Vitae Scholasticae

The Journal of Educational Biography

Volume 26 November 1
2009

Vitae Scholasticae
Volume 26, Number 1, 2009

Vitae Scholasticae is published by the International Society for Educational Biography

Members of the International Society for Educational Biography receive each issue of *Vitae Scholasticae* as part of their membership. Subscriptions are available to other individuals for $50 a year and to institutions and libraries for $100 a year (add $40 per year outside of the United States); single copies of issues may be ordered for $50. See form on page 118.

ISSN 0735-1909.

Articles appearing in *Vitae Scholasticae* are abstracted and indexed in *Historical Abstracts* and *America: History and Life.*

Table of Contents

Editor's Note

In presenting the new issue of *Vitae Scholasticae* we bid a fond farewell to former Editor Patricia Inman, who has retired from the journal, and welcome Laurel Puchner in her new role as Assistant Editor. We also extend our thanks to scholars from Australia, Canada, and the United States who produced the thought-provoking essays that comprise this issue. Their work reflects *Vitae Scholasticae*'s mission to encourage a broad range of methodological approaches among educational biographers throughout the world.

In this issue A J. Angulo explores the relationships between biographers and historians in "Beyond Life Writing: Reflections on Biography and Historiography." Angulo's reflections are juxtaposed against the life story of William Barton Rogers, the conceptual founder of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Also in this issue, Andrea Walton addresses gender barriers in U. S. higher education in "More Valuable Than Even Radium: Christine Ladd-Franklin's Perspective on Intellect and the Life of the Mind."

Kay Whitehead's essay, "Contextualizing and Contesting National Identities: Lillian de Lissa, 1885-1967," sheds light on the work of a pioneering educator of Australian birth who crossed national boundaries in promoting the schooling of young children. Lynne Trethewey recalls the activism of another Australian woman who furthered the cause of kindergarten in "Lucy Spence Morice: Working Towards a Just Society Via the Education of Citizens and Socialist Feminist Collective Action."

Karleen Pendleton Jimenez and Esther Sokolov Fine present an alternative educational biography derived from the experiences of a Toronto middle school girl in "Safe Walk Home: Cultural Literacy in the Regent Park Community." Lucy E. Bailey also takes an unconventional approach to educational biography in "Necessary Betrayals: Reflections on Biographical Work on a Racist Ancestor." Bailey reminds readers that biographies are not always heroic narratives; indeed, they may be "fraught with darkness as well as light."

We hope these essays will prompt readers to examine their own work and engage in conversations about future possibilities for educational biography. Please continue to give substance to those conversations by sending your manuscripts to *Vitae Scholasticae.*

—Linda Morice

Beyond Life Writing:
Reflections on Biography and Historiography

A.J. Angulo
Winthrop University

In May 2001, I attended a conference on "The Craft of Biography" hosted by Harvard University's Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History. At the conference, historian Bernard Bailyn discussed the challenges of writing *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson*. He concluded his talk with a surprising and memorable comment: there are really only three reasons why anyone should bother writing a biography. One reason, he argued, was that the subject must have influenced the course of history. Lives in this category have left an imprint on a branch of history—whether political, intellectual, economic, religious, and so forth—in some significant way. Second, if not a significant participant in recorded history, the figure must give special insight into the experiences and interests of large numbers of people. In this case, the life becomes a means through which we can improve our understanding of broader social movements and realities. Third, if neither of the first two applies, the life must have been witness to a significant historical event. By this standard, the selection of the subject is almost wholly dependent on the extent and quality of records the subject left behind.[1]

At the time, I was conducting research for what became *William Barton Rogers and the Idea of MIT*. What struck me right away about Bailyn's reasons was how each of them applied to Rogers. I'd learned enough about Rogers by this point to know that his life had historiographical value well beyond his most oft-cited claim to distinction—that he was the conceptual founder of

the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He was also a nineteenth century scientist—a geologist and physicist—who spent half of his career at William and Mary and the University of Virginia, who directed the Virginia Geological Survey, who was active in the professionalization of science, and who later left the South as the Civil War approached, began anew in Massachusetts, and went on to establish MIT. What drew me to this subject was the way in which his life intersected with broader concerns (and even heated debates) in the historiography.[2]

This essay will consider three of these intersections and how they align with Bailyn's heuristic. First, there's the traditional interpretation of MIT's origins. I suggest below that our understanding of this contribution to educational history has been wedded unnecessarily to macro-level developments in mid-nineteenth century America; in essence, scholars have ignored a critical, biographical perspective—the life experiences and intellectual history of the founder—that offers a much more satisfactory explanation for why and how the institution came into being. Second, Rogers participated in a broad-based movement to bring about the professionalization of science. His approach to scientific inquiry sidestepped well-established categories created by historians of science, providing an alternative glimpse into the lives of scientists of the era. Finally, Rogers's life as an educator and researcher in Virginia engages a longstanding debate in southern history. Some scholars have viewed the Old South as romantic and unscientific, perhaps even hostile to science; others vehemently reject this view; very few have made much use of biography to engage either side. Rogers served as a crucial witness to the development of southern science and higher education in the years leading up to the Civil War, and his letters and papers offer a new dimension to this historiographical controversy.

A Life in Education

Rogers's idea of MIT was a hotly-contested and, yet, highly influential model in higher education history. It was controversial to classicists and scientists alike, but influential in shaping the discourse and, at many institutions, the practice of science and scientific instruction. The forces and principles that brought this institution into existence, however, have largely been misunderstood in the literature.[3]

Historians of higher education have long dubbed MIT as a product of mid-nineteenth century American utilitarianism. This claim is present in classic as well as recent histories of American colleges and universities. According to classic works by Frederick Rudolph (*The American College and University: A History* and *Curriculum: A History of the Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636)*, the Institute emerged as a result of the Land-Grant Act of

1862. MIT, argues Rudolph, came into existence because "state legislatures were supporting higher education of a more popular nature than the old time college with its religious orientation and adherence to the classical course of study." More recent work by Roger Geiger extends this interpretation. Geiger suggests that MIT's origins are linked to an antebellum technical education movement and the ultra-utilitarian ideals the movement represented. The Institute, rooted in the "useful knowledge tradition," had a "technical" mission that "secured sponsorship from among the industrial and intellectual elite of Boston" and, thus, secured "public support as Massachusetts's land-grant engineering school." This story reappears in John Thelin's *A History of American Higher Education*. Thelin reminds us of the "useful education" and the "practical education" that was promoted by Justin Morrill's act through institutions like MIT.[4]

While the literature has focused on the populist, technical, land-grant aspects of the Institute's origins, scholars have overlooked the life of its founder and the founding documents he produced. The absence of a biographical study on Rogers (and, until recently, a substantive institutional history of MIT) has left the principal agent in the story silent and invisible.[5]

A cursory review of Rogers's early career as an educator is sufficient to illustrate that the land grant movement was virtually irrelevant to the origins of MIT. The idea of the Institute came about long before any talk of granting western lands for the benefit of east coast colleges. Its origins can be traced back to Rogers's first faculty appointment at the Maryland Institute in 1827. After having studied science under his father at William and Mary, he became an instructor at the Maryland Institute in Baltimore where he taught courses on mathematics, physics, chemistry, and astronomy. The Institute was a

short-lived experiment that offered popular scientific lectures to the general community, but its impact on Rogers had great staying power. It launched his thinking about the need for an institution that promoted "scientific information" without the typical trappings of the classical college and its curriculum centered on Latin and Greek. Without question, his experiences in Baltimore were formative.[6]

His stint at the Maryland Institute sparked a lifelong passion for educational reform out of which came a series of proposals for the establishment of his own "polytechnic" institute. Each of these proposals emphasized the need to teach practical and theoretical sciences for the preparation of the next generation of scientists. He drafted his first formal plan in 1837 for the Franklin Institute in Pennsylvania. By this time, Rogers was a professor of science at the University of Virginia, an institution that provided great freedom to teach and conduct research in the sciences—more so than almost any other antebellum college. Nevertheless, he believed that a distinct institution was necessary for the kind of studies he envisioned. In this "School of Arts" proposal for the Franklin Institute, he wanted to offer future scientists, engineers, mechanics, and others a professional scientific education. The proposal faded into the mist of a financial panic that hit the state and the country, but he refined the ideas and built on them for a second proposal: "Plan for a Polytechnic School in Boston (1846)." Rogers sent the plan to John A. Lowell of the Lowell Institute and redoubled his efforts to promote a professional scientific education. Although Lowell gave it a cool reception, a very similar program was established at Harvard as the Lawrence Scientific School in 1847. It's highly probable that Lowell shared the plans with Abbott Lawrence, a close business associate of Lowell's, who then pressed the idea, accompanied by a generous endowment, in Cambridge. Rogers closely monitored developments at Lawrence and noted how its most dominant member, Louis Agassiz, had recast the school in his own image. Agassiz pushed for basic research and science and thwarted the mission of offering a broad professional scientific education. This gave Rogers a final opening in 1860 to propose a third and final three-part plan (e.g., research, teaching, and service) for a Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a plan that was approved by the state legislature and chartered the following year.[7]

The original program of study offered by the Institute reflected Rogers's dual approach to scientific inquiry based on theory and practice. His objective, put simply, was to offer more breadth and depth in scientific training than any other institution in America. That meant more practical and more theoretical work than any course of study taught elsewhere. He laid out this vision in two documents, now known as the *Objects and Plan* (1860) and the *Scope and Plan* (1864). MIT's Bachelor's of Science, he explained, would be a four-year degree program. The first two years of formal study focused on

general scientific theories, followed by another two years of specialized course work in either applied or basic science. Rogers described it as a plan that began with "fundamental principles" and led to a "systematic training in applied sciences" or "advanced" studies. Students could specialize in one of several areas: chemistry, geology, architecture, two kinds of engineering (civil and topographical; mechanical), and "general science and literature," a theory-oriented degree concentration.[8]

Rogers's early career and reform efforts provide an important corrective to the two main impressions that have been well-established in the historiography of American higher education: that MIT is inextricably linked to the land-grant movement and that MIT was essentially fitted for practical, utilitarian studies. Neither assertion can be reconciled with Rogers's life in education. He began proposing educational reforms in the 1830s and continued this line of work until the founding of MIT in 1861 (a year before the Morrill Act). What's more, it would be a mistake to characterize the work at the Institute as applied or utilitarian. Rogers approached scientific instruction through a combination of both theory and practice. In his last speech at MIT in 1882, he reminded listeners that "formerly a wide separation existed between theory and practice. Now in every fabric that is made, every structure that is reared, they are closely united into one interlocking system—the practical is based on the scientific, and the scientific is solidly built upon the practical." He saw MIT playing a central role in bringing together these branches of science. The founding seal he approved for the institution (and still in use today) captured his belief in the need for both theory and practice.[9]

MIT Seal[10]

Rogers's dual aims for the Institute, as portrayed in his life's work and represented in the seal, complicates traditional interpretations in the

historiography. Biography, in this case, highlights this complexity and informs our understanding of the experiences that led to the idea of the Institute. This is significant, according to Bailyn's first rationale, largely because Rogers's idea had long-term consequences for the scope and development of American higher education.

A Life in Science

While Rogers's life refashions our understanding of MIT's origins, his participation in the professionalization of American science engages two basic claims made by historians of science: one intellectual, the other social. His life intersects with an important intellectual claim about how scientists of the early to mid-nineteenth century thought about science. His approach to research as well as statements about the synergy between the instrumental and the theoretical have direct implications for established categories in the literature. The social claim has to do with the process of professionalization. Rogers took part in profession-building activities, and this dimension of his life adds nuance and texture to the historiography.

Historians of science have written extensively on an intellectual divide that existed in early nineteenth century American science between Baconians and Humboldtians. Followers of Francis Bacon generally focused on fact-collecting, as opposed to theory-building. Baconians tended to shy away from grand speculation and preferred instead to gather data, specimens, observations, and so on, as if to create a storehouse of knowledge for later generations. Their view, in short, was that scientists should refrain from constructing theories in such areas as zoology or botany until all the facts were in. Great museums and collections were built around this tendency. Consider, for instance, the storied Museum of Comparative Zoology and Botanical Gardens at Harvard. These became leading repositories of facts. In the case of the MCZ, this meant thousands of jars containing all manner of animal specimens at different stages of development. In the case of the Gardens, it meant bundles of grasses, drawers bristling with flowers, envelopes brimming with seeds. An inductive approach to science carried the day in these repositories. At the same time, those who followed Alexander von Humboldt, the German naturalist and explorer, found the Baconian project wanting. As early as 1805, Humboldt chided those concerned "exclusively with the descriptive science and collecting." Instead, he aimed for a "terrestrial physics" to discover "the great and constant laws of nature." What good was a rock found in the Andes, wondered Humboldtians, without an understanding of the many forces and phenomena surrounding the rock and its environs? The real task of the scientist, they argued, was to develop a theoretical understanding, something generalizable or at least something

with the potential for generalization.[11]

Rogers doesn't fit neatly into either dominant category discussed by historians of science. His approach to science gives rise to an alternative perspective identified in *William Barton Rogers and the Idea of MIT* as the"useful arts." The useful arts, to his mind, meant an appreciation for the advancement of practical *as well as* theoretical knowledge. He viewed these bodies of knowledge as separate and distinct, both of which were essential for the full understanding of natural phenomena and the improvement of the human condition. The useful arts also stood for the belief that the exploration of practical and theoretical scientific knowledge as separate fields of inquiry would naturally yield insights into the interrelationship between the two. Theory could inform practice and practice could inform theory. On these matters, Rogers was no systematic philosopher of science and, therefore, the concepts of theory and practice aren't defined with precision in his personal and professional papers. But when he talked in terms of theory, he often referred to "general laws" and "principles" of science. He viewed his own theories as reaching beyond fact-gathering and into the realm of generalization. When discussing practice, Rogers described "practical lessons" or the "applications" of knowledge for practical purposes. He believed that the everyday practical concerns of nineteenth century Americans, from farmers to engineers, could be improved by the deliberate exploration and refinement of practical knowledge. These were the convictions that stood at the center of what Rogers meant by the useful arts.[12]

His scientific activities in geology and natural philosophy were firmly rooted in the useful arts tradition. His geological research on the Survey of Virginia, an internal improvements project of the antebellum period, offers a good illustration of this approach. As director of the Survey, Rogers explicitly aimed for the advancement of practical and theoretical knowledge. The practical knowledge produced by the project had implications for agriculturists, miners, builders, and architects. Those working in agriculture, for instance, stood to benefit from Rogers's soil analyses and stratigraphic studies that dispelled certain myths about farming prevalent in the early to mid nineteenth century. At the same time, he was engaged in a separate and distinct process of constructing a theory about mountain chain formation. As the survey moved from east to west, from farmland to the Appalachian mountains, Rogers turned his attention to the theoretical debates in geology then occurring in Europe. With one of his three brothers, he produced a "wave theory" that generalized about the formation of all mountain chains across the globe.[13]

The historiographical significance of Rogers's research is that it gives insight into a circle of scientists who moved beyond the Baconian-Humboldtian divide. This circle generally understood the useful arts as

having to do with the application of knowledge for practical purposes. Some emphasized knowledge in the definition, such as the concepts, theories, and ideas of science. Others emphasized the practical applications, as in the tools, methods, and machinery that science was perceived to produce. Still others, like physicist Joseph Henry, understood the useful arts to represent a balance between theory and practice that approximated Rogers's own use of the phrase. As Henry put it, "We have practical men in great numbers without theory and theoretic men without practice. Now it is evidently the union of these two in the same individual from whom we must expect the greatest and most successful efforts of art." Rogers, Henry, and other adherents of the useful arts persuasion developed patterns and values that tended to blend mainline Baconian-Humboldtian approaches.[14]

This useful arts approach to science clearly distinguished Rogers from a number of well-studied scientists of his generation, such as Louis Agassiz and Jacob Bigelow. On the one hand, Agassiz, a zoologist and natural historian, can be accurately described as representing the nineteenth century impulses for basic research. Little in his scientific thought aimed at producing knowledge that was applied in nature. In the 1840s, when he accepted a position at Harvard's Lawrence School of Science, Agassiz steered the program toward basic and theoretical interests. Jacob Bigelow, on the other hand, was a physician and professor of medicine at Harvard who advocated an ultra-utilitarian approach to science. He believed scientists should work on "ameliorating the condition of the human race, from the want of any solid and sustaining basis of practical utility." Rogers's useful arts ideal was not merely a median point between Agassiz and Bigelow, but, rather, a composite of the two. Eschewing the partisan rhetoric of both, Rogers displayed across his career an interest in the goals of basic, theoretical research as well as practical knowledge.[15]

As with his scientific activities, the useful arts came to define Rogers's approach to the professionalization of science. Historians have long considered profession-building as "the most significant development of nineteenth century American science." Rogers helped organize and lead the American Association for Geologists and Naturalists, American Association for the Advancement of Science, the National Academy of Sciences, and other local, national, and international organizations. Across most of his career, however, his useful arts ideals clashed with the values held by the self-proclaimed Lazzaroni, a group of elite American scientists. The Lazzaroni, headed by Alexander Dallas Bache, Superintendent of the United States Coast Survey, were influential in national-level science. In their effort to distinguish American scientists from "charlatans" and to mirror the attention given to theory in European science, Bache and his cohort privileged theoreticians (at the expense of practitioners) in American science organizations. Rogers

offered an alternate vision, one based on the useful arts. While also concerned with the prevalence of charlatans in America and the state of science in Europe, he viewed practical scientists as essential to the comprehensive exploration of scientific knowledge. He valued the interactions between theoreticians and practitioners as much as he valued the interactions between theoretical and practical ideas in his own research. Rogers's experiences with the professionalization of science reveal the role played by the useful arts as an organizing theme in the American scientific community. They illustrate the conflicting values, aims, and ambitions of this generation of scientists.[16]

Rogers's clashes with the Lazzaroni add to the historiographical discourse over whether the elite group existed at all. Historians March Beach and Robert V. Bruce, for example, have separately examined the characteristics of this cohort and have reached differing conclusions. Beach's still-provocative analysis argues that no such cabal ever existed. His work points to evidence that suggests that the Lazzaroni rarely met as a group and rarely agreed on matters concerning education, control of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the establishment of the Dudley Observatory, and the founding of the National Academy of Sciences. Based on this lack of cohesiveness and internal consistency, Beach concludes that these scientists wielded less power as a group than historians have previously attributed to them. Bruce's research, however, paints a different picture. In his response to Beach, Bruce claims that members of the Lazzaroni "did see one or another of the group often, they had close professional ties, they corresponded voluminously, and—what is most telling—they consciously saw themselves as a brotherhood, united in promoting the scientific enterprise in America along organized, European lines."While the Lazzaroni can't be said to have been monolithic on every concern, Rogers's conflicts with them indicate that they closed ranks when they were opposed, particularly when faced with a useful arts proponent such as Rogers. While there were many minor clashes, the most prominent involved a "constitutional crisis" at the American Association for the Advancement of Science in the 1850s and the founding and membership of the National Academy of Sciences in the 1860s. Rogers's emphasis on both theory and practice challenged the Lazzaroni's European-styled ambitions for organizing the science community and established a useful arts undercurrent in nineteenth century professionalization.[17]

A Life in the Old South

As with the history of education and history of science, Rogers's life adds a valuable perspective to our understanding of southern history. In this case,

scholars have for decades debated a central point: Was antebellum southern culture anti-intellectual and, more specifically, inimical to science and educational reform?

On the one hand, a solid line of scholarship states emphatically that slavery impeded the development of science and education in the Old South. Samuel Eliot Morrison and Thomas Cary Johnson touched off the scholarly quarrel in the early twentieth century. Johnson took personally Morrison's interpretation that conditions in antebellum southern states worked against creative and scientific thought. In response, Johnson wrote *Scientific Interests in the Old South* to defend the region's achievements. His study sought to uncover "the fact" that in the sixty years before the Civil War "those people of the Southern States . . . were intensely interested in the exploration and mystery of the forces of nature." Mid-twentieth century scholarship followed Morrison's interpretation with Clement Eaton's depiction of the southern mind as largely romantic and unscientific. In his *Freedom-of-thought Struggle in the Old South* and *The Mind of the Old South*, science languished under the medieval imagination of plantation communities. His influential works defined the problem in terms of the demise of liberal philosophy. Southern political culture of the late eighteenth century, he argued, commonly identified with Enlightenment beliefs centered on reason, tolerance, and cosmopolitanism. Yet by the early nineteenth century, the values had transformed into a form of "benightedness" centered on emotionalism, hyper-sensitivity, and provincialism. The transformation, he noted, loomed large for scientists in slaveholding societies who encountered isolation or even blatant opposition, such as intimidation and violence, to their teaching and research. Other writers of Eaton's period emphasized the way the Old South's sensitivity to northern criticism on the slavery issue extended to other areas of thought. "From the taboo on criticism of slavery," argued journalist and historian Wilbur Cash, "it was but an easy step to interpreting every criticism of the South on whatever score as disloyalty—to making such criticisms so dangerous that none but a madman would risk it." Conformity and consensus, described Cash, came to dominate southern life. In such an environment, scientists struggled to advance interests that required free inquiry and debate. Later studies by historians like George H. Daniels (1968), Drew Faust (1977), John McCardell (1979), John C. Green (1984), and Robert V. Bruce (1987) continued the line of scholarship that emphasized the lack of science in the Old South.[18]

Recent scholarship has returned to the debate by probing more deeply into the lives of the Joseph LeContes, John Bachmans, and other scientists of note from the antebellum period. As Ronald and Janet Numbers have argued, the accomplishments of these scientists show "there are few historical or logical reasons for suspecting that slavery per se inhibits

science." In their reappraisal of science in the Old South, Numbers and Numbers assert that science developed firm roots in the region. Lester D. Stephens's more recent assessment takes their idea one step further, declaring that "only three other cities in the United States . . . exceeded Charleston in natural history studies." According to Stephens, historians have overlooked the productive circle of naturalists in Charleston that included Edmund Ravenel, John Edwards Holbrook, Lewis Gibbes, Francis Holmes, John McGrady, and John Bachman. Admitting to a comparatively lower output of scientific research in the Old South, Stephens nevertheless maintained that "factors other than slavery" were at fault.[19]

Rogers's exposure to southern civilization makes him a special witness to events leading up to the Civil War. He studied at the College of William and Mary (1819-1821), assumed a science professorship at the same institution (1828-1835), and moved to a natural philosophy professorship at the University of Virginia (1835-1853) before leaving for Massachusetts where he lived until his death in 1882. This means that he lived, worked, taught, and conducted research for almost thirty-four years in the Old South.[20]

He came away from his southern experience with the belief that the culture of slavery significantly impeded the development of education and science. It detracted from education for the same reason Thomas Jefferson believed that slavery had a negative impact on the cultural development of the South. Jefferson once said that "The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other." For him, the impropriety of slavery was not the injustice to African-Americans. Jefferson owned slaves and, although he had misgivings about the institution, didn't free them. Rather, the problem was that "Our children see this, and learn to imitate it. . . puts on the same airs . . . [and] gives loose to his worst passions." Rogers discovered exactly this problem in southern higher education as it related to the slave society's code of honor. Southern students, he observed, often lost control of their passions if a professor failed to treat these individuals as sons of a master class. The institution of slavery had made them terribly sensitive to any commands made by faculty. If a student viewed an order or command as a breach in the code of honor, faculty would expect a fierce response.[21]

His first discovery of student "passions" that detracted from the learning environment was during his student years. One of his peers, John A. Dabney, was reprimanded by Rogers's father, Patrick Kerr, for whispering in class. As soon as the student was reprimanded, Dabney began to demand "satisfaction." His honor challenged, Dabney looked to settle the matter after class where he waved a menacing stick and shouted that "his gray hairs only, protected him from the Punishment which his Conduct merited." A scuffle

followed.[22]

Witnessing his father in a brawl with a student gave Rogers (and gives us) insight into the problem of slavery and antebellum higher education, but it probably didn't prepare him for his own encounters with student "passions." After replacing his father at William and Mary, Rogers experienced first hand surprisingly violent manifestations of slave culture. On one occasion, he found himself at the receiving end of a loaded pistol. The confrontation began when student Charles Byrd had been disciplined for riding a horse inside a campus building. Rogers described the enraged student as having a stick in one hand and a pistol in the other, addressing the professor in "the rudest and most insulting language" and "demanding satisfaction" from Rogers for injuring his honor. Byrd stated that he "had a mind to cowhide" Rogers, an allusion to the punishment typically given to slaves. The professor fled to his apartment on campus; the student followed, and, while slamming against the professor's door, Byrd promised to shoot Rogers. In the end, the faculty voted to submit the case for legal prosecution, but it began wearing Rogers's patience thin. So too did the events he witnessed in Charlottesville. During his tenure at the University of Virginia, he saw eminent professors like mathematician James Joseph Sylvester driven away because of student "passions." He battled the Virginia Assembly's attempts to cut funding for the university—and even permanently shutter Jefferson's experiment—because of rioting and disturbances on the campus. He grieved over the fatal shooting of the institution's president (then called chairman) John A. G. Davis during another student rebellion.[23]

Rogers's experiences indicate that the slave-related cultural problem faced in the Old South may have been a far larger and stronger force than recent scholars suggest. It affected campus life, as witnessed by Rogers and his father, but it also affected scientific research. As Director of the state's Geological Survey, Rogers faced annual funding problems by a legislature embroiled in sectional matters. Much of the difficulty had to do with the view that his research represented "Yankee" science, especially his exploration of coal in the western part of the state. Virginia leaders lost interest in the project as North-South tensions escalated. Comparing his survey to those being conducted in New England around the same time, he stated "But how sad the contrast experienced here. . . . I feel that I am but half-alive here, and am more than ever resolved, when able, to quit the scene for one more congenial to my tastes and more likely to promote my happiness." The Survey became another casualty in the culture war on the way to the Civil War when the Virginia Assembly cancelled its funding, denying Rogers the opportunity to finish the research, final analysis, and written report.[24]

To Rogers, these were problems emanating from slaveholding civilization not found to the same degree elsewhere in the nation. The intellectual

energies, he believed, "have been *misapplied*. They have not been directed to the investigation of the best modes of elevating the *moral nature* of our citizens, of dispensing *truth* in all its purifying and en[n]obling influences." Rather, slavery had defeated attempts at "establishing that foundation of knowledge upon which every *permanently-good* superstructure in government must be raised." The problem, in short, is that the South's defense of slavery had "devoted with all the energy of selfish passions, to the most futile energies to balancing and counterbalancing local interests and local prejudices." With these observations, Rogers concluded that the violence, intolerance, and anti-intellectualism of southern culture couldn't be reconciled with his personal goals as a scientist and as an educational reformer. So he left for Boston in 1853.[25]

Rogers's life enters the historiographical debate about the Old South by illustrating that a plan on the scale of MIT couldn't have been established in the region at that time. The culture of slavery—with its code of honor, violence, and lack of state interest in non-slavery related pursuits—made MIT, for Rogers, an impossibility. "Ever since I have known something of the knowledge-seeking spirit, and the intellectual capacities of the community in and around Boston," he sighed, "I have felt persuaded that of all places in the world it was the most certain to derive the highest benefits from a Polytechnic Institution." He was hardly alone. Other professors experienced similar struggles and gave similar reasons for leaving southern institutions of higher education before the Civil War. F.A.P. Barnard, John and Joseph LeConte, William T. Sherman and Francis Lieber all left before, during, or immediately after the Civil War. This scientific and educational "brain drain" can be described as the Southern Sieve, a movement of intellectuals out of the region that's well-documented by Rogers and has direct implications for historiographical debates about the Old South.[26]

Conclusion

It would be difficult to overstate the significance of biography in relation to historiography in a case like William Barton Rogers. His life informs our understanding of history of education, history of science, and history of the Old South. His life experiences tell us something new about how MIT emerged, what scientists thought about science and professionalization, and how slavery affected science and education in the South before the Civil War. Rogers, as a biographical subject, also confirms the usefulness of Bailyn's three-part heuristic. That Rogers contributed to higher education history is clear with the establishment of MIT. His scientific research and professional activities illuminate the lives of other scientists who typically fall outside the dominant interpretive framework established by historians of science. And

his observations about antebellum Virginia offer an unmistakable volley in the ongoing debates over slavery, science, and education in the region.

What all this may suggest to those interested in either biography or historiography is that both biographers and historians should be alert to the ways in which these kinds of interrelationships exist. Without an adequate reading of the many bodies of historical scholarship that relate to a particular life, it's unlikely that biographers will have the breadth necessary to see how a subject challenges or reinforces traditional interpretations in the literature. It's more than an academic exercise; it's critical to why we should bother writing our biographies in the first place, as Bailyn explains it. What's more, the historiographical literature is too often guilty of making sweeping claims that don't align with the experiences of specific individuals. Biographies offer an essential counterpoint. They are vital to understanding whether a general interpretive framework from the historiography can sustain scrutiny at the individual level.

Notes

[1]Bernard Bailyn, *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1974).

[2]A. J. Angulo, *William Barton Rogers and the Idea of MIT* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).

[3] On MIT as a controversial and influential force in American higher education history, see A. J. Angulo, "The Initial Reception of MIT, 1861-1882," *Perspectives on the History of Higher Education* [formerly, *History of Higher Education Annual*] 26 (2007): 1-28. See also, Julius A. Stratton and Loretta Mannix, *Mind and Hand: The Birth of MIT* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005).

[4]Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), 188; Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636* (San Francisco, 1977); Roger Geiger, "The Rise and Fall of Useful Knowledge: Higher Education for Science, Agriculture, and the Mechanic Arts, 1850-1875," in *The American College in the Nineteenth Century*, ed., Geiger. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000), 154-155, 160; John R. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 77, 123. Most of the literature that bears directly on MIT has approached the Institute from an internalist perspective; see, for example, Samuel Prescott, *When MIT was Boston Tech* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1954); Richard Rakes Shrock, *Geology at MIT, 1865-1965: A History of the First Hundred Years of Geology at Massachusetts Institute of Technology* (2 vols., Cambridge: MIT Press, 1977-1982); Silas W. Holman, "Massachusetts Institute of Technology," in *History of Higher Education in Massachusetts*, ed., George Gary Bush. (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1891): 280-319; James P. Munroe, "The Beginning of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology," *Technology Quarterly* 1 (May 1888): 285-297.

[5]For the most recent institutional history of MIT, see Julius A. Stratton and Loretta

Mannix, *Mind and Hand: The Birth of MIT* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005).

[6]Angulo, *Rogers and the Idea*, 1-2, 13-16.

[7]Angulo, *Rogers and the Idea*, 71-85, 89-100.

[8]Angulo, *Rogers and the Idea*, 89-100, 117-123.

[9]Angulo, *Rogers and the Idea*, ix.

[10]Angulo, *Rogers and the Idea*, 157.

[11]Nicholas Jardine, James A. Secord, and Emma C. Spary, eds., *Cultures of Natural History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996) includes a cultural survey of approaches to nineteenth century natural history; Michael Dettelbach, "Humboldtian Science," in *Natural History*, eds., Jardine, et. al., 288-289. For a sampling of the literature on Baconianism in America, see George H. Daniels, *American Science in the Age of Jackson* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968); John C. Greene, *American Science in the Age of Jefferson* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1984); Robert V. Bruce, *The Launching of Modern American Science* (New York: Knopf, 1987); Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *Protestants in an Age of Science: The Baconian Ideal and Antebellum Religious Thought* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977); and Herbert Hovencamp, *Science and Religion in America, 1800-1860* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania 1978).

[12]For examples of Rogers' views on theory and practice, see the following: *Memorial for the Establishment of a School of Arts* (Philadelphia: J. Crissy, 1837), 8-9; "A Plan for a Polytechnic School in Boston [1846]," in *Life and Letters of William Barton Rogers*, ed., E. Savage. (2 vols., Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1898), I, 420 (cited hereafter as *LL*); *First Annual Catalogue of the Officers and Students and Programme of the Course of Instructions of the School of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1865-6* (Boston: John Wilson and Sons, 1865), 23.

[13]Angulo, *Rogers and the Idea*, 32-56.

[14]Joseph Henry cited in Arthur P. Molella and Nathan Reingold, "Theorists and Ingenious Mechanics: Joseph Henry Defines Science," *Science Studies* 3 (October 1973): 333. Hugo Meier, "Technology and Democracy, 1800-1860," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 43 (1957): 618; David Noble, *America by Design: Science, Technology, and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism* (New York: Knopf, 1977); Bibi Zorina Khan, "'The Progress of Science and the Useful Arts': Inventive Activity in the Antebellum Period" (Ph.D. diss., UCLA, 1991); Joseph Kett, *The Pursuit of Knowledge Under Difficulties: From Self-Improvement to Adult Education in America, 1750-1990* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 104; Geiger, ed., *The American College in the Nineteenth Century*, 154-155.

[15]Edward Lurie, *Louis Agassiz: A Life in Science* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988); Clark A. Elliot and Margaret W. Rossiter, eds., *Science at Harvard University: Historical Perspectives* (Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 1992); Jacob Bigelow, "On Classical and Utilitarian Studies. Read Before the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, December 20, 1866," reprinted in *Modern Inquiries: Classical, Professional, and Miscellaneous*, ed., Bigelow. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1867), 46.

[16]George H. Daniels, "The Process of Professionalization in American Science: The Emergent Period, 1820-1860," in *Science in America Since 1820*, ed., N. Reingold. (New York: Science History Publications, 1976), 63; Thomas L. Haskell, *The Emergence*

of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth Century Crisis of Authority (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977), 68-74; Sally Kohlstedt, *The Formation of the American Scientific Community: The American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1846-1860* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976), 156; Lilian B. Miller, in *The Lazzaroni: Science and Scientists in Mid-Nineteenth Century America* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1972).

[17]March Beach, "Was There a Scientific Lazzaroni?" in *Nineteenth Century American Science: A Reappraisal*, ed., George H. Daniels. (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1972), 115-132; Robert V. Bruce, *The Launching of Modern American Science* (New York: Knopf, 1987), 263-266

[18]Samuel Eliot Morrison, *The Oxford History of the United States* (Oxford: University Press, 1927); Thomas Cary Johnson, *Scientific Interests in the Old South* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1936), 10; Clement Eaton, *The Freedom-of-thought Struggle in the Old South* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964) and *The Mind of the Old South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1976); W. J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* (New York: Random House, 1941), 90; George H. Daniels, *American Science in the Age of Jackson* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968); Drew Gilpin Faust, *A Sacred Circle: The Dilemma of the Intellectual in the Old South, 1840-1860* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977); John McCardell, *The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalists and Southern Nationalism, 1830-1860* (New York: Norton, 1979); John C. Greene, *American Science in the Age of Jefferson* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1984); and Robert V. Bruce, *The Launching of Modern American Science* (New York: Knopf, 1987).

[19]Lester D. Stephens, *Joseph LeConte: Gentle Prophet of Evolution* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982); Ronald L. Numbers and Janet S. Numbers, "Science in the Old South: A Reappraisal," *Journal of Southern History* 48 (1982): 184; Lester D. Stephens, *Science, Race, and Religion in the American South: John Bachman and the Charleston Circle of Naturalists, 1815-1895* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 2, 266.

[20]Angulo, "Tenure in the Tumult," in *Rogers and the Idea*, 17-31.

[21]A. J. Angulo, "William Barton Rogers and the Southern Sieve: Revisiting Science, Slavery, and Higher Learning in the Old South." *History of Education Quarterly* 45 (March 2005): 21.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Ibid., 22, 30-32.

[24]Angulo, *Rogers and the Idea*, 22-26.

[25]Angulo, *Rogers and the Idea*, 20-21.

[26]William Barton Rogers to Henry Darwin Rogers, March 13, 1846, *LL I*, 259; William J. Chute, *Damn Yankee!: The First Career of Frederick A. P. Barnard, Educator, Scientist, Idealist* (Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1978); E. Merton Coulter, "Why John and Joseph LeConte Left the University of Georgia, 1855-1856." *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 53 (1969): 18-40; Stanley P. Hirshson, *The White Tecumseh: A Biography of General William T. Sherman* (New York: J. Wiley, 1997); Charles R. Mack and Henry H. Lesesne, eds., *Francis Lieber and the Culture of the Mind* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2005).

More Valuable Than Even Radium[1]:

Christine Ladd-Franklin's Perspective on Intellect and the Life of the Mind

Andrea Walton
Indiana University

"I hold out to them the good example of the University of Chicago, and I hope to make it 'work' in course of time," confided Christine Ladd-Franklin, noted color theorist and logician, to a sympathetic male colleague in 1914.[2] An unsalaried lecturer and one of the few women then offering graduate instruction at Columbia, Ladd-Franklin was critical of the gender barriers and anti-feminist biases she perceived at the Ivy League university. To Ladd's frustration, Columbia remained far more willing to admit women into its graduate departments than to hire them as faculty. This was the case despite women's achievements not only at the nation's women's colleges but also at male-dominated coeducational universities. Ever the tireless reformer and optimist, Ladd-Franklin hoped that her own example as a highly productive scholar and distinguished lecturer, together with her vigilance and continued prodding, might prick the conscience of Columbia men and help break down the barriers militating against women's advancement on campus. These barriers continued, she believed, contrary to both common sense and meritocratic values. To her, the mind was neither male nor female: it was gender-neutral. Intellectual power was not to be wasted; it was to be embraced, cultivated, and enabled. From her vantage point, the intellect was, simply put, "more valuable than even radium."[3]

This essay explores how Christine Ladd-Franklin (1847-1930) conceptualized the capabilities and contributions of educated women and the

meaning she attached to the life of the mind. As such, this study builds upon and contributes to a rich feminist literature aiming to integrate women's experience into historical writing on higher education, the disciplines, and the professions. In addition to recovering the research achievements of women scientists like Ladd-Franklin, historians have pointed to gender biases within academic culture, considered whether gender shapes scientific knowledge, and highlighted the strategies women adopted to fight exclusion and marginalization in male-dominated fields and institutions.[4] In making common cause with the existing literature on women academicians and scientists, this biography hopes to emphasize a dimension of scholarly women's story that albeit embedded within accounts of her pioneering achievements is too often overshadowed or muted by discussion of the hurdles she negotiated striving to build a career and achieve by male-modeled norms—and that is, what did intellect and the opportunity to pursue a life devoted to intellectual matters (traditionally held to be a masculine rather than a feminine pursuit) mean to this woman?

In order to consider this question, this essay considers the contours of one particular woman's life in depth. Biography, as Barbara Finkelstein has described eloquently, "is to history what a telescope is to the stars. It reveals the invisible, extracts detail from myriad points of light, uncovers sources of illumination, and helps us disaggregate and reconstruct large heavenly pictures." Indeed, moving well beyond mere chronology, the historical study of a life "offers a unique lens through which one can assess the relative power of political, economic, cultural, social, and generational processes on the life chances of individuals."[5]

In focusing on Christine Ladd-Franklin, this essay seeks to open a window to the social world that Ladd-Franklin and other kindred women were compelled to negotiate in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. We see how Ladd-Franklin's ability to envision and, beyond that, to realize an intellectual life and solidify her identity as an intellectual woman—to embrace her heroine Mary Wollstonecraft's dictum that women's "first duty is to themselves as rational creatures"—took shape against the landscape of major growth and innovation in higher education, especially the pivotal educational advances for women and the rise of research universities in the decades from the 1860s through the Progressive Era.[6] As this essay will explore, Ladd-Franklin's career was profoundly shaped by and capitalized upon these major changes. She was an early female collegian (Vassar Class of 1869), was among the first generation of university-trained psychologists, traveled to Germany for post-doctoral training, and spearheaded efforts of the Associate of Collegiate Alumnae (ACA) and, later, the American Association of University Women (AAUW) to improve research conditions and fellowship opportunities for women. Further, although she lacked a

regular academic appointment, she prized her years at two of the nation's top research centers—Johns Hopkins University and Columbia University.

These notable achievements solidified Ladd-Franklin's international reputation during her life time, and in our day have interested feminist historians of science.[7] This essay seeks to broaden our angle of vision of Ladd-Franklin's biography, to discern the pivotal moments in her life—in her girlhood, adolescence, schooling, married life, and career—that contributed to shaping her identity as an intellectual woman and helped steel her commitment to a scholarly life. The aim is to understand better how this accomplished woman—whom philosopher-settlement founder Jane Addams once described (though perhaps not entirely admiringly) as "the most intellectual woman" she had ever met—viewed the life of the mind and the connection between individual intellectual fulfillment and one's contribution to women's advancement.[8]

Fulfilling an Intellectual Mother's Expectations

Christine Ladd, also known as Kitty, was born in New York City on December 1, 1847, the first child born to Eliphalet and Augusta Niles Ladd. Her father, a New York City merchant, taught his daughter the value of hard work and perseverance. Her mother, a homemaker with a progressive social outlook (she was a staunch supporter of women's rights), encouraged her three children in daily prayer and avid reading. Both parents hailed from Protestant, patrician New England families that prided themselves on public service, duty, and leadership. In turn, their daughter's intellectual aspirations and the career she forged, one blending a dedication to the ideals of the academy and the rigors of intellectual life, especially to science, and support for women's intellectual and social rights, exemplified this Yankee heritage.[9]

Christine Ladd spent her early years with her family at the Niles family homestead in Windsor, Connecticut, but was sent to live with her paternal grandmother in New Hampshire in 1860, following Augusta's death from pneumonia. Ladd's diary entries from this formative period contain stylized expressions of a daughter's grief, provide insight into her family life, and shed light on Ladd's preoccupation with many of the intellectual questions, aspirations and social concerns (e.g. slavery and women's rights) that were shared widely by her generation of white, middle-class young women—particularly those who became teachers, settlements workers, and charity organizers.

The restlessness of Ladd's teenage years seems to have been tied, at least in part, to an inner struggle centering on her own spirituality and emergent identity as an intellectually ambitious young Christian woman, and by her growing sense of isolation and disillusionment with the foibles she perceived

in her own character and in those around her: "I cannot make up my mind to be a Christian, although I long to be one," she wrote in the summer of 1861.[10] Ladd was also troubled by her father's remarriage. In response, Ladd tried to devote her energies to study and self-cultivation, viewing this as a period of youthful independence before assuming the conventional responsibilities of adulthood—or what she in fact described as the "trials and sorrows" of womanhood. Relishing her "educational privileges," she found her intellectual ambitions consonant with the sense of duty upheld by her extended family, but had great difficulty reconciling her ambition and cerebral bent—traits that were culturally acceptable for men—with traditional religious sentiment and the social conventions of "women's sphere."[11]

Even as a teenager, Ladd valued public achievement above all else, and impatiently berated herself for not yet making her mark upon the world. In her prayers for Thanksgiving Day, 1861, the young woman stalwartly resolved to display more "energy," "industry," "tact," and "promptitude."[12] Such traits, she believed, were key to a "better happiness in a world to come."[13] But despite the outstanding scholastic performance her hard work produced, young Ladd's confidence was fragile and at times wavered. In such moments, she turned to her mother's memory, for Augusta had been her major role model of strength, intellect and caring. "If only I had someone to love me . . ." she agonized in her diary, but I am so "unpleasing, so disagreeable, no wonder I am despised." She continued, "Oh mother come back from the echoless shore."[14]

A turning point in young Ladd's ability to conceptualize her own future as a leader came in early 1863. As she witnessed the violence unleashed by the Civil War, questions about social justice, the nature of equality, and her own life's purpose preoccupied her heart and mind. She took a keen interest as the subject of slavery was debated at prayer meetings and in the press. Writing in her diary on the 12th of May, 1863, she described the "genius and esprit" of abolitionist Harriet Beecher Stowe, and began to contemplate her own life's course, reflecting a growing maturity and heightened social awareness.[15] What was life's purpose? What would be a suitable goal for her ambition? she mused. Her initial choice of vocation was set: she planned to study to become a literature teacher.

To Ladd's thinking, all else paled compared in significance to a consideration of the social issues facing the country and the task of settling on one's path in life. The youthful world of dance parties and flirtatious kissing games that seemingly absorbed her cousins held no attraction for her, and she found herself disaffected from many of her adult relatives.[16] She dreamed of living instead "among educated people," individuals who like herself believed that "there is nothing like intellectual labor to polish one."[17]

Even if the independent-minded Ladd at times ascribed her spiritual

wavering or limitations, at least partly, to her gender, she eventually, like many women of her generation who forged public careers, would envision her gender as her strength.[18] Part of her education in this regard came from being exposed to intellectual women. Indeed, she came to understand more clearly the conservatism of her household and the oppression of women in society when she attended a lecture by the woman's rights advocate and abolitionist Anna Dickinson. Arriving at the lecture hall "fully prepared to find fault" with the speaker's views, Ladd was instead impressed by Dickinson's eloquence and by the righteousness of her social cause. Her faith in women and self-confidence restored, Ladd was determined to cast off the conventional thinking of her relatives: "So long have I been under the government of these antiquarians . . . now I shake off the shackles and am once more my own master."[19]

Ladd's youthful struggle to excel and shape her own identity—to harmonize spiritual and intellectual life—led her to focus on education and to find encouragement in the advances for women she observed. "I am crying for very joy. I have been reading an account of the Vassar Female College that is to be the glorious emancipation proclamation for woman,"[20] she wrote on March 27, 1862. This "collegiate experiment" in women's liberal arts education, she believed, would build laudably upon the pioneering efforts of earlier seminary founders Catharine Beecher (Hartford Seminary, 1821) and Mary Lyon (Mt. Holyoke, 1836). In Ladd's view, women had been excluded or distanced from the institutions of male-dominated culture, by custom and law, and then ridiculed by men for their shortcomings. The opening of collegiate education to women was, she believed, a vital avenue for improving women's collective lot and a direct challenge to pseudo-scientific and anti-feminist doubts about women's intellectual capabilities.[21] Having excelled in Greek and having graduated at the head of her class at coeducational Wesleyan Academy (in Wilbraham, Massachusetts), Ladd made preparing for the Vassar entrance examination the focus of her energies. To Ladd, attending college would honor her mother's memory and uphold the qualities she most admired in Augusta: her "angel's zeal" for learning, her self-reliance, and her belief in working for the complementary goals of women's advancement and Christian goodness. Standing among Vassar's earliest graduates would satisfy the emotional imperative of embracing her mother's values and, beyond that, would enable her to contribute, on a personal level, to the process she described joyously as the "great reformation" of American "womanhood."[22]

One cannot underestimate the considerable difficulties that Ladd and other young women of her generation encountered in trying to develop their intellectual selves and their identities as scholars. Social pressures and attitudes precluded an academic career for all but the most ingenious and

persevering or privileged women. "Surely woman has in her something noble, something higher than bread and butter. If ambition is right in man, is it not also right in woman?" Ladd asked. "Shall she not seek with all her strength to elevate her sex above its present degraded position, seek to attain her proper sphere . . .?" Her admiration for female leaders like orator Anna Dickinson led Ladd to consider her own possible niche. Her deep attachment to the notion of social progress and individual achievement reflected the pervasive Social Darwinism of her era: "The true sphere for everyone is that for which his capacity fills him, and to no other ought he to aspire. But the ages onward roll and still the world progresses . . . God cannot let his people continue forever in ignorance and blindness.""I am to do something, no matter how humble, for the benefit of my race," wrote Ladd, in 1863, and then added purposefully, "Let me strive to do something befitting womanhood." [23]

Christine's diary entry described her resolve to secure a Vassar education in cadences evoking what M. Carey Thomas described as the "passionate desire" of women of this generation to pursue higher education.[24] "I must be firm, perhaps I have some money . . . which will take me to that consummation devoutly to be wished," Ladd wrote. She vowed to "give up any and everything for knowledge . . . . I feel that I am born for something higher and nobler than to be married off [to] the highest bidder in the market of husbands."[25]

Her enthusiasm notwithstanding, Ladd's path to obtaining her Vassar degree in 1869 was far from smooth. In July of 1866, after weeks of trepidation, she finally gathered the courage to disclose her college aspirations to her relatives only to have her grandmother vehemently oppose her plan, warning that four years of advanced studies would seriously diminish her marriage prospects. Ladd's response, albeit self-deprecatory, proved strategically sound. "[I]t would afford me great pleasure to entangle a husband but there was no one in the place who would have me or whom I would have . . . ." she claimed. Marshaling statistical evidence of a "great excess of males" in New England, she justified her plans not in terms of her intellectual ambition or affinity with the woman's rights crusade but as a practical matter—namely, preparation for the period of economic independence before marriage that many young women faced. Satisfied with her coup, she wrote in her diary, "[I] proved that as I was decidedly <u>not</u> handsome my chances were very small. Therefore since I would not find a husband to support me I must—myself . . . so I needed an education. Grandma succumbed."[26]

Fortunately for Ladd, her aunt, Augusta's sister, was more receptive to the idea of a young woman attending college. Thanks largely to her aunt's emotional and financial support, Ladd was able to enroll in Vassar's second entering class. Although the college represented a noteworthy development

in women's education in terms of rigor and endowment, Vassar College was by no means a seedbed of radicalism. Its curriculum and campus culture were designed to cultivate the refined, admirable qualities of educated Christian womanhood in students rather than imbue them with independence and inspire them to pursue a career. Moreover, Vassar's small faculty and daily academic affairs were dominated by men.[27]

To her disappointment, Vassar failed to measure up to the vision of a "cloistered" tower of learning that Ladd had relished as an intellectually eager school girl.[28] Perhaps, however, no mid-nineteenth-century American college, even one of the established Eastern men's institutions, could have satisfied Ladd's heightened expectations. After a year, she left Vassar temporarily, to help care for her younger siblings and to earn some money by teaching before resuming her studies. The hiatus also allowed her to consider her post-college plans. Ladd's first love was physics, yet she was pragmatic. She realized that women, regardless of their intellectual gifts and qualifications, were excluded from most universities and had great difficulty obtaining access to scientific equipment and laboratories.[29] She therefore turned to teaching, a socially acceptable and accessible form of employment and financial independence for women. Ladd wrote to her friend Dr. G.H. Sherman of Yale as she weighed the possibility of joining a small circle of her college classmates in opening a secondary school to prepare girls for Vassar, "I hate teaching, but there is nothing else for poor women to do. Meanwhile I can devote my spare time to optics which is at present the object of my dreams."[30] In the years immediately following Vassar, Ladd taught school, with the aim of financing her graduate studies, and likely studied mathematics on a non-degree basis at Harvard with W.E. Byerly and James Mill Pierce. She also began to publish, with articles appearing in *The Analyst* and *The Educational Times*.[31]

From Women's College to University: Another Experiment in Higher Education

Much as she had single-mindedly pursued admission to Vassar—touted as the 'best' in women's liberal arts education—Ladd aspired to the 'best' in university education—Baltimore's Johns Hopkins University (JHU). Opened in 1876, JHU emphasized German-style graduate seminars, laboratory work, and original investigation. Whereas by the 1870s, state universities had generally adopted coeducation (compelled by their public mission), privately-endowed JHU was able to guard its all-male admission policy.

Christine Ladd's graduate admission at Johns Hopkins (actually, the acceptance of "C. Ladd," as her application read) was advocated by the English-born and -trained JHU professor of mathematics J.J. Sylvester, who

recognized Ladd's name from her publications in the *Educational Times*.[32] Upon Sylvester's urging, JHU officials invited the young school teacher to begin her studies in 1878; and, later, provided her with a fellowship from 1879 to 1882.

Ladd was not the first woman to make special arrangements for graduate studies at JHU.[33] One of her notable predecessors was M. Carey Thomas (Cornell, A.B. 1877), who would later become president of Bryn Mawr College (1894 to 1922) and a prominent advocate for women's education as a leader in the College Entrance Examination Board and the AAUW.[34] Hailing from one of Baltimore's well-to-do Quaker families, Thomas, like Ladd, had a father who fully supported his daughter's intellectual ambitions.[35] Moreover, Thomas similarly saw her academic pursuits as part of the fight on behalf of all women—and felt both the exhilaration and anxiety of belonging to a pioneering generation of female collegians. As a young girl, she had tearfully sought her mother's reassurance after reading Dr. Edward Clarke's *Sex in Education* (1873), a popular treatise arguing that collegiate studies imperiled female reproductive health.[36]

But Thomas's admission to study Greek at JHU "without class attendance," fell far short of her childhood dreams: she had to sit behind a screen during lectures or to consult privately with professors. Dissatisfied with such dehumanizing arrangements—"a kind of living death"[37]—Thomas left JHU, traveling first to Leipzeig, Germany, where women were permitted to study but were not awarded degrees, and then to Zurich, Switzerland, where she earned her Ph.D. in philology in 1882.

No less aware of the inequalities women faced at JHU than Thomas, Ladd opted to remain, primarily to continue her studies with William Storey and C.S. Peirce. She completed the coursework for a doctorate in mathematics in 1882, writing a well-received dissertation on "The Algebra of Logic," but Johns Hopkins officials withheld her degree.[38] At the time few American women, even faculty at the prestigious Northeastern women's colleges, held doctorates, and JHU's status-conscious trustees were wary that any hint of formalizing coeducation might diminish the university's stature and competitive standing.[39]

The end of her doctoral studies, though, opened a new chapter in Ladd's JHU career. That August, Ladd married Fabian Franklin, a Hungarian-born mathematician somewhat her junior, who, after receiving his Ph.D. from JHU in 1880 joined the faculty. The marriage between Christine Ladd-Franklin (she used a hyphenated surname) and Fabian Franklin was a marriage of equals, anchored in their shared commitments to intellectual life and career, family, civic reform, and social concerns. In many ways, Christine Ladd-Franklin found her guide for living–whether in personal or professional matters—in Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792).

Here was a well-reasoned justification for women's education and a persuasive argument for "men [to be] content with rational fellowship instead of slavish obedience" on women's part.[40]

These early years as a faculty wife at JHU found Ladd-Franklin forging a career that combined childrearing (her daughter Margaret was born in 1883), unsalaried lecturing, reform activity in Baltimore, and contributions to the *Nation* on scientific news and a host of topics relating to women: including, for instance, ethnological perspectives on female subordination, the social contributions of working-girls clubs in America, the exclusion of women from intellectual and public life in Germany, and reviews of recently published biographies of talented and unconventional women—such as author Louisa May Alcott, astronomer Maria Mitchell, and physician Elizabeth Blackwell.[41]

Given her wide range of talents and interests perhaps no other US academic institution could have offered Ladd-Franklin so stimulating an intellectual environment.[42] This was the era when JHU was home to G. Stanley Hall, Charles S. Peirce, G.S. Morris, and a cluster of talented male graduate students who would later be influential in the field of psychology, among them John Dewey, James McKeen Cattell, Joseph Jastrow, and E.C. Sanford.[43] But even if JHU was an intellectually vibrant campus, academic affairs in the department of psychology were not always calm. Department chair G. Stanley Hall alienated many of his JHU students and colleagues (on both personal and intellectual grounds). Certainly, there is little evidence to suggest, especially if the views of intellectual women Hall later published in *Adolescence*, 1904, are telling, that Hall would have been sympathetic to someone like Ladd-Franklin.[44] But the void left by Hall's resignation in 1888 created a possibility for JHU—and, eventually, for Ladd-Franklin. By 1903, JHU had recovered from the financial straits of the 1890s, and President Ira Remsen, Daniel Coit Gilman's successor, had hired Princeton's James Mark Baldwin to re-organize the Johns Hopkins psychology department. Ladd-Franklin knew Baldwin, having already served for two years as an associate editor (logic and philosophy) for his *Dictionary of Philosophy*. Under Baldwin, the department departed from Hall's German-style model and re-emphasized psychology's links to philosophy. By 1895 Fabian Franklin had resigned his JHU mathematics professorship to pursue a full-time career in journalism, accepting an editorship at the *Baltimore News*, but from 1904 to 1909, Ladd-Franklin lectured in the psychology and logic department. By this time, she had already traveled to Germany (having accompanied her husband during his sabbatical year, 1891-92), where she studied with three world renowned researchers in the study of color vision—G.E. Muller, Hermann von Helmholtz, and Arthur Konig—and had garnered attention for her own theory of color vision at the International Congress of Psychology in London.

Ladd-Franklin Advocates for Women's University Education

In addition to her growing preeminence as a scientist, Ladd-Franklin also had emerged during the JHU stage of her career as a stateswoman who had a keen grasp of trends in higher education and of the intellectual and financial resources needed to cultivate female talent. From her New England youth and Vassar days, Ladd-Franklin had regarded education as a touchstone for liberating women and men from unexamined tradition and irrational patterns of thought. Why should there be "patrician" and "plebeian" education that buttresses the disparities between the educated and the uneducated, and a system that perpetuates sexual inequality? she asked. Like many other thinkers of her day, who were weaned on Social Darwinian notions, Ladd-Franklin was convinced that society's advancement would depend on broadening educational opportunities for women. She was encouraged that college attendance for women was becoming more acceptable and more financially attainable. Too many women, she believed, had internalized and, thereupon, perpetuated the very social expectations that oppressed women. "Self-sacrificing" women, Ladd-Franklin argued, must be "artificially guarded against themselves." Living in a college community helped free a young woman from the conservatism of family and home and from the "unavoidable annoyances" of housekeeping; engagement in campus life would elevate her "mental plane."[45]

If, in Ladd-Franklin's view, college was in fact an inherent part of a young woman's road to emotional maturity and intellectual independence, she also realized that the academic enterprise and the pathway to intellectual and social leadership had changed fundamentally during the span of her own career. Twenty-five years earlier, a competent individual might have advanced by "easy stages" from being a college student to a professor, but by the 1890s the growing emphasis on expertise and credentials now required candidates who aspired to leadership in scientific and scholarly professions, charity organizations, or any other public field be educated "far beyond a college course."[46]

What type of education did modern women need? Although she was the product of a woman's college and a loyal member of women's advocacy groups, such as the AAUW, throughout her adult life, Ladd-Franklin rejected gender segregation in intellectual matters. Her Johns Hopkins years gave Ladd-Franklin insight into the ways institutions routinely structure the relationship between the sexes and led her to reject separatism as outdated. Her own success lecturing at JHU strengthened Ladd-Franklin's belief that there was little "abnormal" or "improper" about women teaching men. Coeducation at the university level, she believed, as did her former JHU classmate M. Carey Thomas, was a sensible, efficient use of intellectual

resources.[47] Educating men and women together recognized the contributions of both. Moreover, the presence of researchers and graduate students, regardless of sex, uplifted the tenor and rigor of undergraduate life. In short, it was imperative to equalize educational and career opportunities for women. This meant opening admission for women to the nation's premier research universities like Johns Hopkins, whose laboratory and library resources and faculty expertise could not be duplicated.[48]

Ladd-Franklin understood that it was possible to help broaden educational opportunity for women working through the power of philanthropy and voluntary action and the power of the pen.[49] Drawing upon her organizational savvy and energized by her feminist politics, Ladd-Franklin helped organize and served as chair of the Baltimore Association for the Promotion of the University Education for Women in 1897. Members of this advocacy group were disappointed that Baltimore's citizenry in terms of their engagement with the cause of women's education as a matter of civic pride, if not simple justice, lagged behind their counterparts in New York City, Cambridge, Providence—or even the centuries-old university towns of England.[50]

Ladd-Franklin, noted philanthropist Mary Garrett, and the eleven other members of the Baltimore Association petitioned the Johns Hopkins trustees to adopt graduate coeducation ("one of the most salient and unmistakable phenomena of our time"), but the Johns Hopkins Trustees rejected the proposal in polite but summary terms as "inexpedient."[51] The Association therefore set about to publicize women's plight by offering a $500 fellowship for a Maryland woman to pursue advanced studies abroad. (Ladd-Franklin chaired the first selection committee.) [52] Ladd-Franklin similarly led the ACA in establishing fellowships for US women to travel to Europe for first-rate advanced training.[53] As an admiring ACA colleague put it, the fellowships were a means by which to "storm the coveted citadels of learning" and give women entry to those "sacred precincts."[54]

Ladd-Franklin was astute enough to realize that creating more equitable opportunities for women meant changing attitudes and common practices in academic culture. Why should women's opportunities be so restricted? Ladd-Franklin asked in a 1904 article for the ACA, titled "Endowed Professorships for Women." Scholarly editors, she pointed out, concerned themselves only with the caliber of one's intellectual contribution and did not ask whether an author was a man or a woman. What if trustees and presidents were to follow this same "dispassionate" method in evaluating candidates for professorships in coeducational colleges? Ladd-Franklin proposed. While believing that professorships could be decided "without regard to sex or with very little regard" there was also, in Ladd-Franklin's view, a justification for more affirmative steps on behalf of women based on sex, given the formida-

ble biases against hiring and promoting women: "whenever the woman applicant for a position is distinctly superior . . . she shall have the position." This was a "modest intermediate stage" toward an endowed professorship for women.[55]

Ladd-Franklin's vision of change hoped to equalize the playing field for women. By the turn of the century, when the numbers of female doctorates had risen nearly eight-fold, she identified the crucial need to provide intellectual women with career alternatives to teaching: "It is the more highly trained who are most deserving of our sympathy. It is for them that we wish to secure—by hothouse methods if necessary—not the position of the overworked teacher in the smaller colleges but rather the minor professorships in the major universities, those which offer leisure at first, and, later, opportunity for advancement."[56]

Ladd-Franklin was convinced that the principle of economy largely explained the teaching profession's openness to women, and therefore argued that money could provide an "entering wedge" for women doctorates seeking employment. "At the present time (in the East) a woman must either be very cheap or very distinguished . . . we propose to make her the one to enable her to become the other," she wrote in 1905.[57]

Changing Worlds: From Johns Hopkins and Baltimore to Columbia and New York City

When Christine Ladd-Franklin, husband Fabian, and young daughter, Margaret, arrived in Manhattan in 1910 (Fabian had accepted an editorship), faculty at Columbia and academics nationwide still hotly debated the nature of women's intellectual achievements and the relationship between sex variability and genius.[58] Columbia's psychology department—which included such notables as department chair James McKeen Cattell, Robert Sessions Woodworth, Edward Thorndike, John Dewey, and James Hyslop—had no women faculty, though numbers of women had earned master's degrees and doctorates since the days back in 1891 when Columbia's trustees deliberated for a month before permitting the gifted Vassar graduate Margaret Floy Washburn to audit Cattell's courses.[59]

Editor of *Science* and *American Men of Science* [sic], Cattell was familiar with Ladd-Franklin's submissions to *Science* and respected her starred status in the first edition of his *American Men of Science*, which recognized 982 men and only 18 women.[60] But Cattell had angered many female academics, Ladd-Franklin included, by discounting social prejudice among university men as an explanation of women's underrepresentation in *American Men of Science* and the professoriate. A feisty, strong-willed man whose ideas reflected a striking and unusual combination of sexist and socialist politics,

Cattell, like Ladd-Franklin herself, never backed away from controversy. "It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that there is an innate sexual disqualification," he wrote in 1910.[61] But, as Margaret Rossiter has discussed, Cattell's views on the subject had already begun to shift when Ladd-Franklin joined his department.[62]

For her part, Christine Ladd-Franklin was, by all accounts, already a controversial figure in psychological circles and a familiar name to readers of the *Nation* when she arrived at Columbia. Her theoretical contributions and extensive publications by their example rebutted the views of female inferiority put forth by some influential scientific men, among them her Columbia colleague Edward Thorndike and former JHU colleague now Clark University president G. Stanley Hall. Moreover, Ladd-Franklin had achieved a confident—and in some eyes, too aggressive and disquieting—self-image as a scientist. She was outspoken when researchers or textbook editors deferentially acknowledged the early works of Helmholtz or Herring (two pillars of German psychology), but failed to cite her more recent and synthetic evolutionary theory (which she touted as a "Hegelian" contribution in an age of increasing compartmentalization). She protected her intellectual property vigorously and in the process gained a reputation as a feisty, "belligerent" proponent of her color theories.[63] Ladd-Franklin was often devastatingly brutal in her criticism of colleagues whose experimentation or scholarship she believed lacked rigor, and she was equally impatient with social views she deemed guided by prejudice rather than rationality.[64] She keenly resented any instance when she was seemingly denied an invitation to attend a scientific meeting or join a committee because of her sex. Such action was an untenable violation of the principles of science and professional ethics.[65]

In October, 1914, Ladd-Franklin approached Robert S. Woodworth, Cattell's successor as department chair, about securing a formal appointment to lecture on her specialties—color vision and logic. In support of Ladd-Franklin's case, Woodworth reminded Columbia's President Nicholas Murray Butler that "her reputation and mastery of her specialty would reflect credit on the University and be of service in the work of the department."[66] Butler, himself a Columbia-trained philosopher, had once heard Ladd-Franklin lecture at Johns Hopkins and was quite impressed by "the originality and profundity" of her literature on Logic. He supported the idea of a lectureship for Ladd-Franklin but did not commit Columbia's financial resources toward creating a position. He recommended her to an unsalaried position in December of 1914.

The next March, armed with the legitimacy of her Columbia University title, Ladd-Franklin wrote to Cornell's E.B. Titchener, founder and head of the Experimentalists, a small professional group that refused women member-

ship, about the group's upcoming meeting to be held on Columbia's campus. She criticized his policy of barring women, especially at her "very door," as "unconscientious, so immoral—worse than that—so unscientific!" Her criticism rested not only in Titchener's disregard for the precedence that the Philosophical and Psychological Associations admitted women, but also in the belief that the exclusion of women (or, more to the point, her exclusion) hindered the quality of the scientific debate: "And you need me! I particularly want to discuss for you at this meeting the present vagaries of Watson, Dunlap, and [her Columbia colleagues] Rand and Ferree—(Watson doubly)."[67]

While Ladd-Franklin generally showed the world beyond Columbia's campus only her pride in her Columbia University affiliation, her close friends knew the barriers she encountered and the frustrations she endured. Her friend Dr. Simon Flexner, a noted medical educator-researcher and supporter of women's education and opportunities in science, encouraged her. He was "delighted" that she had secured the library facilities at Columbia that she needed, which, he added, "should have been placed at your disposal long ago and without delay."[68]

Even after her formal appointment at Columbia, Ladd-Franklin's negotiations with university officers to maintain her minimal professional requirements—an office and a phone—were at times contentious. One such incident occurred late in 1917 when a Columbia official, perhaps Secretary Frank Fackenthal, became annoyed by Ladd-Franklin's complaints and reminded her that one "so unemolumented" as herself should make no demands on the university. She rejoined that "Mr. B. [President Nicolas Murray Butler] is a gentleman," to which the official firmly replied, "I am not. I am an officer of the government of the university."[69]

Ladd-Franklin's ire was raised. Having confidently assessed her intellectual value to Columbia, she steeled herself to fight. How many Columbia professors lectured in four departments? How many had been among Cattell's first five hundred starred scientists? Had she not been told by a German professor that she was "better fitted" for university life than any of his colleagues [all men]? Her personal notes on the incident reflected her deep sense of propriety and her indignation at what she regarded as Columbia's refusal to extend her due professional courtesy: "What letters, what appeals over his head to the trustees to be allowed to present a modest locker, bookshelf to the university and to lend it my books!" This particular situation was eventually resolved and tensions diffused when a university official assured her that Columbia had been congratulated on having the privilege of hearing her lectures on symbolic logic.[70] Ladd-Franklin was not impressed by insincere flattery but a certain deference and recognition of her preeminence as a scientist were prerequisite to any relationship with her.

Ladd-Franklin was keenly aware that not all Columbia departments and faculty members were unequivocally accepting of a woman colleague. As she wrote to a friend at all-male Princeton University in 1917, "Columbia is far too proud to permit a person of my poor sex to address it on the subject of logic! Men are `simply wonderful' in the discovery of premises!" Fittingly, she underscored the irony of her marginalization at Columbia with a syllogism, "None can be members of the faculty who are not in receipt of a salary. Dr. Ladd-Franklin is not in receipt of a salary. . .." Continuing, she added, "I have never definitely refused to accept one—it is that I offered, faute de mieux, to lecture for nothing, and I have been, for four years, a member of the psychology faculty."[71]

Perhaps it was the heady nature of university life and an affirming sense of intellectual if not financial reward that sustained Ladd-Franklin's Columbia career, despite the rocky times. Certainly she valued the respect she felt on President Nicholas Murray Butler's part. Her cordial relationship with President Butler was anchored in their shared intellectual standards and common disciplinary interests but also in their mutual interest in reform and civic life. Both valued the ties between university and city life. She occasionally sent him a courteously phrased, but assertive, note directing his attention to her latest lecture series. She was never reluctant to speak directly to Butler when she discerned a problem or felt slighted or wronged, as was the case, for example, when she was denied a library carrel, or when the psychology library was overcrowded, or yet another time when some Columbia College boys teased her as they crossed on the Broadway sidewalk.[72] For her part, Ladd-Franklin conceptualized the university as an arena to be guided by intellect and moral integrity. Ladd-Franklin was therefore incensed that Columbia's School of Journalism hired the behaviorist J.B. Watson, who had been fired from Johns Hopkins in 1919 for having an extra-marital affair with his graduate assistant.[73] Alarmed by what she perceived as Columbia's acquiescence in a professor's impropriety, Ladd-Franklin sent a brief note admonishing President Butler, Was Columbia "to fail to support President Goodenow [of Johns Hopkins] in this effort to keep this world good and decent?" She then added, asserting her own indignation and sense of self-importance as a Columbia affiliate and, hence, representative of the university: "I like to know, in such cases—authoritatively—just what one is to say."[74]

Full Circle: A Mother's Example, a Daughter's Contributions to Change, and the End of A Career

Ladd-Franklin's years at Columbia brought the deep satisfaction of once again being situated at a leading university. From here, reflecting back over the years of her highly productive career, she could "[extract] detail from

myriad points of light" (to borrow Finkelstein's phrase) and discern the figures and moments that saliently shaped her career.[75] Her intellectual life had taken root in antebellum New England, had been enriched by the educational experiments at Vassar and JHU, and her hard-won education applied not only in the science lab but also in her leadership in women's voluntary associations, professional groups, and civic life in Baltimore and Manhattan, but in some ways it was the women of her family who had most inspired her. In an April 1918 interview for the *Buffalo Express*, she recalled that "the first specific influence that led me toward serious intellectual pursuits was my mother's character and family circle." As she explained, "My mother was one of four sisters, all of whom were brilliant women. In spite of the fact that they were widely separated by marriage, they would return in the summers to our family home in Windsor, Connecticut, and there led a delightful intellectual life together."[76]

Much as memories of Augusta Ladd's social values had profoundly inspired her daughter, Ladd-Franklin's scientific career, her spirited civic involvement, and her work in women's organizations inspired her daughter Margaret, Bryn Mawr College, '07, to work on behalf of women's intellectual and social equality. Notably, Margaret published *The Case for Suffrage* in 1913 and in the 1920s helped galvanize support among New York City women's groups and Columbia alumni to open Columbia's Law School to women. This goal was finally achieved in 1926. Proud of her daughter's triumph (the type of satisfying work on behalf of womanhood to which young Christine Ladd had herself aspired), Ladd-Franklin's mind turned toward correcting an old injustice. She decided to petition the Johns Hopkins trustees for the doctorate she had rightfully earned in 1882, and, in fact, was adamant that the Ph.D. be awarded for her graduate studies rather than for her professional work during the intervening forty-four years. She received the doctorate in 1926, during the same week as JHU commemorated the 50th anniversary of the late Daniel Coit Gilman's inauguration as its first president. While some interpreted the bestowal as a sign of "the great change that [had] come over U.S. education in less than a century," history, including controversy in our own times over women's scientific abilities, shows that gender biases were not so easily erased.[77]

"Labor is Heaven's choicest gift," Christine Ladd had asserted in her girlhood diary.[78] What began in the 1860s as a New England school girl's crusade to win her own family's support for her plans to attend Vassar College became a young woman's venture to secure advanced scientific training, first at Johns Hopkins and later at the German universities of Gottingen and Berlin. What had been an individual goal eventually translated into a lifelong devotion to a public cause. Ladd-Franklin's last years at Columbia were busy and productive, filled with nine-hour work

days, punctuated by the occasional cigarette break. Four years after belatedly receiving her Ph.D., Christine Ladd-Franklin died at the age of 82, after a brief case of pneumonia. "She was the youngest person on the Columbia campus," wrote her Columbia eulogist Cassius J. Keyser, Adrain Professor Emeritus of Mathematics. "It should be noted that her strenuous intellectual life was not incompatible with the possession of great feminine charm," he wrote assuredly. Hers was a "long unbroken scientific activity fashioned by a very rare union in her of analytical and logical power with intuition."[79] Keyser's remembrances while conveying his deep collegial respect nevertheless reflected the cultural tensions between intellect and femininity that confronted Ladd-Franklin throughout her career. A woman who from girlhood prided herself on living by reason, rather than by sentiment, and who committed her considerable energies not only to building her own career but also to advancing women's status in the academy, Ladd-Franklin continually pushed back. Even in death, Ladd-Franklin contributed to advancing commonly held views about scholarly womanhood. As the *New York Times'* tribute succinctly put it, her many accomplishments were something "for anti-feminists to consider."[80]

Notes

[1]Undated memorandum on the Ph.D., page 2, Box 49, Christine Ladd-Franklin and Fabian Franklin Papers, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York; hereafter CLF & FF Papers.

[2]Christine Ladd-Franklin to Professor Moore, December 8, 1918, Box 18, CLF & FF Papers.

[3]See note 1.

[4]For example, Margaret Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982); Penina Glazer and Miriam Slater, *Unequal Colleagues: The Entrance of Women into the Professions, 1890 to 1940* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1987); Elizabeth Scarborough and Laurel Furumoto, eds., *Untold Lives: The First Generation of American Women Psychologists* (1987); Pnina G. Abir-Am and Dorinda Outram, eds., *Uneasy Careers and Intimate Lives: Women in Science, 1879-1979* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1987), Evelyn Fox-Keller, *Feeling for the Organism: The Life and Work of Barbara McClintock* (San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 1983); and Londa Schiebinger, *Gendered Innovations in Science and Engineering* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2008).

[5]Barbara Finkelstein, "Revealing Human Agency: the Uses of Biography in the Study of Educational History," in Craig Kridel, ed., *Writing Educational Biography: Explorations in Qualitative Research* (New York**:** Taylor Francis, 1988), 45; 45-60.

[6]M. Carey Thomas, "Present Tendencies," *Educational Review* 35 (1908): 64-85; Ladd-Franklin's review of the new edition (1891) of Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Women,* as cited in Furumoto, "Collegial Exclusion," 110.

[7]Furumoto, "Collegial Exclusion," 109-129; Furumoto, "Joining Separate Spheres:

Christine Ladd-Franklin, Woman Scientists (1847-1930), *American Psychologist* 47 (February 1992): 175-182; Andrea Walton, Chapter 4, in "Women at Columbia: A Study of Power and Empowerment in the Lives of Six Women," (Columbia University Ph.D dissertation, 1995), 115-168; *Notable American Women*, s.v. "Ladd-Franklin, Christine."

[8]Victoria Bissell Brown, *The Education of Jane Addams* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 175.

[9]Ladd-Franklin's father's uncle, William Ladd, founded the American Peace Society. Her mother's uncle, John Milton Niles, served as a senator from Connecticut and was later Postmaster General. See various clippings in the CLF & FF Papers.

[10]Christine Ladd-Franklin diaries, July 27, 1861; November 29, 1861, Vassar Archives and Special Collections Library, Vassar College Libraries, Poughkeepsie, New York; hereafter CLF diaries.

[11]CLF diaries, April 15, 1863.

[12]CLF diaries, Thanksgiving, 1861.

[13]CLF diaries, December 31, 1860.

[14]CLF diaries, November 25, 1861 and November 29, 1861.

[15]CLF diaries, March 12, 1863.

[16]CLF diaries, January 2, 1863; February 25, 1863.

[17]CLF diaries, January 8, 1863.

[18]CLF diaries, January 22, 1863.

[19]CLF diaries, n.d. p. 96; *Notable American Women*, s.v. "Dickinson, Anna."

[20]CLF diaries, March 27, 1862.

[21]CLF diaries, n.d. p.104. See also Christine Ladd-Franklin, "Vassar College," *Nation* (1890) 50: 483-84.

[22]CLF diaries, May 1, 1863.

[23]All quotes from CLF diaries, May 15, 1863.

[24]Thomas, "Present Tendencies."

[25]CLF diaries, March, 1863.

[26]CLF diaries, July 23, 1866.

[27]Frances A. Wood, *Earliest Years at Vassar: Personal Recollections* (Poughkeepsie: Vassar College Press, 1909), 6.

[28]Undated manuscript, p.33, Box 12, CLF & FF Papers.

[29]*The Biographical Cyclopedia Of American Women* (1928), s.v. "Ladd-Franklin, Christine."

[30]Ladd to Sherman, April 17, 1869, Box 22, Ladd-Franklin Papers.

[31]*Women in Psychology: a Bio-Bibliographic Sourcebook* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990), s.v. "Ladd-Franklin, Christine."

[32]Fabian Franklin, *The Life of Daniel Coit Gilman* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1890), 214.

[33]See also Julia B. Morgan, "Women at The Johns Hopkins University: A History," *www.library.jhu.edu/collections/specialcollections/archives/womenshistory/index.html* (accessed December 29, 2008).

[34]Andrea Walton, "Cultivating a Place for Selective All-Female Education in A Coeducational World: Women Educators and Professional Voluntary Associations, 1880-1926," in *"A Faithful Mirror" – Reflections on the College Board and Education in*

America, edited by Michael Johanek, (New York: The College Board, 2001), 134-193.

[35]Laurel Furumoto, "Joining Separate Spheres: 175-182.

[36]Marjorie Housepian Dobkin, ed., *The Making of a Feminist: The Early Journals and Letters of M. Carey Thomas* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1979) 69.

[37]Quoted in Edith Finch, *Carey Thomas of Bryn Mawr* (New York: Harper, 1947), 72;

[38]Her alma mater, Vassar, awarded her an honorary degree, LLD, in 1887.

[39]Margaret Rossiter, "Doctorates for American Women," *History of Education Quarterly* 22 (1982): 159-183.

[40]Christine Ladd-Franklin, *Nation* 52 (February 19, 1891): 163.

[41]See, for example, the review of Edward von Hartmann, *The Sexes Compared and Other Essays* by Ladd-Franklin in the *Nation* 61 (August 29, 1893): 154-5. Furumoto argues that Mitchell was a great inspiration to Ladd-Franklin in "Joining Separate Spheres," 177.

[42]Like many scholars in the nation's new research universities, Ladd-Franklin's interests embraced several interrelated areas that had yet to delineate their boundaries and professionalize: among them, psychology, philosophy, physics, logic, and mathematics.

[43]Philip J. Pauly, "G. Stanley Hall and His Successors: A History of the First Half-Century of Psychology at Johns Hopkins," in *One Hundred Years of Psychological Research in America: G. Stanley Hall and the Johns Hopkins Tradition*, ed. Stewart H. Hulse and Bert E. Green Jr. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 21-51. See "The Johns Hopkins University, 1882-1884," in George Dykhuizen, *The Life and Mind of John Dewey* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), 28-43, esp. 29-32.

[44]Scarborough and Furumoto (1987) note Hall's view, expressed in *Adolescence*, that intellectual women were "functionally castrated," 4.

[45]See Christine Ladd-Franklin, "College Life for Women," *Nation* 49 (October 24, 1889): 327; "Coeducation," *Nation* (January 24, 1888): 293; M. Carey Thomas, "Present Tendencies," *Educational Review* 35 (1908): 68; Barbara Cross, ed., *The Educated Woman in America* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965), 41.

[46]Ibid.

[47]Thomas, "Present Tendencies."

[48]Ibid, 10. See also Christine Ladd-Franklin**,** Undated manuscript, p. 12, Box 18, CLF & FF Papers.

[49]Andrea Walton, *Women and Philanthropy in Education* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005).

[50]Lilian Welsh, *Reminiscences of Thirty years in Baltimore* (Baltimore: Norman Remington, Co, 1925), 16.

[51]Quoted in Welsh, *Reminiscences,* 17.

[52]Welsh, *Reminiscences*, 23.

[53]Rossiter discusses Ladd-Franklin's efforts as part of a broader discussion of activist-minded female scientists in *American Women in Science*, 38-50. See also, Margaret Rossiter, "Doctorates for American Women," 165.

[54]Bessie Bradwell Helmer to Phoebe Hearst, 1 May 1894, cited in Rossiter,

American Women Scientists, 169. Christine Ladd-Franklin, paper presented to the ACA, 24 October 1890, Series 6, No. 20.

[55]Kate Holladay [Claghorn] to Ladd-Franklin, October 14, 1898; October 25, 1898, Box 3, CLF & FF Papers. See also Rossiter, *American Women Scientists*, 49-50 for Ladd-Franklin's involvement with the ACA Berliner Fellowships, which helped support women's research.

[56]Christine Ladd-Franklin, "Endowed Professorships for Women," *Publications of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae*, Series III, No. 9 (1904): 55; 53-61.

[57]Manuscript, 1905, Box 18, CFL & FF Papers.

[58]Cynthia Russett, *Sexual Science:* The Victorian Construction of Womanhood (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991).

[59]See "Margaret Floy Washburn," in vol. 2 of *History of Psychology in Autobiography*, ed. Carl Murchison (Worcester, Ma.: Clark University Press, 1932), 338; Furumoto, "A Little Hard on the Ladies," and Rosalind Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (New Haven: Yale University Press), 67.

[60]Cattell wrote to Ladd complimenting her: "Everything you write seems to me excellent," August 3, 1896, Cattell to Ladd, Box 10, CFL & FF Papers. Both Christine Ladd-Franklin and Fabian Franklin had been starred in Cattell's original (1910) list of prominent scientists.

[61]James McKeen Cattell, "Further Statistical Study of American Men of Science," *Science* 176 (1910): 110.

[62]Rossiter, *American Women of Science*, 108-109.

[63]Christine Ladd-Franklin, *Colour and Colour Theories*, C.K.O. preface, ed. Robert Woodworth (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1929), vii; *Notable American Women*, s.v. "Ladd-Franklin, Christine."

[64]Ladd-Franklin to Ferree, May 30, 1921; Ladd-Franklin to Professor Carr, August 16, 1925; Ladd-Franklin to Professor Hunter, January 8, 1928; Ladd-Franklin to Professor Keyners, August 3, 1927; Ladd-Franklin to Muller, April 18, 1928; Ladd-Franklin to M. Pieron, July 25, 1926; Ladd-Franklin to Titchner, August 16, 1925 all in Box 8, Ladd-Franklin Papers. Harry Helson, *Saturday Review of Literature*, 20 July l929. My interpretation here follows along lines similar to Laurel Furumoto, "Collegial Excursions," 109-129.

[65]Helson, *Saturday Review of Literature*, July 20, l929.

[66]Woodworth to Butler, October 26, 1914, Robert Sessions Woodworth Papers, Central Files Collection, Columbia University, New York City, New York; hereafter cited as Woodworth Central Files.

[67]Ladd-Franklin to Titchener, n.d., Box 8, CLF & FF Papers.

[68]Flexner to Ladd-Franklin, November 21, 1913, Box 3, CLF & FF Papers.

[69]Handwritten notes dated November 12, 1917, Box 14, CLF & FF Papers.

[70]Ibid.

[71]Christine Ladd-Franklin to Professor Moore, December 8, 1917, Box 8, CLF & FF Papers.

[72]Ladd-Franklin to Butler, May 11, 1920, Box 3; undated handwritten note, Box 8; CLF & FF Papers. See also, Nicholas Murray Butler to Dean F.J.E. Woodbridge, February 18, 1924, Butler Central Files, Columbia University, New York.

[73]For Ladd-Franklin's sense of "Anglo-Saxon morality"; see Christine Ladd-

Franklin, "Dangers of Paris for the American Student," *Nation* 71 (1900): 149.

[74]Ladd-Franklin to Butler, n.d., Box 8, CLF & FF Papers.

[75]Finkelstein, "Revealing Human Agency," 55.

[76]Quoted in vcencyclopedia.vassar.edu/index.php/Christine_Ladd-Franklin, (accessed May 15, 2009).

[77]"At Johns Hopkins," *Time Magazine.* March 1, 1926.

[78]CLF diaries, n.d., p. 74.

[79]Obituary, Box 14, CLF & FF Papers.

[80]Obituary, *New York Times*, March 7, 1930.

Contextualizing and Contesting National Identities:
Lillian de Lissa, 1885-1967

Kay Whitehead
Flinders University

When Lillian de Lissa retired as Principal of Gipsy Hill Training College in England in January 1947, her colleagues presented her with a testimonial, which read in part:

> We recognize with pride her magnificent work of helping to create in this country a demand for nursery schools, and of founding a College for teachers of young children. We remember that Gipsy Hill Training College was a pioneer college and suffered periods of great stress… We also remember Miss de Lissa's contribution to international understanding, especially in the field of education.[1]

Constructing a biography to encompass de Lissa's national and international influence, however, is a complex process. She was born in colonial New South Wales in 1885. By the time her career began, white women were counted as citizens in the newly federated Australia. She was a British subject by virtue of Australia's membership of the British Empire, and she lived in England from 1917 until her death in 1967. Additionally, her personal and professional networks transcended both national and imperial borders. Interpretations of de Lissa's life and work varied over time and according to the country in which they were produced. American, Australian and British sources, for example, constructed de Lissa's national and international influ-

ence from different standpoints. It is thus difficult to define de Lissa "in terms of an identity, especially a national identity."[2]

De Lissa was one of a growing number of middle class women, among them many educators, whose careers crossed national boundaries in the early twentieth century. These women established webs of influence that linked independent white settler societies such as Australia and the United States as well as the "so-called [imperial] center." A transnational rather than a comparative or an international methodology is needed to encapsulate these complex links.[3] Transnational history is defined by Curthoys and Lake as "the study of the ways in which past lives and events have been shaped by processes and relationships that have transcended the borders of nation states."[4] This paper will use a transnational framework to explore the interconstitutive connections between various people and places that came within the ambit of Lillian de Lissa's life and work.

Julia and Montague de Lissa (a wine and spirit merchant) married in 1874 and brought up their family in Sydney, the capital city of the British colony of New South Wales, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Julia de Lissa had seven children, four of whom survived into adulthood. Lillian Daphne was born on 25th October 1885 and grew up with her older brother and sister, Osbourne and Ethel, and younger brother, Gerald in Woollahra, a suburb which "housed the 'select of the elite'."[5] Family members traveled back and forth between England and Australia, thereby indicating their wealth and their attachment to the imperial center. Remote white settler societies such as New South Wales were considered low in the imperial hierarchy, but there was an emerging colonial nationalism among the locally born white population. Matthews argues that Sydney's elite was "proud to be British and saw England and Australia as parts of a single empire."[6] This was the context in which Lillian spent her childhood and youth.

The de Lissas were portrayed as "an English family for generations interested in educational matters."[7] English families often "saw themselves as improving rough colonial society with their superior values and social standing."[8] At the same time, parents were concerned that "girls here are apt to grow up what they call Colonial, but in other words vulgar", so their exposure to such influences was carefully controlled.[9] Lillian and Ethel were educated at Riviere College, Woollahra, a private school for young ladies. Ethel's education continued at Sydney University and Lillian enrolled at the Sydney Kindergarten Training College (also known as Froebel House), thereby beginning a life-long interest in early childhood education.[10]

Lillian trained with twenty-eight students, seven of whom lived in Froebel House. The Principal, Frances Newton, had been recruited from the United States in 1902, an indication of the interest in American progressivism among reforming members of Sydney's elite. A graduate of the "Free

Kindergarten Training School of Chicago" in 1890, she had also been much influenced by Dewey's work at the Chicago Laboratory School and his reinterpretation of Froebel's ideas to effect social reform.[11] She was a seminal influence on Lillian who graduated with distinction after two years and was "put in charge of" Ashfield free kindergarten for eighteen months. This was followed by a "course of training preparing me to train teachers."[12]

There are several explanations of de Lissa's childhood and youth, not necessarily congruent, and her decision to enter the field of early childhood education. These retrospective accounts are embedded in the discourses of the era as well as the place in which they were constructed. There is also "interplay between what people are able to tell about their lives and what they perceive to be of interest to their audience."[13] As this paper will show, de Lissa had a keen sense of her audience and was ever diplomatic when it came to representing national identities.

In an interview with the *Daily Herald* in 1913, de Lissa stated that her "original plan was music as a career … but I worked so hard it did not turn out well for my health. The kindergarten was pushed into notice as a sort of counter irritant; it became an absorbing interest."[14] The *Lone Hand* added, "it was with some consternation that her people realized that the 'balancer' had entirely tipped the scale."[15] Here, de Lissa is portrayed as thinking independently of her parents in the manner of an "Australian girl." The following issue of the *Lone Hand* argued that the "Australian girl" was modern, vivacious and self-possessed but also displayed "a quick warm sympathy" for others, whereas the "English girl" was said to be "plain, commonplace" and "more or less tainted with the appalling English superciliousness."[16] De Lissa integrated these understandings when she responded to the question why she "took up this work":

> To be very candid I was rather lordly about it. I thought it would be a nice way to do things for the poor little children, and I started the thing in a very snobbish sort of way. I went down to Woolloomooloo [free kindergarten] with the attitude of a Lady Bountiful. My mother had sent me to take up the work because I was specializing too much in music and she wanted me to have some other interest. Needless to say when I got close to the suffering of the people and realized all the hardships of their lives, my attitude soon changed … Such suffering as kindergartners see makes one want to do and give all possible to make conditions better and happier for the people. What kindergarten work has meant to me is more than I can put into words. It has altered the outlook of my whole life. It has made all things different. It is rather a difficult thing to discuss.[17]

Her initial reason was located in the British tradition of middle class women's philanthropy but she re-positioned herself as a modern, progressive social reformer and "kindergartener," by which she meant a kindergarten teacher. By the 1930s, however, philanthropy had been professionalized and the focus of reform had shifted to the individual child. Thus an Australian newspaper stated that de Lissa "first became interested in the problem of the pre-school child in industrial areas, when as a young girl, she used to teach and play with the children in the Woolloomooloo district."[18] Then in 1943 while on a lecture tour of the United States, American newspapers proposed that de Lissa had experienced an "idyllic girlhood 'down under'" and drew on contemporary preoccupations with modern youth and the generation gap to portray her as a rebellious Australian girl. "Miss de Lissa started out to be a Sydney Society girl. But one year while her well-to-do parents were 'back home' in England on holiday she enrolled in a training school for teachers there."[19] The *Oakland Tribune* stated that "lacking funds for fees, she earned her way as a pianist for the college and by teaching fellow students." De Lissa added that her American principal "encouraged me in every way and fortified me for the storm I anticipated with the return of my parents."[20] Writing for an English audience in 1957, however, de Lissa represented her girlhood as "English" though located in Australia.

> My parents were apprehensive of my undertaking professionally what they had previously indulged as a hobby; and they were soon more so at the prospect of my going to live in a city a thousand miles from home unchaperoned. Up to that time I had not been shopping or even to the kindergarten without a chaperone, as was customary in those days among English residents, who like my mother, strongly resisted the free-and-easy ways of Australians and clung tenaciously to English traditions.[21]

The city to which de Lissa referred was Adelaide, the capital city of South Australia. In September 1905 she and Newton were invited to Adelaide by Bertram Hawker to demonstrate kindergarten methods and generate interest among progressive educators, social reformers and philanthropists. The Kindergarten Union of South Australia (KUSA) was formed at a well-attended public meeting and twenty-year old de Lissa was then employed to establish the first free kindergarten in the city. She took up her position as Director of the Franklin Street free kindergarten in January 1906.[22]

The free kindergarten movement in Australia, as elsewhere, was at the nexus of social and educational reform, and thus attracted many feminists. In Adelaide de Lissa worked closely with KUSA secretary and leading feminist, Lucy Morice, so much so that she subsequently portrayed Morice as her

"guide, philosopher and friend." Kindergartens were part of Morice's reform agenda and when she established the Women's Non-Party Political Association in 1909 and the School for Mothers in 1910, de Lissa served on their executive committees.[23] Nevertheless, the core of de Lissa's activism was educational reform which she believed led to social reform. With the benefit of hindsight in 1962, she wrote to an Australian friend,

> I do remember my enthusiasm for education and my unquenchable confidence in the possibility inherent in it in bringing about a new social order … I still believe that the education of the whole man is the only sound way of making for social wellbeing – slow as it inevitably is.[24]

De Lissa taught at the Franklin Street free kindergarten for only one year. For the following decade her role was two-fold. Firstly, she was General Director of KUSA and supervised the establishment of kindergartens. She was a passionate advocate of Froebelian methods and traveled widely in Australia to both learn and proselytize. In 1911, Western Australia's leading feminist, Bessie Rischbieth, invited her to Perth to demonstrate kindergarten methods. At a public meeting to consider the formation of a Kindergarten Union, "Miss de Lissa delivered an interesting discourse on the kindergarten, the training of teachers for the work, and the enormous benefits, social and national, which were to be derived from the teaching of young children under the Froebelian system."[25] In turn, in the wake of Australian federation in 1901, de Lissa's work was constructed as "vital to the wellbeing of any nation."[26] Her visit to Western Australia prompted one commentator to "wish she could be traveling Australia –with her power of inspiring enthusiasm – as a Federal Kindergartner."[27]

De Lissa's capacity to engage and inspire was already well honed by 1911 and lasted throughout her life. She was widely read, not only in educational matters, well-prepared, and often used humor (sometimes self-deprecating) at the beginning of her speeches to engage her audience. As the *Daily News* reported in 1911, "The lady who has a charming manner, also - unlike many whose paths lie in the direction of philanthropy - has a decided sense of the humorous."[28] De Lissa gave countless speeches, preferring a live audience over the new medium of radio. "When I can see my audience and the degree of the response, or boredom, or opposite, it helps me to know how to go on developing what I want to say and what changes to make."[29] These skills served de Lissa well in the second aspect of her work in Adelaide, that is Principal of the Kindergarten Training College (KTC).

The KTC was established on the same principles as the Sydney KTC and de Lissa always acknowledged her debt to Newton. She focused on the holis-

tic development of the kindergartner, that is her head, heart and hands. Theory and practice were integrated in general and professional studies as well as practical teaching in the kindergartens. Indeed, teaching methods simulated those advocated in kindergartens. De Lissa's reports were peppered with quotations from American educators, especially Dewey, and her students also recalled the influence of American progressivism.[30] Her vision was that young women would graduate from the KTC with "a clear vision, a well-stocked and balanced mind, rich in culture, alert and interested, and eager in its search for truth, and … a spirit of devotion to their country."[31] Kindergartners, therefore, would be both educational and social reformers.

Notwithstanding her enthusiasm, the first decade of de Lissa's work as a teacher educator was difficult. Some influential members of KUSA proposed that the KTC be amalgamated with the state training college, thereby depriving de Lissa of her position as Principal. At the annual general meeting in 1910, the twenty-five year old de Lissa was pitted against leading men, including the professorate of the University of Adelaide. Her uncharacteristically intemperate speech triggered questions in parliament the next day, but Morice, the consummate strategist, had deployed her feminist networks to attend and defeat the motion for amalgamation.[32]

In 1914 de Lissa was sponsored by Bertram Hawker to spend the year in Europe and the United States. She studied with Montessori in Rome and narrowly avoided being caught up in the hostilities at the outbreak of World War One when traveling to England to speak at the first Montessori conference. There, she replaced the keynote speaker, Edmond Holmes, at short notice. Some of England's leading progressive educators formed the New Ideals group at this conference, included de Lissa (and subsequently recruited her to establish the Gipsy Hill Training College in 1917). Unfortunately, de Lissa became ill in England, abandoned her plans to travel to the United States, and returned to Australia by mid-1915.[33]

Following her studies abroad, de Lissa determined to meld Froebelian and Montessorian methods in the kindergartens. In the midst of World War One she told kindergartners, all women of course, "that with us lies the work of bettering the country, building and safeguarding from within our nation that is costing so many lives to defend from without."[34] Yet de Lissa decided to leave Australia for more remunerative work in England. Given national and imperial sensitivities, her career choice required careful justification. There was a widespread perception that there were fewer opportunities for highly skilled people in Australia so when asked whether she was "sorry" to leave, de Lissa responded "Yes… I would rather have worked in my own country had that been possible. But I am happy in the thought of my new sphere."[35] However, choosing an Australian to establish a British training college was deemed "proof that we are well up-to-date here."[36] Thus by conceptualizing de Lissa's

national identity as Australian, her future achievements could demonstrate that Australia was a modern, progressive nation. KUSA's annual report praised de Lissa's work in Adelaide generously and went a step further, positioning her as "one of the Empire Builders in Education."[37] For a new nation seeking power within the British Empire, de Lissa's projected influence could be simultaneously national and imperial. From an Australian perspective, de Lissa would be at the center of a web of influence, taking Australian ideas to Britain and many more countries besides.

In 1917 de Lissa traveled to England via the United States, making a point of visiting Hull House, Chicago, and meeting Jane Addams. Unlike many Australians who encountered prejudice on account of their colonial origins, the New Idealists embraced de Lissa and some such as Holmes served on GHTC's governing body. As a white woman with powerful networks de Lissa could thus move easily in English society. Belle Rennie, the founder of GHTC, joined Newton and Morice as one of de Lissa's confidantes.[38] When Rennie applied to the Board of Education for GHTC to be recognized as a training college, she cited de Lissa's KTC experience, her studies with Montessori and subsequent report to the South Australian government as confirmation of "Miss de Lissa's status in the Commonwealth."[39] The new principal's Australian origins and Montessori Diploma were acknowledged at the opening ceremony and on GHTC's letterhead until about 1920.[40] Rarely thereafter, did de Lissa or others in England claim her national identity as Australian and, indeed, she returned to Australia only once in 1955.

After a brief courtship, de Lissa married Harold Turner Thompson, a Captain in the RAF and a sales manager in civilian life in December 1918. An Australian newspaper pointed out that the bride "was better known as Miss de Lissa" and, indeed, she retained her surname.[41] One of the College residences was re-organized to accommodate the newlyweds but there is no further public mention of Thompson's presence in de Lissa's life.[42] Given the rising postwar divorce rates, to which this couple contributed, it might be assumed that some wartime marriages "united men and women who were ill-matched."[43]

By 1924 de Lissa had purchased the "Old Cottage" at Oxshott and was spending her weekends and vacations there, indulging her passion for gardening. This "replica of an Old English Cottage … combined the picturesqueness of the past with the hygienic conveniences of the present."[43] According to Gipsy Hill students, the Old Cottage was "a real dream house made from 500-year-old oak beams and bricks. We thought Miss de Lissa's pictures, brass bowls and other treasures showed to advantage at [Gipsy Hill] but here, as the Americans say, they really 'Belong'." [45] These reports constructed de Lissa as a modern middle class woman and as English in her

cultural and national identity.

Whereas marriage signaled the termination of paid employment for most middle class women, de Lissa's work as GHTC's Principal proceeded apace. The Board of Education regulated "voluntary" (private) training colleges such as GHTC. As the first college to cater specifically for nursery school and infant teachers, GHTC was granted "provisional" status and accorded considerable autonomy over curriculum content and examinations. The Board and external assessors moderated the results.

From the outset, GHTC was portrayed as "breaking new ground" in its focus on a mixture of progressive educational ideas that would bring about "the educational revival in England."[46] Initially de Lissa drew on Froebel, Montessori and Dewey in much the same manner as the KTC, and students had ongoing practical experience in the application of Froebelian and Montessorian methods at Rommany Nursery School which was attached to the College. Although students studied the same subjects as other training colleges, the rationale and content differed, especially in Biology and Hygiene. Biology's purpose was to develop the scientific skills and attitudes to study children in the manner advocated by Montessori, and Hygiene was conceptualized as a social science course that dealt with social conditions, wages, social services and so on.[47] Rennie later stated that the Board of Education "accepted and blessed various rather unconventional departures from ordinary training college procedures … to bring out and foster personal qualities of independence, thoughtfulness and initiative to a greater degree than in ordinary institutional training."[48] Chief among these was the College Council, where students and lecturers shared equally in the general management of the College. GHTC was a democratic community.

Gipsy Hill's reputation as a pioneer college was thus established but its financial position was precarious. Rennie had originally acquired two Victorian mansions on the outskirts of London and with increasing student numbers, three more properties were leased. By 1921 debts had mounted to £10,000. A bequest and Rennie's donation of the balance saved the College but the leases were non-renewable after 1942. GHTC depended entirely on Board of Education grants and student fees, and was never able to accumulate the capital required to buy permanent premises. De Lissa (and Rennie as the College Treasurer) carried this burden for thirty years.[49]

The year 1927 brought permanent recognition by the Board of Education, which de Lissa identified as "our first big landmark." Shortly afterwards the Joint Education Board was formed and GHTC came under the University of London's jurisdiction. Thus Gipsy Hill was incorporated into mainstream British teacher education, and its examinations were more closely aligned with other training colleges. From de Lissa's perspective, the College was seminal to the "extension and development" of nursery education and much

of what was "revolutionary" in GHTC's curriculum and pedagogy became "generally accepted" in the 1930s. However, democratic governance remained as a special feature of this institution.[50]

For de Lissa, 1927 was a landmark in her personal life as well as her work. She took advantage of the 1923 reforms to English divorce laws and in March 1927 filed for divorce, citing her husband's adultery at a hotel "on/about February 15/16 1927."[51] Thompson did not contest the case. Stone argues that

> By allowing a wife to divorce a husband because of a single act of adultery, Parliament had in practice made it easy for the rich to divorce by mutual consent. The way it was done was for the husband to provide his wife with the evidence of his adultery by a procedure known as a "hotel bill case."[52]

The reasons why de Lissa chose to end the marriage officially in 1927 are open to conjecture and neither she nor Thompson is known to have entered into long-term intimate relationships. Given the social stigma surrounding divorce, which intensified with the King's abdication to marry an American divorcee in 1936, the silence about this aspect of de Lissa's life is not surprising.[53]

Although her marital status was not common knowledge, de Lissa's empire-building work was reported privately among Australian friends and publicly in the press. In 1923, for example, Morice passed on "excellent news of Miss de Lissa" to Adelaide's daily newspaper: "At the great Imperial Conference on Education lately held in London, she was the only woman chosen to give an address, and her speech was printed verbatim in the *Times Educational Supplement*."[54] De Lissa articulated her long-held view that nursery schools made valuable contributions to "national life" and specially trained teachers were the keys to their success. She also described GHTC's innovative approach to teacher education.[55] In May 1924 de Lissa chaired a "propaganda meeting" at the British Empire Exhibition at Wembley.[56] These exhibitions were "designed as spectacular tourist attractions that would educate Britons and colonials alike on the extent, power and possibilities of the empire."[57] De Lissa was not speaking as an Australian, but under the auspices of the new Nursery School Association (NSA) whose object was to secure "the effective working of the [1918] Education Act as regards nursery schools."[58] Her "magnificent work of helping to create in this country a demand for nursery schools" would be carried out through this organization.

De Lissa was a key member of the NSA from its foundation in 1923. Besides presenting at its twice-yearly conferences, she participated in publicity campaigns, deputations to government departments and inquiries, and

negotiations with other organizations. The NSA published three of her speeches as pamphlets, thereby indicating the alignment of their ideals.[59] Both focused on the education of the pre-school child (rather than infant care), advocated a range of methodologies, and believed that all children, not just poor children, should attend nursery school. The NSA thus resisted the National Society for Day Nurseries and the Froebel Society's requests for mergers. De Lissa was at the center of both discussions.[60] She became Chairman of the NSA in 1929 and was soon embroiled in a dispute with the NSA President, Margaret McMillan, which resulted in the latter's resignation. McMillan claimed that she was being treated as a "figurehead" by de Lissa and others, and that the NSA was doing "excellent work in well-to-do areas and also for teachers", but neglecting poor children.[61] Nevertheless, de Lissa and the NSA were active in the 1933-34 slum clearance campaign and lobbying for nursery schools on new housing estates.[62] When she resigned as Chairman in 1938, she was eulogized as "a most effective speaker on the Nursery School platform" and "a most competent Chairman."[63]

De Lissa's contribution to international understanding began with her students. Having long held the view that "teachers are not merely makers of men, but makers of society", in 1926 she added that they also needed "to have wide sympathies and to think internationally in terms of human brotherhood."[64] Like many, de Lissa feared another war and her anxieties escalated in 1931 when she took a year's sick leave and spent time in Europe. From Heidelberg she told her students, "Europe is more armed today than in 1914… nothing can save Europe from this catastrophe except education."[65] Gipsy Hill students soon responded by forming a League of Nations Union.[66]

A handful of "students from abroad" gave GHTC an international profile. Among the first was Bek Keng Chui from China. A reference to her as "our little Chinese student", however, is indicative that an imperial hierarchy was embedded in international understanding.[67] As Woollacott points out, white women's interactions with nonwhite people "underscored for them that being white meant being part of the imperial ruling elite."[68] Students from Canada, Denmark, Estonia and Turkey, some sponsored by their governments, attended GHTC. Additionally, some British graduates "carried Gipsy Hill to the ends of the earth."[69] For example, much was made of a GHTC teacher's recruitment by Edna Noble White to set up the first Merrill-Palmer Nursery School in Detroit, and in 1926 the College newsletter proudly announced that "still more Gipsy Hill students have 'Gone West', two of them to The Dalton School" in New York.[70] Although international students and graduates who worked abroad were a minute proportion of the cohort, they featured repeatedly in GHTC publicity and correspondence, including de Lissa's discussions with the Board of Education over the College's future.

With the building leases due to expire in 1942, the College Governors

launched a public appeal for £50,000 in March 1938. In order to support the appeal, the College's twenty-first birthday was a grand occasion. GHTC was constructed as a unique institution, "the first of its kind to prepare teachers for the nursery school movement" as well as making national and international contributions as suggested above.[71] The Duchess of Kent's presence implied that GHTC was important to the British Empire and Queen Mary's visit to the College in 1939 reinforced these connections.[72] News of the Duchess of Kent's visit reached Australia and gave rise to an article on de Lissa, entitled "Nursery School expert in England: Sydney woman's work in establishing movement." This piece constructed de Lissa as an "Australian woman" who was now prominent in English national education and culture, the latter signified by her "charming home." The article also noted that de Lissa was about to publish a book on nursery schools.[73]

Life in the Nursery School was published in July 1939.[74] According to the Reader's Report, this "book by an English teacher on English schools and methods would be more popular than a translated account of similar books" in French and German.[75] There were many reviews in British, Australian and American newspapers and journals, some of which acknowledged the author's Australian origins. The book was praised for its capacity to engage both mothers and teachers, and also for the breadth and balance that came from de Lissa's wide reading. Although she focused on the whole child, her scholarship indicated the increasing influence of psychology in the interwar years. The book sold well and its royalties were added to the Building Fund.[76] However, the outbreak of World War Two dashed all hope of a successful appeal.

Like many other training colleges, GHTC had to evacuate its buildings, which were subsequently destroyed in air raids. After some dislocation, de Lissa leased a mansion in Yorkshire for the remainder of the war years. As well as re-establishing GHTC, she was involved in organizing the mass evacuation of children from London and the emergency provision of wartime nursery schools.[77] Such was her national profile that she was invited to contribute to a series of articles on post war education in the *Times Educational Supplement* in 1942.[78] Then in March 1943 she traveled to the United States with the head of the women's section of the British Information Service, having been invited by the Child Study Association, Progressive Education Association and other groups.[79] De Lissa's three-month lecture tour was extended by popular demand to six months, and she spoke at mixed and women's gatherings across the country. In Detroit where she visited with her friend, Edna Noble White, her major public meeting was advertised as "War-time care of children – Britain answers our questions." In addition to the emergency provision of wartime nurseries, the flyer posed questions about women's war work, juvenile delinquency, the role of labor unions.[80] This tour was indicative not only of de Lissa's national profile but

also her international standing.

As with de Lissa's departure from Australia in 1917, her 1943 lecture tour necessitated careful negotiation of national and imperial sensitivities. Goodman argues that "there remained among most Americans a visceral distrust of British motives" in World War Two.[81] De Lissa experienced this at the end of a meeting of 600-700 women in Pasadena, California, when two of them accused England of starting the war. They yelled loudly "We just won't go on being Santa Claus to England. Stop your wars yourself."[82] This incident was not reported in the American press and de Lissa did not take it to heart. She later commented to an Australian friend "There are such silly prejudices – both sides of the Atlantic."[83] Reports of her speeches in American newspapers were very positive and several identified her as "Australian-born" and "British."[84] These references to de Lissa's dual identity positioned her as an international authority rather than wholly British, and thus diluted the potential for British imperialism. They also implied a shared heritage between Australia and the United States as independent white settler societies.[85] As previously mentioned, her independent girlhood in Australia and her connections with American Frances Newton were emphasized in some newspapers. According to the *Oak Leaves*, "one guest said as Miss de Lissa left, 'If all ambassadors could kindle such friendly feelings for their countries as Miss de Lissa inspires in an hour's talk, it would be easy to achieve that neighborly international community'."[86] From an American perspective there was no evidence of English superiority in de Lissa's presentations, but from her British friend's viewpoint her English charm had conquered American brashness.

> I have thought of you such a lot being rushed about all over the States and always I have felt glad that it was you, with all your keenness and gracious personality, who had been chosen to represent us. They have plenty of keenness in the States, but I doubt if they have much of the other.[87]

Her lecture tour was represented by GHTC students as "the outstanding event of the year", and her diary and newspaper clippings were preserved by the College.[88] In Australia the *Sydney Morning Herald* made sure that its readers knew that de Lissa had formed her ideas in Australia before becoming "one of the leading authorities" in Britain, and that she was now passing them on to the Americans.[89]

De Lissa "nearly wept with joy" to see "the beauty of England" after the grueling tour.[90] She was fifty-eight years old, thought that "a younger woman was needed to build up the work" at GHTC, and longed to retire. But the College was literally homeless. The Board of Education was keen that the

College continue because of its "very good reputation." De Lissa and Rennie were faced with the options of either amalgamating with another training college or persuading a County Council to take over Gipsy Hill. The first option was rejected because it would compromise GHTC's distinctive curriculum and democratic governance. After fruitless discussions with two County Councils, de Lissa and Rennie decided that GHTC would have to close. However, with the support of the Board of Education, they eventually negotiated with the Surrey County Council to take over GHTC from mid-1946. De Lissa supervised its relocation from Yorkshire to Kingston Hill, a suburb of London, inducted her successor, Frances Batstone, and retired at the beginning of 1947.[91]

Although de Lissa ceased paid employment she did not sever her connections with the field of education. Ever concerned to support international understanding, she was involved in a British/American exchange teaching program under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and the English Speaking Union.[92] She continued committee work and chaired a National Union of Teachers (NUT) enquiry into early childhood education. In 1947 she predicted that she would have to write the report as the committee had "too poor a secretary for this."[93] She also mentioned that she was revising a draft for her forthcoming book. The 1944 Education Act had incorporated nursery schools into the national education system and both the NUT report and *Life in the Nursery School and Early Babyhood* focused on postwar reconstruction. De Lissa articulated views she had held from the beginning of her career, namely that "education and social progress must go hand in hand … The contribution men and women are able to make towards the enrichment of national and international life depends on the nature of the education they have received." Of course, teachers were the key to "building a future of national and international significance."[94]

De Lissa's commitments to GHTC graduates and students were also maintained throughout her retirement. Their parting gift was £50 to restock her garden which had been neglected during the war. Along with an invitation to inspect the new garden in 1948, graduates were forewarned that de Lissa

> Had already traced our likenesses in specific flowers. We feel we should go prepared to have some of our cherished personal illusions shattered. All flowers may be charming but if one thought one was a tulip, it would be so disheartening to be pointed out as a diminutive item in a rock garden.[95]

There is no record of illusions shattered or confirmed, and de Lissa maintained contact with some GHTC graduates personally, as well as the Old

Students Association, which she chaired jointly with Batstone.[96] It was her intention to be a "guide, philosopher and friend" to Batstone and their relationship became one of mutual respect.[97]

Between 1947 and 1967 GHTC's Principal and former Principal cooperated in representing its past to students and graduates. De Lissa gave talks on the College's history to current students, checking beforehand "what, from the point of audience would be interesting points to include and what to omit."[98] She also wrote brief historical essays in College newsletters. In most accounts GHTC's raison d'etre was to "change the educational system" and its intellectual traditions were constructed as European. Montessori was always acknowledged and sometimes Holmes, but Froebelian influences were downplayed in the wake of World War Two. Although de Lissa's Australian origins were usually acknowledged, there was no indication that she had drawn on these experiences or on American progressivism. GHTC's curriculum was portrayed as innovative as was its democratic governance, but little was included about its influence internationally.[99] To have highlighted graduates who were employed abroad rather than in Britain would have seemed like a waste of scarce resources in an era of postwar teacher shortages.

In 1953, "old students and many other friends of the College" commissioned Gilbert Spencer to paint de Lissa's portrait, to be hung in the College hall. At the presentation ceremony her progressive theory and practice, and her international profile were highlighted: Her name "was known in many lands"; she had received "a wonderful reception in the United States" and she had also "been invited to return to Australia next year." De Lissa's response began with characteristic humor, thanking Spencer for his "kindness" but "perhaps chiefly, for his great tact in deciding what to leave out."[100] She was equally tactful in this speech for she later wrote "nearly everyone thinks the portrait not only very unflattering, but that it misses the real 'me'! So if the majority opinion is a true one, the future generations will not know what the maker of the College looked like!"[101] Perhaps she had this issue in mind when she commissioned a photographic portrait and presented it to KUSA at their Golden Jubilee celebrations in Adelaide in September 1955.

De Lissa was guest of honor at the KUSA celebrations and a picture book commemorating her as the maker of kindergartens (assisted by Morice and Hawker) was presented to every kindergarten child. Alas, upon meeting her, one little boy could not reconcile her "with the lady in the book … because as he said, 'YOU wear proper clothes'."[102] As this paper has shown, identity is always contextualized and contested, not the least by de Lissa. She had traveled to Australia on a British passport and is recorded as widowed in the shipping register.

The *Advertiser* re-introduced de Lissa to South Australians as "a woman

who played an important part in the establishment of pre-school education in this state, and whose name is distinguished among educationists in the UK and the US."[103] She spent two very busy months in Adelaide, attending the opening of Lillian de Lissa House at the KTC, celebrating her seventieth birthday at a Garden Party, and delivering seven major speeches. Addressing professional women at the Lyceum Club, de Lissa claimed to be an Australian who was not simply abreast of ideas that were circulating within and across national borders but one from whom many ideas radiated during her career. She told of visitors from America and students from "China, Turkey, India, Denmark, Estonia and Canada" who studied at Gipsy Hill "so Australian influence traveled to these lands too." Graduates taught in Canada and the United States, and "a little bit of Australia" was left in Poland as a result of her "educational mission" after World War One. She concluded "it has been a wonderful privilege for me to have been able to take and spread abroad some of the inspiration I received here in Australia and the educational ideas and ideals that took shape during my professional work in this city of Adelaide."[104] Upon returning to England, however, de Lissa published an essay about her early work in Adelaide, (eliding the amalgamation dispute of 1909/10), along with an account of the jubilee celebrations. In contrast to her speech to the Lyceum Club, she simply stated that "Gipsy Hill students will be interested to know that their college, is in a sense, descended from the Adelaide one."[105]

De Lissa's pace of life slowed considerably after she returned from Australia. Her great joy was her garden and 1957 saw "the loveliest of lovely spring … never have I had so many primroses (carpets of them) or bluebells (great pools of blue)."[106] She entertained a steady stream of visitors including family members from Australia, GHTC graduates and even the adult children of KTC graduates. She had always been an avid reader, pronouncing in 1950 that "Churchill's second volume" was "splendid."[107] By 1960 she had resigned from most committees so "had far more leisure", but "life is duller for the lack of contacts the work brought me." She enjoyed the wireless and the new medium of television. However, she was "starving for someone who is interested in ideas and not only things!"[108] Increasingly frail and with prolonged bouts of illness, she employed a gardener and a housekeeper, but spent the last months of her life in a nursing home.

In 1966 Batstone lobbied unsuccessfully to have Lillian de Lissa included in the British New Years Honors list.[109] When she died on 16th October 1967, shortly before her eighty-second birthday, Batstone spoke at her funeral and a eulogy was published in the GHTC newsletter.[110] The NSA established a Lillian de Lissa Memorial fund and donated £500 to the new Lillian de Lissa Nursery School in Birmingham in 1972. Although those who decided the New Years Honors recipients must have contested de Lissa's national influence, the *Birmingham Post* proclaimed her as "one of Britain's greatest

educational pioneers."[111] However, this paper has demonstrated that de Lissa's national identity was never fixed, but constructed in context. Her death was reported in Australia under the heading "World Pioneer in Nursery Education." The first sentence claimed that she "was distinguished among educators in the United Kingdom and United States as well as Australia." Entries claiming her as a significant Australian have subsequently appeared in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography, 200 Australian Women: A Redress Anthology* and books on Australian women pioneers in early childhood education.[112] Such are the transnational connections between people and places that marked de Lissa's life and work.

Notes

[1]Tribute to Lillian de Lissa, De Lissa Graduates Association files, Curriculum Centre, University of South Australia, Magill Campus.

[2]J. Matthews, "Modern Nomads and National Film History: The Multi-Continental Career of J. D. Williams," In *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective,* ed. A. Curthoys and M. Lake. (Canberra: Australian National University E Press, 2005): 167.

[3]J. Goodman, "'Their Market Value Must be Greater for the Experience They had Gained': Secondary School Headmistresses and Empire, 1897-1914," In *Gender, Colonialism and Education: The Politics of Experience,* ed. J. Goodman and J. Martin. (London: Woburn Press, 2002): 188; See also A. Woollacott, *To Try Her Fortune in London: Australian Women, Colonialism and Modernity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

[4]A. Curthoys and M. Lake, "Introduction," in Curthoys and Lake, *Connected Worlds,* 5.

[5]New South Wales Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages, available from http://www.bdm.nsw.gov.au/cgi-bin/IndexSearch?form=IndexingSearch&SessionID+98 INTERNET; J. Matthews, *Dance Hall & Picture Palace: Sydney's Romance with Modernity* (Sydney: Currency Press, 2005):193.

[6]Matthews, *Dance Hall & Picture Palace,* 200; Woollacott, *To Try Her Fortune in London,*16.

[7]*Daily Herald* (Adelaide), 4 January, 1913: 13.

[8]P. Russell, *A Wish of Distinction: Colonial Gentility and Femininity* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1994): 7.

[9]Nora Young, quoted in K. Whitehead, "Women's Life-Work: Teachers in South Australia, 1836-1906," PhD Thesis, University of Adelaide, 1996: 62.

[10]H. Jones, "The Acceptable Crusader: Lillian de Lissa and Pre-School Education in South Australia," In *Melbourne Studies in Education 1975, ed.* S. Murray-Smith. (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1975): 126-129.

[11]E. Russell, "What is the Kindergarten? Teaching the Froebel System in Australia." *New Idea,* 6 May, 1903: 794-795; see also Matthews, *Dance Hall & Picture Palace*, 202.

[12]"Final Report of the Royal Commission on Education Together with Minutes of Proceedings, Evidence and Appendices," *South Australian Parliamentary Papers 1913*, no. 75: 122.

[13]P. Summerfield, *Reconstructing Women's Wartime Lives: Discourse and Subjectivity in Oral Histories of the Second World War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998): 20.

[14]*Daily Herald* (Adelaide), 4 January, 1913: 13.

[15]*Lone Hand* (Adelaide), 1 February, 1913: xxxvi.

[16]*Lone Hand* (Adelaide), 1 May, 1913: 54-55.

[17]"Final Report of the Royal Commission on Education," 129.

[18]Undated newspaper clipping, Edith Hubbe (Cook) and Marjorie Caw (Hubbe) Papers 1859-1988, MSS 0046/47/2, Barr Smith Library (BSL) Special Collection, University of Adelaide (hereafter Hubbe-Caw Papers, BSL).

[19]*Daily Times* (Chicago), 21 April, 1943: 30.

[20]*Oakland Tribune,* 21 June, 1943.

[21]*Gipsy Hill Training College Newsletter*, June 1957: 2.

[22]Jones, "The Acceptable Crusader," 127-137.

[23]L. Trethewey, "Lucy Spence Morice: 'Mother of Kindergartens' in South Australia," *History of Education Review* 37, no. 2 (2008): 14-25.

[24]L. de Lissa to Mrs Finniss, 4 June 1962, De Lissa Graduates Association files, Curriculum Centre, University of South Australia, Magill Campus.

[25]*West Australian* (Perth), 16 September, 1911: 11.

[26]*Lone Hand* (Adelaide), 1 February, 1913: xxxvi.

[27]*Australian Kindergarten Magazine,* 11, no. 2 (1911): 5.

[28]*Daily News* (Perth), 15 September, 1911: 8.

[29]L. de Lissa to Miss Trevan-Hawke, undated, Gipsy Hill Training College Box 26, Kingston University Archives and Special Collections (hereafter GHTC Box 26).

[30]K. Whitehead, "The Construction of Early Childhood Teachers' Professional Identities, Then and Now," *Australian Journal of Early Childhood* 33, no. 3 (2008): 35-36.

[31]Kindergarten Union of South Australia Annual Report 1915/16: 8, State Library of South Australia (hereafter SLSA).

[32]K. Whitehead, "'A Decided Disadvantage for the Kindergarten Students to Mix with the State Teachers'," *Paedagogica Historica* (in press).

[33]Whitehead, "The Construction of Early Childhood Teachers' Professional Identities," 37.

[34]L. de Lissa to Chairman of Kindergarten Union, 1 September 1915, Kindergarten Association of Western Australia, MN 525 Acc 2308A/159, J. S. Battye Library of West Australian History.

[35]*Observer* (Adelaide), 24 February, 1917: 27; Woollacott, *To Try Her Fortune in London,* 6.

[36]*Observer* (Adelaide), 24 February, 1917: 27.

[37]Kindergarten Union of South Australia Annual Report 1916/17: 2, SLSA.

[38]*Gipsy Hill Training College Newsletter*, June 1957: 2; See also Woollacott, *To Try Her Fortune in London,* 14, 34, 48.

[39]B. Rennie to Secretary, Board of Education, 29 March 1917, 14 May 1917, GHTC

Box 15.

[40]*Times Educational Supplement,* 18 October, 1917: 400.

[41]*Observer* (Adelaide), 12 April, 1919: 42.

[42]*Gipsy Trail* no. 1, 1921-22: 12-14.

[43]R. Phillips, *Putting Asunder: A History of Divorce in Western Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988): 519.

[44]Undated newspaper clipping, MSS 0046/47/2, Hubbe-Caw Papers, BSL.

[45]*Wraggle-Taggles, One and All,* June 1925.

[46]*Times Educational Supplement,* 18 October, 1917: 400.

[47]Whitehead, "The Construction of Early Childhood Teachers' Professional Identities," 37-39.

[48]B. Rennie to E. Wilkinson, 1 October 1945, Gipsy Hill Training College – General Correspondence 1946, ED 78/376, The National Archives of the United Kingdom (hereafter TNA).

[49]Whitehead, "The Construction of Early Childhood Teachers' Professional Identities," 37-38.

[50]*Gipsy Hill Training College Newsletter*, June 1958: 5-6.

[51]Divorce Petition, Thompson, Lillian Daphne V Thompson Harold Turner, J77/2391, TNA.

[52]L. Stone, *Road to Divorce: England 1530-1987* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990): 397.

[53]Phillips, *Putting Asunder,*528.

[54]Undated newspaper clipping, MSS 0046/47/4, Hubbe-Caw Papers, BSL.

[55]*Times Educational Supplement,* 30 June, 1923: 305-306.

[56]Nursery School Association First Annual Report, 1924:1, British Association of Early Childhood Education 22/1, London School of Economics (hereafter BAECE 22/1, LSE).

[57]Woollacott, *To Try Her Fortune in London,* 149.

[58]G. Owen, *Nursery School Education,* 3rd Edition (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1928): 6.

[59]See minutes 16 October 1936 and 22 January 1937, NSA Publications Committee Minutes 1936-1938, BAECE 21/6, LSE.

[60]K. Nawrotzki, "'Froebel is Dead; Long Live Froebel!' The National Froebel Foundation and English Education," *History of Education* 35, no. 2 (2006): 214-215.

[61]M. McMillan to L. de Lissa, 8 May 1929, 18 May 1929, Margaret McMillan correspondence 1927-1930 BAECE13/8, LSE.

[62]*The Times*, 17 October, 1933: 10; Nursery School Association Twelfth Annual Report, 1935: 12, BAECE 22/3, LSE.

[63]NSA Fifteenth Annual Report 1938: 1, BAECE 22/4, LSE.

[64]*Gipsy Trail* no. 5, 1925-26: 2.

[65]*Wraggle-Taggles, One and All,* November 1931, GHTC Box 3.

[66]University of London. Training Colleges Delegacy, Visitation of Gipsy Hill Training College for Teachers of Young Children, 21 February 1933, ED 78/39, TNA; *Gipsy Trail* no. 14, 1934-35: 1.

[67]*Gipsy Trail* no. 4, 1924-25:10-11.

[68]Woollacott, *To Try Her Fortune in London,* 14.

[69]*Gipsy Trail* no. 18, 1938-39: 3.

[70]*Wraggle-Taggles, One and All,* May 1926, November 1926, GHTC Box 3.

[71]*The Times,* 2 April, 1938: 8;11 November, 1938: 11; *Gipsy Trail* no. 18, 1938-39: 3.

[72]*Gipsy Trail* no. 18, 1938-39: 2.

[73]Undated newspaper clipping, MSS 0046/47/2, Hubbe-Caw Papers, BSL.

[74]L. de Lissa, *Life in the Nursery School* (London: Longmans Green and Co.,1939).

[75]"Extract from Reader's Report," GHTC Box 26.

[76]Mr Higham to L. de Lissa, 8 February 1940, and 11 November 1944 and also Newspaper Clippings Book, GHTC Box 26.

[77]*Wraggle-Taggles, One and All*, Summer 1943, GHTC Box 3; *Gipsy Trail* no. 19, 1947-48: 3.

[78]*Times Educational Supplement,* 24 January, 1942: 41; 31 January, 1942: 53.

[79]*Washington Post,* 27 March, 1943: 1B.

[80]See flyer in Merrill-Palmer Institute: Edna Noble White Collection Acc. 1066, Box 58, Folder 12, Archives of Labor and Urban Affairs, Wayne State University (hereafter Edna Noble White Papers, WSU).

[81]D. Goodman, "Loving and Hating Britain: Rereading the Isolationist Debate in the USA," In *Britishness Abroad: Transnational Movements and Imperial Cultures,* ed. K. Darian-Smith, P. Grimshaw and S. Macintyre. (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2007): 193.

[82]L. de Lissa to M. Gutteridge, 9 June 1943, Box 58, Folder 14, Edna Noble White Papers, WSU.

[83]L. de Lissa to M. Gutteridge, 19 November 1944, Box 58, Folder 13, Edna Noble White Papers, WSU.

[84]See for example *Pasadena Star Times,* 6 July, 1943; *Los Angeles Times*, 4 June 1943: A5; *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 26 April, 1943: 22; *New York Times,* 11 March, 1943 in Newspaper Clippings Book, GHTC Box 26.

[85]Curthoys and Lake, "Introduction," 10.

[86]*Oak Leaves,* 6 May, 1943.

[87]J. Boyce to L. de Lissa, 20 October 1943, GHTC Box 26.

[88]*Wraggle-Taggles, One and All*, Summer 1943, GHTC Box 3; 'Diary of American Tour', GHTC Box 9; Newspaper Clippings Book, GHTC Box 26.

[89]*Sydney Morning Herald,* undated, GHTC Box 9.

[90]L. de Lissa to Mr Ayrton, 23 September 1943, GHTC Box 16.

[91]L. de Lissa to Mr Woodhead, 26 May 1945, GHTC Box 16; Gipsy Hill Training College correspondence 1937-1945 ED 78/124, TNA; *Gipsy Trail* no. 19, 1947: 4.

[92]*Advertiser,* 9 September, 1955: 10; L. de Lissa to M. Caw, 1 July 1956, MSS 0046/47/1, Hubbe-Caw Papers, BSL.

[93]L. de Lissa to M. Caw, 17 December 1947, MSS 0046/47/1, Hubbe-Caw Papers, BSL.

[94]L. de Lissa, *Life in the Nursery School and in Early Babyhood* (London: Longmans Green and Co.,1949): x; National Union of Teachers, *Nursery-Infant Education: Report of the Consultative Committee Appointed by the Executive of the National Union of Teachers* (London: Evans Bros Ltd, 1949).

[95]*Wraggle-Taggles, One and All,* May 1948.

[96]L. de Lissa to Old Students, undated, GHTC Box 3.

[97]See correspondence in GHTC Box 10.

[98]L. de Lissa to F. Batstone, undated, GHTC Box 10.

[99]*Gipsy Hill Training College Newsletter,* June 1958: 2-8.

[100]B. Rennie to Miss Trevan-Hawke, 27 October 1953, GHTC Box 3; *Presentation of the Portrait of Miss Lillian de Lissa, First Principal 1917-1947 by Gilbert Spencer, ARA* (Mayfield: The Mayfield Press, 1953): 1-6, GHTC Box 3.

[101]L. de Lissa to F. Batstone, 23 June 1954, GHTC Box 10.

[102]*Gipsy Hill Training College Newsletter,* June 1957: 4.

[103]*Advertiser,* 9 September, 1955: 10.

[104]*Talks Given by Lillian de Lissa at the Golden Jubilee of the Kindergarten Union of South Australia 1955* (Adelaide: Kindergarten Union of South Australia, 1975): 3-6.

[105]*Gipsy Hill Training College Newsletter*, June 1957: 4.

[106]L. de Lissa to M. Caw, 27 April 1957, MSS 0046/47/1, Hubbe-Caw Papers, BSL.

[107]L. de Lissa to M. Caw, 19 March 1950, MSS 0046/47/1, Hubbe-Caw Papers, BSL.

[108]L. de Lissa to K. Mellor and D. Hughes, 1 November 1960, and 24 February 1962, De Lissa Graduates Association files, Curriculum Centre, University of South Australia, Magill Campus.

[109]See draft of application, 12 October 1966, GHTC Box 3.

[110]*Gipsy Hill Training College Newsletter,* 1968: 5.

[111]*Birmingham Post,* 26 April, 1972.

[112]*Australian Dictionary of Biography,* Vol. 8 (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press): 273-274; H. Radi, *200 Australian Women: A Redress Anthology* (Sydney: Women's Redress Press Inc., 1988): 146; J. Waters, *With Passion, Perseverance and Practicality: 100 Women Who Influenced Australian Children's Services, 1841-2001* (Melbourne: OEMP Australia, 2002): 62-63.

Lucy Spence Morice:
Working Towards a Just Society Via the Education of Citizens and Socialist Feminist Collective Action

Lynne Trethewey
University of South Australia

Brought up in the free-thinking tradition of the Unitarian Church but turning to Socialism and the Anglican Church after marriage, Lucy Spence Morice (1859-1951) was actively engaged in the educative work of numerous intellectual and social reform groups in Adelaide, South Australia (SA), from 1895 onwards. Other than inclusion in Jones' research publications of the 1980s[1], however, Morice's name and place in South Australian history is all but forgotten. This article seeks to revivify memories of Morice as an enfranchised, cultured, intellectual woman possessed of a highly-developed social conscience and a wide-awake vital interest in the foremost questions of the day, whose life was devoted to the pursuit of social justice in the interests of women and children especially.

The ensuing exposition of Morice's political philosophy and contribution to the advancement of post-suffrage feminist causes in South Australian society pulls together, expands upon, and re-interprets Jones' seminal work on Morice and her associates from a feminist revisionist historical perspective. Informed by the writings of Caine, Lewis, Ryan and Lake[2], this article utilizes biographical methods and network analysis to help explain the genesis of Morice's passion for studying social problems 'from all sides', and her socialist-feminist politics. It seeks also to argue that her informal but expansive social ties, plus her links to professional women and social progressives of both sexes, were central to her unpaid labour in organiza-

tions/associations which aimed to effect reforms via the education of citizens and collective, non-party political activism.

"Surrounded by fine and enriching influences in her early life, Mrs. Morice is not a sympathiser merely on the surface"

Louise (Lucy) Spence Morice, daughter of Jessie (née Cumming) and John Brodie Spence (E.S.& A. Bank manager, State M.P. 1881-87), was born in Adelaide on 1 March 1859. Brought up "in the broadest possible way" in the Unitarian Church rather than the orthodox Presbyterianism of her Scottish forebears, Lucy was educated in private schools. In the summer quarter when the Spences resided at the beach suburb of Glenelg she attended "the most absurd educational establishment where the girls of the first families learnt to read, write and do sums", conducted by "an ancient Scottish lady" whose pedagogical approach involved the use of Dr. Brewer's *Guides to Knowledge* – "questions and answers to be memorized". Whilst otherwise living above the E.S. & A. Bank city branch, she appreciated the "most intelligent teaching of English and French" by the "quite unconventional" Annie Montgomery Martin at her progressive school for girls, mainly from Unitarian and other non-conformist families, in Pulteney Street, Adelaide.[3] Here it is important to note that Unitarians like the Spences and Miss Martin, to whom Lucy owed to a great extent her love and knowledge of literature, were an intellectual elite in colonial Adelaide. Prominent in discussions of contemporary issues and at the forefront of social reform, subscribers represented every shade of political opinion for the Church's principal appeal to well-educated people of substantial means lay in its emphasis on rationality and, in the tradition of nineteenth-century liberalism, the right to individual conscience and independent conviction. A member of the Suffrage League deputation to the Premier in 1891, Martin was also active in the (short-lived) Woman's League which Morice initiated in July 1895 with a view to educating recently-enfranchised South Australian women "socially and politically … apart from all considerations of class and party, and to interest ourselves specially in questions relating to women and children".[4]

The young Lucy Spence was also surrounded by "fine and enriching" family influences. "To have had Catherine Helen Spence for my aunt", she enthused, "was indeed wonderfully good fortune, and added to that my beloved parents, John and Jessie Spence, both of them intelligent, educated, liberal and over-flowing with kindness".[5] In particular, her distinguished 'Auntie Kate' – a teacher, journalist, author, Unitarian Church preacher, philanthropist, political and social reformer, and self-styled 'new woman' of the late nineteenth century - was to niece Lucy a dear friend, mentor and inspira-

tional role model. Describing her as "a wonderful personality with such a generosity of mind and such marvellous knowledge stored up", who "made no social nor cultural distinctions", Lucy considered that knowing C. H. Spence was in itself a liberal education. Further recalling her aunt's regular Sunday visits after church, armed with a sheaf of letters from world-wide correspondents to discuss with her favourite brother, Lucy averred: "I was the only one of the clan (second-generation) who cared for any of the things which so vitally interested her and my father. Socialism, Single Tax, Proportional Representation, Communism … all phases of religious thought and philosophy … everything for the furtherance of human happiness and well being she studied earnestly, and all schemes for betterment and reform had her attention".[6] Thus, even in her 'carefree days' Lucy was "not without a sense that there were more interesting and dignified employments in life than ribbon work and gossip, and for this I was indebted to my kinswoman Catherine Helen Spence [whose] motto was 'Everything human can be improved'." [7]

As Jones summarizes, the bond between Lucy and her Auntie Kate (even stronger after John Spence's death in 1902) was based on strong family ties, their shared Unitarian faith and deep love of reading, many mutual friends, and years of co-operation in working for social justice, especially for women and children, from mid-1895 until C. H. Spence died on 3 April 1910. Morice's own niece, Anne Wainwright, claims that what Morice wrote of 'Auntie Kate' is self-revealing, for she too gave freely to anyone needing practical help or understanding and was entirely without class prejudice. Always interested in women's reform efforts, she kept herself well informed on current affairs at home and abroad, had connections to "everyone who was 'doing anything' [in Adelaide]" and therefore likely to engage with her in varied forms of social service – all the while being "as devoted to new ideas as most people are to old" and studying the underlying causes of social ills from wide-ranging viewpoints.[8] Jones' description is of a woman more passionate and impulsive than her aunt, equally dedicated to righting social wrongs but whose energy for some years was directed to her family.

Lucy Spence married London-born and Bedford Grammar School-educated James Percy Morice (SA parliamentary librarian 1886-1918 and parliamentary clerk 1901-1936) at a Unitarian service in her father's home, "Fenton", Glenelg, on 20 March 1886. In 1892 she gave birth to a son and some time later a daughter who died shortly after being delivered by a midwife whose unprofessional, unhygienic ways almost caused Mrs. Morice's death too. Only the intervention of her neighbour and close friend Joanna, wife of the wealthy businessman and philanthropist Robert Barr Smith, saved her life. In the broader context of early twentieth century concern about the high rate of infant mortality, this birthing experience combined with Morice's compassion for all children furnished a personal motive for her later joining

the Puericulture Committee of the British Science Guild SA Branch (inaugurated July 1910), which repeatedly lobbied Parliament in the 1910s for implementation of its recommendations on infant nurture, maternal education, early notification of births and the registration of mid-wives. Also to found the Adelaide School for Mothers with Dr. Helen Mayo (an Adelaide medical graduate) in 1909, and as the Institute's first president to campaign against high infant mortality rates.[9]

Morice's socialist-feminist politics

Morice's activism in the 1890s and early twentieth century was premised largely on Fabian ideas and feminist modes of 'doing politics'. Her feminist politics were clearly influenced by C. H. Spence and their mutual friends in the fin de siècle women's movement in Australia – most notably Annie M. Martin and Rose Birks who both held office in the South Australian Woman's Suffrage League, and the founders of women's non-party political education associations interstate, Rose Scott in New South Wales and Vida Goldstein in Victoria. These leading women subscribed to the following tenets of organized post-suffrage feminism: non-party, non-sectarian ideal; stand together as women irrespective of class or cultural difference; emphasis on educating women socially and politically; spirit of co-operation with men in politics; key role of the state in making collective provision for the less fortunate; equal citizenship and an equal moral standard for men and women a major aim; joint action to educate the public and pressure governments. Summarizing her own strongly-held beliefs, Morice declared before a 1920s' meeting of the Adelaide Archdiocesan Mothers' Union: "What is necessary for the common weal is individual conscience and collective action. … We are citizens with duties to fulfill to the community to which we belong … the chiefest [being] the education of the ignorant, the protection of the weak; and [since] individually power is very small we must join together with societies for doing that great work that is waiting to be accomplished".[10] Now because "knowledge without action is barren and action without knowledge is often disastrous", she added, we must first educate ourselves by studying social problems in depth, then act – constitutionally, in united fashion and undaunted by criticism, to develop public opinion in favour of whatever reforms may be required.

Her embracing of Fabianism came after the Morices read, "with illuminating effect", all of George Bernard Shaw's works and tracts produced by the Fabian Society in London (established 1884), which were regularly debated in the socio-political and intellectual circles in which they moved. Fabianism, an approach to the study of social questions based on socialist ideas, eschewed grandiose theoretical speculations and concentrated on how to

implement detailed practical reforms by constitutional means. Fabians rejected the economic doctrine of laissez-faire and, putting their hopes in the 'permeation' of existing institutions and the 'inevitability of gradualness', stressed the need for state action to ensure greater equality and the elimination of poverty.[11] The Morices foregathered with the Shaws, the Chestertons, the Sidney Webbs and other prominent Fabians in London in 1903. They became particularly friendly with Mr. Pease, secretary of the Fabian Society, and his "extraordinarily capable" wife whom Lucy greatly admired: "She was one of those clever and charming women who somehow combined djibbahs and domesticity, cooking and intellectual conversation – a Poor Law guardian, a member of the Board of Education, and the best of wives and housekeepers. The Labor Party afterwards invited her to become a candidate for Parliament".[12] On returning to South Australia the Morices helped to found an Adelaide Fabian group together with an Anglican clergyman, for according to Lucy it was becoming a Socialist that led her into the English Church. Here she discovered anew "the simple, beautiful Socialism of the Gospels", declaring that "as a matter of fact Socialism is only this – an effort to put into practical politics the teaching of them".[13]

"My dear, I have hitched my wagon to so many stars!" Engaged all her adult life in the most varied forms of social service and education

The right to vote was extended to South Australian women in January 1895. Freed by domestic help, and with husband James sharing her passion for modern literature and for delving deeply into the reason of existing social conditions, a middle-aged Lucy Morice embarked upon multifarious reform projects.

1. Morice's first public experiment in women's social and political education

Morice's socialist-feminist politics, personal ideals, and preferred modus operandi are nowhere more clearly articulated than in her inaugural address to the Woman's League (WL) that she and C. H. Spence founded together in July 1895. It is therefore worth quoting at length.

> So long as we women of South Australia were unenfranchised there was much talk amongst those in favour of the extended franchise as to the effect we should have. Public life was to be moralised and politics purified, but the Bill has been passed for more than six months and what do we find? The women are either doing nothing to fit themselves for the task …. or else joining on to the existing Leagues and accepting the teachings and opinions of their leaders. Some of us,

feeling that this line of action might stultify us, and could not lend to independence of thought, determined to try and rouse ourselves and other women to form a 'Woman's League'.

Realizing that individually only a few of us are capable of teaching, yet the co-operative force of many earnest-minded women must be a force for good, the first object of the Woman's League is educational – To educate ourselves, politically and socially, that we may be capable of intelligently taking part in the politics of our country. To attain this end we must realize our own ignorance, and once having done that, set about diligently learning and unlearning; giving to matters of public importance conscientious and disinterested thought. With our own advancement will come as matter of course the necessity for able representatives, and our endeavours must be given to securing these men, or, if need be, women of ability and good character. The means of education that the League proposes to adopt is, first of all, a series of free elementary lectures to be given by those who have had some experience and opportunity for study on such subjects as 'Our Duties as Citizens'. We hope shortly to start a library for members, and shall be glad of gifts of books on political and social subjects.

The second object, which contains in its essence, to my mind, the most important factor of all, is the assertion that we are to stand together as women, apart from all considerations of class and party. … The latter part of clause 2 comes as a natural sequence – 'To interest ourselves specially in questions affecting women and children'. That means a great deal, following as it does upon a recognition of our common womanhood and consequent sisterhood. We hope that the League, formed as it is on a basis of absolute equality, will be able to so act upon public opinion that Early Closing Acts will be unnecessary and sweating work impossible.

The third object – 'To try by all means in our power to interest other women in this movement, and to awaken in them a sense of responsibility', is one that every League member should take to heart. If each one of us works for the cause in our own circle, quietly and earnestly, it will spread and spread, and become a real power for good in the land.[14]

Subsequently speaking out in opposition to the Woman's League joining forces with the National Defence League and Young Liberal Party Association, Morice further revealed her ideological stance. The main reason for not allying themselves with such associations, she argued, was to avoid binding WL members to vote according to the dictates of their male Executives – not only because these associations fought against extension of the franchise to women but now, seemingly intent on silencing women's

voices or calling upon them to vote in the interests of the propertied and privileged classes, were acting "with unconstitutionality and unconscientiously". To have any effect on the political world, she elaborated, "we should stand clear of existing parties and make a new party to support the right and not the expedient course; a woman's party for all women where those of the classes above stand shoulder to shoulder with their sisters of the masses", each learning from the other so as to break down mutual distrust and suspicion between rich and poor, the educated and the uneducated, "which in itself would help the work along".[15] Few of us recognize the interdependence of humanity, she continued, "that if one class suffers wrong and injustice in the long run the consequences inevitably must be felt by the whole body politic". Besides, it was in their own interests to demand of the state that the people shall be decently housed, educated and employed, the weak protected, the strong curbed; and albeit "state control is stigmatised as Socialism, with our very imperfect human nature we need a system by which at least equality of opportunity can be guaranteed to the sons of men". In conclusion, Morice asked WL members to go into the question at issue for themselves: "do not be content with the shallow learning of people who only repeat parrot-like and who have never given an hour's serious study to any of the social problems confronting us". If any wished to know what socialism is, though, she would recommend the Fabian Society's publication of the same title, it being "the best exposition of our aims and ideals that has been written".[16]

Over the next year the Woman's League held meetings on a catholic range of topics: "The State Ourselves", early closing, better protection for young girls, constitutional reform, free education, the Guttenberg System, amendment of laws in respect of women and children, effective voting, official and parliamentary positions for women, property laws, "Foundations of Government", vivisection, "Individualism and Collectivism", Federation, "Lessons from the recent elections", the laws of bequest and maintenance, plus Morice's own papers on the nationalisation of health and the Fabian Society publication "Sweating, its causes and cure". Additionally, the League Committee voted to preserve any important lectures, speeches and letters on political and social questions garnered from Adelaide's two daily newspapers, worked co-operatively with the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) and the Working Women's Trade Union (WWTU), and publicized its open meetings, held "to discuss serious subjects for our enlightenment", in the Woman's Column of the *Weekly Herald* (Adelaide's labor newspaper).[17] To Morice's great disappointment, though, the Woman's League ended in April 1897 – in her view because of the absorption of women into party politics and "Brother Man, who desired above all things to keep the world safe for [male-controlled] democracy and sound finance, and distrusted the entry into polit-

ical life of mothers and wives and sisters who might be expected to bring along disturbing ideas and suggestions".[18] Irrespective of the reasons for the League's demise, as Jones points out, Morice's experience of her first public venture gave her a basis for future activities – notably in the Women's Non-Party Political Association (WNPPA) which she founded in July 1909 on the advice of Victorian feminist and long-time friend Vida Goldstein.

2. Social study and women's industrial reform

In the interim and beyond, Morice engaged in a range of other intellectual pursuits as well as social and industrial reform initiatives, always for the purposes of self- and public education and based on the principle of co-operation. In sequence, there was 'The Social Students' over which C.H. Spence presided: "a very small, insignificant body of no practical importance, just enquiring into things".[19] Morice was also a member of the Theosophical Society (like her aunt), held salon afternoons for 'interesting persons' of different intellectual persuasions, and in 1911-12 served on the board of the Adelaide Literary Theatre. All the while she kept in touch with even the smallest sidelines of social reform throughout the globe via newspapers, her network of interstate and overseas correspondents, and the modern literature in the fields of social work, education, history and philosophy she avidly read.

Next came the Working Women's Co-operative Clothing Company (WWCCC) whose factory was opened by C. H. Spence in February 1902. Morice was a 'housewife' member, her aunt's successor as Board chairman in 1910, and liquidator in February 1913 when notices of winding up the company were issued. An idealistic enterprise designed to overcome women's economic difficulties, the Company provided exemplary working conditions in its capacious, well-lit, scrupulously clean and electric-powered two-storied factory for the mutual benefit of members. The all-female shareholders in this co-operative venture were a truly representative group, comprising those who designated themselves 'lady', many 'housewives', a grocer, a baker, a domestic servant, matron of a girls' club, a nurse at the Destitute Asylum, WCTU members, several school teachers, women employed in the clothing trade, the WWTU secretary, Inspector of Factories Agnes Milne, and Morice's close friend Joanna Barr Smith (née Elder, whose brother Thomas and husband Robert were partners in a leading mercantile and pastoral firm). Jones concludes from the foregoing list of shareholders' names and occupations that such widely-based co-operation provided powerful evidence of the effects of informal education among women on industrial matters and opened opportunities for further influence.[20]

During this same period, as the WWCCC flourished, Morice and C. H. Spence also supported a new women's trade union, the Women Employees' Mutual Association (WEMA), whose aims were to: "1. improve the conditions

of employment in the various classes of work engaged in by its members; 2. amicably settle by conference or arbitration any dispute which may arise between employers and its members; 3. promote the welfare of its members morally, socially and intellectually; 4. co-operate with other organisations having similar objects and aims; 5. carry out the provisions of the Provident Fund".[21] Morice joined the United Trades and Labor Council committee which collaborated with another committee from the Working Women's Trade Union to bring Labor organizer Miss Lilian Locke of Victoria to Adelaide. The goal of this endeavour was to get 'all sorts' of women workers organized (not just those in the clothing trade already represented by the WWTU, formed in 1889 in response to the problems of sweated labour). Arriving in Adelaide on 16 September 1905, Locke spent the next three weeks publicizing her message of women's industrial unity and friendly co-operation at public meetings in the city and suburbs, in the homes of 'lady sympathisers' like Morice, at Democratic Clubs, and at a Trades Hall social gathering over which Labor Premier Thomas Price presided. Exemplifying the links that existed in Adelaide between women from differing backgrounds who worked for common causes, Locke stayed with Morice for one week of her visit and Morice subsequently became an active honorary WEMA member. She 'presided' at the piano for the opening song, "Come friends, the world wants mending", at its first meeting in January 1906 and addressed the April 23 meeting on the co-operative movement in Ghent (where, two months prior, a convention of socialist women had resolved to agitate for universal women's suffrage and the election of women socialists to public office).[22]

Shortly thereafter Morice discontinued active participation in the WEMA due to other time-consuming commitments. Most notable among these commitments were her unpaid work in connection with the fledgling free kindergarten movement in South Australia, the Adelaide School for Mothers' Institute, and the Puericulture Committee of the British Science Guild SA Branch, plus the foundation of a new but this time practical experiment in women's political education and social reform – the Women's Non-Party Political Association (WNPPA). All this in a period when improved paediatric practices and New Education ideas had reached Australia amid concern about the education, health and welfare of 'the child as a future citizen' and post-suffrage feminists articulated the idea of Australia as an ethical, maternalist welfare state. Members of feminist organizations such as the WNPPA in Adelaide thus worked together to enhance women's independence but also addressed the realities of interdependence, calling for collective provision and state regulation as well as the appointment of women to a range of protective positions in state bureaucracies.[23]

3. Women and child health, education, and welfare initiatives

A recent article by Trethewey[24] details Morice's contribution to the cause of Kindergarten in South Australia, which in a life dedicated to varied forms of philanthropic social service became her dearest work. Kindergarten she regarded as "not a charity but a far-reaching educational reform, … a regenerating factor which brings love and order and beauty into the lives and homes of the people, … a spiritual force helping to build securely the future of the Commonwealth".[25] Earning the appellation 'mother of the kindergartens' in Adelaide, Morice played a key role within the Kindergarten Union of South Australia (KUSA) that she co-founded in September 1905. As long-serving honorary secretary of the Union and its education committee she gave KUSA's record a continuity it could not otherwise have had. As an unpaid lecturer at the Kindergarten Teachers' College she made her history of education course "a good line of hooks on which to hang her many ideas and ideals of education".[26] She was also a prime force in the first decade of the Kindergarten Graduates' Club whose program provided in-service education for kindergartners, was an important additional means of funding KUSA's activities, and strengthened bonds of friendship as well as the social service ideals that underpinned the Union's work. Lastly, as with her other reform initiatives, Morice exploited her social connections to the full in advancing the cause of Kindergarten financially, policy-wise and practically.

Then, as a result of networking with visiting delegates at the May 1909 Interstate Congress of Workers among Dependent Children in Adelaide, and stimulated by an address on the St. Pancras School for Mothers that Englishman Mr. McDougall delivered before a small gathering of women whilst visiting his sister, Rose Birks, Morice co-founded the Adelaide School for Mothers Institute with Dr. Helen Mayo. Morice chaired the inaugural School for Mothers Committee meeting, held on 22 September 1909, at which the aim of the association was defined: "to promote the education of the Mother in all that concerns the physical, mental and moral development of herself and her offspring … avoiding charity in any material sense" such that "when the workers of the Association meet with cases of need they shall communicate with the charitable agencies already existing".[27] The actual work and implementation of policy lay mainly with Dr. Mayo and Miss Harriet Stirling, a member of the State Children's Council along with C. H. Spence. Paid secretarial assistance was provided by social welfare activist Annie Hornabrook, daughter of Archdeacon Hornabrook whom Morice knew well through her affiliation with the Church of England. Hornabrook's brief was to attend the weekly (from 1910 fortnightly) mothers' meetings where work "of a practical and educational character" was undertaken; also all committee meetings, and to do some home visiting. Notably, all three women were foundation members of the WNPPA which Morice was

similarly inspired to form by a delegate at the aforementioned child welfare conference – Vida Goldstein, representing the Women's Political Association of Victoria, who stayed with the Morices during her visit from Melbourne.

Mayo was also involved with Morice in the work of the Kindergarten Union. Illustrating the strong personal links that underpinned the complementary activities of KUSA and the Adelaide School for Mothers, she acted as both medical officer to the kindergarten children and unpaid lecturer in hygiene at KTC until November 1910. In her role of KU Organising Secretary Morice arranged for the Mothers' School to begin as an amplification of existing KU Mothers' Clubs, meeting on Thursday afternoons at the Franklin Street Free Kindergarten where advice was given on feeding, bathing, dressing and sewing babies' clothes in addition to the routine weighing of infants to help determine their general progress. When president of the School for Mothers Institute from September 1909 until March 1911, Morice in typical fashion also drew upon her excellent organizing skills and extensive social contacts to engage speakers for the program of lectures/demonstrations, arrange a public meeting to publicize the School's work, hold a fund-raising performance of "Prunella", and hold tea-parties for kindergarten mothers to explain plans for the next year. Meanwhile she also encouraged Central Methodist Mission crêche workers to collaborate with the Mothers' School and she actively supported Mayo's campaign to reduce the high rate of infant and maternal deaths in South Australia. Mayo and Stirling's health care initiative thus successfully launched under Morice's presidential wing, the Adelaide School's work quickly expanded in the Institute's own premises and later at suburban and country branches.[28] Re-named the Mothers' and Babies' Health Association in 1926, the School for Mothers was credited with having been responsible for a steady fall in the State's infant mortality rate to a low 2.3 per cent of births in 1937.

After resigning from the School for Mothers' Institute Committee, Morice pursued the work of women and child health reform through the puericulture sub-committee of the Science Guild. The Guild's modus operandi was consistent with Morice's preferred way of 'doing politics.' Thus, before tabling reports in February 1914 and in 1916, the Puericulture Committee's professional and lay members of both sexes firstly enquired into the conditions of children's birth, rearing, and health. Their recommendations were then set before the Guild "for consideration, discussion and finality, also to a practical issue". The Guild subsequently proceeded, "by joint action, to convince the people at large, the Government and political parties, by means of publications, meetings, lectures, conferences and deputations", of the necessity of applying scientific principles to all branches of human endeavour as affected the national welfare.[29] Constituted "as a distinct educational movement", the Guild in Adelaide attracted interest in its puericulture

work through re-publication in *The Mail* from week to week "those of its reports which bear upon the physical, intellectual and moral improvement of childhood, and its development into a healthy and useful manhood and womanhood". Sometimes, though, its public advice on the management of children's health and well-being was greeted with derision. For instance, 'Anti-Meddling' protested against the sanctity of the home being invaded by "the machinations of eugenicists, hygienists and all other varieties of faddists", and in the belief that mothers instinctively knew best noted that "the well-meaning busybodies who profess to be so concerned about the care of babies" were mostly childless themselves. A Guild spokesperson tersely replied that "the control of [scientific] knowledge" was infinitely better than "the laissez-faire of ignorance".[30] On a second front, Guild deputations to the Peake and Vaughan governments in April 1914 and October 1915, both led by University of Adelaide Professor of Physics Kerr Grant and including Helen Mayo, were sympathetically heard but the various puericulture reforms they urged were not translated into legislation until much later. The Notification of Births Act (No. 1775), for example, required concerted action on the part of the National Council of Women (representing about forty women's organizations), at the behest of the School for Mothers, before it was finally passed in 1926.

4. An effective educational force: the Women's Non-Party Political Association

The lessons Morice had learned about the power of women's networks to effect change, and the importance of personal contacts between organizations constituted for common purposes, were put to best use in the WNPPA that she founded in July 1909. Morice personally moved in varied circles. She had connections with women unionists, professional women, and via her aunt with feminist activists everywhere. At the same time, she also attended Government House functions and was best friends with wealthy philanthropist Joanna Barr Smith. In her work for the Science Guild and KUSA she was directly involved with high-ranking politicians, medical men, and leading educationists and academics. Prominent clergy and their wives were among the steady stream of visitors that the Morices received at home. By virtue of her husband's parliamentary work and membership of the exclusive, male-only Adelaide Club she was ideally placed to gain intimate knowledge of South Australian political affairs and take advantage of his social connections with 'men of influence'. C. H. Spence's journalism contacts likewise proved beneficial to Morice's reformist endeavours.

Jones argues that the likes of Morice and her associates, already in the vanguard of the post-suffrage women's movement, exerted an even more powerful influence in the relatively small, close-knit Adelaide community once they were conjoined in the WNPPA (more commonly known as the

Women's Non-Party (WNPA) and later re-named the League of Women Voters). Morice succeeded her aunt as president of this feminist organization which took practical and successful steps to educate citizens and thereby stimulate legislative and administrative reform in numerous areas affecting women and children. Working at grass-roots level in separate committees, this articulate, well-educated group with delegates from all other women's associations in Adelaide generated pressure on politicians for social change by means of deputations, petitions, letters and newspaper publicity, by joining forces with other social reform bodies, and by networking with feminists in other States.[31]

Growing into a more than 300-strong association by 1929, the WNPA's foundation membership included private and state school teachers and headmistresses, social welfare workers, artists, wives of clergy, WCTU members, medical graduates Dr. Violet Plummer and Helen Mayo, plus other women who had worked for feminist causes with Morice previously. Morice organized this disparate group of like-minded women into a tight-knit, active body with specific aims: "to educate citizens to appreciate the value of non-party political and industrial action, and to protect the interests of women and children and the home under Municipal, State and National Government".[32] These objects were amplified in the platform which formed part of the constitution and in 1912 included: equal federal marriage and divorce laws, equal parental rights over children, equal pay for equal work, pure food and milk supply, education reform, protection of boys and girls to the age of 21 against the vicious and depraved, appointment of a special children's magistracy and of women to public office, stringent legislation to protect the child wage earner, reform of the liquor trade, international women's suffrage, international peace and arbitration, and proportional representation.

Members frequently discussed formal education topics at WNPA meetings, Association speakers addressed other women's societies, and the Executive sought widely for outside experts to inform the membership and the general community about subjects that were the focus of their reformist endeavours. Morice herself spoke on new education ideas and "experiments in education", the Science Guild's efforts to effect puericulture reform, Olive Schreiner's book *Women and Labour*, implications of the militant suffrage movement in England for South Australian women, and women, war and social reconstruction thereafter. Additionally, the widely-read Morice was a logical choice to convene the Library Committee, responsible for circulating and recommending works on current topics dealing with women. Study and Debating Circles likewise concentrated on WNPA members' self-education, the Press and Paper Committee on educating the public by passing records of Association meetings to journalists, meanwhile sharing news of women's activities, accomplishments and their legal position and rights at home, inter-

state and overseas via the association's in-house monthly newsletter. (From 1922 they produced their own newspaper, *The Non-Party News*.)[33] Correspondence was also maintained with women's non-party organizations in other States: Vida Goldstein wrote from Victoria, Bessie Rischbieth from Western Australia, and Rose Scott from New South Wales. In turn, WNPA news was sent to Goldstein's journal, the *Woman Voter*, and Rischbieth's publication *The Dawn*.

At Morice's invitation Goldstein addressed the 15 October 1913 WNPA meeting and gave a public lecture in the Co-operative Hall on October 31 on "The importance of non-party organisation". Some months earlier Morice reminisced in a press interview about her personal relations with Goldstein, their shared political views, and Goldstein's role in forming the WNPPA of South Australia. "We've been friends for years", said Morice, and on the subject of Goldstein's recent fight for the Federal seat of Kooyong: "I consider that she is the only candidate in the Commonwealth really representing women, and she's been loyally supported". As for politics: "We have a lack of education there, have we not? After the Suffrage Bill passed my first public work was to form a Woman's League for Political and Social Education – it didn't flourish very well after the first enthusiasm passed, and when Vida Goldstein came to me for a visit we turned it into the Non-Party Political Association".[34] When the WNPA celebrated its twenty-first birthday in June 1930, Goldstein and past-president Morice were invited to a public meeting where the subject for discussion was "The need for a more co-operative spirit in politics" – the mantra of both of these leading feminists in their respective States.

Such co-operation between women, or at least sisterly sympathy, extended beyond local and interstate networking to the forging of international links. The first recorded instance of this is the visit to Adelaide in May 1913 of two English teacher-suffragists, Harriet Newcomb and Margaret Hodge, who at a special WNPA meeting chaired by Morice outlined the franchise movement in England from its early nineteenth-century beginnings up to the foundation of the Women's Social and Political Union (representing 44 franchise societies and religious bodies). As ANZWVA secretary, Newcomb also spoke about the work of the Australian and New Zealand Women Voters' Association in London, and of plans to form a British Dominions Woman Suffrage Union (BDWSU) on their return to England. Following their addresses the WNPA passed a motion "expressing sympathy with our unenfranchised sisters overseas" together with the formal resolution: "That knowing from 18 years experience the value of co-operation between men and women in political life, this meeting express[es] the desire that the principle of universal suffrage be extended all over the British Empire".[35] Morice afterwards declared that she personally was "entirely with" the English suffra-

gettes: "They know what they are about, and one pays no heed to the lying reports that are circulated. They are grand, heroic women". When then asked "What do you think of the attitude of our [Adelaide] women to politics and their own sex?" Morice replied: "Ah, there is a great need of an improved sense of solidarity. More than anything else women here in our country need to learn loyalty to their own sex, to stand by other women, sinking pettiness and differences out of sight when the occasion arises, for the women to stand together. We were granted the vote so easily and we had not the suffrage fight to bring out these fine qualities as it is doing in the women in England. There is so much work waiting here for women to take hold of and always the same few are pushed into it. It moves one to think what women could do in this State, in this city, if there was unity of purpose among us".[36]

Newcomb and Hodge were respectively elected secretary and press secretary of the BDWSU which was formally inaugurated in July 1914 and occupied an office in the same building as the International Women's Suffrage Alliance. In following years Newcomb's correspondence with feminist organizations like the WNPA kept the enfranchised and non-enfranchised women of the Empire in touch with each other and informed them of developments in the international women's movement. Hodge publicized the activities of the Union and its affiliates both in England and overseas.[37] Such international links were renewed when WNPA activist Annie Hornabrook travelled to London to assist the BDWSU's war-time work, and when in 1920 she, Lucy Morice and Mrs. Elizabeth Nicholls (long-serving president of the WCTU of SA) were appointed to represent the WNPA and its West Australian counterpart, the Women's Service Guild, at women's conferences in Europe.

Meanwhile, in Adelaide, Morice assiduously worked on the WNPA subcommittee formed in 1911 "for the protection of women and children", cooperating with delegates from other women's organizations and the Social Reform Bureau on influential deputations to the Premier and Chief Secretary which requested reform of the female prison system. Specific requests included the appointment of women as jurors, justices, police matrons, and board members of government-supported institutions, a special magistrate for the Children's Court, a female probation officer attached to the Police Court, and a medical woman to have charge of all female inmates of gaols and reformatories.[38] Indeed it was largely due to WNPA political activism that Senior Probation Officer Kate Cocks was transferred from the State Children's Department towards the end of 1915 in order to establish South Australia's Women Police Department. Her case is a prime example of how women's non-party political associations operated to win support for feminist policies, help shape legislation, and install women in public office.[39]

Morice represented the WNPA on the April 1915 deputation to Chief Secretary Styles which secured Cocks' appointment as Principal Police

Matron; also on the deputation (likewise organized by the Social Reform Bureau) in November 1915 which sought alterations in the law of bequests for the benefit of widows and orphans. Several years earlier she successfully proposed a resolution, sent to Federal Members of Parliament, which initiated another (long-term) WNPA educational project: "As women of the Commonwealth are enfranchised citizens equally with men that women have equal opportunities for employment as men as well as equal pay for equal work in the Federal [public] service".[40] Intimating in a footnote that if women could not obtain justice from men the WNPA would have to take steps to send women to represent them in Parliament, Morice also kept alive C. H. Spence's campaign to institute the Hare system of proportional representation by leading a WNPA deputation to Premier Verran on 'effective voting' in August 1913. Moreover, it was at her suggestion that during State elections all parliamentary candidates' views on feminist policies were canvassed by the WNPA and the responses publicized in order to better inform women's vote, which they were exhorted to use collectively and wisely. Reflecting Morice's own reform agenda, questions circulated during the 1912 and 1918 elections included: Are you in favour of equal pay for equal work? The resolutions contained in the report of the SA Branch of the British Science Guild on infant nurture? Increased government support to a) the School for Mothers b) Free Kindergartens c) children's playgrounds?

Remembering "a very remarkable old lady"

L. S. Morice, in her prime at this time, was remembered as "a plump motherly figure, determined, sure and energetic, her drive and humanity forever seeking a cause. … Her bluntness was sometimes browbeating, her impatience with those whose vision was not as great as hers sometimes tactless, but she never asked others to do what she would not do herself".[41] Her activism within the WNPA continued into the 1920s when she was in the sixth decade of her life and the Association's name changed to the League of Women Voters. In 1936, aged seventy-seven but still a very active member of the Kindergarten Union Executive and in regular contact with League members who perpetuated her legacy, Morice's life-time of service to education and the welfare of others was recognized by the award of an M.B.E. (Member of the British Empire). At the age of eighty-six she was described as "a diminutive figure, retaining all the graciousness and dignity of her generation, with a pretty wit, a live interest in modern literature and philosophies, and a wide knowledge of the affairs of the day … a very remarkable old lady whose qualities made her an inspiring leader, not only among those interested in social and educational reforms but in the intellectual life of Adelaide".[42] In the annals of this State, remarked the same journalist, "the

name of Lucy Morice is worthy of a place alongside that of her distinguished kinswoman, Catherine Helen Spence". Before dying on 10 June 1951, "very weary of the frustration and ineptitude which accompanies great age" (she was ninety-two), Morice left instructions that her body be privately cremated and that "no-one shall wear mourning for me nor send any flowers".[43] Accordingly only a brief notice (no obituary, nor mention in the "Deaths" column) appeared in the Adelaide *Advertiser*. The only permanent memorial to Lucy Spence Morice is the North Adelaide kindergarten where her M.B.E. hangs below a photograph of her taken on the occasion of this award.

Notes

[1]Helen Jones, *Nothing seemed impossible: women's education and social change in South Australia 1875-1915* (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 1985); *In her own name. Women in South Australian history* (Adelaide: Wakefield Press, 1986); "Lucy Spence Morice and Catherine Helen Spence: partners in South Australian social reform", *Journal of the Historical Society of South Australia* (*JHSSA*), 11 (1983): 48-64.

[2]Barbara Caine, "Feminist biography and feminist history", *Women's History Review* 2, no. 2 (1974); Jane Lewis, *Women in social action in Victorian and Edwardian England* (Aldershot: Edwin Elgar, 1990); Mary Ryan, "The power of women's networks", In *Sex and class in women's history*, ed. J. L. Newton, M. P. Ryan and J. R. Walkowitz (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983); Marilyn Lake, *Getting Equal. The history of Australian feminism* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1999).

[3]"Auntie Kate – Catherine Helen Spence. Reminiscences of her niece, Mrs Lucy Spence Morice" (typescript, n.d.): 1-2, Mortlock Library of South Australiana (MLSA), PRG88/18; S. Eade, "Summary of transcript of tape recording made at Mrs Caw's flat with Mrs Beckwith, Mrs Moore and Mr Kirby re the Unitarian Christian Church and its subscribers in 1870s Adelaide", Barr Smith Library (BSL) Special Collection, Hübbe-Caw papers (1859-1988), MSS0046/47/4.

[4]"Objects", Woman's League Minute Books (1895-1897), MLSA, SRG690/2.

[5]"Auntie Kate": 2; "Our Adelaide Women of Interest. A chat with Mrs Morice", *Daily Herald*, 28 June 1913, Magazine section: 13.

[6]Lucy Morice to Rose Scott (founder of the Women's Political Education League in NSW), 12 April 1910, Mitchell Library, Sydney, Rose Scott correspondence, A2278; L. S. Morice, "Biographical notes on C. H. Spence": 1-3, 16, MLSA, PRG88/19; "A chat with Mrs Morice".

[7]"About Catherine Helen Spence. Lighter side of a leader's life. Told by Lucy Morice" (newspaper clipping, n.d.), Papers re Catherine Helen Spence, BSL, MSS0046/47/4.

[8]Anne Wainwright, "A tribute to Lucy Spence Morice" (typescript: Adelaide, 1962), University of South Australia Kindergarten Teachers' College archives; "Educationist honoured", newspaper cuttings re Lucy Morice, Hübbe-Caw papers, MSS0046/47/4.

[9]For details of Lucy Morice's involvement with Helen Mayo and Harriet Stirling of the State Children's Council in early twentieth century puericulture reform, see

Jones, *In Her Own Name*, 166-7.

Note: The birth of Lucy and James Morice's daughter was not officially recorded.

[10] "Address by Mrs Morice to the Church of England Mothers' Union, Diocese of Adelaide" (handwritten, n.d.), Hübbe-Caw papers, MSS0046/47.

[11] A. Bullock and O. Stallybrass, eds., *The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought* (London: Fontana/Collins, 1983), 226.

[12] "Kindergarten progress. Views of Mrs J. P. Morice" (newspaper clipping, n.d.), MSS0046/47/4; "A chat with Mrs Morice".

[13] L. S. Morice, "Address to the Woman's League" (n.d.), SRG690/2/5.

[14] L. S. Morice, "Condensed copy of report presented at the League's first meeting showing the aims and scope of its operations", SRG690/2.

[15] Morice, "Address to the Woman's League".

[16] *What Socialism Is* (Adelaide: Fabian Society, c.1890).

[17] L. S. Morice, "Hon. Secretary's Report for 1896", SRG690/2/3; "The Woman's Column (by a lady contributor)", *Weekly Herald*, 31 July 1896: 5; Woman's League Minute Books, SRG690/1.

[18] Morice, "Auntie Kate": 4; SRG690/2/3.

[19] "Auntie Kate": 4.

[20] Jones, *JHSSA* 11: 53-54.

[21] "Rules of the Women Employees' Mutual Association of South Australia", MLSA, 334.7/W.

[22] "Minutes of UTLC meeting, 27 November 1908", Trades and Labor Council Minutes Book (1906-1910), MLSA, SRG1/1/4: 351; "Trades and Labor Council" and "Women Employees' Mutual Association", *Daily Herald*, 3 March 1906: 5; 28 April 1906: 8; 12 May 1906: 5; 7 July 1906: 7.

[23] Lake, *Getting Equal*, 11-12, 55-58.

[24] Lynne Trethewey, "Lucy Spence Morice: 'mother of kindergartens' in South Australia", *History of Education Review* 37, no. 2 (2008): 14-25.

[25] Kindergarten Union of South Australia, "Annual Report" (1906-07): 5; (1909-10): 3; (1911-12): 8, State Records of South Australia (SRSA), GRG69/17.

[26] "Talks given by Lillian de Lissa at the Golden Jubilee of the Kindergarten Union of SA, 1955": 10, MLSA, de Lissa papers, PRG253/10.

[27] "Minutes of Committee meeting, 22 September and 20 October 1909", School for Mothers Minute Book, MLSA, SRG199/1/1; Committee of the School for Mothers' Institute, Adelaide, "First Annual Report" (22 September 1909-31 July 1910), SRG199/2/1: 1.

[28] Dr Helen Mayo, "History of the Mothers' and Babies' Health Association of South Australia", MLSA, Helen Mayo papers, PRG127/6; School for Mothers Minute Book (September 1909-September 1913), SRG199/1/1 (unpaginated).

[29] British Science Guild, *Objects and Constitution* (pamphlet, n.d.), State Library of South Australia (SLSA); British Science Guild, SA Branch, "Annual Report for 1914-15": 1, and 1915-16: 1-3, and 1917-18: 3-4, and *Race Building. Science Guild's great work. No. 1* (pamphlet: Adelaide, 1916), SLSA; "Care for the child. Deputation to Chief Secretary. Better legislation asked for", *Register*, 2 April 1914: 16; "Caring for infant life. Deputation to the Premier", *Register*, 5 October 1915: 8.

[30] Letters to the Editor, "Care of the child", *Register*, 3 April 1914: 7 and 4 April

1914: 19.

[31]Jones, *JHSSA*11: 58-61; Lake, 13.

[32] "Constitution of the Women's Non-Party Political Association of South Australia", Minutes of WNPPA meetings (July 1909-October 1922): pasted in at 1 February 1911, MLSA, SRG116/1/1; "Women's Non-Party Political Association" (objects, officers, platform), *Herald*, 11 September 1911: 4.

[33]Vivienne Szekeres, "A history of the League of Women Voters in South Australia 1909-1976", B.A. Hons. thesis (University of Adelaide: 1976); Minutes of WNPPA meetings July 1909-October 1922: various pages, SRG116/1/1.

[34] "A chat with Mrs Morice".

[35]WNPPA, "Minutes of Special Meeting, 1 May 1913", SRG116/1/1: 73. See also Lynne Trethewey and Kay Whitehead, "Beyond centre and periphery: transnationalism in two teacher/suffragettes' work", *History of Education* 32, no. 5 (2003): 547-59.

[36]*Daily Herald*, 28 June 1913.

[37]K. Whitehead and L. Trethewey, "Aging and activism in the context of the British Dominions Woman Suffrage Union, 1914-1922", *Women's Studies International Forum* 31 (2008): 30-41.

[38] "Social questions. Prison reform promised. Responsibilities of citizens", *Evening Journal*, 1 December 1911: 1; "Wanted – women police patrols. Strong case made out by Social Reform Bureau. Chief Secretary promises consideration", *Daily Herald*, 28 April 1915; "Women police. Request to Government", *Register*, 28 April 1915: 7; WNPPA, "Minutes of Special Meeting to consider punishments for assaults on defenceless women and children, 9 October 1911" and "Minutes of 41st WNPA meeting, 18 June 1913" and "70th meeting, 21 April 1915", SRG116/1/1: 46-7, 75, 117-8.

[39]L. Trethewey, "Christian feminism in action: Kate Cocks's social welfare work in South Australia, 1900-1950", *History of Education* 36, no. 6 (2008): 715-34.

[40] "Minutes of WNPA Committee meeting, 26 September 1911".

[41]H. Jones, ed., *Jubilee History of the Kindergarten Union of South Australia 1905-1955* (Adelaide: KUSA, 1975), 60.

[42] "The Mother of the Kindergartens", *Advertiser*, 30 October 1946.

[43]Wainwright, "A tribute to Lucy Spence Morice": 10; H. Jones, "Morice, Louise (Lucy)", In Bede Nairne and Geoffrey Searle, gen. eds., *Australian Dictionary of Biography. Vol. 10* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1986), 587; "Death of Mrs Lucy Morice", *Advertiser,* 13 June 1951:2.

Safe Walk Home:

Cultural Literacy in the Regent Park Community

Karleen Pendleton Jiménez &
Trent University

Esther Sokolov Fine
York University

We address biography through the experiences of a middle school student whose ability to express and act upon her understanding of the needs of her community is strengthened with cultural literacy. A vice principal and social worker at Nelson Mandela Park School in the Regent Park community of Toronto offered alternative space and specialized language to the student who already knew how to think critically but had difficulty being heard. Drawing upon social learning theory, we consider notions of "periphery," and "shared-repertoire," and the life stories that motivated each participant to learn through the forging of relationships.

Setting: Nelson Mandela Park School

Along a curve of Shuter Street on the east side of downtown Toronto stands a stately brick school building. At the entrance of Nelson Mandela Park School are a dozen long steps framed by large columns in an Egyptian revival style. The entire building is the color of the red desert of Northern Arizona, highlighted on every side by the lush green of a Canadian spring.

There is a row of carved stone medallions inset along the third story facade, evidence that this school was built at a time when bricklayers also worked as artisans. Tall windows in groups of five rest on crumbling windowsills on all sides of this three-story building.

Facing the school on the opposite side of the street is a row of old workmen's cottages with mansard roofs, flanked by Victorian houses on either side, then modern co-ops, then tenements. Tiny gardens and stoops separate front doors from sidewalks, and children are visible everywhere: walking, playing, riding their bikes around the neighborhood.

Introduction

Public Schooling in Canada is structured through "social divisions" such as "denomination, language, race, [gender, sexuality,] and ethnicity,"[1] peoples with different, and sometimes opposing, educational values. Determining the strength of democracy in any given context means not only assessing how much "freedom" many residents have to choose schooling structures "according to their needs and wants,"[2] but also how well equipped they are to express their wishes and be heard.[3]

In order to strengthen democracy, educational theorists have turned to critical literacy as a means of empowering students.[4] Critical literacy is frequently defined, more or less, as the capacity to recognize that "the ideological foundations of knowledge, culture, schooling and identity-making are …unavoidably political, [and] marked by vested interests and hidden agendas."[5] It is believed that if students are taught to question and resist the intentions of hegemonic structures of knowledge, they will have greater access to valuing their own experiences, as well as imagining and working toward alternative (and hopefully more democratic) social configurations.

In this essay, we approach critical literacy from another angle, exploring relationships that participants build together, and the skills of expression they teach one another in order to be heard. It is about adults making room and engaging in challenging conversations with a middle school student who already knew how to think critically. Drawing upon "Communities of Practice Theory,"[6] we take up the notions of "periphery," and "shared-repertoire" in order to examine how this student developed "power over [her] own life,"[7] as well as the tools to advocate for other community members. We address the following questions: 1) How do alternative educational biographies interface with relationships and learning within the fringe spaces on school sites? And 2) How can cultural literacy serve to protect and empower critical thinkers?

A group of eleven people from the Nelson Mandela Park school community contributed knowledge and ideas to this retrospective research. We

gathered together at various times and in various configurations: a classroom, a private home, and at a large table in Room 12 at the school.

The participants were Mandy Swinamer, Ainsworth Morgan, and Lloyd Wyse, three former students who now work in the community, Mandy as the community safety coordinator, Ainsworth as a grade 7 - 8 teacher, and Lloyd as an educational assistant trained to work with children who have specific disabilities. Also present are principal Jeff Kugler; school social worker Janis Beach; and Faye Collins and Mary Wybrow, two recently retired teachers who were at the school for much of the past thirty years.

This research centers on the life of Mandy Swinamer, a former student, and the relationships she forged with Jeff Kugler and Janis Beach, who served as the vice principal and social worker at Nelson Mandela Park School in the Regent Park community of Toronto. The data were primarily gathered through interviews and visits to Nelson Mandela Park School in the Spring and Summer of 2004. The writing in this article follows the path of Mandy's life, from primary school student, to middle school "trouble-maker," to coordinator of Regent Park's Safe Walk Home Program.

Mandy

In 1982 on the carpet of Faye Collins's grade 2 classroom at Park School, a group of Regent Park's children were reading about the Underground Railroad. Seven-year-old Mandy Swinamer sat in the circle and read her paragraph aloud when she was prompted. As Mandy now recalls, Faye was impressed with her reading skills and exclaimed, "Oh my gosh, I can't believe this kid can read this book; she knows it word-for-word." As soon as Faye expressed her joy at Mandy's fine reading, Mandy threw down her book.

Interviewer: So she said you could read and then you didn't want to?

Mandy: That was always the thing with me. I think I like defiance, because they go, "What a wonderful job!" and then I go, "Forget it."

Janis (social worker): "Screw you!" is really how it would go.

This is not a conventional story about child literacy; Mandy already knew how to read. It's not really a story about critical literacy either; Mandy already knew how to read the system. She was suspicious of the most common of classroom exchanges: teacher prompts student with task, student responds correctly, student receives recognition.[8] Mandy refused the recognition. Perhaps at seven she did not have the language to critique schooling as a series of structured practices, but she nevertheless practiced her own method of resistance. As she grew older, she developed a reputation for being "disruptive," "unmanageable," and a "pretty angry kid."

Mandy's mother knew intimately about the need to resist authority. Mandy says her mother was born in "hellhole, small-town Nova Scotia." She

survived "a ton of trauma," poverty, denial of her Mi'kmaq blood in a light-skinned body, and silencing of her history. She watched her cousins disappear to residential schools.[9] She ran away to Toronto at sixteen, to the Regent Park community, only to confront street-life, pregnancy, and the removal of a baby by social authorities. To say that she had many reasons for mistrusting government institutions is a gross understatement. "The system" hurt her, and she is a woman who fights back.

Her daughter, Mandy, has fought too; as a young student she chose what she would learn. Janis, the school social worker describes her as "quite out there and saying I'm only going to learn what it is I think is important to learn." She said it clearly. Mandy describes this as her "mother's voice in the back of my head saying those history books are not true." Mandy and her mother have had every reason to contest the curriculum. Canadian textbooks have been notorious for offering misrepresentations of our national history in general and Native peoples in particular.[10] As with numerous former colonies (e.g. Australia, the United States), Canada's educational policies are tied to a colonial agenda,[11] or what Bannerji[12] refers to as a "liberal democracy" tainted by "colonial legacy." What counts as knowledge has been formed by European invasion:[13] colonization has caused the simultaneous destruction of lives, land, and knowledge.[14] While Mandy might have been a contrary kid, on some level her vocal attempts to control her own learning represented a kind of confrontation with two hundred years of colonization.

But Mandy's school environment contained teachers at different and conflicting positions on the political spectrum. There were many teachers who upheld "the system," where socio-economic hierarchies were enforced through a disregard for children from this marginalized neighborhood. As former vice principal Jeff Kugler notes, they "shouldn't have been there and really had no interest in [the Regent Park community] with those kids or had any beliefs that those kids could become anything or could become what they wanted to be." On the other hand there were teachers like Mary Wybrow who encouraged parent participation, fought the administration for more resources, assistants, and specialized projects in order to provide quality education for the students. In addition, Mandy's grade 2 teacher Faye Collins was an activist and pioneer in the field of social justice education. Faye grew up on an Ontario farm with open-minded parents. As the oldest of three girls, she "was raised believing that [she] wasn't bound by what women in the 50s were bound by." Confidence enabled her to seek a university degree (at a time when many of her colleagues only had high school diplomas), and she found herself in the first graduating class in the Faculty of Education at Toronto's York University. In discussion, Faye explains, "It was a very political time, and I was left wing already. So I came with a particular political perspective…. I was very much a part of the 60s and radical to an

extreme." Faye describes her activism as "sticking up for what was right" and on some level "thriving on confrontation." Her political convictions translated into involvement in education beyond the classroom, including community meetings, literacy programs, anti-racist workshops, and pivotal discussions at a boardroom level. However, Faye's left wing approach was only one component of Mandy's educational experience.

Location also had its influence on Mandy. As Mary Pardo explains, "The places in which we live, learn, shop, and play are more than simply buildings; they represent outcomes of social relations that we take for granted."[15] Mandy was trapped in a big block of a school, on colonized land, and she had witnessed firsthand her mother's struggle as a Native woman to survive such dangerous territories.[16] Given who she was and the conditions of her life, Mandy could not find comfort in her classrooms.

Mandy discovered her own capacity for defiance, and she learned some of the consequences of swearing at teachers, but she does not recall learning much of the intended school curriculum. "It was boring for me as a young kid … and it was so structured." Classroom time stood in contrast to the freedom she experienced after school as the daughter of a single mother who worked a heavy schedule. "To try and tell me to sit there for hours on end just wasn't going to happen," she said. When asked if she has any sense of what was going on in her mind as she attempted to sit, she explains that, "probably the seagulls were too distracting. Like I would look out the window and that was it." The high-ceilinged classrooms have thick walls with an elaborate pulley-system inside to raise and lower enormous windows. These windows are placed high on the wall, architecturally designed to thwart student daydreaming. Mandy looked anyway and found her birds.

In addition to an education system that stifled Mandy's desire for a more liberated approach to life, she also confronted gender/sex/sexuality-based aggression inside and outside school. As Mandy explains, simply being female made her a target, "violence against women in Regent Park was pretty popular." However, as a "tough girl," she carried an added burden; boys fought her as a kind of "challenge," to see if they could take on "a woman who was tougher than them to see whether or not they could win." Her love and mastery of sports contributed to the competition, where boys would taunt her with lines like, "you are too butch to be a girl," and "you must be part man or something," and then attempt to fight her. Even though she did not come out as lesbian until grade 8, she regularly faced these types of homophobic/transphobic comments throughout her schooling.

By grade 7, her disregard of the teacher's agenda, coupled with aggressive responses to taunts from the boys, landed her regularly in the vice principal's office. She was "sent home many a half days." As she tells a story from her grade 7 French class, "Bill from across the room said, 'I'm going to

rape you after school.' And I flip the table over, and I attacked him and had him on the ground and then off to the office I went." Given the viciousness of Bill's words, Mandy's response seems appropriate enough in hindsight. However, in the context of a busy, living classroom, unraveling the motivations of one child lunging at another is a complicated process.

Jeff

Enter Jeff Kugler, the twenty-six-year-old vice principal, ready to make good on a lifetime of leftist ideology. He knew that when Mandy was sent to his office, "it was always for reasons, it would always be seeking justice in [her] mind." In her own way, she was either advocating for her rights, or those of her friends.

Jeff's interest in working at Nelson Mandela Park School in the Regent Park community was driven by his political convictions. As Jeff said, "That was the kind of school I wanted to be in because, politically, I felt you needed to be dealing with the issues around poverty and racism, and all that stuff was something I needed to be a part of personally." Jeff grew up around a dinner table where "every night there were big fights about politics." Descended from generations of activists, including his grandfather's involvement with the communist party, he knew that "progressive politics was part of the way that we looked at everything … that's the way we looked at the world." He studied political science in university before searching for a place to act on his understanding of the world. "I believed that it was my job and my responsibility to talk about injustice; I still do." At Nelson Mandela Park School, his politics translated into intervention for students whose voices were not heard. "There were a lot of teachers that I had to protect kids from. I felt that they were being mistreated and legitimately rebelled in a lot of cases… I supported those kids in ways I could."

Regent Park is a place to talk about injustice; it is a community with built-in contradictions. Community members talk to one another and take care of each other, providing support, building relationships. This public housing project may have been built, in part, as a first stop for immigrants intending to move on, but the sense of a shared community, especially in the raising of children, remains. As Ainsworth Morgan, formerly a student of Nelson Mandela Park School and later a teacher there, describes it, this is a community of children. It is a place where he felt the freedom to play as a child, and where he feels safe to let his own children play today, because "there are always eyes on you." The notion of looking out for each other's families is as consistent and concrete for the members of this community as the massive stone school building towering above the neighborhood. Nevertheless, the devastation of poverty makes even the best of community

intentions difficult to fulfill.

The majority of students came from the dense block of high-rise apartment buildings that constitute one of Canada's largest subsidized housing communities. Several of the buildings overlook and surround the school. There is a wide cross section of racial and ethnic minorities represented with significant numbers from small Ontario towns, the Atlantic provinces, newly-arrived immigrant families from the Caribbean and various parts of Asia, as well as second and third generation White "welfare families" from the downtown area. Many students come from single-parent families and some from two-parent families with both parents working at minimum wage. Many families have a large number of children housed in small quarters. There is a high incidence of teen-age mothers in this community, and the school has had a special daytime program for these extremely young women and their babies. There is a very high incidence of family violence and child-abuse, alcoholism, drug abuse, prostitution, and other forms of crime in the area. Some infamous and dreadful murders have taken place in the immediate neighborhood.[17]

Peripheries

Within the larger city of Toronto, Regent Park does not have the best reputation. It's that "bad" neighborhood that people in any city talk about. As such it has become separated (rendered peripheral) and receives the worst of Toronto's prejudice; children's potential and dreams are often overlooked. As Faye puts it, "A lot of people who were working here had worked here for years and they believed that the kids they were teaching were inferior and couldn't learn and were just poor kids. I mean there was that belief. It wasn't just the administration. It wasn't just the people running the Board; it was right throughout the system." Children growing up in Regent Park have experienced the contradictory nature of living in a peripheral space; they are located in the heart of Toronto in close proximity to the wealth of resources in the largest city of Canada, and yet they have been instructed that they have no right to achieve academically, or to imagine alternative lives for themselves.

Regent Park tends to attract media attention for the violence that occurs there, as well as for its stories of individual success, its social justice work, and its community services. Just as it became known for harsh economic conditions, it also became the place for educators interested in social justice to learn democratic, anti-racist and anti-classist pedagogical strategies and programs. In this article we hope to neither idealize community nor minimize its significance in understanding the exchange of knowledge at Nelson Mandela Park School. Etienne Wenger's theory of "communities of practice"

offers insight into the relationship between education and formations of community, while acknowledging that community is not always a positive experience.[18] Wenger's communities, while possibly sharing mutual histories or identities, are officially constituted by shared practices. Wenger's "social account of learning" investigates "the intersection of issues of community, social practice, meaning, and identity."[19]

Communities of practice do not exist in isolation. They are layered, each level having an impact on the next. The Regent Park community, home of Nelson Mandela Park School, is a dynamic neighborhood, transforming itself through patterns of international and national migrations, and subject to the whims of the Ontario Government's social funding or lack thereof. Regent Park provides the setting for an intimate community of practice formed by Mandy, Jeff, and Janis (Janis Beach will be introduced shortly). We will examine learning as it has emerged as these three individuals shared their lives with one another. We will focus on the influences of particular components of their community, on peripheries, shared repertoire, and relationships forged between them. Wenger argues that boundaries and peripheries are entwined.[20]

> Peripherality is thus an ambiguous position. Practice can be guarded just as it can be made available; membership can seem a daunting prospect just as it can constitute a welcoming invitation; a community of practice can be a fortress just as it can be an open door. Peripherality can be a position where access to practice is possible, but it can also be a position where outsiders are kept from moving further inward.[21]

In this story there are two peripheries. One is the neighborhood, Regent Park itself; the other is the office space offered by Janis and Jeff. "The periphery of a practice is … a region that is neither fully inside nor fully outside, and surrounds the practice with a degree of permeability."[22]

Sometimes, within education, peripheral opportunities can be found between the cracks in contradictory moments. These can be claimed by students and teachers and turned into possibilities for the creation of an open space for new forms of school talk in which the patterns of authority can begin to shift. Such a space can be claimed by students for the articulation of lived experience, the asking of new questions, and the generating of new knowledge.[23]

Regent Park is one type of periphery of Toronto. In 1986, back when Mandy was sitting in Jeff's office, Regent Park was in the midst of crisis. Crack cocaine had intruded upon homes, streets, and playgrounds.

> Jeff: At that time, before recess, I would have to go out and ask the crack dealers to leave the schoolyard until recess was over … they would come back, so it was bad. And the hookers used the slide on Shuter Street – the kindergarten slide – to do tricks; mostly at night, but sometimes during the day.
> Mandy: Yeah, our buildings were flooded with crackheads. There were like nine, ten crackheads every day sitting in the hallways tooting their pipes. And they were in the stairwells, down by the garbage incinerators, they would be turning tricks in the elevators, they were everywhere.

Regent Park bore the brunt of Toronto's larger drug problem. In that vice principal's office in 1986 Mandy was negotiating her schooling in the middle of a threatened landscape. Land and learning are intertwined.[24] And as Davis argues, "Most of our curricula leave out the harsh experiences of working class life and racism."[25]

An alternative curriculum existed in the vice principal's office, which is located to your right as you enter the school. It rests halfway below the first floor. There are two small cream-colored rooms, with a closet that runs another ten feet into a mysterious pocket of the building. As the rooms are tucked between floors, the ceilings are quite low, with windows facing out between the front columns. In contrast to the high ceilings and broad hallways of polished terrazzo flooring that characterize the rest of this building, the vice principal's office is a little nook.

> Jeff: Mandy came many, many, many times to the office. She was twelve and really, really, really, I think a pretty angry kid; and she let us know that all the time – so she was there a lot … she was in my office more than she was in class for that year, I think.

Jeff's dedication to social justice brought him to this office at this school. Mandy's resistance to classroom practice brought her to him. Here in the vice principal's office, a place as central and yet peripheral to the school as social justice is to the curriculum, Mandy and Jeff began the kind of conversation that can only happen in such a contradictory space. The exchange began in the ordinary way, two people form a relationship by delighting in each other's company. Mandy engaged Jeff with stories.

> Jeff: [turning to Mandy] Right away I felt that you were an unusual person … you were extremely beyond twelve in your thinking and in your ability to see things.

In turn, Jeff worked to earn Mandy's trust.

> Mandy: I had spent so much time with Jeff in the office and in con-

> versations … I think he engaged himself in me and had to kind of build that trust …[turning to Jeff] you didn't deceive me in any way, I don't think. You didn't run and tell my mother things that you said you weren't going to tell her.

The mutual appreciation that developed between Jeff and Mandy is not necessarily what one would expect to arise in a situation such as this one. Traditionally, the vice principal's office is a site of conflict. It is the place students are sent when they're "bad" and where parents arrive when they're "mad." It is a place to be upset. It is a place to be feared. Instead of becoming more angry, Mandy was calm and articulate in Jeff's office.

> Jeff: [turning to Mandy] All the stuff that you did in class sort of never came out. You were a different person in the office, when you sat down to talk, you just had a conversation.

Place can alter identity.[26] If you have an identity of resistance,[27] and you sit in a "regular" classroom, you may need to perform some mischievous feat to maintain your identity. After all, Mandy had a reputation to live up to. On the other hand, if you are already sitting in the vice principal's office, a place designed for trouble, then no performance is required. You could do almost anything, or nothing at all, and still radiate an aura of trouble. This frees you up to do other things – like talk, like listen, like begin a lifetime relationship with the vice principal.

Janis

Janis Beach is another prominent member of Mandy's fan club. Since 1986, she has also been listening to Mandy's stories, finding value in her accounts of the world at a time when many other adults could only see an angry kid.

> Jeff: How did you meet Janis?
> Mandy: Through you. I think you sent me to Janis, [laughter], you couldn't suspend me any more, [laughs harder]. Go see Janis! This kid needs help.

Exactly one floor above (halfway between the first and second floors) is the former office of the school social worker. It is blue and a bit larger than the other offices with its own "Ladies" room attached. In those days of greater funding, Janis's office held large chairs and couches. Both she and a school nurse were on site during most of the school week. Janis describes her office as "a meeting place for the adults and the students in the building to get a different sense of each other."

Like Jeff, Janis brought a social justice perspective to her position as the

Park School social worker. However, the origin and route of her politics differ considerably from Jeff's.

> Janis: My parents were very conservative, and I grew up in [the suburb] Mississauga. [My left-wing politics developed later] because there weren't the opportunities to have a meaningful voice at the table.

At university she found the language she longed for, words that described the inequities and discrimination she saw and experienced in the world. She entered a progressive social work program, graduated, and set out hoping to contribute to the quality of people's lives. At Nelson Mandela Park School, she found a way to fulfill her political goals, through listening carefully to students and advocating for them, in effect, offering them a "meaningful voice at the table." She also thought the schedule of a school social worker would best suit her life as a working mother. While she and Jeff have enjoyed working in education, it is the structure of schooling that has provided opportunities for them to do the kind of social justice work that was central to their lives. The ways in which they took up their work in school demonstrates that while state curricula might impose specified roles, schools are actually sites for diverse occupations and agendas.

Janis senses that it is the construct of her occupation as a social worker that offered her the possibility to hear Mandy in ways that many of Mandy's teachers could not.

> Janis: I had a different kind of opportunity just by the name of my work in the school … I had the luxury of time in my position to just sit and talk and listen and move forward and develop relationships with kids in a different way and certainly with Mandy.

Janis acknowledges that her role as a social worker did not ensure a relationship with any student, but it did provide a setting conducive to making those connections between herself and students "work sometimes." It was from this position that she sat and listened to Mandy.

> Janis: You would always come in with very long, very intense sociological observations about the school. It was astounding. But you had a real sense of what was going on and could provide an amazing understanding of why kids were behaving the way that they were. To have conversations with you was amazing.

Janis also found the element she needed to begin a long relationship with Mandy; her description speaks to the pleasure of hearing Mandy's stories. In addition, the content of Mandy's stories, the social analysis, was precisely the type of knowledge Janis had sought in university. Janis and Jeff

were not the only social justice workers in the school. Mandy herself was far more interested in honing her skills as an ethnographer of social relationships than she was in attending French class. They were all exchanging knowledge in this peripheral learning space.

The peripheries of communities of practice can offer these opportunities of engagement: material space, and a sharing of alternative values and practices. As Wenger states: "Peripheries refer to continuities, to areas of overlap and connections, to windows and meeting places, and to organized and casual possibilities for participation offered to outsiders or newcomers."[28] On some level all three participants are both insiders and outsiders to the traditional business of school: classroom learning. Their contradictory positioning provides them with a meaningful place to speak and work. The pedagogy of conforming to school norms, of acquiring the appropriate social discourse of the given community[29] is not necessarily the point. The interactive work of Janis, Jeff, and Mandy expands what education means; it is subversive work. Such peripheral experiences are what make communities more democratic; they are dynamic, they push at the boundaries, connecting communities "with the rest of the world."[30] It is precisely such peripheries that are being cut in current school budgets, positions such as vice-principals and social workers are diminished or eliminated, narrowing the possibilities of what education can do.[31] As well, there are fewer safer places for "tough" students to learn.

"They Were Advocating For Me": Developing a Shared Repertoire

Mandy directed her own schooling. Because she already was able to perform at the required level in her classroom work, she did not qualify for any formal academic or special education support. With her reputation as a "tough girl," who knew better than to work with "the system," she got herself kicked out of classes. We cannot know whether Mandy consciously responded with anger in order to receive such "punishment." More important, she may have orchestrated conflicts with her teacher so that she would have opportunities to "fight for [her] freedom…to run…to go out into the community with [her] homeboys and give props." The result of her classroom responses, however, meant that she spent most of her time in grades 7 and 8, apart from her classmates, learning in Jeff's and Janis's offices. Even though Janis and Jeff were not the most traditional representatives of formal schooling, they did not lack systems and discourses with which to educate Mandy. Janis and Jeff had long conversations with Mandy, protected her from adults who did not have time to recognize her value, and throughout, offered her language and strategies for resistance within "the system."

> Interviewer: Mandy, why did you decide to trust them?
> Mandy: I think I saw that they were advocating for me. Like when I was kicked out of class … I felt that they were there for me and going to kind of fight for me.
> Janis: You knew we would be there so that if you came down and you had something to say you knew somebody would hear it and validate it.

The acts of listening to Mandy and fighting for her seem to have involved a transmission of language: words such as, "advocating," and "validating." Now an adult, these words roll off Mandy's tongue with ease, as she sits at the table beside her two mentors. The three converse comfortably with many shared terms and phrases, such as: "structure," "the systemic approach," "justice," "context," "stigma," "stereotypes," "triggers," "on the board," "meetings," "racism," "a safe space," "in transition," "support," and quite often, "advocate." This type of language, popularized by progressive members of schools, community and government agencies, and universities, has become a "shared repertoire"[32] between Jeff, Janis, and Mandy. Wenger believes that a shared repertoire plays a central role in creating and maintaining coherence in a community of practice. It can include: "routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions or concepts that the community had produced or adopted in the course of its existence, and which have become part of its practice."[33] Jeff, Janis, and Mandy have not only developed specific language together, but also shared practices: in this case, particular types of employment, a focus on similar issues, and a belief in appropriate and effective responses to problems. While Mandy continues to witness injustice in her community, her language and strategies for responding have altered considerably since grade 7.

In 1986, Mandy used defiance and aggression to "advocate" for her peers and herself. She showed her anger to those around her through rough language and physical action. She targeted the formal authority of the school, neighborhood men, gangs other than her own, and antagonistic boys. As Jeff noted earlier, Mandy's fighting "would always be seeking justice in [her] mind." Fortunately, for a brief but significant period of time, inside the structure of the school, the consequences of her actions were not as great. For grades 7 and 8, she landed in the hands of Jeff and Janis. They attempted to teach her safer responses to acts of injustice. Jeff Kugler puts it this way:

> I think that the main thing that I really tried to [say] was—we did this a million times—"Mandy, you are way too smart to do this to yourself, to allow this to happen to you," and we really worked on—even if this was like a really stupid thing, and even if this was a ter-

> rible thing that happened—"who is here in the office now, Mandy? Is there a way you could have handled it so that you wouldn't be the one in the office, for your own interest?" We spent a lot of time trying to get her to see that it didn't have to always end up this way. That she had a role in changing the way it ended up.

While Jeff offered Mandy the language and actions required to avoid punishment, Janis worked as a translator, a go-between for Mandy and her instructors. She describes her role as looking "for those pieces of kids that don't have a voice in the school and to try and then bring it to teachers." After listening to Mandy's perspective on a classroom incident, Janis would approach her teachers and do "some buffer work." She would "bring her [Mandy's] voice to the table in a way that it could be heard." In Wenger's terms, Jeff and Janis acted as "border brokers," making communication possible between Mandy and Mandy's teachers, bringing together their own two worlds of social justice and government institutions. Jeff's and Janis's actions involved communication skills that employed both language and behavior. Mandy lacked the appropriate "voice" to be understood by "the system." In order to do the type of social justice work that she found meaningful in a way that was less harmful to her being, Mandy needed to become literate in the language of the system.

Take for example that earlier incident with the boy who threatened to rape Mandy. That boy did not receive punishment because Mandy did not tell anyone what he had said. Mandy clarifies her silence, "You didn't involve anybody from a system or you didn't seek help. You took care of things on your own. Beat someone up and that would be it. It's the end result." She followed her community code: Never disclose certain insider knowledge to teachers, who are perceived as outsiders and representatives of the system.

Kelly[34] defines cultural literacy as a "literacy of morality," the acquisition of a shared sensibility and culture. Citing Lankshear and McLaren,[35] she couples cultural literacy with functional literacy, as "'pedagogy of domestication' … actively encouraging the internalization of social hierarchies." Kelly places cultural literacy in contrast to progressive and critical literacies. The latter two she describes as performing types of social justice, a discovery of self and a critique of structural systems. However, we see Mandy's learning with Jeff and Janis as both cultural literacy and the work of social justice. While it is true that Mandy has acquired a discourse from her vice principal and her social worker, and most likely from her mother as well, it is not a dominant discourse of schooling. Their shared repertoire allows her to successfully accomplish goals of resistance she has always appeared to value. Mandy's core "sensibilities" have not been altered; she has simply acquired more tools with which to express them.[36] She no longer needs a translator

for institutions. She has found ways to utilize the social service system in order to address harm.

It took Mandy many years to find comfort in a discourse of social justice. She may have had access to Jeff and Janis's offices in grades 7 and 8, but as a teenager, she could not find a place for herself within the Toronto school system. Jeff and Janis may have offered her language for surviving "the system," but in the five years following her graduation from Park School, she confronted life without school. She dropped out, experienced difficulties with drugs, and could not find meaningful work opportunities. Her high-risk activities took their toll on her. Her trouble with government institutions and family climaxed when she was eighteen, a time when she says she "hit a brick wall." It was not until that point that she decided it was time to change. She returned to education, and a few years later had the good fortune to find Jeff once more. They happened to bump into each other, and he recommended she apply for a position as a special needs assistant at the school.

Perhaps she needed the passage of time, or maybe the power of being an adult, before she could return and use her acquired discourse in professional settings. These are long-term learnings that come into play twelve years later. A decade, or perhaps even a lifetime is needed to trace paths of understanding. Finally, it was not the discourse alone that brought Mandy home safely. The meaningfulness of the words emerged through the relationships she formed with Jeff and Janis.

In 2009, Mandy still keeps watch over her neighborhood. One of her roles has been that of safety coordinator of the Safe Walk Home Project in Regent Park (a position Jeff Kugler urged her to apply for). In response to a serious increase in neighborhood violence (nine men murdered within the community in a single year), this program was established to escort children from school to after-school programs to home. It was established through the Kiwanis Club, the Girls Club and the School Community Action Alliance in Regent Park. She took the position of co-coordinator of the program, training more than 20 young people from the community to work as safe walkers. In the interview, she announces her job title with much laughter, celebrating the irony of having moved from the position of troublemaker to that of guide. While it appears to be a significant shift, in reality, Mandy has maintained a role as protector of her community.

Her community continues with its contradictions, but in the midst of a major transition. Mandy believes the levels of poverty are much worse than when she was a child, without a comprehensive government social net to support the most marginalized residents. Jeff argues, however, that community members have come together and built a stronger political network. "People are more together than they were in terms of knowing what they want. There's more people to speak out than there were…and I think the

community agencies have more residents [involved]." Meanwhile Regent Park is entering phase two of a massive "Revitalization Project." Community members are temporarily relocated in alternative quarters while whole buildings are demolished and new buildings constructed. Community members have participated in formal and informal planning with the city and architectural planners in a collaborative effort to render this community more comfortable and safe for residents. The revitalized community will combine subsidized housing with privately owned residences to promote integration and expand services as well as enterprise in the heart of Toronto. It is impossible to know at this time whether the high hopes of this project will be fulfilled. It is also impossible to gauge the effects that dislocation will have on individuals, families, schools, and the Regent Park community as a whole.

Conclusion

This is a story of people who have allowed each other entrance into their respective lives and communities, and learned as a consequence. It is a story that involves generosity and trust. It began when Mandy was first sent to the offices of Jeff and Janis, who offered themselves as examples of how social justice work could be accomplished within "the system," of how lives could be conducted based on such values. In return, through her stories, Mandy offered them genuine accounts of Regent Park as she experienced it. She made real what they had studied in books. In risking the vulnerability that accompanies the sharing of their lives with each other, they established a relationship of long-term "mutuality," what Wenger considers the "miracle" of education,[37] These miracles serve as learning while they "renew" communities.

They are not only giving Mandy opportunities, they are teaching Mandy how to give these opportunities to others, and in effect, teaching "the rhythms by which communities and individuals continually renew themselves."[38]

When asked what she has learned from her relationship with Jeff and Janis, Mandy replies:

> If they didn't take the hour a day to sit down and have a good talk with me, like who would have? I mean, now I deal with a lot of kids who are in transition, just dropped out of school, thinking about going back, but not quite sure. It has taught me to be an advocate for that young person. Like I mean, sometimes you have to go back into the school and fight with the vice principal to get this [student] back on the enrollment, or whatever it may be. But [I also learned] the importance too of letting them [the youth] decide for themselves, and just supporting them along the way.

Mandy takes hold of the practices she has learned through her relationship with Jeff and Janis: listening in offices; marching off to advocate; respecting the insights and decisions of young people; and offering them support for paths, if chosen, back into schools, back into their communities, paths back home. Sites of education have never ensured connection, but some relationships will emerge, and when they do, they will bring with them beauty and worth.

Limiting the opportunities for such relationships, cutting peripheral positions, offices, and alternative literacies from our schools to accommodate lower budgets endangers powerful students such as Mandy. We have shown how peripheral locations and cultural literacy play a significant role in the learning, maintaining, and renewing of the Regent Park community. If formal peripheries are eliminated, new ones will emerge. The risk is that these could be places that do not have supervision, guidance, and safety.

Our recent conversations in Regent Park suggest that given the stressed conditions of twenty-first century schooling, between standardized tests and funding cuts, children of today will continue to need true mentors in their schools and communities. The fervent hope is that talented and caring adults such as Jeff, Janis, and now Mandy will always find the time, space, and courage to listen to them, to see who these children are, to learn what they have to teach, and possess the strength to act in their best interests. It is reassuring to know that in present day Toronto, honest conversation with a principal, a school social worker, and a community safety coordinator can still become a safe walk home.

Notes

[1]Ronald Manzer, "Public Schools Democracy, and Historical Trends," *Education Canada*, 44, no. 4 (Fall 2004), 4.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Linda Brodkey, *Writing permitted in designated areas only* (Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota Press, 1996); Davis, 2004; and Giroux, 2004.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ursula Kelly, *Schooling Desire: Literacy, Cultural Politics, and Pedagogy* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 10.

[6]Etienne Wenger, *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press., 1998).

[7]Davis, 2004, 17.

[8]Courtney Cazden, Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1988).

[9]Celia Haig-Brown, *Resistence and Renewal: Surviving the Indian residential school* (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1988).

[10]Susan Dion, *Braiding histories: Learning from Aboriginal Peoples' Experiences and Perspectives* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 2009).

[11]John Willinsky, *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1998)

[12]Himani Bannerji, The dark side of the nation: Essays on multiculturalism, nationalism and gender (Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc., 2000).

[13]Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992); and Pierre Walter, "Literacy, imagined nations, and imperialism: Frontier College and the construction of British Canada, 1899-1933, *Adult Education Quarterly*, 54(1), (2003), 42-58.

[14]Taiaiake Alfred, *Peace, power, righteousness: An Indigenous manifesto* (Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 1999); and Celia Haig-Brown & Karen Dannenmann,"A pedagogy of the land: Dreams of respectful relations,"*McGill Journal of Education*, 37 no. 3, 2002, 451-468.

[15]Mary Pardo, Mexican American women activists: Identity and resistance in two Los Angeles communities (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998), 5.

[16]Leslie Roman, *Dangerous territories: Struggles for difference and equality in education*. New York: Routledge, 1997).

[17]Fine, Esther Sokolov, *Interrogating Silences Collaborative Production of Dramatic Text in a Special Education Classroom* (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1990) Unpublished Thesis.

[18]Wenger, *Communities of Practice*, 125.

[19]Ibid, inside cover.

[20]Ibid, 120.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ibid, 117.

[23]Pseudonym A, 1990,10.

[24]Alfred, *Peace, Power, Righteousness*; Haig-Brown & Dannenmann, A Pedagogy of the Land.

[25]Davis, 15.

[26]Pardo, *Mexican American Women Activists.*

[27]Na'ilah Suad Nasir,"'Halal-ing' the Child: Reframing Identities of Resistance in an Urban Muslim School, Harvard Educational Review, 74 no. 2, 2004, 153-174.

[28]Wenger, Communities of Practice, 120.

[29]James Gee,"What is Literacy?" In C. Mitchell & K. Weiler (Eds.), *Rewriting literacy culture and the discourse of the other* (New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1991) 3-10.

[30]Ibid, 117.

[31]Leistyna, Lavandenz, & Nelson, 2004.

[32]Wenger, *Communities of Practice.*

[33]Ibid, 83.

[34]Kelly, *Schooling Desire.*

[35]Lankshear and McClaren, 1993.

[36]Brodkey, *Writing Permitted in Designated Areas Only.*

[37]Wenger, Communities of Practice, 277.

[38]Ibid, 263.

Necessary Betrayals:
Reflections on Biographical Work on a Racist Ancestor

Lucy E. Bailey
Oklahoma State University

I sometimes feel like I'm betraying her
One hundred and fifty years after she wrote that first book.

"Julia" I call her,
though she usually signed her name "Author."

"Read with sympathy," she wrote in 1879…
though I've spent years doing the opposite:

pointing out her racist characters—her fear of immigrants—the white, always white kids in her stories who triumph over evil—her nature stories where even the ants become slaves.

How ironic, I've said, that all her books on how to clean house, how to be a proper woman, how to raise children were all written behind closed doors while her own children wandered on New England beaches, slid down hillsides—and waited—for her to put down her pen.

Latch key kids before latch keys.

These are the kinds of things I say about this woman, this ancestor, this writer—dozens of books—2 children—fifty years behind closed doors.

And yet, I know,
as I sift through her pages and think about those years,
that every single word and every racist character she crafted
paved the way
for me
to write now-

paved the way
for me
to betray her.

I wonder who might read my writing one hundred and fifty years from now and what they will need to say.

Some betrayals are necessary.

Introduction

> *Learn all you can about the authors whose books you read…read with sympathy. Throw yourself into the age and race of which you read, make the past present, and the distant near.*[1]

The impetus for this methodological paper lies in my interests in qualitative, historical, and biographical scholarship and my belief in the value of theorizing the complex connections between researcher and subject for the conduct and representation of research. Although biographers have explored such connections in a variety of ways, including the motivational power of researchers' emotional bonds with their subjects, the limits of such affinities, and the complexity of researching and representing diverse subjects across time and place, I consider here the contours of a particular kind of researcher-subject relationship—ancestral connections—for approaching, analyzing and representing research.[2] I draw from Michelle Fine's useful construct, "working the hyphen," and reflections on my ongoing analysis of the life and writing of a 19th century ancestor to work various aspects of what I call the "genealogical hyphen" in interpretive work.[3] To Fine, the hyphen between researcher-subject symbolizes the enduring if sometimes im-

perceptible ways researchers are linked with those they study. Some researchers romanticize the complex links and affinities they perceive between researcher and subject; some leave such relationships under-theorized; others wrestle with the methodological possibilities and interpretive minefields such relationships present for the conduct of inquiry. I suggest that family relationships between researcher-subject present particular opportunities to consider how we as researchers speak "of" and "for" our forefathers/mothers and when we must speak "through" them for other purposes.

In this paper, I consider methodological aspects of ancestral connections for the conduct of inquiry. Working the genealogical hyphen involves considering the cultural tendency to romanticize bloodlines, the particular purpose of the research enterprise, the type of "relationship" between researcher and subject, and the implications of familial representations. As part of this effort, I use Jean Patterson and Joseph Rayle's reflections on ancestral racism and descendent accountability to consider analysis of an ancestor's writing as a necessary anti-racist act.[4] This is a particular methodological choice, what might be considered a necessary betrayal of a woman immersed in a particular racial episteme, one of thousands seizing pens, who, arguably, paved the way for my own work today.[5] This focus might be considered a "betrayal" because this writer committed years of her life to forging a writing voice against a historical backdrop of gendered silencing. She took writing for women seriously, asking readers to "read with sympathy" and to throw themselves into the "age and race" of which they read.[6]

What might be considered an additional betrayal is that what seemed dear to this writer's identity—her family relationships and the values she espoused—hold little interest for me. I have always seen "her" work as a productive site to explore questions about the 19th century educational imagination, including how white women's writing constructed race. Indeed, my conviction is that our cultural tendency to romanticize bloodlines may undermine productive critical questions in inquiries that happen to involve family members. This point may be particularly important to consider in historical research on foremothers/fathers whose lives do not map on to conventional narratives of heroism and success. The purpose of a given study, the particular "relationship" between biographer-subject, and the methodological import of that aspect of subjectivity must determine the significance of a given relationship for the researcher endeavor.

In what follows, I begin by contextualizing my ancestor's work in white women's 19th century writing patterns, the racist elements of such texts, and the importance of highlighting our forefathers/mothers' racist legacies. I then describe the process of learning about this writer and what this memory

reveals about the inherent silences and near misses that can occur in historical and biographical research. In the remainder of the paper, I work the genealogical hyphen, considering different ways of thinking about research on/with ancestors. I include brief excerpts from different genres of this writer's work to provide a glimpse of her writing. I conclude with the argument that researchers should remain vigilant in analyzing their investments so they can choose narrations that fit their research purpose and the life under study. As Michael Quinn Patton argues, purpose guides the research enterprise.[7] Romanticized constructions of subjects, particularly family members, may interfere with the general mission of the biographical enterprise: to narrate a life.

Women's Writing, Race, and Representation

> *Why pet, you cannot get the black from my skin…but God made my soul White, and I'm trying to keep it so. I do not want a black heart, I can tell you.*[8]

This excerpt from a brief temperance lesson for children published in 1883 depicts a black nurse speaking to an Anglo-Saxon child of her struggle to remain pure of heart. It provides an example of the way my ancestor constructed and mobilized race to serve pedagogical ends. In the tale, a mystified child attempts to scrub his nurse's black skin free of its color and she gently responds, "why pet, you cannot get the black from my skin." The author uses the nurse's black body and white "heart" and "soul" as a springboard to aid white children in understanding differences between good and evil, blackness and whiteness, drinking and sobriety, nature and choice. The nurse in the tale is simply object and prop, frozen in servitude to a young white male citizen-in-the-making.[9] The author of this little lesson, who I refer to as Julia, was an educator (1840-1902) born and raised in New York state. During her sixty-two years of life, she received a private education, married a Presbyterian minister and professor, taught briefly in a women's college, and raised two children. She wrote an array of didactic novels, tracts, textbooks, and manuals of interest to women and children across a forty-six year span, a period in which American women published in unprecedented numbers.[10]

Julia's writing, like that of other 19th century female authors, offers fraught contributions to women's history. On one hand, women's staggering educational and literary production during this century reflects changing educational fortunes and expanding professional opportunities for women worth noting and celebrating. Occupational opportunities such as authorship became increasingly available to primarily white[11] middle-class women

throughout the century as literacy rates grew, the publishing industry expanded, the women's rights movement gained momentum, and the written word accrued value as a symbol of middle-class civility. Some women viewed authorship as a respectable alternative to teaching and an avenue to earn a modest income from the comfort and safety of their homes. The impossibility of pursuing higher education for the majority of American women heightened the value of printed texts, periodicals, and literary societies for women readers.[12] The public demanded texts and the publishing industry responded with zeal. The massive production of women's writing—novels, textbooks, histories, journal articles, children's books, didactic fiction, tracts—thus represents remarkable achievements for middle-class white women denied formal educational opportunities for centuries. It also represents meaningful opportunities for them to read, create, gain a public voice, and forge professional identities that had been unavailable to them previously.

Yet, white women's writing production during these years, however laudable a place it holds in American women's history, also perpetuated racist and xenophobic sentiment constitutive of an era of manifest destiny, slavery, and mass immigration. Texts that championed the domestic sphere and contributed to advancing white women's status in the 19th century were also riddled with racist constructions, ethnic caricatures, and assimilative imperatives.[13] Julia's work was no exception. As the excerpt of the black nurse struggling to "keep her soul white" demonstrates, Julia often used flat and one-dimensional characters of color as springboards for lessons in sin and salvation for Anglo-Saxon characters. The mobilization of black bodies as pedagogical tools seemed an unremarkable undertaking in her writing world, a tool no different from the insect collections, spelling words, and poetry another educator might use to facilitate white children's learning. Scholars argue that such belittling constructions of immigrants and people of color and the raceless construction of whites in literature functioned in part to maintain Anglo-Saxon privilege in an age of anxiety and rapid change.[14]

This anxiety is certainly legible in Julia's texts. "I sing an old song," she writes in a school book preface in 1888, "when I say we are a nervous race and our children are more intensely nervous than their parents."[15] Her text is part of a broader social effort to extol nature as a tonic for rapid industrialization and demographic change. Similarly, in a work of religious fiction published in 1897 a character expresses, "it's a riddle…a riddle, this nineteenth century life with its bad and its good, its boasting and failing. A riddle."[16] Her anxious characters often puzzle over how best to stem an increasing flow of alcoholic spirits, the exploitation of women factory workers, or the steady stream of worshippers abandoning their church pews for the lure of materialism. Other texts present earnest Anglo-Protestants in "superior" moral and social vantage points working to spur the spiritual and social "uplift" of people of

color. These paternalistic "top down" approaches to benevolence reflect the discourses of moral suasion and social reform that gripped many middle-class citizens during this century.[17]

Yet, as Vron Ware argues in her study of feminism's development within racist societies, even progressive social movements cannot escape the white supremacy that shapes their cultural context. Racist beliefs and judgments of the "worthy" and "unworthy" poor affect reformers' benevolent impulses.[18] However well-intentioned, the work of moral reformers and educators inevitably reflects the Colonialist, Imperialist and/or racist context in which it is embedded.[19] Read through this lens, Julia's educational texts and those of her contemporaries are fraught contributions to 19th century women's history and my own "narrative inheritance."[20]

This inheritance has possible implications for my analytic work on Julia's life and writing. In a reflective and partially autobiographical essay on whiteness, Patterson and Rayle urge whites to interrogate how they/we are all implicated in the history of American racism. Their essay emerged from their experiences in a doctoral session at a southern university in which an African-American colleague challenged her white classmates to consider and take responsibility for their own southern ancestors' complicity in racist practices historically, in particular, American slavery. Patterson and Rayle explore their ancestors' involvement in the system of slavery that dominated southern culture and economics for centuries and thereby render visible their own connections to America's racist history. They write, "as Whites become aware of the atrocities committed by their forebears in some distant and…nightmarish social habitus, they must begin the process of exploring and owning their personal connections to both the past and present realities of race."[21] In this view, the past "realities of race" are constitutive of our own experiences and identities in present day and the refusal to consider the possibility or actuality of our ancestors' contributions to this history is an act that displaces responsibility on to a vague Other called "racism" that remains nameless, faceless, disembodied. Theorist Donna Haraway might consider this displacement a version of a "god trick," a construction in which knowledge, action, science seems to emerge "from nowhere" rather than a situated and embodied historical subject.[22]

Approaching biographical and historical scholarship as an anti-racist act subjects The Past to the concerns of The Present, or perhaps unfairly, in Voltaire's words, "plays tricks on the dead." "Reading with sympathy," we can recognize that our foremothers and fathers were products of their time as we are of ours. Indeed, part of the biographical and historical enterprise is to explore and situate the lives under study in the context in which they lived, including in this case, the authorial shifts and racialized discourses that shaped Julia's experiences and nourished her authorial imagination. She was

born and raised in an episteme in which race became a meaningful category through which to view, sort, and rank the world's inhabitants. Her conviction that America was among the "most highly civilized nations" and that "slow," "materialistic," and wicked Alaskan tribes would benefit from Protestant benevolence reflect common colonialist views in the late 19th century.[23] These views clearly informed her life and writing and are among many key trajectories to follow in narrating her past.

Yet emphasizing dominant racial discourses that inevitably informed her writing and the audience needs she imagined may render invisible how she as a flesh-and-blood-being contributed to those discourses. Emphasizing discourse rather than individual acts might be read as a potentially distancing approach, a 'god trick,' that constructs the history of racism as something "that happened" rather than something that individual human beings did-created-perpetuated, acts which have cast long shadows into the present. Holroyd usefully reminds us that the biographical genre demands casting individuals into relief against the "remoteness of history."[24] And Julia, who lived primarily in white middle-class communities or small rural towns throughout her life, championed whiteness and wrote into being a string of racist characters that reflect her active paternalistic and racial imaginary.

A Turn in a Stairwell

> *Come…we expect to be packed full of learning which will benefit our descendants at least to the fourth generation. Begin, Cousin Ann, time is not tarrying….*[25]

A character in one of Julia's domestic manuals delivers this beckoning line in 1879, calling to a family member to join their reading discussion and thus be "packed full of learning" to benefit descendants "to the fourth generation." I began my analytic work on Julia four generations after she wrote that line and after learning of her existence through a happenstance disclosure on my mother's part.[26] While touring the Mormon leader Brigham Young's historic home in downtown Salt Lake City, my mother and I paused in a stairway alcove, waiting for the seemingly endless line of tourists in front of us to ascend the stairs. A worn brown text with gilded lettering—several inches wide on the bookshelf—caught my mother's attention. Startled, she said, "why, my ancestor wrote that book!" I remember feeling disconcerted as we stood side by side, two generations, staring through the glass pane on an antique bookshelf, not only because I knew of no such writer in my family history but because of the rather surreal circumstances of learning this during a chance tourist excursion in the home of a patriarchal church leader and polygamist.[27] I knew a little of the Scottish cheese-makers in my family line,

the narcissistic philanderer, and the cerebral soul who collected so many books his home needed special supports. I also knew of the young man who died mysteriously, tragically, leaving his family haunted with unanswered questions. Other names are etched into the family Bible, representing lives and loves that are now simply fading traces on paper. But I knew nothing of Julia; and my mother, who has little interest in romanticizing ancestry or tarrying unproductively in the past, had little more to say on the subject. The book in question turned out to be Julia's 500-something page best seller, *The Complete Home* (1879), a compendium of tips to aid white women with the staggering responsibilities of maintaining their 19th century households—a fitting tool, perhaps, for Brigham Young's polygamous household with over 50 children.

My thoughts have returned to that curious turn in a stairwell many times—a moment that crystallizes for me the near misses that can occur in historical work and the erratic gaps and silences that constitute any family history.[28] It has also left me with a painful and lingering picture of the unjust ways society has sifted and sorted women historically: Brigham Young's many wives huddling to consult Julia's manual from the confines of their kitchens, while Julia, thousands of miles away on a New England beach front, was writing feverishly to glorify the household so she could forge a professional identity beyond those domestic walls. Her children, so the story goes, were left to entertain themselves while whatever servants she could employ were left to mop up the breakfast crumbs. Indeed, however much Julia glorified the domestic sphere in her written work, one descendent recalled that every time Julia's 'hired girl' quit, she took to her bed until another was found.[29]

As Julia continued to write from within those walls, perhaps she felt deeply the words one of her characters expressed in 1895,

> In all these questions of social life, it is the woman who has most at stake and whose voice is least heard; her opinion is ruled out of politics, even out of her church affairs, and frequently the battle is waged to rule her out of the household destinies where the fortunes of the children, whom she represents, are to be made or marred.[30]

This passage, written nearly fifty years after American women's rights activists launched the movement in Seneca Falls, seems intended to laud the work of women and protest their circumscribed economic, social, and legal status. Women's voices, Julia suggests, are those "least heard." Yet her texts protested only the cultural silencing of white women; the African-American figurations that appear nursing, farming, and fiddling in her texts often seem content with their lot. However much gender compromised Julia's legal rights and life choices, her access to the very tools through which she decried

gender inequity and contributed to racist discourse—quill and ink, publishing, literacy—resulted from her class, race, and citizenship privilege. Married privilege helped as well; her husband often took responsibility for corresponding with her male publishers, perhaps so she might avoid the suggestion of impropriety sometimes associated with the act of exchanging letters with men.[31] Race and class privilege thus saturates the material form of the few artifacts that survive from any of my ancestors. Quilts stitched, songs sung, babies held, tears shed leave few material traces for the biographer's consideration.

The access to literacy and publishing these material artifacts represent provide an example of the sometimes invisible threads with which we might link The Past to The Present and the enduring legacies of privilege and racism to which Rayne and Patterson refer. The specific content of Julia's texts also casts into sharp relief her racial imaginings. The "time blurred" caricatures of people of color and ethnic minorities legible in her texts are numbingly predictable and painful to consider today: a photograph of an African-American child smiling and clutching a watermelon with the caption "happy thief" written below; a grizzled black character with a racialized dialect and expertise in opossums; blackened and sinister Irish clergy who vie with the Protestant church for the allegiance of innocent white maidens; "uncivilized" Native Americans awaiting redemption from white missionaries; and heavily masculinized or nurturing African-American female characters who serve white children. Julia's racial imaginary creates one-dimensional and formulaic characters of color and erases the subjectivity and agency of all but Anglo-Protestants.[32]

Researcher/Subject Relationships: Working the Genealogical Hyphen

> *There is no thought more beautiful and far-reaching than this of the solidarity or oneness of the Family…the individual is solitary, but God setteth the solitary in families. The stream of time is crowded with the ships of households, parents and children, youth and infancy, age with its memories."*[33]

Cultural investments in bloodlines, in the "oneness of the Family," raise concrete methodological and representational issues with which biographers must grapple in the conduct of inquiry. In her notable essay, "Working the Hyphen" (1994) educational scholar Michelle Fine argues that researchers must work what she called the Self-Other hyphen in research, considering the ways various "relations between" researcher-subject limit and shape the inquiry process. Like others working within critical and interpretive para-

digms, Fine refuses the conventional research stance that researchers are transparent vessels who objectively collect data from "out there" and deliver it to others without mediation or distortion. Dismissing the possibility of researcher neutrality, she argues that traditional research practices are "long on texts that inscribe some Others, preserve other Others from scrutiny, and seek to hide the researcher/writer under a veil of neutrality or objectivity."[34] She suggests that however researchers and subjects are linked, considering their attachments in the research enterprise is an important aspect of qualitative work.

Indeed, interrogating such attachments might be particularly important in biography given some scholars' conviction that bonds between a biographer and his/her subject—however partial, however constructed—are useful, if not imperative, aspects of biographical labor. Identification with A Subject, either still living or long departed, may inspire the biographer, personalize inquiry, and thicken the rendering of a human life in substantial and perhaps irreplaceable ways.[35] One feminist biographer's reflections offer a glimpse of the inspirational potential of this connection: "Emily has always been with me, invading my research and pulling at my heartstrings. I finally gave into her last year and agreed to research and write her story."[36] Similarly, for Blanche Wiesen Cook, "personal involvement [with the subject] is central….if it fails to emerge in the course of research, I change subjects."[37] She converses with her subjects, disagrees with them, and dreams about them, and such interactions facilitate her ability to narrate their lives with sensitivity and depth.

Such identification may particularly inspire a researcher recording for posterity the life of a related individual. Bloodlines are deeply romanticized in culture, in American law, in family lore—indeed, the countless hours descendents spend sifting through attic trunks, dusty archives, and faded microfilm for traces of the past indicate their relevance for many in making sense of self, family, and heritage. The researcher's "relationship" with his/her ancestral subject may become threaded with family lore, shame and pride, the trope of bloodlines, and significantly, the identity work of the researcher. As Foucault suggests in his essay, "What is an Author?" "…I believe that it is better to try to understand that someone who is a writer is not simply doing his work in his books…but that his major work, is, in the end, *himself* in the process of writing his books."[38] Many biographers agree. Alpern suggests feminist biographical initiatives inspire deep "attachment" and "identification" with the Subject because "any biography uneasily shelters an autobiography within it." Read through these lenses, biographers "writing" their relatives may, in part, be "writing" themselves.[39]

But what do the biographers yearning for such affinity as a springboard for their research do when their subjects embody more troubling aspects of

humanity, however they might define it—war criminals, war deserters, terrorists, slave owners, convicted sex offenders? Might one be more willing to explore the contributions of and develop biographical affinity for a Kennedy, an Albert Einstein, or a Martin Luther King? Are family connections with some notoriety more comfortable to admit and appealing to explore, however fraught personally—the Mommie Dearests, the Elvises, the J.D. Salingers—than those which link our bloodlines too closely with human beings who have committed deplorable acts against humanity? Cook affirms that identifying with her subject is imperative for her work: "most biographers choose to write about people they care about and can identify with."[40] These questions remind me of an acquaintance's quest to trace his family lineage in Oklahoma that he ended abruptly, after discovering his ancestor had served a life sentence for murder. The association so troubled him that he refused to explore his lineage further, wary of what else he might discover, wary of what other secrets might lurk in his family history, and what the crimes of The Past might mean for his own sense of identity in The Present.

Such abruptly-truncated searches speak to the power of family lineage and bloodlines in culture, discourse, and identity. They speak to the ways we all may choose to look away from some ancestors and toward, for example, the Civil War heroes or the industrious settlers that risked life and limb to help forge our nation. They speak to the ways constructions of The Present and The Past can inform each other. And also, significantly, they speak to the ways silences, inherent selectivity in family attachment, and the erratic nature of ancestral knowledge to begin with—what if I had taken that turn in Brigham Young's hallway more quickly?—fundamentally shape the biographical and historical enterprise.

Another aspect of the genealogical hyphen that merits consideration is the potential for family connections to enrich and complicate qualitative work. From a pragmatic perspective, relatives may have access to letters, photographs, and other biographical traces unavailable to those outside the family circle. Margaret Salinger relied on the confidences of her aunt and mother to write about her reclusive novelist father, J.D., as well as a crucial directive he offered years before: "the biographical facts you want are in my stories, in one form or another."[41] Although anyone could shuffle the pages of a Salinger novel searching for revealing biographical gems, only intimates might recognize the significance of a turn of phrase or a fleeting event for the man behind the novel. Similarly, outsiders to Maori culture would be hard pressed to entice Maori women to tell their tales as some would entrust their stories only to daughters and granddaughters.[42] Shared epistemologies, cultural allegiances, as well as the ethnocentric history of Western anthropology may account in part for such protective impulses, but many recognize that family members, partners, and spouses might have unique access to anec-

dotes and experiences essential for crafting a full sense of the subject.

Cultural investments in bloodlines raise challenging methodological issues for researchers. In the case of biographers crafting narratives on foremothers/fathers, researchers and interviewees intrigued with ancestral linkages might easily slip into glorifying their subjects' accomplishments at the expense of critical questions. Or others relying on interviews with family members as a data source might find themselves treading carefully in their representational choices so as not to offend the very informants that make the biographical enterprise possible. I have heard scholars relate varied struggles concerning which family secrets to include in their work (the affairs, the legal tussles, the alcoholism?), how to negotiate such decisions with family members, and, in the end, how to bear the ethical dilemma of championing particular aspects of a life and remaining silent on others that present the subject in a richer, more human, and yet, less favorable light. Researchers in such circumstances might yearn for bloodlines to carry far less symbolic weight.

Among the angles of the genealogical hyphen to consider is that focusing too heavily on contours of the researcher-subject relationships might interfere with the research enterprise. As additional theoretical frameworks "emerge to…situate" biographical subjects, thinking beyond preconceived ideas about researchers' investments might serve biographical labor.[43] Indeed, scholars invested in narrating the lives of Others have cautioned that the trend toward researcher reflexivity in the "post-experimental" moment has at times tipped the balance between what feminist historian Marjorie Theobald calls "the imperative of the authorial voice" and the need to "empower the [historical] subject."[44] Researchers busy wrestling with methodological dilemmas and reflecting on their research investments may overshadow, in the case of biographical work, the humanist subject that inspired their quest to begin with and leave that subject to fade back into the dust of history waiting to catch another researcher's eye. As Theobald's comments suggest, such wrestling might interrupt the biographical enterprise of narrating lives. And there are many lives to narrate.

Historians Kathleen Weiler and Sue Middleton also caution researchers of the dangers of considering too vigorously the ways they are "implicated in the choice of what is represented" in that the researcher may "write more about herself than she does about that outside of herself which she is trying to know."[45] Similarly, feminist methodologist Patti Lather reminds us in her criticism of anthropologist Ruth Behar's intensely reflexive scholarship, a fine—but crucial—line exists between acknowledging the inevitable presence of The Self in the work and shifting undue attention from The Work (however conceived) to The Self.[46] These remarks indicate the delicate balance researchers must strike between theorizing their investments and

the potential erasure of the subject or the clear hyphen between researcher-subject such reflexivity might inspire. The relevance of such theorizing does not mean researcher or subject merit equal, similar, or unilateral attention at the onset of research. Theoretical investments and project purpose shape the conduct and representation of research.

Investments and Imaginaries

> *Shame to you, to turn against your own kith[!]* [47]

In this line from a temperance tract published in 1879, a middle-aged domestic expresses outrage that the uncle of a recently-orphaned child refuses to support his own kith and kin. "Shame on ye!" she cries to the man who dislikes children, refuses to care for the child, and resents the child's father for dying in the first place. Julia's stories are full of such betrayals: drunken fathers who abandon their families, Protestants who join the Catholic Church, men and women who turn away from their "kith" and kin to pursue their own interests. What might be considered a productive betrayal in my own analytical work is that Julia as an ancestral essence, living more than a century ago among a bevy of other ancestors, holds little interest for me. Even as I work slowly to reconstruct her life, even as I feel gratitude to have remnants of her writing labor, I subject "her" to my own interests and preoccupations. I have always seen her texts as productive analytic sites for exploring a number of methodological and historical trajectories: forms of American racism, shifts in women's lives in the 19th century, the emergence of female authorship, the complexities of female subjectivity, the possibilities of feminist biography, the discursive construction of gendered whiteness through the racializing of textual Others, and the boundaries of contemporary methodological imperatives.

In a moment of fancy, I might imagine a connection to the flesh-and-blood being who was Julia when she writes to women readers in 1879,

> Take the trouble to compare, to criticize, to generalize, feel when you are reading anything *that you are your own steward*, and that you will call yourself to account some day for these precious things that you are putting to trust.[48]

I love this line, this call to women to read actively, passionately, to become agents in their intellectual lives. I can easily pluck these words from their 19th century context and use them to serve my 21st century projects, to claim a kind of license to be my own steward through the pages of her work, to interpret it as I may, even if such stewardship tramples on her original intent.

I am equally intrigued when I stumble across descriptions of Julia charging down nature paths on a beautiful spring day with "butterflies swimming in the air." When I read such lines I hope that any woman might experience this pleasure in nature, this mobility, this freedom to pursue that which enlivens her mind. Such images inspire for me the questions Rose believes the work of life history is intended to inspire in readers: "have I lived that way? Do I want to live that way? Could I make myself live that way if I wanted to?"[49]

Where this fleeting and constructed affinity falters for me, and one of many reasons I argue that we must critically analyze the contours of researcher-subject relationships to determine which aspects are and are not significant for our research purposes, is in, for example, Julia's venomous constructions of Irish Catholic priests or her paternalistic and racialized caricatures of people of color. For instance, in the final text Julia published (1902), she creates a black female character named Fiddlin' Jim who is "the most saucy, lazy, untidy, no account darkey alive."[50] Jim plays a fiddle, lives in squalor, and wears garish clothes more fitting for a minstrel show than a lady's parlor. A Protestant-owned press published this text to promote benevolence toward social unfortunates who reformers might have deemed at first glance as beyond redemption. Accordingly, the story depicts an articulate, respectable white woman sweeping into Jim's life with petticoats swirling and Bible in hand to transform the saucy, fiddle-playing ne'er do well into a tidy, religious and industrious soul. There is little in this tale to glorify.

Equally troubling are the black hired hands and immigrants that appear in the texts simply to advance plotlines. For example, in the lesson introduced earlier featuring the character of the black nurse, the nurse bears the white child's attempt to scrub her skin clean of its color and insists, "god made my soul white and I'm trying to keep it so."[51] Utilizing the enduring tropes of whiteness and blackness to symbolize purity and evil, Julia mobilizes a character who tolerates scrubbing and prodding to serve the spiritual education of a young white boy. And Julia seemed to hold high hopes for the socializing power of such educational texts. As a character in a domestic manual expresses, "And we shall find when all the years are told, that nothing has so moulded and fashioned our inner lives—so made us what in the end we shall be—as reading."[52] These sobering textual constructions are part of women's history, part of my history.

Leon Edel reminds us of the need to remain vigilant to which investments and imaginaries drive our biographical choices. He writes, "in a world full of subjects—centuries crowded with notables and dunces—we may ask why a modern biographer fixes his attention on certain faces and turns his back on others."[53] Families are comprised of any number of notables and dunces upon which to focus. Considering this point in relation to my on-

going work on this ancestor's writing, one might argue that my "relationship" to this author would unquestionably influence how I interpret her work, my project, in fact, begin a form of "homework" in Elizabeth St. Pierre's sense of the term: studying something potentially significant for the researcher, such as a hometown or a group to which he/she belongs.[54] If interpreting a text is a "dialectical process resulting from the interface of the variable interpretive resources people bring to bear on the text"[55] my own position as descendent of this educator (as woman) stands to be an interpretive resource influential for my approach to and analysis of her life and writing (as extensions of that woman).

These reflections bring me to a key aspect of working the genealogical hyphen: I want to speak against a discourse that romanticizes too readily the messy cultural and psychological investments in ancestry. Although organizations such as the Daughters of the American Revolution are founded on cross-generational devotion and genealogical research is a deeply meaningful enterprise for many, it is important to remember that these "discourses of affiliation"[56] are constructed affiliations, constructed investments, constructed ways of making sense of Self and Other. They are fraught, selective, partial, and riddled with cultural beliefs about identity, lineage, and what constitutes a valuable life. Like approaching a research enterprise with the conviction that sexuality, race, class, sex (or any number of other analytics) have equal significance for varied inquiry projects, the assumption that "ancestry matters" mobilizes too liberally at the outset the significance of an element that can only be determined through considering the specific research purpose. Fine reminds us that working these messy details and nuances of the hyphen is key to exploring and understanding our own investments.

The idea that this writer as an ancestral essence matters more to me than my methodological interests, my feminism, or any number of my other personal and professional allegiances constructs a romanticized vision of bloodlines that seems forced at best across one hundred years, multiple generations, and the specific purposes of my research. Working the genealogical hyphen through Patterson and Rayle's reflections on ancestral racism produces different analytical possibilities than Theobald, Weiler, and Middleton's reminder that researchers' reflections sometimes obscure the subjects they seek to explore. As I continue to slowly sketch a portrait of Julia, consider her work, and seek ways to understand the struggles of 19th century female educators within their historical context, I also continue to work the hyphen differently.

My broader methodological contention is that researchers must consider the particular implications of research projects with, on, or for ancestors and family members so they can make analytical and representational choices that fit their project purpose and personal investments. And they must do

so with the awareness that broader cultural investments in "family oneness" can shape their choices of subject, the tales they choose to tell, how they choose to tell them, and how audiences interpret them. The biographical genre welcomes subjects cast in a romantic glow. Readers and authors are often intrigued with heroic narratives of great lives, origin stories, and family connections. Yet our connections to the past are constructed, complex, and fraught with darkness as well as light, and these complexities merit exploration and representation, and at times, betrayals. I do not know how Julia would interpret the "tricks" I have played on her —the critical questions I have asked about family connections, her work, or her life. Yet, Alice Wexler's struggle to represent Emma Goldman in all her complexity—in her case, to criticize a heroic figure—underscores my conviction that necessary tales are not always romantic ones.[57]

Notes

[1]Julia Wright, *The Complete Home.* (Philadelphia: J.C. McCurdy and Co, 1879), 211.

[2]See, for example, Blanche Weisen Cook, "The Issue of Subject: A Critical Connection" and Lynda Anderson Smith, "The Biographer's Relationship with Her Subject" in *Writing Educational Biography: Explorations in Qualitative Research,* ed. Craig Kridel. (New York: Garland Publishing, 1998); Michael Holroyd, *Works on Paper: The Craft of Biography and Autobiography*, (Washington, D.C.: Counterpoint, 2002).

[3]Michelle Fine, "Working the Hyphen: Reinventing Self and Other in Qualitative Research." In *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*, eds. N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004), 77-82.

[4]Jean A. Patterson and Joseph M. Rayle, "De-Centering Whiteness: Personal Narratives of Race," in *Postcritical Ethnography: Reinscribing Critique,* eds. G. Noblit, S. Flores, and E. Murillo, (Creskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press, 2004).

[5]See Lucy E. Bailey, "The Absent Presence of Whiteness," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation (Ohio State University, 2002) for initial methodological reflections on the issue of ancestral connections between researcher and subject, including my concern that cultural romanticizing of bloodlines and genealogy may—at the expense of the analytical project—preoccupy readers and researchers intrigued with such links. I suggest the importance of considering when and under what circumstances imagined connections between researcher and subject potentially interrupt analytic work and run counter to project purpose. At times, resisting the romanticizing of bloodlines and engaging in what I call a "genealogical refusal" that focuses on project rather than researcher-subject "relationship," may be a methodological necessity.

[6]As Marjory Wolf argues, analytic approaches produce different interpretations, and I have interpreted Julia's work differently elsewhere. See *A Thrice Told Tale: Feminism, Postmodernism, and Ethnographic Responsibility,* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992).

[7]Michael Quinn Patton, *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods, Third Edition* (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2002).

[8]Wright, *The Temperance Second Reader for Families and Schools*, (New York:

National Temperance Society and Publication House, 1883), 53.

[9]I draw examples from her texts to serve methodological reflections on the biographical project; for detailed racial analysis, see Bailey, "Absent Presence," and "Wright-ing White: The Construction of Race in Women's 19th Century Didactic Texts," *Journal of Thought*, 41.4 (2006): 65-81; I draw ideas and language from this earlier work throughout this essay.

[10]For information on 19th century women writers and their varied work see Nina Baym, *American Women Writers and the Work of History,* 1790-1860 (New Brunswick, N.J, 1995), *Woman's Fiction: A Guide to Novels by and About Women in America, 1820-1870* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993 [1978]) and Susan Coultrap-McQuin, *Doing Literary Business* (North Carolina: Chapel Hill, 1990); For information on this author, see Bailey,"'A Plain Woman's Story,'"Unpublished Master's Thesis (Ohio State University, 1997). I use Julia's first name because it personalizes racism and conveys familiarity as a biographical subject.

[11]I use the term "white" and "Anglo-Saxon" interchangeably here, recognizing their socially-constructed, fluctuating meanings and reflecting Toni Morrison's critique of the absent presence of whiteness in canonical literature. See *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*, (New York: Vintage Press, 1992).

[12]For a history of 19th century women's literary societies, see Theodora Penny Martin, *The Sound of our Own Voices* (Beacon Press, 1989).

[13]See Donnarae MacCann, *White Supremacy in Children's Literature: Characterizations of African Americans,* 1830–1900 (New York: Garland Publishing, 1998).

[14]See MacCann, *White Supremacy,* and Morrison, *Playing in the Dark*.

[15]Wright, *Sea Side and the Way Side, Book Three,* (Boston: D.C. Heath and Company, 1888).

[16]Wright, *The Cardiff Estate,* (New York: American Tract Society, 1897), 347.

[17]Helen Damon-Moore,"The History of Women and Service in the United States: A Rich and Complex Heritage," in *The Practice of Change: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Women's Studies*, B. J. Balliet and K. Hefferman, eds. (Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 2000), esp. 48-49.

[18]Damon-Moore,"The History of Women and Service,"48-49.

[19]Vron Ware, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism and History*, (London: Verso, 1992), esp. 119.

[20]According to H. L. Goodall,"narrative inheritance"refers to stories given to children by and about family members." See,"Narrative Inheritance: A Nuclear Family with Toxic Secrets," *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11.4 (2005): 492-513.

[21]Patterson and Rayle,"De-Centering Whiteness,"249.

[22]Donna Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 188 and 191.

[23]Wright, *Among the Alaskans*, (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1883), 19-35.

[24]Michael Holroyd, *Works on Paper: the Craft of Biography and Autobiography*. (Washington, D.C.: Counterpoint, 2002).

[25]Wright, *Complete Home*, 130.

[26]This section is developed from initial reflections on that turn in Bailey, 2002.

[27]Brigham Young was a key early leader in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints who helped settle the Salt Lake Valley during the late 19th century. Polygamy was a normative practice in the church's early years but the contemporary LDS Church forbids it. The common misconception that LDS church members practice polygamy results in continued religious discrimination against them and thus merits emphasis here.

[28]See Goodall, "Narrative Inheritance," for more on gaps and silences.

[29]The texts in the bookcase were likely props selected during restoration. The "narrative inheritance" is a construction that emerges from family papers and mythology.

[30]Wright, *Priest and Nun,* 1895.

[31]See Susan Coultrap-McQuin, *Doing Literary Business* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990) for a discussion of women authors' efforts to navigate gendered social propriety with the demands of doing business; See Sally L. Kitch, *This Strange Society of Women: Reading the Letters and Lives of the Woman's Commonwealth*, (Columbus: Ohio State Press, 1993), for a discussion of the letter as a gendered literary form laden with symbolism.

[32]Grace Elizabeth Hale uses "time blurred" in *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890-1940* (New York: Pantheon, 1998); Bailey, "Wright-ing White," 2006.

[33]Wright, *The Complete Home,* 4.

[34]Fine, "Working the Hyphen," 73.

[35]See Louis Smith, "The Biographer's Relationship with Her Subject" and Linda C. Wagner-Martin, "The Issue of Gender," in *Writing Educational Biography: Explorations in Qualitative Research*, C. Kridel, ed. (New York: Garland Publishing, 1998).

[36]K. R. Mehaffey, "They Called her Captain: The Amazing Life of Emily Virginia Mason," *The Journal of Women's Civil War History* 2 (2001): 74-85.

[37]Cook, "The Issue of Subject," 81.

[38]Quoted in David Schaafsma, "Performing the Self: Constructing Written and Curricular Fictions," In *Foucault's Challenge: Discourse, Knowledge and Power in Education*, ed. T. Popkewitz (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 255-277.

[39]Sara Alpern, Joyce Antler, Elisabeth Israels Perry and Ingrid Winther Scobie, *The Challenge of Feminist Biography: Writing the Lives of Modern American Women* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 10-11.

[40]Cook, "The Issue of Subject," 80.

[41]Margaret Salinger, *Dream Catcher: A Memoir* (Washington Square Press, 2000), xiii.

[42]Linda Tuhiwai-Smith, "Connecting Pieces: Finding the Indigenous Presence in the History of Women's Education," In *Telling Women's Lives: Narrative Inquiries in the History of Women's Education,* eds. K. Weiler and S. Middleton (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1999), 64; also see Tuhiwai-Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples,* (London: Zed Books, 1999).

[43]Alice Wexler, "Emma Goldman and the Anxiety of Biography," in *The Challenge of Feminist Biography: Writing the Lives of Modern American Women*, eds. S. Alpern, J. Antler, E. Israels Perry, and I. Winther Scobie (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 47.

[44]Marjorie Theobald, "Teachers, Memory and Oral History," In *Telling Women's Lives,* 15.

[45]Weiler and Middleton, *Telling Women's Lives,* 3. Similarly, Craig Kridel expresses frustration with qualitative researchers'"endless" methodological discussions even as he advocates for greater attention to method in the field of educational biography. See "Biographical Meanderings: Reflections and Reminiscences on *Writing Educational Biography,"Vitae Scholasticae* (2008): 5-16.

[46]Patti Lather,"A Response to Doug Foley," (Unpublished Manuscript, 1997), 1.

[47]Wright, *Firebrands*, 11.

[48]Wright, *Complete Home*, 212.

[49]Phyllis Rose, *Parallel Lives* (New York: Knopf, 1984), 5.

[50]Wright,"Fiddlin' Jim,"*Stories in Hearts*, (New York: American Tract Society, 1902), 134.

[51]Wright, *Second Reader*, 53.

[52]Wright, *Complete Home*, 199.

[53]Leon Edel, *Writing Lives: Principia Biographica*, (New York: Norton, 1984), 60.

[54]Elizabeth St. Pierre and Wanda Pillow, Eds. *Working the Ruins: Feminist Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education,* (New York: Routledge, 2000); Bailey, 2002.

[55]Norman Fairclough,"The Technologisation of Discourse." In *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*, eds. Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard (New York: Routledge, 1996), 71-84.

[56]Shawn Michelle Smith discusses the historical exclusion of African-Americans from the Daughters of the American Revolution, see *American Archives: Gender, Race, Class in Visual Culture* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1999); for "discourses of affiliation," see Jo Anne Pagano, *Exiles and Communities: Teaching in the Patriarchal Wilderness.* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1990), 11.

[57]Wexler,"Emma Goldman,"48.

Membership Form:
International Society for Educational Biography

Members of the International Society for Educational Biography receive current issues of ***Vitae Scholasticae*** as part of their membership benefits. Member dues are $75 per year. Please use the form below to join:

ISEB Membership Form:

Name_____

Institution_____

Address_____

City, State, ZIP, Country_____

Please send with your $75 check payable to ISEB to:

Lora Helvie-Mason, ISEB Treasurer
1907 Illinois Ave.
Kenner, LA 70062

Subscribe
To *Vitae Scholasticae*

q Please enter my subscription
for the next year of ***Vitae Scholasticae***

Name _____

Institution _____

Address _____

City, State, Zip, Country _____

_____

Type of subscription:
q Individual subscription ($50 per year)
q Institutional subscription ($100 per year)
q Add $40 if outside the United States

Method of payment:
q Check enclosed payable to International Society for Educational Biography
q Money order enclosed payable to International Society for Educational Biography

Mail completed form to:

Professor Linda C. Morice
Department of Educational Leadership, Campus Box 1125
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Edwardsville, Illinois 62026-1125 USA
Telephone: 618-650-3278; Fax: 618-650-3808; Email: lmorice@siue.edu

Contributing Authors

A. J. Angulo is an associate professor of educational foundations and research at Winthrop University (U.S.A.).

Andrea Walton is an associate professor and history of education chair at Indiana University Bloomington (U.S.A.).

Kay Whitehead is a professor in the school of education at Flinders University (Australia).

Lynne Trethewey is an adjunct senior research fellow in the school of education (Magill campus) at the University of South Australia (Australia).

Karleen Pendleton Jimenez is an assistant professor in the school of education at Trent University (Canada).

Esther Sokolov Fine is an associate professor of education at York University (Canada).

Lucy E. Bailey is an assistant professor of social foundations and qualitative inquiry at Oklahoma State University (U.S.A.).

Vitae Scholasticae

Information for Contributors

Vitae Scholasticae welcomes manuscripts dealing with all aspects of educational biography. The 15th edition of *A Manual of Style* from the University of Chicago Press is the final authority for most questions of style and structure. Manuscripts should be submitted via e-mail with author identification on the cover page only; the text of the manuscript should be in Microsoft Word.

For more information about ***Vitae Scholasticae*** visit the International Society for Educational Biography website at http://iseb.blogs.edu.yorku.ca/submission-to-vitae-scholasticae/ or contact:

Professor Linda C. Morice
Department of Educational Leadership
Campus Box 1125
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Edwardsville, Illinois 62026-1125, U.S.A.

Electronic submissions should be directed to: **lmorice@siue.edu**

All statements of fact or points of view in articles are the responsibility of authors and do not represent any official position of the International Society for Educational Biography or ***Vitae Scholasticae***.

Articles appearing in ***Vitae Scholasticae*** are abstracted and indexed in *Historical Abstracts* and *America: History and Life*.

International Society for Educational Biography

Membership in the International Society for Educational Biography is open to anyone interested in educational biography. Dues are $75 per year, which includes issues of ***Vitae Scholasticae***. See membership form on page 117.