

Why A Mode? The Mysterious Origin Of Fashions

Have't You Often Wondered What Person or Persons De-creed Our Ever Changing Garb?

PARIS, March 6.—What causes a mode to be or not to be the fashion is a very profound question. Anything from a simple and artistic dance to a war may be the innocent cause. I say innocent, for the event which generally furnishes the inspiration for a mode very rarely gives any consideration to the clothes of fair women.

Who makes the fashions—what person or persons? This is a difficult question, for there is no high priestess who can declare what women shall wear. Dame Fashion is a mere myth!

However, it is a recognized fact that all successful fashions are created in Paris. And that their creators number about a dozen or 15 dressmakers and eight to 12 milliners.

Americans Inspire Styles.

Although Paris is the scene of the birth of fashions, it does not always furnish the inspiration for their creation. As an illustration, the American millinery buyers have just been here to get the modes for Spring—the very hats whose origin was governed by the lawmakers of their own United States.

As there is a law which prohibits the importation of alpacas, birds of paradise and other plumages, the Paris milliners could not expect to sell hats trimmed with these feathers, for they were nothing when these beautiful (and objectionable in the United States) trimmings were removed. This decision was a sad blow to our modistes, for it meant that they would have to turn to flowers and less luxurious feathers for trimmings, to say nothing of conceiving new ideas for using silks and ribbons. The result is that millinery modes have been revolutionized to conform with a law that is enforced 3000 miles from Paris and not merely to fulfill the whims of our great artists.

When Redfern costumed the production of "King Dagobert" some years ago he never dreamed that he was also starting a new era in fashionable dress. Many women who saw the play were so charmed with the artistic lines of the costumes, which were true to the Moyennege period, that they went to Redfern and requested him to modify the style for them. Within a few weeks



Starting a Style is as Difficult as Cranking Up a Motor—It Must be Turned Often and Coaxed Along Before it Will Go.

Nearly four months passed before the Minaret tunic became a dominant style, and several more months elapsed before it was the favorite fashion of Europe and the United States.

The Butterfly Mode.

Last June the butterfly had a rather modest entry into the fashion world. It came in two guises—a tiny but natural-looking affair of feathers; and in quite an extreme form, with large spread wings of black tulle—but in every instance it was perched upon a hat of black velvet, lace or tulle. As its debut occurred at the races at Auteuil and Longchamps, fashion-seeking eyes from all over the world feasted upon it, and carried the idea to the four corners of Europe and America.

Inside a few weeks hundreds of thousands of women were wearing chapeaux trimmed with butterflies.

That the Paris dressmakers also noted the artistic possibilities of the butterfly was quite evident when they presented their models for the Autumn. After visiting several openings, I was amazed to find that the butterfly motifs all presented in white and black, even though their ideas were quite different. This was surprising, inasmuch as there are so many specimens of butterflies which would have given wonderful for combining colors.

Beer's butterfly gown was appliqued with thousands of tiny jet and crystal beads in a design copied from the wings of a butterfly; while Bernard's model had draperies of silk and tulle, which suggested the spread wings of a papillon; and Worth did not hesitate to pose a large butterfly-shaped ornament of jet and tulle at the point of an exceedingly low décolletage.

They do, and yet they don't! The same answer may be applied to the question whether the Paris dressmakers influence the manufacturers.

time a very few people took the idea seriously, for the bustle which it created was a rather perturbed affair of tulle; as a matter of fact, I think that only one large establishment in New York was brave enough to import it. But now—five months later—the bustle is much talked about and is being worn. However, other dressmakers have also appropriated the idea and developed it into a more practical draped affair of silk.

To get a comprehensive view of this situation one must realize that a number of European fabric manufacturers are great artists, and that they are wonderfully creative. Of course these men are not content to "mark time" and wait for the command of certain dressmakers. Therefore, some of them never cease designing new and more beautiful weaves, while others are experimenting with colors to produce new and exquisite tones. Twice a year—generally several months in advance of the costume seasons—they submit their collection of several thousand samples to the leading dressmakers of Paris. Perhaps Paquin will choose a dozen kinds of silks from one manufacturer, twice as many from another, only two or three from another, and so on. Probably she will create views of all of them, and probably not—and even then the manufacturer must wait and see if the dear public likes them.

Sometimes, much to the disgust of the manufacturers, a dressmaker may adopt a certain material, the public will become very enthusiastic over it, and a demand will follow. An excellent illustration of this is occurring at present. In the instance of taffeta, Last Autumn Jeanne Halle created a charming dancing frock of lace with panier draperies of taffeta, and within a few months such dresses have become the vogue on both sides of the Atlantic. I hear that this mode is being pushed in the United States because their mills are more adequately prepared to furnish the demand than are those of Europe.

Monsieur Paul Poiret is one of the few dressmakers who co-operates directly with the manufacturers by furnishing them with designs of his own creation. This season he has given some of them to a well-known silk manufacturer who has extensive mills in America, as well as in Lyons, so that his American admirers might easily get the silks that he is using.

JUSTICE—AND THE LABOR QUESTION by THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Chapter 52—In Roosevelt's Own Story of His Life.



As a true political democracy in the United States. This is a fact which many well-intentioned people do not understand. They do not understand that the labor problem is a human and a moral as well as an economic problem; that a fall in wages, an increase in hours, a deterioration of labor conditions, means a wholesale moral as well as economic degeneration, and the needless sacrifice of human lives and human happiness; while a rise of wages, a lessening of hours, a bettering of conditions, means an intellectual, moral and social uplift of millions of American men and women. There are employers today who, like the great coal operators, speak as though they were lords of these countless armies of Americans who toil in factories, in shop in mill and in the dark places under the earth. They fall to see that all these men have the right to protect their families from want and degradation. They fail to see that the Nation and the Government, within the range of fair play and a just administration of the law, must inevitably sympathize with the men who have nothing but their wages, with the men who are struggling for a decent life, as opposed to men, however honorable, who are merely fighting for larger profits and an autocratic control of big business. Each man should have his ear carved whether by brain or body; and the director, the great industrial leader, is one of the greatest earners and should have a proportional reward; but no man should live on the earnings of another, and there should not be too gross inequality between service and reward.

We Can't Go Back Half a Century.

There are many men today, men of integrity and intelligence, who honestly believe that we must go back to the labor conditions of half a century ago. They are opposed to trade unions, root and branch. They note the unworthy conduct of many labor leaders, they find instances of bad work by union men, of a voluntary restriction of output, of vexatious and violent strikes, of sectional disputes between workmen, which often disastrously involve the best intentioned and fairest of employers. All these things occur and should be repressed. But the same critic of the trade union might find equal cause of complaint against individual employers of labor, or even against greater associations of manufacturers. He might find many instances of an unwarranted cutting of wages, of flagrant violations of factory laws and tenement house laws, of the deliberate and systematic cheating of employes by means of truck stores, of the speeding up of work to a point which is fatal to the health of the workmen, of the sweating of foreign-born workers, of the drafting of feeble little children into dusty workshops, of blacklisting, of putting spies into union meetings and of the employment in strike times of vicious and desperate ruffians, who are neither better nor worse than are the thugs who are occasionally employed by unions under the sinister name "Entertainment Committees."

I believe that the overwhelming majority both of workmen and of employes are law-abiding, peaceful and honorable citizens, and I do not think that it is just to lay up the errors and



Coal Miner's Rescue Outfit.

United States, without regard to creed, color, birthplace, occupation, or social condition. My aim is to do equal and exact justice as among them all. In the employment and dismissal of men in the Government service I can no more recognize the fact that a man does or does not belong to a union as being for or against him than I can recognize the fact that he is a Protestant or a Catholic, a Jew or a Gentile, as being for or against him.

The Government and Its Employes.

This question came up before me in the shape of the right of a nonunion printer named Miller to hold his position in the Government Printing Office. As I said before, I believe in trade unions. I always prefer to see a union shop. But my private preferences cannot control my public actions. The Government can recognize neither union men nor nonunion men as such, and is bound to treat both exactly alike. In the Government Printing Office not many months prior to the opening of the Presidential campaign of 1904, when I was up for re-election, I discovered that a man had been dismissed because he did not belong to the union. I reinstated him. Mr. Gompers, the president of the American Federation of Labor, with various members of the executive council of that body, called upon me to protest on September 23, 1903, and I answered them as follows:

"I thank you and your committee for your courtesy, and I appreciate the opportunity to meet with you. It will always be a pleasure to see you or any representatives of your organization or your Federation as a whole.

"As regards the Miller case, I have little to add to what I have already said. In dealing with it I ask you to remember that I am dealing purely with the relation of the Government to its employes. I must govern my action by the laws of the land, which I am sworn to administer, and which differentiate any case in which the Government of the United States is a party from all other cases whatsoever. These laws are enacted for the benefit of the whole people, and cannot and must not be construed as permitting discrimination against some of the people. I am President of all the people of the



ductiveness. Everything possible should be done against the capitalist who strives, not to reward special efficiency, but to use it as an excuse for reducing the reward of moderate efficiency. The capitalist is an unworthy citizen who pays the efficient man no more than he has been content to pay the average man, and nevertheless reduces the wage of the average man; and effort should be made by the Government to check and punish him. In labor-saving machinery introduced, special care should be taken by the Government if necessary—to see that the wage-worker gets his share of the benefit, and that he is not absorbed by the employer or capitalist.

The following case, which has come to my knowledge, illustrates what I mean. In a certain shoe factory, introduced, special care should be taken by the Government if necessary—to see that the wage-worker gets his share of the benefit, and that he is not absorbed by the employer or capitalist.

The following case, which has come to my knowledge, illustrates what I mean. In a certain shoe factory, introduced, special care should be taken by the Government if necessary—to see that the wage-worker gets his share of the benefit, and that he is not absorbed by the employer or capitalist.

The following case, which has come to my knowledge, illustrates what I mean. In a certain shoe factory, introduced, special care should be taken by the Government if necessary—to see that the wage-worker gets his share of the benefit, and that he is not absorbed by the employer or capitalist.