



2020

Double Mint and Double Standard: American Attitudes toward Women Chewing Gum, 1880–1930

Brooke Sutton
fiveontheside@msn.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/thetean>



Part of the [Social History Commons](#), and the [Women's History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sutton, Brooke (2020) "Double Mint and Double Standard: American Attitudes toward Women Chewing Gum, 1880–1930," *The Thetean: A Student Journal for Scholarly Historical Writing*: Vol. 49 : Iss. 1 , Article 12.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/thetean/vol49/iss1/12>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in *The Thetean: A Student Journal for Scholarly Historical Writing* by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Article

Double Mint and Double Standard

American Attitudes toward Women Chewing Gum, 1880–1930

Brooke Sutton

“Look at that woman’s mouth. She’s a chewing gum fiend,” said an observant man. [The] woman’s mouth certainly was large and lop-sided, lips were thick, and skin was purplish. At the corners of the mouth were ugly wrinkles. It was a mouth that nobody would care to kiss, not even in the dark.

—*Los Angeles Times*, 1895¹

DESPITE ITS POPULARITY, THE AMERICAN PRESS IN THE LATE 1800S called chewing gum a loathsome habit, expressing broad social attitudes. A Pennsylvania reporter argued that gum chewers could be found at any time and any place; the church and the den of vice, the parlor and the hovel, the schoolroom and the opera. Users included society belles, street walkers, and all grades in between. “This habit . . . finds willing devotees everywhere.”² The *New York Times* and *Chicago Tribune* represented the opinions of those exposed to the largest amount of gum consumers; Chicago and New York City chewed the most gum in the entire world.³ The *Chicago*

1. “Gum Chewing: the habit said to injure the appearance of the mouth,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 26, 1895, *ProQuest*.

2. Kerry Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America, 1850–1920: The Rise of An Industry* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, 2015), 68.

3. Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 85.

Tribune, in 1888, reported gum to be a necessity of life while comparing it to an infection.⁴ The *Los Angeles Times* described a much smaller population on the other side of the country also plagued by the gum mania. A man speaking from Oakland, California in 1890 said, “There is a gum craze on, and you’d be surprised at the amount of the stuff chewed in this city.” Brooklyn manufacturers reported that children first loved chewing gum, then women embraced the “enticing cud.”⁵ Oddly, chewing gum reached all levels of society while being considered the nasty habit of women and children.

However, by World War I, the public embraced gum chewing as an American habit. It no longer held the banner of disgust due to male athletes, soldiers, and sailors enjoying the confection. Gum held little place on the printed page and articles were usually positive. The habit of chewing gum did not change its nature in order to be acceptable to Americans, but rather changed its consumer from women to men. The evolution of public thought about gum at the turn of the twentieth century reflected a contemptuous attitude toward women more than an abhorrence of chewing gum.

Historiography

Kerry Segrave compiled a comprehensive study of chewing gum—*Chewing Gum in America, 1850–1920: the rise of an industry*. It covered its birth as well as its business potential.⁶ While the book reported the condemnation of gum-chewing women, the unfairness of the situation, and the change in public opinion once the habit was not uniquely feminine; Segrave did not propose that the attitude towards gum, before World War I, was actually a reflection of American sentiments about women rather than any prejudice against gum.

The women’s suffrage movement and the antisuffrage movement in America gained steam at the same time newspapers berated women who chewed gum. *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage: Selections from the Classic Work of Stanton, Anthony, Gage, and Harper*, offered a complete history of the Women’s Suffrage Movement. One of the selections used in this publication was *Preceding Causes*; written in 1881 by Matilda Joslyn Gage. In the text, she placed

4. “Gum-Chewing the Rage: The Peanut and Banana Men Left in the Shade,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*. September 23, 1888, *ProQuest*.

5. Segrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 68.

6. Segrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 51.

the nineteenth-century women's movement within a larger historical context spanning centuries. Among other issues, she recognized the double standard between men and women. She criticized Guizot, another historian, for failure to recognize the caste system that existed everywhere; the caste of sex which created a "diverse code of morals for men and women."⁷ Anne M. Benjamin wrote *A History of the Anti-Suffrage Movement in the United States from 1895 to 1920*. She detailed the antisuffrage movement from the Referendum of 1895 to the passage of equal suffrage in 1920.⁸ Is it a coincidence that the antisuffrage movement lasted from 1895 to 1920; the height and reversal of chewing gum animosity? Just as equal suffrage was passed, gum transformed from a negative female vice to an encouraged American pastime. While this connection deserved more research, this paper instead focused on the social contempt of women who chewed gum rather than the women's movement.

The History of Chewing Gum and its Consumer

Chewing gum appeared early in the new republic and first attracted children. In 1848, John Curtis produced it commercially in Bangor, Maine from the sap of a Spruce tree. In 1869, the famous Santa Anna offered a chunk of the "treasure of Mexico," a dirt-like substance made from the sap of the Naseberry tree, to Thomas Adams. After attempting to make rubber, Adams produced a marketable chewing gum still in stores today.⁹ Later that landmark year, Dr. William Semple, a dentist from Mount Vernon, Ohio received the first patent for chewing gum. His gum consisted of rubber dissolved in naphtha and alcohol; flavored with licorice. Although intended as a dentifrice, children delighted in chewing gum. An anonymous American rhyme sang, "The gum-chewing kid and the cud-chewing cow are somewhat alike, yet different somehow. And what is the difference? I think I know now—it's the clear thoughtful look, on the face of the cow." The American public disparaged the practice; naming gum

7. Mari Jo and Paul Buhle, *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage: Selections from the Classic Work of Stanton, Anthony, Gage, and Harper* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1978), 52.

8. Anne M. Benjamin, *A History of the Anti-Suffrage Movement in the United States from 1895 to 1920: Women against Equality* (Lampeter, Dyfed, Wales: Edwin Mellen Press, 1991), 1–18.

9. Cyril B. Kanterman, D.D.S., "Something to Chew On," *Tic* 45, no. 2 (1986): 1.

an offense against society to chew it in public and too silly to do it in private.¹⁰ The public considered it to be not only childish, but repugnant.

Despite social censorship, gum continued to grow into a powerful industry and became very popular with women. In 1897, the Los Angeles Times reported on the largest chewing gum factory in the world, located in Cleveland, Ohio. The owner started his factory in the basement of a building. He began a poor man with 100 dollars to invest; his wife his sole assistant. After ten years, the company had manufactured 50,900 miles of gum; 13.5 miles sold each day. The enterprise made six brands of gum and its owner a millionaire.¹¹ Brooklyn manufacturers reported that children first loved chewing gum, then women embraced the “enticing cud.”¹² The use of bovine metaphors when describing the habit proved society’s disgust with it and those that used it. William Wrigley also profited from this unsuitable female commodity. He started selling his father’s soap at the age of 13. At age 29, he added free baking soda to his product-package to increase sales. Wrigley found consumers wanted baking soda more than soap, so he sold baking soda and threw in free gum to increase sales. Finding gum more popular than either soap or baking soda, he turned his attention to gum and marketed it heavily. By 1893, he had two brands; Wrigley’s Spearmint and Juicy Fruit. In 1908 Wrigley’s Spearmint topped \$1 million.¹³

By 1900, opinions began changing about gum. An advertisement by the Adams Chewing Gum Company found its home on the walls of the New York Theater. It pronounced gum as the ideal habit of the lively. The author of “The Chewing Gum Drama” in *Comedians All*, George Jean Nathan, remarked that since ads were placed where they would most impress, the New York Theater audience must not complain about the advertisement. His conclusion: the audience believed Dr. Beeman was greater than Beethoven.¹⁴ Although a bit disparaging, Nathan did not single out women in his critique; proof that the habit was gaining acceptance by upper class society and was not uniquely feminine.

10. Lisbeth A. Cloys, B.S., D.D.S., Arden G. Christen, D.D.S., M.S.D., and Joan A. Christen, B.G.S., M.S., “The Development and History of Chewing Gum,” *Bulletin of the History of Dentistry* 40, no. 2 (1992): 58–60.

11. Todd E. Pleasant, “How Chewing Gum is Made,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 8, 1987, *ProQuest*.

12. Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 81.

13. Patrick Perry, “Chew on This!” *Saturday Evening Post Weekly Newsletter*, January 18, 2016, <https://www.saturdayeveningpost.com>.

14. George Jean Nathan, “The Chewing Gum Drama,” in *Comedians All* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1919), 196.

By 1916, Dr. Frank Crane extolled the warrants of gum and those that chewed it. He believed that gum chewing belonged to one class of people—the alert. Crane referred to gum in glowing terms for male professionals: soldiers, baseball players, engineers, sailors, farm hands, steel workers, automobile racers, golfers, tennis players, and marathon runners.¹⁵

Other countries resisted the gum craze, and although it became uniquely American, it maintained the stain of taboo for women. An article in the *Chicago Daily Tribune*, in 1917, professed that few things were as vulgar as chewing gum in public. “A woman may retire to her home and indulge, but her secret should be dark and hidden. She does not want to be an example to young people.”¹⁶ Even as the author, Elisabeth Rensselaer, affirmed that chewing gum was distinctly American, she directed these negative comments to women. By this time, men regularly used gum without censure.

Gum consumption rapidly increased and sales exceeded former years. In 1920, Chicle disclosed that consumers in the United States spent \$100 million on chewing gum that year.¹⁷ By 1927, each man, woman, and child in the United States consumed 105 sticks of gum every year.¹⁸

Chewing Gum—A Feminine Habit

Professor Charles Norton, of Harvard University, wrote an article in 1897 that harshly spoke out against gum and women. It tied the female gender to the habit and revealed the popular opinion of women at that time. The *Los Angeles Times* reported his conclusions as of the highest importance to scientists and social reformers. Norton declared that, “Chewing gum has such a large sale because young women have not risen far above barbarism.” Furthermore, he considered the habit inherently evil; existing despite our great civilization.¹⁹ Norton’s article blamed the profitability of gum solely on young women and their insufficient character and evil natures. The intellectual and spiritual community concurred. In their opinion, the popularity of gum may not have been

15. Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 143.

16. Elizabeth Van Rensselaer, “Etiquette,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, April 8, 1917, *ProQuest*.

17. Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 73, 75, 90.

18. “American chewing gum has taken hold abroad,” *New York Times*, June 15, 1930, *ProQuest*.

19. “Why Girls Chew Gum,” *Los Angeles Times*, January 16, 1897, *ProQuest*.

a respecter of class, but it surely was of gender. While newspapers disparaged women on a regular basis for chewing gum, men were exempt from scrutiny. They simply were not singled out; thus, the numbers of men who may have participated in the habit could not be discerned.

Whether intentionally demeaning or not, gum companies associated chewing gum with women. The *Chicago Tribune* described an advertisement for gum inside a museum. A beautiful, blond woman in a rich evening gown of white satin sat inside the museum on a raised platform. She dressed her hair in the latest fashion. With an air of delicate breeding, she was perfect in her shapeliness and beautiful face. A poster behind her declared that she only chewed one particular brand of gum. Indeed, she sat on her platform and chewed gum tirelessly for twelve full hours. The article's title was: "A Chewing Gum Freak." Surely, the gum company wanted to identify their gum with female sophistication and beauty, but the printed word failed to recognize it. The paper claimed she was a freak on display; put there to engender speculation at the odd sight.²⁰

Newspapers negatively referenced the female, gum-chewing population. The *Chicago Daily Tribune* reported the winner of a gum contest. The woman won because she moved her jaws 6,000 times in 60 minutes; a wild guess made to humiliate the winner.²¹ Another article in that same newspaper speculated that aristocratic girls enjoyed gum more than country girls. "They keep time with horse racers."²² The only value these topics retained in taking up valuable newspaper space was sensationalism and humor at the expense of the female population. Gum was not only placed in relation to women, but always in an unflattering manner.

In addition to demeaning women, newspapers enjoyed detailing the injuries gum caused to their beauty. In 1897, an article in the *Chicago Tribune* warned readers that chewing gum caused wrinkles at the corners of the mouth. Tutti-frutti girls (sexually provocative in attire) especially were to take warning.²³ This not only intimated that gum ruined beauty, it also associated gum-chewers with feminine immorality. Another article warned of the ugly results; the discolored, engorged lips, and stupid gasping expression of gum chewers. The lips twitched and the chewer acquired a sullen, discontented expression. "They might with less

20. "A Chewing Gum Freak," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 26, 1888, *ProQuest*.

21. "A gum chewing contest," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, July 16, 1886, *ProQuest*.

22. "The increase in Chewing Gum," *Chicago Tribune*, June 9, 1888, *ProQuest*.

23. "Chewing Gum Causes Wrinkles," *Chicago Tribune*, July 22, 1897, *ProQuest*.

danger to health and beauty, use tobacco.”²⁴ The article referenced women negatively, elevated tobacco, and intimated that any discerning person would draw these conclusions. The public failed to acknowledge nasty habits engaged in by men, like chewing tobacco, that diminished their appearance—the puckering of the mouth as they spit; the bulbous tongue constantly tucking the chew into the lip; the spittle collecting in the wrinkles of the mouth; the flakes of tobacco accumulating between rotten teeth; or the red, inflamed gums of the tobacco freak. The public considered chewing gum a destructive habit of women while chewing tobacco remained an acceptable masculine pastime.

Double Standard

From 1880 to 1920, newspaper articles concerning gum illustrated that Americans held women to a higher standard than men. The *Iowa State Reporter* warned that if chewing gum was a necessity for the comfort or pleasure of a woman, it should be done in the home. A Colorado Springs newspaper allowed that men chewed tobacco in public, practicing it so long, it was not objectionable. “But it does not create the painful surprise nor utter disgust that comes over one upon seeing an apparently refined bit of femininity chewing away like mad, for all the world to see as though she were a cow.”²⁵ In society’s view, masticating was an exhibition of vulgarity for women, but completely acceptable for men,

This double standard was openly discussed by men. The owner of Nasby’s Bazaar, a social club for men, defended women who chewed gum. He acknowledged that it was not very dignified, but wondered what vice a girl could have that wouldn’t be criticized, “. . . they can’t chew tobacco, smoke or drink whisky, and I say if they can derive any pleasure from chewing gum let them enjoy it.” His companions disagreed. In particular, they believed it was a disgusting and unattractive habit for women; unladylike and undignified.²⁶ Baseball fans, largely men, purchased large quantities of gum in the grandstands. They conceded it was not for indigestion, but for the habit. Men badgered and humiliated women for being addicted to gum even as they laughingly admitted their own dependence.²⁷

24. “Gum Chewing: the habit said to injure the appearance of the mouth,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 26, 1895, *ProQuest*.

25. Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 101.

26. Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 83.

27. Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 86.

Women also shamed women for enjoying gum. The President of the Women's Christian Temperance Union deplored the increased use of chewing gum among young ladies. No mention was made of the male consumption of gum or other masculine habits like chewing tobacco. The topic ranked high for the temperance association and was addressed at their first annual session.²⁸ Of all the habits disparaged by the temperance movement, gum-chewing among young ladies warranted first place on their agenda.

Tobacco—Masculine and Acceptable

While society associated women with bovine metaphors, newspapers extolled men who chewed tobacco. In 1899, the *Chicago Tribune* interviewed a nostalgic man. He recalled that in the middle of the century everyone chewed tobacco. Men's cabins in ferryboats were almost impassable due to the amount of tobacco spit on the floor. At the theater, women had to sit with raised skirts and men did not place their hats under the seats because of the river of expectorant that flowed under them. "Anyone can look back thirty years—everyone chewed . . . Then, boys wanted to be manly so they chewed . . . The chewer was a good solid citizen; not light-headed or flighty. A pretty decent fellow given to solid thought."²⁹ He did not vilify the tobacco chewer but remembered him fondly while describing disgusting conditions.

Articles focusing on tobacco chew remained neutral or positive even when those articles reported a ban on tobacco. Shortly before 1900, a crusade began against spitting tobacco juice in public places. New York acquired an ordinance against spitting on the floor of public buildings, ferryboats, and street cars. Men were astonished and indignant. The police apprehended two men in the act. Once inside the courtroom, the defendants noticed court officers frequently spitting on the floor.³⁰ The article did not castigate men for this practice but reported the event with a bias against the ordinance; trying to prove the injustice of the law. Oddly, the same issue propelling government to act against tobacco could have been used against gum; both habits had unsanitary practices that spread disease. While government used legislation to curtail the use of tobacco in public places, society employed bogus scare tactics to gain conformity instead of addressing real problems.

28. "Chewing Gum Too!" *New York Times*, June 8, 1888, *ProQuest*.

29. "Tobacco Chewers Passing Away," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, February 5, 1899, *ProQuest*.

30. "Crusade Against Spitting," *New York Times*, April 12, 1900, *ProQuest*.

Wasted Newspaper Space, Wasted Opportunity

News articles used outrageous health claims to deter the population from chewing gum. The *Chicago Tribune* reported a girl suffering from facial paralysis and nerve deterioration due to her habit.³¹ The *New York Times* announced that chewing gum caused appendicitis.³² Two years later, the *New York Times* proclaimed that chewing gum was more dangerous to children than Italian ice cream.³³ The *Los Angeles Times* believed a woman died in her sleep as a result of swallowing a piece of gum; she did not choke, but died a month later from the shock of violently expelling it.³⁴ An article in the *Dental Herald* noted that chewing gum excited the whole glandular system and diverted attention away from clearly established uses. “The human being is not a ruminant—a cud chewer. One class of animals cannot adopt the natural habits of another without suffering from so doing.”³⁵ Science did not produce these ridiculous opinions. Newspapers carried them for entertainment and sensationalism, but only while chewing gum remained a female habit.

Before 1900, newspapers forfeited valuable editorial space about issues of gum disposal and the spread of disease. Americans chewed the same piece of gum for months on end to save money. They stored it on their bedpost at night. During the day, they placed it under counter tops, tables, and chairs for use later. A journalist in Salt Lake City wrote of a soda fountain where the “chewing gum girls” hang out. The soda jerk revealed copious wads of gum under every counter, table, and chair. “I’ve seen girls come in here a day or two after leaving their gum, and happening to think about it, reach under the counter and slip it in their mouths before going out. Of course, they might get some other girl’s gum.” This did not cause great concern because it was common to trade gum with others. A boy in California contracted diphtheria from trading wads of gum with a buddy that already had the disease.³⁶ These cases should have been foremost in print instead of focusing on the bad manners and ruined beauty of women; proving negativity to gum was more about the person consuming the gum.

31. “Paralyzed by Chewing gum,” *Chicago Tribune*, October 31, 2019, *ProQuest*.

32. “Chewing Gum Causes Appendicitis,” *New York Times*, April 19, 1896, *ProQuest*.

33. “Against American Chewing Gum,” *New York Times*, September 11, 1898, *ProQuest*.

34. “Chewing Gum Kills Woman,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 30, 1910, *ProQuest*.

35. “Gum Chewing is Injurious,” *Chicago Tribune*, January 15, 1887, *ProQuest*.

36. Seagrave, “Chewing Gum in America,” 173, 175.

A Change in Attitude towards Chewing Gum

Men decreased their use of chewing tobacco when public institutions began prohibiting it. In 1898, Boston University banned it from the law school and the front steps.³⁷ In 1906, the University of Nebraska outlawed chewing tobacco from campus.³⁸ The Methodist Protestant General Conference adopted an amendment prohibiting the use of any kind of tobacco for candidates of the ministry.³⁹ At the end of the nineteenth century, the United States Engineer Corps threatened two soldiers with a court martial for spitting tobacco juice on a lake used for skating. The Corps also harvested ice from this lake and after a lot of expectorant, the ice resembled chocolate.⁴⁰ To overcome the chewing tobacco habit, men needed a cleaner alternative.

Chewing gum became not only a more sanitary choice, but a healthier one as well. Due to stomach upset that occurred when tobacco juice was swallowed, doctors suggested men decrease their tobacco use.⁴¹ The *Chicago Tribune* declared that a southern congressman learned from his doctor that excessive use of chewing tobacco was bad for his health. The doctor suggested he chew gum one day and chew tobacco the next. Other congressmen tried this method and found success.⁴² “As queer as it may be, a great many of those who buy [gum] are men. Why do they get it? They buy it to break themselves of habits.”⁴³ The *New York Times* featured an article in 1904 declaring that men buy gum as freely as women to assuage their craving for tobacco and also just for the pleasure of chewing.⁴⁴ The public gave men a pass for this odd (feminine) pastime, because they were breaking a habit. Only a few years earlier, gum was considered a terrible addiction for women.⁴⁵

Around the same time, articles promoted the healthful effects of gum on athletes. In 1916, the *New York Times* disclosed that gum promoted greater stamina

37. “Prohibits Tobacco Chewing: Chesapeake and Ohio Road’s Efforts to Keep Stations and Cars Cleaner,” *New York Times*, December 21, 1898, *ProQuest*.

38. “Open War on Tobacco Users,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 27, 1906, *ProQuest*; “Must Give Up Tobacco or their Studies,” *New York Times*, *ProQuest*.

39. “Ministers must give up tobacco,” *New York Times*, May 25, 1900, *ProQuest*.

40. “Soldiers Chewing Tobacco by Rule,” *New York Times*, January 3, 1895, *ProQuest*.

41. “Tobacco Chewing Decreases,” *Chicago Tribune*, May 19, 1888, *ProQuest*.

42. “Gum one day, tobacco the next,” *Chicago Tribune*, February 3, 1896, *ProQuest*.

43. Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 87.

44. Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 86.

45. “Sought cure for gum chewing,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, October 14, 1900, *ProQuest*.

and speed for runners compared to better nutrition and rest. It also helped baseball players concentrate during games. Baseball pitcher, Christy Mathewson, stayed unperturbed during games due to his steady use of chewing gum.⁴⁶

After World War I, prominent men spouted gum's importance in winning the war. Regarded as a luxury before the war, the Red Cross considered it a necessity after the war. The same gentlemen that considered gum vulgar before the war, now insisted on getting their share overseas. Two characteristics of the American soldier emblazoned themselves upon the French people; the cigarette and chewing gum. "The jaunty cigarette and the nervous habit of gum chewing is but surface indication of the highly strung and active American manhood."⁴⁷ At this point, gum suggested virile American manliness. Public opinion changed about chewing gum when men embraced it; transforming it into an American habit.

No longer considered obscene, gum's usefulness filled newspapers. These articles were as ridiculous as the negative ones published twenty years earlier. After the turn of the century, two separate articles credited gum with saving two little girls from rattlesnake bites. In both instances, gum distracted the snake so she could kill it.⁴⁸ A neurologist in Minnesota claimed it cured insane people.⁴⁹ The number of absurd claims denouncing it before 1900 and a similar number promoting it after 1900 proved that the attitudes about gum had nothing to do with the integrity of the habit, but with the gender who enjoyed it.

Some opinions made sense. In 1912, department stores encouraged sales ladies to chew gum to promote sweet breath and bring in more customers with a better first impression.⁵⁰ Sadly, employers approved of chewing gum only to exploit their female employees. In 1929, Dr. Frank McCoy, author of *The Fast Way to Health*, said the moderate use of chewing gum stimulated secretions of saliva that cleansed the teeth. Chewing gum also helped fasting patients and made their breath nicer.⁵¹ Ten years after World War I, doctors embraced gum's healthful effects. This had nothing to do with changes in scientific evidence or

46. Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 141.

47. Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 92–96.

48. "Chewing Gum Saved Girl's Life" *Los Angeles Times*, July 11, 1913, *ProQuest*; "Chewing Gum for Rattlesnakes," *Los Angeles Times*, September 30, 1909, *ProQuest*.

49. Seagrave, *Chewing Gum in America*, 136.

50. "Salesladies and Gum Chewing," *Los Angeles Times*, March 11, 1912, *ProQuest*.

51. Dr. Tom McCoy, "Health and Diet Advice," *Los Angeles Times*, November 2, 1929, *ProQuest*.

the manufacture of gum; it was a change in the perception of gum due to the gender of the person who consumed it.

Conclusion

The evolution of public thought about gum, at the turn of the twentieth century, reflected a contemptuous attitude toward women more than an abhorrence of chewing gum. Before the 1900s, society considered gum-chewing primarily a feminine habit and so vulgar, it should be kept secret. At the same time, men spit rivers of tobacco juice in public buildings without censure. As legislation banned the use of tobacco in public buildings and men connected its use with poor health, they turned to gum. The military became dependent on the relaxing effects of gum-chewing, making it a masculine habit. No one denied the bravery of America's rugged soldiers and sailors. Gum chewing not only became ultra-male, but uniquely American and an acceptable public pastime for men. Sadly, society continued to excoriate women for partaking, not because the habit of chewing gum was vile, but because society did not respect women. Gum did not ruin the character of women; women had devalued gum. The character of gum did not change, but rather its consumer.

Brooke Sutton graduated in the spring of 2020 with a degree in family history from BYU. She currently lives with her husband in Lander, Wyoming. While working towards accreditation as a genealogist, she is building a business to help others discover their roots.