspire derision among those who see it as an activity that is frivolous, perhaps even injurious, if one engages with it too eagerly or too often.[106] This attitude recalls warnings issued to young women about sex and the dismissal of shopping most certainly has something to do with anxieties about gender and the ways that consumption has been eroticized over time as pleasurable and sensual. I do not, however, regard shopping with any such disdain. I view it as an act of creation, the production of a narrative, certainly within the context of film costume production, but also in daily life. In her discussion of department store culture in early 1900s London, the historian Erica Rappaport describes the

---

[106] The historian Mary Louise Roberts suggest that two 19th century figures of female depravity, the prostitute and the kleptomaniac, were tied to anxieties about the growth of consumerism in modern life. from "Gender, Consumption, and Commodity Culture" by Mary Louise Roberts.

retailer Gordon Selfridge's mission to construct a "compelling narrative about consumption, novelty and pleasure, [and] women and the city" (131). Rappaport argues that Selfridge excelled at creating advertising that considered the cinema as a "model of how to turn images into consumer desire" (136). The impulse to narrativize shopping has been with us ever since Selfridge's conflation of image, desire, and story. It has been powerful enough to fuel consumer culture for over a century.

In the 1960s, Madison Avenue advertising agencies seized upon a formula that combined slick production with compelling emotional narrative in a way that elevated marketing to heroic cultural proportions. This is depicted in the television show *Mad Men,* which demonstrated that techniques of seduction are an integral part of advertising. The production design of the show, which famously strove to be authentic, was part of its allure. The success of the program, with its sixties revivalism, attests to the relevance of that decade in contemporary culture. The "authentic" nature of *Mad Men* appealed to audiences as a "true" picture for the decade and the impulse to believe in its world has roots in the act of creation. The fashion scholar Heike Jenss points out that authenticity is itself a cultural construction. The word is etymologically related to the Greek "authenticos" and "authentes," meaning author (395). The success of sixties revivalism in *Mad Men*, and perhaps the lingering fascination with the era in general, has something to do with our need to rewrite it. Revisiting an historical period implies a desire to re-authenticate a moment by proving that current conceptions of it are erroneous. It betrays a certain compulsion to author a "truer" history. *Mad Men*, and its costumes in particular, which have found new currency in contemporary retail collections, offer just such an opportunity to re-author the era by draping ourselves in it. I would extend this even further to suggest that costumes more broadly provide portals through which to continually rewrite history as an act of maintenance.

For me, this work has been wonderfully material and abstract at once, and I have regarded it as something more than an exploration of ruins; it has, instead, been a lovingly assiduous task.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

"5-Appeal Trailers on 'Glass Boat.'" *The Hollywood Reporter,* 1966. Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files, *The Glass Bottom Boat.*

"20th-Fox Global Contest to Promote Doris Day." *Boxoffice (Archive: 1920-2000)*, vol. 87, no. 25, Oct 11, 1965, pp. 10*, Entertainment Industry Magazine Archive*, http://pitt.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1475961979?accountid=14709. Accessed 15 March 2014.

Aghayan, Ray. "The 'Caprice' Look: A Conversation with Costume Designer Ray Aghayan." *Caprice* DVD Special Features, Turner Entertainment Co., 2005.

---. Letter to Hedda Hopper. 21 January 1964. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Hedda Hopper, Ray Aghayan.

Alpert, Hollis. *The Glass Bottom Boat* review. *Saturday Review*, 25 June 1966. Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files, *The Glass Bottom Boat.*

Andre, Tom. Letter to Jess Morgan. 05 January 1962. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, George Stevens Papers, #952.

Ansoff, H. Igor. "Strategies for Diversification." *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 35, no. 5, September/October 1957, pp. 113-124. EBSCO*host*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=bth&AN=6769323&scope=site.

Aronson, Sidney. "The Sociology of the Telephone," *International Journal of Comparative Sociology,* vol. 12, no. 3, 1971, pp. 153-167.

Ball, Donald W. "Toward a Sociology of Telephones and Telephoners." *Sociology and Everyday Life,* edited by Marcello Truzzi, Prentice-Hall, 1968, pp. 59-74.

Banacki, Raymond. "Entertainments: *Caprice*." *Film Quarterly*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1967, pp. 58.

Barber, Eve. Letter to John C. Flim, Columbia Pictures. 07 December 1959. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Marty Weiser Collection, f. 213.

Best, Kate. *The History of Fashion Journalism.* Bloomsbury Academic, 2017. *ProQuest ebrary,* http://site.ebrary.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/lib/pitt/reader.action?docID=11285731&ppg=174.

"Boat Fashion Tieup." *Hollywood Reporter,* 22 April 1966. Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files, The Glass Bottom Boat.

Boettinger, Henry M. "Our Sixth-and-a-Half Sense." *The Social Impact of the Telephone,* edited By Ithiel de Sola Pool, The MIT Press, 1977, pp. 200-207.

Brog. "Film Review: *The Barretts of Wimpole Street*." *Variety*, vol. 205, no. 7, 16 January 1957, pp. 6, 18. *Entertainment Industry Magazine Archive, ProQuest* database, http://search.proquest.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/docview/1014813966/fulltext/9DEAA2A2D 6BA4A7DPQ/77?accountid=14709. Accessed 02 December 2015.

Campbell, Kay. "Pictures: H'WOOD FASHIONS' BOOM YEAR." Variety (Archive: 1905-2000), vol. 248, no. 7, Oct 04, 1967, pp. 5, Entertainment Industry Magazine Archive, http://pitt.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/964066798?accoun tid=14709.

Canby, Vincent. "The Screen – *The Glass Bottom Boat.*" *The New York Times,* 10 June 1966, pp. 53.

"Celanese at the Fashion Exhibit." *New York Times*, 16 January 1930, pp. 39. *ProQuest Historical Newspapers,* http://search.proquest.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/docview/99093040?pq-origsite=summon.

Celanese Corporation. "Our History." *Celanese.com.* https://www.celanese.com/About-Us/History.aspx. Accessed 06 April 2016.

---. "Star in Crepe" press release. 07 June 1961. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Edith Head Papers, Programs 1960-1965, f.218.

"Celanese Testing Fashion Show via Disk Series." *Variety*, vol. 161, no. 11, 20 February 1946, pp. 24. *Variety (Archive: 1905-2000),* http://search.proquest.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/docview/1285872279?pq-origsite=summon.

"Come Aboard 'The Glass Bottom Boat'…Your Exploitation Treasure Ship!" Exhibitor's Campaign Book, 1966, 12 pp. Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files, *The Glass Bottom Boat*.

Costume report for *The Greatest Story Ever Told.* 25 February 1963. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, George Stevens Papers, folder #952.

Crawford, Joan. Correspondence to Jill-Melody Gauron. 1963-1970. Margaret Herrick Library, Vertical File Collection, Joan Crawford Correspondence.

Crowther, Bosley. "Screen: 'Caprice' Opens Doris Day Plays a Spy at Several Houses." *New York Times (1923-Current file)*, 08 June 1967, pp. 52*, ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times; ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times with Index*, http://pitt.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/117778255?accountid=14709.

Davis, Frank. Copy of notes from a meeting with David Berman, Novarese, Tom Andre, Ray Gosnell, and Vellani CC'd to George Stevens. 08 February 1962. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, George Stevens Papers, #952.

Derode, Julien. "The Day of the Jackal -Wardrobe" memo to Fred Zinnemann. 06 March 1972. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Fred Zinnemann Papers, 15-f.180.

"Dress and the Picture." *Moving Picture World.* Vol. 7, no. 2, The World Photographic Publishing Company, 9 July 1910, pp. 73-4. *Archive.org*, https://archive.org/stream/moviwor07chal#page/72/mode/2up. Accessed 15 Dec 2015.

"Exploitips." Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files, *The Glass Bottom Boat.*

---. *The Mechanical Smile Modernism and The First Fashion Shows in France and America, 1900-1929*. Yale University Press, 2013.

The Fashion Industries Club for Mount Sinai Hospital and Clinic of Los Angeles. "A Night To Remember" fashion show program. November 1960. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Edith Head Papers, Programs.

"Fashion Promos Help Sail Boat." *Variety*, vol. 243, no. 9, 20 July 1966, Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files, The Glass Bottom Boat.

Flinn, John. Letter to Dick Kahn. 15 January 1960. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Marty Weiser Papers.

Gertner, Richard. "The Glass Bottom Boat" review. *Motion Picture Herald,* 27 April 1966. Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files, *The Glass Bottom Boat.*

Gilbert, Eugene. "'What Young People Think' Debbie, Newman Top Ten Film Poll." 11 March 1965. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Hedda Hopper Papers, f.30.

The Glass Bottom Boat Exhibitors Press Book. Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files, *The Glass Bottom Boat.*

"The Glass Bottom Boat" review. *Cosmopolitan* magazine, June 1966. Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files, *The Glass Bottom Boat.*

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Anchor Books, 1959.

Haffenden, Elizabeth and Joan Bridge. "The Day of the Jackal-Wardrobe" memo to Fred Zinnemann. 27 April 1972. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Fred Zinnemann Papers, 15-f.180.

Handford, Jack. Letter to Marjorie Best from Handford, President of the California Apparel Designers. 14 January 1950. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Marjorie Best Papers, Correspondence.

Head, Edith. May Co. fashion show program. 25 August 1962. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Edith Head Papers, folder Fashion Shows 1964-1966.

---. Memo from Edith Head to "Lee." 29 August 1966. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Edith Head Papers, folder 182.

---. Programs for fashion shows. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Edith Head Papers, "Programs 1980-1982."
---. Programs for fashion shows. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Edith Head Papers, "Programs 1960-1965," f.218.

Head, Edith and Jane Kesner Ardmore. *The Dress Doctor.* Little Brown, 1959.

Head, Edith and Joe Hyams. *How to Dress for Success.* Illustrated by Edith Head. Random House, 1967.

"Here and There." *The Hollywood Reporter,* 06 April 1966. Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files, *The Glass Bottom Boat.*

Hopper, Hedda. Interview with Ray Aghayan. 13 April 1965. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Hedda Hopper Papers, Ray Aghayan, file 569.

Horne's photographs. *The Daily News,* McKeesport, PA, 09 May 1978. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Edith Head Papers – Horne's Fashion Show, f. 191a.

Klein, Alvin. "Dina Merrill: A Star on her Toes." *The New York Times*, 03 April 1983, pp. L_1_17. *New York Times (1923-Current File), ProQuest* database. Accessed 18 December 2015.

McCall's. Vol. 88, no. 1, October 1961, microfilm.

---. Vol. 89, no. 7, April 1962, microfilm.

---. Vol. 89, no. 10, July 1962, microfilm.

---. Vol. 89, no. 1, October 1962, microfilm.

---. Vol. 91, no. 7, April 1964, microfilm.

---. Vol. 92, no. 7, April 1965, microfilm.

---. Vol. 92, no. 1, October 1965, microfilm.

---. Vol. 93, no. 1, October 1966, microfilm.

Mensh, Gladys. Letter to Marjorie Best. 12 November 1956. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Marjorie Best Papers, Correspondence.

MGM Wardrobe Department. *Across the Wide Missouri* costume plotbook. 29 June 1950, Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, MGM Wardrobe Department Records, folder 2.

---. *The Barretts of Wimpole Street* costume plotbook. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, MGM Wardrobe Department Records, folder 16.

---. *The Carey Treatment* costume plotbook. 1972. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, MGM Wardrobe Department Records.

---. *The Courtship of Eddie's Father* costume plotbook. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, MGM Wardrobe Department Records, folder 48.

---. *The Glass Bottom Boat* costume plotbook. 20 July 1965. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, MGM Wardrobe Department Records, folder 90.

---. *The Great Sinner* costume plotbook. Costume design by Irene, 21 September 1948. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, MGM Wardrobe Department Records, folder 96.

---. *Made in Paris* costume plotbook. Costume design by Helen Rose, 01 February 1965. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, MGM Wardrobe Department Records, folder 167.

---. *Pretty Maids All in a Row* costume plotbook. 1971. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, MGM Wardrobe Department Records, folder 199.

---. *The Wheeler Dealers* costume plotbook. 10 February 1963. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, MGM Wardrobe Department Records, folder 291.

Morley, Ruth. "Approximate Costume Budget." Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Ruth Morley Papers, folder *Hustler* – misc.

---. "Deal memo." 06 December 1971. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Ruth
Morley Papers, *Child's Play* – misc. wardrobe.

---. Memo to John Graham. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Ruth
Morley Papers, folder *Hustler* – misc.

---. Production notes for *Child's Play.* Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Ruth
Morley Papers, folder *Child's Play* – misc. wardrobe.

---. Production notes for *The Connection.* Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Ruth
Morley Papers.

---. Production notes for *The Hustler.* Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Ruth
Morley Papers, folder *Hustler* – misc.

---. Production notes for *Lilith.* 19 June 1963. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections,
Ruth Morley Papers, folder 2 of 2.

Morris, George. *Caprice* film review. *The Films of Doris Day,* edited by Derald Hendry,
http://www.dorisday.net/caprice/. Accessed 12 June 2017.

Murf. "Film Reviews: Caprice." *Variety (Archive: 1905-2000)*, vol. 216, no. 13, 17 May 1967,
pp. 6*, Entertainment Industry Magazine Archive*,
http://pitt.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1017156899?accou
ntid=14709.

Newman, Robert V. Memo to George Stevens. 12 July 1962. Margaret Herrick Library, Special
Collections, George Stevens Papers, #952.

Novarese, Nino. Memo to George Stevens. 15 March 15 1963. Margaret Herrick Library, Special
Collections, George Stevens Papers, #952.

"The Oh-Oh-Sex Girl." Promotional advertising materials for *The Spy in Lace Panties* (aka *The
Glass Bottom Boat*). Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files,
The Glass Bottom Boat.

Peruzzi, Guiseppe. Letter in translation to Nino Novarese. 10 January 1962. Margaret Herrick
Library, Special Collections, George Stevens Papers, #952.

"Pictures: 'DIANE' FAIRISH 10G, PITT; 'FRONTIER' 9G." *Variety*, vol. 201, no. 6, 11 January
1956, pp. 18. *Entertainment Industry Magazine Archive*, *ProQuest* database,
http://search.proquest.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/docview/1017020585/fulltext/F77817CA26E
C402EPQ/155?accountid=14709. Accessed 6 January 2016.

"Pictures Grosses: 'Bedrooms' Pale 6G, Seattle; '10 C's' 12G." *Variety*, vol. 206, no. 5, 03 April

1957, pp. 9. *Entertainment Industry Magazine Archive, ProQuest* database, http://search.proquest.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/docview/1032373740/fulltext/5A1D4F7B71 1E4E26PQ/101?accountid=14709. Accessed 02 December 2015.

"Pictures Grosses: 'Cinerama' Still Tops Cleve., 25G." *Variety,* vol. 205, no. 11, 13 February 1957, pp. 8. *Entertainment Industry Magazine Archive, ProQuest* database, http://search.proquest.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/docview/1014790711/fulltext/A34C0863498 4F67PQ/93?accountid=14709. Accessed 2 December 2015.

"Pictures Grosses: 'Pretty Baby' Fat $8,500, Pitt; 'Barretts' Sad 8G, 'Anastasia' Mighty 12G." *Variety*, vol. 205, no. 11, 13 February 1957, pp. 9, 18. *Entertainment Industry Magazine Archive, ProQuest* database, http://search.proquest.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/docview/1014801803/368184F5F51B45BAP Q/105?accountid=14709. Accessed 02 December 2015.

"Pictures: Non -Showmen Think all that TV Gravy would do More' for their Complexes." *Variety (Archive: 1905-2000)*, vol. 244, no. 11, 02 November 1966, pp. 3, 24, *Entertainment Industry Magazine Archive*, http://pitt.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/103244150 0?accountid=14709.

"POPULARITY: The All-American Favorites of 1970." *Boxoffice (Archive: 1920-2000)*, vol. 99, no. 8, Jun 07, 1971, pp. d19, d20, d21, d22, d23, d24, d25, d26*, Entertainment Industry Magazine Archive*, http://pitt.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1476028321?accou ntid=14709. Accessed 04 March 2014.

"POPULARITY: THE WINNERS." *Boxoffice (Archive: 1920-2000)*, vol. 94, no. 25, 07 Apr 1969*,* pp. 19, *Entertainment Industry Magazine Archive*, http://pitt.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1476019522?accou ntid=14709. Accessed 04 March 2014.

Powers, James. "'The Glass Bottom Boat' Highlighted by Doris Day." *The Hollywood Reporter,* 20 April 1966. Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files, *The Glass Bottom Boat.*

Records of the Penn Theater, Pittsburgh, PA, 1927-1964. Penn Theater. University of Pittsburgh, Hillman Library, Archives Service Center, AIS.1968.06.

Rose, Helen. Memo to Pandro Berman. 8 January 1960, Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, MGM Wardrobe Department Records, folder 30.

Roth, Harry. Letter to Marjorie Best from Roth, President of the Fashion Industries Club for Mount Sinai Hospital and Clinic. 2 November 1956. Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Marjorie Best Papers, Correspondence.

Scheuer, Phillip. "Visual Gags: 'Glass Boat' Draws Laughs." *Los Angeles Times*, 17 August
      1966. Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection – Production Files, *The Glass Bottom
      Boat.*

"The Sick Boy and the Sitter." *The Dick Van Dyke Show,* created by Carl Reiner, episode 1,
      CBS, 03 October 1961.

"Space Chase." *Time* magazine, 17 June 1966. Margaret Herrick Library, Core Collection –
      Production Files, *The Glass Bottom Boat.*

Stevens, George. Memo to Frank Davis. 13 February 1962. Margaret Herrick Library, Special
      Collections, George Stevens Papers, #952.

"Store Planned for Pittsburgh," *The Vindicator, The People's Paper,* Youngstown, OH, Business
      section, 13 March 1990, pp. 20.

"Vintage Fashion Newsreel: 1967 Astro-Fashion." *YouTube,* Posted by onbcjohnnydeppzone, 2
      July 2010, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3JxXnQRxLGw. Accessed 04 April 2016.

Vreeland, Diana. *Vogue.* 01 January 1965.

Whit. "Pictures: Diane." *Variety,* vol. 201, no. 3, 21 December 1955, pp. 16. *Entertainment
      Industry Magazine Archive, ProQuest* database,
      http://search.proquest.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/docview/1017021520/fulltext/7E2AEE19EF
      AD412BPQ/145?accountid=14709. Accessed 6 January 2016.

Zinnemann, Fred. "The Day of the Jackal-Wardrobe" memo to David Deutsch. 27 April 1972.
      Margaret Herrick Library, Special Collections, Fred Zinnemann Papers, 15-f.180.

Secondary Sources

Affron, Charles and Mirella Jona Affron, *Sets in Motion: Art Direction and Film Narrative.* Rutgers University Press, 1995.

Aragon, Louis. "On Décor," *The Shadow and Its Shadow: Surrealist Writings on the Cinema,* edited by Paul Hammond, City Lights Books, 2000, pp. 50-54.

Aspers, Patrik and Frederic Godart. "Sociology of Fashion: Order and Change." *Annual Review of Sociology,* Vol. 39, 2013, pp. 171-192.

Baldaia, Suzanne. "Space Age Fashion," *Twentieth-Century American Fashion*, edited by Linda Welters and Patricia A. Cunningham, Berg, 2005, pp. 169-190.

Barsacq, Leon. *Caligari's Cabinet and Other Grand Illusions: A History of Film Design.* Graphic Society, 1976.

Bartlett, Djurda. *Fashion Media Past and Present*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.

Basinger, Jeanine. *The Star Machine.* Knopf, 2007.

Bernard, Malcolm. *Fashion as Communication*. Routledge, 1996.

Bennett, Tony and Janet Woollacott. *Bond and Beyond: The Political Career of a Popular Hero.* Macmillan Education, 1987.

Berry, Sarah. *Screen Style Fashion and Femininity in 1930s Hollywood*. University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Bordwell, David. "Historical Poetics of Cinema." *The Cinematic Text: Methods and Approaches,* Edited by R. Barton Palmer, *Georgia State Literary Studies*, no. 3, pp. 369-98. D*avidbordwell.net*, http://www.davidbordwell.net/articles/Bordwell_Cinematic%20Text_no3_1989_369.pdf. Accessed 5 May 2017.

Bruzzi, Stella and Pamela Church Gibson. *Fashion Cultures Theories, Explorations and Analysis.* Edited by Bruzzi and Gibson, Routledge, 2000.

Caldwell, John. *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television,* Duke University Press, 2008.

---. "Para-Industry: Researching Hollywood's Blackwaters." *Cinema Journal*, vol. 52, no. 3, April 2013, pp. 157-164.

Conekin, Becky E. "Fashioning Mod Twiggy and the Moped in 'Swinging' London." *History and Technology*, vol. 28, no. 2, June 2012, pp. 209-215.

Davis, F.D. "Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology." *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 13, no. 3, September 1989, pp. 319-340,

de Grazia, Victoria. "Empowering Women as Citizen-Consumers." *The Sex of Things Gender and Consumption in Historical Perspective*, edited by Victoria de Grazia with Ellen Furlough, University of California Press, 1996, pp. 275-86.

Du Gay, Paul, et al. *Doing Cultural Studies The Story of the Sony Walkman.* Sage Publications in Association with The Open University, 1997.

Dyer, Richard. *Heavenly Bodies Film Stars and Society.* Macmillan, 1986.

Eckert, Charles. "The Carole Lombard in Macy's Window." 1978. *Fabrications Costume and the Female Body,* edited by Jane Gaines and Charlotte Herzog, Routledge, 1990, pp. 100-121.

Enns, Anthony. "The Fans from U.N.C.L.E.: The Marketing and Reception of the Swinging '60s Spy Phenomenon." *Journal of Popular Film and Television,* vol. 28, no. 3, 2000, pp. 124-132.

Evans, Caroline. "The Walkies: Early French Fashion shows as a Cinema of Attractions." *Film and Fashion*, edited by Adrienne Munich, Indiana University Press, 2011, pp. 110-125.

Feldman, Christine Jacqueline. '*We are the Mods': A Transnational History of a Youth Subculture*. Peter Lang, 2009.

Finamore, Michelle Tolini. *Fashioning Early Cinema: Dress and Representation in American Film, 1905-1930*. The Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts, Design, and Culture, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2010. http://search.proquest.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/docview/250272906?pq-origsite=summon.

Fischer, Lucy. "Introduction." *Art Direction and Production Design*, edited by Lucy Fischer, Rutgers, 2015, pp. 1-22.

Frascella, Larry, and Al Weisel. *Live Fast, Die Young: The Wild Ride of Making Rebel without a Cause*. Simon & Schuster, 2005.

Gaines, Jane. "Costume and Narrative: How Dress Tells the Woman's Story." *Fabrications Costume and the Female Body,* edited by Jane Gaines and Charlotte Herzog, Routledge, 1990, pp. 180-211.

---. "On Wearing the Film: *Madam Satan.*" *Fashion Cultures Theories,*

Explorations, and Analysis, edited by Stella Bruzzi and Pamela Church Gibson, Routledge, 2000, pp. 159-177.

---. "The Queen Christina Tie-Ups: Convergence of Show Window and Screen." *Quarterly Review of Film & Video*, vol. 11, issue 1, 1989, pp. 35-60.

---. "Wanting to Wear Seeing." *Fashion in Film*, edited by Adrienne Munich, Indiana University Press, 2011, pp. 135-151.

Galarte, Francisco J. "Fashion-ing Pedagogies." *Transgender Studies Quarterly*, vol. 2: no. 3, 2015, pp. 519-521.

Govil, Nitin. "Thinking Nationally: Domicile, Distinction, and Dysfunction in Global Media Exchange." *Media Industries History, Theory, and Method*, edited by Jennifer Holt and Alisa Perren, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, pp. 132-143.

Sarah-Grace Heller, "The Birth of Fashion." *The Fashion History Reader Global Perspectives,* Edited by Giorgio Riello and Peter McNeil, Routledge, 2010, pp. 25-39.

Gregg, Ronald. "Fashion, Thrift Store and the Space of Pleasure in the 1960s Queer Underground Film." *Birds of Paradise: Costume as Cinematic Spectacle*, edited by Marketa Uhlirova, Koenig Books, 2013, pp. 293-304.

Guerin, Polly. "The Edith Head Collection - Spotlight on Hollywood Glamour Dolls." *Doll World Magazine*, vol. 22, no. 2, April 1998.

Hartzell, Freyja. "The Velvet Touch: Fashion, Furniture, and the Fabric of the Interior." *Fashion Theory: The Journal of Dress, Body & Culture,* vol. 13, no.1, 2009, pp. 51-82.

Haskell, Molly. *From Rape to Reverence The Treatment of Women in the Movies 2ed*. 1973. University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Herzog, Charlotte. "'Powder Puff' Promotion: The Fashion Show-in-the-Film." *Fabrications Costume and the Female Body,* edited by Jane Gaines and Charlotte Herzog, Routledge, 1990, pp. 134-159.

Higashi, Sumiko. *Stars, Fans, and Consumption in the 1950s: Reading Photoplay.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Hilmes, Michele. "Nailing Mercury The Problem of Media Industry Historiography." *Media Industries History, Theory, and Method*, edited by Jennifer Holt and Alisa Perren, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, pp. 21-33.

Hindson, Catherine. "Dancing on Top of the World: A Serpentine through Late Nineteenth-Century Entertainment, Fashion and Film." *Birds of Paradise: Costume as Cinematic Spectacle*, edited by Marketa Uhlirova, Koenig Books, 2013, pp. 65-78.

Hine, Thomas. *Populuxe*. Knopf, 1986.

Hollander, Anne. *Seeing Through Clothes.* Avon Publishers, 1975.

Holliday, Laura Scott. "Kitchen Technologies: Promises and Alibis, 1944-1966." *Camera Obscura*, vol 16, no. 2 47, 2001, pp. 79-131.

Jenss, Heike. "Dressed in History: Retro Styles and the Construction of Authenticity in Youth Culture." *Fashion Theory*, vol. 8 no. 4, 2004, pp. 387-404.

Jerde, Judith. *Encyclopedia of Textiles*. Facts on File, 1992.

Kaufman, Debra. "New Media Entice Auds: Ancillary Content Can Lure Viewers to Traditional Platforms - if it Stands Out." *Daily Variety*, 2 May 2011, pp. 9. *Academic OneFile*. Accessed 30 November 2015.

Keller, Suzanne. "The Telephone in New (and Old) Communities." *The Social Impact of the Telephone*, edited by Ithiel de Sola Pool, The MIT Press, 1977, pp. 281-302.

Lacohee, H., N. Wakeford, and I. Pearson. "A Social History of the Mobile Telephone with a View of its Future." *BT Technology Journal*, vol. 21, no. 3, July 2003, pp. 203-2011.

La Motte, Richard. *Costume Design 101: The Art and Business of Costume Design for Film and Television*. Michael Wiese Productions, 2001.

Landis, Deborah Nadoolman. *Dressed: A Century of Hollywood Costume Design.* Collins Design, c2007.

---. *Hollywood Costume.* Edited by Deborah Nadoolman Landis, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Association with the Victoria and Albert Museum, V&A Publishing, 2012.

Larrabee, Eric. "Autos and Americans: The Great Love Affair." *Industrial Design*, August 1955, pp. 97.

La Vine, W. Robert. *In Glamorous Fashion The Fabulous Years of Hollywood Costume Design*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1980.

Lee, Edith C. "Helen Rose." *International Dictionary of Films and Filmmakers, 4th ed., vol. 4, Writers and Production Artists*. Edited by Sara Pendergast and Tom Pendergast, St. James Press, 2000, pp. 733-735. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*. Accessed 15 Dec. 2015.

Lee, Edith C. "Walter Plunkett." *International Dictionary of Films and Filmmakers, 4th ed., vol. 4, Writers and Production Artists*. Edited by Sara Pendergast and Tom Pendergast, St. James Press, 2000, pp. 678-681. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*. Accessed 30 May 2017.

Maddox, Brenda. "Women at the Switchboard." *The Social Impact of the Telephone*, edited by Ithiel de Sola Pool, The MIT Press, 1977, pp. 262-280.

Maltby, Richard. "New Cinema Histories." *Explorations in New Cinema History Approaches and Case Studies,* edited by Richard Maltby, et al., Wiley-Blackwell, 2001, pp. 3-40.

Marling, Karal Ann. *As seen on TV : the visual culture of everyday life in the 1950s.* Harvard University Press, 1994.

Marvin, Carolyn. *When Old Technologies were New: Thinking about Electric Communication in the Late Nineteenth Century*. Oxford University Press, New York, 1988.

May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound American Families in the Cold War Era.* Basic Books, 1998.

Mayer, Vicki. "Bringing the Social Back in: Studies of Production Cultures and Social Theory." *Production Studies: Cultural Studies of Media Industries*, edited by Vicki Mayer, et al., Routledge, 2009.

McDonald, Paul. *The Star System Hollywood's Production of Popular Identities.* Wallflower Press, 2000.

McDonald, Tamar Jeffers. *Doris Day Confidential: Hollywood, Sex & Stardom.* I.B. Tauris, 2013.

---. *Hollywood Catwalk: Exploring Costume and Transformation in American Film*. I.B. Tauris, 2010.

McGee, Garry. *Doris Day: Sentimental Journey.* McFarland & Company, 2005.

McKnight, Ralph. *"Caprice." The Films of Doris Day*, http://www.dorisday.net/caprice/. Accessed March 2014.

McRobbie, Angela. *British Fashion Design: Rag Trade or Image Industry?* Routledge, 1998. ProQuest ebrary, http://site.ebrary.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/lib/pitt/detail.action?docID=10099103.

Merck, Mandy. "Travesty on the Old Frontier," *Move Over Misconceptions: Doris Day Reappraised*, BFI Dossier 4, edited by Jane Clarke and Diana Simmonds, BFI, 1980, pp. 21–28.

Merz, Melissa L. *The Art and Practice of Costume Design*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2017. *ProQuest ebrary,* http://site.ebrary.com.pitt.idm.oclc.org/lib/pitt/reader.action?docID=11269864&ppg=214#.

Miller, Toby. "Can Natural Luddites Make Things Explode or Travel Faster? The New Humanities, Cultural Policy Studies, and Creative Industries." *Media Industries History, Theory, and Method*, edited by Jennifer Holt and Alisa Perren, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, pp. 184-198.

---. *Spyscreen Espionage on Film and TV from the 1930s to the 1960s.* Oxford University Press, 2003.

Monaco, Paul. *History of the American Cinema, The Sixties 1960-1969*. University of California Press, 2001.

Napoli, Philip M. "Media Economics and the Study of Media Industries." *Media Industries History, Theory, and Method*, edited by Jennifer Holt and Alisa Perren, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, pp. 161-170.

Nielsen, Elizabeth. "Handmaidens of the Glamour Culture: Costumers in the Hollywood Studio System." *Fabrications Costume and the Female Body,* edited by Jane Gaines and Charlotte Herzog, Routledge, 1990, pp. 160-179.

Purdy, Daniel Leonhard. *The Rise of Fashion A Reader*. Edited by D.L. Purdy. University of Minnesota Press, 2004.

Rich, B. Ruby. "The Party Line: Gender and Technology in the Home." *Processed Lives: Gender and Technology in Everyday Life*, edited by Jennifer Terry and Melodie Calvert, Routledge, 1997, pp. 221-232.

Quirk, Lawrence J. and William Schoell. *Joan Crawford: the Essential Biography.* University Press of Kentucky, 2002.

Rappaport, Erika. "'A New Era of Shopping': The Promotion of Women's Pleasure in London's West End, 1909-1914." *Shopping for Pleasure: Women and the Making of London's West End*, Princeton University Press, 2001.

Riello, Giorgio and Prasannan Parthasarathi. "The Globalization of Cotton Textiles: Indian Cottons, Europe, and the Atlantic World, 1600-1850." *The Spinning World A Global History of Cotton Textiles, 1200-1850.* Oxford University Press, 2009.

Roberts, Mary Louise. "Gender, Consumption, and Commodity Culture." *The American Historical Review*, vol. 103, No. 3, June 1998, pp. 817-844.

Schatz, Thomas. "Film Industry Studies and Hollywood History." *Media Industries History, Theory, and Method*, edited by Jennifer Holt and Alisa Perren, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, pp. 45-56.

Silver, Sheila. "Then and Now: Women's Roles in *McCall's* Magazine, 1964 and 1974." College Of Journalism, University of Maryland, Conference Presentation, The 59th annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism, 31 July – 04 August 1976.

Shiber, Susan I. "Markels Roberts Looks Down in an Upward Direction," *Chester County Life*, March/April 2009, pp. 12. http://divingcatstudio.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/MarkelsStory.pdf. Accessed 27 March 2017.

Sobchack, Vivian. "What is Film History? Or the Riddle of the Sphinxes." *Spectator - the University of Southern California Journal of Film and Television*, vol. 20, no. 1, 1999, pp. 8-22

Sontag, Susan. "Notes on Camp." *Against Interpretation and other Essays,* Picador, 1965, pp. 274-292.

Stacey, Jackie. *Star Gazing: Hollywood Cinema and Female Spectatorship.* Routledge, 1994.

Stamp, Shelley. *Movie-Struck Girls Women and Motion Picture Culture after the Nickelodeon.* Princeton University Press, 2000.

Tashiro, C.S. *Pretty Pictures: Production Design and the History Film.* University of Texas Press, 1998.

Trotter, David. "Mobility, Network, Message: Spy Fiction and Film in the Long 1930s." *Critical Quarterly*, vol. 57, no. 3, 2015, pp. 10-21.

Troy, Nancy J. "Poiret's Modernism and the Logic of Fashion." *The Fashion History Reader Global Perspectives*, edited by Giorgio Riello and Peter McNeil, Routledge, 2010, 455-476.

Turim, Maureen. "Designing Women: The Emergence of the New Sweetheart Line." *Fabrications Costume and the Female Body,* edited by Jane Gaines and Charlotte Herzog, Routledge, 1990, pp. 212-228.

Tweedie, James. *The Age of New Waves: Art Cinema and the Staging of Globalization.* Oxford University Press, 2013.

van der Heijden, Hans. "User Acceptance of Hedonic Information Systems." *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 4, 2004, pp. 695-704.

Walker, Nancy. *Shaping Our Mother's World American Women's Magazines*. University of Mississippi Press, 2000.

Wasko, Janet. *How Hollywood Works.* Sage, 2003.

Wilkinson-Weber, Clare M. "From Commodity to Costume Productive Consumption in the Making of Bollywood Film Looks." *Journal of Material Culture,* vol. 15, no. 1, March 2010, pp. 3-29.

Williams, James C. "Getting Housewives the Electric Message: Gender and Energy Marketing in the Early Twentieth Century." *His and Hers: Gender, Consumption, and Technology,* edited by Roger Howowitz and Arwen Mohun, University Press of Virginia, 1998.

Wilson, Elizabeth. *Adorned in Dreams Fashion and Modernity Revised and Updated.* 1985. I.B. Tauris, 2003.

Wojcik, Pamela Robertson. *New Constellations: Movie Stars of the 1960s*. Rutgers University Press, 2012.

FILMOGRAPHY

The Ambushers. 1967, costumes by Oleg Cassini and Sy Devore, performance by Dean
     Martin, produced by Meadway-Claude Productions, distributed by Columbia Pictures.

The Ballad of Josie. 1968, costumes by Jean Louis, performance by Doris Day, produced by
     Universal Pictures.

Beach Blanket Bingo. 1965, costumes by Marjorie Corso, produced by American International
     Productions.

By the Light of the Silvery Moon. 1952, costumes by Leah Rhodes, performance by Doris Day,
     produced and distributed by Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.

Calamity Jane. 1953, costumes by Howard Shoup, Marie Pickering, and Mary Dery,
     performance by Doris Day, produced and distributed by Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.

Casino Royale. 1967, costumes by Julie Harris and Bermans of London, produced by Famous
     Artists Productions, distributed by Columbia Pictures.

Do Not Disturb. 1965, costumes by Ray Aghayan, performances by Doris Day and Rod Taylor,
     produced by Arcola Pictures Corp. and Martin Melcher Productions, distributed by
     Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.

Fathom. 1967, costumes by Kiki Byrne, Bridget Sellers, Henry Bardon, performance by Raquel
     Welch, produced by Twentieth Century-Fox Productions, distributed by Twentieth
     Century-Fox Film Corp.

The Glass Bottom Boat. 1966, costumes by Ray Aghayan, performance by Doris Day,
     produced by Arwin Productions, Inc. and Reame Productions, distributed by MGM.

Gidget Goes Hawaiian. 1961, costumes unlisted, produced by Jerry Bresler Productions,
     distributed by Columbia Pictures.

How to Stuff a Wild Bikini. 1965, performance by Annette Funicello, costumes by Richard
     Bruno, produced by American International Productions, distributed by American
     International Pictures.

I'll See you in my Dreams. 1952, costumes by Leah Rhodes and Marjorie Best, performance by Doris Day, produced and distributed by Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.

In Like Flint. 1967, costumes by Ray Aghayan and Martin of California, performance by James Coburn, produced by Saul David Productions, distributed by Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.

It Happened to Jane. 1959, costumes unlisted, performances by Doris Day and Jack Lemmon, produced by Arwin Productions, Inc., distributed by Columbia Pictures,

Julie. 1956, costumes unlisted, performance by Doris Day, produced by MGM and Arwin Productions, Inc., distributed by Loew's Inc.

Love Me or Leave Me. 1955, costumes by Helen Rose, performances by Doris Day and James Cagney, produced by MGM, distributed by Loew's Inc.

Lover Come Back. 1961, costumes by Irene, performance by Doris Day, produced by 7 Pictures, Arwin Productions, Inc., Nob Hill Productions, distributed by Universal-International.

The Man Who Knew Too Much. 1956, costumes by Edith Head, Lee Forman, and Leonard Mann, performance by Doris Day, produced by Paramount Pictures Corp. and Filwhite Productions, Inc., distributed by Paramount Pictures Corp.

Midnight Lace. 1960, costumes by Irene, performance by Doris Day, produced by Universal-International Pictures Co., Inc. and Arwin Productions, Inc., distributed by Universal Pictures Co., Inc.

Modesty Blaise. 1966, costumes by Bumble Dawson, Evelyn Gibbs, Douglas Hayward, Marissa Martelli, performance by Monica Vitti, produced by Modesty Blaise Ltd., distributed by Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.

Move Over Darling. 1963, costumes by Moss Mabry, performances by Doris Day and James Garner, produced by Twentieth Century Fox and Melcher-Arcola Productions, distributed by Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.

On Moonlight Bay. 1951, costumes by Marjorie Best, performance by Doris Day, produced by Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., distributed by Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.

Our Man Flint. 1966, costumes by Ray Aghayan, Ed Wynigear, Willie May Neal, performance by James Coburn, produced by Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.

Murderers' Row. 1966, costumes unlisted, performance by Dean Martin, production by Meadway-Claude Productions #2, distributed by Columbia Pictures.

The Pajama Game. 1957, costumes by William Eckart and Jean Eckart, performance by Doris Day, produced and distributed by Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.

Pillow Talk. 1959, costumes by Jean Louis, performance by Doris Day, produced by Universal-International Pictures Co., Inc. and Arwin Productions, Inc., distributed by Universal Pictures Co., Inc.

Please Don't Eat the Daisies. 1959, costumes by Morton Haack, performances by Doris Day and David Niven, produced by MGM and Euterpe Productions, distributed by Lowe's Inc.

Romance on the High Seas. 1948, costumes by Milo Anderson, performance by Doris Day, produced by Michael Curtiz Productions, Inc., distributed by Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.

Send Me no Flowers. 1964, costumes by Jean Louis, performances by Doris Day and Rock Hudson, produced by Martin Melcher Productions, distributed by Universal Pictures.

The Silencers. 1966, costumes by Moss Mabry, performance by Dean Martin, produced by Meadway-Claude Productions, distributed by Columbia.

Storm Warning. 1951, costumes by Milo Anderson, performances by Doris Day and Ronald Reagan, produced and distributed by Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.

Teacher's Pet. 1958, costumes by Edith Head, Glenita Dineen, Marie Pickering, and Jess Munden, performance by Doris Day, produced by Perlsea Co., distributed by Paramount Pictures Corp.

That Touch of Mink. 1962, costumes by Rosemary Odell and Norman Norell, performances by Doris Day and Cary Grant, produced by Arwin Productions, Inc., Granley Co, and Nob Hill Productions, distributed by Universal-International.

The Thrill of it All. 1963. Costumes by Jean Louis, performance by Doris day and Rock Hudson, Produced by Arwin Productions, Inc., and Ross Hunter Productions, Inc., distributed by Universal Pictures.

With Six you get Eggroll. 1968, costumes by Glenn Connelly, performance by Doris Day, produced by Arwin Productions, Inc. and Cinema Center Films, distributed by National General Pictures Corp.

The Wrecking Crew. 1969, costumes by Moss Mabry, Sy Devore, performance by Dean Martin, production by Meadway-Claude Productions #4, distributed by Columbia Pictures.