

## Just saw this today. How true was this?

December 12, 2019 | 197 upvotes | by [username2136](#)

---



**Olivia Waite**

@O\_Waite



Just an evening reminder that jewelry was a traditional gift demanded by women not because we're frivolous magpies but because we weren't permitted to have bank accounts in many times and places and needed shit we could sell for cash in a pinch.

9:03 PM · 4/11/19 · [Twitter for iPhone](#)

---

**2,492** Retweets **9,043** Likes

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](https://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

AbstruseMurmurings • 88 points • 12 December, 2019 10:06 PM

Untrue. First, personal banking is very recent in human history; throughout most of history, wealth was owned property, generally land and goods, and banks did not exist. Second, women have always been merchants, have always conducted business and wealth, even before recorded history in archaeological finds. Feminist history is fiction.

baronmad • 68 points • 12 December, 2019 07:46 PM

Its actually very false, women were allowed to have bank accounts if their husband vouched for them, or if a landlord vouched for them.

It was a different time before we had voting for everyone and so on, it wasnt that they were denied it was just the case they couldnt provide a security for their loan.

BlatantNapping • 0 points • 12 December, 2019 11:21 PM

Married women were not allowed to open bank accounts without their husbands' permission until the 1960s in the US and 1975 in the UK.

I don't think it's accurate to assert that they were allowed bank accounts when there was such a major caveat before that time.

Unmarried women could not apply for credit on their own (without a male cosigner) until 1975 in the US.

Women could not own their homes outright until 1976 in Ireland.

<https://www.theguardian.com/money/us-money-blog/2014/aug/11/women-rights-money-timeline-history>

machevil • 4 points • 13 December, 2019 10:25 AM

Those may be true, but women wanting/loving shiny/colorful shit (jewelry, trinkets etc) predates any kind of banking system we had by a couple thousand years, and that is as far as we know currently, it is probably longer than that.

LaMaquinaDePinguinos • 2 points • 13 December, 2019 07:47 AM

Take my upvote, I don't know why you don't have more.

DevilishRogue • 1 point • 13 December, 2019 10:35 AM

Because what has been posted is untrue.

BlatantNapping • 1 point • 13 December, 2019 12:23 PM

I posted my source, where is yours? Or are you taking the Trump route and just calling anything you don't like untrue?

DevilishRogue • 0 points • 13 December, 2019 03:58 PM

You haven't posted a source, you've posted someone saying so publicly and then added bits that also aren't correct like women not being allowed to open bank accounts in the UK until 1975.

BlatantNapping • 1 point • 13 December, 2019 04:08 PM

I posted a link to an article by the guardian, which itself includes sources, in addition to the information about women opening accounts and houses. You do know the little blue text at the end of my comment was a link right? To all the information I stated? While you're just wildly yelling 'false' like that means anything.

DevilishRogue • 1 point • 13 December, 2019 04:14 PM

"False" means it is untrue. As in "What you are claiming is not so." There is lots in that Guardian link that is untrue but I was specifically referring to what you wrote in your comment, as I pointed out above.

BlatantNapping • 1 point • 13 December, 2019 04:24 PM

Ah so you do live in that version of reality where facts researched and presented by reputable sources are "untrue" if they don't fit your narrative. I bet you think the world is flat and climate change isn't real also.

As you're not able to give any equally reputable evidence to back up your rebuttal, you've lost your argument by any intelligent understanding of debate.

DevilishRogue • 1 point • 13 December, 2019 04:42 PM

I am specifically referring to the claim that women supposedly were not able to open bank accounts in the UK until 1975 without a husbands permission. I know for a fact that this is untrue. But as well as being an arrogant simpleton with delusions of superiority you seem to not realise that you are asking me to prove a negative in refuting this utterly ridiculous and posterous claim.

baronmad • 1 point • 13 December, 2019 09:40 PM

They were perfectly free to open a bank account if they held land.

manumission • 1 point • 16 December, 2019 10:50 PM

I call bullshit on all of these claims. Note the linked article only contains two of these statements, and neither are sourced. The guardian has a habit of reporting feminist propaganda without fact-checking it. <https://b0yp0wer.wordpress.com/2019/09/30/132/>

snatfaks • 1 point • 13 December, 2019 10:24 AM

Husband's permission isn't a "major" caveat.

MegaMindXx • 15 points • 12 December, 2019 09:59 PM

Women now vote for the party that has suppressed them for over a century. Even now all the Democrat campaigns pay women less than men. Obama did it, so did Hillary. So if women want to be taken seriously about these issues. They need to stop supporting their suppressors.

<https://www.theblaze.com/contributions/in-1920-republicans-defeated-democrats-war-on-women>

sum\_muthafuckn\_where • 9 points • 12 December, 2019 10:52 PM

Not true. In most societies a woman would be entitled to a dower worth a portion of her husband's estate (at least equal in value to the dowry money given at their marriage) if he died or refused to provide for her. Also, gifts of jewelry for men and women go back far earlier than any kind of finance does.

Faqir\_Indahbat • 7 points • 13 December, 2019 04:54 AM

Full of shit. They were status symbols.

SunnyGay73 • 7 points • 12 December, 2019 10:53 PM

i'm p sure women want jewelry bc we *are* frivolous magpies

enteralterego • 4 points • 13 December, 2019 05:34 AM

This has multiple facets.

Yes - people always looked for easily movable collateral throughout history. Jewelry, made of precious metals fits the bill.

Secondly - if you're familiar with the "handicap principle" in evolution, jewelry is similar to the peacocks tail. Meaning : a male that can afford to spend resources on a "pretty ornament" is desirable. So its not just women asking for jewelry to secure finances - it is also men racing to providing these to secure access to the best mates. The male that can afford to spend money on jewelry, is essentially applying the same principal of the peacock male (species - not individuals) to grow a very heavy tail that will make it easier to catch to predators. They're both trading survival fitness for themselves to gain access to better mates.

Also you have to think of this in terms of evolution - the first items exchanged that falls within the handicap principal was not pretty ornaments but most probably food. In fact there are studies that show macaque monkeys figured that they can give out food to get sex in exchange.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003347207003119>

As human societies develop - men displaying value and engaging in practices that are costly to them to secure the best mate available, evolved alongside outright paying for sex (prostitution).

Coming back to her comment about banking -I'm not sure if first official banks in the modern senses allowed women to open bank accts or not is true - but it is certainly true that they werent mostly allowed to own property and property rights were transferred from the father of the bride to the groom, and then to his sons etc.

Which on surface seems unfair - however you need to consider the fact that women did not have to wait for their father to die to get their share of the family money. They would get their dowry when they married. Also the dowry of the bride - which is economic resources earned and managed by the men in the family was a direct indicator on how well of a mate they would have access to. Back then it was a 2 way street.

Ferretninja007 • 2 points • 13 December, 2019 02:16 AM

Even if this was true this isn't true today so the claim holds no value

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 December, 2019 05:24 AM

True or false, it was BEFORE. Before feminism. Before emancipation. Now, there are no reasons anymore to give a woman any expensive shinny things to "seal a deal" she can brake anytime, in a blink, just because. What Olivia wants it seems, alongside with almost 10000 other "traditionalist-when-it-fits-my-purpose", is having her cake and eat it too. Nope. Doesn't work that way. Freedom to do whatever you want, whenever you want comes with a price. No expectations to receive gold and diamonds for a fluctuating loyalty should be part of the new deal.

LaMaquinaDePinguinos • 2 points • 13 December, 2019 07:49 AM

I can understand the idea that (*IN THE PAST*) having something of value that you own when you personally can't own an awful lot else.

BUT NOT IN 2019. This is now having cake and eating it too.

machevil • 2 points • 13 December, 2019 10:36 AM

Completely wrong. People, especially women, hoarding jewelry predates the banking system by a couple thousand years. Banking took off in late-medieval/renaissance era. The jewelry thing is much older than that. Ancient Egyptian kings and queens were buried with a shit ton of jewelry.

Case closed.

InformalCriticism • 2 points • 13 December, 2019 04:25 PM

This is just factually wrong.

OnlyHanzo • 3 points • 12 December, 2019 11:42 PM

Well, precious metals is the most stable saving strategy. A bar of gold is a bar of gold, even in Venezuela.

But she isn't fooling anyone. They don't think about such things when demanding jewelry. They just want to "look expensive" as their world does not go beyond physical.

ulgulanoth • 1 point • 13 December, 2019 07:10 AM

Ignoring historical facts and taking this at face value, it's actually a good argument to never buy her any jewellery, because you know they have bank accounts and jobs now

RichardJLyon • 1 point • 13 December, 2019 12:23 AM\*

A woman's husband died years sooner than her from occupational injury, disease, or accident, and she continued to require money long after he stopped providing it.

megytron • -3 points • 12 December, 2019 06:29 PM

That actually sounds pretty accurate