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SARTORIAL NATIONALISM AND
SYMBOLIC GEOGRAPHY

Clothing can express several social meanings, and attitudes toward clothing reflect and embody not only ideologies of gender, class, but also nationalism. The national dimension of clothing was perhaps most salient during that period when the manufacture of clothing became an international industry. In the eighteenth and nineteenth century, nationalist attitudes toward fashionable clothing became intertwined with anxieties about the nation’s vitality, autonomy, and moral development. Fashion was linked to cultural superiority: sartorial discourse associated centers of fashion such as Paris and London with civilization, and folk costume with picturesque backwardness. By examining the xenophobic themes in fashion discourses, one can construct a symbolic geography of European sartorial nationalism.

Sartorial nationalism is a subset of nationalism, here understood in a broad and non-pejorative sense. This study rejects any contrast between virtuous “patriotism” and pathological “nationalism.” Instead, it uses the term “nationalism” to distinguish theories of political legitimacy that rest ultimately on the will of the “people,” however imagined, from the monarchical principle, which ultimately derives its legitimacy from divine sanction. Early nationalism, both sartorial and otherwise, inherited many traditions and concepts from the hierarchical power structures of pre-national monarchies, and an analysis of sartorial nationalism requires a survey of clothing politics in pre-national monarchies.

Most pre-national states expressed royal privilege and social hierarchy through sumptuary laws, which assigned sartorial restrictions to different estates. Such laws defended and supported elite power and privilege, though a charitable interpretation of sumptuary legislation might see the desire to curb wasteful luxury as benign paternalism. Medieval clothing regulations were not gender-blind, but concentrated mostly on social
hierarchies. Liselotte Eisenbart’s study found that “in the majority of sumptuary laws, the estate principle is clearly the most important and trumps all others.” Duke Amadeus VIII of Savoy, for example, assigned unique sartorial privileges to 39 different social categories, though most German ordinances specified a social hierarchy with six estates. For example, Vienna’s 1552 law, reconfirmed in 1671, created six classes of citizens, each with its own rules, leaving the upper aristocracy unfettered by any restrictions. Sumptuary laws rarely specified the shape or design of garments, focusing instead on restricting the use of precious materials, such as gold, silk, fur, or expensive dyes, to social elites.

Despite the best efforts of sumptuary legislators, clothing styles are subject to gradual cultural drift. Under the reign of Louis XIV, however, a new phase in human sartorial history began with the emergence of what might be called the “fashion system.” At the court in Versailles, elites displayed their wealth and power not only through the use of expensive materials, but through continual changes in fashion. During the seventeenth century, as the luxury and extravagance of the French court became proverbial, arts, artisans and luxuries enhanced and sustained the glory of French absolutism. These early fashions followed royal whims; Antoine Furetière’s 1690 Dictionnaire universel even defined fashion as “the manner of dressing that follows the received usage at court.” As the court at Versailles became the envy of other European monarchs, the fashions of French aristocrats became the model of elegance for noble elites throughout Europe.

During the eighteenth century, however, the structure the fashion system changed. The ability to set the bon ton ceased to be a royal monopoly: new styles of clothing came in and out of fashion through the dictates of an amorphous public consensus. The geographic center of fashion shifted from the court at Versailles to Paris. Montesquieu wrote that “A woman who leaves Paris to spend six months in the country, returns from it as out of date as if she had been forgotten for thirty years. The son does not know the portrait of his mother, so strange does the dress in which she was painted appear to him.”

The social center of power shifted down the social hierarchy from the king and the aristocracy to certain fashionable individuals. These new trendsetters aroused considerable social anxiety. Fashionable salon ladies undercut male privilege, but more threateningly, dandies of indifferent social origins usurped social status from aristocrats. The very concept
of “good taste” has been interpreted as a middle-class weapon against the aristocracy: immense wealth ceased to define status, if, as Jennifer Jones put it, “the most essential quality for dressing fashionably was taste (goût) rather than ostentation (luxe).”

The ever-changing codes of the fashion system proved a more powerful marker of status than ineffective sumptuary regulations. By the end of the eighteenth century, the importance of Paris as the center of fashion resulted in what Jean-Jacques Rousseau called a “general European tendency to adopt the tastes and manners of the French.” A German traveler wrote in 1804 that “French fashions are spreading with the same speed in Italy as everywhere else.” In 1808, Leipzig’s Allgemeine Moden-Zeitung [General Fashion Magazine] claimed that “Paris fashions rule in Holland, as in other countries of the continent.” Indeed: the influence of Paris spread to other continents as well. In 1839 Woodbine Parish found that “the men of the better classes in Buenos Ayres are hardly to be distinguished in their dress from the French and English merchants who have fixed themselves amongst them, whilst the ladies vie with each other in imitating the latest fashions from Paris.” Paris retained its centrality for the entire nineteenth century, and the first half of the twentieth. The American ready-made industry dethroned Paris after the Second World War, but Elizabeth Hawes, a fashion designer who had worked in Paris and whose company did much to destroy Parisian hegemony, still began her 1938 tract against fashion by attacking the “French legend” that “all beautiful clothes are made in the houses of the French couturières and all women want them.”

During the nineteenth century, therefore, France occupied a singular place in the European sartorial system. As American traveler James Jarvis put it in 1855,

Paris is the central star of fashion. Whatever is seen elsewhere is a ray from her light, diminishing in luster as it recedes from that city. ... There is not a race on the globe that does not seem destined to lose its national costumes and habits before the invincible power of French fashions.

In Jarvis’ Copernican analogy, each national fashion would be a planet orbiting the French sun, though the balance between centrifugal
and centripetal forces often shifted. This analogy suggests, however, that French sartorial nationalism forms a special case. Though French fashions drew inspiration from foreign clothes, French sartorial nationalism did not develop in opposition to the influence of a foreign fashion industry. If anything, it formed a source of pride: “The whole civilized world dresses itself out in the cast-off clothes of Paris,” boasted one French traveler in England: “What has Paris not?”

The fashion system had numerous critics, and the backlash against it, both within and beyond France, had several dimensions. Fashion, once liberated from the monarch’s control, threatened the aristocratic hierarchy. Elites sought to maintain their hold on sartorial power by attacking the “presumption” or “arrogance” of their inferiors. Antifashionism drew on traditional morality: moralists criticized fashion as a species of sinful luxury, and clergymen condemned fashionable clothes as evidence of vanity. Sarah Maza has further argued that “fear of ‘luxury’ signaled aversion to change.” Many antifashion pamphlets emphasized economic arguments: patriots influenced by cameralism or mercantilism, for example, believed that money spent on fashionable clothing would be better spent elsewhere. All these patriots, however, juxtaposed “national” clothes with foreign fashions, thus placing the sartorial nation in geographic context.

Nationalists attacking the fashion system, who might be collectively called “sartorial nationalists,” started from the assumption that dandyism was unpatriotic and that fashion was a national problem. They proposed a variety of solutions that progressed in tandem with the national clothing industry. During the eighteenth century, when clothing production was a cottage industry, most sartorial nationalists urged their countrymen to wear simple clothes of unchanging design, a position that might be described as “frugalism.” Frugalists often had a social agenda, usually manifested in an attempt to revive or reform sumptuary legislation. Several proposed the introduction of a mandatory civilian uniform to enforce the barriers between social estates. Gustav III of Sweden, equating his nobility with the “nation,” actually imposed a nationella dräkten on his court.

Frugalism could also have an egalitarian tone. During the Age of Revolutions, several radicals suggested national uniforms that were specifically designed to erase social hierarchy. In 1787, an Irish journalist who had emigrated to the United States proposed an American uniform for the new Republic, but uniform proposals were widely discussed at the
highest levels of government during the French Revolution: Robespierre himself suggested that children wear a uniform beginning at the age of five so as to inculcate egalitarianism. After Napoleon’s eventual defeat, hierarchical uniform schemes enjoyed a comeback, particularly in Germany, but also in Holland. As late as 1860, English author John Ruskin argued that

Every effort should be made to induce the adoption of a national costume. … it is the peculiar virtue of a national costume that it fosters and gratifies the wish to look well, without inducing the desire to look better than one’s neighbors – or the hope, peculiarly English, of being mistaken for a higher position of life.

Such proposals rarely had much impact, but the consistent desire to use clothing regulations as a tool for social engineering illustrates how much anxiety ever-changing fashions aroused in patriotic circles.

A different critique of fashion became dominant during the nineteenth century, however, as the industrial revolution progressed. A school that might be called “fashionism” argued that producers of clothing were important to the economy. The main target of fashionist rhetoric was slavish obedience to foreign fashions. Fashionists promoted domestic manufactures from economic patriotism: why should foreigners dominate the market for fashionable goods? Did not local producers possess the taste and skill to manufacture fashionable clothing? The glorification of domestic manufacturers meant that any locally produced folk costume became a symbol of national vitality. Fashionists sometimes even defended sartorial extravagance on economic grounds, since it transferred wealth from the rich to the working classes: as Mary Wilton put it in 1864, “Spinning, dyeing, weaving, give employment to multitudes of people, and the very mutability of the mode is greatly to their benefit.” Anne Aikin-Barbauld wondered that an anthropomorphized Queen Fashion could be “so cruel, so fickle and so arbitrary,” yet accepted that she benefited “the industrious poor, to whom the queen was secretly distributing bread. I saw the Genius of Commerce doing her homage, and discovered the British cross woven into the insignia of her dignity.”

Fashionists saw fashionable clothing as an integral feature of modern civilization, and proclaimed the need to wear clothes produced by the fashion industry. In 1892, an English author calling himself “K.” wrote that
dress is a very foolish thing, and yet it is a very foolish thing for a man not to be well-dressed, according to his rank and way of life ... the difference between this man of sense and a fop is, that the fop values himself upon his dress, and the man of sense laughs at it, at the same time he knows he must not neglect it.\textsuperscript{37}

Even staunch advocates of fashionable clothing saw male dandyism as morally suspect, though female love of fashion was accepted with resignation as a peculiar weakness of the fair sex. Fashionist patriots, however, concentrated on the economic aspects of fashion: they were concerned that national manufacturers could compete effectively. Fashionism peaked under the fascist governments in the interwar period, since both Mussolini’s Italy and Hitler’s Germany established state-run fashion institutes to compete with Parisian manufacturers.\textsuperscript{38}

All schools of sartorial nationalism, however, attacked foreign clothing, which situated the nation in a symbolic geography that juxtaposed the nation against the foreign. This sheds light on national anxieties. Sartorial nationalism in the German-speaking countries, for example, defined Germany in opposition to France. Johann Zedler’s frugalist essay in the \textit{Universal-Lexicon} of 1732 claimed that “We Germans generally get our fashions, and particularly in clothing, from France, because most of us have the preconception that the French are the most clever in creating new things.”\textsuperscript{39} Zedler saw this as a problem:

the French, more than all other Europeans, are the most changeable, and are the greediest in adopting new fashions. Since we Germans have started to admire and imitate them, and to visit them in their own country, so this changeability has started to influence our countrymen. The frequent asylum granted to Protestants driven from France and their settlement in German provinces has helped not a little in making German provinces half French.\textsuperscript{40}

Francophobia proved an enduring feature of German antifashion, and such examples are easily multiplied. In 1778, for example, H.P. Sturz wrote that it was “tasteless to dress like a Parisian under every sky, if the climate, custom and body demand different coverings.”\textsuperscript{41} Viennese author Joseph Sonnenfels claimed in 1785 that he “cast a scandalized sideways glance at the Germans, who ... at the wave of a Frenchman’s hand, change
clothing, hairstyle, coach and household items, and finds nothing beautiful or civil which is not sent from Paris or Lyon.” In 1786, the appearance of fashion magazines aroused disgust in Berlin: “The country on the far side of the Rhine does not only think about how to reform our taste in light of its inventions, but assists us in easily learning about the most important of these inventions.”

Weimar’s *Journal des Luxus und der Moden* [The Journal of Luxury and Fashion], an influential fashion magazine, marks the transition from Frugalism to fashionism. In 1786, the journal published a frugalist scheme to introduce a German national costume “available to rich and poor,” arguing that imported clothing imported “lowers the level of our morality, our finances, and our balance of payments.” In January 1793, it complained Germans have “paid gigantic annual sums in gold cash for France’s idiocies, for her exciting luxuries, for her refined sensual pleasures.”

August 1793, complaining that, “France has led Germany around like a slave on a chain,” the journal also called for the creation of “a National Industry Institute for Germany” which would be “solely devoted to discovering natural resources in their province, promoting the cultivation thereof, and to animating the artisanship of its inhabitants.”

By 1815, a Berlin correspondent used explicitly fashionist arguments in an essay rejecting the idea, then popular, of introducing a mandatory “old German costume”:

But do not think of me that I am for foreign fashions. No, a German should wear products of domestic factories, dress according to personal taste, and not abandon claims to individual taste and discernment by aping the form and cut of others. Why should Berlin and Vienna lag behind Paris in good taste, and though I do not wish to denigrate the latter city, why should it not perhaps be nobler and better here than there, precisely because we never showed such vanity and craving to please?

Fashionism had become the dominant theme in German sartorial nationalism by 1848. During the Revolution, a Viennese fashion magazine wrote that “Good German women should not seek to dress according to fashion journals à la Paris, but in a German way.” Leipzig’s *Allgemeine Moden-Zeitung* wrote hopefully that German fashion could free itself of French influence.
if we only desire it, i.e. when the women in seriousness wish to buy only German fabrics, and when the manufacturers decide not merely to imitate the French and German fabrics but to create new things on their own and to compete with the products of French art and labor also in taste and elegance.49

The Allgemeine Moden-Zeitung explicitly rejected a national uniform, encouraging Germany’s capital cities to become centers of German fashion:

We would like very much to report on beautiful patterns for clothing, hats and so forth, whether they appear in Berlin, Vienna, Munich, Leipzig, or wherever else if they deserve to be imitated – only against one thing do we declare ourselves opposed, and not only in the interest of elegance and luxury, but also in the interest of the hard-working hands that receive their occupation from the continuous change in fashion [...]: to devise and introduce a German costume.50

German national fashion proved easier to desire than to create: German manufacturers responded by putting tricolor decorations on their products.51 Three issues after its call for German fashion, the Allgemeine Moden-Zeitung despairingly urged national manufacturers to show “more restraint and taste. We saw, for example, new fabric for summer clothing which had stripes in the German colors the width of a hand on a gray background; can anybody consider this beautiful? A lady in such a dress would look like a living flag.”52

The supremacy of French fashion in German-speaking Europe caused particularly bitter resentment during the First World War. Norbert Stern, whose Mode und Kultur [Fashion and Culture] included a chapter called “Away from Paris!”, called for the Parisian fashion system to be overthrown and replaced with a German fashion:

We will not be able to leave Paris wholly behind. We will still make purchases there, things that can be made useful for our fashion. But we will no longer pay so many million Marks as yearly tribute to its great name. [...] In the land of philosophers and poets, one will also found and materialize a spirit of fashion as well.53
Habsburg official Adolf Vetter, in a 1917 pamphlet on "Fashion Reform," described Paris as "a technical, artistic and financial organization of the fashion industry, such as exists nowhere else in the world," and admitted that German fashions had not yet achieved "the special artistic skill and good taste of the French." In 1923, when the trade journal of the German fashion industry called for its members to boycott French fashion products, it admitted that "we in fashion are fully aware of our dependence on Paris to provide us with the taste of worldwide fashion. It is better to say things directly than to talk around the issue." The journal suggested that its members could "travel to Holland, Switzerland or Vienna to view French developments and perhaps purchase copies from houses that were in Paris" since "the purchase of original patterns from Paris or any sort of fashion goods originally from France is not permitted."

An equally consistent tradition of Francophobia characterizes sartorial nationalism in England, spanning the transition from frugalism to fashionism. In 1889, when Oscar Wilde described fashion as that of a Queen who "rules the civilized world from her throne in Paris," sartorial nationalists in England had literally spent centuries condemning French influence on national fashion. In 1661, frugalist John Evelyn had linked French clothing imports to national security: his *Tyrannus, or the Mode* claimed that "La Mode de France, is one of the best Returnes which they make, and feeds as many bellies, as it clothes Backs; or else we should not hear of such Armies, and Swarmes of them, as this one City alone maintains." Two years later, Samuel Butler wrote a "Satire upon our Ridiculous Imitation of the French." In 1711 frugalist Joseph Addison wished for "an act of parliament for prohibiting the importation of French fopperies."

English frugalism began to gave way to fashionism at the end of the eighteenth century. In 1783, a public debate was held on the question: "Is the excess of Dress and Fashionable Amusements more prejudicial to the Morals, or beneficial to the Commerce of this Country?" Characters in an 1832 novel described the crinoline as "the most deforming of all fashions to a fine figure ... introduced, no doubt, by some cunning Frenchwoman, ... which Englishmen have ridiculed in vain." In 1892, an author identifying himself only as "K." lamented that since the English followed "every variation in la mode Parisienne, and slavishly followed its decrees," the very words *Modes de Paris* "reveal the national supremacy of France." K. expressed his fashionism, however, by highlighting and
praising the British contribution to the fashion system: “the prevailing genius of Fashion to-day in Paris is [Frederik] Worth, not Monsieur, but plain English Mister Worth, born among us, here in England. O wise, and worthy Worth, how we do honour thee!”

Germany and England are both in close proximity to France, and might be expected to feel the cultural influence of their immediate neighbor. Similar forces operated to France’s southern neighbors. In 1765, Giuseppe Parini’s analysis of Italian fashion discussed the “daring genius of France.” Characters in an 1860 opera by Spanish playwright José Picón refer to Paris as the birthplace of new fashions; and in 1916 the fashion magazine Les Elégances Parisiennes, which despite its title was published in Spain, wrote that “Paris creates fashion, and the whole world goes to Paris to seek the secret of elegance.”

The influence of Parisian fashion, however, was not merely a question of simple proximity to France, since the pull of French fashions was equally powerful on the other end of the European continent. John Thomas James wrote that in St. Petersburg “French manners and fashions give the ton [sic], and their poison, which is not always rejected by men, is incense to the female heart. Women … are captivated by ever thing that breathes the air of Paris.” Saxon physician Johann Friedrich, furthermore, reported that French fashions had reached provincial Russia circles. In 1825, he attended a ball at the home of an Armenian customs official in Astrakhan, and found to his surprise a “modern house not only tastefully decorated in the European style, but also a ball arranged as at home. The Armenian ladies of this obviously none-too-numerous society appear, like the Russian ladies, in French costume.”

As in Germany and England, the influence of French fashion led Russians to sartorial nationalism. Aleksandr Shakhovskoi’s 1815 play about spa culture characterized aristocratic fashion as “an infection initially contracted from a French governess during childhood.” The defining features of the play’s villain, the philandering count Ol’gin, are “fawning before French fashion, syrupy speech peppered with Gallicisms and utter hypocrisy.” Shakhovskoi, of course, wrote immediately after the Napoleonic invasion, a time when anti-French sentiment was widespread in Russia. Sartorial nationalists in both Germany and France could also draw on a long tradition of anti-French prejudice; sartorial opposition to Parisian fashion built on non-sartorial Francophobia.
Sartorial nationalism could however be Francophobic even in a Francophile political context. In Adam Mickiewicz’s play Pan Tadeusz [Sir Thaddeus], which takes place during the Napoleonic wars, an outspoken supporter of Napoleon condemns French fashions:

Ach ja pamiętam czasy, kiedy do Ojczyzny
Pierwszy raz zawitała moda francuszczyzny!
Gdy raptem paniczki młode s cudzych krajów
Wtargnęli do nas hordą gorszą od Nogajów,
Prześladowując w Ojczyźnie Boga, przodków wiarę
Prawa i obyczaje, nawet suknie stare.

Ah, I remember the times when our fatherland
First saw these French fashions!
Suddenly, these young lords from foreign lands
Invaded us more violently than barbarian hordes.
Oppressed God the faith of our fatherland,
Our laws, and customs, even our national dress.71

In 1929, barely ten years after Romania and France had fought as allies in the First World War, Matieu criticized “the purely Romanian trait, which is to humiliate ourselves in front of other people by denigrating our own country,” and condemned the “fascination [that] the smallest trifles from Paris exerted over us!”72

But while the influence of Paris had a long reach, several sartorial nationalists directed their ire against other centers of fashion. Sartorial nationalists from the Celtic nations of the United Kingdom, for example, focused primarily on the struggle against London fashions. In 1662, for instance, Irish patriot John Lynch wrote that “the adoption of the English dress supplies no better proof of the conquest of Ireland by the English … We were never such victims of fickleness that, like Proteus, we should be constantly changing our dress, according to the fleeting fashions daily imported from England.”73 In 1794, Welsh patriot Edward Williams unfavorably compared devotees of fashion to

the Hottentots, a very polite people according to modern ideas of politeness [...] The Hottentot [...] would rather be out of the world than out of the fashion, dresses his hair well with any kind of grease, and then powders it, à la mode des Londres, with fine pulverized cow-dung, just in the same
manner as the cockneys use pomatum and powder; with this difference, that the Hottentot never imports.74

In 1858 *Cambrian Journal* proclaimed the existence of “a national Welsh costume,” it urged “all who really love Wales and its usages to bring it more generally into vogue. It is certainly better adapted to both the climate and scenery of Wales than the absurd English dress of the present day.”75 The same year a Scottish essay lamented that “in the Lowlands of Scotland, even in the most out-of-the-way rural districts, how seldom now is to be seen the blue bonnet and hodden grey of her independent sons. London fashions reign instead.”76 Sartorial nationalists in the United States also struggled primarily against English fashions, at least in the years directly after the country won its independence from Great Britain. Consider Matthew Carey’s 1787 scheme for a civilian national uniform:

Perhaps we shall be told, that an American is not in fashion, who dresses like other Americans; he must dress as people do in London. If they change their clothes once a month, so must we. If they wear buttons the size of a saucer, in the form of a hexagon, or a square, so must we. What a pity it is, that fashions should wear out in London, before they can arrive at New York or Philadelphia! If there was a glass in the moon, we might catch the fashions as they rise.77

If English fashion orbited the Parisian sun, then English colonies were moons circling an English planet.

Sartorial nationalists beyond the direct reach of the British Empire also felt the pull of London. Starting in the era of the French Revolution, some authors began to imagine the universe of European fashion orbiting not merely the Parisian sun, but a binary star system. In 1798, for instance, the German fashion magazine *London und Paris* explained its title with the claim that

all other capitals of Europe step willingly into the second row. From London and Paris orders are issued that are more rapidly obeyed in Philadelphia and Calcutta, on the Neva or in Cape Town, than could be made noticeable to the most sensitive electrometer of a political observer.78
Joseph Marshall also saw London and Paris as equivalent centers of luxury, and Francis Trollope’s 1856 *Fashionable Life* was subtitled “Paris and London.”

Fashions that came jointly from Paris and London offended sartorial patriotism as deeply as purely Parisian fashions. An 1784 poem condemning “The Fashionable Tone,” published in Halle’s *Damenjournal* [Ladies’ Journal], attacked Britain and France as joint corrupters of German morality:

*Man spottet des Gebets, höhnt die Religion und dies nennt man den Modeton. Seitdem die Gallier und Briten Verfeinerer der deutschen Sitten und – unser Muster worden sind.*

One mocks prayer, scoffs at religion, and this is called the fashionable tone Since the Gauls and Britons have became the refiners of German custom and – our models to emulate.

In 1808, by contrast, a fashionist article in the *Allgemeine Moden-Magazine* envied Britain and France for possessing a great capital city to serve as a center of fashion:

France and England, which set the tone of fashion, have a large capital city, where the most admired and richest people press together. Wealth creates luxury; luxury, changes in fashion. Germany has several capital cities, but none rules over the entire German land, but only that realm of which it is capital. The German capitals are neither as rich or as populated as London or Paris and cannot bring about either luxury or hunger for fashion.

Nor were Germans the only Europeans to treat London as a rival to Paris. Dining at a Christian house in Varna in 1845, English scholar Andrew Paton conversed with a local “Dandy of the lower Danube,” whom Paton referred to simply as “Exquisite.” Speaking in poor French, Exquisite asked if Paton had ever been to Bucharest, because he wished to know “if Bucharest is now like Paris or London.”

Vienna also formed a regional center of fashion, though it never rivaled either Paris or London. The Hamburg *Mode Journal*, published 1828-1830, described its contents as “a collection of the newest and most tasteful fashions appearing in Paris, London and Vienna.” The *Mode Journal*
later changed its title to the *Petit courir des dames – Neueste Pariser Damen-Moden*, thus demonstrating the general supremacy of Paris.

Vienna, however, dominated the Habsburg Empire. Non-German patriots in the Habsburg Empire, whose national struggle was a struggle against German influence, understood that fashions came from Paris; nevertheless Czech and Hungarian sartorial nationalists often condemned fashion as a Viennese import, much as Germans resisted the influence of Paris. When courting gentlemen in Prague abandoned the indigenous čamara for the frack coat, a Czech fashion magazine criticized this “German delight” as a loss of love to the homeland and the nation.⁸⁶ *Humoristické listy* [Humorous Pages] complained about the influence of German “*kulturtréghi*” [from German *Kulturträger*, “carriers of culture”] on the national spirit:

They have dressed us in their uniform, and today they want to have everything that is ours: our country, our land, our children, our girls and boys, our body and soul. Enough, fools! We are ourselves! Away with everything gloomy, all frock coats and top hats, away with lickspittle dandies, idiots with dressed hair and powdered flappers, away with capuchin hoods, all fashionable mumbo-jumbo […] we only want to keep ourselves and our freedom!⁸⁷

*Humoristické listy* could hardly call for Czech political independence, in 1866, but the rejection of fashion served as a proxy rejection of all German influence in the country.

Czech attacks on the frock coat, however, illustrate an important point: fashionable clothes themselves did not express national loyalty. While *Humoristické listy* condemned fashionable frock coats as German, German critics of the frock coat, notably Ludwig Foglar, stigmatized the garment as French.⁸⁸ Czech sartorial nationalists experienced the products of the fashion system as a German influence because they entered the Czech lands through German intermediaries. A similar mechanism probably explains why Celts saw fashion as the work of London. In practice, the frock coat was trans-national. Men wearing frock coats, whether in Europe or beyond, did not express their nationality, but were instead demonstrating that they were sophisticated, modern, fashionable, respectable, etc.

Hungarian sartorial patriots, like their Czech colleagues, also struggled to bring Hungarian fashion out of the Viennese orbit. When Józef Gvadány
criticized foreign fashions in his 1793 “Egy Falusi nótárius budai utazása [The Village Notary’s Journey to Buda],” the foppish nobleman proclaims absurd clothes not the latest Parisian fashion, but the latest fashion from Vienna:

For this is now the fashion, and every noble youth of any birth or breeding is dressed the same in truth both here and in Vienna you’ll see the same forsooth! Well, out of my way, you nitwit! of manners so uncouth!

The notary protagonist condemns “English dress” as suitable only for Englishmen and then rebukes the dandy as follows:

I’d have you know, Your Grace, don’t take it too unkind – that this whole world o’er no finer dress you’ll find Than our Magyar costume. And he of Magyar line Who does not wear it on him must be of unsound mind.89

In 1797, Hungarian nobleman Gregor Berzeviczy similarly complained that “we mostly get our luxury wares, jewelry, lace from Vienna, where the gold and silver from Hungary and Transylvania flows.”90 Over a century later, Gyula Sebestyén’s 1906 Dunátúli gyűjtés [Transdanubian collection] spoke with horror about

Sása istan ostora – the lash of the Saxon woman’s God –
Hát a krinolin-szokna! In other words, the crinoline-skirt!91

Hungarian fashion only escaped the Viennese orbit when the Habsburg empire collapsed.

As it happens, the Hungarian national movement against Habsburg Austria placed unusual importance on national clothing, because the Hungarian nobility actually possessed a genuinely popular national costume.92 The existence of a national costume made frugalism unusually attractive in Hungary. Nevertheless, English traveler Arthur Patterson reported that fashionism had struck deep roots in Hungarian culture by the 1860s:
To subscribe to a journal of fashions, written in the Hungarian language, is spoken of as an act of patriotism. All this seems to us [in Britain] very absurd, but from the standpoint of the Hungarians themselves it is quite intelligible. The most mindless and frivolous of women, even if she have neither husband nor child, has still some influence in society.93

The geographical proximity to Vienna nevertheless meant, as Krisztina Szűr found in her study of women’s fashion in Austria-Hungary, that the “noble and great bourgeois women of Budapest preferred to shop in Vienna than Paris.”94 Indeed, Hungarian fashionism focused so strongly on opposing the Austrian influence that Imre Vahot, the editor of the Budapesti Divatlap [Budapest Fashion Journal], even praised “the new Parisian fashion” as a source of inspiration that “flows from the source of the republican spirit that radically changes all circumstances, pours out as a refreshing stream onto the fertile soil of intellect and pure morality and which will bring about radical reform and improvements.”95 For Vahot, Paris was not as a threat, but a possible counterweight to Vienna.

Hungarian sartorial nationalists, of course, sang a different tune during the First World War, when Hungary was at war with France and allied to Austria and Germany: the Divatsalon [“Fashion Salon”] declared that “Now we see Budapest, Vienna and Berlin as our centers.”96 The Czechs, on the other hand, experienced the war as their liberation, and gratefully embraced French fashion: Czech fashion historian Eva Uchalová found that in this period the words France and Paris “became the guarantee of quality and elegance,”97 while the Czech magazine Gentleman: Revue moderního muže [Gentleman: Review of the Modern Man], reporting on “what is worn abroad” in 1925, discussed America and England.98

Hungarian and German sartorial patriots struggled against different foreign influences, but the structure and evolution of their arguments had much in common. The fashion system originated in France, and when its products penetrated German-speaking countries, they provoked a Francophobe nationalist response. The same products in Hungary, however, were imported from Vienna, and were thus ascribed a German character. Indeed, the pattern may have been further repeated within Hungary. Minority nationalities in Hungary first saw the products of the fashion system being worn by ethnic Hungarian nobles. Patterson reported in 1869 that “the Hungarian gentry, at any rate in the capital, have to a great extent adopted ‘German’ i.e. European dress,” while Wallachians,
Serbs, and Bulgarians manufactured cloth by hand. “This circumstance.” Patterson continued, “explains why the costumes of the Magyar peasantry are less interesting than those of the ‘nationalities’: the Magyars are, in fact, more civilized, and therefore less picturesque.”

Patterson was not unique in equating mass-produced fashions with “civilization,” nor in contrasting civilized fashions with the “picturesque.” In 1855, when the French fashion magazine *Journal des tailleurs* lamented that the Scottish servants of Queen Victoria no longer wore kilts, they equated the spread of the silk top hat and trouser with “becoming civilized”:

> It was pleasant to think of Turks in their dolmans with golden suns embroidered on the backs, Scots garbed in their indispensable garment, Tyrolians wearing hats trimmed with eagle feathers, and Spaniards solemnly dressed in cape and sombrero. But Turkey is becoming civilized, Scotland has abandoned the kilt for the common trouser, Tyrol has adopted the silk top hat, and Spain imitates our fashions with the most scrupulous exactness. Thus, everyone you see seems to have lived always on the rue de Rivoli…

Cecil Street, traveling in interwar Czechoslovakia, may have lamented the disappearance of exotic “national dress, entirely different from the conventional western apparel that one sees on the streets,” but nevertheless saw its disappearance as evidence of progress: “The gradual disuse of the dress, spreading from the west to the east, is a measure of the march of civilization.”

In the Eastern half of Europe, where patriots tended to juxtapose “civilization” against the “Asiatic,” the spread of fashion was equated with an idealized “European civilization,” and the products of the fashion system described as “European.” As Said might have predicted, Europeans defended their claim to represent genuine civilization by ridiculing any attempt to adopt “Western” clothes as ineffective. Vasily Rozanov’s 1900 article “Zheltyi chelovek v peredelke [The Yellow Man Made Over],” ridiculed Japanese converts to Christianity living in Russia, claiming that a person who changes costume is “always to some extent a lackey of the one into whose costume he changed.” Charles Boner, an Englishman traveling in Hungary, lamented that “the charms of the crinoline seem to be everywhere irresistible.” He also disapproved of Serbs in mass-produced clothing: “their Frank uniform becomes them much less than their own
native costume.” Boner however praised a Turkish regiment drilling in an exotic costume, because “nothing could be more picturesque.”

Turks, indeed, came in for particular abuse if they dared to wear “Frankish” costume. When the Sultan introduced what Bayle St. John described as “a kind of Frankish costume,” St. John found himself disposed to think that this change has gone a great way toward destroying the nationality of the Turks, and revealing their nakedness to the world. It was thought that with the European dress these barbarians would assume the activity and energy of the Giaours – perhaps, also, their instruction and their civilization. The maxim that the coat makes the man, was pushed to its utmost extreme: the result, however, did not answer the expectation.

Walter Thornbury similarly reviled Turks wearing “a feeble, miserable admixture of European and Asiatic dress, flapping, buttonless waistcoat, and trousers of dirty grey plaid silk.” Siegfried Kapper wrote that “European dress ... utterly disfigures the Turk: the picturesque costume is necessary to the graceful motion.” In 1855 an anonymous American traveler described Turks that had “the rigid appearance of a collection of stuffed specimens of Parisians,” and concluded that “the Turk has sunk from the height of barbarous magnificence to the lowest round of European civilization.”

Praise for “picturesque” dress, therefore, was a strategy for ensuring that uncivilized peoples remained inferior. This has a certain parallel with attempts to prevent parvenus from consuming elite fashions. In 1808, the Beau Monde even railed against “the absurdity of imitative fashion, and affectation of rank,” and Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine took an even harsher line:

Fool, mind thy own business, and stick to thy shop or thy station, whatever it may be; to which while thou stickest, though must be respectable, but which when thou wouldst quit, desperately to seize the hem of our lordship’s garment, thou becommest the laughing stock of us and our class, and we cannot choose but despise thee thoroughly.

Blackwood’s Magazine also derived superiority of the aristocrat from biological difference: “The physique of the true fashionable is peculiar and characteristic. From the toe of his boot to the crown of his hat, there is that
unostentatious, undefinable something about him distinctive of his social position.” This analogy, helps explains why, as Thomas Abler found in his study of “hinterland soldiers and military dress,” all European empires dressed soldiers from colonized ethnic groups in uniforms based on folk costume: a picturesque uniform kept them in a subordinate position.

This consistent association between fashion and “civilization” proclaimed European moral superiority; as Michael Levin observed, “the whole point of the term [‘civilization’], at least from the eighteenth century onwards, was bound up with the Western view of itself as in advance of the rest of the world; that it had developed and the others hadn’t.” When travelers from France or Britain characterized the societies they visited as picturesque and backwards, they thus implicitly defined their own country, or sometimes a group of similar societies collectively described as “the West,” as modern, progressive and civilized. Elizabeth Hurlock’s 1929 Psychology of Dress even made this link explicit: “As Western ideas are accepted, Western fashions are also.” The claim to possess or understand fashionable dress, particularly when described as “Western” dress, thus fits into a wider discourse first described in Edward Said’s influential study of Orientalism: societies claiming to be rational, modern and civilized expressed their right to dominate their sensuous, backwards, picturesque colonies.

Several patriots stuck on the “picturesque/backwards” half of this dichotomy both attempted to reject such discourse. One of Patterson’s informants explained the spread of fashionable clothing in Hungary by proclaiming that “Civilization is getting too strong for us.” Sonda Matieu, writing in the Romanian fashion magazine Domnita [Lady], argued that “the time for excessive illusions about countries more civilized than our own has passed.” In 1936 Die deutsche Landfrau [The German Farmer Woman] urged national women not only to sew folk dresses, but to manufacture the fabric at home, because fashionable clothes were “products of a senile, hybrid civilization.” If wearing “civilized” fashions meant accepting global dominance of Paris and London, then some authors were prepared to reject “civilization.” Few European patriots, however, could resist the temptation to stigmatize their neighbors as barbarous. The same patriots from Germany to Turkey who fumed as their neighbors to the immediate west claimed to be more “civilized” were quick to attack their neighbors to the immediate east as backwards.
At first glance, the mediated spread of fashion from its origin in Paris (and London) to Vienna, thence to Budapest, and so on, replicates what Attila Melegh has called the “civilizational slope.” Paris, the center of “civilization,” exported its fashions to Germany, which consequently suffered a corresponding inferiority complex. But when Vienna emerged as a regional center and exported fashionable products to its own colonies, it could pose as a center of civilization. Czechs and Hungarians found themselves in turn cast in the role of backwards barbarians. The Hungarian nobility in turn posed as modern civilization when speaking to the Hungarian peasantry. This “civilizational slope” model, however, does not extend indefinitely Eastwards. The fashion system reached the East-Central European Czechs and Hungarians via the central European Germans, but East European Russians, Romanians and Turks imported fashionable products by sea, and thus experienced the cultural influence of Paris and London directly.

The symmetry breaks down somewhere in the Slavic Balkans. Adrian-Silvan Ionescu reports that Romanians who wore “European clothes” were originally called “drunken Germans,” since Saxon merchants first brought the styles to the Romanian principalities, but Francophilia soon brought Romanian patriots into direct contact with Paris. Rebecca West reports that during the late 1930s, Macedonian women in Skoplje read the German fashion magazine Die Dame, and mass-produced clothing in among Ottoman South-Slavs was sometimes known as “German dress” (or “Russian dress”). Yet tailors producing clothes in the new style were known as “French style tailors,” suggesting that the such clothes were widely experienced as a French influence.

Observers of East-Central Europe often interpreted the civilizational slope in terms of a binary geographical division between “East and West.” The spread of the fashion system produced similar results without being located on the East-West axis. John Milford, after sympathetically describing Norway’s national costume, found:

it is pleasing to see this picturesque and peculiar form of apparel, when we reflect upon the fatal inroads la mode de Paris is making throughout Europe, by obliterating all distinctive dress, destroying nationality, and reducing mankind to one hideous uniformity of round hats and long-tailed coats, a combination of form so diametrically opposed to the beautiful, that nothing but the perverse ingenuity of a Frenchman could have designed it, and nothing but the tyranny of fashion could have rendered it endurable.
Michael Honan wrote that “the Catalonese have borrowed French fashions, and, not knowing how to turn them to account as a Parisian would, they become clumsy imitations of an elegant original.”\textsuperscript{126} Samuel Widdrington wrote of Spain that “the most frivolous importations, in dress and manners, are daily taking place, and their assemblies are vapid copies of Paris and London.”\textsuperscript{127} Travelers made similar comments about peasant costumes throughout Europe.\textsuperscript{128} The discourse Said memorably described as “Orientalist” did not divide Europe into Western and Eastern halves, since the binary oppositions civilized/barbarian, developed/backwards and modern/picturesque did not always corresponded to the West/East binary. The civilizational slope generated by the self glorification of Paris and London did indeed map onto the East-West dichotomy in the Balkans, but Scandinavia, Italy, Iberia, and the Celtic fringe underwent analogous symbolic peripheralization.

This observation suggests what might be called a “Copernican” symbolic geography, in which some societies circle others like planets orbiting a star, though peripheral cultures may find themselves orbiting local centers, much as moons circle a planet. Paris was the central star of this fashion universe, though London became a near rival during the nineteenth century. Both in Europe, and in the Americas and beyond, other sartorial cultures orbited these central stars. Regional centers such as Vienna, however, exerted their own gravitational pull over other their peripheral neighbors. Czechs and Hungarians may have felt the pull of Vienna more strongly than that of distinct Paris and London, yet these moons circling the Viennese planet still orbited around a Parisian sun.
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