This document is protected by copyright. It is published with permission and all rights are reserved.

Usage of any items from Buckinghamshire New University's institutional repository must follow the usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the institutional repository is subject to

**Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)**

Please note that you must also do the following;

• the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
• a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
• the content is not changed in any way
• all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

• sell any part of an item
• refer to any part of an item without citation
• amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator’s reputation
• remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

If you need further guidance contact the Research Enterprise and Development Unit
ResearchUnit@bucks.ac.uk
Chocolate Heaven: Productive Consumption and Corporate Power in the Recreational landscapes of Cadbury, Bournville and Hershey, Pennsylvania in the early Twentieth Century.

Designer, poet and socialist William Morris, for whom gardens and flowers embodied ideals of beauty and morality, believed that gardening could redeem working as well as private lives. In his polemic ‘The Factory as it Might Be’, published in Justice in 1884, Morris imagined a ‘not for profit’ industrial utopia where workers on a four-hour day would ‘delight in the most innocent and pleasant’ of occupations - gardening in the factory grounds. Allotments or ‘community gardens’ provided in the workplace to encourage temperance, good health and sound domestic economies, had been common in the industrial landscape from the early nineteenth century. By the early twentieth, corporate leaders, motivated by similar ideals as Morris, but seeking to profit by them, provided increasingly sophisticated gardens and parks for their employees. Attractive factories came to be signifiers for burgeoning consumer goods companies as they exploited the associations of natural beauty and healthy environments to present their products as healthy, wholesome and hygienic. The packaged foods industry had a particular need to promote these attributes, notably the chocolate companies Cadbury at Bournville in the UK, and Hershey in the USA, where attractive landscapes and extensive recreational facilities became decisive factors in shaping their reputations as model factories, or industrial utopias, and in their commercial success.

This article builds on emerging research into the history and cultures of corporate recreational landscapes in Britain and the United States, in discussing the alternative landscaping and recreation strategies of the chocolate manufacturers Cadbury at Bournville in the UK and Hershey in Pennsylvannia, USA in the first three decades of the twentieth century. While I have discussed the Cadbury landscapes in previous publications, I mention the company town of Hershey only in passing, because my published research to date has focused on a type of corporate recreation ground that was not the park of an industrial town or village. However, a comparison of the Cadbury factory parks that became models for corporate landscaping until well into the twentieth century, and Hersheypark which was atypical within corporate landscape typologies, reveal new insights into corporate landscaping practices as industry engaged in negotiating the emerging social democratic age of mass consumption, mass leisure and mass media. This comparison also contributes to the limited scholarship that analyses dialogues between European and American Progressivism in
the early twentieth century era of social and urban reform when the United States initially took ideas from Europe and then developed them in alternative ways.⁶

The Cadbury Brothers, George and Richard, and Milton Hershey, were distinctive amongst industrialists in the early twentieth century in their skill in exploiting cultural landscapes as marketing devices to promote a new product to the masses, milk chocolate, when in a climate of temperance, chocolate was regarded as a healthy alternative to alcohol and parks and gardening substitutes for the pub or saloon or other ‘amusements’ considered to be amoral. As astute and experienced businessmen, they understood the value of distinctive architecture in attractive landscapes to attract a high quality workforce and shape and enhance their brand as a means of gaining advantage in a period of mass media and fierce competition.⁷ In doing so, both brands became twentieth century ‘national treasures’ in their respective nations and their destinations as family tourist attractions, the themed exhibitions Cadbury World and Hershey’s ‘Chocolate World’ and the theme park Hersheypark, are still in business today.⁸ Within typologies of corporate landscapes, Hershey and the Cadbury factory represent alternative, and to some extent opposing approaches to exploiting landscapes for commercial success. At the same time, their landscapes illustrate the paradoxes in using landscaping to enhance productivity and labour and improve employee relations, for they become spaces both liberating and controlling.

Geographer Richard Schein is one of many scholars who have argued that the landscape, a material artefact, offers and invites individual agency, but also limits personal and collective freedoms: ‘U.S. cultural landscapes ultimately are viewed as material phenomena, reflective and symbolic of individual activity and cultural ideals, as they simultaneously are central to the constitution and reinforcement of those activities and ideals.’⁹ Building on this paradox of liberty and control, I draw on Foucault’s concept of heterotopia, or ‘spaces of alternate ordering’, and Henri Lefebvre’s theory of appropriated and dominated space, to understand the complexity of corporate landscapes as social spaces.¹⁰ I am also indebted to Elizabeth Outka’s book Consuming Traditions in which she introduces the idea of the ‘commodified authentic’. Using Cadbury as an example, Outka identifies a phenomenon of commodified nostalgia abounding in the early twentieth century British marketplace; a contradiction of authenticity in a modern setting of mass production.¹¹ I show how Hershey began to commodify nostalgia in his promotional landscapes in the 1930s, when the Cadburys had already abandoned this promotional technique.

While the discussion of Cadbury is based on extensive primary documentation as well as the numerous historical and architectural studies of Bournville and the Cadbury firm, the primary and secondary sources on Hershey are more limited in scope and in their objectivity. Hershey controlled the local newspaper the Hershey Press and his publicity journal, Hotel Hershey High-Lights, bragged about the town, the park and all the wealthy folk who stayed at the grand hotel, opened in 1933 to accommodate a social elite. While the Cadbury archives hold plans of the grounds, the original designs for Hersheypark have not yet been found, perhaps due to the premature death in 1915 of the park’s designer, Oglesby Paul, and as far as I know, no repository of his papers exists. The Hershey archive holds plans of the town, and information on the park’s development and attractions can be found in promotional literature and in the local press. Two substantial biographies of Milton Hershey have been invaluable to this study and one of these, by journalist Michael D’Antonio, a key source in
this discussion, is rare amongst sources on Hershey for being ‘Neither authorized nor sponsored by the Hershey Company’.  

The discussion begins with an outline of how the Cadbury and Hershey parks are placed within the history of utopianist corporate landscapes and in the context of attitudes to and policies for public leisure in the early twentieth century. I will consider why parks became a part of corporate spatial and social planning and why they differed to the social spaces of municipal parks and gardens. I will argue that corporate parks became archetypal heterotopic spaces of modernity in the ways they functioned both as recreational spaces to enhance opportunities for a variety of leisure activities, and as a means to control employee morality, and as channels for corporate promotion and advertising.

**The prospect: constructing utopianist corporate space**

When the Cadbury brothers and Milton Hershey began to provide significant recreational landscapes in the first decade of the twentieth century, reforming industrialists had been experimenting with ways of organising and motivating large labour forces through outdoor recreation for more than 100 years. Gardens and allotments were provided in factory villages such as Samuel Greg’s Quarry Bank Mill outside Manchester, UK (from 1784) and from 1800, social reformer Robert Owen laid out country walks along the River Clyde at his mill village New Lanark, near Glasgow, Scotland to encourage workers to exercise in their limited free time, and he promoted, or perhaps enforced, open air dancing, amongst other ‘improving’ activities (figure 1).

Insert figure 1 here

Following Owen’s example and those of later utopian industrial villages such as Saltaire (from 1851), Pullman (from 1880) and Port Sunlight, (from 1888), some entrepreneurs not building factory villages constructed model factories with gardens and parks where conditions were considerably better and working hours fewer than required by legislation. Gardens and parks in industrial communities did not always suggest model working conditions however. The company town of Pullman, initially highly regarded for the beauty of its architecture and landscape, lost its reputation as the ‘World’s Most Perfect Town’. Following a disastrous strike in 1894, which was brutally supressed, George Pullman’s heavy-handed management systems were exposed, and Pullman was forced to sell-off all non-industrial property in the town.

The Cadbury Brothers and Milton Hershey are likely to have known about Pullman because following the strike the man and his town became infamous as a failed experiment in industrial organisation. In building their industrial communities, the Cadburys and Hershey attempted to avert an overtly paternalistic culture, but using different strategies. George Cadbury built Bournville Village, but due to his policy of renting housing on the open market, the community and company were not interdependent. Hershey planned from the start to sell the houses and plots in the town to his employees and he opened Hersheypark to the wider community. However, to different degrees, a paternalist, closely supervised culture prevailed in both companies.

**Utopianist landscapes at Cadbury and Hershey**
When caramel manufacturer Milton Hershey was planning to enlarge and diversify his business in the 1890s, he visited chocolate and other companies in England, Germany, France and Switzerland. Scholars agree that if he did not visit the famous model factories and villages of Saltaire, Port Sunlight, Bournville and New Earswick (the village of the Rowntree chocolate firm in York), he would have known them by reputation. The Cadbury factory, built by the Cadbury brothers when they moved their firm from the centre of Birmingham in 1878, within two decades had gained a reputation for its attractive environment and for employee welfare of the highest order. As Quakers, a healthy, attractive industrial site satisfied the brothers’ objectives to profit through hard work in a humane environment, with picturesque buildings in attractive landscapes. From the start, the company provided amenities and other benefits for employees including a small ‘playground’ for the female employees and sports ground for the men and beautified the factory and office entrances with trellises and flowers. If Hershey visited Bournville after 1895, he would have also seen the beginnings of George Cadbury’s model village, Bournville, and he is likely to have heard about the Cadburys’ plans to improve the factory environment. In that year, the brothers purchased the 18th century Bournbrook Hall, a private estate of twenty-six acres, which lay across the road from the factory and from the Men’s Recreation Ground, and they opened the house and grounds to their female employees for recreation and later for sports (figure 2).

The ‘Girls’ Grounds’ and the Men’s Recreation Grounds at Cadbury, strictly gendered and segregated spaces, gave the Cadbury employees generous, recreational space with cultural capital in a new suburb with, as yet, few leisure opportunities for the working classes. Modern recreation parks, with sports facilities as well as pleasure gardens were opening in increasing numbers in towns and cities, but by building recreation grounds at factories where the workforce was drawn from more distant or disparate communities, the Cadburys were able to attract the ‘best’ employees and more directly shape social cohesion and the health and moral character of their workforce to improve their reputations and chances of economic success.

When Milton S. Hershey laid the foundation for his chocolate factory in rural Pennsylvania in 1904, his plans included a town with social infrastructure including a park, for the success of his business depended on attracting a socially aspirant workforce to the area. Hershey, born in 1857 on a farm in rural Pennsylvania to parents of the Mennonite faith, after several business failures, became by the 1890s one of the State’s most successful businessmen as the owner of a large caramel manufacturing plant in Lancaster. Following his travels across Europe and the United States, including to the Chicago World’s Fair of 1893, and finding a gap in the market for the growing demand for affordable milk chocolate, he seized the opportunity to expand his business and build a utopianist industrial community on the model of those he had seen or heard about at home and abroad, but larger and more splendid. In 1903 he bought 600 acres of farmland near the homestead and confident that secure jobs, quality housing and exceptional amenities would attract labour from within the state and beyond, he commissioned civil engineer Henry Herr to lay out a town to emulate any other company town in the United States or Europe, including luxurious houses with indoor plumbing, central heating, electricity and gardens. Architect Emlen Urban designed the factory, large public buildings and a house for Hershey and his family, High Point.
status of the factory buildings was later enhanced with ‘artistic landscaping effects’, including ‘velvety lawns dotted here and there by tastefully executed horticultural designs’, where on sunny days, employees would eat their lunch.26

While the houses may have been functionally superior, the plan of the town lacked the charm and subtlety of Bournville or Port Sunlight, being built along wide, straight boulevards in the typical grid pattern of American towns - more like Pullman, but without that town’s variety and intimacy. Herr attempted a token reference to a village-like layout with the humbler workers’ housing behind the factory, but the town lacked an aesthetic cohesion. The engineer Herr’s unsophisticated plan could be attributed to a lack of urban design expertise at a time when, in the early 1900s, architects and landscape architects were just beginning to improve the design of company towns, as they joined social reformers in campaigning for better working and living conditions for industrial workers.27

From the start, Hershey set aside 150 acres of farmland north of the town and the factory for a park28 and commissioned landscape architect Oglesby Paul, celebrated for his contributions to Philadelphia’s Fairmount Park, to design it. A plan of Hershey dated 1915 and photographs of the site emphasise the park as a priority space, with more park to built space and designed to entice new residents and business investors to the town as well as visitors (figure 3).

Insert figure 3 here

Paul designed an attractive pleasure ground and picnic site to provide innocent pleasures and ‘rational recreation’,29 not unlike the function of the Bournville grounds, or the ‘reform parks’ opening in increasing numbers across the United States.30 Amenities included picnic sites, a bandstand, children’s playgrounds and a sports ground, although on a much larger scale than at Bournville. Unlike at Bournville there was no earlier historical landscape to emulate, so Paul made the most of the farmland topography and the watercourse, Spring Creek, which became a centrepiece to the park, but also functioned as the factory’s water supply.

Boating on the creek became popular with families and courting couples31 and later supplied water for more elaborate sports and water features. A large pavilion offered entertainments such as dancing and roller-skating and soon after the factory opened, a demand for baseball was satisfied with the construction of the first sports field.32 Paul’s design brought a spirit of authentic urbanism to the park’s entrance with floral bedding displays in island beds, a conventional and ubiquitous coding for municipal parks from the late 19th century33 (figure 4). With few leisure opportunities in a rural area, public interest in the park increased rapidly and hundreds, then thousands came by train and trolley from nearby towns to enjoy days out in the park and buy chocolate from booths stationed at the entrance.

Insert figure 4 here

Milton Hershey’s park not only helped to attract the workforce he needed, but also secured the town’s transport infrastructure. As Judith A. Adams has noted, a rapidly growing trolley industry was directly responsible for the development of the American amusement park, for
a park at the end of the line brought in customers during the quiet times such as evenings and weekends, giving more profit for the trolley companies who were often charged a flat monthly fee for their electricity supply. Hershey’s new town needed a trolley line to bring in employees, and a park to make it profitable and the 5c trolley line opened in the autumn of 1904.

As Hershey was laying out his park, the Cadburys were modernising the Girls’ Grounds to improve their value as recreational space. It is tempting to think that reports of Hershey had reached them, for the firm spared no expense, appointing in 1907 a well-known firm of garden architects, Cheals of Crawley, to update the grounds. Bournville Hall was demolished, and replaced by a lily pond with modest fountain, formal hedging, paths, borders and seating (figure 5).

Cheals replaced the old stables with a towered pavilion topped by a lantern overlooking the tennis court, giving dignity and distinction to the gardens (figure 6) (figure 7).

Beyond this lay the original walled kitchen garden from which a large team of gardeners supplied the factory with flowers and the dining rooms with fruit and vegetables. With the addition of a pergola at the entrance to the gardens, the Cadburys created a modern garden in the Arts and Crafts fashion of the day, while retaining a nineteenth century romanticism with woodland walks and shrubberies. Cheals also supplied the female employees with spaces for more vigorous exercise; a playground for the younger girls, hockey and cricket pitches and a gym (figure 8).

The Cadbury factory parks in many respects followed the model of municipal parks in providing floral displays, water features and sports facilities for rational recreation, but the Girls’ Grounds retained the status and exclusivity of its private origins and remained strictly gender segregated. The company promoted outdoor dancing, and apart from members of the accompanying band who all appeared to be male, men were strictly forbidden to join them.

By the 1920s as the company expanded, a more democratic landscape began to emerge at Cadbury with the opening of Rowheath park, half a mile from the factory, which rivalled the best municipal pleasure and sports provision in the country. Rowheath covered an area of about forty acres (sixteen hectares) and bore a strong resemblance to a high quality municipal park, with boating lake, walks, thousands of new trees and shrubs, bowling, tennis, a large pavilion and sports grounds that would have been the envy of any small town. The women’s and men’s sports clubs offered athletics, swimming, diving, life-saving, tennis, hockey, cricket and football and the company held social events such as outdoor dances (figure 9).
By the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, both Cadbury and Hershey had become renowned for the sophistication of their recreational landscapes, opened for similar objectives of ‘doing good while doing well’, and to attract a high-quality workforce. Both were both guided by non-conformist religious faith, the Cadburys were committed Quakers, active in philanthropic community projects, and although Hershey was not a religious man, his biographers agree that the strict Mennonite, Pennsylvania Dutch community in which he was raised, profoundly shaped his personal and business philosophy. The parks offered free opportunities for sports and recreation in a high quality industrial environment at a time when respectable and rational recreation was promoted. They were distinctive in the ways the spaces and the employees were commoditized to promote authenticity and construct corporate and cultural identity for commercial gain, but here their similarities ended. The Cadbury parks were exclusive to factory employees and families (only later opened to friends) for traditional recreations in a space as much situated in past, élite landscape and cultural traditions as in the present industrial landscape of modernity. The much larger Hersheypark was open to all and within ten years, had become a renowned amusement that looked to the future, visited by thousands offering unprecedented amenities and amusements for a factory town.

**Utopianist and heterotopic landscapes of power**

The adjectives ‘utopian’ or ‘utopianist’ are freely applied to accounts of factories and industrial towns with a high proportion of green to built space and where natural beauty and recreation space provide antidotes to the negative aesthetic and social effects of industry. Gibson Burrell and Karen Dale are amongst those who have argued that the garden has always been a prime constituent and metaphor of the utopian vision. The garden ideal shaped the spatial design of Cadbury and Hershey and cemented their fame as industrial utopias and yet the positioning of green recreational space as an ideal in an industrial setting is problematic, for the motives for making these landscapes are ambiguous. The ideologies of landscape represented in utopianist texts published concurrently with the development of Cadbury and shortly before the foundation of Hershey, are similarly contradictory. In Edward Bellamy’s centralized socialist state in *Looking Backward* published in the USA in 1888 and William Morris’ decentralized one in *News from Nowhere* published in the UK in 1890, ‘perfect’ landscapes lie at their spatial and ethical core. However, in both there are tensions between the authoritarian ‘utopian’ and the more liberating ‘eutopian’, or ‘good place’ principles on which their ideal societies were constructed.

However, Michel Foucault reminded us that we need to look beyond the idea of utopias for they exist only as symbolic or imaginary spaces. He argued that in the space of the real in the modern world we often find ourselves in ‘other places’ or ‘heterotopias’ which reflect wider social forms or orders which are in themselves contradictory or paradoxical; ‘the heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible.’ Foucault gave the garden as an example of a heterotopic space, because historically it has been a small physical space and yet it symbolises the centre of a spiritual world order: ‘The garden is the smallest parcel of the world and then it is the totality of the world.’
Kevin Hetherington has argued that factories are archetypal heterotopic, complex and paradoxical spaces because they combine modern ideals of technology, nature, the commodity and the consumer society, a juxtaposition of signs that culturally are seen as not going together, because their relationship is unexpected. The factory garden and park becomes an extension of controlled corporate space where the workforce and visitors perform ‘rites and rituals’ but only within the orbit and regulations of the company and in using the spaces, employees and visitors become passive accomplices to corporate promotion and identity. Hersheypark presents a particularly interesting example of heterotopic space, because it is a landscape of power in its function as a private commercial space, but also more literally in the ways in which technology comes to dominate the nature ideal in the space.

The typology of corporate parks therefore provides an opportunity to develop the concept of gardens and heterotopic space. They express ideals through the encompassing presence and power of nature, or ‘the totality of the world’, and yet they are spaces of corporate power, dependent on technology. They offer opportunity and agency, wellbeing and pleasure, but employees using them become subsumed within the compass of the commodity and in collusion with the brand. The corporate park therefore might be understood as a meta-heterotopia. The juxtapositions of meanings are not random and arbitrary but linked in a web of associations bringing a clear, fixed message of expected behaviours to support defined goals.

The next section examines juxtapositions present in the Cadbury and Hershey landscapes through the dualities of the machine and the garden, freedom and control, popular culture and middle-brow culture. Nature and technology become metaphors for and symbols of corporate power and representative of cultural and national difference.

**Cadbury: from gendered space to modern recreation park.**

The Cadburys were leaders amongst Progressive reformers in offering high quality, healthy, accessible and affordable recreation space that was not necessarily available or affordable elsewhere, particularly for women. The Girls’ Grounds were progressive by the standards of the day, offering space for female employees at lunchtime twice or three times a week and after work to play tennis, hockey, cricket, a gym for indoor exercise and a playground for the younger girls. The extensive lawns, woodland and a formal garden provided for relaxation and socialising. In the summer, company clubs and societies used the grounds for theatrical and musical performances, garden produce shows and other middle-brow company events (figure 10).

However, the strictly wholesome grounds were unlikely to have been universally popular, because before the First World War the benefits of the parks at Cadbury came on the company’s own terms, a high-brow and puritanical social vision of decorum and restraint to encourage a ‘respectable’ class of employee. The Girls’ Grounds were presented as a retreat from the mechanical and commercial world, and from forms of popular culture the Quaker employers regarded as immoral or indecorous, particularly those where the sexes mixed freely. It was a strongly didactic, gendered space, aligned to elite landscape traditions, to
protect female employees, or ‘The Cadburys’ Angels’ as they were known, within a timeless, stable and respectable environment\(^{46}\) (figure 11). Although it was not unusual to segregate men and women in the workplace in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century to protect working women from discrimination, the Girls’ Grounds remained mostly segregated even into the 1930s. According to Gladys Jones, who worked in the Bournville factory in the 1930s, twice per week men were allowed to cross over the bridge that separated the Men’s Recreation Ground from Girls’ Grounds to spend half an hour socializing with the women, but supervised by ‘a couple of charge hands, of course.’\(^{47}\)

Insert figure 11 here

The Cadbury promotional materials make the recreational landscapes and employees using them highly visible, and consumers’ attention is diverted from the commercial and utilitarian function of the factory, driven by machines, to metaphors of nature as enabler and supporter of health and opportunity. Image and text present, on the one hand, a modern company bringing women’s emancipation through independence, sport and access to private space, and on the other, women conforming to the strict social codes and expectations of their employers, sentimental images of virginal women protected in their ‘hortus conclusus’, an obfuscation of their roles as factory workers. The women and their bodies become subsumed into the commodity and brand (figure 12). As Henri Lefebvre has argued in discussing corporate space, the community comes under the absolute rule of the company.’\(^{48}\)

Insert figure 12 here

Corporate space is managed by a power over which users have little control for employees must submit to company rules and expectations of behaviour and deportment to keep their job, or become complicit in shaping the company image or brand through representations of their recreational activities in corporate literature. As Elizabeth Outka has argued, ‘Bournville was … designed to express physically a temporal and spatial conflation, joining a nostalgic return to preindustrial life with a kind of utopian modernity that promised to bring the latest technology to both town and works.’\(^{49}\) By the 1930s however, as Cadbury employees joined sports and leisure clubs in a modern recreation park managed by works committees, the company abandoned the images of controlled sentimentality in their promotional photographs.\(^{50}\) Photographs of dancing in Rowheath park show women’s and men’s social and bodily emancipation. No longer sedate, or segregated by gender, the more assertive dancers are enjoying modern American swing and jazz, formerly regarded as degenerate (figure 13).\(^{51}\)

Insert figure 13 here

**Hersheypark, from reform park to amusement park.**

In its earliest years, Hersheypark, like the Cadbury parks, was a respectable space for family outings and supervised social and sporting activities, a beauty spot for rational recreation and the romantic gaze. In the early twentieth century, evangelistic social reformers censured the rapidly expanding amusement park industry,\(^{52}\) a form of mass culture which they thought promoted immorality, exploited people for profit\(^{53}\) and was even a threat to the
fabric of American society. At Hersheypark as at Cadbury, the utopianist beauty and healthful attributes of landscape and plants, enhanced by design, contributed to a respectable company image. The park gave the town, its citizens and commodity a reputation as the perfect American combination of popular, affordable, accessible, aspirant but healthy and decent. Hershey’s biographer, Joseph Snavely visiting the park in the late 1920s, or early 1930s, was at pains to emphasise the beauty of the park with its ‘groves of majestic trees’, ‘deep dales’ and ‘picturesque paths’, a respectable ‘beauty spot’ for all ages, in contrast to amusement parks of ill repute, with their ‘bedlam of raucous shouts’ (figure 14). 

As Hershey’s profits grew however, and his town expanded, he began to add a broader range of popular amusements to the park, reflecting a climate in America for the democratisation and commercialization of leisure and catering for an increasingly affluent and aspirant population. As working hours reduced, incomes rose, social restraints relaxed and by 1925, despite rampant inflation after the War, Americans in work had more disposable income. Hershey embraced social and technological change with enthusiasm and instead of obscuring the technology on which the company, product, brand and a modern consumer society depended, as the Cadburys had done, he seized and celebrated the seductive power of the machine to create a park stimulated by speed, a space which consumed nature and accelerated time, provided pleasure and opportunity, but also became central to his commercial ethos and success.

Hershey’s amusement park is likely to have been inspired by his visits to Coney Island, which he loved and to the Chicago Columbian Exposition which opened in 1893 where, as Judith A. Adams has argued, ‘technology joined with art and a progressive spirit [to] create a garden city out of the wilderness.’ Hershey loved the Midway Plaisance, a popular entertainment and amusement area at the exposition, with its hedonistic amusements, driven and illuminated by the marvel of electricity, a force of power used ten times more than at the Paris World’s Fair in 1889. But while the Chicago fair was temporary, Hershey aspired to permanence with a pleasure park based on a consummate union of nature and technology, the machine and the garden. He joined a small, but growing band of entrepreneurs opening amusement parks from the 1890s.

At Hersheypark, nature began to take second place to technology. The ‘electric park’ looked to the future with lights strung along paths and illuminating the dance pavilion at a time when electricity had not yet reached rural areas. (The town’s houses also had electricity, when fewer than eight percent of American homes were connected.) By 1910, the park offered a dance pavilion that shone like a beacon at night, a miniature railroad, and a zoo to an eager public, and in 1913, the park attracted 100,000 visitors per year. By 1915, visitors were also enjoying a swimming pool, a Convention Hall for events seating 6,000, a baseball field, grandstands and a water toboggan ride, ‘Shute the Shute’. The boom in car ownership was perhaps not predicted, for early aerial photographs show many cars lining the roadways and verges (figure 15).
By 1923, many of the thousands of people now visiting the park during the summer months were drawn by the first roller coaster, the Wild Cat, an immediate success, and in 1935 a sunken garden with electric fountain giving coloured sprays, one of many new attractions, sealed the park’s reputation as a spectacular tourist destination. In the 1920s, roller coasters were not uncommon in the United States, but were still a relative novelty, particularly in rural areas (figure 16).

Insert figure 16 here

Hershey named the park ‘Pennsylvania’s summer playground’ and between the Wars, thousands came from all over the US and from abroad to visit the town, including three members of the Cadbury family in 1937. As at Cadbury, the park featured prominently in promotional materials, but Hershey thought of a more ingenious method to link his product to its place of production. Millions of specially-sized postcards showing the delights of the factory, town and park were inserted into standard size chocolate bars, so news of the model community spread far and wide. Hersheypark rivalled popular amusement parks opening across the nation with their hedonistic pleasures, driven by new technologies that symbolised and played a key role in widening leisure opportunities in American popular culture.

As a young man for whom the hedonistic pleasures of life had been denied through an absent father and his upbringing in a strict Mennonite community, Hershey was skilled in balancing his love of popular culture, travel and luxuries with an overlay of restraint and discipline, particularly where his town and employees were concerned. Moralising policies at Hersheypark, such as gender segregation, were less evident than at the Cadbury parks, although it is likely that those using the park were strictly monitored and their behavior controlled. Evidence for rules and misdemeanors at Hershey is elusive as the reports in the Hershey-run press focus on the park’s delights and increasing attractions, but it is likely that Hershey ran his park on strictly moral lines for he and his representatives would often be seen in town and factory observing his employees and tenants and reporting immoral behaviour, or checking that homes were tidy and lawns mown. At Cadbury and in the community of Bournville, the consumption and sale of alcohol were forbidden while at Hershey, saloons were banned from the start, and alcohol consumption strictly policed, even before Prohibition. In 1911 Hershey employed private detectives to spy on employees drinking at a local hotel, one of the few businesses they did not control. It is very likely therefore that in his park, as in the Cadbury parks and in many other provincial parks, locals and visitors were expected to behave with decorum and punished, banned from the park, or even dismissed for poor behaviour.

As one journalist expressed it in Fortune magazine in 1934, Hershey’s ‘inhabitants lead their daily lives in a relationship so close to Mr. Hershey as to be patriarchal’, and Hershey’s biographer Michal D’Antonio called it a ‘philanthropic dictatorship’. Although respected by many, Hershey ruled at times by fear and would fire employees for superficial reasons. Hershey’s control of the town was absolute for his town was never incorporated, had no mayor, no police station and no municipal government.
As at Cadbury, the Hershey archives contain thousands of publicity photographs where the parks feature prominently. This photograph of women in Hersheypark taken approximately five years earlier than the Cadbury photograph discussed above (see figure 11), presents an alternative view of women enjoying their leisure in the early twentieth century (figure 17).

Insert figure 17 here

These women may, or may not be employees of the company, but they are commodified, unwittingly promoting the Hershey company. Like their British counterparts, they wear white, or light-coloured dresses, but while the Cadbury girls wear their modest work gowns during a working day, the Hershey women are freely at leisure in their Sunday best, displaying their conspicuous consumption in hats, lace, jewellery and shoes. Although the women stand on a rustic bridge, designed to connect park users to an authentic rural past, the signs of modern leisure, ‘Shute the Shute’ and ‘Swimming Pool’ are clearly visible. The women symbolise a growing independence in the Progressive age, confident in the public realm, consuming the delights of the park, a modern space of mass consumption. They are friends at ease with their sexuality in an affluent present, and pioneers in a hopeful future. Here, there is little place for nostalgia, for the commercial life of opportunity is the authentic. While the ambiguous Cadbury image denies the machine, and distances its subjects from consumption, the Hershey women are clearly consumers. At Cadbury, extreme emotions are suppressed in the Girls’ Grounds, a private, passive and familiar retreat. At Hershey emotions are clearly encouraged in energetic, fast and multi-sensory experiences, where strangers can be encountered and the unexpected happen.

By the 1930s, as Cadbury’s modern sports and recreation park, Rowheath was in full swing, and visitors to Hersheypark continued to grow, Milton Hershey, by now in his seventies and with money to divert into more social projects, ordered another park to be constructed in town, not an amusement park, but an ornamental public garden planted with a profusion of roses, on a hill near the hotel, overlooking the town. Hershey Gardens represented the type of nostalgic American retreat, which, in the 1930s, began to respond to a folk law of family values and a retreat into an imagined innocence of a pre-technological age (figure 18).

Insert figure 18 here

In America visual culture of the 1930s, the allure of the modern city waned in favour of ‘Middletown-style villages and small communities’ an ‘American Way’ which appeared in consumer products and advertising. Hershey Gardens represented a domestic, traditional image of American identity, denying technology and embracing the nostalgic image of private pleasure garden, much like the Girls’ Grounds at Cadbury, but more extravagant in its abundance of flowers.

The spectacle, opportunity and variety of park-life at Hershey were not matched in any company town in the United States between the Wars. In Britain, amusement parks were becoming more popular, but company parks, like most of those in the USA, remained sedate spaces devoted to healthy sports and recreations. The extravagant use of electricity might have been regarded with some incredulity in Britain, at a time when electricity was still a novelty in domestic space.
Conclusion

The Cadbury factory parks and Hersheypark offered accessible opportunities to working people, whether for rest and quiet contemplation of nature, competitive sport, social interaction, and in the case of Hershey, heightened physical and emotional stimulation outside the routines of everyday life. In the early twentieth century, the Cadburys emphasised the benefits of a green environment to their employees’ health and to their business, but in representing their parks in corporate literature, they downplayed the commercial functions of their private parks. This approach reflected a Morrisian paradox to deny popular culture and the domain of consumption on which their business depended. Hershey, a private park open to the public was less didactic, and more overtly commoditised as a showpiece for the company and product. In constructing Hersheypark, Milton S. Hershey embraced and celebrated modernity and popular culture, with new technologies offering novel forms of leisure and entertainment, attracting visitors from around the world.

The Cadbury and Hershey parks represented opposite typologies of corporate park, alternative heterotopias through landscape, although neither were typical. The users of parks at Cadbury and Hershey were integral and integrated into the commodity and the brand that funded them. Through the media of photography, promotional materials and journalism, Cadbury and Hershey constructed new layers of space in which employees and visitors became the object and the subject, the commodity and the commoditization. The companies exploited national identities of authenticity to promote product and brand, but they used alternative authentics of modernism. Hershey Park embraced the modern values of consumption and the thrill of the machine age and technological progress, a ‘frontier’ future in a period of rapidly developing popular and consumer culture, a more overt commodification of space, which flagrantly celebrated the technological age of mass consumption, mass leisure and mass media. For America, the authentic was the present of consumer culture. Initially the Cadbury grounds denied the commercial domain, but by the 1930s, their gardens and sports grounds represented the more social democratic present and future. At the same time, Hershey in his gardens, retreated from his electric present, into a romantic and nostalgic past.
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