"BUILDING USEFUL WOMEN FROM THE DEPTHS OF POVERTY": A SOCIAL HISTORY OF THE GIRLS' INDUSTRIAL HOME AND SCHOOL IN ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, 1853-1935

By

LISA G. GUINN

Bachelor of Science
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas
1989

Master of Arts
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, Kansas
1996

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
May, 2003

"'BUILDING USEFUL WOMEN' FROM THE DEPTHS OF POVERTY: A SOCIAL HISTORY OF THE GIRLS' INDUSTRIAL HOME AND SCHOOL IN ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, 1853-1935"

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Advisor

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the OSU History Department for allowing me to study with such a gifted faculty and for the funding provided me while completing my dissertation. The Townsend Dissertation Fellowship in 2001 and a Graduate Research Fellowship from the History Department in 2002 allowed me to make several research trips to St. Louis. The opportunity to teach gave me valuable experience and the funding necessary to sustain myself while writing.

I would also like to thank my fellow graduate students in the History Department who have persevered with me through the difficult, yet rewarding experience of obtaining a PhD. A special thank-you to Shelly who listened to me complain through my endless "crises of confidence" and offered reassurance that the feelings were perfectly normal. To Jim, Mark, and Stefanie, I appreciate your friendship and words of encouragement. To Tom, I thank you for not only listening to me talk about my topic, but also for reading several conference papers and helping me make sense of many ideas that I could not seem to articulate. Thank you also for the support you have given me. I feel very fortunate to have been in the program at the same time with such intelligent people.

I would like to add a special thank-you to my committee: Dr. James L. Huston, Dr. Richard Rohrs, Dr. John Paul Bischoff, and Dr. Jean Van Delinder. All of you have increased my knowledge of history by allowing me to benefit from your individual expertise. I feel incredibly fortunate to have had each of you as professors in the classroom and dissertation committee members.

The archivists at the Missouri Historical Society in St. Louis, Missouri were an incredible help in pointing me in many right directions while searching for obscure

information on the Girls' Home. Even during the final stages, they answered my last-minute email requests with promptness and usually with much-needed information. I also want to thank Susan Corrington, director of the Edgewood Children's Center. She was gracious enough to allow me access to the private collection of the Center, including case records from the Girls' Home. I cannot express how valuable these records were in telling the story of the Girls' Home. I hope that the Center is pleased with the outcome of the dissertation. I would also like to thank the staff in charge of the Western Historical Manuscript Collection housed at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. The collection houses not only the records of the Girls' Home, but also the Health and Welfare Council Records which provided me with much information on the Girls' Home in the twentieth century.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends. In ways that each of you will probably never know, you have inspired me to go further than I thought I could. This dissertation is dedicated to all of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
I. "Beyond All Their Hopes, They Found This Venture A Success": A Chronological Overview of the Girls' Industrial Home and School, 1853-1935	24
The Formative Years, 1853-1857	32
GIH as a Residential Home and Day School, 1858-1899	37
GIH as a True Industrial School, 1900-1935	43
II. "Guarding against making it an 'Institution'": The Girls' Industrial Home and School and Its Progressive Ideas of Child Welfare	60
III. "Making every dollar do double duty": The Economic Role Played by the Women of The Girls' Industrial Home and School	91
IV. "'Claiming the glorious privilege of being independent'": The Girls' Industrial Home and School, the Training in Domestic Skills, and the Meaning of Independence	120
V. "Removing the Frequent Companion of Vice": The Girls' Industrial Home and School and the Mission to Rescue Destitute Girls	154
VI. "'Uniting us more closely to our suffering and less fortunate sisters'": The Girls' Industrial Home and School and the Experience with Class and Child Neglect	190
CONCLUSION	219
EPILOGUE: The Therapeutic Years of the Girls' Home, 1936-1978	230
APPENDIX— Available statistics on admissions and dismissals from GIH	247
BIBLIOGRAPHY	249

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Organizations making garments for use in GIH, 1880-1914 74

2. Dollar amount of money spent on salaries, and percentage of total expenses for GIH in five year increments from 1854 to 1913 81

3. GIH Annual Meeting Locations 1854-1875 100

4. GIH spending in dollars and percentage, 1854-1914..... 105

5. GIH funding in dollars and percentages, 1854-1914..... 111

6. Select occupations employing female workers in St. Louis, and percentage of total employed, 1870-1920 132

7. Percentage of native-born and foreign-born girls residing at GIH 133

8. Age range of girls residing at GIH, 1860-1920 135

9. Conditions of Female Commitments in St. Louis House of Refuge, 1855-1899 158

10. Ethnicity of women and girls residing at GIH, 1860-1920 206

INTRODUCTION

The establishment of a benevolent organization "was not so much a rejection of woman's sphere as it was an attempt to give institutional form and public importance to its most positive features."
— Suzanne Lebsock, *Free Women of Petersburg: Status and Culture in a Southern Town, 1784-1860* (1984)

"Associations provided careers for many women, careers from which the income was psychic rather than material."
— Anne Firor Scott, *Natural Allies: Women's Association in American History* (1991)

In 1853, four St. Louis women established The Girls' Industrial Home and School (GIH) to deal with poverty-stricken children in the city. The object of the mission was to rescue girls from lives of destitution, give them an education in basic literacy, and provide them with adequate skills that would enable them to seek reliable employment and become self-supporting. Not unlike other benevolent associations that formed in the nineteenth century, GIH emphasized the dual role of education and shelter for young children whose parents were unable or unwilling to care for them properly. The women involved in the creation and management of GIH came from different Protestant denominations in St. Louis, giving the institution a religious, yet non-sectarian emphasis. The association was extremely successful. It existed for 125 years as an independent, private association and provided care for thousands of girls in the city of St. Louis and the surrounding community.

This is a social history of GIH from 1853-1935. The ending date is 1935 because it was then that GIH managers began to change the mission of the association from custodial to therapeutic. That transition was complete by 1958. The adaptation to therapeutic care by the mid-twentieth century did not lessen the importance of GIH, rather it continued to operate as a viable facility for an additional twenty years. This study tackles

the question of the nature of nineteenth-century reform and the specific subjects of institution building, gender, juvenile delinquency, and class.

The women of GIH operated as nineteenth-century social reformers who were driven by middle-class interests. While they saw the problems created by poverty and sought a way to solve those problems, their solution was to teach the poor, specifically children, the middle-class values of industry and self-reliance. Their reform methodology began with institutional care that sought to protect children from immorality, vice, and the lessons of idleness. Antithetically, the GIH managers attempted to maintain the sanctity of the home by replicating it in the institution while sanctioning the removal of children from their own homes. Managers also emphasized maternalism in their method of reform by focusing solely on children (specifically on girls), and emphasizing protection as a key to the mission of the institution. Moral reformation and religious instruction was an element in the mission, but it was not as direct as other nineteenth-century institutions for girls. GIH did not enact strict and monotonous standardization in their program, or stress the importance of wifehood and motherhood at the expense of individual womanhood.

Contributing to the institutional reform methodology was the emerging importance of childhood in the nineteenth century. Childhood, distinct from adulthood and infanthood, became a recognized "phase in the life course," especially amongst the growing middle class.[1] At least within the urban areas where middle-class fathers worked for wages in the market economy, nineteenth-century children of the middle class no longer needed to labor and contribute to the family subsistence. New psychological and educational methods began informing parents of the importance of pre-pubescent and adolescent periods for children's mental and emotional growth. As a result, middle-class children experienced an extended adolescence and more educational opportunities than pre-nineteenth-century children. The need to protect the inherent innocence of childhood and insure children a productive upbringing became a primary motive of nineteenth-century

reformers. The plethora of children's institutions built throughout the nineteenth century sought to care for the orphaned, reform the delinquent, and educate the illiterate.[2]

Nineteenth-century reform was done at the local level in the various urban areas that grew at an enormous pace during the second quarter of the century. Although the women of GIH did not actively seek reform on the state or national level, they appeared ahead of their time compared to other nineteenth-century reformers. In the mid-nineteenth century, GIH managers recognized the existence of environmental causes of poverty, spoke openly about social problems that affected the lower class, and implemented practical methods of industrial training with the intent of eliminating dependency upon charitable aid. Despite being closely tied to the various Protestant denominations, the women of GIH placed practical training above moral reformation. Throughout their history, they emphasized the importance of education, marketable skills, and emotional stability for the young girls they helped. The women of GIH did all of this without implementing a program of rigid standardization, harsh discipline, or monotonous routine. Because GIH operated for over a century, it provides an interesting view of changes in the ideology and systematic methodology of social reform.[3]

For the most part, the study of reform has fallen into a bi-polar debate over social justice and social control. According to Historian Anne Firor Scott, social justice came out of the late nineteenth-century social criticism, such as Edward Bellamy's nationalism, Henry George's single tax, and Jane Addams's settlement house movement.[4] Under the premise of social justice, social critics, civic organizations, philanthropic groups, and reform-minded politicians sought to improve the problems of the industrialized world by reducing poverty through systematic changes at the local, state, and national levels. The premise of the social justice movement was humanitarian concern and improvement of the industrialized system.[5] In contrast, the most outspoken statement on social control came from Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward in their work, *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare*. Published in 1971, Piven and Cloward firmly stated that

their book was "about relief-giving and its uses in regulating the political and economic behavior of the poor." They described periods of relief as cyclical, claiming that relief escalated in times of crisis and contracted once that crisis ended. Through this subtle method, reformers could control radical elements to maintain middle-class order.[6]

Adherents of social control point to the rapid institution building during the nineteenth century to reinforce their argument. Institutions for the poor, idle, mentally-ill, and delinquent were meant to not only provide shelter, food, and clothing, but also offer a means of reformation. The inmates of such places received education and learned skills that would make them marketable once they left, and also received Christian training that added a moral element to their reformation. Many of the institutions operated on a system of patriarchal authority and strict obedience, providing the inmates with what reformers believed was a proper training in good manners and respect for authority. Children's institutions also began to appear in the nineteenth century, following periods of epidemics that left many orphans in the urban areas. Reformers dealing with the issue of child welfare grappled with the need to keep children and adults separated, but still provide them similar experiences that would insure their self-sufficiency once they returned to the community. Because there was no wide-scale public welfare throughout much of the nineteenth century, many of institutions were private facilities that relied on philanthropic donations rather than public funds. Many of the reformers themselves held to prevailing nineteenth-century class prejudices that blamed poverty on individual flaws. According to reformers, reformation programs within institutions trained lower-class individuals to be industrious and productive citizens.

By the end of the nineteenth century, Progressive reformers began to question the very concept of institutionalization for children. An increasing emphasis on science and rationality created a system based on professionally-trained social welfare workers that dealt with issues of dependency and delinquency in new ways. These ideas criticized the institutional emphasis on discipline and routine, and, instead, stressed the concepts of

individualism and scientific care. By the turn of the century, schools training social workers existed in many large cities. Within a few decades, psychiatric evaluations based on scientific studies became a standard part of institutional methodology. In addition, Progressive reformers began advocating "indoor relief" that provided aid such as mother's pensions within the home, rather than "outdoor relief" that removed children from the home and placed them in institutions. Progressives emphasized keeping families intact if at all possible, or foster-care placement over institutional placement. By the turn of the century, there was also an increasing emphasis on public relief, as Progressives called for more state and federal intervention in social welfare. By the turn of the century as well, reformers began to recognize that poverty was less a product of inherent individual flaws, and more a result of environmental factors beyond the control of the individual. Despite the changing attitudes, institutionalization remained the primary method of dealing with problems of dependency and delinquency.[7]

With the onset of the Great Depression in 1929, and the subsequent policies of the New Deal in the 1930s, social welfare became increasingly publicly-funded and nationally-oriented. Franklin Delano Roosevelt's policies to alleviate unemployment and poverty recognized that environmental factors (in this case, a financial depression) resulted in not only physical harm, but also psychological damage. In creating the Works Progress Administration, Roosevelt sought to put people to work through public works programs that allowed them to retain their individual self-esteem and dignity. Historian Robert Bremner asserted that nineteenth- and early twentieth-century reformers would have applauded Roosevelt's effort to save not only the "bodies" of the unemployed, but also their "self-reliance, courage, and determination." The most impressive example of state welfare (although ultimately falling short of a national health care policy) came with the introduction of the Social Security Act in 1935, that offered old-age and unemployment insurance to many Americans. For the first time, the government admitted an obligation not only to participate in social welfare, but also its commitment to play a leading role on

the national level. In addition, new understandings of human behavior created sympathy for the poor and recognized the existence of psychological problems caused by emotional trauma.[8]

The history of GIH parallels the changes in reform ideology. Throughout the nineteenth century, GIH was both a residential home and industrial school for girls that also included policies of "placing-out" girls in permanent homes through adoption or as domestic servants through indenture contracts. From its inception, GIH emphasized the ideas of education and shelter, distinguishing between its dual role as a school and home. The 1872 Annual Report stated, "as a home, it receives those who, from various causes, or from tender age, are unable to help themselves, . . . [and] as a school, it teaches what will prepare its inmates for future usefulness and self-reliance."[9] The institutional setting was the basis for their method of reform. In 1857, GIH managers acquired an old brewery in St. Louis that provided them the space needed to establish the association on a more permanent basis as a residential institution.

GIH operated both as a residential home and a day school with a dual curriculum in industrial training and elementary education until 1905, when managers began sending the older girls to public school. After 1905, GIH eliminated their on-staff teacher and terminated the education curriculum becoming a "true industrial school" focusing solely on domestic skills. The association continued to operate a kindergarten, established in 1901, to provide an early education for the younger girls. The kindergarten remained active until 1917 when the public schools lowered the attendance age of children to five. By the turn of the century, it was no longer necessary to educate children in the institutional environment. Compulsory education laws now insured that most children under the age of sixteen would receive a free, public education. Although the elementary curriculum of GIH was one of its most important characteristics, GIH adapted to the change well. Now, it turned its full attention to the industrial training of young girls in skills that would insure them reliable employment.[10]

By the second decade of the twentieth century, GIH faced competition from the increasing number of publicly-funded vocational rehabilitation schools in St. Louis. Based on the realization that the institution could no longer compete with these schools, GIH began a transition from focusing on girls who merely needed custodial care and industrial training to ones who needed remedial treatment. To accommodate this transition, GIH added its first paid social worker to the staff in 1922. Also, for the first time, the association began receiving some public funding from the newly-established Community Fund in St. Louis. By the late-1950s the transition was complete and GIH had formally changed its mission, becoming an institution that provided therapeutic support for emotionally-troubled adolescent and teen-age girls and their families. GIH maintained its therapeutic support program as an independent association until 1978 when it merged with the Edgewood Children's Center in Webster Groves, Missouri.[11]

There are several themes that provide major contributions to this study. Chapter two addresses the theme of rapid institution building in the nineteenth century, dealing specifically with the standard routine and discipline found in many institutions for children. This type of structure resembled the patriarchal authority of the family. Historians studying the rise in the number of nineteenth-century institutions have explained it in two ways. Either it represented a true effort at reform, or an attempt at social control. According to the social control model, by using methods of discipline and authority similar to the patriarchal structure of the family, inmates would be rehabilitated into good middle-class citizens thereby protecting the established middle-class order. In his study of institution-building, Historian David J. Rothman argued that order was a key element in the creation of large-scale asylums. The asylum emphasized rehabilitation of inmates, and "by virtue of its success, set an example of right action for the larger society."[12]

Interestingly, GIH lacked much of this harsh discipline and rigid structure, yet it successfully operated for over a century with minimal discord. The fact that GIH did not rely on such characteristics made it appear more like a Progressive-era facility than a mid-

nineteenth century one. Several explanations exist for why GIH successfully operated without the discipline and standardization. First, GIH was entirely managed by women and focused only on girls. The absence of male authority or influence created a maternalistic atmosphere that emphasized protection and affection, rather than a patriarchal one, that emphasized physical discipline and strict authority. Consequently, the women of GIH modeled the institution on a family, rather than an asylum. Second, GIH managers regulated the admission policy to include "dependent" girls, and prohibited girls with "delinquent" characteristics. For GIH, "delinquent" characteristics usually meant sexual activity. The decision to restrict admissions negated the necessity of separating the "good" girls from the "bad" ones, and eliminated the need for any policy of moral reformation based on authority and obedience. Finally, GIH remained a small and private institution throughout its history which allowed for self-management unimpeded by the control of the city or state.

Chapter three and four deal with the subject of gender bias in the nineteenth century. The issues of women's public involvement in reform, and the contradiction that this work was non-economic, make up the major portion of chapter three. The argument focuses on social constructs of gender in relation to the public role of women in social reform. The women of GIH established the institution in a business model and dealt with all aspects of management, including financial. Because reform was essentially volunteer work, it bore the stigma of being "non-economic" much the same way that women's housework became "non-economic" in a growing wage economy. The important element that this label omits is productivity. Women's reform associations were enormously productive in raising, spending, and investing money (not to mention the care given to thousands of individuals on a daily basis). Women's labor was productive in maintaining the day-to-day administration of the institution. Despite both of these roles being non-wage-earning positions, their contribution to economic and social productivity cannot be denied.

The actions of the women of GIH also challenged the prevailing rhetoric that relegated nineteenth-century women to the private sphere. According to the ideology of separate spheres, middle-class women should have been isolated from the corrupt workings of the public world, secure in their own private domain of the home. Yet, the women of GIH clearly knew what was going on in the public sphere. They exhibited a keen understanding of the market economy, particularly recognizing that investment was the proper course for financial security. They knew that by investing their monetary contributions, they could insure a secure financial future for the association. This would free them from reliance on donations and labor-intensive money-making ventures. By successfully securing their financial future, the women solidified the permanence of GIH long after the first generation of women died. Through the work in their institution, GIH managers operated successfully despite being in a male-dominated business world and market economy.[13]

GIH managers also showed that it was not necessary to advocate women's rights to promote the cause of women's opportunities. In a sense, the women who participated in GIH stumbled upon feminism. They would not refer to themselves as "feminists" (or women's rights advocates), and, in fact, would probably have rejected that label. But they projected feminist ideas (consciously or unconsciously), such as individuality and self-sufficiency for girls; womanhood before wifehood; and careers for themselves beyond the private sphere, including roles in financial management. Even though the women of GIH were not on the front lines of the women's movement— either in the 1850s or the 1960s— they perpetuated the idea that these young girls could become self-supporting women. They also showed on a daily basis that women were just as capable as men in running an enterprise that required careful planning, financial management, and political maneuvering.

In the 1970s, the new social history began analyzing the role women played in nineteenth-century reform movements as activities beyond their traditional private sphere. According to historians such as Anne Firor Scott, Suzanne Lebsock, Nancy Hewitt, and

Lori Ginzberg, women, from their early work in abolitionist, temperance, and benevolent organizations learned political and organizational skills long before obtaining the legal right to participate in the political sector. Women spoke in public for their causes and petitioned the local and national government for change. In addition, women who established charitable relief organizations learned skills of money management before it became legal for married women to hold property or manage their own assets.[14]

Considering the legal, social, political, and economic disadvantages faced by nineteenth-century women, their accomplishments beyond the private sphere were noteworthy. Association women creatively manipulated a system that criticized their involvement in the public arena. By using their husband's names, and allowing men to participate in their organizations and chair their meetings, women limited public censure. By incorporating their organizations in the early- and mid-nineteenth century, married women received privileges not given to other nineteenth-century women, like the ability to own property. And, by working in charitable organizations, women quieted any rebuke, claming that they were only doing what society expected, and accepted, of them. What is interesting about these women is that they established long-term, successful enterprises that rivaled male businesses. That they were non-profit organizations should not in any way diminish their importance. GIH managers were active members in successfully extending the private sphere into the public arena.[15]

Chapter four addresses GIH managers' dominant focus on domestic skills throughout much of its history. Analyzing why managers chose to emphasize industrial training in the domestic arts provides an interesting look at nineteenth- and twentieth-century attitudes toward not only women and girls in general, but specifically women and girls of the lower class. GIH managers hoped to give girls skills so they could secure employment and become self-supporting. This meant providing girls with the ability to remove themselves from not only dependency on charitable relief, but also economic dependence on men. The definition of what constituted female independence was different

than what constituted male independence. While wage-earning positions could be demeaning for some men (because of the contradiction with the idea of republicanism), earning wages (and being able to control the spending of those wages) could be liberating for women. In the expression of grievances against men, *The Declaration of Sentiments* in 1848 mentioned the issue of women's economic dependence twice. First, the declaration recognized the inability of married women to retain their own wages, and second, it criticized a male-dominated society that lessened women's self-respect and personal confidence so as to make them "willing to lead . . . dependent and abject" lives.[16]

The women who managed GIH recognized that it was domestic skills that best provided girls with an opportunity for employment. This can be interpreted in two ways. Either the women accepted the prevailing class prejudices that relegated members of the lower class to menial positions of wage labor and exploitation. Or, the women recognized the reality of female employment opportunities in St. Louis and trained girls in the skills that offered them the best route to self-sufficiency. Statistically, the jobs available to women and girls throughout the nineteenth century in not only St. Louis, but also the United States were in the domestic arts, including servants, milliners, dressmakers, and seamstresses. Based on GIH annual reports, managers hoped to place girls in families as domestic servants. Managers argued that if a girl had to labor for wages, a "home-like setting" provided the best situation, insuring security and moral guidance. However, GIH managers fell short in addressing problems of labor exploitation based on indentured contracts, low wages that failed to offer self-sufficiency, and the lack of independence found in domestic service positions.

Chapter five addresses the problematic attempt by GIH managers (and reformers in general) to distinguish between girls who were dependent versus those who were delinquent. In the nineteenth century, reformers began emphasizing both the protection and the reformation of children. While it became necessary to protect dependent children, it also was important to reform the delinquent ones who had been lost to the temptations of

vice. Although most reformers agreed that two categories of children existed, few could agree on a systematic method of distinguishing between the dependent and the delinquent. In establishing their admission policy, GIH managers refused to admit any "delinquent" girl to the institution. Their admission policy focused solely on girls who were dependent, neglected, or destitute. According to managers, delinquent girls were potentially dangerous, not only to themselves, but also to the innocent girls who suffered only from neglect. The fear was if the two groups came together, the delinquent girl would tempt the destitute one into the path of vice. In the absence of definitive definitions of what constituted a delinquent girl, GIH managers turned to the issue of virtue. Thus, delinquent girls were those who had violated the norms of female virtue and somehow tainted their reputations. This usually meant girls who had engaged in sexual activity.

This leads to an interesting look at nineteenth- and twentieth-century attitudes toward women and girls, specifically the importance of their character and virtue. It was generally thought by many reformers that if a girl fell prey to vice, her character was forever scarred, and any attempt at rebuilding it was nearly futile. For this reason, reformers advocated the importance of saving a girl *before* she became "contaminated" by bad influences. This was an entirely different attitude than the one directed toward delinquent boys. According to reformers, boys of all ages could be reformed simply by spending time in a house of refuge or a school of reformation. This view emerged from a nineteenth-century expectation that placed girls on a higher moral plane than boys. According to reformers, a girl exposed to "immorality" was in essence "tainted," and therefore "irredeemable." It is no coincidence that GIH managers focused on young girls (annual reports list girls as young as three) because it was in the crucial period of infanthood and adolescence that young minds, they thought, were most impressionable.

Finally, chapter six deals with how middle-class interests shaped the reform effort of GIH managers. By the second quarter of the nineteenth century, a growing middle class, distinct from the upper and lower classes, had become visible in America. The

middle class espoused a distinct value system based on evangelical Protestantism, temperance, and industry. The majority of nineteenth-century reformers, including GIH managers, came from the middle class. Their reform methodology sought to use the new "middle-class values" as a reformation tool to solve the problems of poverty, juvenile delinquency, and intemperance. Reformers believed if they could show the lower class the benefits of industriousness, temperance, and self-reliance, the problems of poverty and vice would be solved. The assumption was that the middle class did not have the problems of immorality, alcoholism, and idleness, leading many reformers to accept a biased attitude toward the poor, one that blamed the conditions of poverty on individual flaws. This is known by historians as the individualistic argument.

While remaining within the middle-class value system, GIH managers began to question the individualistic argument. As early as the mid-nineteenth century, GIH managers identified environmental causes of poverty, recognizing that in certain cases, the plight of the poor had less to do with character flaws, and more to do with the problems created by American industrialization. Annual reports and case records show that GIH managers commented on financial depressions, the harshness of war, and the loss of employment opportunities in St. Louis. In many instances, managers saw a legitimate connection between such environmental factors and poverty in the city. This recognition affected the way that managers dealt with the parents of the young girls cared for in the institution. For example, managers seemed to distinguish between the parents' *inability* to provide proper care for their children and the parents' *disinterest* in providing proper care.[17]

Despite their efforts, managers often fell prey to their middle-class bias, particularly in instances when individuals refused to abide by middle-class values. In most cases, managers harshly criticized intemperate parents encountered on visitations. There were also unkind words for parents who were, what managers called, "immoral examples" to their children. In most cases, these parents were members of the lower class. In many

cases, they were immigrants. Looking at what types of parents GIH managers praised versus those they criticized provides an interesting glance at nineteenth- and twentieth-century class prejudice. It is important to note, however, that this criticism always came as a result of visitation or investigation. What managers actually witnessed seemed to determine their opinions. The ability to rise above individual prejudice may have resulted from the close interaction with members of the lower class, as well as the personal relationships developed with the inmates residing at the institution.

Immigration to St. Louis throughout the nineteenth century resulted in a diverse group of individuals residing at GIH. Prior to the 1840s, the German immigrants were predominantly affluent middle- to upper-class merchants, bankers, doctors, and estate owners. The Germans arriving after the political unrest of the 1840s (the "forty-eighters") were predominantly of lower-class status, such as landless farmers and artisans. A similar situation accompanied Irish immigration to St. Louis. The Irish who migrated during and after the famine were increasingly members of the landless poor. Many of them took up residence in the Kerry Patch, a place of "stark poverty and raucous violence" located on the common fields northwest of the city limits. The first permanent location of GIH was a few blocks south of the Kerry Patch. Census records showed a majority of the girls residing at GIH from 1860 and 1870 were foreign-born. In the following decades, the majority of the girls were native-born, but many of them had foreign parentage.[18]

Although not addressed in a specific chapter, immigration provides another important theme to this study. Between 1840 and 1920, approximately thirty million immigrants came to America. Those arriving before 1885 consisted of western Europeans— mainly German and Irish; those arriving after 1885 hailed from southern and eastern Europe— Russians, Poles, and Italians. Many immigrants chose to remain in the East Coast cities where they disembarked, but others traveled westward, lured by the promise of good land and individual autonomy. The increase in immigration resulted in the escalation of class and ethnic tensions in the urban areas where immigrants competed with

native working-class whites for industrial jobs. Riots displayed this nativist attitude in many urban areas in the nineteenth century. The 1850s witnessed one of the most vocal nativist periods with the emergence of the Know-Nothing Party.[19] Many of these newly-arrived immigrants became part of the urban poor and subsequent targets for evangelical reform that saw its flowering in the emergence of the Second Great Awakening.

Evangelical religion was a driving force in institution building in the nineteenth century, making many institutions seem more religious than secular. GIH was an institution established by women of various Protestant faiths, including Unitarians, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists. From the beginning, GIH managers stressed the non-sectarian nature of their institution. This was reflected in the places they held their annual meetings, the ministers who attended the annual meetings, and the members of GIH. Although the Second Great Awakening created numerous new Protestant sects, non-sectarianism (at lest within the Protestant faith) emerged as a way to stress the humanitarian obligation of Christianity to assist the less fortunate in society. The concept of Christian benevolence dominated most of the nineteenth-century reform institutions and many of them included policies of religious education. In contrast, GIH managers prohibited any sectarian instruction as part of the educational curriculum. So, although religion played a role in the history of the institution, the fact that GIH managers chose to relegate it to a secondary position, made the institution more secular than religious.

This study is about the women who established and managed GIH, rather than the girls who resided there throughout its long history. This has more to do with the availability of sources than specific interest. The main primary source for the study is the Girls Industrial Home and School Annual Reports from 1854-1918, including individual reports from the secretary, treasurer, and visiting committee. The secretary's annual report provides an account of the previous year, including financial problems, personal accounts of the girls, extra- curricular activities, and other pertinent information. These reports were published each year. The treasurer's reports provides a detailed list of credits and debits

for the institution. They also provide information on the endowment and financial investments. Every annual report included a list of donations and the person or company donating. There are separate lists for monetary donations and contributions in supplies and clothing. The partial visiting committee reports give detailed information on visiting the homes of the poor. These documents are part of The Western Historical Manuscript Collection, at the University of Missouri-St. Louis.[20]

Unfortunately, little information exists today concerning the girls utilizing the institution. No admission or dismissal records are currently available. Annual reports sporadically mention individual case records, as well as the number admitted and dismissed (either through adoption or indenture, or return to their parents). But, where these girls went and what they experienced is a mystery. Luckily, census records listed the names, ages, and nationalities (some including nationalities of parents) of girls residing at GIH for the years 1860, 1870, 1880, 1900, 1910, and 1920. From this, I was able to get an idea of ethnicity and age for girls residing at the institution at least for those years.[21]

There are also case records for girls admitted to GIH in the 1920s and 1930s. These records are incredibly detailed and provided significant information for that period. Some of these records include personal letters to family members, psychiatric and medical evaluations, and investigations completed by the GIH social worker. Unfortunately, only partial case records (fifty-four to be exact) existed as part of the private collection of the Edgewood Children's Center in Webster Groves, Missouri.[22]

The Admission and Departure Records of the St. Louis House of Refuge from 1855 to 1899 provided a context for female juvenile delinquency in St. Louis. These records are located at the Missouri Historical Society in St. Louis, Missouri. The House of Refuge was a county institution for juvenile offenders beginning in 1851. The records list the name, age, admission and dismissal dates, circumstances of commitment, person authorizing the commitment, and the circumstances of dismissal for each child. According to the records, there were very few girls moved from the House of Refuge to GIH. This

fits the preference of GIH managers not admitting delinquent girls to the institution. There are several examples within the records where the House of Refuge dismissed girls to other children's institutions, but only twice did girls go to GIH. These records also showed that female "delinquency" was not well-defined. Often, girls admitted to the House of Refuge were guilty only of destitution or neglect. GIH managers routinely pointed to this, criticizing the housing of "good" girls, guilty only of neglect, with "bad" girls, those who had committed "real" crimes, such as larceny and prostitution. It is clear from GIH managers' criticisms that they believed mixing the good girls with the bad girls was harmful.

The National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings*, beginning in 1874, also helped to establish an ideology not only about juvenile delinquency, but also social welfare in general. The organization that would become the National Conference of Charities and Corrections began in 1874 when members of various state boards of charities got together while attending the annual meeting of the American Social Science Association. The purpose of this "get together" was to "discuss common problems and compare methods used to solve them."[23] This was essentially the beginning of the professionalization of social work. By 1884, the organization included not only public charities, but private (both secular and religious) ones as well. That year, three GIH officers attended the annual meeting held in St. Louis. Periodically, GIH annual reports mentioned the National Conference indicating that managers either attended the annual meetings or kept up with the *Proceedings*.

On the local level, the Missouri State Conference of Charities and Corrections *Reports* beginning in 1901 provide information on child welfare at the state level. In 1892, St. Louis held its own conference of charitable and philanthropic institutions, and published the various reports in a journal. GIH managers participated in this conference, designed to bring together all religious and secular charitable organizations in the city. The conference included Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant organizations, both public and

private. The Missouri Children's Code Commission published a report in 1917 on the status of child welfare in Missouri. It sparked a re-definition of child welfare laws throughout the state. All of these documents are located at the Missouri Historical Society in St. Louis, Missouri. Finally, the Health and Welfare Council Records (1911-1975) included studies on juvenile delinquency and child welfare in St. Louis completed by the Child Welfare League. Individual histories and agency narratives on children's institutions in the city were also included. These records are part of the Western Historical Manuscript Collection at the University of Missouri-St. Louis.

This study contributes to the larger context of women's history, family history, labor history, class interaction, and social reform. The actions of the women involved questioned the idea of separate spheres and they also contradicted notions that women and girls were destined to be economically dependent. Through the training of domestic skills, GIH managers offered girls a chance at employment in the domestic arts. In creating an institution that was family-like, rather than asylum-like, managers attempted to replicate the family structure, however, they did not address the contradiction of removing children from their own homes. The women's actions also blurred the prevailing notions of class as the women managers ventured into the homes of the poor in St. Louis. Once there, managers witnessed the plight of the poor and based on that evidence made judgments about them. This took the place of blind acceptance of stereotypical images of the lower class that encompassed the prevailing attitude of the time. Finally, managers' actions showed humanitarian concern for the social welfare of young girls. The women worked diligently within the institutional setting to fund the institution from private donations and establish it as a permanent structure in St. Louis. They did so without using harsh discipline and rigid impersonalization, two characteristics usually associated with nineteenth-century children's institutions. The association adapted itself to the changing nature of child welfare and endured. There no evidence of any major discord in the institution throughout its long history.

Historians have questioned the purpose of reform since the turn of the twentieth century. Was benevolent reform primarily secular or religious? Were the reformers attempting to change society for the better, or seeking to impose conformity and social control on the lower class? Were the reformers pragmatic people reacting to the times, or idealists with a vision for a better world? As the various interpretations began to unfold, historians discovered that reformers had a wide range of motivations. Benevolent attempts at reform included religious aspects, particularly when looking at the various Catholic and Protestant charities, but many created institutions that became more secular than religious. Some reformers used the rhetoric of social and moral control that sought to impose "middle-class values" on the lower class in an effort to maintain middle-class power, while others used the values of industriousness and self-reliance to teach the poor how to raise themselves up out of the depths of poverty. Other reformers exhibited genuine humanitarian interest and expressed a Christian obligation to assist the underprivileged in society by providing what help they could at the local level.

This study analyzes one institution and its ideas about social reform. The women of GIH were not radical in their policies or their reform efforts. They were, however, different in many respects. GIH managers did not break down class barriers, but they did blur the lines a little. By attempting to replicate the family within the institutional environment and teach the young girls the values of industriousness and self-reliance, managers emphasized the republican ideas set down by the Revolutionary generation. The women of GIH did not effect state and national change, but they did provide aid to thousands of girls in St. Louis. The women did not march for the cause of women's rights, but they did advocate, in their own unassuming way, the ideals that women did not have to be economically dependent on men. In many respects, the women of GIH were content in their own little world. They were, in essence, pragmatic reformers. They did what they could to aid the plight of the poor on a day-to-day basis in the city of St. Louis. For this reason, their story is worth telling.

ENDNOTES

[1] Michael Katz, *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse: A Social History of Welfare in America*, 10th ed. (New York: Basic Books, 1996), 119. See chapter five for Katz's discussion of childhood and the child saving movement.

[2] There is a distinct difference between urban and rural childhood. While reformers criticized child labor in industry (usually urban), they lauded children's work on farms (rural). Rural farm work was seen more as "chores" than "labor." Reforms emphasized the good lessons of hard work learned on rural farms, as well as the abundant fresh air and sunshine that rural environments afforded children. The best example of this type of attitude was Charles Loring Brace and the Children's Aid Society. Brace "placed-out" poor children from New York to rural families in the western United States, claiming that a better life awaited them in rural homes than urban ones. Accompanying the attitude on labor was an effort to remove children from the corrupt urban environment where they would be exposed to the temptations of vice. The assumption was the rural areas were free from vice, therefore safe-guarding poor children. See Robert Hunter,

[3] See GIH Annual Reports (1854-1918) and GIH by-laws (February 13, 1855).

[4] Anne Firor Scott, *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), chapter seven.

[5] Women's organizations proposed the concept of "municipal housekeeping" that broadened women's domestic influence beyond the realm of the private sphere. The concept pushed women's moral influence into the public world of political corruption, crime, sanitation, housing reform, and city beautification. The early twentieth-century Progressive reformers put forth their own interpretation, arguing that reformers sought true progress for society by attempting to introduce ideas of social leveling, thus bringing more equality and fairness to all people. Post-WWII consensus historians countered this interpretation, claiming that reformers were driven only by "status anxiety" to a changing social, economic, and political climate. To consensus historians, reformers were only reacting to these changes and attempting to re-establish order in the older Protestant and individualistic values. There was no genuine humanitarian impulse in their methods. Interpretation from the late 1950s and 1960s reflected the experiences of that generation. Scott, *Natural Allies*, 141.

[6] Mary P. Ryan espoused the concept of "middle-class morality" in her work. Ronald Walters argued that reformers attacked "sin" rather than social problems, and urged repentance rather than legislation, thus religion played a major role. Steven Mintz argued that reformers tried to impose "middle-class morality" on society consisting of values of hard work, self-help, thrift, sobriety, self-discipline, ambition, respectability, and self-improvement. Movements such as the Social Gospel attempted to reinstall morality by creating a Christian Socialist Commonwealth, the Populists and Socialists sought to nationalize corrupt aspects of industrialization to eliminate the burden on the working people. Mary P. Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Ronald Walters, *American Reformers 1815-1860* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978); Steven Mintz, *Moralists and Modernizers: America's Pre-Civil War Reformers* (Baltimore: Johns

Hopkins University Press, 1995); Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward, *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare* (New York: Vintage Books, 1971), xiii.

[7] In effect, the "friendly visitors" of the benevolent associations became trained social workers. John H. Ehrenreich, *The Altruistic Imagination: A History of Social Work and Social Policy in the United States* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985); Regina G. Kunzel, *Fallen Women, Problem Girls: Unmarried Mothers and the Professionalization of Social Work, 1890-1945* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993); Roy Lubove, *The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965); Daniel J. Walkowitz, "The Making of a Feminine Professional Identity: Social Workers in the 1920s," *The American Historical Review* 95 (October 1990): 1051-1075.

[8] Robert Bremner argued that it was from the mid-1850s to the 1920s that the recognition of poverty became clear. Throughout this crucial period, Bremner saw three significant changes: a) the problems of insufficiency and insecurity overshadowed the emphasis on dependency; b) environmental causes of poverty overshadowed moral causes; c) social reform overshadowed individual reform. Bremner asserted that the earlier benevolent, Christian focus of reform became an interest in the living standards of everyone and the labor conditions of working people. Robert H. Bremner, *From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States* (New York: New York University Press, 1956), introduction.

[9] GIH Nineteenth Annual Report (1872), 6.

[10] The minimum age for kindergarten prohibited many young girls from attending public school, so a kindergarten appeared necessary. This showed continued concern by managers for the education of young girls unable to attend the public schools. The kindergarten continued until 1917 when the age for attending public school was lowered to five. Because GIH had few girls under the age of five, there was no need to continue the kindergarten. Sending the older girls to public school provided a convenience and allowed for social interaction. To provide further educational opportunities, managers provided education classes for one month in the summer, pending financial support and available teachers.

[11] The Edgewood Children's Center is located at 330 North Gore Avenue in Webster Groves, Missouri. Originally beginning as the St. Louis Protestant Orphans Asylum, the agency merged with the Soldier's Orphans Home in 1869 and occupied the current site, The Forest Park Children's Center in 1956, and the Girls' Home in 1978. In 1998, the Edgewood Children's Center acquired the Childhaven Agency in St. Louis. Today the Edgewood campus consists of twenty-three acres providing long and short-term residential and day treatment to approximately ninety children and their families. The Edgewood Children's Center's mission statement is as follows: "Edgewood Children's Center is committed to the care and treatment of severely emotionally disturbed children and to the strengthening of families through the development and delivery of professional services." Edgewood Children's Center Brochure, Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[12] David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company) , xix.

[13] See the following: Barbara J. Berg, *The Remembered Gate: Origins of American Feminism, The Woman and the City, 1800-1860* (New York: Oxford

University Press, 1978); Jeanne Boydston, *Home and Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Barbara M. Brenzel, *Daughters of the State: A Social Portrait of the First Reform School for Girls in North America, 1856-1905* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1983); Nancy Cott, *The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977); Estelle B. Freedman, *Their Sisters' Keepers: Women's Prison Reform in America, 1830-1930* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1981); Lori D. Ginzberg, *Women and Antebellum Reform.* The American History Series. (Wheeling, IL: Harlan-Davidson, Inc., 2000); Lori D. Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the Nineteenth-Century United States* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990); Nancy A. Hewitt. *Women's Activism and Social Change, Rochester, New York, 1822-1872* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984); Nancy A Hewitt and Suzanne Lebsock, *Visible Women: New Essays on American Activism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993); Julie Roy Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement.* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998); Suzanne Lebsock, *The Free Women of Petersburg: Status and Culture in a Southern Town, 1784-1860* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1984); Kathleen D. McCarthy, editor, *Lady Bountiful Revisited: Women, Philanthropy, and Power* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990); Kathleen D. McCarthy, *Noblesse Oblige: Charity and Cultural Philanthropy in Chicago, 1849-1929* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982); Peggy Pascoe, *Relations of Rescue: The Search for Female Moral Authority in the American West, 1874-1939* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Mary P. Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Mary P. Ryan, *Women in Public: Between Banners and Ballots, 1825-1880* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990); Scott, *Natural Allies.*

[14] Ginzberg, *Women in Antebellum Reform*, 18-9; see also Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence.*

[15] Prior to the introduction of married women's property laws, married women could not own property or retain control of their own wages. Widowed women could own property following the death of their husbands, but they were restricted in their control of that property. Single women were not prohibited from owning property, but it required a substantial amount of money to do so. Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence*; Hewitt, *Women's Activism and Social Change*; Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism*; Lebsock, *The Free Women of Petersburg*; Ryan, *Women in Public*; Scott, *Natural Allies.*

[16] Nick Treanor, editor, *The Feminist Movement.* (San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 2002), 37-47.

[17] In 1917 the Missouri Children's Code Commission recommended that parents be held accountable for the delinquency of their children. The Commission noted that "children are often abused by worthless parents; incompetent parents are often responsible for the incorrigibility of children." GIH visiting committee reports and annual reports made it very clear that intemperate parents represented those "disinterested" in taking care of their children. Missouri Children's Code Commission, "Report of the Missouri Children's Code Commission," (1917), 42, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[18] Throughout most of the twentieth century, the girls were mostly likely native-born and Protestant, although case records revealed random examples of Italian and Irish

Catholics. It is important to note that blacks were not a part of GIH until the 1960s when the institution integrated. By the early 1970s, non-white girls made up approximately 40 to 50 percent of the residences. James Neal Primm, *Lion of the Valley: St. Louis, Missouri, 1764-1980* 3d ed. (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1998), 339.

[19] A congressional race in 1854 inspired the worst nativist riot in St. Louis history. The riot began in the Fifth Ward in August and spread throughout other parts of the city. By the time it ended a few days later, ten were dead, thirty-three wounded, and ninety-three buildings damaged. Primm, *Lion of the Valley*, 170-173.

[20] For clarification, the term managers includes the elected officers of the institution, but not the enrolled members. I consolidated the two labels because it was easier to say "managers," rather than "officers and managers" throughout the text. Both were elected officials and both worked within the institution. When it was necessary to single out either officers or managers specifically, I used the appropriate label.

[21] Fire destroyed the 1890 census.

[22] Formal adoption records did not begin until 1917 in St. Louis, administered by the St. Louis Circuit Court. Research into those records yielded no help. Juvenile court records from Jefferson City, Missouri were sealed.

[23] Walter I. Trattner, *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America.* 6th edition (New York: The Free Press, 1999), 235.

CHAPTER ONE

"Beyond All Their Hopes, They Found This Venture A Success": A Chronological Overview of the Girls' Industrial Home and School, 1853-1935

"The object of this Association shall be to provide a temporary shelter for young girls and children of depraved and destitute parents, where they may be instructed in habits of industry and an elementary English education; and as early as possible to procure for them suitable and permanent homes."
— By-laws of The Girls' Industrial Home and School, *Incorporation Charter*, (February 13, 1855)

"The Girls' Home provides a temporary home for girls over three years of age, when unfortunate family conditions make placement necessary. It assumes responsibility for their physical and moral development, education, vocational training and recreation, and by quality of service assists in better character building in preparation for their return to the community."
— Girls' Home Seventy-eighth Annual Report (1935-36)

At its formation in 1853, the mission of the Girls' Industrial Home and School (GIH) in St. Louis, Missouri emphasized the rescue of poverty-stricken girls from a life of crime and destitution. It also stressed educating the girls in industrial skills and elementary studies, thereby letting the girls obtain a moderate level of literacy and providing them with the opportunity to acquire employment as domestic servants, milliners, dressmakers, or seamstresses. In its early years, GIH aimed to help the class of girls that the public schools exempted for financial or social reasons. The officers and managers of GIH also included in their patronage girls excluded from orphan asylums.[1] Very few of the girls admitted to GIH were actually orphans; most were either half-orphans or had both parents living yet unable or unwilling to care for them. At the National Conference of Charities and Corrections held in St. Louis in 1884, Clara Barnard, an original member and secretary of GIH from 1881-1907, noted that officers and managers fed, clothed, educated, and adopted-out girls. She included that the mission of the association focused on teaching the

girls to be self-supporting and keeping them from a life of destitution and crime.[2] In 1935 the superintendent of GIH, Pearl Micel still reinforced the emphasis on self-support, stating "it is particularly important that our children be given a well-rounded training if they are to function successfully as self reliant individuals in a work-a-day world."[3]

This chapter outlines the mission of GIH and provides a chronological history of the institution. It also includes information on the women who founded and managed the institution throughout its history. The chapter is divided into three sections, each defining a distinct period in the history of GIH. The first section (1853-1857) outlines the formation of the association, its incorporation status, and creation of a constitution, by-laws, and rules for the home and school. The second section (1858-1899) details the establishment of the association as a permanent home and school with the acquisition of the old St. Louis brewery. During this period, GIH became a residential home for girls and operated a dual curriculum of industrial skills (domestic) and elementary education within the school. The third section (1900-1935) deals with the change in curriculum to one focusing solely on industrial (still domestic) skills. It was during this period that GIH became a "true industrial school." This section also highlights the emerging influence of the Progressive ideas of science and rationalization upon the association and shows that increasing competition from public vocational training schools necessitated a change in curriculum.

Although a small, local institution, GIH managed care for thousands of girls in its long history.[4] Individual admission and dismissal records for GIH are unavailable, however, the annual reports usually recorded the totals for each year. Based on annual reports, newspaper articles, and case studies completed by child welfare organizations in St. Louis, the following assessments can be made. According to the annual reports between 1854 and 1916, an average of sixty-three girls resided in the institution each year; thousands of other girls sporadically attended school and received meals. An average of fifty-five girls were dismissed annually, either through adoptions, indentures, or return to parents.[5]

The mission of GIH represented a duality of practical goals and moral rhetoric. Like many nineteenth-century institutions for children, managers of GIH emphasized the qualities of self-support and self-sufficiency. Because the majority of the children housed in nineteenth-century institutions came from the lower class, many from newly-arrived immigrant families, the teaching of marketable skills became a major goal of reformers who sought an end to public dependency and juvenile delinquency. GIH managers provided this service to the community of St. Louis. They taught young girls domestic skills that enabled them to become self-supporting. But, unlike other nineteenth-century institutions that elevated moral training over industrial training, GIH emphasized the practical element of industrial training first. GIH managers used moral rhetoric when talking about "rescue," but did not implement any specific moral training in their daily curriculum. In fact, GIH managers chose to avoid moral reformation altogether by refusing admission to delinquent girls with arrest records. In this respect, GIH was a unique institution that did not emphasize the policies of social control or moral reformation; rather, it focused on practical goals that would, through the experience of self-support, "build useful and productive women."

The creation and maintenance of a successful association required loyalty and service by generations of women involved in GIH. There were three ways that women participated in the institution: as an elected officer, as an elected manager, or as a paying member. Both officers and managers had active roles in the daily administration of the institution. The members nominated and voted for the elected offices, but did not have specific duties under the by-laws. The women who served as officers and managers devoted decades to the institution. Between 1854 and 1916, only thirty-five different women served as an officer. Of the four major elected positions (first directress, second directress, treasurer, and secretary), twenty-four different women served. The second directress position had the most turn-over in those years, with eleven different women serving in that position. Of the positions, this was the least significant, serving only as a

"back-up" for the directress. Of the three other elected offices, only four different women served as first directress, eight served as treasurer, and five as secretary.

In those same years, only 287 different women served as elected managers.[6] Given the fact that GIH maintained approximately thirty managers per year, that is an overwhelming indication of loyalty to the association. GIH by-laws required each of these women to work in the institution at least one day per week. Of the 287 women serving the institution, sixty-seven (23 percent) dedicated more than a decade of volunteer service. Twenty-five of the sixty-seven (37 percent) remained an elected manager for more than two decades.[7] The dedicated service given to the association over these crucial years must account for the longevity of the institution.[8]

The GIH annual reports were written primarily by two women who served as secretary of GIH from 1855 to 1907, Elizabeth Clarke and Clara Barnard. From the language of the reports, both were well-educated, middle-class women. Both served the association for over twenty-five years (Barnard served for almost fifty). Some knowledge of these women would be pertinent. Elizabeth Clarke lived in both Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania before coming to St. Louis in the late 1840s. She was secretary of GIH for twenty-nine years, assuming her role at the age of fifty. She resigned in 1881 due to illness, yet remained an active member of GIH. She was seventy-nine when she died in 1884. Her final annual report as secretary in 1881 reflected her years of individual reward, giving "personal thanks to the managers for their many hours of pleasant social intercourse— and, wishing increasing usefulness in their present labor of love."[9]

In 1884, newly-elected secretary, Clara Barnard praised Clarke's "earnest efforts" in GIH and attributed her "loving tenderness . . . in comforting each suffering child of sorrow" to the death of Clarke's husband and children early in life. In fact, Clarke had lost a significant number of her family. She was only ten when her father, a merchant, died at sea enroute from Cadiz to Portsmouth.[10] Her husband, William Clarke, died only five

years after they married. Both of Clarke's children, one of which she delivered just ten days after the death of her husband, died in young adulthood. William Wallace Clarke, died at the age of nineteen in 1844, and Lizzie Mary Clarke died at the age of twenty in 1847. Clarke also lost a brother, Richard, to yellow fever at the age of nineteen.[11]

These tragedies may explain Elizabeth Clarke's active interest in the association. After the death of her husband in 1827, Clarke moved to Philadelphia to reside at the home of her younger brother, Augustus Frederick Shapleigh. She followed her brother to St. Louis in the late 1840s following the death of her daughter. During her years in St. Louis, Clarke resided at the home of Shapleigh on Washington Avenue, an affluent middle-class neighborhood.[12]

Clara Barnard, the longest standing charter member of GIH, served the association for over fifty years from 1854 to 1907. She began her long career as a manager and member of the association, and became secretary after the death of Elizabeth Clarke. Barnard remained in her position as Secretary until her death in 1907. Barnard's husband worked as a druggist and also sold patent medicines before his death in 1879.[13] In the memorial for Clara Barnard, newly-elected secretary, Abby Todd, praised Barnard's strength and lifetime devotion, stating that "her enthusiasm in the work overcame many obstacles, and as long as the Institution survives her memory will remain as one of the substantial workers, who helped in its development and maintenance."[14]

As an active member of GIH, Clara Barnard campaigned publicly for an "Association of Charities" in St. Louis. In 1892 Barnard represented GIH at the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions in the city. She not only presented the "Report of the Girls' Industrial Home," but also a paper entitled "The Care of Children" that proposed cooperation between all the charities of St. Louis under the title "Association of Charities." The proposal expressed "hope" at the success of such an association due to the presence of so many different charitable organizations at the meeting.[15] Unfortunately, Barnard's vision failed to materialize in her lifetime. In a bold opening statement to her

report in 1892, she declared "that the all-engrossing duties of each institution have prevented the social commingling . . . leading to mutual aid and strength. A depressing feature of the work so admirably conducted is the total ignorance in one charity of the work done or attempted by the other."[16]

The position of first directress, or president, was also a long-term one. Between the years 1858 and 1915, there were only two women who served as president of the association. Marion Thomson maintained the role for thirty-four years from 1858 to 1891. She assumed her position at the age of forty-four. She died in 1891 at the age of seventy-six. Thomson was from Pennsylvania, while her husband was a native of Scotland. He worked as a commercial merchant until the early 1870s when he became a clerk in the Post Office. He remained at that position until his death in 1885. They had three children, listed at ages twenty-two, eighteen, and ten in the 1860 census.[17] In Thomson's memorial, Clara Barnard praised the long and devoted service given by Thomson. Remarking that "her many years of service deserve more than a passing notice," Barnard acknowledged "her devotion to this work— no duty too small to claim her attention, none too great that she feared to brave it."[18]

Maggie Hendel assumed the role of president following the death of Marion Thomson. Hendel served in other offices prior to becoming president. She was a manager from 1884 to 1887 and recording secretary from 1888 to 1891. She became president in 1892 and remained in that position until at least 1915. She was forty-three years old, and a mother of two children, when she began her work at the institution. She was also a widow by that time.[19]

From these four women, representing long-standing members of GIH, several generalizations can be made. Each appeared to have minimal family responsibility beyond the association. Both Elizabeth Clarke and Maggie Hendel were widows when they began their work with the association. Clara Barnard and Marion Thomson became widows during their service to the association. Barnard was already a widow by the time she took

over the duties of secretary. Clarke had no living children when she assumed her role as secretary. Thomson had only one child under the age of eighteen when she became president (that child was eight). Of Hendel's two children, only her son was a minor when she became a manager and both her children were grown when she assumed the role of President. At least Clarke and Thomson had servants in their household to deal with daily chores. Because Clarke lived in her brother's household, she benefited from the aid of her nieces, nephews, and a sister-in-law. Hendel lived in her father's household after she became a widow. Each lived in a middle-class environment that afforded them the luxury of benevolent participation.[20]

There was also an apparent influence from the Eastern United States, where evangelical reform activity originated. Many of the women came to St. Louis from the East. Supporters of the institutions also hailed from the East. William Greenleaf Eliot who was an active supporter of GIH was the first Unitarian minister in St. Louis. Eliot was born in Massachusetts and educated at Harvard before coming west. His sister, Caroline Kasson, was an original founder of GIH. GIH annual reports hint at the influence of the "philanthropic exertions of [our] Eastern sisters.[21]

The majority of the women involved in GIH were also married or widowed. Annual reports listed only two single women serving as officers from 1855 to 1915. In those years, only forty-three of the 287 women serving as managers were single, approximately 15 percent of the total. The two single women serving as officers were also managers before being elected to the higher position.[22] Being married or widowed remained the standard for officers and managers until the late nineteenth century when more single women began participating. In 1899, GIH managers made it a point to establish an auxiliary board, of which the majority members were younger, single women. The role of auxiliary members was the management of the new domestic science division. This addition reflected the managers' attempt to involve a younger generation. As early as 1883, managers noted the importance of including younger women to replace the aging founders

and maintain the association for future generations. Referring to these women as "our younger sisters," Clara Barnard made a point to review the past history of the association so that this new generation could better "understand the nature of . . . [the] work."[23]

Other elected officers and managers also held office for decades. Maria Corbitt served as recording secretary for six years from 1883 to 1889 before assuming her role as treasurer in 1890. She remained in that position until her death in 1911. Upon her death, Lizzie Conant remarked "enough cannot be said in praise of her noble work, which covered over thirty years of service." Mary Eliza Libby served the association as an elected manager and treasurer for forty years. She became a manager at the age of thirty-nine and remained active until her death in 1912. Conant memorialized Libby's term of service by calling it a "beautiful testimony."[24]

By 1929, seventy-five years after its establishment, only five different presidents had served GIH. Considering the volunteer nature of benevolent work, this remains an amazing statistic.[25] For these women, GIH became an encompassing career, as each of them devoted decades to the association. Clearly, GIH offered them a fulfilling role beyond women's traditional role in society. Elected managers and paying members showed up year after year on the rosters of GIH, many of them second and third generation. In 1929, the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* reported that "participation in its [GIH] management has been handed down from the women of one generation to another, a sort of legacy in charity." The article referred to GIH as being a "family affair."[26]

The longevity of the association and the loyalty shown by the officers and managers became a great source of pride for the women who spent lifetimes actively participating. In 1895, Clara Barnard emphasized this loyalty when she stated: "we have few resignations to record, the term of service being usually a life tenure. We guard sacredly the trust of the selection of managers, her faithfulness being her one requisite."[27] Examples of this loyalty and pride can also be found in the memorials written for the women. When Susan Glover,

a founding member of the association, died in 1885, Clara Barnard honored her with the following remarks on loyalty:

> to her, as much as to any one person, do we owe its [GIH] success. . . . Her gentle cheerfulness midst the greatest discouragements, excited alike, our gratitude and our tenderest love; and, when in after years, her own church, to which she was so devoted, established a mission kindred in its aims, she, with rare fidelity, remained loyal to her trust here.

Mrs. Robert Anderson "filled many places of trust" within the association, and Mrs. Samuel Pepper was "for nearly a quarter of a century . . . our earnest coadjutor." These women's lifetime service to the success of this private, charitable association was indeed a noteworthy accomplishment.[28]

The evolution of GIH from a custodial-care institution to a therapeutic-treatment facility reflected not only an awareness of the changing times, but also showed that the women of GIH intended that the institution adapt and endure. Many nineteenth-century institutions simply faded out of existence once accomplishing their purpose; others adapted their missions, reworked their organizations, and continued to provide a useful service to the community. GIH represented the latter. In 1883, Clara Barnard expressed the intent to "see this home so firmly established that succeeding generations may have no fear of failure."[29] The majority of the officers and managers devoted decades to the Home. For these women, the institution represented more than just a fleeting thought or a respite from domestic boredom. Involvement gave the women legitimate and fulfilling careers that lasted a lifetime.

The Formative Years, 1853-1857

After personally witnessing the plight of poor children on several occasions, four St. Louis women announced, in their respective Protestant churches, their intent to establish an institution that would offer children an alternative to a life of begging. Interested women assembled at St. George's Episcopal Church in St. Louis on Saturday, February 4, 1853, to establish an "Industrial School and Temporary Home for Destitute

Children"[30] At that meeting, the women elected four officers and thirty managers to administer the institution. One week later, the women reassembled at the Unitarian Church of the Messiah to design a daily curriculum for the children that included elementary education (reading, writing, and arithmetic) and domestic training (sewing and household cleaning). Contributions from several Protestant churches, as well as citizens of St. Louis, financed the first residence in a small house on the corner of Seventh and Carr. The association began with a mere five students, but ended its first year aiding a total of ninety-two children.[31]

The first four years of operation, GIH existed only as a day school because of the inability to find a permanent location suitable to accommodate children as residents. Two small residences served as locations in the early years. They were places that required a yearly rent and proved too small to house girls overnight for long periods of time. For this reason, the managers made it their sole purpose to find a suitable location to establish the institution on a more permanent basis. This prompted Elizabeth Clarke to remark that in the early years, the women of GIH had "real estate on the brain."[32] While searching for a new home, managers began establishing their institution on paper by writing a charter, by-laws, and rules for the government of the home and school. They also filed for incorporation status, establishing the institution as a "body corporate and politic."[33]

At the first annual meeting, held on October 31, 1854, Catherine E. Kasson, then Secretary of GIH, proposed an application for incorporation at the next session of the Missouri State Legislature. The Incorporation Charter, acquired on February 13, 1855, established GIH as "one of the permanent charities of the city" and gave the association certain privileges guaranteed to incorporated charities.[34] As a "body corporate and politic," the women of GIH could sue and be sued, could purchase and hold both real and personal estate or annuities and endowments, could accept the written surrender from the parent of any child in the home, and could "bind out" any child through adoption or indenture. Incorporation also allowed members of the association (those women who paid their three

dollars annual dues) to elect annually the officers and managers responsible for directing the daily administration of the Home. The charter empowered the officers to administer all business transactions relating to the association, including all financial transactions, and to set their own rules and regulations. The document was "perpetual" and applied to all "associates and successors in office." The specific mission statement and rules for the association also existed within the Incorporation Charter.[35]

The by-laws of the association emphasized the need to help children incapable of helping themselves by providing them with quality industrial and elementary educational opportunities and securing adopted homes when the situation warranted. The industrial element of GIH occupied a central position in the mission because it was through that sector that newly-trained girls could find useful employment and become self-supporting. In addition to industrial skills, by-laws stressed the importance of literacy and the curriculum of the school included an elementary education. Giving the girls a common education in addition to industrial skills remained a significant part of the GIH mission as long as attendance at public schools remained impossible. Elizabeth Clarke boasted that a prerequisite for indenture of their girls included the ability to "write a legible hand."[36] From the beginning, GIH maintained a strong emphasis on education, both industrial and elementary, representing a focus on building well-rounded and useful individuals.

The primary leadership positions in the institution were the elected officers and managers. The officers consisted of the following titles: First Directress, Second Directress, Recording Secretary, Corresponding Secretary, and Treasurer. Occasionally, additional offices appeared in the annual reports. This expansion reflected either a growth in the number of girls housed at the Home or an illness of one of the elected officers. In 1878 the title "Directress" changed to "President" for the first time. Members of GIH elected officers at the annual meetings held in October. The by-laws of GIH also allowed for the election of fifteen to thirty managers to assist the officers with the daily administration of the Home. The primary duties of the managers included collecting yearly

subscriptions and donations, and administering various activities that provided additional funding. Members could also elect "honorary members" who received all privileges relating to membership, except the right to vote and hold office.[37] Lifetime members were those women paying a thirty dollar fee in one year guaranteeing them all the privileges of membership, including voting and holding office. GIH by-laws limited membership to women, specifying that "any lady by contributing annually the sum of three dollars, or more, may become a member of this Association, and shall be entitled to vote at the annual meeting."[38]

The elected officers were in charge of the administration of the institution outlined in the by-laws. The First Directress presided over all meetings of the board, maintained "order therein," and acted as an official member of all committees. In her absence, the Second Directress assumed the role. The by-laws defined the duties of the Recording Secretary as keeping the minutes of meetings, maintaining account records of all money received and disbursed by the Treasurer, and issuing notices pertaining to the association. The Corresponding Secretary wrote annual reports, maintained correspondence, and gathered and recorded all facts relating to the association. The Treasurer kept financial records and presented reports at the annual meetings, deposited money into the appropriate financial institution, and generally maintained "custody of all moneys, notes, deeds, bonds, and other securities, belonging to the Association." The officers, with an additional five members elected by managers, formed the Executive Committee, responsible for meeting every week to "transact all business submitted to them by the Board of Managers." The members nominated women for office one week before the annual meeting.[39]

The by-laws required elected managers to serve on various standing committees pertaining to the daily administration of the association. All applications for admission or dismissal from GIH passed through the Committee of Admission and Dismission. Responsibilities also included keeping detailed personal records of all girls and obtaining signatures of parents choosing to relinquish control of their children. The Providing

Committee purchased or sought the donations required to maintain GIH. The Committee of Education directed the course of instruction by weekly class visits and provided assistance to the teacher as needed. The Wardrobe Committee handled clothing donations and with the help of the sewing class transformed the donated clothing into suitable attire for the girls. The Household Committee visited GIH once a week insuring "that the household affairs are conducted with order, economy, and prudence," and assisted the matron when needed. The Sewing Committee represented the only committee directly linked to industrial training. Members of this committee assisted the teacher in providing the girls with sewing skills. The committee also provided clothing, blankets, towels, etc. for use at the home. Each committee rendered monthly reports to the officers.[40]

The Visiting Committee was the most active, and in some case the most important, investigating and visiting the homes of the children "as often as circumstances may require." These visitations helped bridge the gap between the middle-class women managing the home and the lower-class families utilizing it. Early reports revealed mostly visits to homes of children who temporarily took part in the school or had meals at the home. If a child failed to show up for extended periods, visitors investigated the reason at the home of the child. An extract from a visiting committee report in 1857 began: "To-day, among the list of our absent scholars," and proceeded to recount several investigations into the reasons for the absences. Annual reports and case records of the association revealed investigations completed prior to admission as well as follow-up visits after dismissal.[41]

In addition to the officers and managers, a limited staff— both paid and volunteer— contributed to the administration of the association. From its earliest establishment, GIH utilized the services of a matron and a teacher, both usually single women and elected annually. The first two women, unanimously elected at the First Annual Meeting in 1854 earned a salary of three hundred dollars each per annum. The "Rules for the Government of the Home and School," part of the Incorporation Charter, outlined the duties of the matron and teacher and reflected the dual role of the association— as a home and a school.

Responsible for the general management of the home, the matron supervised the children, insuring their sanitation, safety, and general well-being. The teacher maintained the school and conducted the studies of the children, including both common education and industrial skills.[42] Each permanent matron and teacher resided at the home. In selecting women for these positions, GIH managers sought ones committed to long-term service. Between 1859 and 1920, GIH employed only four different women as matron. A similar situation existed with the salaried teacher.[43] GIH also employed various paid servants, including a cook, laundress, seamstress, and numerous housemaids. Volunteer physicians provided health care for the children for over a century. Because funds remained limited throughout much of its history, the residents assisted with the daily maintenance of the home.[44]

The organizational process used by the women of GIH indicated practical business skills in establishing and maintaining the association. The early acquisition of incorporation status provided them with certain privileges not given to other nineteenth-century women, particularly the ability to transact financial dealings. The Incorporation Charter insured them the status of a "corporation." The women built the association on a hierarchical system, with elected officers and a Board of Managers. They established various standing committees to administer the daily workings of the association and insure its sufficient management. They also utilized the labor potential of managers and the resident girls by putting them to work at the daily upkeep of the Home and the yearly collection of donations and monetary funding. Finally, the women provided practical skills to the girls they helped, including literacy and domestic science. Similar to the Progressive reformers forty years later, the women of GIH established their association based on a businesslike, rational approach to charity. It is that approach that insured their longevity.

GIH as a Residential Home and Day School, 1858-1899

The second crucial period for the managers of GIH was their establishment of the institution as a permanent residential home and day school. From 1857 to 1899, GIH

educated and housed thousands of girls in a new location. With the search for a permanent home behind them, managers began their mission of training girls in domestic skills, educating young children in elementary studies, and finding suitable homes or places of employment for those girls whose parents had relinquished control of them. The women also began establishing a firm financial basis for their institution, insuring stability and longevity. It is during this forty-two year period, that GIH established itself as "one among the provident institutions of the city."[45]

In 1857, GIH managers purchased the old St. Louis brewery at Nineteenth and Morgan, giving them the location to establish the institution as a residential home. That year, Elizabeth Clarke expressed hope that the transformation to a more permanent establishment would soon be complete, stating "we have now a reasonable prospect of a permanent Home."[46] The brewery, measuring 82 feet on Morgan Street and 150 feet on Nineteenth Street, was part of the late Thomas Gray's estate. The large lot included a house with ten rooms that GIH used for the residence of the girls and staff. An additional structure located on the lot became the dining area and schoolroom. The total cost for the property was fifteen thousand dollars, including the purchase price of eleven thousand dollars, repairs, and furnishings.[47]

Despite being classified as a residential home, GIH maintained, as part of its mission, a goal of keeping children only temporarily. This reflected a belief that children should not be institutionalized for long periods of time, rather they flourished better in a family home. From its inception, the founders described their association as a "temporary home for destitute children." When a parent or legal guardian agreed to relinquish control of a child to GIH or in the case of orphaned children, managers sought placement with a family within a year. That year provided GIH with sufficient time to train the child as a domestic servant, give her the ability to read and write, and find a suitable home and family. Elizabeth Clarke stressed the temporary nature of the association commenting that "we prefer to place our 'little people,' as speedily as good homes can be obtained" because

the children "are received only to train them for future usefulness."[48] In this respect, GIH acted as an interim stop on the girl's journey, either back to her own home or to another permanent one. Annual reports noted that GIH rarely kept girls beyond the age of twelve because they had been placed in permanent homes, sometimes as domestic servants, or released to parents.[49]

In their role as a placing-out service for young girls, GIH used their emphasis on industrial skills as a means to a greater end. Making a young girl marketable by giving her domestic skills only enhanced her chances of being adopted into a good family. Although the annual reports repeatedly emphasized the preference of finding good *adopted* homes for the children, GIH managers pragmatically recognized that *indenture* provided the girl with a self-supporting occupation in a good family environment. The hope was that each indentured girl would be welcomed and treated as part of the family that she served. Managers reserved the right to recall any child mistreated in either an indentured role or an adopted home. In 1887, Clara Barnard noted that "we insert a clause, reserving the right to recall . . . [the girls], if . . . we deem it advisable." Henry Hitchcock, GIH legal counsel, administered all contracts. As late as 1909, GIH records indicate girls indentured as domestic servants.[50] The practice of indenture only ended in the 1920s.

One year after establishing the institution as a residential home, the officers of GIH formally decided to focus solely on girls. Prior to 1858, the association offered shelter, meals, and schooling to both boys and girls, often siblings. The managers intended to focus on girls from the very beginning, but oftentimes, girls arrived at the institution accompanied by their brothers. Rather then turn the children away, managers accepted both. According to Elizabeth Clarke, the decision to assist girls reflected a belief that they needed the most immediate attention. Clarke's Fifth Annual Report described girls as "that class of children who suffer most from early neglect."[51] In 1858, managers formally noted the change of allowing only girls as residents of the home; boys under eight could continue at the school. In 1881, Clarke recognized that girls had less opportunities than boys in a

world defined by separate spheres, stating that "our business lies entirely with *Girls*, who are equally important to the body *politic*, though forbidden to *harangue* in political meetings."[52]

Shortly after acquiring the brewery, managers expressed an interest to increase the number of girls cared for in the institution. Earlier annual reports repeatedly mentioned an inability to expand the benevolent efforts of the association due to a lack of space, even to the point of turning applicants away. Within a year of setting up residence in the brewery, Elizabeth Clarke revealed a new objective— to raise enough money to enlarge and modify the existing structures. She stressed the need for modification, stating that the brewery was "entirely too small to accommodate our numerous family with anything but a moderate degree of comfort." She listed such problems as a crowded schoolroom, ill-ventilated dorms, and a lack of space for an infirmary.[53] Using the irony of the current living situation, Interim Secretary Rebecca Hazard sought the aid of public donations for the needed improvements by reminding the public that a building that was once a "brewery" was now a house of benevolence. Hazard noted that the "'Old Brewery' . . . exists only in the traditions of the past, and from its ruins has sprung a structure which, if possessing no outward attractions, contains much that is necessary to comfort and convenience, and is certainly an improvement on its predecessor."[54]

Inadequate finances and cumbersome city taxes delayed the completion of the expansion for ten years and canceled a plan for an additional new structure fronting Nineteenth Street. Elizabeth Clarke recounted the financial problems in 1867, complaining that "we were just commencing to calculate the amount of brick and lumber" needed for the new building "when an aeorlite descended in the form of tax bills to the amount of $1100."[55] Payment of the taxes forced GIH to delay its contract for building and the women raised additional funds through door-to-door donations and a restaurant at the St. Louis Fair. The Treasurer's Report in 1867 listed a total of $11,254.00 in the building fund. The report also recorded a payment of $6,514.36 to the architectural company of

Ramsey and Son for payment on account.[56] After expending all the money in the building fund for the enlargement in 1867, the report revealed a need for two thousand additional dollars to furnish the enlarged section. Although the enlargement took ten years to complete, Elizabeth Clarke noted that it was well worth the wait because it "put a new face on our otherwise unsightly building," and increased the residential capacity of the Home from thirty to seventy.[57]

Although GIH was a woman's organization, the by-laws allowed for the creation of a male advisory committee to assist in matters of finance, such as purchases of real estate and investment planning. The advisory committee, although not formally listed in annual reports until 1859, assisted officers with the purchase of the brewery as early as 1856.[58] The committee consisted of two to seven men, usually relatives of officers or managers, and its duty was to verify and audit the treasury reports submitted at the annual meetings. In 1882 the advisory committee changed its title to the Board of Trustees, listing the investments made in the establishment of a formal endowment fund for the association. No evidence exists showing that the male advisory committee participated in the governance of the institution except in financial matters. The advisory committee helped to limit public criticism of women's involvement in financial ventures, and represented the practical reality that men could more easily participate in financial ventures than women in the nineteenth century. In 1867, Elizabeth Clarke commented on the benefits of this financial assistance, stating "though our affairs are carried on chiefly by ladies . . . we are not so 'strong-minded' as to act without consultation and advice from those more frequently placed on committees of ways and means than ourselves."[59]

The establishment of a permanent endowment fund enabled the association to operate on the interest, freeing the officers and managers from tedious money-making ventures. The 1878 Treasurer's Report included a detailed account of "The Investment Fund," totaling $12,161.15. The fund began with various legacies bequeathed to the association and the subsequent investment of those legacies. The first recorded legacy was

a one thousand dollar bequest by Mary Rhodes, a former manager, in 1861. After this donation, Elizabeth Clarke announced that officers would invest this money and use the interest to enlarge the brewery.[60] Not all legacies were monetary. The 1878 Treasurer's Report listed a legacy of $1,750.00 in Kansas Pacific Second Land Grant Bonds and a Leavenworth County Bond of $1,000.00. In 1882 the Board of Trustees began listing in the annual Treasurer's Reports detailed accounts of the growing endowment fund, including investments and bonds. One of the first permanent "memorial funds" began in 1882 after the death of a long-time manager, Fanny Knight. The 1881 annual report paid tribute to Knight, and, thereafter, Treasurer's Reports listed an annual sum of three hundred dollars from the fund for the association. GIH received a bequest in 1899 of $1,000.00 from Henry Shaw, famous for Shaw's Botanical Gardens in St. Louis.[61]

In the latter years of the nineteenth century, GIH managers also became actively involved in establishing an "Association of Charities" in St. Louis, an attempt to bring all organizations into one community of charity. Clara Barnard rarely failed to mention the importance of "a joining of sister societies" in her annual reports. In 1886, she informed the citizens of St. Louis that other cities had been successful when systematizing their charitable enterprises, and she pledged "the hearty co-operation of this Home" in that endeavor.[62] In her report at the 1892 Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions, Barnard stated that "the formation and effectual working of the associated charities has been with me a hope, often tried, as often defeated" and she expressed continued "hope" that it would someday become an "established fact."[63]

An "Association of Charities" would include all organizations (both public and private) regardless of religious affiliation into a managed system of charitable collection and distribution. This systematization of charity represented the increasing emphasis on scientific and rational approaches to charity introduced by reformers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It focused on more efficient management, less overlap of competing charities, and better record-keeping. The goal was to end indiscriminate and

sentimental charity distribution.[64] The question of systematization of all charitable associations marked an important topic at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections held in St. Louis in 1884, and dominated as a topic at the 1892 conference.[65] But, the reality of such an association was still far in the future.

GIH as a True Industrial School, 1900-1935

During the nineteenth century, GIH operated a dual curriculum, providing both an elementary education and domestic skills to girls. In addition to their studies of reading, writing, and arithmetic, the girls learned the basic skills of sewing in a classroom setting. Their training in cooking, serving, and laundry skills came more from their participation in performing these daily duties for themselves than from a structured classroom experience. The curriculum of GIH changed at the turn of the century. By the early twentieth century, girls housed at GIH could attend public schools, eliminating the need for an elementary curriculum at the institution. Managers also purchased a new site and constructed a new building in 1899 that gave them the necessary space to establish structured classrooms for cooking and sewing classes. With this change, GIH became a "true industrial school" by implementing a domestic science division and eliminating the elementary school curriculum.

As early as 1883, Clara Barnard announced that managers intended to begin a manual training school for girls, "fitting them for the employments they seem best adapted for, and perfecting them in the work." She attributed this "radical change" in curriculum to the increased number of charitable institutions in St. Louis and the subsequent "marked improvement" in the class of destitute children.[66] Because of the reduced need for custodial care for destitute and neglected girls, the officers of GIH opted to modify their mission to focus more on the training of young girls for lucrative and stable employment. Although the 1883 annual report revealed that girls dismissed from GIH were employed in a variety of occupations, officers chose to continue their focus on domestic science.[67] Annual

reports revealed numerous financial problems that prevented the association from making this transition until 1899 when an auxiliary board formed to manage the new domestic science division and the association took up residence in a new and larger building.[68]

In the latter years of the nineteenth century, GIH opted to re-locate because of the encroachment of "undesirable elements" and the desire to revise the curriculum. Clara Barnard noted two important purposes behind the relocation— the need for more space and increasing safety concerns. As early as 1892, Barnard indicated "a serious problem" with the location at Nineteenth and Morgan. She declared: "we can no longer close our eyes to the fact that the changes of time and traffic have served to make this Home, its alleys and by-ways unsafe for our girls."[69] The report indicated the intention to move as soon as a suitable location was found. In 1897 Barnard noted the continuing dangers including "discordant elements that make night hideous with their pandemonium." She cited incidents of nightly pistol shots and constant danger of fire as reasons to relocate. Recounting a recent narrow escape from fire, Barnard noted that authorities saved the old brewery only because the fire occurred during the day and not at night.[70]

Although the officers and managers of GIH secured a site as early as 1893, financial depression and war slowed the acquisition of building funds, delaying construction of the new home until 1899. In 1893 Clara Barnard reported the purchase of a lot on Maryland Avenue measuring 150 by 240 feet, providing "ample room for buildings." That year, the Treasurer paid $11,250.00 ($75.00 per square feet) for the lot. Barnard noted that the managers quickly began securing a building fund despite "the sad depression in the financial world."[71] Collections for the building fund reflected the financial problems: collections totaled $3,681.00 in 1893; only $280.00 in 1894; and $14.50 in 1895. The situation improved after 1895 and the Board of Trustees listed several securities and bonds totaling five thousand dollars for the building fund in 1896. A new problem arose in 1898 as Barnard noted that the "rumblings of war" led to another period of decreased donations.[72]

Although GIH completed the construction of the new building in 1899, further complications threatened to destroy the financial security and livelihood of the association. The first problem involved the existing lot. In 1899 the officers and managers of GIH opted to sell the existing lot on Maryland and purchase a second lot on the corner of Belt and Von Versen Avenues. The new lot, measuring 224 by 185 feet presented a more desirable location overlooking Forest Park. The second problem involved further financial obstacles. In 1899 Clara Barnard explained that new legislation required all buildings sheltering children be fireproof which added an additional 25 percent to the cost of the new structure. GIH managers encountered a third problem when they attempted to sell the brewery. Barnard reported that a flaw in the title to the property delayed the sale and pushed the association into debt for the first time in forty-five years. Managers intended to use the money from the sale of the brewery as final payment on the new building, but instead had to settle the claim against the title with a one thousand dollar payment and borrow money to pay the architectural fees for the construction of the new building. In her annual report in 1899, Barnard reflected the "bravery of our managers in attempting the building of a new Home under such adverse circumstances."[73]

Despite the problems with the construction, GIH managers took great pride in its completion. Clara Barnard described the new building as a square structure, sixty feet front by sixty-six feet deep, with wide halls, broad stairs, and spacious dorms and bathrooms, complete with marble walls and tile floors. There was sufficient room for the cooking school— including new appliances— a kindergarten, laundry, nursery, library, and parlor. For the first time, GIH established an infirmary separate from its main building. The increased space enabled GIH to expand its potential residents to one hundred. Barnard boasted that the new Home was "fireproof from foundation to topmost round, with an improved spiral fire escape on the outer wall as further means of safety." She continued, the "yard has been made beautiful" with gifts of "many rare and beautiful plants" donated by Shaw's Botanical Garden.[74]

In contrast to the obvious pride in the new home, the officers and managers of GIH regretted the debt caused by construction. They took steps to rid themselves of the burden as quickly as possible. Barnard reflected this in the annual report of 1901 acknowledging that "this burden of debt has been a new and sad experience."[75] At one time the debt reached twenty-one thousand dollars, including $15,500.00 borrowed from Samuel Cupples, a local businessman and contributor to GIH, to pay off the balance on the property and construction. Commenting on the perseverance of the officers and managers, Barnard boasted that "while never relaxing our efforts, we advanced slowly, step by step, and by our united efforts this debt was reduced to $3,000.00" by 1902.[76] An anonymous donation enabled the association to free itself of debt. The sale of the lot on Maryland Avenue for over eleven thousand dollars in 1902 also lessened the burden. The building fund for that year reported a payment in full to Cupples. In addition, when managers encountered problems selling the brewery, they decided to rent the house, netting them over four hundred dollars per year from 1900 to 1904. They finally sold the property in July 1904 for twenty-five thousand dollars and converted the money to interest-bearing securities. Their short experience with debt over by 1903, Clara Barnard noted that once again "we were free."[77]

After the completion of the new Home, GIH focused its curriculum more on industrial skills making it a "true industrial school." The added space offered by the new structure allowed GIH to begin regular cooking and sewing classes, as well as give girls first-hand experience in their new laundry facility. All of these exercises worked to give the girls skills needed for their eventual move into domestic service occupations, but it also helped with the daily management of the Home. The girls sewed much of the clothing and cloth items needed by the association, as well as helped out with the preparation of meals and daily laundry chores. A report in 1916 noted that girls residing at GIH worked in the kitchen and laundry and received training in serving.[78] As late as 1940, GIH annual reports still revealed a curriculum in "plain sewing, laundering, cooking, and other

subjects— covering all phases of homemaking." The days of indenturing domestic servants gone, some of the girls worked as part-time baby-sitters for families in the surrounding area or became mother's helpers.[79]

In the early 1900s GIH began sending the older girls to public schools and by 1915 all girls attended public school.[80] The girls attended Clark Public School, located on Union Avenue. Reports indicated approximately sixty girls attending Clark in 1910. To monitor the progress, the Educational Committee expanded its duties to include meeting with teachers and administrators and "checking-up" on attendance. Sending the girls to public school reflected more than just a convenience for the association, it provided the girls with outside social interaction and regular exercise. Abby Todd, Secretary of GIH, noted that sending the girls to public school "has been very beneficial to them" providing them with exercise while walking to school and a "much needed stimulus" in mingling with the other teachers and scholars.[81] Some of the girls also joined outside social organizations, such as the Girl Scouts. The Auxiliary Board of GIH established a kindergarten in 1901 and continued its operation until 1917 when the age for attending public school was lowered to five.[82]

The "Association of Charities" also came into being after a long period of ambivalence between the public and private charitable organizations in the city. In 1911 the Missouri State Board of Charities and Corrections proposed state regulation of private charities. Proposals appeared in the 1911-12 Annual Report of the State Board of Charities of Corrections recommending two specific regulations: (1) private charities obtain an annual license of operation from the state, and (2) private charities submit an annual report to the State Board.[83] In 1917 the Missouri Children's Code Commission echoed the problem of non-regulation of private charities declaring that "the care of destitute children in Missouri is in a chaotic condition." The Commission directed much of its criticism toward the fifty-plus private charities and child-placing services caring for approximately five thousand children throughout the state. The Commission complained that none of the

private organizations were "under any supervision by the state," implying that this lack of regulation created chaos. Although the proposals for an "Association of Charities" never mentioned state or local *regulation*, it did propose *cooperation* between the existing charities.[84]

A unifying organization became a reality due to the increasing efforts of the newly-formed Missouri State Board of Charities and Corrections and the attention brought to problems of child welfare by the Missouri Children's Code Commission. In 1922 the people of St. Louis established the Community Fund, a non-sectarian organization designed to solve the problem of competing charities. Fourteen years later, it officially united with Catholic Charities and the Jewish Foundation to form United Charities of St. Louis.[85] By 1935, GIH received partial funding from the Community Fund, money used to supplement the endowments and donations that formed the foundation of GIH's operating expenses.[86]

Although by the 1920s GIH was cooperating with numerous other child agencies in St. Louis and receiving aid from the Community Fund, the association remained predominantly privately funded. GIH received grants of public money only when a city, county, or state agency placed a girl in the Home. If managers approved admission, public money paid the boarding expenses of the girl and public officials retained legal control. Although these cases were rare because of the existence of public institutions, GIH did cooperate with other children's services, both public and private. Recommendations by the juvenile court, established in St. Louis in 1903, as well as other child agencies in St. Louis litter GIH case records. To deal with this increased cooperation, GIH added a paid social worker to its staff for the first time in 1922.[87] The role of the social worker was to investigate a child's need and specifically, the validity of that need. In 1929, the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* indicated that there was a "waiting list" for admission into GIH.[88] This cooperation between St. Louis children's organizations and GIH continued throughout the

life of the association and eventually resulted in a joining of like organizations to form one therapeutic support institution.

Although GIH cooperated with other children's organizations, there was visible tension between the public and private character of the various agencies. In June 1928, GIH admitted a girl (L.E.) at the request of the Methodist Children's Home. L.E.'s father was alive and cared for L.E.'s brother upon the mother's death in April 1928. L.E. went to live with a great aunt following the death of her mother. When the aunt became ill, L.E. was referred to GIH. GIH agreed to admit L.E. "temporarily" and worked closely with the juvenile court for permanent placement. In April 1929, GIH brought the case before a committee at the Case Conference on Children's Problems. The case questioned whether L.E. should be in a public or private institution based on her status as a non-dependent. An additional problem existed because the GIH caseworker who made the initial investigation on L.E. refused admission, but found her at GIH when the caseworker returned from a vacation.[89]

The committee, including representatives from GIH, the Board of Children's Guardians, and the juvenile court, recommended that L.E. be placed in a public rather than private institution. They cited two reasons: a) the girl would most likely be institutionalized for an extended period of time; and b) it was unlikely the father would offer any financial assistance because of his "low mentality and poor work record." L.E. was placed with the Board of Children's Guardians. This case, spanning approximately one year, shows not only the cooperation of various children's organizations, but also the questions raised when public and private agencies interact. Because L.E. had a living father, although apparently not willing or able to assist with the girl's upkeep, she was not considered a dependent. Because the juvenile court had been actively involved from the beginning, L.E. was essentially a case taken up by a public agency— the juvenile court. GIH, by nature of its private status, would have required public funds to assist with the care of L.E. while she remained at the institution. The committee recognized that placing

her in a public facility would negate the need to pay for L.E.'s upkeep in a private institution.[90]

The history of GIH reveals much about the evolution of women's activity in nineteenth- and twentieth-century America. Not all nineteenth-century women's benevolent associations were auxiliary of men's organizations. Many of them were established and managed independently by women. The women who formed these associations were actively involved in all aspects of management, including financial. GIH provides a good example of women who collected and invested funds, and made decisions for the allocation of such funds. These women also kept accurate and detailed records of all financial transactions concerning the institution. Women's associations were also actively aware of their surrounding environment. They recognized not only the need for such associations, but also when those associations had outlived its usefulness. Many, like GIH, adapted their mission to fit the changing needs of society and endured.

ENDNOTES

[1] Public schools began in St. Louis in 1838, but all charged some type of fee and required appropriate attire to attend. Most of the poor girls in St. Louis did not have the money or the proper clothing. GIH early annual reports repeatedly emphasized the clean clothes provided to the girls upon admission. In 1855, Elizabeth Clarke stated: "it is for a class of children which Orphan Asylums' and Public Schools cannot reach, that this Institution is opened." She made this statement even though the majority of orphans in asylums were not full orphans. Many only had one parent dead, or had been abandoned or neglected. GIH Second Annual Report (1855), 5.

[2] National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 11 (1884), 354-5.

[3] GIH Seventy-eighth Annual Report (1935-1936).

[4] The numbers of girls cared for in the institution according to various reports was as follows: by 1866— @ 3,000; by 1892— @ 8,000; by 1911— @ 10,000 for periods ranging from three to five years. GIH Thirteenth Annual Report (1866); Clara Barnard, "Report of Girls' Industrial Home," *Journal of the Proceedings of the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions, of St. Louis.* (St. Louis: Commercial Printing Company, 1892), 70; GIH Fifty-eighth Annual Report (1911).

[5] A listing of available yearly totals for admission, residence, adoption and indenture, and day school attendance is provided in the appendix. The average yearly total of residents is based on available numbers for the years 1859-1863, 1869-1875, 1881-1900, 1904-1911, and 1916. The average number of dismissals is based on numbers for the years 1854-1874, 1881-1899, 1904-1905, 1911, and 1914. These numbers represent those statistics included in the annual reports, newspaper articles, and studies completed by the Child Welfare League, the St. Louis Planning Council, and the City of St. Louis. GIH Annual Reports (1854-1918); GIH Case Records (1920s and 1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[6] Meaning that in the sixty-one year period, an average of only five new women served each year.

[7] I only have available annual reports listing elected managers to 1915. Records indicate that many of the women serving after 1900 would still be serving after 1915. Of the thirty-six women new to the association from 1900, seventeen were still serving in 1915.

[8] Officers and managers were predominantly middle- to upper-middle class. There were women involved who can be categorized as elite— for example, Martha S. Cupples, wife of Samuel Cupples, a prominent merchant and manufacturer in St. Louis, and Cynthia M. King, wife of Washington King, mayor of St. Louis in 1855. Specific occupations of officers' husbands included: secretary for an insurance company, co-owner of a paper and rag store, and wholesale commission merchant. St. Louis *City Directories* 1854-1899; *Federal Census, St. Louis Missouri,* 1860.

[9] According to her will, Clarke bequeathed $250 to GIH. GIH Twenty-eighth Annual Report (1881).

[10] Clarke's father died in the wreck of his ship in 1813. Captain Richard Shapleigh's ship, *Granville*, was bound from Cadiz to Portsmouth in April 1813. According to reports, the ship was "cast away on a ledge of rocks extending a short distance off Rye Beach, at four o'clock on Wednesday morning, the fourteenth of April." The ship was broken into pieces. Captain Shapleigh was swept from the deck while trying to cut away the mizen mast. He was drowned. The people of Rye Beach rescued thirteen of the crew members. Captain Shapleigh's body washed ashore two days after the wreck. *Granville* was carrying salt, four hundred boxes of raisins, and a quantity of lemons. The entire cargo was lost. Shapleigh left four children and a widow. Elizabeth was the oldest of the children at the age of ten. To support the family, Elizabeth's mother, Dorothy operated a boarding house in Portsmouth and Boston before moving to Philadelphia then St. Louis with her children. GIH Thirtieth Annual Report (1884); Nathaniel Adams, *Annals of Portsmouth, New Hampshire*. (Portsmouth, NH: C. Norris, Printer, 1825), 357; Brian J. L. Berry, *The Shapleigh, Shapley and Shappley Families: A Comprehensive Genealogy, 1635-1993*. (Baltimore, MD: Gateway Press, Inc., 1993), 54-5.

[11] I found no information on the death of Elizabeth Clarke's husband in the Portsmouth newspapers. I also found little information on the deaths of her children. The Philadelphia *Public Ledger* lists them both, but gives no reason for their deaths. The obituary for William Wallace Clarke indicated that he lived at the home of his uncle A. F. Shapleigh; the *Public Ledger* listed Lizzie Mary's address as "her late residence." By the time of Lizzie's death, Augustus F. Shapleigh had moved to St. Louis to begin his career in the hardware business. Philadelphia *Public Ledger* March 6, 1844, December 24, 1847.

[12] Elizabeth Clarke's brother, Augustus F. Shapleigh became a clerk in a hardware store in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, after the death of his father, eventually moving to Philadelphia to continue his work in the hardware business. He moved from Philadelphia to St. Louis in 1843 to establish and manage a western branch of The Rogers, Shapleigh Hardware Company, the Philadelphia company where Shapleigh had been an employee. Shapleigh maintained a partnership in St. Louis until 1888 when he assumed full control of the A. F. Shapleigh Hardware Company. It eventually became A. F. Shapleigh and Sons. Shapleigh's real estate value amounted to approximately ten thousand dollars, because of his business. The 1860 census listed Shapleigh and his wife, Clarke, her mother, three servants, and six children (all Shapleigh's) in the household on Washington Avenue. A. F. Shapleigh Hardware Co., Vertical File. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; *Federal Census, St. Louis, Missouri*, 1860.

[13] Barnard changed residences frequently following the death of her husband. She lived in various locations, among them Washington Avenue, Maryland Avenue, and finally on Delmar Avenue (formerly Morgan Street).

[14] GIH Fifty-fifth Annual Report (1908).

[15] The Catholic St. Vincent de Paul Society and the Jewish United Educational and Charitable Association co-existed with the Provident Association (Protestant) in St. Louis.

[16] Clara Barnard, "The Care of Children," *Journal of the Proceedings of the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions, of St. Louis*. (St. Louis: Commercial Printing Company, 1892), 88-92.

[17] Two Irish servants also lived in the household. The Thomson's resided on Locust Avenue and Morgan Street. The 1860 census listed John Thomson's real estate value at twenty thousand dollars. After her husband's death, Marion Thomson resided on Cardinal Avenue and various other locations. The change in employment and residences could indicate a failed business, or simply reflect the advanced age of Marion Thomson's husband. At the time of his employment as a postal clerk, John Thomson would have been sixty years old.

[18] GIH Thirty-eighth Annual Report (1891), 8.

[19] Hendel's mother, Elizabeth Arnot, also participated in GIH as a manager and member in addition to founding the Methodist Orphan's Home.

[20] Hendel's son was sixteen in 1884. She also had a daughter who was twenty-four. Both of the children lived with their mother in the household of their grandfather, Jesse Arnot, the owner of a livery stable business in St. Louis.

[21] Annual reports also mentioned the reform measures taking place in Five Points, New York, specifically remarking on the similarities between transforming a former brewery into a House of Mission or House of Industry. GIH Third Annual Report (1856).

[22] Abby Todd was assistant secretary from 1906 to 1909, and secretary from 1909 to 1911. Isabelle Anderson served as second vice-president from 1900 to 1903.

[23] GIH Thirtieth Annual Report (1883).

[24] Corbitt's husband was a merchant in St. Louis. He died in 1893. Libby served as treasurer from 1870 to 1878. Her husband owned a paper and rag store until his death in 1884. His obituary listed him as a "prominent member of Oddfellows" and a member of the "Board of Trustees of Covenant Mutual Life Insurance Company." St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* October 11, 1884; GIH Fifty-ninth Annual Report (1912).

[25] The five presidents were: Marion Thomson, Maggie Hendel, Mrs. F.B. Chamberlain, Mrs. Charles H. Scaritt, Mrs. S.T.G. Smith, newly elected in 1928. St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* November 24, 1929.

[26] St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* November 24, 1929.

[27] GIH Forty-second Annual Report (1895).

[28] Susan Glover was a manager for twenty-three years. GIH Thirty-second Annual Report (1885), 6.

[29] GIH Thirtieth Annual Report (1883).

[30] In 1857, the name officially changed to "The Girls' Industrial Home."

[31] Original contributions came from various churches and local St. Louis residents. The list of donations in the First Annual Report included six churches making monetary contributions: Second Presbyterian, $100.00; Union Presbyterian, $168.78; Second Baptist, $37.65; Christian Church, $28.00; Fourth Street Methodist, $17.10; Universalist Church, $56.50. Residents of St. Louis donated articles of clothing, school supplies, shoes, blankets, furnishings, etc. These donations became standard throughout the history

of the Home. The officers and managers of GIH paid three hundred dollars rent for the house at Seventh and Carr. GIH First Annual Report (1854).

[32] GIH Twenty-fifth Annual Report (1878).

[33] GIH, *IncorporationCharter* (February 13, 1855).

[34] GIH First Annual Report (1854), 6.

[35] Lori Ginzberg noted that women's organizations that became incorporated showed good business sense, stating: "women's very interest in becoming incorporated challenges their insistence on a protected female sphere." Lori D. Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the Nineteenth-Century United States* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), 48; GIH, *IncorporationCharter* (February 13, 1855).

[36] GIH Twenty-second Annual Report (1875), 6.

[37] Honorary members were usually women who had been involved with GIH but had moved from St. Louis or had died.

[38] Although several men donated money and goods to GIH, they were exempt from membership and participation in the business aspects of the association. GIH by-laws, *IncorporationCharter* (February 13, 1855).

[39] Ibid.

[40] Ibid.

[41] GIH Fourth Annual Report (1857).

[42] Following are specific duties outlined for the matron and teacher: the matron assigned duties to children, dealt with insubordination, insured that the children were neat and clean before coming to the table or going to school, kept inventory records of furnishings and clothing donated to the institution, kept records of girls admitted and dismissed, and supervised visitations with parents. The matron could not admit or dismiss a child without the authorization of the elected officers and board of managers. In addition to her teaching duties, the teacher assisted in the sewing department, kept the schoolroom in order, kept records of daily attendance in school, and kept records of donations. "Rules of the Government of the Home and School," *IncorporationCharter* (February 13, 1855).

[43] Harmonia Badger served as matron from 1859-1864, L. A. Lammers from 1864 to her death in 1871, Catherine Baker from 1873 to 1908, and Anna Hitch from 1908 to 1920. Four women served as teacher for extended periods from 1861 to 1905. The two longest-serving teachers, Lucy Ella Rose and Isabella Hunter served for thirteen years and twelve years respectively.

[44] St. Louis census records indicated the following servants residing at GIH: 1860— one matron, two servants, and one seamstress; 1870— one matron, one seamstress, one cook, and one laundress; 1880— one matron, one teacher, one nurse, and two servants; 1900— one matron, one matron's assistant, one cook, and one housegirl; 1910— one matron, three housemaids, one cook; 1920— one matron, one servant, one nurse, one attendant. Over the years GIH listed physicians, usually thanking them for their

services in the annual reports or listing them along with officers and managers in the annual reports. Eventually GIH received the services of a dentist and oculist in addition to the general practitioners. The same men served GIH year-after-year. Some of them were relatives of officers and mangers. The association was not able to add a separate infirmary until they built their new building in 1899. *Federal Census St. Louis, Missouri*, 1860, 1870, 1880, 1900, 1910, 1920.

[45] GIH Ninth Annual Report (1862).

[46] GIH Third Annual Report (1856).

[47] Originally, GIH expected to receive a donated lot on which the managers intended to build a brand new structure. After the unexpected withdrawal of the donation, managers immediately sought a new place and discovered the available brewery. In 1857 GIH managers paid $11,185.24 in two installments as payment for the brewery establishing the permanent Girls Industrial Home. GIH Third Annual Report (1856); GIH Fourth Annual Report (1857).

[48] GIH Fifteenth Annual Report (1868); GIH Twenty-fourth Annual Report (1877).

[49] Elizabeth Clarke commented that managers preferred to keep girls for at least one year after admittance, but often the girls returned to their own families, into conditions managers referred to as "poor," before that time. Some parents chose to relinquish total control of the children to GIH; others sought only temporary boarding after they "fell on hard times" and commenced "getting back on their feet." According to the law, GIH could indenture- or adopt-out any child whose parents relinquished total control. Thus, GIH also became a placing-out service for the children. GIH Twenty-fourth Annual Report (1877); GIH Eleventh Annual Report (1864).

[50] Child Welfare League of America, "Report on the Child Welfare Work of St. Louis, Missouri, and Recommendations Leading to the Development of a Community Plan on Children's Work" (1928), Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri; GIH Thirty-fourth Annual Report (1887), 7.

[51] GIH Fifth Annual Report (1858), 6.

[52] I also believe that the decision to focus on girls reflected the need to protect girls from both delinquency and dependency, two characteristics seen as detrimental to the character of a girl. Working-class girls, particularly newly-arrived immigrants, and later, girls with emotional problems stemming from abusive or broke homes were statistically more likely to become delinquents. GIH Twenty-eighth Annual Report (1881), 6.

[53] The annual report of 1859 stated that the lack of space marked the only reason GIH could not help more girls. In 1863, managers expressed an interest in expanding the institution to include "children of more tender years," but commented that the lack of money and space prevented them. Annual reports of 1864 and 1865 reported that GIH repeatedly had to turn girls away because it lacked room, and that the present building (brewery) provided comfortable accommodations only for thirty girls. The Civil War caused an increase in the need for temporary and permanent homes for children in Missouri, as well as refugees from nearby states. This accounted for the problem of space for the years following 1863. GIH Fourth Annual Report (1857); GIH Sixth Annual

Report (1859); GIH Tenth Annual Report (1863); GIH Eleventh Annual Report (1864); GIH Twelfth Annual Report (1865).

[54] Hazard also made reference to the fact that the transformation of the brewery was the second of its kind, meaning the transformation of the Five Points brewery into a mission and house of industry. GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859), 7.

[55] From the annual reports and treasury reports it was clear that the newly-purchased brewery needed many repairs. The reports from 1858 to 1867 listed numerous payments for repairs, as well as taxes. 1859— $1401.10 paid on new building; 1860— $2,055.96 paid on new building and $280.11 paid in taxes for grading and paving the street; 1861— $320.34 paid in taxes for guttering and curbing; 1862— $62.60 paid on repairs to building and $92.55 paid in a tax for a sidewalk; 1863— $35.75 paid on repairs; 1864— $31.00 paid on repairs; 1865— $460.55 paid on repairs; 1866— $127.72 paid on repairs and $680.65 paid for sewering and $100.47 paid in city taxes. GIH Fourteenth Annual Report (1867); GIH Fifth-Fourteenth Annual Reports (1858-1867).

[56] Of the total amount: $5,051.11 was "balance on hand" beginning November 1866; managers collected $3805.70; GIH received $322.57 for interest; and $2074.71 was proceeds from the fair. The total cost of the enlargement was $12,000. GIH Fourteenth Annual Report (1867).

[57] Because of the increased residents, by-laws changed to require elected managers serve one day per *week* rather than per *month* assisting the staff at the Home. GIH Twenty-fifth Annual Report (1867).

[58] Elizabeth Clarke stated: "Chance at length threw in our way the property known as the St. Louis Brewery . . . and after much deliberation, with the full concurrence of our advisory committee . . . a purchase was made for the sum of ($11,000) eleven thousand dollars." GIH Fourth Annual Report (1857).

[59] Following is a list of available real estate value of the male members of the advisory board and legal counsel of GIH: Levin Baker, member of advisory board, was President of Lindell Hotel, with a real estate value of $250,000; C.C. McClure, counsel for GIH, had a real estate value of $200,000; and interestingly, Henry Hitchcock, counsel for GIH, had no real estate valued listed, but his wife had a real estate value of $100,000. *Federal Census, St. Louis, Missouri*, 1860; GIH Fourteenth Annual Report (1867).

[60] Mary Rhodes is listed as a manager for only one year in 1856. GIH Third Annual Report (1856); GIH Fourteenth Annual Report (1867).

[61] One of the largest endowments came from James Gay Butler sometime between 1915 and 1917, totaling approximately twenty-five thousand dollars. GIH invested the majority of the money and used a portion of the fund to add a new building in 1926. In the mid-1920s GIH began receiving aid from the Community Fund. In the 1950s, GIH began receiving partial funding from the United Fund of St. Louis. They continued to receive partial money until the merger in 1978. GIH managers resisted merging with Edgewood Children's Center in 1957 because of concern for their substantial endowment fund. Because of legalities, managers worried about transferring the funds to a different organization.

[62] GIH Thirty-fourth Annual Report (1887), 7.

[63] The formation of an "Associated Charity" was a consistent theme at the St. Louis conference in 1892. The conference included Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish charities and one of the main topics revolved around the formation of the association without regard to religious affiliation. The idea of an "Associated Charities" began in the United States in Buffalo, New York, in December 1877. The model was the London Charity Organization Society. According to William Trattner, by 1883 twenty-five cities had organizations that systematized their charities and by 1900, 138 similar organizations were in operation. For more information on the charity organization movement in the United States. Clara Barnard, "The Care of Children," 89; Robert H. Bremner, *From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States* (New York: New York University Press, 1956), 51-7; Walter I. Trattner, *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America* (New York: The Free Press, 1999), 93-103.

[64] Scientific charity also tended to be more individual oriented, meaning there was less focus on societal reform and more focus on individual rescue or charity.

[65] Throughout much of the nineteenth century, private rather than public charities provided much of the poor relief in St. Louis. The first city-wide Protestant charitable organization in St. Louis formed in 1862 with the creation of the St. Louis Provident Association. The Provident Association declared itself to be a non-sectarian Protestant charitable organization. It co-existed with the Catholic St. Vincent de Paul Society and the Jewish United Educational and Charitable Association. The Provident Association merged with the Children's Aid Society in St. Louis in 1936 to form the Family and Children Services of Greater St. Louis. In its First Annual Report, The Provident Association listed approximately thirty-six private, city, and county charitable institutions and organizations in St. Louis. The Provident Association annual reports revealed the majority of their aid went to help widows and stressed that they helped those groups not covered by other charitable organizations. St. Louis Provident Association Annual Reports, Mercantile Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

[66] A standard manual training school would focus less on education and more on industrial skills. Prior to the early twentieth century, GIH operated with the dual role. After 1905, GIH became a true industrial school. GIH Thirtieth Annual Report (1883), 7.

[67] For example, the report listed two girls as dressmakers (one working in a large millinery establishment), one baker that routinely offered her expert skills at bread-making to the Home, and one girl who was a superintendent of a woman's department in one of the city factories. GIH Thirtieth Annual Report (1883).

[68] The report noted that "all charities are quick to feel the depressing throb of the mercantile pulse." Sarah Paddock, the President of the Industrial Education Association of New York, provided the following descriptions of services offered by institutions: Industrial Education— training in common education and in industrial and business pursuits; Industrial School— any school that teaches one or several branches of industry, the higher grades dubbed technical schools; Manual Labor— purpose to enable poor children to earn money as soon as possible rather than delayed training. GIH Thirty-second Annual Report (1885), 6; Sarah Sands Paddock, "Industrial and Technological Training," National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 11 (1884), 207.

[69] GIH Thirty-ninth Annual Report (1892).

[70] GIH Forty-fourth Annual Report (1897).

[71] GIH Fortieth Annual Report (1893).

[72] The Board of Trustees listed the following securities for the Building Fund in 1896: 3 Bonds, Nos. 336-7-8, St. Clair, Madison and St. Louis Belt R.R. Co. Bridge 5%, $1,000— Face value, $3,000, Cost, $2,500; 1 Bond, No. 366, Mo. Electric Light and Power Co., 6%— Face value, $1,000, Cost, $1,014.33; 1 Bond, No. 9966, Laclede Gas Light Co., 5%— Face value, $500.00, Cost, $481.25; 1 Bond, No. 9968, Laclede Gas Light Co., 5%— Face value, $500.00, Cost, $485.00; Total listed— Face value, $5,000.00, Cost $4,480.58. GIH Forty-third Annual Report (1896); GIH Forty-sixth Annual Report (1899).

[73] GIH Forty-sixth Annual Report (1899); GIH Forty-seventh Annual Report (1900), 12.

[74] Construction on the new buildings began on June 26, 1899 and managers took up residence on March 31, 1900. The treasurer's report listed the following costs for the new building: lot purchase price— $9,000.00; main building construction cost— $38,242.85; hospital and laundry additions— $3,500.00; architect's fees— $2,200.00. GIH Forty-seventh Annual Report (1900); GIH Forty-eighth Annual Report (1901).

[75] GIH Forty-eighth Annual Report (1901), 15.

[76] GIH Forty-ninth Annual Report (1902), 9.

[77] The Building Fund for 1902 listed the following: Credits— $328.80 for rent on brewery property; $11,244.75 for sale of Maryland Avenue property; $3,000.00 from anonymous donation; $2,500.00 bequest from A.F. Shapleigh; $6,500.00 borrowed from Samuel Cupples; Debits— paid $15,500.00 to Samuel Cupples for previous loan and $6,500.00 for mortgage. GIH Forty-ninth Annual Report (1902), 9.

[78] Francis. H. McLean, "Survey of Charities in St. Louis, Summary of Important Findings and Recommendations, 1916," Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscripts Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[79] In 1920, only ten percent of the total one hundred thousand women in the workforce in St. Louis held professional jobs. Approximately forty-five percent worked in domestic service, and forty-five percent worked as waitresses, hairdressers, factory labor, or retail and office work. Katharine Corbett, *In Her Place: A Guide to St. Louis Women's History* (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1999), 157; GIH Annual Report (1940).

[80] In 1905, Missouri implemented its state compulsory school attendance law.

[81] GIH Fifty-third Annual Report (1906), 10; GIH Fifty-fourth Annual Report (1907), 11.

[82] The Auxiliary Board reported that it discontinued the kindergarten for the year 1913 because there were not enough students to warrant its operation.

[83] State Board of Charities and Corrections of Missouri, *Eighth Biennial Report*, (1911-1912), Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[84] Missouri Children's Code Commission, "Report of Children's Code Commission" (1917), 47, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[85] The name changed to Community Chest in 1946, and eventually became the United Fund of St. Louis in 1955. In 1975 the United Fund merged with the Health and Welfare Council becoming the United Way of Greater St. Louis. The United Way of Greater St. Louis, "The Best Way to Care, History of the United Way," (United Way of Greater St. Louis, Inc., 2002).

[86] The treasurer's report for the year ending December 31, 1935, showed that the institution received $3,619.40 from the Community Fund during the year 1935. This was approximately 13 percent of total funding for that year. The treasurer's report for the year ending December 31, 1940, showed a total of $2,662.00 received from United Charities. This was approximately 11 percent of total funding for the year. It is possible that aid from the Community Fund came earlier, perhaps in 1922 when GIH added the social worker to the staff. It may have been a condition of funding that GIH employ a trained social worker. GIH brochures from circa 1960 indicated that the institution was a "United Fund Agency." Two brochures advertising the institution are located in the Edgewood Children's Center Collection, Mercantile Library, St. Louis, Missouri; GIH Treasurer's Reports (1854-1913).

[87] In the 1890s, there was an increased emphasis on professionalized and educated social workers. In 1898, the New York Charity Organization Society founded the first school on social work. By the end of the 1920s, social work changed from an emphasis on "cause" to one on "function," meaning an increased emphasis on a therapeutic, rather than custodial service. The volunteer "friendly visitors" of a previous generation now became paid, trained caseworkers as part of the new rational, scientific systematization. In 1903, the St. Louis Provident Association established a "School of Philanthropy" to train volunteer charity workers. In 1909, it became the St. Louis School of Social Economy, part of Washington University. That year, Roger Baldwin, a nationally-known Progressive reformer and first teacher of sociology at Washington University, took control of the school. According to Katharine Corbett, "between 1909 and 1915, more than half the masters degrees awarded by Washington University were in social work." Corbett, *In Her Place*, 157; although not a comprehensive list, see the following for the evolution of social work: Bremner, *From the Depths*; Roy Lubove, *The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965); Trattner, *From Poor Law*.

[88] St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* November 24, 1929.

[89] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[90] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

CHAPTER TWO

"Guarding against making it an 'Institution'": The Girls' Industrial Home and School and its "Progressive" Ideas of Child Welfare

"Our children have a healthful, happy home. There are few better regulated families (we see no reason why we should not say so)."
— Girls' Industrial Home Thirty-ninth Annual Report (1892)

"The Work in an institution of this kind is most difficult, as the pupils are constantly changing, so the same progress cannot be made as in a regular school."
— Girls' Industrial Home Forty-ninth Annual Report (1902)

Institution building is a well-known and widely-debated topic amongst nineteenth-century social historians. Two questions dominate the discussion: were the middle-class reformers who built institutions trying to force their morality on the lower classes in an effort to control them (and thus, maintain social order), or was there a genuine humanitarian impulse to help the less fortunate? Historians have championed both theories. The social control theory purports that with increasing industrialization, urbanization, and immigration beginning in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, middle-class men and women grew fearful that social disorder would increase, particularly in the cities. Driven by this fear, the newly-expanding middle class began establishing institutions by which they could control the undesirable elements of society. Workhouses were meant for the idle, prisons for the criminals, insane asylums for the mentally defective, and houses of refuge for delinquent and destitute juveniles. A more radical critique of social control argued that reformers sought more than simply control. Reformers established policies and facilities to maintain the capitalist system of exploitation that created poverty itself. There was no real reform motive in their action, other than the continued exploitation of the lower class.[1]

The humanitarian theory maintained that the middle class, driven by genuine feelings of humanity that increased with the Second Great Awakening, constructed institutions to provide genuine aid to the less fortunate. As a result, a different view of institutions formed. Workhouses taught skills, prisons protected society from hardened criminals and reformed them in the meantime, and houses of refuge sheltered and reformed children who otherwise would wander the streets learning criminal trades.[2]

Although the *purpose* of such institution building remains a debatable issue, how such institutions operated does not. The general description of nineteenth-century institutions maintains that they were rigid, impersonal, regimented, disciplined, confining, and "almost certainly monotonous."[3] Anyone facing a "sentence" in such places experienced a life of character-building exercises, structured routine with little independence, harsh discipline including corporal punishment, and constant supervision and surveillance. In his study of the "discovery of the asylum," Historian David J. Rothman argues that nineteenth-century institutions were regimented because their purpose was to teach discipline, making them more prison-like than family-like.[4]

Whereas the early intention of such institutions was therapeutic, Rothman and other historians argue that because of the regimentation, institutions turned into custodial-care asylums rather than therapeutic-reform facilities. Their interpretation maintains that the administration of such institutions was primarily concerned with maintaining order rather than caring for inmates' needs.[5] Even Charles Loring Brace, founder of the Children's Aid Society in New York and quite possibly the most famous nineteenth-century child welfare reformer, criticized asylum care and favored the "placing-out system." Brace argued that the biggest deterrence to crime for children was not asylum life, but family life. His system of placing children in rural, western homes reflected this attitude.[6]

The establishment of institutions in the nineteenth century was a product of a reform mentality. Reformers assumed that individuals admitted to such places were in need of reformation, whether they were criminals or simply victims of poverty. In his study of

delinquents and reformers, Eric C. Schneider argues that the reform mentality "taught the lessons of an emerging bourgeois culture." Such lessons included "attentiveness to time, . . . industriousness, . . . self-discipline, . . . [and] regularity."[7] All of these values represented what social control historians call "middle-class values." It was through the process of being in the institution and obeying its regimented schedule that the "undesirable elements" of the population evolved into good, self-supporting citizens. Otherwise, they would become burdens on society, and dangerous members of a lesser class that tended toward chaos and revolution.

The Girls' Industrial Home and School (GIH) was atypical of nineteenth-century institutions because it did not rely on routine schedules, harsh discipline, or rigid standardization. When managers used these methods it represented more of an anomaly than a regular part of the daily administration. There are several reasons why GIH was able to succeed without implementing policies of regimentation. First, throughout much of its history there was an absence of male authority and dominant ideas of patriarchal discipline. As a result, the women of GIH emphasized maternalistic affection and devotion rather than paternalistic authority and physical punishment. Second, as a private institution, managers controlled the admission and dismissal policy, allowing them to regulate the type of girl admitted. Consequently, GIH did not emphasize moral reformation as part of its mission statement, so social and moral control was of secondary importance. Third, the institution's multi-faceted programs served a wide variety of purposes, making routine and regulation difficult to administer. Finally, because GIH remained small in size, managers were able to offer individual attention to the girls and run the institution more like a home.

In many ways, the women who established and managed GIH were ahead of their time because the very qualities they exhibited in the 1850s, Progressive reformers emphasized in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The Progressives criticized the rigidity and impersonal atmosphere of nineteenth-century institutions. Even though

continuing to hold to the reform mentality, Progressives sought a change in the nature of institutional care. They argued against the regimentation, routine, and monotony in favor of a more relaxed environment and an open curriculum. They also criticized the lack of individualism, particularly the barracks-style living and eating arrangements. The Progressives recommended a family-like cottage system where individuals could interact in smaller groups and receive personal attention from trained personnel. They also began to de-emphasize the need for harsh discipline in favor of daily recreational activities and educational lessons.[8]

From the beginning, GIH managers emphasized the creation and maintenance of a "homelike atmosphere," rather than an institutional one. Managers referred to their admission policy as an "open table," because many children simply wandered in for meals or attended the school. Although these children were different from the permanent residents, they were treated the same. Because of this elastic admission policy, GIH did not have a formal daily routine until the beginning of the twentieth century. In addition, the girls never wore uniforms and managers used little discipline. Corporal punishment, demerit systems, and categorized ranking remained absent throughout the long history of GIH. Unlike other children's institutions, GIH did not require the girls to work for wages to support the institution financially.

When changes did occur in the administration of the institution, it reflected the changing nature of institutional care itself. For example, there was little routine and standardization in the early years because it was nearly impossible to manage the hundreds of children coming and going from the day school. However, that changed by the turn of the century. After creating a formal domestic science division in 1899 and beginning domestic science classes, routine weekly class schedules increased. In addition, once the girls began attending public school and managers eliminated the elementary school curriculum, the problem of part-time and seasonal students decreased, allowing the managers to concentrate specifically on the industrial aspect of their mission.[9] With the

addition of a social worker in 1922 and the beginning of the transition to a therapeutic-treatment program, standardization increased to accommodate the nature of remedial treatment. Even then, rigid structure and discipline were absent. A newspaper article in 1929 (just prior to the transitional period) emphasized that the girls were still not uniformed, and despite their assistance with the daily upkeep of the institution, they were "allowed all the time they possibly need[ed] for study and recreation."[10]

The lack of rigid structure and discipline reflected the difference in gender roles of men and women. Nineteenth-century gender roles for men, as heads of households, included discipline, usually harsh and physical. Women's roles as childrearers and "keepers of hearth and home" took on the characteristics of gentleness and moral virtue, even when in positions of disciplinarian. David J. Rothman estimated that between 1830 and 1850, male philanthropists established approximately fifty-three private orphan asylums. Within the next few decades, childcare institutions (including orphan asylums and houses of refuge) grew at an enormous rate, making such institutions common sites in various urban areas. Men established, managed, and financed the majority of these places. Although women may have staffed the institutions, men made the decisions and dealt with the daily administration.[11]

The programs of these institutions revealed two important themes: reformers hoped to teach children the "primacy of obedience" and instill in them a "respect for authority." Both of these components carry strong patriarchal connotations. The structure of patriarchy within the home placed the responsibility of disciplining children on the father, the head of the household. The discipline served the purpose of teaching children obedience and respect for the authority of the father. In her study of the family, Mary P. Ryan argued that religion played a prominent role in the re-enforcement of patriarchy within the family. According to Ryan, in the nineteenth century, "authority rather than affection . . . reigned supreme" in maintaining an evangelical patriarchal order in the family.[12] Not unlike a family structure, nineteenth-century children's institutions also re-enforced the

patriarchal order. Philanthropists established institutions that insured children would be taught order, discipline, respect, and obedience. Rarely (if ever) did GIH annual reports mention terms like "obedience" and "authority." Throughout the entire history of the institution, discipline, routine, standardization, and regimentation were absent. The fact that women were the primary decision-makers must have had something to do with the absence of such readily-used and acceptable practices in other children's institutions.

Although GIH managers maintained this emphasis on building a "home," versus an "institution," the nature of their mission forced them intermittently to use strict regulation and structure. At the root of the mission was a program of safety and rescue of destitute and neglected girls and the training of them in useful skills that would provide them with gainful employment. Because the mission focused on rescue, sometimes, for the safety of the girl, GIH managers increased their control and limited her independence and freedom of movement. In the early years of GIH, managers forbade visits by parents, or insisted on supervised visitation only on an assigned day of the week. As a general rule, managers restricted the girls from visiting their former homes for fear of undoing the good work of the institution. Although this policy became more flexible over time, eventually encouraging parental interaction, managers continued to keep a close watch on the girls even after they left the home.[13]

When GIH placed limitations on individual independence it usually resulted from recommendations made by the GIH visiting committee, psychiatric evaluations, or evidence of physical abuse. In 1857, Elizabeth Clarke recounted the story of a young girl who came to GIH in tears, fleeing the brutal abuse of her older brother. GIH admitted the girl immediately and restricted any interaction with the brother. After he demanded the return of his sister, GIH managers sought the help of the local authorities. Eventually, the mayor appointed a guardian for the girl, removing her permanently from the dangerous environment. Similarly, in 1923, a psychiatric report recommended "a sheltered life with active supervision" for a thirteen-year old girl who had admitted to having sexual relations

with an older man. The recommendation insured that the girl did "not succumb to the sex advances of men" in the future.[14]

GIH managers seldom admitted girls believed to exhibit "questionable" characteristics or "delinquent" behavior. From annual reports, visiting committee reports, and investigations by the social worker, such "questionable" behavior included "running around with men," "using bad language," and having "immoral relations" with unscrupulous individuals. GIH managers did receive requests for admission from other local institutions or the juvenile court for girls exhibiting these characteristics. Managers usually hesitated admitting such girls. If managers agreed to admission, any sign of continued behavior while a resident of GIH resulted in dismissal. Records indicated that after the turn of the century, in the cases where managers allowed admission, psychiatric evaluations were given to the girls. There was also an increased amount of investigation by the social worker to ascertain the source of a girl's problems.[15] Case records from the 1920s and 1930s also showed that every girl admitted to the home was given a test for syphilis to determine whether she was sexual active.[16] Although these particular policies were restrictive, the sporadic use of them indicated they were more a tool used by GIH managers rather than a standard method of reform.

From its inception in 1853, the women who established GIH emphasized their intent to build a "home" (not simply a shelter) for destitute and neglected children. In the first three years of operation, GIH never had a location that provided adequate space for a residential home. The few children who were kept overnight usually resided at the private homes of managers or friends. For this reason, one of the first goals was to procure a suitable site, large enough to accommodate children as temporary residents. In this case, temporary residents meant children who could spend the night or who remained at the institution until adopted, indentured, or returned to their parents or guardians. GIH managers recognized the problem of teaching the children during the day only to return them to their homes at night. Shortly after opening, Charlotte H. Gough, acting GIH

secretary, asserted this point, recognizing the disadvantage of "children who pass only a part of their time under the influence of proper training and return in the evening to the haunts of misery and dissipation."[17] The acquisition of the brewery in 1856, a site large enough to accommodate up to thirty children as residents, enabled GIH managers to establish their first residential home for girls.

This, however, did not mean that all girls at the institution became residents, under the legal control of the managers. In fact, most did not. Simultaneously, GIH was a day school (including industrial training and elementary education), a boarding house, and a residential home. This multi-faceted program resulted in three types of girls utilizing the institution— the student (or "scholar," as managers dubbed each girl), the boarder, and the resident. The student only attended classes at the school, participating more in the common education studies than the domestic arts curriculum. The boarder lived at the home, usually upon petition of one or both parents, temporarily until being returned to the parents or other family members. While residing at the home, the boarder participated in both the elementary and industrial curriculum.[18] The students and boarders made up the largest number of girls at the institution in the first eighty years of operation. The resident lived at the institution full-time with the intent of being adopted out to a family or placed in some type of employment that would allow for self-support. The resident also participated in both the elementary and industrial curriculum. The parents of full-time residents signed away parental rights, allowing GIH managers to find the girls new homes or employment opportunities. GIH managers acted as legal guardians only for the resident girls, not the boarders or students.[19]

There were also varying periods of time in which each girl stayed at GIH. For this reason, set rules and regulations were difficult to establish. In 1868, the annual report noted that there was "no specified limit to the time our inmates are retained after their admission."[20] Some girls came only sporadically, either for meals or occasional classes at the school. Thus, it was not unusual for managers to see new faces on a daily basis in the

day school or at the noon table. The girls residing in the institution as temporary residents were no different. Case records revealed that girls resided in the care of GIH for periods of days or years, regardless of their status as boarders or residents. Case records from the 1920s and 1930s show the longest noted case was three sisters who remained at the home for over eight years, and one girl who remained over ten years; the shortest record was a few days. In 1864, Elizabeth Clarke stated that GIH managers preferred "to retain any child . . . at least one year from its entrance." However, she admitted that "frequently only a few weeks intervenes [sic] between the reception of an inmate and her transmission to her [new] home." Clarke blamed the lack of finances for the problem. The children being dismissed could be going to a new adopted home, a new place of employment, or back to their own family.[21]

Because of this quick turnover, establishing a set routine and enforcing daily discipline was futile because a girl could be in the school one day, but gone the next. The annual report in 1872 referred to the day school enrollment as "large and frequently varying," making it difficult to regulate. Clara Barnard expressed this difficulty in one of her annual reports, stating the "diversity of ages in the School had rendered it a difficult task to introduce the discipline of the public schools."[22] The same frustrations appeared in the reports of the GIH Auxiliary Board, established in 1899, and placed in charge of conducting a kindergarten for children too young to attend the public schools. In 1902, Mrs. T. P. Riddle reported that the work was difficult because the "pupils are constantly changing, so the same progress cannot be made as in a regular school."[23]

There was also the problem of seasonal fluctuations. The enrollment of the day school increased during winter when the warmth of the schoolroom beckoned children. In 1860, the annual report described the schoolroom as "warm and well ventilated," adding that children not only received the benefit of "daily instruction," but also a "substantial dinner." Usually, the increased enrollment included a number of young boys. In 1856, Elizabeth Clarke reported that in winter, the frozen Mississippi River contributed to the

"stagnation of business," preventing young boys from securing employment running errands in the city. The result was a larger number of them asking for meals and daily shelter. Clarke assured the public that the institution could not deny them simply "because they were dressed in a boy's jacket instead of a girl's sacque." The boys attended the school and received meals in exchange for assisting managers by bringing in water from the well, "a labor too burdensome for most of the girls."[24]

GIH managers often blamed the problem of irregular attendance at the school and quick turnover at the home on the parents, particularly those who refused to relinquish control of their children. In 1860, Elizabeth Clarke expressed frustration at the reluctance of a mother to give up control of her children even "when perfectly aware of their improved condition" while at the institution. Three years later, Clarke criticized parents for standing in the way of their children's education, writing that many of the children were frequently "compelled to remain at home to assist in various household duties— their mothers often believing the school to be merely secondary in importance."[25] This statement showed that managers were more than willing to determine what constituted a good "home" environment for these children. In this case, it was the ability to become literate through an elementary education.

There were repeated examples in the GIH annual reports of managers attempting to influence legislation that would give them more authority over the children while they resided at the institution. In an effort to convince legislators that neglectful parental care contributed to the rise in juvenile delinquency, Elizabeth Clarke proclaimed in 1856 that legislators should "give to some benevolent society the right to withdraw these children from contaminating influences [parents]." The result would be a reduction in the juvenile delinquent population in St. Louis.[26] In 1860, the annual report hinted at the problem of caring for children without having legal control over their lives. Clarke complained of the problem of liability, almost confessing that GIH had been criticized recently for its

institutional care. She stated:

> the stranger who comes in to supply the place of parents is ever liable to misrepresentation, and though he [or she] may perform his [or her] duty in the fear of God, and for the best interests of the child, there will always be some to question his [or her] motive and doubt the justice of his [or her] discipline.[27]

GIH managers essentially acted as surrogate parents for the girls, but, in most cases, they did not assume legal guardianship. There was no evidence that managers were successful in their attempts to gain legal control over children without the consent of their parents.

Interestingly, managers' labeling of parents as obstacles changed by the early twentieth century, possibly as a result of the Progressive emphasis on keeping the family together. The idea of outdoor relief, meaning children cared for in institutions outside the home, changed to one emphasizing indoor relief, meaning organizations provided aid within the home. An example of this was mothers' pensions. Although GIH retained its institutional-care status, continuing to care for children within the institution, GIH managers did change their attitudes toward parental interaction. In 1912, Lizzie Conant, secretary of GIH, stated that the children performed a play "for as many parents as could attend." Conant confessed that this was an "excellent way of keeping the parents in touch with the children."[28] Case records from the 1920s and 1930s showed considerable parental interaction with the girls housed at the institution. A note from the superintendent of GIH in 1927 indicated that children should be placed with relatives if at all possible because the institution did not support the separation of families.[29] This new attitude recognized that the idea of "family" could take many different forms. Later, when GIH became a therapeutic-care facility, its mission emphasized aid for emotionally-troubled girls *and their families*.[30]

To emphasize the "homelike atmosphere" of the institution, managers often described their role (as well as the role of the matron and teacher) as a mother-figure rather than a benefactor. In many ways, these women represented surrogate mothers to the girls in their care. In the teaching of domestic skills, the women of GIH fulfilled a crucial

socialization role between mother and daughter that was often absent in the lives of destitute or orphaned girls. One annual report noted that managers' duties were "like those of a prudent, loving mother," and referred to GIH as a "family circle." The managers' care did not even stop after the girls found homes or returned to their own families. Rather, "with the anxiety of a mother's heart," managers continued to "watch over their destiny."[31] Visiting committee reports and written annual reports showed that follow-up visits and letters were part of GIH policy after a girl left the institution, whether she was adopted or returned to her own family. The emphasis on a motherly image resonated in the following statement about long-time matron Catharine Baker: "the Home is presided over by one who is frequently known and called by that noblest of all titles, 'Mother.'"[32]

The establishment of a "homelike atmosphere" included a policy of maintaining a girl's individuality while she resided at the home. In the early twentieth century, Progressive reformers attacked nineteenth-century institutions for their repressive programs that left children with all the "personal charm and . . . spontaneity of a statue."[33] To these reformers, such institutions opposed individualism in favor of "rote, routine, and dead-levelism," that reflected programs of "discipline without individuality, and play without initiative."[34]

GIH managers emphasized that their institution sought the *maintenance* of individuality, not the *repression* of it. Even though their program focused on domestic arts, girls also trained in business, nursing, and art. After 1905, the girls attended public school so they could socialize with other youth. And, annual reports repeatedly boasted of the many recreational activities that the girls enjoyed, ranging from ballroom dances to rides in the country. Some of the girls were also members of the Girl Scouts. In 1872, Elizabeth Clarke emphasized that "no means of confinement or high walls are used" at this institution. In 1899, Clara Barnard noted that mangers "sought to guard against making it an 'Institution,' preserving the individuality of each child, and fitting her for the vocation to which she seems best adapted."[35]

Within the institution, GIH managers never classified the girls based on behavior or rewarded or punished them based on deportment. This reflected a policy different than other children's institutions in St. Louis (and other institutions throughout the nation). The St. Louis House of Refuge, a county home for juvenile offenders established in 1851, classified their inmates using a grade system that rewarded good deportment with a "badge of distinction," and punished bad deportment.[36] The Catholic reform school for girls in St. Louis, The Convent of the Good Shepherd, established in 1849, classified their girls into four categories. The first category referred to the Sisters themselves and indicated a status of purity or someone without fault. The second, the Magdalens, performed penance for their sins and thus, were "reclaimed." The third and fourth levels represented girls who were in "danger of contamination" due to association with unsuitable companions, and girls in need of reform because they had "led lives of deepest degradation." The Convent of the Good Shepherd segregated each category in work, housing, and recreation.[37]

Curriculums in houses of refuge and reformation throughout the United States also emphasized labor over education, believing the former helped to inculcate the value of industriousness in the inmates. David J. Rothman estimates that the time devoted to labor in all houses of refuge in 1857 was approximately six to eight hours per day, versus three to four hours devoted to education. In his study of juvenile delinquency, Robert Mennel argues that in the New York House of Refuge, contracting out the labor of inmates was less about teaching the children a trade, and more about maintaining control and preventing idleness. Timothy Hacsi, in his study of nineteenth-century orphanages, maintained that even when children performed chores within the institution (usually for the benefit of the institution, and usually masked as teaching the child a trade), it was about encouraging proper development and building industrious citizens.[38]

It was also not uncommon for nineteenth-century children's institutions to benefit monetarily from the labor of inmates. Houses of refuge, set up as workhouses and reform institutions for delinquent youth, usually received monetary benefits from labor completed

by inmates. Institutions contracted for children to do such work as making cane chairs, brass nails, shoes, and shirts. At the New York House of Refuge, contractors paid the institution ten to fifteen cents per day for the labor of one inmate. At the House of Refuge in Philadelphia, inmates contracted for twenty-five cents per day but faced severe beatings if they fell short of their allotted quotas. According to Robert Mennel, the income from contract labor could pay up to 40 percent of the operation expenses of institutions. Even though contractors paid well below the normal wage for similar labor outside the institution, this policy was not seen as exploitative until the child-saving movement in the 1880s.[39]

There is evidence that GIH managers utilized the labor of the girls in the form of daily chores and activities at the institution. Annual reports showed that managers required resident girls to assist with the maintenance of the home, a necessity considering the institution relied only on private annual funding. This assistance allowed managers to provide for the necessary maintenance without employing a large and costly staff. However, managers made it clear that daily tasks were "so arranged that they do not conflict with school hours."[40] The matron routinely assigned daily chores to each resident, such as food preparation (annual reports mentioned the making of bread as a particularly arduous task), or assisting in the school in the absence of the teacher. Unable to purchase clothing and linens, the girls made all the bed coverings and mended garments donated by the public in their "stitch-in-time" sewing class. Between 1880-1914, GIH made approximately 58 percent of its own garments and linens. Churches assisted with the remaining 42 percent of the sewing (see Table 1). GIH managers saw these tasks less as "work" and more as part of the "learning experience," and the training of industrial skills.[41]

Table 1: Organizations making garments for use in GIH, 1880-1914

Organization	percentage
GIH wardrobe committee and children	58 (6,218 pieces)
Second Presbyterian Church	8 (809 pieces)
First Presbyterian Church	6 (692 pieces)
Pilgrim Congregational Church	5 (503 pieces)
Second Baptist Church	3 (372 pieces)
Union Methodist Episcopal Church	3 (281 pieces)
First Congregational Church	3 (338 pieces)
West Presbyterian Church	3 (287 pieces)
St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church	2 (262 pieces)
21 additional organizations[42]	9 (983 pieces)
Total	100 (10,745 pieces)

Source: GIH Annual Reports (1880-1914).

In contrast, the St. Louis House of Refuge income reports included monetary gain from the labor performed by inmates within the institution as well as non-monetary economic benefit. The House of Refuge "employed" boys in a shoe shop and a tailor shop. From July 1, 1855 to April 1, 1856, the shoe shop reported a total income of $862.23. In his report in 1856, F.S.W. Gleason, Superintendent of the House of Refuge, confirmed the financial benefit such a department provided, stating "if one set of boys are continued at the business an average of one year, this department will become a source of some pecuniary benefit." The tailor shop reported a profit of $623.53 from January 18, 1855 to April 1, 1856.[43] Similar to GIH, the "Female Department" within the House of Refuge mended or made various clothing items for use in the home. From March 1, 1855 to March 31, 1856, female inmates made approximately 2,154 items, mended 6,108 items, washed 11,232 items, and ironed 10,410 items. The House of Refuge's general policy

required all inmates to labor an average of six hours per day (excluding holidays and Sundays). This drastically limited the number of hours left to education.[44]

Similar to the House of Refuge, the Convent of the Good Shepherd utilized the labor of inmates to fund operating expenses of the institution. A 1922 advertisement for the Convent of Good Shepherd showed its labor potential. The sewing department accepted "orders for plain and fine needlework . . . embroidery, feather stitching and smocking"; the laundry department was "competent to handle all kinds of flat work" at twelve cents per pound; and the junior department was efficient in "addressing envelopes . . . copying form letters, folding circulars, inserting, preparing for mailing, [and] stringing tags." The advertisement made a special appeal to hotels, restaurants, and railroads to take advantage of the "fully-equipped" laundry department within the institution. In 1892, the Convent of the Good Shepherd reported a total of $14,588.26 earned from sewing, embroidery, store work, laundry, and sales of ready-made clothing. In contrast, the Convent earned only $3,468.45 in annual subscriptions to finance the institution.[45]

GIH Treasurer's Reports do not show any money received from the outside labor of girls indentured to private homes, or money made from labor performed by the girls while residing at the institution. GIH managers chose not to utilize this method despite constant concerns over finances. In fact, Treasurer's Reports show that GIH employed a laundress to do most of the washing and ironing at the institution.[46] GIH also may not have been equipped for "commercial" work that would monetarily benefit the home. Both the House of Refuge and the Convent of the Good Shepherd were larger institutions, backed by the city of St. Louis and the Catholic Charities, respectively.

Even though GIH strove to maintain a "homelike atmosphere," rules and regulations, however limited in nature, were a necessary part of management. For the most part, the "Rules for the Government of the Home and School," included in the GIH Charter and Constitution, pertained directly to staff members. Eleven of the twelve rules specifically outlined the duties of the matron and teacher. The only rule that applied directly

to the inmates prohibited "begging in the streets." Violators were reported to the visiting committee, who were instructed to "take proper measures to prevent a recurrence." There was no indication of what "proper measures" implied, and no evidence that managers enforced it. One additional rule required that parents or guardians leaving children at the institution for a period exceeding six months sign a bond relinquishing control of such children to the institution. GIH also did not enforce this rule. Many girls remained at the home for periods exceeding six months without the parents relinquishing control.[47]

One of the main reasons that GIH avoided the need for discipline and regulation was the institution's controlled admission policy. While maintaining an "open table" and "open school," managers limited those girls admitted to the home as residents and boarders. The Admission and Dismission Committee carefully screened applicants, inquiring about the girls' friends, family, and environment.[48] The care taken to screen girls reflected the managers' policy of not admitting girls with delinquent arrest records or girls with "potential delinquent habits." Unlike publicly-funded institutions, GIH did not have to admit girls recommended by the St. Louis Juvenile Court or any other city or state agency. Rather, it was the decision of the managers to accept or deny anyone. When managers did admit a girl upon recommendation by the juvenile court, the court usually guaranteed the non-delinquent status of the girl. Because GIH did not admit delinquent girls, there was no need for regulations pertaining to segregation of "good" girls from "bad" girls, or constant surveillance of girls' activities.[49]

In contrast to GIH, the St. Louis House of Refuge and the Convent of the Good Shepherd cared for both dependent (meaning their only crime was vagrancy, defined as wandering and begging in the streets) and delinquent girls. For example, both institutions admitted prostitutes. Because the GIH did not admit prostitutes, the necessity for moral reform programs remained absent. Institutions for girls operated policies of moral reformation primarily when "crimes of morality" existed. This meant when girls had been sexually active. Within the House of Refuge and Good Shepherd, delinquent and

dependent girls intermixed, prompting GIH managers to fear the corruption of the dependent by the delinquent. Both Elizabeth Clarke and Clara Barnard stressed this fear several times in their annual reports, usually making reference to the House of Refuge. Similar to the GIH, both the House of Refuge and Good Shepherd maintained programs of industrial training for girls, but unlike GIH, it came second to the emphasis on moral reformation.[50]

GIH managers also implemented specific policies for dismissing children from the home, particularly in cases of adoption and indenture. According to annual reports, St. Louis lawyer Henry Hitchcock maintained all adoption and indenture contracts for the institution. Annual reports specified that any person seeking to obtain a child from the home had to communicate their desire in writing or in person, with a member of the Board of Officers. Through this communication, managers intended to determine the intent of the people seeking the child, particularly whether the child was to become part of the family or simply provide labor. Managers also insured that educational and religious training would be provided to the child after leaving the home.[51] Managers did not allow children to be adopted or indentured without good references, preferably a personal recommendation by a member of the institution. A trial period of three to six months preceded a permanent adoption or indenture. Managers also extended their watchful eye over parents and guardians of the children temporarily residing in the home. In 1860, Elizabeth Clarke admitted that "in no case is any one placed entirely beyond our control until we are perfectly satisfied with the character and habits of their guardians."[52]

Even dismissals reflected a lack of uniform regulation because of the ambiguity of adoption and indenture contracts in the nineteenth century. Generally, institutions in the Antebellum period witnessed more "indentures for labor" than "adoptions for love." Adoption laws in many states were either non-existent or so vague that institutions used indenture to provide good homes for children, hoping they would be welcomed as a member of the family rather than solely as labor. By the late nineteenth century the practice

of indenture declined, and institutions instead sought permanent adopted homes for children. Foster care provided a temporary solution to a lack of permanent homes and aided the effort of Progressive reformers and child savers to de-institutionalize child welfare. The implementation of state adoption laws in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (Missouri implemented its adoption law in 1917), aided this process. Until that time, contracts remained informal documents between the institution and the individual seeking a child.[53]

Although no indenture/adoption contracts were found for GIH, examples from the Protestant Orphans' Asylum and the Soldiers' Orphans' Home in St. Louis provided considerable detail on how these agreements worked. They also revealed the ambiguous nature of such agreements. Although a contract in 1869 began with "this indenture," it showed the term "apprentice" crossed out (three separate times) and replaced with the words "adopted child." While the contract guaranteed training for the child in "housekeeping and sewing" and a "good English education," it also required that fifty dollars and a suit of new clothes be provided to the child "when free." From the language of the contract, it was unclear whether the child was being adopted or indentured. This contract did not mention whether the child was an orphan. Other indenture contracts specified periods of service— for girls until the age of eighteen, for boys until the age of twenty-one— and the status of the child as orphan. The contract in 1869 did not specify a time of service, leaving that space blank.[54] GIH annual reports indicated a number of girls "placed out" or dismissed from the institution; periodically, the report specified whether the child was adopted or indentured.

The lack of regimentation and discipline within GIH can also be partly attributed to the open nature of the institution, resulting in the establishment of a multi-faceted curriculum. Programs within the home aimed at training girls in the industrial arts, elementary education, and practical life skills. For the first fifty years of operation, GIH operated a dual curriculum in common education and domestic arts. The mornings were

spent studying reading, writing, and spelling; the afternoons employed in the learning of household duties, such as sewing, knitting, washing, and cooking. In learning both basic literacy and industrial skills, managers insured that the girls would be able to "earn a respectable living." In 1890, the annual report referenced this multi-faceted curriculum, emphasizing three separate roles: Home, School, and Industrial Department.[55]

After 1905, when the institution eliminated the elementary school curriculum and sent the girls to public school, industrial education became the main focus. Girls were trained in domestic classes, particularly sewing and cooking, in the afternoons after returning from school. GIH managers hired specialized teachers, trained in those particular skills. Pictures from the sewing class, circa 1914, show twelve girls and one teacher, all sewing by hand. There are no sewing machines. This could indicate that GIH trained girls specifically to be domestic servants or millinery employees, rather than factory workers. The girls in the sewing class ranged in age from eight to sixteen. A picture from the cooking class, circa 1914, shows seven girls and one teacher, all standing next to two long tables. The girls range in age from thirteen to sixteen. The pictures reveal a small classroom setting.[56]

The small size of GIH also played a role in the limited use of discipline and standardized routine usually found in larger institutions. Although GIH managers reported the care of thousands of children over its lifetime, the average number of *residents* (including boarders) at the home between 1857 and 1930 was approximately fifty-five per year. Managers never exceeded the capacity of one hundred potential residents, a number that still afforded them the atmosphere and manageability of a home.[57] Small, usually private institutions, represented more of a family-like environment than the larger institutions because "more attention is paid to the individual needs and capacities of children, and more care is taken to place them early in good homes, and to look after them in those homes."[58]

Maintaining this small size allowed managers to develop GIH in a family-type environment and retain control over its internal policies. The admission and dismissal procedures were only one example of internal control. Managers also controlled all financial administration within the institution. As a private institution, GIH received no city or state funding; rather all monetary support came from private donations. Because GIH received no city or state money, those agencies had no control over GIH administration.[59] Because the home remained small in size, GIH managers also did not need to employ a large staff that cost money and required supervision. Rather, the managers utilized the labor of members of the association as well as the girls residing at the home.

GIH employed only a few paid staff members throughout the first eighty years of operation. The teacher and matron were the primary paid staff members, supplemented occasionally by assistants. The remainder of the salary expenses went to pay servants, including a cook and laundress. Between 1854 and 1913, GIH spent $81,757 on salaries, an average of 29 percent of each year's total expenses. The average annual expenses for the institution amounted to approximately $4,727.00, of which $1,363.00 went to pay salaries. The money spent on salaries remained approximately the same throughout the fifty-nine-year period. Any dramatic changes in the percentage spent on salaries usually represented a financial crisis or additional total expenses.[60]

Unlike other nineteenth-century institutions that replaced their volunteer staff with paid employees by the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, GIH maintained its volunteer nature throughout much of its history. Although GIH did hire a salaried social worker in 1922, elected managers and board members, all volunteer, played as crucial a role in the financial and administrative operation of the home in 1935 as they had in 1854.[61] This process saved the institution thousands of dollars in administrative costs and maintained a family-like structure.

Table 2: Average dollar amount spent on salaries, and percentage of total expenses for GIH from 1854 to 1913

1854 - 1858	$ 362.00 = 37
1859 - 1863	$ 860.00 = 33
1864 - 1868	$ 467.00 = 27
1869 - 1873	$ 885.00 = 24
1874 - 1878	$ 1334.50 = 40
1879 - 1883	$ 1361.00 = 41
1884 - 1888	$ 1220.00 = 30
1889 - 1893	$ 1658.00 = 34
1894 - 1898	$ 1764.00 = 33
1899 - 1903	$ 1764.00 = 38
1904 - 1908	$ 2123.50 = 28
1909 - 1913	$ 1929.65 = 25

Source: GIH Treasurer's Reports (1854-1913)

Even though GIH was more like a Progressive-era institution than an Antebellum one from the beginning, managers emphasized many of their "Progressive" qualities during the height of that reform movement. As early as 1887, annual reports began emphasizing the cleanliness and spaciousness of the rooms, as well as the plentiful recreation and exercise that the girls enjoyed. In the latter years of the nineteenth century, Progressive reformers and physicians began emphasizing a new scientific theory for a "sound body" that included fresh air, cleanliness, and exercise.[62] GIH managers advantageously pointed out that their institution operated with these characteristics already. When GIH moved into a newly-constructed building in 1900, the annual report boasted of the "sunny dormitories," and "light and airy school-room." The biggest attraction was the location. Near Forest Park, and surrounded by a big yard with ample trees, the girls had plenty of sunshine and fresh air.[63] When managers began sending the older girls to public school in 1905 annual reports noted that the "exercise of walking to the school and returning" provided the girls with a "much needed stimulus."[64]

Managers also expressed negative views on harsh measures of discipline and punishment, and especially lauded their prohibition of the use of corporal punishment in the institution. In 1875, Elizabeth Clarke expressed managers' animosity toward corporal

punishment stating "though a leather strap may make a stubborn or lazy pupil *smart*, it is much better avoided if possible." GIH managers preferred to use the Progressive concept of a "good meal and recreation" to stimulate the mind. In 1892, Clara Barnard added her disgust at harsh discipline, reasserting that managers forbade corporal punishment because it "never restores a child's self-respect."[65]

Other nineteenth-century institutions used a wide variety of discipline to insure order, such as peer review, whipping, solitary confinement, and loss of privileges. For example, the New York House of Refuge used penalties such as loss of play periods, solitary confinement while wearing a ball and chain, and corporal punishment in response to disobedience.[66] The Boston House of Reformation did not use corporal punishment, claiming their discipline was "moral" rather than physical. Offenders faced a jury of their peers and children judged themselves, a task managers indicated taught children self-discipline. The St. Louis House of Refuge included the phrase "punishment of juvenile offenders" in its mission statement, noting that the punishment could be solitary confinement and bread and water.[67] In many cases, nineteenth-century institutions implemented policies of harsh discipline to accommodate the attitude that out-of-control children would become burdens on society if not taught practical life skills.

GIH managers did not emulate other well-known nineteenth-century children's institutions. They avoided the discipline measures found in houses of refuge, the moral reform programs found in houses of reformation, and the exploitation of labor found in virtually all types of children's institutions. Rather than confining the girls, GIH managers allowed them freedom of movement. Rather than exploiting the labor of the girls by making them work for wages to support the institution financially, managers educated them in basic literacy skills and trained them for self-sufficiency. Rather than force the girls to adopt a daily monotonous routine, managers allowed an "open table" and open school, where girls could come and go. The absence of such restrictive and disciplinarian policies made GIH unique among nineteenth-century children's institutions. Managers were

essentially exhibiting attitudes about child welfare that would not be seen on a large scale until the Progressive era.

In 1892, Clara Barnard was asked to present a report on the care of children at the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions in St. Louis for local charities in the city. In her report, she offered her own opinion on how best to care for poverty-stricken and neglected children. Barnard emphasized the importance of solving the problem of overcrowding in the city to insure "each child its birth-right of fresh air and sunshine." She also mentioned better enforcement of education laws to insure children had the opportunity to attend school, become literate, and increase their "moral development." Barnard also stressed the importance of bringing "out the noblest traits of [children's] character," to insure that each child would "be made better than its father." In her annual report the same year, Barnard wrote that within GIH "our children have a healthful, happy home. There are few better regulated families."[68] Clearly, she thought of the institution as both a home and a family, a very Progressive concept.

ENDNOTES

[1] See the following for the social control thesis: Paul Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978); Clifford S. Griffin, *Their Brother's Keepers: Moral Stewardship in the United States, 1800-1855* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1960); Michael B. Katz, *The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968); David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971); Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward, *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare* (New York: Vintage Books, 1971).

[2] See the following for arguments against the social control thesis: Robert H. Bremner, *From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States.* (New York: New York University Press, 1956); Gerald Grob, *Mental Institutions in America: Social Policy to 1875* (New York: The Free Press, 1973); Steven Mintz, *Moralists and Modernizers: America's Pre-Civil War Reformers* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995); Walter I. Trattner, *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America* , 6th ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1999); Ronald Walters, *American Reformers, 1815-1860* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978; reprint, New York: Hill and Wang, 1997).

[3] In chapter five, Timothy Hacsi noted that nineteenth-century institutions were grounded in discipline, such as routine, uniforms, capital punishment, and solitary confinement. Kenneth Cmiel made a similar argument about the Chicago Asylum. David Rothman described in detail a daily schedule at the New York House of Refuge— it was most certainly routine. Timothy A. Hacsi, *Second Home: Orphan Asylums and Poor Families in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 148-149; Kenneth Cmiel, *A Home of Another Kind* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), chapter 1; Rothman, *Discovery of the Asylum*, 225.

[4] Rothman, *Discovery of the Asylum*, 258-260.

[5] According to Walter I. Trattner, Rothman and Gerald Grob argued that asylums failed because they did not reform inmates, they were expensive to maintain, and they went from therapeutic objective to custodial care facilities. Michael Katz went further saying that asylums were doomed from the beginning because the primary objective was maintaining order rather than helping the sick, troubled, and neglected in a therapeutic way. Rothman, *Discovery of the Asylum*, 235; Trattner, *From Poor Law*, 61.

[6] Clay Gish, "Rescuing the 'Waifs and Strays' of the City: The Western Emigration Program of the Children's Aid Society," *Journal of Social History* 33 (1999), 132; see also, Charles Loring Brace, *The Dangerous Classes of New York, and Twenty Years' Work Among Them* (New York: Wynkoop and Hallenbeck, Publishers, 1872); Charles Loring Brace, "What is the Best Method for the Care of Poor and Vicious Children?" (1880), in Robert H. Bremner, ed., *Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History*, vol. 1, 1600-1865, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970).

[7] Thomas Bender argued that Antebellum reformers placed people in "well-ordered" asylums to prevent further disintegration of community. Bender argues that reformers

advocated rehabilitation in asylums because a "regular regimen would inculcate the discipline that the urban church and family were failing to provide." Eric C. Schneider, *In the Web of Class: Delinquents and Reformers in Boston, 1810s-1930s* (New York: New York University Press, 1992), 39; Thomas Bender, *Toward and Urban Vision: Ideas and Institutions in Nineteenth-Century America* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1975), 133.

[8] See Trattner, *From Poor Law*, 122-124; Cmiel, *A Second Home*, chapter 2; David J. Rothman, *Conscience and Convenience: The Asylum and its Alternatives in Progressive America* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1980), 12.

[9] For example, after GIH created the domestic science division, a regular schedule appeared with cooking classes held every Monday and sewing classes every Thursday. Before, these classes were sporadic to accommodate the elementary curriculum that was taught at GIH as well. In 1875 the annual report noted that the various departments at GIH were "frequently out of order" because the managers could not regulate the punctuality required in the public schools. The problem remained at GIH with the kindergarten, established in 1901, to accommodate the younger children not attending public school. All the girls attended public school by 1915, eliminating the problem of irregular attendance.

[10] GIH completed its transition to therapeutic program by the mid-1950's, but still received criticism for its lack of standardization. Francis Goodall, Secretary of the St. Louis Social Planning Council, commented that GIH lacked "total clinical and casework facilities which are necessary in order to do a quality job." St. Louis Planning Council, "Minutes of Meeting of Committee on Affiliation of Three Institutions," February 18, 1954; St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* November 24, 1929.

[11] Rothman, *Discovery of the Asylum*, 207, 214.

[12] Ryan discussed patriarchy, religion, and the family on pages 65-75. Mary P. Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 71.

[13] In 1860, Elizabeth Clarke reported that the "instances are numerous where the children themselves refuse to return even for an hour to the miserable homes from which our kindness has delivered them." GIH Seventh Annual Report (1860), 6.

[14] The man was arrested and tried in February 1923. The girl testified that he was the man who "did it." He was found guilty and sentenced to five years in the State Penitentiary. GIH case records reported that she was a "problem girl," running away repeatedly. GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[15] Increased investigation by the social worker included repeat visits to the home of the girl, sometimes daily visitations. Also, the social worker investigated neighborhoods where girls lived prior to admission into GIH. Neighbors, near-by business owners, and family members were questioned, and living environments observed. When another institution requested admission to GIH for a girl, reports on the status of the girl accompanied that request.

[16] The Wassermann Test, circa 1909, detected syphilis using the serum of an infected individual.

[17] In 1856, Elizabeth Clarke stressed that the institution was not established "as a school only, but as a *home* for friendless children." GIH Second Annual Report (1855), 5; GIH Third Annual Report (1856).

[18] If the girl boarded, GIH required some fee for her care. Sometimes, mothers worked at GIH to compensate the institution for child care and boarding fees. From 1854 to 1914, managers received $38,469.90 (15 percent of its total funding) for board.

[19] GIH Annual Reports (1854-1918); GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[20] GIH Fifteenth Annual Report (1868).

[21] Of the thirty-one case records that recorded the date of admission and dismissal, two girls remained at GIH for less than one year, twenty-four stayed between one and six years, four remained between six and ten years, and only one resided at the institution over ten years. Clarke also noted that the problem with this quick turnover was that the children go to their new home "with all the faults and vices taught for many a day by wicked and dissolute parents." In short, a few weeks was not enough time to teach the children proper moral and practical life skills usually absent in their own homes. The longest and the shortest stay was determined from available case records. However, some annual reports did refer to girls who had literally "grown up" in the institution's care. GIH Eleventh Annual Report (1864); GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[22] GIH Seventeenth Annual Report (1870); GIH Third Annual Report (1856); GIH Fortieth Annual Report (1893).

[23] Report of the kindergarten, GIH Forty-ninth Annual Report (1902).

[24] Elizabeth Clarke stated that the "family always increases as the winter winds sigh round the dwellings of the poor." She noted the increased expenditure to the institution as the enrollment increased, particularly because of the increased amount of clothing needed. GIH Seventh Annual Report (1860), 6; GIH Third Annual Report (1856); GIH Twenty-fourth Annual Report (1877), 6.

[25] GIH Seventh Annual Report (1860); GIH Tenth Annual Report (1863).

[26] GIH Third Annual Report (1856).

[27] Hacsi argues that most nineteenth-century children's institutions wanted complete parental control over their wards with limited obstacles from biological parents or legal guardians. Hacsi, *Second Home*, 126; GIH Seventh Annual Report (1860), 5.

[28] Part of the Missouri Children's Code Commission report in 1917 was a call for laws pertaining to adult neglect of children. At the time of the report, some adults could be placed under parole if convicted of neglect, but the report indicated that parole was rarely enforced. Missouri Children's Code Commission, *Report of the Children's Code Commission.* (1917), Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; GIH Fifty-ninth Annual Report (1912), 15-16.

[29] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s); Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[30] My italics. GIH pamphlets, circa 1950 and 1970, Edgewood Children's Center Collection, Mercantile Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

[31] GIH Ninth Annual Report (1862).

[32] Catharine Baker was matron of GIH for thirty-five years. GIH Thirty-sixth Annual Report (1889).

[33] State Board of Charities and Corrections of Missouri, *Seventh Biennial Report* (1909-1910), 94.

[34] Rudolph Reeder, Superintendent of the New York Orphanage, "How Two Hundred Children Live and Learn," (1910), in Robert H. Bremner, editor, *Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History*, 3 volumes, 1866-1932, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971): 194-200.

[35] GIH Forty-sixth Annual Report (1899).

[36] "Report of Managers of House of Refuge" and "Report of Superintendent of House of Refuge," in *Mayor's Messages*, May 12, 1856, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[37] Mrs. E. T. Farish, "Report of the Convent of the Good Shepherd, St. Louis," *Journal of the Proceedings of the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions, of St. Louis* (St. Louis: Commercial Printing Co., 1892), 170-1.

[38] Rothman, *Discovery of the Asylum*, 225-229; Robert M. Mennel, *Thorns and Thistles: Juvenile Delinquents in the United States, 1825-1940* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1973), 20; Hacsi, *Second Home*, 173.

[39] Mennel, *Thorns and Thistles*, 20-21, 59-60.

[40] GIH Eleventh Annual Report (1864), 4.

[41] Elizabeth Clarke noted that the sewing class had made approximately six hundred garments in the past year. In addition to the chores listed, the annual report in 1892 noted that girls helped with laundry and dressmaking. GIH Twenty-first Annual Report (1874); GIH Thirty-ninth Annual Report (1892); GIH Fortieth Annual Report (1893).

[42] The churches and organizations are as follows: St. Mark's Lutheran Church (126 pieces); Third Baptist Church (123); St. Mark's Methodist Church (108); Lafayette Avenue Methodist Church (89); Immanuel Baptist Church (75); Central Christian Church (75); Lindell Avenue Methodist Church (72); Brank's Memorial (46); Grand Avenue Presbyterian Church (43); Cooke Avenue Methodist Church (38); Cabanne Methodist Church (27); Dr. Stimson's Church (24); Centenary Church (24); Park Avenue Church (23); Dr. Merrill's Church (18); Church of Ascension (18); Young Ladies Society (12); Ladies of Pacific Missouri (12); Richmond Heights Presbyterian Church (12); St. George's Guild (12); Westminster Presbyterian (6).

[43] Report of the Superintendent of House of Refuge, in *Mayor's Messages* (May 12, 1856), Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri..

[44] In 1856, the Superintendent of the House of Refuge reported that because of the high level of work, girls would only attend elementary education classes for two hours in the morning, canceling the additional two hours in the afternoon, Report of the Superintendent of House of Refuge, in *Mayor's Messages* (May 12, 1856), Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[45] *A Brief History of the Convent of the Good Shepherd*, circa 1922, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; Mrs. E. T. Farish, "Report of the Convent of the Good Shepherd, St. Louis," 173.

[46] The first time a laundress was mentioned in the census records was 1870. Servants were listed from the beginning. In 1869, Margaret Hitchcock awarded a special endowment to GIH specifically for laundry purposes.

[47] Section number twelve of the "Rules for the Government of the Home and School," GIH *IncorporationCharter* (February 13, 1855).

[48] Various persons and agencies sought application for admission. Sometimes the girl herself petitioned for admission. More often, the parents or guardians made application, sometimes due to the death of one or both parents. Various St. Louis agencies also petitioned GIH for admission of girls— St. Louis Juvenile Court, Board of Religious Organizations, St. Louis Protestant Orphans' Asylum, Children's Aid Society, St. Louis Provident Association, all were mentioned in records. Investigations verified places of employment and marriage licenses, informally talked to neighbors, and visited homes. GIH also investigated individuals requesting that girls be released into their care. For example, GIH investigated the new wife of a man who had placed his children in the institution after desertion by his first wife. When the new wife requested the girls be released to the father and herself, GIH visiting committee members set up certain conditions that had to be met— education, medical, etc. Managers completed follow-up visits after they released the girls and before managers officially closed the case, GIH Annual Reports (1854-1918); GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s) (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[49] GIH managers repeatedly criticized the St. Louis House of Refuge for their policy of housing girls who were merely dependent and neglected with those who exhibited real delinquent habits. A discussion of the differences between dependent and delinquent children, as well as the problems of housing "good" girls with "bad" girls can be found in chapter five. GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[50] Refer to chapter six of Farish's report for a discussion on the moral reform programs of the Convent of the Good Shepherd and other St. Louis institutions. "Report of Managers of House of Refuge" and "Report of Superintendent of House of Refuge," in *Mayor's Messages*, (May 12, 1856), Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; Farish, "Report of the Convent of the Good Shepherd" (1892).

[51] Specific guidelines for requesting a child from the institution was first mentioned in the 1874 annual report.

[52] GIH Seventh Annual Report (1860), 8.

[53] Timothy Hacsi used the phrases "indentures for labor" and "adoptions for love" in his book. Bremner argued that until approximately 1875, indenture was a favorite

method of children's institutions for providing homes for destitute and orphaned children. Hacsi, *Second Home*, 133; Bremner, *From the Depths*, 47.

[54] Copies of random indenture/adoption contracts can be found in the Edgewood Children's Center Collection. The Protestant Orphans' Asylum, the Soldiers' Orphans' Home, and the Girls' Home records are all included. Unfortunately, I have been unable to locate any indenture/adoption contracts from GIH, although GIH annual reports refer to numerous yearly adoptions and indentures. Adoption records for St. Louis are located in the Circuit Court dating from 1917. No record of GIH was found there either.

[55] By practical life skills, I mean behavioral skills learned in adolescence. Many nineteenth-century reform schools made this their first mission— the teaching of behavioral skills that would allow the child to return to society and become a good citizen. As early as 1854, managers described their curriculum as "singing, sewing, arithmetic, writing, and reading." In addition, household duties that would enable the girls to seek good employment. Many of the GIH annual reports mention the mission of the institution being self-sufficiency for the girls. GIH First Annual Report (1854), 5; GIH *Constitution* (1855); *Thoughts About the City of St. Louis, Her Commerce and Manufactures, Railroads, &c.* (St. Louis: Republican Steam Press Print, 1854); GIH Thirty-seventh Annual Report (1890).

[56] Even after sending the girls to public school, morning classes were held in the summer to allow the girls to keep up with their schooling. The teacher was a former GIH student who was attending the Normal School in St. Louis to become a teacher. Treasurer's reports show the teacher received approximately sixty dollars for the summer. Pictures included in GIH Sixty-first Annual Report (1914); GIH Fifty-second Annual Report (1905), 10.

[57] GIH Forty-sixth Annual Report (1899).

[58] Clara T. Leonard, "Family Homes for Pauper and Dependent Children," National Conference of Charities and Correction *Proceedings* 6 (1879), 171.

[59] GIH did receive city funding if managers admitted a girl on recommendation by the juvenile court. Interestingly, GIH did not change to the Progressive idea of a cottage system until the mid-1950s when managers remodeled an existing building. Even though GIH maintained the dormitory-style living until this time, it is obvious that mangers thought of their institution as "homelike." The cottage system allowed the girls individual "apartments" with a kitchen unit and common living area. The girls housed two to a room, approximately twelve per cottage. Mrs. Richard A. Jones. "History of the Girls' Home," (March 1965), Edgewood Children's Center Collection, Mercantile Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

[60] For example, in 1857, the percentage spent on salaries was only 6 percent of the total expenses, despite the dollar amount being $845.46. It was that year that GIH managers enlarged buildings on the site meaning their spending was a larger amount than previous years. Chapter three provides a complete breakdown of spending for GIH. GIH Treasurer's Reports (1854-1914).

[61] The annual report referred to the girls' labor as no more than is "found in many of the dear homesteads of our land." GIH Eighteenth Annual Report (1871).

[62] Progressives emphasized the ideas of recreation and play for all children. The Playground Association of America evolved from this concept, providing play areas for children in the urban areas.

[63] GIH Forty-seventh Annual Report (1900).

[64] GIH Fifty-third Annual Report (1906).

[65] GIH Twenty-second Annual Report (1875); GIH Thirty-ninth Annual Report (1892).

[66] Interestingly, the New York House of Refuge required that the matron be present if a girl received corporal punishment. Rothman, *Discovery of Asylum*, 230-231.

[67] Cmiel, *Home of Another Kind*, chapter 1; Hacsi, *Second Home*, 148-149; Wiley B. Sanders, ed., *Juvenile Offenders For a Thousand Years: Selected Readings From Anglo-Saxon Times to 1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1970), 348, 354.

[68] Clara Barnard, "The Care of Children." *Journal of the Proceedings of the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions, of St. Louis* (St. Louis: Commercial Printing Company, 1892): 88-92, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; GIH Thirty-ninth Annual Report (1892).

CHAPTER THREE

"Making every dollar do double duty": The Economic Role Played by the Women of The Girls' Industrial Home and School

> "Women raise money in a variety of mostly labor-intensive ways and spend it with extraordinary care. They rarely count the cost of their own labor, even though it often far outweighs actual money resources in the conduct of the organization's affairs."
> — Anne Firor Scott *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History* (1991)

> "Another man says, why, women cannot manage the money matters of a public institution! The answer to this might be made that they have not been tried in this role to any great extent. Large female seminaries of learning could be mentioned however in which the superintendents know how to take care of the funds."
> — Rev. James L. Milligan, National Conference of Charities and Correction *Proceedings* (1882)

Women's benevolent activity in the nineteenth century marked an important step in the acceptance of females beyond the private sphere. During the Antebellum era, middle-class women formed benevolent societies and organizations to assist the poor and neglected. But, these associations were more than charitable activity— they represented a determined action by women to involve themselves openly in the daily world of political, economic, and social issues. Many of these women did not stop at collecting money for the poor *during a crisis*: they created enduring organizations that served the indigent population for decades; they lobbied city and state legislatures for changes in poor laws; they spoke and wrote publicly about social problems; and many established long and rewarding careers for themselves within these associations.

Most of the women participating in benevolent associations were not standing on the front-lines of the early woman's movement, yet they contributed much to that movement. Their actions give historians a greater understanding of the way women existed in a world defined socially and intellectually by the rhetoric of separate spheres as well as

the way women exercised economic and political power while being limited in those roles.[1] Historian Barbara Berg, dating the origins of feminist thought to the benevolent societies of the nineteenth century, noted that "feminists" did not have to carry the banner of woman's rights or suffrage; rather, they simply had to support the freedom to choose their own destiny, to express their own thoughts and actions freely, and to rid themselves of repressive sex-determined roles. In this respect, the essence of feminist thought is free choice. It does not necessarily mean that each action provokes widespread change, it means that each action challenges a prevailing ideology that limits women's independence. In September 2000, Gloria Steinem, a leader of the second-wave feminist movement and founder of *Ms.* Magazine married for the first time at the age of sixty-six. Ridiculed for supposedly committing an "un-feminist" act by engaging in "holy matrimony," Steinem simply replied, "I hope this proves what feminists have always said— that feminism is about the ability to choose what's right at each time of our lives."[2]

Women who participated in benevolent activity in the nineteenth century chose to challenge not only the rhetoric of separate spheres, but also the dominant ideology of patriarchal authority. Patriarchy relegated women to the private sphere and restricted their roles in public life. The most impressive example of this is in the legal status of coverture, a system that pertained primarily to married women. Under the system, married women were essentially "covered" by their husbands in all legal, civil, political, and economic roles. The system, called "femme covert," literally relegated married women to a "civil death." In a system that afforded women limited opportunity to hold property (for example money, including wages), processes such as fund-raising and money management within benevolent institutions became "radical" events. To combat the limitations, many women chose to have men govern their finances, while others selected single or widowed women as treasurers to eliminate the problem of married women's inability to hold property. Others insured their independence in money management by acquiring incorporation status, granting women special privileges, such as holding property. However they chose to

implement it, money management by women was an active part of most nineteenth-century benevolent associations, thus challenging the dominant ideology that restricted women's economic roles in society.

Understanding feminism within the context of these existing limitations helps to explain the apparent contradictions of the women who participated in the Girls Industrial Home and School (GIH) in St. Louis. While allowing men to chair their annual meetings and continuing to emphasize domestic skills for young girls well into the twentieth century, these women also supported the concepts of individuality, self-support, and entrepreneurship, not only for themselves, but also for the girls cared for in the home.[3] Thus, these women challenged the rhetoric of separate spheres and the non-economic nature of women's work by their benevolent actions without directly campaigning for married women's property laws, woman's suffrage, or equal pay for equal work. The benefits of participating in a benevolent organization did not extend to the other women in the nineteenth century, but it did serve as a model for the girls who resided and studied at the institution. This chapter addresses these apparent contradictions, particularly as it applied to the business aspects and financial planning of GIH. It attempts to explain how GIH officers and managers advanced the cause of woman in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries without directly participating in the woman's movement.

Historians have long argued whether women's benevolent activity reinforced or challenged the nineteenth-century concept of separate spheres. While some argue that women moved into the public sphere through their benevolent work, others maintain that benevolent activity was merely an extension of the private sphere occurring in the public arena. Other historians have begun to challenge the basic validity of separate spheres, claiming that middle-class women were not as isolated in their private spheres as previously thought. Women involved in benevolent activity clearly worked in the public sphere. They visited homes in lower-class neighborhoods, places where respectable middle-class women dared enter. They lobbied political leaders for social welfare legislation and learned how to

budget money and invest funds they collected. Many of them spoke often in public and published their own annual reports.[4]

But, benevolent activity also represented "women's work" and women represented the class of people suited for the care of the poor, particularly children. It was because this activity represented "women's work," that some historians label it an extension of the private sphere. This argument tends to lessen the importance of women's activity. Whether benevolent activity represented a step forward or a step sideways, the simple fact that women created, managed (including the finances), and maintained (sometimes for centuries) these associations and institutions exemplified an independent progression for women. Through their involvement, women learned political and organizational skills, speaking and writing proficiency, financial expertise, and most of all, a sense of pride. Anne Firor Scott remarked that women's participation "was surely to begin to change the social definition of women's roles." Whether inadvertently or purposefully, women participating in benevolent organizations exhibited feminist qualities that helped to transmit feminist thought.[5]

Nineteenth-century rhetoric also labeled women's work within the home as unpaid labor, relegating women to non-economic members of the household, and thus of society as a whole. In the private sphere, women labored in domestic tasks and childrearing duties that yielded moral and social status, but no monetary reward. In maintaining a good home environment, a woman created a haven for her working husband, or breadwinner; in rearing children, she molded the youth of America into virtuous and industriousness citizens. Although women's benevolent associations dealt daily in money management, the "non-economic" label extended to them. For this reason, benevolent activity also appeared as non-economic women's work.[6]

Living under these societal constraints, nineteenth-century women developed ways of exploiting the concept of separate spheres, usually by masking their involvement in the public sphere. The women of GIH achieved their long-term success by manipulating their

"appropriate" gender role, creating an organization that appeared to be an extension of the domestic sphere but concealed the integration of business and charity. Women participating in benevolent institutions, like GIH, strategically utilized the "men's realm of power" to acquire authority for themselves.[7] In one respect, GIH represented the type of work— child care— acceptable for women; on the other, it provided women with business-like careers that supported a policy of independence and self-sufficiency for girls trained at the home. For example, because the financial management of GIH represented a role that contrasted with the nineteenth-century non-economic nature of women's work, GIH managers established a male advisory board to "assist" in financial matters. This not only limited public criticism, but also provided access to financial opportunities often closed to nineteenth-century women.[8] Through participation in GIH, managers overcame these political, social, and economic "disabilities," using their association to influence public policy and social welfare despite being denied the vote and participation in public politics.

Participation in GIH also gave managers a political voice despite being excluded from the political realm. Early annual reports mentioned their influence on a city ordinance prohibiting begging by children. Annual reports consistently hinted at their influence on other institutions in St. Louis, as well as the leading role played by Clara Barnard in calling for an "Association of Charities" in that city. In advocating a "joining of sister organizations," Barnard stressed the examples of other cities where it had been successful and financially lucrative.[9] Managers also took part as invited guests at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections annual meeting held in St. Louis in 1884. There, Barnard referred to the association as "the pioneer institution of St. Louis" and one of the only associations in the city still entirely supported by voluntary contributions.[10] GIH also claimed to be the longest existing non-sectarian institution for girls in the city. The women managers also did not shy away from public criticism directed at city and state legislators

for failure to support legislation that would aid their cause in protecting these destitute children.[11]

It was the practicality of the women of GIH that gave them the ability to participate in this "silent activism," creating new roles for themselves while limiting any criticism from advocates or antagonists of the new woman's movement.[12] In 1869, Elizabeth Clarke criticized the idea of woman's suffrage and upheld the virtue of separate spheres. She stated "whatever ground the much argued idea of Woman's Suffrage may take, we are generally under the impression that a man's duties are public, a woman's private."[13] The annual reports were written with the idea of public approval in mind, and with the hope that donations would be solicited from the annual meetings. Thus, whatever their opinion of woman's suffrage or separate spheres, the annual reports needed to reflect a standard that was acceptable to the public. There is no indication that the women of GIH participated in the suffrage movement in St. Louis. It is also important that Elizabeth Clarke was sixty-six years old when she made the above-mentioned statement. Her advanced age may explain a generational difference in the acceptance of woman's suffrage.[14]

The annual meetings of GIH also appeared to confirm the sanctity of separate spheres, because although the women wrote the annual reports and maintained the treasury reports, men chaired the meetings and read these reports to the public. During her twenty-nine-year tenure as secretary, Elizabeth Clarke personally delivered her annual report to the public only once. By the time Clara Barnard became secretary in 1884, it was more acceptable for women to speak in public. Barnard not only spoke at the annual meetings of GIH, but also at the local and national conferences on charity in St. Louis. It was also common to have men, usually ministers, chair the annual meetings of the association. Having a *minister* chair the meeting further legitimized the association in the face of the public. Men participated in every annual meeting from 1854 to 1915. The participants were usually local ministers or businessmen. Interestingly, the elected members of the Advisory Board rarely participated in annual meetings (although they surely attended).

These men played a symbolic role in the association, and never spoke as an authority on the home for interviews or at national or local meetings.[15]

It was no secret that women's associations often allowed men to chair their meetings to limit criticism of their public work. In her book on women and benevolent organizations, Lori Ginzberg argued that to avoid open criticism and maintain at least the illusion of separate spheres, women often asked men to chair their meetings and do the public speaking. This, however, did not limit the relevance of women's authority in the public realm. Likewise, Suzanne Lebsock proposed that women in nineteenth-century benevolent organizations gave in to "ritual submission" by using their married name rather than their own first name.[16] Routinely, GIH officers and managers used their married names, making it difficult at times to trace them in local records. The women of GIH used these tactics to assure public acceptance. In allowing men participation in their annual meetings, managers utilized the accepted position of patriarchy in the public sphere to their own advantage.[17]

Even though the women of GIH submitted to these gendered rituals, they still maintained sole authority within their association. While many benevolent associations in the nineteenth century represented merely auxiliary organizations of male-dominated ones, GIH maintained itself as a woman-dominated association for the duration of its history.[18] No male officer served on the board of GIH until 1950 when members elected a male director for the first time, an event that Mary Kimborough, writer for the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, referred to as a "radical decision."[19] The women of GIH were solely responsible for the funding, through collecting annual subscriptions door-to-door and organizing yearly fund-raising events. Even though GIH established a male advisory board in 1856 to assist with financial matters, GIH managers maintained control over the investing and spending of the association. In 1925, the Board requested the "actual authority to invest and re-invest funds" which would have given it a "larger responsibility" in the finances of the association. GIH managers apparently denied this request because a

year later the secretary of GIH called a meeting of the Advisory Board to discuss "the importance of immediately selling securities . . . to meet payments due."[20] Clearly, the officers of GIH made the decisions concerning financial investments; the male members of the Advisory Board merely signed on the dotted line.

Officers and managers operated GIH in a bureaucratic style similar to corporate businesses of the nineteenth century and identified their organization as "business-like." In 1870, Elizabeth Clarke referred to committee and annual meetings as "business meetings," and two years later, she labeled officers and managers "business women." In 1884, Clara Barnard referred to the "retirement" of two long-time managers. The following year she recognized the association as a "joint-stock company, having many corporators."[21] Managers created a strong organization through meticulous financial planning, characterized by a hierarchical structure, written by-laws, legal assistance, incorporation status, and public involvement. All of these elements represented "business-like" qualities that led to the stability and longevity of the association. This largely-volunteer organization maintained itself as an independent association for 125 years. During that time, it received little aid from public sources. Although the managers cooperated with public organizations, like the St. Louis Juvenile Court, during the surge of publicly-funded child welfare systems, GIH remained independent and private. The ability to build a structurally-sound business enterprise that lasted for over one hundred years is a noteworthy accomplish.

In building support for their association, managers established the necessary support staff and patronage to secure a successful business enterprise. Repeat names on the lists of annual subscriptions and donations showed a consistency in both the membership and contributors. GIH managers knew their loyal supporters and sought their support year after year, building a patronage that guaranteed future success. Some St. Louis businesses participated for decades by donating various goods and services. Like all good businesses, GIH also acquired and maintained the aid of legal counsel. Volunteer

lawyers, usually husbands of managers, assisted with adoption and indenture contracts, and financial ventures.[22]

In employing salaried teachers and matrons from the beginning, GIH managers emphasized professionalism associated with the Progressive movement fifty years later. In 1908, the treasurer's report indicated for the first time, a pension provided to the matron. For this first year, the pension totaled $180.00; thereafter, it doubled to $360.00. This coincided with the elimination of the education curriculum and, thus, the salaried resident teacher. That "extra money" may have provided for a pension. Considering the volunteer nature of the association, providing a pension to the matron emphasizes the importance of the position. It represented a business-like action.[23] The women of GIH also established a penalty system for anyone violating the written by-laws. They required each elected manager to spend one day per week assisting the teacher and matron in the institution. Officers imposed fines on those not fulfilling this obligation. [24]

Managers also attributed their long-term success to the association's policy of impartiality, or non-sectarianism, at least among the Protestant denominations. From the beginning, managers insisted on a completely non-bias religious status. Article four of the by-laws specified that the thirty managers must come from "the different Protestant denominations of the city."[25] Several Protestant churches aided the establishment of the association in 1853. Six different churches— two Presbyterian, one Baptist, one Methodist, one Universalist, and one Christian— donated money totaling over four hundred dollars after the first meeting. The two Presbyterian churches donated approximately three-fourths of this early money. Various Protestant churches continued to donate money and clothing throughout the existence of the home. While the girls frequented the First Presbyterian Church for Sunday services while residing on Morgan Street, and the Emanuel Baptist Church while on Enright Avenue, it reflected more a matter of convenience than preference. Locations of annual meetings also reflected the emphasis

on non-sectarianism as meetings rotated between the various Protestant churches and the home.[26]

Table 3: GIH Annual Meeting Locations 1854-1875*

Church	Years Held
Second Presbyterian Church	1854, 1859, 1863, 1871
Central Presbyterian Church	1855
Church of the Messiah	1857, 1862
First Methodist Episcopal Church	1858
Congregational Church	1860, 1867
First Presbyterian Church	1861, 1868, 1873
Union Methodist Church	1864, 1872
Second Baptist Church	1865, 1869, 1875
Pilgrim Congregationalist Church	1874

* After 1875, all annual meetings were held at the institution.
The following years are not available— 1856, 1870.
Source: GIH Annual Reports 1854-1914

The non-sectarian status benefited the association, and managers insisted that much of their success came from the varying opinions and views that the different denominations contributed. Annual reports noted the "equally divided opinions" from "every diversity of Protestant polity" providing managers with "true strength." In 1870, Elizabeth Clarke wrote that "no private jealousies or disputes have ever risen" despite the different opinions being "freely expressed." Even though Clara Barnard recognized that individual members stayed true to their particular faith, she also made clear that "within the Home [the women] are as one."[27] This unity provided managers with diverse and broad opinions that remained consistent throughout the years. Eighteen years after Clarke noted the free expression of members, Barnard described the women as "representative . . . of widely diversified

opinions, each loyal to her own convictions of church polity, [yet] working together harmoniously." The evident admiration of such accomplishment still existed in 1901, when Barnard noted that the women "set aside creed" for the association's "broad humanitarian management and its non-sectarian principles."[28]

As a crucial part of a successful business, GIH managers recognized the importance of good financial planning, particularly concerning the future of the home. Treasurer's reports revealed the establishment of a permanent building fund within three years after the founding of the association. This fund remained separate from the regular operating expenses. Officers and managers used this money for real estate purchases, and for future additions and repairs to existing or new structures. It was this fund that enabled the women to purchase the old St. Louis brewery in 1857, make enlargements to the existing structures in 1867, purchase a lot on Enright Avenue in 1898, and build a new home in 1899. The money also provided financial support in making repairs over the years. Much of the money prior to 1898 was spent on the steady deterioration of the brewery site. The increasing totals spent on repairs influenced the managers' construction of the new home on Enright Avenue.[29]

The purchase in 1857 of the brewery not only allowed managers to establish GIH as a permanent residence, but also marked their most impressive financial venture. In making this purchase, managers showed financial initiative and ingenuity. The annual reports first mentioned a building fund in 1856— the total amount collected equaled $65.00. The following year when the brewery came available, the treasurer's report revealed a massive collection of $11,420.80.[30] In the solicitation for funding, GIH managers showed determination and persistence, stating "we leave our cause with the generous public, certain of success— for when were western women, any more than western men, known to fail, when our minds were determined to accomplish a useful or praiseworthy project?"[31] For an association that constantly complained of the difficulty of making ends meet, raising over eleven thousand dollars in one year showed persistence and

determination. The managers recognized the availability of the brewery and wasted no time in assuring a permanent establishment for their home.[32]

A similar situation followed with the purchase of the property for the second (and last) permanent home on Enright Avenue. Managers reported in 1899 a building fund totaling $27,264.16, of which they collected $21,775.26 in annual subscriptions. The Advisory Board contributed nearly five thousand dollars, but clearly the women managers raised the overwhelming majority of this money in less than six months (subscriptions began on May 9, 1899 and ended on October 31, 1899).[33] The managers also secured the services of an architect and contracting company to build the institution on the newly-purchased lot. Following the successful completion of the new home, Clara Barnard boasted that even though faced with financial uncertainty when beginning the task, managers pledged, "each to each . . . that 'we would build this Home in the near future, consecrating it free from debt.'" Once the new home was built, managers set out to solicit donations for furnishing it, successfully completing that task as well.[34]

Financial planning also included building and maintaining a permanent endowment that would provide the association financial security for the future. After receiving their first legacy in 1861, GIH managers began investing in the Real Estate Savings Institution earning 6 percent interest. In 1862, Elizabeth Clarke reported that managers were able to use the interest money to help with the internal expenses of the institution. This was only the beginning in managers' creation of an endowment fund that insured financial stability. In 1912, Lizzie Conant reported the managers' goal of building a separate endowment fund of twelve thousand dollars to sustain the domestic science department.[35] The legacies bequeathed to GIH throughout its life ranged from small gifts of $250.00 left by Elizabeth Clarke to a $25,000.00 gift contributed by Republican politician James Gay Butler in the late 1910s. These consistent gifts and the practical investment of the money enabled managers to build an endowment fund that freed them from fund-raising events and subscription collections by the 1920s.[36]

The secretary's annual reports reflected the importance of building this endowment and showed the managers' sense in realizing the financial security that such a fund would provide. Four years after the establishment of the association, Elizabeth Clarke made a covert plea for a big endowment: "It has long been the cherished wish of the managers of our Institution, that it should be established on a more permanent basis by an appropriation which would place it beyond the contingencies of optional contributions."[37] The managers knew that a substantial endowment could provide the association with enough interest to sustain it indefinitely. Clarke's report then turned to the age-old tactic of persuasion, continuing: "until that period shall arrive, (and from present indications it is far in the future)" GIH will have to "trust" in its subscribers.[38] In the 1882 report, Clara Barnard "suggested" to members that instead of paying the annual dues of three dollars year after year, they should donate the one-time payment of thirty dollars for a lifetime membership. Barnard shrewdly noted that this had benefits for both the contributor and the collector. On the one hand, it freed managers from the rigorous door-to-door solicitations, and, on the other, it allowed for investment opportunities that yielded substantial interest.[39]

Managers were also frugal in their spending, allowing them to maximize their money supply. When managers began purchasing supplies at wholesale for a cheaper price, Clara Barnard labeled them "the closest buyers in the market." The donations provided by local businesses and citizens freed managers from purchasing daily-use items such as hairbrushes and writing tablets. Managers only spent $88,398 on supplies for the institution throughout the years 1854 to 1914 (approximately 32 percent of total spending). In supporting an "Association of Charities" in St. Louis, Clara Barnard stressed that a "greater degree of suffering" could be relieved by the combined management of like charities "with less expenditure of money" by each charity.[40] Successful financial planning and the ability to "make every dollar do double duty" enabled GIH to avoid debt for the majority of its life and successfully accommodate the students and residents each year. In 1868, Elizabeth Clarke remarked on the "close calculation" of managers that combined with

the "constant liberality" of loyal friends to keep the institution above the "starving point and . . . reasonably well supplied."[41]

Because of the reliance on private donations, GIH managers recognized their obligation to account for every penny spent and every item received. Detailed treasurer's reports, provided at each annual meeting and later published, allowed the public an opportunity to follow their own contributions. In these reports, the treasurer carefully accounted for the yearly expenditures because in receiving the "liberality" of the public, GIH was bound to "account for it." Each annual report also included a list of donated items. The list represented a wide range of goods, the majority necessary to the daily life of the home. Sometimes, the secretary's annual report recognized the generosity of a particular citizen. In 1882, the report thanked Samuel Cupples for installing a furnace in the home and supplying five tons of coal per year for warmth. Managers also showed that donations specified for a particular use were used properly. In 1869, Mary Hitchcock donated $175 for the sewing department, and Margaret Hitchcock donated $200 for laundry purposes. That year, a separate treasury listing appeared for the sewing and laundry departments accounting for the money. In doing this seemingly simple task, managers re-assured the contributors that the money was used properly.[42]

Table 4: GIH spending in dollars and percentage, 1854-1914

Supplies	88,398 (32)
Salaries	86,115 (32)
Deposit into savings	21,680 (8)
Repairs on GIH buildings	20,591 (8)
Fuel (coal, wood, gas)	14,951 (5)
Dry goods	9,852 (4)
Other*	9,703 (4)
Furnishings	6,895 (2)
Taxes, licenses, insurance	6,862 (2)
Incidental expenses	3,007 (1)
Printing and advertising	2,420 (1)
Expenses for fund-raising programs	2,283 (1)
Total	272,757 (100)

* laundry, rent (prior to 1858), medicine and funeral, clothing and shoes, school supplies, baker's bill, planting trees, lawyer's fees, payment to Central Council of Social Agencies.
Source: GIH Treasurer's Reports (1854-1914)

The secretary's annual reports also dealt with the issue of donations, particularly in requesting the continued financial support from loyal patrons. Different than the treasurer's reports that only recorded the numbers, the secretary's report used a persuasive tone to solicit donations for the upcoming year. The report represented the managers' one chance to speak to the public and persuade them that GIH was a worthy charity. In 1856, Elizabeth Clarke requested that patrons "cast a thought to the shivering and half-clad applicants" of GIH and donate to their future welfare. Almost twenty years later, she

appealed to patrons stating "do not forget that winter, with its numerous discomforts, is close upon our little ones, and while providing luxuriously for your own cherished darlings, extend your purchases for some less expensive material in aid of the otherwise suffering inmates of GIH." Sometimes, the reports included individual stories of poverty and neglect, meant to convince the public to give readily to the home. The resident children also routinely appeared at the annual meetings (often singing a song, or displaying their sewing projects), a convincing display of the good work done at the institution.[43]

The rhetoric used in the annual reports also showed the importance of the yearly contributions to the literal existence of the institution. Both Elizabeth Clarke and Clara Barnard exhibited little timidity when "reminding" the public of the importance of its contributions. They also routinely emphasized their own institution over other charitable enterprises vying for similar donations. In 1865, Elizabeth Clarke declared that the association's "means of usefulness" would be "proportionately increased," if "did but a small per centage of the amount flow into our treasury for a whole year which has, within the past few weeks, been donated to other charities."[44] Managers got only one chance a year, at their annual meeting, to speak publicly to the citizens of St. Louis on behalf of their association, and they seldom wasted the opportunity. Managers used strong language and tactical phrasing to persuade the public of its charitable obligation to these neglected and destitute children.

Even though managers operated under the label of non-paid labor that tended to diminish the importance of their economic contribution, they routinely expressed a sense of pride in their financial accomplishments. Four years after the establishment of GIH, Elizabeth Clarke described the home as being "less fortunate than many of our charitable associations" because GIH had "no regular income, and depend[ed] entirely on the collections from the charitable."[45] In maintaining their association, GIH managers saved the city of St. Louis money by caring for destitute girls at no expense to the city and annual reports repeatedly noted that the success of the home came without "a single cent . . . from

state, county, or city."[46] The assertion of this point meant two things: pride in establishing and maintaining an institution solely on private donations and resentment that the local government did not offer monetary aid. GIH managers also reported with pride that despite the difficulties, the association remained debt-free for the first forty-five years of its life. Clara Barnard referred to the women of GIH as pioneers of benevolent work stating, "led by our example, encouraged by our experience, kindred institutions after a time were multiplied in our city."[47]

Believing that they saved the city of St. Louis money by existing as a private charity, GIH managers criticized any taxes inflicted on the association for various city improvements. While treasurer's reports showed numerous taxes throughout the years, managers sought relief from both the county court and city council. Their efforts usually fell short, and according to Elizabeth Clarke, "expostulation was in vain." Clara Barnard criticized taxes for the reconstruction of Morgan Street in 1893 by claiming that the street commissioners had the institution in their "ruthless grasp." Barnard further noted that GIH protested the tax but to no avail, showing that "Might makes Right" when dealing with the city government. The "exasperating" tax also appeared unnecessary as she insisted that the institution's premises were already in good condition.[48] Barnard continued to complain of the 1893 taxes two years later, referring to it as an "unjust street improvement tax."[49] Most of the animosity reflected the strain these burdensome taxes imposed on the already limited financial resources of GIH and the belief that private charities should be exempt from all taxation.

As the taxes continued to deplete the institution's resources, particularly the building fund, managers sternly criticized city leaders. In 1867, when the failed exemption of some $1,100 in taxes prevented the construction of a planned additional structure, Elizabeth Clarke attacked city leaders, writing: "That incorporations have no souls is an old axiom, and you must hold us excused if we forget the reverence due to our city fathers, who of course could do no wrong."[50] As a result of this tax burden, managers had to

delay a contract with an architectural firm and solicit additional private donations. When these new donations fell short of the amount needed to continue construction, managers reluctantly voted to abandon the additional structure and settled for making repairs to the existing buildings, a project which again found them almost $3,500 short. Annual reports revealed the difficulty in maintaining a consistent building fund because of the constant drain on resources by taxes. Similar to the situation in 1867, taxes in 1893 also delayed the construction of the new building on Enright Avenue.[51]

Because GIH sustained itself by annual subscriptions, private donations, and various extra activities, fund-raising played a crucial part in the financial management of the association. Although the managers knew the importance of these fund-raising events, it did not preclude them from expressing their animosity toward the labor-intensive projects. In 1867, Elizabeth Clarke noted: "When the idea of a restaurant at the Fair was proposed it was carried out with much labor, and also a publicity from which we would gladly have been excused; but there was no alternative."[52] In 1874, she referred to the initial suggestion of participation in fairs and festivals as "an hour of terrible thinking." In 1892, Clara Barnard referred to the process of "'selling tickets,'" as the "'Bete Noir' of every woman." However, managers also realized that they raised approximately 15 percent of their operating costs from these events. Thus, they became a means to a financial end, making them at least tolerable in the eyes of managers.[53]

These extra activities represented the third largest financial resource in the maintenance of GIH. They included such events as fairs, strawberry festivals, restaurants, lectures, poetry readings, and other innovative ideas. All these events required good organizational planning and financial management. Clearly, the fact that these activities provided such a lucrative sum of money to the annual financial subsistence of GIH shows "that benevolence and money went hand in hand."[54] Based on this assessment, it becomes impossible to ignore the economic aspect of women's benevolent work. The bazaars, booths, and poetry readings represented annual events for GIH managers. Occasionally,

they exploited one time opportunities as well. In 1904, managers took advantage of the World's Fair in St. Louis by renting vacant rooms in the home to visitors. The one thousand dollars raised that year helped to offset the cost of the new building constructed just four years earlier.[55]

GIH managers also showed initiative in their decisions with regard to these fund-raising events. In 1872 the managers opted not to have a restaurant at the Fair, choosing to forego the expense of administering the restaurant where they would have to use money to make money. They still expected the donations though, and Elizabeth Clarke made this point clear in her annual report. She requested that patrons "please forward (the sooner the better)" to the home any donation that would have been made through the restaurant.[56] Managers also realized the importance of timing and prudence when requesting donations. After the Spanish-American War and the beginning of the conflict in the Philippines, Clara Barnard noted that the "rumbling rumors of war: its sad sacrifice of life, its limitless debt, served to teach us this was no time to ask our people for increased expenditures."[57] The restraint must have been especially difficult because GIH managers were in the process of constructing their new home on Enright Avenue, a time when increased donations would have been a necessity.

Even with hard work and initiative the fund-raising efforts did not always generate the desired result. GIH managers were quick to point out a failed event which usually resulted in financial woes for the upcoming year. In 1871 there was a reference to a failed booth at the State Fair due to "'too many competitors in the field.'" In 1893, Clara Barnard noted that an excursion on the steamer *Grand Republic* yielded only three hundred dollars, considered "a poor return for the labor involved."[58] Because these events were not only labor intensive, but also personally distasteful, when managers failed to achieve a great success, they considered it a failure. If they were going to put themselves into these hated positions, they better make a profit for the association.

In its fund-raising efforts, GIH also competed with various events that received national attention, such as fires, depressions, and war. The Chicago Fire in 1871, the Depression in 1893, and World War I affected the finances of GIH by reducing the amount of annual contributions from the charitable in St. Louis. Elizabeth Clarke complained in 1871 that many loyal GIH contributors gave money to the relief efforts in Chicago instead of the home. Clara Barnard indicated that the 1893 Depression not only made it impossible "to make our usual collections," but also increased the "demands upon the shelter of the Home." In 1917, Mary Birge, corresponding secretary, reported on the difficulty of keeping up with expenses because "many demands for money to aid war victims are being made on those accustomed to aid charities."[59] In these periods of tragedy and hard times, charities like GIH faced the paradox of decreased donations but increased demand. GIH annual reports described receiving refugees during the years of the Civil War and after the Chicago Fire. Depressions almost always meant more applicants without an increase in funding. And, wartime contributions deterred annual donations, but also created new orphans. Thus, GIH repeatedly had to turn applicants away due to a lack of funds.

Despite their aversion toward fund-raising events, managers successfully solicited private donations and membership subscriptions by going door-to-door throughout the community. Annual reports routinely referred to this work as labor intensive and rigorous. In 1859, Rebecca Hazard, interim secretary of GIH, referred to the collection of subscriptions and donations as "an exceedingly arduous and unpleasant task, which involves much 'personal obligation' on the part of the collector."[60] Treasurer's Reports from 1854-1914 showed approximately 35 percent of the funding for GIH came from annual subscriptions. In contrast, passing the collection plate at the annual meetings yielded little monetary reward. Less than 1 percent of the annual funding came from these donations.[61] GIH managers were definitely doing the leg-work to support their association.

Table 5: GIH funding in dollars and percentages, 1854-1914

Collected by managers	107,662.87 (43)
Interest	48,931.63 (19)
Fairs, parties, lectures, readings, etc.	37,789.32 (15)
Board	38,469.90 (15)
Rent*	13,199.81 (5)
Other	4217.55 (2)
Collected from annual meetings**	964.60 (1)
Total	251,235.68 (100)

* rent not collected after 1904 because the property sold
** no report for collection at annual meetings after 1871.
Source: GIH Treasurer's Reports (1854-1914)

By virtue of being an incorporated association, GIH managers experienced certain rights not given to other women in the nineteenth century. These "rights" provided them with the freedom to act in a business-like manner and successfully move beyond the limits of the private sphere. They were able to do so with little criticism from the public. The women of GIH dealt with the internal workings of a business organization. They handled money, including investments, drew up contracts of indenture and adoption, and worked with various state and city organizations on the issue of child welfare.[62] Through their participation in social reform, GIH managers simultaneously became businesswomen, teachers, social workers, bureaucrats, lobbyists, fund-raisers, and surrogate mothers. Managers considered their work valuable and useful. Thirty years after the establishment of the institution, Clara Barnard asserted that managers' task required "a forgetfulness of self."[63]

Yet, women still lived under the concept of separate spheres and non-economic production. The creation of a male advisory board permitted GIH managers to undertake financial ventures with limited public criticism. Reassurance to the public on this matter

appeared in the 1867 annual report after managers made the decision to consult with an architectural firm for repairs to the institution. Elizabeth Clarke, secretary of GIH, admitted that "this step was not taken without the approval of our advisory committee," but made it clear that "our affairs are carried on chiefly by ladies."[64] GIH managers admitted the advice of the Advisory Committee because men had more leverage in certain financial circles, but maintained that the managers still conducted the majority of their affairs without advice. The annual report four years later referred to the founding members as being "*strong-minded* [women] in the noblest sense of that word."[65]

ENDNOTES

[1] For example, Suzanne Lebsock argued that women did not necessarily have to be actively fighting in the woman's rights movement to effect change. She stated that "positive change in the status of women can occur when no organized feminism is present." Barbara Berg made a clear distinction between women advancing the cause of "feminism" and those advancing the cause of "women's rights," i.e. property laws, suffrage, etc. Some fought for individual change and made small steps, while others fought on the national level for legislative change. Nancy Cott argued that benevolent societies had a dual effect on women: one reinforced cultural stereotypes, and the other helped women obtain an individual consciousness, bringing into importance matters of women's issues. Lori Ginzberg argued that the ideology of women's benevolent influence played a dominant role in women's social activism in the antebellum years. They used their moral status to obtain access into the public sphere. Suzanne Lebsock, *The Free Women of Petersburg: Status and Culture in a Southern Town, 1784-1860* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1984), 240; Barbara Berg, *The Remembered Gate: Origins of American Feminism, The Woman and the City 1800-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 5; Nancy Cott, *Bonds of Womanhood: 'Woman's Sphere' in New England, 1780-1835* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977), 154-157; Lori Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the Nineteenth-century United States* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), chapter 1.

[2] Many people have a misconception about the purpose of feminist ideas. At the root of all feminism is individual choice, whether it is the choice to be married and run a household, or be the president of a corporate company. Feminist ideas seek to eliminate the barriers of individual choice. *New York Times*, September 6, 2000.

[3] Kathleen McCarthy wrote that four themes generally accompanied women's philanthropic work: 1) a defined constituency marked predominantly by women and children, 2) a strong personal commitment to the work combined with personal labor, usually in the source of fund-raising, 3) a personal identification with other women regardless of class or race, 4) the participation in a public role, albeit limited by legal barriers. These four themes are strongly feminist in their qualities. Kathleen McCarthy, "Parallel Power Structures: Women and the Voluntary Sphere," in Kathleen D. McCarthy, editor, *Lady Bountiful Revisited: Women, Philanthropy, and Power* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990), 4.

[4] Although not a comprehensive list, see the following for arguments on the ideology of separate spheres: Berg, *Remembered Gate*; Jeanne Boydston, *Home and Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Cott, *Bonds of Womanhood*; Anne Firor Scott, *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992); Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence*; Joan M. Jensen, *Loosening the Bonds, Mid-Atlantic Farm Women, 1750-1850* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1986); Rosalind Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982); Mary P. Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Mary P Ryan, *Women in Public: Between Banners and Ballots, 1825-1880* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins

University Press, 1990); Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860," *American Quarterly* 18 (Summer 1966), 151-174.

[5] The Female Charitable Society of St. Louis formed in 1824 as the first women's organization in the city. Their Constitution represented the fine line between private and public work arguing that women "must not be allowed to shrink from acknowledged duty, simply, because that duty is to be performed in public." Female Charitable Society of St. Louis, *Constitution* (1824), Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; Scott, *Natural Allies*, 27.

[6] Barbara Berg referred to this concept as the "woman-belle ideal." Berg, *The Remembered Gate*, chapter four.

[7] Kathleen McCarthy made this argument stating "The tension between the egalitarian rhetoric in which the Revolution and the Constitution were forged, and the domestic, maternal justification for women's political role was to have profound implications for the strategies adopted by women's voluntary associations in their quest for political power." McCarthy, "Parallel Power," 12.

[8] The idea of coverture prohibited married women from controlling their own money, even money donated by the public. Because of this restriction, many benevolent associations appointed single or widowed women as treasurers. This solved the problem of husbands being in control of the money. Incorporation status allowed women to control money even if the laws did not. For the non-economic nature of women's work see Boydston. *Home and Work.* Kathryn Kish Sklar referred to women's political, social, and economic limitations as "disabilities." Kathryn Kish Sklar, "The Historical Foundations of Women's Power in the Creation of the American Welfare State 1830-1930," in Seth Koven and Sonya Michel, editors, *Mothers of a New World: Maternalistic Politics and the Origins of Welfare States* (New York: Routledge, Inc., 1993), 68.

[9] In her report at the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions in St. Louis in 1892, Clara Barnard stated that GIH laws had "been stepping-stones to kindred institutions from Michigan to Mississippi and out to California." The annual report in 1872 stated the following: "Friends . . . have sometimes hinted that we might claim to be the model for sister institutions." Clara Barnard, "Report of Girls' Industrial Home." *Journal of the Proceedings of the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions, of St. Louis.* (St. Louis: Commercial Printing Company, 1892): 66-70, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; GIH Nineteenth Annual Report (1872); GIH Thirty-third Annual Report (1886).

[10] Three elected officials from GIH attended: Clara Barnard, secretary; Maria. Corbitt, treasurer; and Marion Thomson, president. National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 14 (1884), 354.

[11] GIH Annual Reports (1854-1918).

[12] The following statement by St. Louis Unitarian minister William Greenleaf Eliot shows the difficulty of moving beyond the private sphere for women. In his "Lectures to Young Women," Eliot emphasized the importance of women remaining in the private sphere because nothing was more important that providing a moral haven. Eliot stated that a woman "may not neglect them [her domestic duties] even to find time for study or reading, in the improvement of her mind; not even for works of philanthropy or in relieving the poor." Eliot only condoned education for young women if it helped her accomplish her

duties within the private sphere. St. Louis newspapers also expressed the view that women's appropriate role was wife and mother as evidenced by the following statement: "A mother's love or wife's devotion shows, as nothing else can show, that woman's excellencies and capacities are measured only by the magnitude of the objects calling them forth, and fields adapted to their development." Sklar, "The Historical Foundations," 67; William Greenleaf Eliot, "Lectures to Young Women" (1853), 29, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; *Missouri Republican* February 8, 1854.

[13] GIH Sixteenth Annual Report (1869).

[14] Susan Beattie noted that the first recorded activity involving woman's suffrage in St. Louis dates from December 1854 but that movement did not escalate until after the Civil War. The Woman Suffrage Association of Missouri formed in 1867 in St. Louis, and in 1890 it merged with other local organizations to form the Missouri State Equal Suffrage Association. Several speeches and meetings were held in St. Louis throughout the height of the movement. Activity decreased by the turn of the century in St. Louis. There is no indication that any of the women involved in GIH participated in the suffrage activity in St. Louis. Susan Beattie, "The Suffrage Movement," in Katharine T. Corbett, *In Her Place: A Guide to St. Louis Women's History*. St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1999, 130-132.

[15] From 1854 to 1876, annual meetings were held at local Protestant churches, with several local ministers participating. Even after the meetings began being held at the institution in 1876, ministers still actively participated. Adhering to the emphasis on non-sectarianism proposed by the women of the institution, different ministers gave the opening address each year.

[16] Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence*, 39-40; Lebsock, *Free Women of Petersburg*, 198.

[17] Ministers often chaired the annual meetings of GIH, further legitimizing the benevolent work of managers outside the sphere of the home. The men who chaired the meetings of GIH also chaired other institution's annual meetings. For example, William Greenleaf Eliot, Unitarian minister in St. Louis, represented several Protestant institutions in the city. His participation marked more of a symbolic act than anything else. Not until 1950 did a man play a leading role in the management of GIH, when Francis Murphy became director of the institution.

[18] Men dominated both the American Bible Society (1816) and the American Tract Society (1827), although women participated as fund-raisers and distributors. Abolitionists organizations usually included both men and women, but with men controlling the meetings and administration. The largest woman's organization in the nineteenth century, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, did not form until 1874. Local St. Louis Protestant organizations followed a similar pattern. The St. Louis Protestant Orphan's Asylum began after the cholera epidemic in 1834 in St. Louis. Both men and women appeared as officers in the annual reports of the Orphan's Asylum. The comparable male-dominated organization in St. Louis, the Provident Association, began nearly ten years after the establishment of GIH. Interestingly, some of the men participating in the Provident Association had some prior connection to GIH. Provident Association annual reports listed Washington King, former mayor of St. Louis and husband of a GIH manager, as a collector; reports listed William Morrison, husband of a GIH manager, and Levin H. Baker, partial counsel for GIH, as directors. The presence of auxiliary organizations did not preclude the development of individual women's

associations, like GIH, in the nineteenth century. The "evolution" seemed instantaneous. Lori Ginzberg noted that "the steps from female prayer and sewing meetings to auxiliaries to independent female organizations went virtually unnoticed and unremarked." I included the organizations with male participants to show the difficulty women had in forming and maintaining a woman-dominated organization. Even if the work represented "appropriate" female benevolent work, women's organization faced public scrutiny for stepping out of the female sphere. Although GIH represented a local organization, the feat of maintaining the dominating role of women for over one hundred years deserves attention. Lori Ginzberg, *Women in Antebellum Reform* (Wheeling, IL: Harlan-Davidson, Inc., 2000), 21

[19] Mary Kimborough, "Girls' Home— Open 100 Years," St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* May 3, 1953.

[20] There were never more than five members of the advisory committee. These men were not necessarily "related" to managers although husbands and brothers of managers routinely appeared. The letter to the GIH Board of Mangers discussed the availability of United States government bonds and other tax-exempt securities and suggested investment. It was clear that the advisory board needed the permission of the Board of Managers for such an action. The letter stated: "It was felt that we should ask you for your definite opinion and decision as to just exactly what authority our Board should have, namely, should we only pass from time to time upon such financial matters as you should distinctly refer to us at such time or times, or on the other hand, should this Board be vested with full authority to buy securities when you should advise us that there was a surplus on hand." The letter continued: "Therefore, it was the opinion of our Board that the income to be derived from its funds could be more carefully watched if the actual authority to invest and re-invest funds were imposed upon your Advisory Board." The letter noted that "we will abide entirely by your judgment, and if it is your desire that we should only pass upon these financial matters as and when submitted to us, that will be entirely agreeable." With regard to the second letter, it is clear from the "summons" by the Board of Managers that they remained in control as it dictates what "will be discussed" at the meeting called by the Finance Committee of GIH. Letter from Wilbur B. Jones, Secretary, Advisory Board GIH, to Board of Managers, GIH, May 8, 1925; Letter from Eloise Stephens, Secretary GIH, to Wilbur Bixby, member of advisory board, April 30, 1926, both letters in Edgewood Children's Center Collection, Mercantile Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

[21] Interestingly, managers often passed resolutions to formally announce the death of an officer or manager. An example of these business-like resolutions follows: "*Resolved*, That in the death of Mrs. Ann Hitchcock, our Industrial School Association has lost one of its most active and eminent members, the poor a zealous friend and experienced advisor, and society one of its brightest ornaments. *Resolved*, That we deeply sympathize with her large circle of mourning friends, in their bereavement. *Resolved*, That these resolutions be copied into the book of records, and also, that a copy be transmitted to the family." GIH Seventeenth Annual Report (1870), 8; GIH Nineteenth Annual Report (1872); GIH Thirty-second Annual Report (1885).

[22] Particularly, the markets and hotels donated meat and vegetables for food. Annual reports mention the Planter's House Hotel, Barnum's Hotel, and Lucas Market as regular contributors throughout much of its history. Clara Barnard singled out Theron Barnum in her 1892 report at the Conference of Charitable Institutions in St. Louis, remarking, "Theron Barnum, that large-hearted Baltimorian of City Hotel . . . engaged to give us our daily food." Barnard, "Report of Girls' Industrial Home," 67.

[23] Providing a pension may be an unprecedented action. GIH Treasurer's Reports (1908-1915).

[24] It is usually not until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that salaried workers appear in charitable associations. GIH had salaried staff from the beginning. The by-laws originally state that elected managers spend one day per *month* assisting at the institution. Within the second year of operation, officers changed this to one day per *week*. This indicates the success of the institution and the high volume of children taking advantage of the programs offered.

[25] GIH, by-laws, *IncorporationCharter* (February 13, 1855).

[26] Managers insisted on their non-sectarian status stating: "our children attend a Presbyterian Church and Sunday School because it is the nearest, and for no other reason." GIH Twenty-first Annual Report (1874).

[27] GIH Seventeenth Annual Report (1870), 8; GIH Thirty-fifth Annual Report (1888), 6.

[28] GIH Forty-first Annual Report (1894); GIH Forty-eighth Annual Report (1901).

[29] The Treasurer's report for 1888 listed approximately eight hundred dollars spent on repairs; in 1891 approximately six hundred dollars; and 1892, approximately two hundred dollars.

[30] GIH Third Annual Report (1856).

[31] Ibid.

[32] Of the ninety-one individual donations to the building fund, seventeen came from businesses. Four individuals can be identified as women— Miss Mary Collier made one of the five hundred dollar donations. The donations ranged in size: 1— $1,000; 12— $500; 8— $250; 2— $125; 14— $100; 5— $50; and 49— under $50. Managers also recognized the irony of putting a house of charity in an old brewery. They commented on this periodically throughout the annual reports, claiming it was an improvement. They also noted that they were not the first to transform an old brewery into an industrial home— Five Points in New York was the first.

[33] There were 148 individual donations to the building fund in 1899. Unlike in 1857, when the overwhelming majority of the donors were men, sixty-two were women in 1899. Thirty-four were managers of GIH. Managers donated a total of $15,400; an additional donation of $5,000 appeared in Martha Cupples' name posthumously. GIH Forty-sixth Annual Report (1899); GIH Forty-eighth Annual Report (1901).

[34] Donations of furniture equipped the nursery, parlor, library, and dormitories. GIH Forty-sixth Annual Report (1899); GIH Forty-seventh Annual Report (1900).

[35] The records do not indicate that managers accomplished the $12,000 fund for the domestic science division. However, the department continued to operate throughout the 1920s. GIH Ninth Annual Report (1862); GIH Fifty-ninth Annual Report (1912).

[36] GIH Annual Reports (1854-1918); GIH Treasurer's Reports (1854-1918).

[37] GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859).

[38] Ibid.

[39] GIH Twenty-ninth Annual Report (1882).

[40] GIH Twenty-third Annual Report (1876), 7; GIH Forty-fourth Annual Report (1897); GIH Thirty-third Annual Report (1886).

[41] GIH Forty-eighth Annual Report (1901); GIH Fifteenth Annual Report (1868).

[42] By-laws required the treasurer to keep regular accounts, complete with vouchers, to be presented at the annual meetings. GIH Nineteenth Annual Report (1872); GIH Twenty-ninth Annual Report (1882); GIH Sixteenth Annual Report (1869); GIH, by-laws, *IncorporationCharter* (February 13, 1855).

[43] GIH Third Annual Report (1856); GIH Nineteenth Annual Report (1872).

[44] In 1862 there was a $1,000 donation by Mary Rhodes, a former GIH manager. Managers invested the money and used the interest to fund the daily activities of GIH. In 1876, a gift of $350 by Mary Hitchcock annually for five years went toward the establishment of a laundry facility (reference reveals this was for training laundresses). An additional $300 donation by Margaret Hitchcock went toward the Sewing Department. GIH Thirteenth Annual Report (1866); GIH Twenty-third Annual Report (1876).

[45] Ginzberg, *Women and Benevolence*, 59; GIH Fifth Annual Report (1858).

[46] GIH Twenty-second Annual Report (1875).

[47] GIH Thirtieth Annual Report (1883).

[48] Following are some examples of various taxes charged to GIH: 1860- $280.11 for grading and paving the street; 1861- $320.34 for guttering, curbing, etc.; 1862- $92.55 for a sidewalk; 1866- $680.65 for sewering, and $100.47 for a city tax; 1868- taxes of $239.15 were listed; 1869— taxes of $129.75 were listed; 1879— GIH listed a "street sprinkling tax" along with a water license; 1893- $700.91 for reconstructing Morgan Street, and $337.55 for paving Eighteenth Street. GIH Seventh Annual Report (1860); GIH Eighth Annual Report (1861); GIH Ninth Annual Report (1862); GIH Thirteenth Annual Report (1866); GIH Fifteenth Annual Report (1868); GIH Fortieth Annual Report (1893).

[49] GIH Fifth Annual Report (1858); GIH Twenty-second Annual Report (1875), 7; GIH Forty-second Annual Report (1895).

[50] GIH Fourteenth Annual Report (1867).

[51] Ibid.; GIH Annual Reports (1893-1900).

[52] GIH Fourteenth Annual Report (1867).

[53] GIH Treasurer's Reports, 1854-1918; GIH Twenty-first Annual Report (1874); Barnard, "Report of Girls' Industrial Home," 67.

[54] Ginzberg, *Women and Benevolence*, 42.

[55] GIH Fifty-first Annual Report (1904); GIH Fifty-second Annual Report (1905).

[56] GIH Nineteenth Annual Report (1872).

[57] GIH Forty-sixth Annual Report (1899).

[58] GIH Eighteenth Annual Report (1871); GIH Fortieth Annual Report (1893).

[59] GIH Eighteenth Annual Report (1871); GIH Forty-first Annual Report (1894); GIH Sixty-fourth Annual Report (1917).

[60] GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859).

[61] GIH Treasurer's Reports, 1854-1918.

[62] GIH annual reports repeatedly mentioned a petition to the city council, yet I have been unable to document GIH managers role in this. City ordinances were passed in the mid-1850s that made begging on the streets a vagrancy and thus a criminal act. As well, managers included in the "Rules for the Government of the Home and School" dismissal from GIH for any girl caught begging. Clara Barnard mentioned the petition in her 1892 report to at the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions in St. Louis, claiming that managers petitioned the city council "to prohibit begging on the streets by children." Barnard further stated that the city council acted "immediately" upon the petition. In 1903, Clara Barnard made reference to this petition again: "It was requisite the strong arm of the law should be thrown around these little ones in tender protection. Mr. Hitchcock [Henry] drew up a petition, which was presented to the city council, praying that 'begging by children on the streets be made a penal offence,' which was passed." Barnard, "Report of Girls' Industrial Home," 68; GIH Fiftieth Annual Report (1903).

[63] GIH Forty-second Annual Report (1895).

[64] GIH Fourteenth Annual Report (1867).

[65] GIH Eighteenth Annual Report (1871).

CHAPTER FOUR

"'Claiming the glorious privilege of being independent'": The Girls' Industrial Home and School, the Training in Domestic Skills, and the Meaning of Independence

"The only lasting protection of womanhood is in its own power of self-support and self-direction."
— Anna Garlin Spencer, New York School of Philanthropy, National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* (1910)

"The training of the many, many hundreds of young girls who have passed through this institution, and for the time have been protected from the temptations to which helpless waifs are exposed, and are also fitted for useful, self-supporting service, is well worthy of all that is being bestowed upon them."
— Girls' Industrial Home Sixty-fifth Annual Report (1918)

So much of nineteenth-century reform rhetoric emphasized the concept of "usefulness," particularly when referring to destitute and neglected children. According to reformers, reform schools molded children into useful citizens while industrial schools created useful labor. When dealing specifically with women and girls, the term "useful" raises interesting and challenging questions— did useful mean productive, virtuous, or benevolent? For middle-class women in the nineteenth century, useful meant being productive housewives, virtuous ladies, or benevolent altruists. According to the ideology of separate spheres, women's "labor" was synonymous with domesticity and included the tasks of housework and childrearing, both having strong social implications, but neither yielding monetary reward. According to nineteenth-century reformers who built institutions for poor young girls, the term useful meant either turning them into model middle-class women (wives and mothers), or making them self-supporting individuals by providing them the means to acquire wage-earning employment. According to mangers of the Girls' Industrial Home and School (GIH), giving girls the ability to earn wages

eliminated their dependency on not only charitable aid, but also men, making them "independent" in their own right.

Historians have long questioned the contradiction of relating the concept of "independence" with wage labor. According to labor historians, simply by being a wage laborer, one was essentially "dependent" on someone or something for personal livelihood. The most outspoken example of this argument is Karl Marx who maintained that laborers (proletariat) were not only dependent on, but also exploited by the capitalists (bourgeoisie) because they were propertyless wage earners who had to work or starve. Workers were forced to sell their labor as a commodity, rather than reaping the rewards of their own toil. Marx's "dependent and exploited wage earner" came to life in the United States following the War of 1812. As the United States became increasingly market-oriented, due to industrialization and urbanization, the appearance of the wage laborer seemed to contradict the emphasis on self-reliance and independence proclaimed in the political theory of "republicanism," necessitating a modification of the political theory itself. Sean Wilentz argued that the concept of "republicanism" changed to fit the "bourgeois ideal of labor, market, and man" that was quickly growing in the new nation. Thus, Thomas Jefferson's nation of independent, small property owners was fast becoming a nation of wage-laborers dependent on the capitalist merchant.[1]

By the mid-nineteenth-century the question of whether or not wage labor constituted "free labor" entered the political arena when the Republican Party introduced the free labor ideology as a contrast to slave labor in the South. It attempted to show that northern wage laborers, despite their apparent "dependence" on the market economy, were in essence "free labor" because their situations represented voluntary choice, rather than personal dependence. Free labor advocates added that wage labor was but a temporary condition on the way to individual property ownership, which was the very essence of "republicanism." The more radical advocates of free labor understood the contradiction of criticizing a system of slavery in the South while supporting a type of "wage slavery" in the

North. Radical labor activists dubbed wage labor as simply another kind of servitude. The question of wage labor as dependency escalated in the late nineteenth century when gaps between the working class, the middle class, and the upper class became more evident. As the capitalist merchants increased their wealth, union activity grew. Union activists and social reformers began to question the exploitation of the worker and started to advocate labor laws that would protect the worker within the capitalist system.

The question of what constitutes "free labor" essentially forces us to define the concepts of "independence" and "dependence" for wage labor. Historians have dealt with the paradox of paupers, beggars, and the general poverty-stricken individual who represented an extreme form of dependence, being those people who relied on charitable aid or public funds for mere subsistence. The solution to dependency in such cases throughout much of the nineteenth century was to put these "dependents" to work in workhouses or train them in skills that would enable them to become wage laborers. Thus, they were dependents in one sense. But in another sense, they learned valuable skills that allowed them to become self-supporting in the wage-labor market. As more wage workers failed to achieve property ownership though, the argument against any type of dependency intensified. Another type of dependency arose from the gendered sphere. The feminist argument has defined dependency for women as patriarchal authority and legal restrictions that relegated women to economic dependence on men. Jeanne Boydston added that women's work within the home fell victim to the emerging market system after the American Revolution, relegating that type of labor to a non-economic status that yielded no monetary reward.[2]

"Independence" also has varying and often contradictory interpretations, especially when applying the theory to men and women. Based on the theory of "republicanism," independence meant property ownership and essentially self-sufficiency, i.e. yeoman farmers. The free labor ideology defined wage labor as a temporary situation on the road to "independence" because it guaranteed the ability to provide sufficiently for a family while

moving toward the ultimate goal of individual property ownership. Because of the emphasis on property ownership, "republicanism" applied mostly to men. For women, the idea of "independence" was different. Throughout much of the nineteenth century, married women could not own property or retain their own wages, and widowed women faced restrictions on inherited property. These limitations excluded a number of women from participating in the republican idea of independence simply because of the inability to control outright their own property.[3]

For many women, then, "independence" could mean something as simple as self-sufficiency, or the ability to earn and retain their own wages. Historians have studied the role of working women in the market economy and have shown that these women did contribute economically to their family's income. Some married women traded domestic goods on the market for money; others did piece-work for textile factories that provided them with income to supplement their husband's. Studies on single women and widowed women show involvement in jobs such as running boarding houses, working in domestic service, textile mills, and prostitution, all which provided income. The ability to retain their own wages served a twofold purpose: one, it removed them from economic dependence on men; and two, it insured they would not become entirely dependent on charitable aid.[4]

This chapter is concerned with the question of female independence as it relates specifically to the notion of "usefulness," and, therefore, a standard definition needs to be imposed. For the women who established and managed GIH, the term "useful" meant several things: productive service, responsible self-support, and rewarding independence. On the one hand, the women who maintained the association established it as a practical enterprise that provided a useful service to the community of St. Louis. On the other hand, the mission of the association emphasized both useful and practical purposes for girls, including industrial training and elementary education. Industrial training provided girls adequate skills to gain reliable employment, usually in domestic service, making them useful and self-supporting individuals. In her study of domestic service, Faye Dudden

commented that domestic service work "permitted unskilled women to be continuously self-supporting," thus it became a lucrative employment opportunity for women. An elementary education provided by GIH gave the girls the useful skill of literacy, something commonly denied them because of their inability to attend public school. In 1856, Elizabeth Clarke stressed the idea of usefulness when she stated that "the object of the institution . . . [was] not to make fine ladies, but useful women."[5]

The drawback, of course, was that domestic service was a profession that appeared to be more exploitative than liberating. GIH managers never viewed it in this way. Managers never mentioned the exploitation of workers even though they trained their girls with skills that would place them in one of the lowest status positions in the United States— domestic service. Much of the rhetoric used by managers revealed a middle-class attitude that reinforced the ideas of usefulness and industriousness. But, managers also put forth the "republican" attitude that all individuals should have the opportunity to attain, at minimum, a decent standard of living for themselves and their families. This was regardless of class status, ethnicity, or sex. If women had to work to support themselves, managers wanted them to be in positions that offered a good family life, a respectable profession, and protection from the temptations of vice. For GIH managers this meant domestic service. It was evident that the managers' hope was that girls being indentured into homes as servants would be welcomed as a family member rather than simply labor. Beyond the realm of domestic service, managers provided training that would enable their girls to work at any profession requiring domestic skills, which was the largest employment category for women and girls throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

This does not discount the paradox of wage labor as dependency, rather it introduces an additional element. In other words, wage labor was not, for women, the lowest point in society. By insuring economic self-sufficiency, women's labor became in essence a route to personal and economic independence. Similar to the free labor

argument, wage labor for women in the nineteenth century could represent a temporary situation on their path to marriage and family, or act as a stepping stone for advancement into more fulfilling careers. Wage labor could offer working-class women the ability to supplement their husband's income, thus elevating the standard of living for the entire family. Wage labor also provided widows and abandoned women the ability to support their family without turning to charitable aid. Wage labor could allow single women to escape the confines of a parent's home and offer a modicum of personal autonomy. Women's opportunities for paid labor were limited, though, to jobs men would not take, jobs that women knew how to do (because their access to education was limited), and jobs that were socially acceptable for women. Thus, women's means of self-sufficiency were in effect "dependent" on the nature of society as a whole.

Through their focus on the concept of usefulness, the women of GIH rejected the view of wage labor as exploitative by projecting the ideals of self-support and economic independence as positive elements. The fact that GIH emphasized domestic skills brings up interesting paradoxes. First, historians studying domestic service have shown that servants had little individual independence in the workplace, making domestic service occupations seem to be one of the most non-individualistic employment opportunities. While in the household, the servant had little free time and faced constant supervision, usually by the mistress of the house. One servant regarded the lack of independence as "the want of liberty," and criticized the compliance with "whatever rules a mistress may deem necessary." The servant admitted that many girls choose not to engage in domestic service occupations "so that some of their life may be their own."[6] Reflecting their own middle-class ideology, GIH managers saw little conflict between the ideology of individualism and the non-individualistic reality of domestic service. For managers, independence meant economic self-sufficiency. By becoming employed, in any occupation, the girl became reliant on herself. It was a recognizable paradox. Catharine

Sedgwick, nineteenth-century reformer and novelist, called this the paradox of the "republican independent dependent."[7]

Second, the placing of girls in domestic service occupations did not appear to be a "feminist" action because of the negative stigma attached to this type of work. Domestic work was part of the ideology of separate spheres that emphasized women's role within the home. Any work done within the home, such as housework and childrearing tended to be labeled "non-economic" and "natural" women's work. Because the ideology of separate spheres mainly described the middle-class family structure, women working outside the home, even in a domestic role, automatically became associated with the lower class. Many of the women and girls doing domestic service work in the nineteenth century were uneducated, newly-arrived immigrants, making domestic work distasteful for most native-born, white women. Despite these negative stereotypes, GIH managers continued to emphasize the training in domestic skills as a means to independence and self-sufficiency. Why they chose to do so is a crucial element to understanding their definition of independence.[8]

Domestic service occupations represented the most readily available employment opportunity for not only the type of girl utilizing GIH, but also women and girls in general. According to GIH annual reports and case records, girls residing at GIH overwhelmingly came from the lower class; many of them were newly-arrived immigrants with little opportunity for education.[9] In 1873, Elizabeth Clarke commented on the importance of labor remarking that it was necessary to show the girls in the institution "that labor, though toilsome, . . . [was] the only road to comfort and self-support." In this respect, domestic skills became the most important aspect of independence for the girls trained at the institution. Domestic positions became jobs for women and girls with no formal training and those who lacked the "ability to wait for a better position." Even within the already limited options for employment for women, there were additional restrictions, such as class, race, and ethnicity, that limited women's job opportunities even more.[10]

This practical emphasis on domestic skills also showed an awareness by GIH managers that the girls they helped would be active in the working world. Because the ideology of separate spheres technically excluded women from the public sphere (i.e., the working sphere), their usefulness and productivity became associated with being wife and mother.[11] Historians who question the validity of separate spheres clearly show that such a concept did not accurately represent the lives of working-class women.[12] The managers of GIH knew that the girls they helped would be in the working world, and giving them skills became more valuable than grooming them for wifehood or motherhood. Doing so increased the chance of their becoming self-supporting. At the National Conference of Charities and Correction in 1897, Lucy Sickles, superintendent of a girls' school in Michigan, gave a report on the importance of industrial training for working-class girls. In this report, she emphasized the importance of a woman as a self-supporting individual, proposing that proper training enabled a girl "whether married or single" to maintain the "character and ability to stand alone."[13]

In this respect, the mission of GIH emphasized the idea of usefulness and self-support in the cause of "womanhood" before wifehood and motherhood. Whereas other nineteenth-century institutions emphasizing programs of domestic training stressed its importance not only for self-support, but also for the future fulfillment of women's "natural roles," GIH managers rarely did.[14] They maintained this principle despite the fact (or perhaps because of it) that the majority of women managers were (or had been) wives and mothers themselves. This position remained consistent throughout much of GIH's history. Shortly after the establishment of GIH in 1854, the *Missouri Republican* reported the managers' mission of "training to practical usefulness," something that would provide girls with a "*self-maintaining* and self-defensive power."[15] In 1876, Elizabeth Clarke maintained that domestic training gave girls the ability to "obtain their own maintenance, and 'claim the glorious privilege of being independent.'" Clara Barnard repeated similar

views in 1887 and 1900, emphasizing the "safety of self-support," "the happiness of being useful," and "the dignity of labor."[16]

The emphasis on domestic training and self-support alone did not make GIH unique among nineteenth-century institutions. However, the elevation of it to the highest importance in their mission for the sake of "independence" certainly represented a different emphasis. Some nineteenth- and twentieth-century institutions that emphasized programs of domestic training did so in language that stressed moral reformation. Nineteenth-century English reformer Mary Carpenter, famous for her introduction of the "Ragged Schools" for wayward children in England, argued that the purpose of a day school was to train children "for an honest livelihood," making them "a benefit to society rather than its bane."[17] Margaret Reeves, in her study on training schools for girls, admitted the importance of learning a skill but emphasized that "the main proposition is to create in her such a character of uprightness, good will and conscience that the girl will be dependable and will be able to live as a decent, law-abiding citizen in the community."[18] And, in 1910, Anna Garlin Spencer of the New York School of Philanthropy, maintained that industrial training for girls gave them alternatives to lives of prostitution. Spencer noted that industrial training gave girls "greater power . . . to earn her support under *right* conditions."[19]

Other institutions emphasized domestic training for girls to uphold social and cultural stereotypes, a point of view supported by nineteenth-century reformers Catharine Beecher and Emma Willard. Barbara Brenzel, in her study of the Lancaster Industrial School for Girls in Massachusetts, argues that the institution taught domestic skills to reinforce the societal view that women were the moral key to social stability.[20] Thus, teaching domestic skills reinforced the idea of women as keepers of the home with the eventual assumption that they would marry and have children. The ideological convention, known as separate spheres, emphasized women first as wives and mothers, and second as individuals, making them politically and economically subordinate to men. Even Lucy Sickles, who stressed the importance of women as individuals in industrial training

maintained that the aim of such training included giving the girls "such work" that would also "fit them for . . . better wifehood, and better motherhood."[21]

From the beginning, GIH managers emphasized a mission statement that reflected independence in the form of self-support for young girls. Throughout the various stages of its life, the institution held to the idea that industrial training, specifically domestic training, provided the girls with the best options for reliable and secure employment. Despite the negative criticism of domestic service occupations and the broadening of new employment opportunities for women, GIH managers continued to focus on domestic training. In 1892, the annual report noted the existence of a cooking class and stated that "every part of housework receives full attention."[22] Within five years, the managers of GIH established a domestic science division that increased attention on domestic training for the older girls residing at the institution. An auxiliary board of managers, created specifically to manage this new division, hired experienced teachers and began regular cooking and sewing classes. According to GIH managers, the training provided "so great a boon to wage earners," because the girls were "better fitted to earn their living after leaving the Home."[23] GIH continued instruction in domestic skills until beginning the transition from industrial training to therapeutic treatment in the 1930s.[24]

By consciously choosing to focus on domestic skills, GIH managers realized that domestic skills were the single most important element in female employment throughout the first two decades of the twentieth century in St. Louis. Even after occupations in retail, clerical, and industry jobs opened for women in the early twentieth century, positions requiring domestic skills remained an important employment category in both industry and personal service occupations. The training in domestic skills did not necessarily limit women and girls to roles as domestic servants, but opened up options requiring domestic skills, such as dressmakers, seamstresses, and milliners.[25]

Domestic skills were such an important element in employment for women that in the late nineteenth century, after experiencing several decades of a "servant problem"

(meaning high demand, but low supply), social reformers attempted to turn domestic service into a valued profession.[26] To many potential servants, positions in household work, though readily available, carried that traditional stigma of low status and degradation, resulting from the type of girl who typically became a servant— immigrant, lower class, and uneducated. To make service occupations more attractive, reformers implemented domestic science programs (the forerunner to Home Economics) in colleges and industrial training schools, intended to professionalize household labor using scientific and rational methods. How-to manuals and specialized courses provided information to servants and employers on how to run an organized household efficiently. Domestic science programs also focused less on the mundane task of household cleaning, and more on dressmaking and millinery, more "professional" occupations for women (although still with a domestic emphasis). When managers implemented their domestic science division in 1899, they emphasized that the training would make their girls "better fitted to earn their living after leaving the Home."[27]

Following the trend in other urban areas, occupations utilizing domestic skills employed more women and girls in St. Louis throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries than any other. Even though manufacturing and mechanical industry positions employed roughly the same number of women and girls as domestic and personal service occupations by 1910 (32 to 36 percent, respectively), within the former category, the domestic arts still dominated. Dressmakers, seamstresses, and milliners constituted 33 percent of all non-factory manufacturing jobs occupied by women and girls in 1910. Many of those working in factory jobs did so in positions using domestic skills. Thirteen percent worked as sewing machine operators, and 16 percent worked in the shoe industry. Within the specific category of domestic and personal service occupations, servants dominated from 1870 to 1900, constituting 52 percent of female employment in 1870, 47 percent in 1880, 36 percent in 1890, and 27 percent in 1900. That was more than any other single occupation for women and girls throughout that period.[28]

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, the job market in St. Louis broadened for women and girls. Although domestic skills remained important in securing employment, new positions in industry, clerical, and retail work (semi-skilled to skilled positions) began overshadowing the former reliance on domestic service positions. By 1920, there was approximately an equal number of women and girls employed in domestic service, clerical, and manufacturing positions (28 percent, 22 percent, and 24 percent, respectively).[29] Non-factory jobs using domestic skills, such as dressmakers, seamstresses, and milliners employed approximately 16 percent within the manufacturing category. Factory jobs emphasizing domestic skills, such as clothing, shoe, and textile industries, employed approximately 38 percent, while factory jobs not related to domestic skills, such as the cigar and tobacco industries, employed only 4 percent. Specifically, domestic servants constituted only 12 percent of all women and girls employed in St. Louis by 1920, while stenographers and typists made up 10 percent. Thus, even though the job market broadened for women by the early decades of the twentieth century, and domestic servant positions declined in number, occupations utilizing domestic skills remained a viable employment category in St. Louis (See Table 6 for numbers and percentages of select occupations).[30]

Table 6: Select occupations employing female workers in St. Louis, and percentage of total employed, 1870-1920

Year	Servant*	Needle trades**	Retail	Clerical	Factory***	Other†
1870	8,244 (52)	3,082 (20)	142 (<1)	n/a	551 (4)	3,717 (24)
1880	12,310 (47)	5,188 (20)	658 (3)	23 (<1)	1,901 (7)	5,988 (23)
1890	13,746 (36)	8,592 (22)	1,217 (3)	1,938 (5)	2,989 (8)	10,119 (26)
1900	14,464 (27)	10,613 (20)	2,585 (5)	3,263 (6)	7,677 (14)	15,904 (29)
1910	13,368 (17)	8,880 (11)	6,120 (8)	10,082 (13)	10,797 (14)	28,381 (37)
1920	11,923 (12)	5,005 (5)	9,169 (9)	22,397 (22)	23,552 (24)	27,745 (28)

* Domestic servants only. The totals do not include numbers for the entire category of domestic and personal service.
** Milliner, Dressmaker, Seamstress
*** This category includes all manufacturing and mechanical industries, except milliners, dressmakers, and seamstresses.
† This category includes employment in agriculture, professional service, domestic and personal service (other than domestic servant), and trade and transportation.
Source: *Federal Census Records, Population and Occupation Statistics*, 1870-1920.

The type of girls occupying domestic skill positions also corresponded with the type of girl being trained at GIH. Native-born white women and girls dominated the ethnic makeup of the domestic service occupations in St. Louis between the years 1870 and 1920. This included girls who were born in Missouri, but had foreign parentage. This is an important distinction because many of these girls were still considered "immigrants" even though they were native-born. Throughout these years, this group constituted at least 50 percent of the total women and girls employed as domestic servants. Foreign-born white women and girls constituted approximately 25 percent of domestic servants throughout the same period. Other occupations requiring domestic skills followed a similar pattern as native-born white women and girls dominated as dressmakers, seamstresses, and milliners. Laundresses were predominantly African Americans. By 1920, the ethnic makeup of domestic servants began changing. Following a similar trend in the United States, African-

American women made up the fastest growing group employed as domestic servants in St. Louis, expanding from 13 percent in 1870 to 33 percent in 1920.[31]

Statistically, GIH managers were correct that domestic service occupations were the most reliable route to employment for the girls being trained at the institution. Although the majority of the girls residing at GIH were native born, many had foreign parentage. Most of the girls had German and Irish lineage, the two groups constituting the second and third largest ethnic groups employed in domestic service occupations in the nineteenth century (United States lineage being the largest).[32] In 1860, the majority of girls residing at GIH were foreign born. Between 1870 and 1920, the majority were native born, but approximately twenty-nine percent had foreign parentage. The 1910 census showed that all residents were native born and all had native-born parents. In the 1920 census, 92 percent were native born, and 8 percent had foreign parentage. Since native born, white (including those with foreign parentage) was the largest group employed as domestic servants during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it made sense to adhere to an emphasis on domestic skills. Even those not gaining employment directly as domestic servants, acquired skills applicable to dressmaking and millinery.[33]

Table 7: Percentage of native-born and foreign-born girls residing at GIH

Year	**Native-born, Native-parentage** (%)	**Native-born, foreign parentage** (%)	**Foreign- born** (%)
1860	37	0	63
1870	11	44	45
1880	51	46	3
1900	56	44	0
1910	100	0	0
1920	92	8	0

Source: *Federal Census, St. Louis, Missouri*, 1860-1880, 1900-1920

The age range for girls being trained at the institution was more difficult to associate with the job market for several reasons. The availability of ages for girls residing at the institution is limited to census data for the years 1860, 1870, 1880, 1900, 1910, and 1920. In addition, the age of women and girls employed in St. Louis between 1870 and 1920 reflected the change in the job market and the implementation of compulsory education laws and child labor laws.

In 1870, the overwhelming majority of female domestic servants were between the ages of sixteen and fifty-nine. Only 10 percent were under the age of sixteen. That remained the standard for domestic servants until 1910. By 1910, 61 percent of female domestic servants ranged in age from twenty-one to forty-four. Servants ranging in age from sixteen to twenty made up the second largest group at 23 percent. By 1920, women aged twenty-five to forty-four constituted the largest group of female domestic servants at 46 percent; 22 percent of domestic servants were women over the age of forty-five, while 17 percent were between twenty and twenty-four. In 1920, only 12 percent of female domestic servants were under the age of twenty. In contrast, by 1920, roughly the same number of women and girls that were over the age of twenty as were under, were employed in the manufacturing and mechanical industries. By 1920 in St. Louis, young adult women worked primarily in industrial jobs, whereas older women were domestic servants.[34]

According to available census data between 1860 and 1920, the majority of girls residing at GIH were between the ages of six and ten. Girls between the ages of eleven and fifteen were the second largest group; girls between the ages of one and five were the third largest. Rarely did GIH have girls over the age of sixteen residing at the home. These numbers seem to reinforce the mission of placing girls in domestic service occupations by the age of sixteen, but not before the age of twelve. It also seems to reflect the age pattern of female domestic service workers in St. Louis.[35] It is difficult to determine exactly how many girls GIH managers indentured throughout the nineteenth and

twentieth centuries, specifically because those records are unavailable. Even with the totals reported in the annual reports, it is difficult to determine the exact number of indentured versus adopted girls. GIH also released many girls to their parents or guardians after extended residence in the institution. GIH did not appear to place many girls after 1900 in domestic service occupations, instead the majority returned to their own homes or acquired jobs on their own when they reached majority age. That policy reflected the growing disuse of indentured contracts by the late nineteenth century.[36]

Table 8: Age range of girls residing at GIH, 1860-1920

Year	Ages 1-5 (%)	Ages 6-10 (%)	Ages 11-15 (%)	Ages 16-20 (%)
1860	21	74	5	0
1870	17	56	25	2
1880	15	63	20	2
1900	19	54	23	4
1910	15	50	35	0
1920	9	42	44	5

Source: *Federal Census, St. Louis, Missouri*, 1860-1880, 1900-1920

It was through the training in industrial skills that GIH managers gave the girls the ability to become self-supporting and independent women by providing them the means to find reliable, wage-earning employment. Managers emphasized the focus of a "school" before a "home," and placed industrial training in a position of highest importance. Focusing on this type of instruction implied that managers put more importance on economic self-sufficiency than moral reformation. In teaching a girl skills, managers sought "to preserve her individuality and self-reliance, essential to a well-rounded life."[37] To insure that each girl was marketable, GIH maintained a flexible training policy. If a girl failed at one skill, she tried another one, even if it required sending girls to public vocational training programs or specialized educational facilities. In this capacity, the

mission of GIH worked "to prepare the girls for useful service by giving them the widest training in that direction that has been possible."[38]

Although the placing of domestic servants remained the most important element of industrial training at GIH, other options were available. Annual reports indicated that there was also advancement potential beyond the servant occupation. Reports described one girl as an "accomplished dressmaker," another as a "reliable superintendent" of the women's department in a factory in St. Louis, while another "conduct[ed] a large millinery establishment" in another city.[39] According to GIH managers, these girls put their domestic skills to good use, although not necessarily as domestic servants. Girls also became apprentices in millinery establishments, as reports boasted that the girls received such "perfect training" that it virtually reduced their apprentice training by at least "one-half."[40] These stories reflected the success of the institution and a purpose accomplished. Self-sufficiency was the key element in GIH's focus on industrial training.

But, the emphasis on practical methods also had a gendered meaning beyond simply economic self-sufficiency. GIH managers equated self-sufficiency with usefulness, specifically as that term related to women and girls. According to the GIH Constitution, the girls would be trained in "such branches of female industry as may enable them to earn a *respectable* living."[41] This statement reflected a belief that employment in any branch of "female industry" was a respectable option for women and girls. Implied in the statement is the belief that having domestic skills insured the girls a job in something other than prostitution, a vocation considered both a moral and physical danger to young women. GIH mangers never literally spoke of prostitution, but hidden references to the topic appeared in annual reports. In 1855, Charlotte Gough, acting GIH secretary, hinted at the subject when she reported that four little girls had "been removed from the unprotected condition which awaited them, to a position where, in the retirement of the country, their youth will be shielded from the temptations to which beauty made them particularly liable."[42] Domestic service positions also meant that girls would not be working in

industrial factories which were loud, musty, and dangerous. Included in this meaning of "usefulness" was the emphasis that respectable labor equaled safety as well as self-sufficiency.

Nineteenth-century reformers routinely emphasized the usefulness of industrial training to give women and girls more respectable and safe options in an urban environment. For example, reformers proposed industrial training as a rehabilitation tool for teaching prostitutes how to earn a "respectable" living. By the turn of the century, reformers billed industrial training as an alternative to the dangerous "lessons of the dance hall and the saloon."[43] In stressing the importance of industrial training, GIH managers emphasized good character. Clara Barnard noted that GIH "sought to instill in these children a love of goodness, of virtue, [and] the dignity of labor, to build up a pride of *character* that will be their greatest safeguard."[44] The importance of good character carried over into advertisements for servants that often emphasized the desire for respectable women. Similarly, women seeking domestic work advertised themselves as respectable.

Elevating industrial training to a level of highest importance also negated the need for moral reformation in GIH. Unlike other nineteenth-century institutions that cared for girls, religious training played a minor role at GIH. The GIH by-laws emphasized the mission as one of providing shelter to destitute girls "where they may be instructed in habits of industry and an elementary English education; and as early as possible to procure for them suitable and permanent homes." Nowhere in the by-laws or Incorporation Charter did it mention religious training as part of the curriculum. The "Rules for the Government of the Home and School" mentioned religion only in the context of the matron's duties, requiring the girls to repeat the Lord's Prayer every morning and night, say blessing while at the dinnertable, and attend Sunday worship. Because of the emphasis on non-sectarianism, the GIH Constitution expressly stated that "no *sectarian instruction* shall be allowed."[45]

In contrast to GIH, other Protestant and Catholic institutions in the city emphasized religion and moral reformation in their curriculum. The curriculum of the St. Louis Protestant Orphan's Asylum included basic education and "Sabbath-School Training."[46] Most Catholic institutions has some religious training in their daily curriculum, and specific ones, like the Convent of the Good Shepherd in St. Louis, based their mission on reformation and moral training. For example, whereas GIH focused on the inability of young women to find good employment without useful skills, Good Shepherd's mission placed "moral training" of wayward girls before the "impossibility of obtaining good employment." In its mission statement, Good Shepherd noted first the reformation of "the whole moral nature" of girls, then the teaching of skills.[47]

Some parents recognized that the emphasis on industrial training over religious training worked to improve the employment opportunities for their children and took advantage of the GIH curriculum. In 1923 a Catholic mother requested admittance to GIH for her twelve-year-old daughter despite the normal custom of placing Catholic children with Catholic institutions. The mother stated that she preferred a Protestant institution because children "learn too much religion in the Catholic Homes." The same year, another Catholic mother requested admittance for her eight-year-old daughter. She expressed her preference for GIH over St. Mary's Roman Catholic Female Asylum because she wanted to place her daughter in an institution "where she can . . . go to school."[48]

Other parents took advantage of the GIH curriculum as an opportunity for their daughters to become educated and trained so that the parents might benefit. In 1924, a mother requested dismissal of her daughter after four years in the institution. The mother intended that the girl, now with a ninth grade education, get a job and help support the family. The mother had admitted the girl so she could earn an education, learn adequate skills, and contribute monetarily to the support of the family. In some cases, GIH managers recognized the possibility that the girls' labor may be exploited by their own family. Elizabeth Clarke admitted that "in several instances unexpected relatives have laid

claim to some who had been under our charge from almost infancy." She asserted that a simple request of back payment for room and board and clothing "generally set these pretensions to flight." The implication, of course, was that the so-called relatives only wanted to use the girl for her labor potential.[49]

Even though domestic service represented the leading employment category for women and girls, it still remained a position stigmatized by low status, limited personal independence, and little opportunity for advancement. The movement in the late nineteenth century to professionalize domestic service through domestic science programs did little to elevate the status of the position. A partial solution came by the second decade of the twentieth century when domestic service became a live-out position. Domestic service studies reported several disadvantages to these positions in comparison to other female employment opportunities: in contrast to a factory job, there were no regular hours for a domestic servant; whereas factory jobs guaranteed Sundays off, there was little guarantee of free time for a domestic servant; servants faced loneliness because of the lack of companionship; and the servant was always in an obvious subordinate role because she lived within her place of employment.[50]

One of the leading reasons for the unpopularity of domestic service positions was the low social status attached to that particular occupation. Simply using the word "servant," implied subordination and inferiority. In addition, having servants eat in the kitchen and not with the family, having them wear uniforms, and housing them in back rooms or attics provided an unmistakable meaning to the servant's "place" in the household. Domestic servants, coming largely from the immigrant population, also carried the stigma of being uneducated and illiterate. This may have been one reason why GIH managers insisted on having the girls educated in both domestic skills and elementary education. In 1892, Clara Barnard insisted that the hands of each girl "be educated equally with the head; mak[ing] them skilled workers at some useful trade." For GIH managers, industrial skills and common literacy provided girls "the only road to comfort and self-

support."[51] The negative stigma attached to servants also resulted from the numerous stories littering the newspapers of the large cities. Articles recounted domestic servants who stole from their employers, or neglected the care of the children. In 1858, the St. Louis *Daily Morning Herald* reported that a servant girl robbed her employer and poisoned the baby in her care with laudanum to prevent its crying while she made her escape.[52] It was this type of report that stigmatized domestic servants as untrustworthy members of the lower class.

Because of this negative stigma, it became important to "sell" domestic service occupations as positions of value. In his 1981 study of domestic service, Daniel Sutherland indicated that the so-called "servant problem" was less about finding servants and more about finding ones who were satisfactory.[53] Proper industrial training through domestic science courses introduced in the late nineteenth century attempted to solve that dilemma. The purpose of these programs was to teach the servant that "'anything that is worth doing is worth doing well.'" The goal was to weed out the "incompetents" and encourage more native-born white women to take up the "profession."[54] As early as 1866, Elizabeth Clarke commented on the importance of good training for domestic servants: "from the poor, good or bad, you must select servants in your families and nurses for your children. Is it of no importance that while you teach them what is right, others to whom they are entrusted as certainly teach them what is just the reverse?"[55]

Another negative aspect of domestic service was the lack of independence and free time. Because household work was labor intensive, particularly before the innovations of electric irons, gas stoves, and washing machines, domestic servants usually worked seven days a week and averaged ten-hour days.[56] This contrasted with the factory jobs that had set hours, and Sundays and evenings off. Many domestic servants complained of being constantly "on-call" or under surveillance by their employer. This lack of personal independence prompted one servant to remark: "you are mistress of no time of your own; other occupations have well-defined hours, after which one can do as she pleases without

asking anyone." The problem of free time and long hours lessened with the shift from live-in service to live-out work (or day work) by the 1920s, allowing the servant to return to her own home at night, out of the watchful eye of the employer. But, the work still remained labor intensive and low in social status.[57]

Although the list of disadvantages of domestic service occupations was long, there were important advantages as well. Domestic servants usually netted more money than female factory workers, because servants received free room and board. Another advantage was the availability of domestic service positions and the familiarity of women and girls with domestic service work. Literally, domestic service represented the type of work that women did. Domestic positions also offered a means of respectable living within a home environment. In Lucy Maynard Salmon's study of domestic service, published in 1897 and based on a nationwide survey of domestic servants and their employers in 1889-1890, the top two reasons for becoming a servant were availability of jobs and preference for the familiar work.[58]

Nineteenth-century reformers emphasized industrial training in domestic skills for women and girls because it reinforced the middle-class ideal of separate spheres that confined women to the domestic sphere of the home. Historian Barbara Brenzel argues that the Lancaster Industrial School for Girls in Massachusetts focused on domestic training so that girls "would be better able to fulfill their 'natural' roles" within the household. Lucy Maynard Salmon refers to domestic service as "knowledge . . . which every woman, whatever her station in life and whether married or unmarried, has at times most pressing need." Timothy A. Hacsi's study of orphanages suggests that training as domestic servants, "not coincidentally" provided the same skills necessary for becoming wives and mothers.[59] Thus, domestic skills were "natural" positions for women and girls. Based on the expectation that women would be economically dependent on men, the ideals of "independence" and "dependency" had gendered meanings.

Thus, even when new job opportunities opened for women, institutions like GIH continued to focus on domestic skills because it reinforced the familiar view that women and household labor went together. The job market, where most women and girls worked at an occupation utilizing domestic skills, reflected this view as well. This emphasis was so strong that when women received wages for this type of labor, it was not totally "unacceptable." For women to even exist in the working world violated the concept of the "cult of domesticity," and disrupted the notion of the traditional middle-class social order. As Jeanne Boydston has argued, the very concept of "femaleness" was defined in its *absence* from the workplace.[60] Louise Kirkwood of the Wilson Industrial School for Girls in New York City emphasized that domestic skills represented "safe and eminently womanly pathways."[61] Domestic skills for women and girls remained a socially acceptable move into the male working world.

Training in domestic skills also provided women and girls with other job opportunities beyond domestic servant positions. If the women and girls did not want to go into service work, they could work in the textile industry or in millinery establishments, positions that required skills in sewing. Women and girls trained in sewing could work in non-factory jobs as dressmakers and seamstresses. GIH managers attributed much importance to sewing instruction, referring to needlework as the "most necessary accomplishment for woman in every position." Clara Barnard praised the sewing class in 1905, commenting that "some of the larger girls have become so proficient that they have obtained good situations in dressmaking and millinery establishments in the city."[62] Since the majority of women and girls in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were employed in some occupation that required domestic skills, it seemed the most secure and logical path for reliable employment opportunities.

Another advantage of domestic service positions was the safety of the home environment, particularly important for young girls. Many nineteenth-century orphanages, reformatories, and industrial schools that utilized programs of "placing-out" girls under

indenture contracts emphasized the safe atmosphere of a home. Institutions, like GIH, routinely noted the preference to "adopt-out" children rather than indenture them, providing a true home, rather than merely a place of employment. In this respect, it was important to sell the idea of both— indenturing a young girl could lead to a future adoption into the family. In 1870, Elizabeth Clarke expressed the hope that their girls would be adopted into homes "not as servants, but as friends." Many reformers, like Charles Loring Brace, believed that obtaining a good home environment prevented children from merely becoming "cheap labor."[63]

A home environment also provided the servant with the important characteristic of respectability. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century reformers contrasted domestic servants who lived within a home environment with the factory and sales girls who lived in boarding houses and frequented dance halls and saloons for entertainment. To some servants, the advantages of a home environment outweighed the disadvantages associated with service work. A servant from Lucy Maynard Salmon's study expressed this attitude in the following statement: "When I came to . . . [the city] and saw the girls in the large stores and the familiarity of the young men, I preferred to go into a respectable family where I could have a home." The importance of a home environment was evident in the development of "working women's homes" in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These "homes," usually managed by Christian organizations, provided working women an alternative to boarding-house living and after-hours amusements that reformers believed tempted young women into paths of vice.[64]

Because many domestic servants were young girls in the nineteenth century, the mistress of the house also provided them with a maternal role. Similar to the situation between reformer and child within the institutional setting, female employers often became mother figures to their servants, simulating the socialization process between mother and daughter. The role of the mistress as the authority figure, and the servant as subordinate to her, also reinforced the maternal authority in the role of childrearing within the home. Age

marked an important component in this process. The infant and adolescent years represented the critical period when mothers usually taught their daughters those "necessary" domestic and practical life skills. Whereas altruistic reformers, like GIH managers, taught these skills in an institutional setting, a mistress might accentuate them in a home environment. GIH managers routinely emphasized the importance of the adolescent years as being the time when a young girl's mind was "most impressionable."[65]

By the early twentieth century, promoting domestic service as a vocation became more difficult because of the increased employment opportunities for women in other fields. Clerical work, retail work, and medical jobs provided women the choice of higher-paying, higher-skilled jobs. This change in the job market corresponded with the GIH managers' decision to change from an industrial school to a therapeutic treatment facility. By the mid-1930s, GIH managers began feeling the pressure of an increase in publicly-funded vocational schools in St. Louis, and the changing labor market and urban economy.[66] The new job opportunities for white women overshadowed the previous dominance of domestic skills. In Missouri, child labor laws and mandatory school attendance laws, passed during the Progressive era, raised the minimum age of women and girls employed in any occupation creating a necessary shift in the emphasis on the GIH program.[67]

By the beginning of the twentieth century, GIH rarely placed girls as domestics.[68] In 1922 GIH enrolled one of their girls (age seventeen) in a nursing course at Children's Hospital. Within one year she completed the course and earned $7.50 per month. GIH petitioned the Board of Education to admit another girl to vocational school where she could learn business skills. Case records revealed another girl already working as a time-keeper at Union Electric Company in St. Louis. Even with the de-emphasis on domestic skills, GIH continued to express the relevance of vocational training to insure self-support. In 1929, the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* reported that GIH managers never let girls leave the institution "until a job ha[d] been obtained for them."[69] Rather than partaking in the

training of these broader skills themselves, managers utilized the availability of public vocational training schools in St. Louis.

In 1876, Elizabeth Clarke proclaimed that the mission of GIH managers was to provide educational and industrial skills to neglected and destitute girls so that they would be able to "obtain their own maintenance, and 'claim the glorious privilege of being independent.'"[70] At the National Conference of Charities and Corrections in 1897, Lucy Sickles argued that the aim of industrial training was "to give the girls such work as will fit them for better womanhood, better wifehood, and better motherhood."[71] It is significant that this statement emphasized womanhood before wifehood and motherhood, but it is also significant that they are all mentioned together. Women and girls working in domestic vocations did so within a paradoxical environment. While these positions allowed women and girls to earn their own wages and proceed toward independent self-support, the positions also reinforced the connection between domestic labor and female usefulness.

In the nineteenth century, women and girls had few opportunities to enter the paid labor force. Statistics show that domestic skills remained their single most important bargaining tool for obtaining wage labor. Although new job opportunities opened for women in the twentieth century, for the first three decades (and some would argue beyond), domestic skills remained the key to finding employment, even in factory and industry jobs. It may not have been the most interesting or desirable employment option, but it was readily available and relatively secure.

For many modern feminists, the societal and cultural connections linking women and domestic skills has served as a repressive chain that bound women to the "cult of domesticity." But, in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, domestic skills represented the single most important element to procuring employment for women and girls in the United States. Despite the fact that domestic service was repressive in the sense of restricting choice, training in domestic skills became to GIH managers a practical method of attaining self-sufficiency. In 1889, Clara Barnard, made reference to the importance of

skilled training in GIH: "The industrial training of our children is a matter of highest importance. They have been taught trades, fitted for domestic service, [and] have been brought within the kindly influences of instruction and example."[72] In 1897, Lucy Sickles expressed her view on the importance of industrial training: "Womanhood comes in advance of wifehood and motherhood; and the girl who is trained to a noble ideal of womanhood cannot make of life a failure, although she may be no man's wife and no child's mother." This statement emphasized the concept of a woman as an individual, something GIH managers focused on throughout the history of the institution. Industrial training, according to Sickles, should "be such that, whether married or single . . . [a woman] shall have character and ability to stand alone." Elizabeth Clarke asserted the same attitude in 1879, maintaining that "self-dependence is a more imperative duty to be taught to every Child of Earth."[73]

The continued emphasis placed on domestic skills by GIH managers informs us about the limitations of the women managing the institution. They did not break down barriers by emphasizing the restrictive nature of domestic work. They did not campaign for the minimum wage or labor laws that would possibly elevate the economic importance of women in society. Rather, managers worked within the existing system to place girls in occupations that were both readily available and "respectable" positions. The tendency of modern historians to label domestic employment as simply "women's work," or "natural" occupations for women, reduces and devalues the importance of what was the largest employment category for women and girls throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It also omits the importance of these occupations in giving women and girls some level of economic self-sufficiency needed to rid themselves of dependence on husbands, families, or charitable aid.

ENDNOTES

[1] The idea of "civic republicanism" placed value on money and the economic independence of citizens. In the years following the revolution, economic independence meant not only property ownership but the existence of economic dependents in a household. This reinforced the patriarchal model of men as heads of households over women and children as economic dependents. Workers, in Wilentz's view, tried to keep propertied independence; it was employers who modified the concept of "republicanism." Jeanne Boydston, *Home and Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 43-44; See also, Stephanie McCurry, *Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, and the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 85-91; Sean Wilentz, *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788-1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 302-306.

[2] See, Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Jonathan A. Glickstein, *American Exceptionalism, American Anxiety: Wages, Competition, and Degraded Labor in the Antebellum United States* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002); Bruce Laurie, *Artisans into Workers: Labor in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: The Noonday Press, 1989); Julie Saville, *The Work of Reconstruction: From Slave Labor to Wage Laborer in South Carolina, 1860-1870* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Wilentz, *Chants Democratic.*

[3] See Boydston, *Home and Work*; Foner, *Free Soil*; Paul A. Gilje, editor, *Wages of Independence: Capitalism in the Early American Republic* (Madison, WI: Madison House, 1997); Amy Dru Stanley. *From Bondage to Contract: Wage Labor, Marriage, and the Market in the Age of Slave Emancipation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

[4] Thomas Dublin argued that the girls who went to work in the Lowell textile mills exercised a kind of "independence" because they were not simply supplementing family income; rather they earned their own money, and spent it the way they chose. Faye Dudden has shown that single Irish women were expected to be economically independent from a young age to help support the family financially. Thomas Dublin, *Women at Work: The Transformation of Work and Community in Lowell, Massachusetts, 1826-1860* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), 35-40; Faye Dudden, *Serving Women: Household Service in Nineteenth-Century America* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983), 60-63.

[5] Dudden, *Serving Women*, 203; Katharine T. Corbett, *In Her Place: A Guide to St. Louis Women's History* (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1999), 124-6, 157; GIH Third Annual Report (1856).

[6] Quoted in Lucy Maynard Salmon, *Domestic Service* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901), 147-148.

[7] Catharine Sedgwick was a nineteenth-century reformer and novelist. Quoted in Carol Lasser, "The Domestic Balance of Power: Relations Between Mistress and Maid in Nineteenth-Century New England," *Labor History* 28 (Winter 1987), 10.

[8] John Locke's emphasis on "common sense" ideals mirrors the practical, and somewhat conservative, emphasis shown by GIH managers. Locke also emphasized that individualism can be achieved even in the midst of a dominant group by *choosing* to give your labor rather than being exploited for it.

[9] I have included as immigrant girls, those who were born in the United States but had foreign parentage. I am choosing to make this distinction because even though these girls were native born, society dubbed them "foreign" because of their parentage. In short, a daughter of immigrant Irish parents, even though born in Missouri, still was seen as Irish.

[10] See David Katzman, *Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 242; GIH Twentieth Annual Report (1873); Magda Fahrni, "'Ruffled' Mistresses and 'Discontented' Maids: Respectability and the Case of Domestic Service, 1880-1914," *Labour* 39 (Spring 1997), 82.

[11] This is the rhetoric of Republican Motherhood. See, Linda Kerber, *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America* (New York: Norton and Company, 1980).

[12] As shown in the previous chapter, historians also question its validity for middle-class women as well.

[13] Barbara Berg argued that through their work in voluntary associations, women began to see their oppression and through that came a respect for individuality. Barbara J. Berg, *The Remembered Gate: Origins of American Feminism, The Woman and the City, 1800-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 158; Lucy Sickles, "Industrial Training in Girls' Schools," National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 24 (1897), 130-1.

[14] GIH annual reports rarely comment on preparing girls for their roles as wives and mothers. Throughout the nineteenth century and much of the twentieth, GIH continues to focus on the idea of "self-support." It is not until approximately 1940 that reports begin to mention the importance of domestic skills in the fulfillment of wifehood and motherhood. This may reflect the increase in public vocational training schools and the beginning of the transition from custodial care to therapeutic care facility. The institution increasingly began to emphasis the emotional stability of girls to allow them to function in society, usually as prospective wives and mothers.

[15] These words have strong feminist meanings, particularly for the mid-nineteenth century. The italics are original. *Missouri Republican*, February 8, 1854.

[16] These statements were made as the old ideas about free labor were ending. GIH Twenty-third Annual Report (1876); GIH Thirty-fourth Annual Report (1887); GIH Forty-seventh Annual Report (1900).

[17] Mary Carpenter, *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes, and for Juvenile Offenders* (London: C. Gilpin, 1851), 77.

[18] Margaret Reeves, *Training Schools for Delinquent Girls* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1929), 297.

[19] I added the italics for emphasis. Anna Garlin Spencer. "'What Machine-Dominated Industry Means in Relation to Woman's Work: The Need of New Training and Apprenticeship for Girls," National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 37 (1910), 201.

[20] See Barbara M. Brenzel, *Daughters of the State: A Social Portrait of the First Reform School for Girls in North America, 1856-1905* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1983).

[21] Sickles, "Industrial Training," 128.

[22] GIH Thirty-ninth Annual Report (1892), 8.

[23] GIH Forty-eighth Annual Report (1901); GIH Fifty-second Annual Report (1905).

[24] Even after switching to a therapeutic facility, girls still worked as baby-sitters and mother's helpers in homes around the city.

[25] Alice Kessler-Harris, *Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), chapter 5.

[26] The National Council on Household Employment, consisting mostly of social scientists and social workers, took on the task of solving the servant problem by introducing how-to manuals and domestic science programs. See Jane Lancaster, "Encouraging Faithful Domestic Servants: Race, Deviance, and Social Control in Providence, 1820-1850." *Rhode Island History* 51 (1993): 70-87.

[27] Examples of domestic service employment still existed in the late 1890s: one sixteen-year-old, apprenticed earlier, returned to the home to replace the cook who was ill; another sixteen-year-old worked as assistant to the matron and teacher at the institution—these were paid occupations. Although the domestic science movement technically began in the 1890s, reform societies like the Providence Society for the Encouragement of Faithful Domestic Servants attempted to solve the "servant problem" as early as the 1830s. GIH Fifty-second Annual Report (1905), 10; GIH Forty-third Annual Report (1896).

[28] Katharine Corbett stated that 58 percent of all women wage earners in St. Louis were in domestic service in 1880. Corbett, *In Her Place*, 118; *Ninth Census of the United States* (1870) volume 1, Population; *Tenth Census of the United States* (1880) volume 1, Population; *Eleventh Census of the United States* (1890) volume 2, part 2, Population; *Twelfth Census of the United States* (1900) volume 2, part 2, Population, Ages, etc.; *Thirteenth Census of the United States* (1910) volume 4, Population, Occupation Statistics; *Fourteenth Census of the United States* (1920) volume 4, Population, Occupations.

[29] See Table 6. The category of domestic service includes all service positions, not simply servant.

[30] *Ninth Census of the United States* (1870) volume 1, Population; *Tenth Census of the United States* (1880) volume 1, Population; *Eleventh Census of the United States* (1890) volume 2, part 2, Population;*Twelfth Census of the United States* (1900) volume 2, part 2, Population, Ages, etc.; *Thirteenth Census of the United States* (1910) volume 4, Population, Occupation Statistics; *Fourteenth Census of the United States* (1920) volume 4, Population, Occupations. David Katzman revealed a similar pattern for domestic service occupations in the United States. The following statistics show a steady decline of women wage earners working in domestic service: 1870— 50.1 percent; 1880— 40.7 percent; 1890— 35.8 percent; 1900— 29.4 percent; 1910— 24.6 percent; 1920— 16.2 percent; 1930— 18.5 percent. Katzman noted that while the percentage for women wage earners in domestic service declined steadily, from 1870-1910, the percentage of women factory workers increased from 18 percent to 23 percent, and those employed as saleswomen, clerks, and stenographers increased from 1 percent to 15 percent. Katzman, *Seven Days a Week*, 21-2, 53.

[31] In St. Louis by 1900, 92 percent of black women wage earners worked in domestic service. Black women had only two industrial jobs open to them— nut-cracking and tobacco sorting and stemming. With the abundance of white female labor in St. Louis, black women were relegated to the domestic service occupations by 1910. Katzman, *Seven Days a Week*, 313.

[32] It is interesting that the traditional stereotype of domestic servants placed them as immigrants. This can be explained by understanding that most domestic servants, although native born, had foreign parentage. Even native-born children with foreign parents were labeled immigrant. But, many native, white working-women also worked as domestic servants.

[33] *Federal Census, St. Louis, Missouri*, 1860-1920; GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[34] *Ninth Census of the United States* (1870) volume 1, Population;*Tenth Census of the United States* (1880) volume 1, Population; *Eleventh Census of the United States* (1890) volume 2, part 2, Population;*Twelfth Census of the United States* (1900) volume 2, part 2, Population, Ages, etc.;*Thirteenth Census of the United States* (1910) volume 4, Population, Occupation Statistics;*Fourteenth Census of the United States* (1920) volume 4, Population, Occupations.

[35] By 1964 GIH changed its age range to twelve to eighteen. St. Louis Provident Association, *The St. Louis Directory of Charities and Philanthropies* (1909), Mercantile Library, St. Louis, Missouri; Francis H. McLean, *Survey of Charities in St. Louis, Summary of Important Findings and Recommendations* (1916), Mercantile Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

[36] GIH Annual Reports (1854-1914); GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[37] GIH Forty-fourth Annual Report (1897), 11.

[38] GIH Fifty-eighth Annual Report (1911), 12.

[39] Ibid.; GIH Thirtieth Annual Report (1883); GIH Twenty-ninth Annual Report (1882).

[40] GIH Thirty-ninth Annual Report (1892).

[41] Italics are included for emphasis. GIH *Constitution* (February 13, 1855).

[42] GIH Second Annual Report (1855), 7; GIH Forty-seventh Annual Report (1900), 16; GIH Thirty-fourth Annual Report (1887).

[43] In the Social Evil Ordinance established in St. Louis in 1871, provisions were made for establishing "Houses of Industry" that would serve as rehabilitation centers for prostitutes. Reverend John L. Milligan, "Control of Viscous and Criminally Inclined Females." National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 9 (1882), 180.

[44] Italics in original. GIH Thirty-third Annual Report (1886).

[45] Italics in original. GIH by-laws, *Incorporation Charter* (February 13, 1855); GIH *Constitution* (February 13, 1855).

[46] The Orphan Asylum established a domestic science department in 1900 but eliminated it in 1902 because of lack of funds. They added the department only to "keep abreast with the times." Protestant Orphan Asylum Sixty-fifth Annual Report (1900).

[47] A brochure for the Convent of the Good Shepherd stated that the girls were "snatched back to safety," and it was a "retreat" for girls to undo an immoral past. Good Shepherd attributed its success to two things: 1) offering securing shelter to immoral girls 2) letting the past of the girls be buried forever. The institution took "every possible measure to blot out entirely from the memory of the inmates the former life which was spent in sin." English reformer, Mary Carpenter also placed religious and moral training above industrial skills when emphasizing the curriculum of reform schools for wayward children. *The Convent of the Good Shepherd. An Appeal on Behalf of the Reformatory Classes and Protectorate for Children and Young Girls.* (St. Louis: John J. Daly and Co., Printers, 1880), Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; *A Brief History of the Convent of the Good Shepherd*, circa 1922, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; Mary Carpenter, *Juvenile Delinquents, Their Condition and Treatment* (London: W. and F. G. Cash, 1853).

[48] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[49] Ibid.; GIH Sixteenth Annual Report (1869).

[50] Salmon, *Domestic Service*; Katzman, *Seven Days a Week.*

[51] Clara Barnard, "The Care of Children" *Journal of the Proceedings of the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions of St. Louis* (St. Louis: Commercial Printing Company, 1892), 91; GIH Twentieth Annual Report (1873).

[52] St. Louis, Missouri *Daily Morning Herald*, April 20, 1858.

[53] Sutherland, *Americans and Their Servants*, 25.

[54] "Notebook of Instructions for Teaching Girls' Class in Household Administration," (circa 1922), 5, A. C. Hoskins Collection, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[55] GIH Thirteenth Annual Report (1866), 5.

[56] A domestic science class schedule shows the labor-intensive work of domestic servants. Lessons consisted of the following: fire-making, table-setting, waiting tables, clearing tables, washing dishes, bed-making, cleaning rooms, washing, and ironing. This explains why servants worked seven days a week, ten-hour days. A. C. Hoskins Collection, "Notebook of Instruction," (1922).

[57] Salmon, *Domestic Service*, 145-6; Sutherland, *Americans and Their Servants*, 29.

[58] Salmon, *Domestic Service*, 131. Many of the servants surveyed preferred the work of domestic service because it was familiar work and it was within a family atmosphere.

[59] See Brenzel, *Daughters of the State*, 138; Salmon, *Domestic Service*, 137; Timothy A. Hacsi, *Second Home: Orphan Asylums and Poor Families in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 185.

[60] Jeanne Boydston, "The Woman Who Wasn't There: Women's Market Labor and the Transition to Capitalism in the United States," in Paul A. Gilje, editor, *Wages of Independence*, 36.

[61] Brenzel, *Daughters of the State*, 166; Hacsi, *Second Home*, 135; Louise J. Kirkwood "Methods of Industrial Training For Girls," National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 12 (1885), 221.

[62] GIH Second Annual Report (1855), 7; GIH Fifty-second Annual Report (1905), 10.

[63] GIH Seventeenth Annual Report (1870), 7; Charles Loring Brace, *The Dangerous Classes of New York, and Twenty Years' Work Among Them* (New York: Wynkoop and Hallenbeck, Publishers, 1872).

[64] Salmon, *Domestic Service*, 133.

[65] This maternalistic concept was part of the nineteenth-century reform institutions, but it also existed in Progressive reform and domestic service reform. Anne Knupfer noted that maternalism was used in Progressive reform to rehabilitate delinquent girls. She stated that benevolent maternalism advocated "motherhood, homemaking, and marriage" as the way to successful reform. This concept reinforced societal views of women as domestic home-makers, "talents" that were passed from mother to daughter. Anne M. Knupfer, *Reform and Resistance: Gender, Delinquency, and America's First Juvenile Court* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 121; Berg, *The Remembered Gate*, 103; Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 30-35, 63-67.

[66] *Survey of Charities in St. Louis, Summary of Important Findings and Recommendations* (1916), Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[67] *Ninth Census of the United States* (1870) volume 1, Population; *Tenth Census of the United States* (1880) volume 1, Population; *Eleventh Census of the United States* (1890) volume 2, part 2, Population; *Twelfth Census of the United States* (1900) volume 2, part 2, Population, Ages, etc.; *Thirteenth Census of the United States* (1910) volume 4, Population, Occupation Statistics; *Fourteenth Census of the United States* (1920) volume 4, Population, Occupations.

[68] In her history of GIH, Mrs. Richard Jones noted that in 1926, the girls still trained in cooking, sewing, and housekeeping, but not for indenture as domestics. Not only was the mission beginning to change, but now GIH began caring for girls from adolescence to adulthood. Mrs. Richard S. Jones, "History of the Girls' Home" (March 1965), Edgewood Children's Center Collection, Mercantile Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

[69] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri; St. Louis, Missouri *Globe-Democrat* November 29, 1929.

[70] GIH Twenty-third Annual Report (1876).

[71] Sickles, "Industrial Training," 128.

[72] Faye Dudden connected the charity movements with the idea of domestic training, stating "nineteenth-century female charitable and benevolent groups consistently regarded domestic supervision as a model and a resource." Dudden, *Serving Women*, 169; GIH Thirty-sixth Annual Report (1889), 6.

[73] Barbara Berg argued that through their work in voluntary associations, women began to see their oppression. Through this came a respect for individuality with regards to women. Berg, *Remembered Gate*, 158; Sickles, "Industrial Training in Girls' Schools," 130-1; GIH Twenty-sixth Annual Report (1879).

CHAPTER FIVE

"Removing the Frequent Companion of Vice": The Girls' Industrial Home and School, the Mission to Rescue Destitute Girls

"The beggar girls of our city, plying their vocation into the hours of the night, were in deadly moral danger. They must be rescued."
— Girls Industrial Home Thirty-ninth Annual Report (1892)

"Think what some of these little girls might be if deprived of this Home!"
— Girls Industrial Home Fifty-ninth Annual Report (1912)

In 1932 the St. Louis Juvenile Court requested the admission of an illegitimate teenage girl (V.A., age sixteen), to the Girls Industrial Home and School (GIH). The girl's uncle had sent her to live with relatives to shield his sister's reputation and hide the identity of the illegitimate child. By the time she was sixteen, V.A. had bounced from relative to relative, and had been treated badly by some of them. She only knew her real mother, who had since married and had five children, as an "aunt." Upon requesting admission for V.A., the court asked GIH to "make an exception," assuring the managers that the girl was not a "delinquent." The letter promoted V.A. as someone who simply wished to attend high school and suggested that she could be helpful in caring for the younger children in the institution. GIH managers consented to the admission.[1]

The fact that GIH did not allow admission to girls with delinquent arrest records or delinquent characteristics implied that V.A. had neither. But, if she was neither a delinquent or a "potential" delinquent, why was it necessary for the court to "sell" her to GIH? Did V.A.'s illegitimacy serve as a warning sign for possible delinquency? Did the fact that she was sixteen work against reformers' emphasis on early reformation of bad habits? Did the emotional and possible physical abuse that V.A. suffered throughout most

of her life leave her so emotionally battered that in reformers' eyes, reformation was futile? This case brings up interesting questions about the nature of delinquency, particularly how middle-class reformers defined delinquency in contrast to dependency.

Throughout the nineteenth and much of the twentieth century, reformers had no definition of what constituted a delinquent child, nor could they totally agree on the characteristics of potential delinquents. GIH managers shared in this uncertainty. But, GIH offers a unique perspective on the nature of delinquency simply because its policy prohibited admission to any girl considered "delinquent." Thus, who GIH admitted and who they did not provides a fascinating look at how they defined delinquency, particularly as this definition related specifically to women and girls. Throughout its history, GIH managers' definition of delinquency remained ambiguous. For example, they routinely admitted girls who exhibited "delinquent" characteristics by most standards of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Most of these girls were in immediate physical and moral danger. For the most part, managers exhibited middle-class attitudes concerning "delinquency" by placing much emphasis on a girl's character and reputation.

The policy of denying admission to girls with delinquent records or delinquent habits was never part of GIH by-laws or written rules, yet it is obvious from statements made throughout its history, that delinquents were not part of the target group. The question, of course, was what constituted delinquency? A girl with an arrest record was clearly delinquent due to the legal implications of such a record. A girl having "delinquent habits" was more complicated. In the case of V.A., her illegitimacy and the emotional and physical abuse seems to have sparked a question of potential delinquency. The letter from the juvenile court made no reference to any specific delinquent acts committed by V.A., but did point out the illegitimacy and the abuse as if these two things represented some form of emotional instability that could drive a young girl to vice. A review of V.A. one year after her admission revealed that she did have some problems. The report referred to her as being "inactive, dissatisfied, [and] easily lead into disobedience." These are characteristics

that many nineteenth-century reformers would see as warning signs for potential "delinquency."[2]

This chapter deals with this question of delinquency, particularly how GIH managers distinguished between a delinquent girl and a dependent one. In 1863, Clara Barnard wrote that in the homes of the destitute girls cared for in the institution there existed too often a "frequent companion [of] vice." Barnard's report noted the difficulty of saving girls from "the temptations that surround them," finding "evil influences of early life hard to eradicate."[3] According to GIH managers, because delinquency began in the living environments of destitute girls, getting them out of those environments at an early age played a crucial role in the mission. Managers recognized that delinquency and dependency often went together. They held to the prevailing nineteenth-century attitude that girls brought up in poverty were more likely to become delinquent. Historian Robert Mennel showed this attitude when he argued that most laws defining juvenile delinquency, beginning as early as the eighteenth century, were so vague that the term became "less a fixed concept and more a description of certain kinds of behavior by certain children living in certain places." Mennel referred to delinquency as a "violation of mores." This was the environment in which GIH operated.[4]

A consequence of this connection between poverty and delinquency was that many "dependent" children labeled as "delinquent" ended up in reformatories, houses of refuge, and workhouses. In short, there was little distinction between the two. The blame lay with the law, or the absence thereof. Vagrancy laws usually resulted in the arrest of children for begging or loitering. In most cases, no distinction was made regarding the "dependent" status of a vagrant child. The child faced arrest and subsequent detention in a city or state home for juvenile delinquents. In the absence of juvenile facilities, the child ended up in the state prison or workhouse with adults.

The vagrancy law of St. Louis exemplified this problem. Prior to 1860, the law made no mention of age. The 1850 vagrancy law defined vagrants merely as "able-bodied

persons . . . found loitering . . . or going from door to door begging; or placing themselves in the streets, or other thoroughfares, or in public places, to beg or receive alms." In 1860, the revised law defined vagrants as all "able-bodied males and females over the age of sixteen found wandering abroad or begging." Despite this age specification, many children under the age of sixteen who were found wandering the streets or begging found themselves subjected to confinement in the county institution for juveniles. Because no juvenile court system existed in St. Louis until 1903, the vagrancy laws worked to get children off the streets and into the House of Refuge, the county home for juvenile offenders established in 1851. Because the House of Refuge served as a "catch-all" for getting children off the streets, many "dependent" children were housed with "delinquent" children, something reformers, including GIH managers, harshly criticized.[5]

The House of Refuge in St. Louis provided city officials with an institution to deposit these dependent/delinquent children. The Act of Incorporation for the House of Refuge defined it as a place "for the confinement and reform of juvenile offenders." Specifically, section three of the act stated that males under sixteen, and females under fourteen who were "liable to confinement in the workhouse of St. Louis city, the county jail of St. Louis, or the penitentiary of the State of Missouri" could be placed in the House of Refuge at the discretion of the sentencing court or magistrate.[6] All minor children committed to the House of Refuge remained under the control of the managers of the institution until reaching the age of twenty-one. To permit the admission of those children not committing crimes worthy of the state penitentiary or workhouse, section fourteen of the Incorporation Charter allowed for commitment of children found abandoned, neglected, or begging. Children found as prostitutes or in the company of prostitutes also faced institutionalization based on "competent proof" delivered by various city officials.[7] Accordingly, the House of Refuge became an easy solution to the city's problem of vagrant children.

For the managers of GIH, this solution proved unacceptable. City officials' willingness to deposit innocent children into a home for juvenile offenders appeared not only unfair, but dangerous. Accordingly, GIH managers denounced the House of Refuge maintaining that "death would be preferable" to a sentence in that institution.[8] The records of the St. Louis House of Refuge from 1855-1899 revealed the majority of girls committed were not delinquent girls, but dependent ones. Table 9 provides a detailed account of girls admitted to the House of Refuge in those forty-four years. Of the female commitments, 70 percent involved destitution, abandonment, improper exposure, vagrancy, or neglect.[9] All of these relate to "dependency" rather than "delinquency." The two crimes usually associated with female delinquency— incorrigibility and prostitution— made up 17 percent and 4 percent of the commitments, respectively. Larceny or violation of city ordinances, seen as "real crimes," made up 7 percent of the commitments.[10]

Table 9: Conditions of Female Commitments in St. Louis House of Refuge, 1855-1899

Reason for Commitment	**Total number committed (percentage of total)**
Destitution	408 (29)
Indecently Exposed	340 (24)
Incorrigible or Returned by Master	235 (17)
Abandoned	182 (13)
Larceny	72 (5)
Prostitution	54 (4)
Violating City Ordinance	27 (2)
Vagrancy	26 (2)
Neglect	22 (2)
Volunteer or Own Request	18 (1)
Other *	10 (<1)
Protection	9 (<1)
Total	1403 (100)

* Conditions in this category include the following: bad health, unhappy with place, wandering, perjury, lazy habits, bad conduct, instability, runaway, pilfering, in bad company, picking pockets, disturbing the peace, drunk on street, trespassing, exposed to a bad influence, begging, and incompatibility.
Source: St. Louis House of Refuge Records (1855-1899), Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

According to GIH managers, the House of Refuge did nothing but expose innocent children to vice by housing "good" girls with "bad" ones. Nineteenth-century reformers acknowledged this problem by attempting to establish separate facilities not only for adults and children, but also for children who were merely dependent and needed only shelter and care, versus ones who were delinquent and needed discipline and reformation. Reformers designed houses of refuge to serve as places where juvenile offenders received training in discipline and industry that would facilitate their rehabilitation. Orphanages and other children's institutions began to provide aid to neglected, destitute, and orphaned children who had no other means of care.

In theory, these two facilities (orphanages and houses of refuge) were to offer different programs to different types of children. However, they often became "dumping grounds" for any delinquent or destitute children found without parental supervision. Thus, the two elements came into contact with each other and outraged many reformers who believed in the danger of allowing these two groups to mix. The House of Refuge served as this "dumping ground" for children picked up by city officials in St. Louis prior to the creation of the juvenile court system in 1903. After its creation, dependent and neglected children waited in a temporary "staging area" while the court sought a proper environment to place the child. Before the juvenile court, city officials sent these children immediately to the House of Refuge without making a distinction between those who were merely dependent versus those who were delinquent. GIH managers consistently worked with the juvenile court in placing girls who were merely dependent, and admitted many girls on referral by the juvenile court and other public agencies to their institution.[11]

The problem of defining "dependency" and "delinquency" continued even after the juvenile court was created. In 1909, the St. Louis Provident Association defined dependents as those children who had no one to care for them properly. In contrast, a delinquent child usually committed some inappropriate act including any of the following according to the law: "violating general or local laws, being incorrigible, having evil

associates, frequenting 'vile places,' using bad language habitually, knowingly entering a house of ill repute, wandering the streets or railroad tracks, truancy, immoral conduct, loitering, and being absent from home at night."[12]

In 1913, the Missouri State Board of Charities and Corrections described a neglected child as being "destitute, homeless, abandoned, or dependent." A neglected child "begs or receives alms, lives in a house of ill repute or with persons of irreputable character, or suffers from cruelty of parents." It also included children "under age ten peddling on the street or playing/singing for money." In contrast, a delinquent child was anyone under the age of seventeen who violated the laws of the city or state. Delinquent children were "incorrigible, they knowingly entered houses of ill repute, and patronized gaming establishments." They wandered the streets participating in the "gaming business." They were truants who "wandered around the railroad tracks and hopped trains." They used "obscene language, conducted themselves in immoral ways, and were absent from home at night."[13]

Not only were these definitions vague (and obviously had not changed much within ten years), but some of the characteristics also overlapped for both dependency and delinquency. That created a problem of distinction. Because the definitions of dependency and delinquency remained vague, they were broadly interpreted and liberally interchanged. In a report given at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections in 1898, James Allison, Superintendent of the House of Refuge in Cincinnati, noted that these two concepts often merged. Allison argued that "under the regime of evil companions and a bad home, the dependent needs only the opportunity to become delinquent, and the delinquent is such simply because of the deficiency . . . of a moral sense which has failed of its proper development."[14]

Poverty and destitution played a significant role in the linking of these two concepts. According to reformers, the destitute child became the delinquent child if not saved from the certain ruin that awaited. An 1872 report on "Vice, Crime, and Poverty" in

New York concluded that "all outcast children are so liable at any moment to pass the line between vagrancy and crime, that the two classes are practically only one."[15] GIH managers dealt specifically with this question of distinguishing between dependent and delinquent children, seeking to help the former, but avoid the latter. Unlike other institutions in St. Louis that sought reformation of "wayward" girls and "fallen" women, GIH refused admission to any girl labeled "delinquent." This attitude reflected a fear that delinquent girls could easily corrupt the dependent girls in the institution. Thus, keeping them segregated saved the dependent girls from bad influences. However, it did little to offer aid to the delinquent girl.

Three major themes dominated GIH annual reports on the subject of delinquency—gender, age, and environmental surroundings. It was girls, not boys, who managers singled out for rescue; managers made their target group pre-pubescent girls because of the delicate nature of those years; and if at all possible, managers removed girls from their dangerous environments and placed them temporarily in GIH or with families for protection. According to GIH managers, the successful "rescuing" and subsequent protection of dependent girls insured those girls would be raised with the values of virtue and industry. It also protected them from the dangers and temptations of vice, reducing the risk that they would fall into delinquent habits. Elizabeth Clarke acknowledged GIH's mission of "saving children" in 1860, commenting on the necessity of providing not only food and shelter, but also "moral culture" enabling the girls to maneuver "through the numerous ills of early life."[16]

The goal of GIH managers in receiving only dependent girls reinforced the prevailing attitude that saving a girl from ruin was imperative to her social acceptance in society. GIH managers sought the rescue of a girl *before* she became delinquent, rather than reform her afterward. For this reason, age played a crucial role in the mission of GIH and managers rarely admitted girls over the age of twelve. According to GIH managers, the pre-pubescent years represented the best opportunity for ridding the girls of bad habits

and replacing them with good ones. Federal census records for St. Louis from 1860 to 1920 revealed that of the 347 girls listed as residents of GIH, only forty-four were over the age of twelve (13 percent). Of those forty-four, only twelve were over the age of fourteen. One hundred and ninety girls ranged between six and ten years (55 percent); fifty-three were under the age of six (15 percent). It was in these latter age groups that GIH managers believed they could reverse early problems. In short, they were not beyond the realm of saving.[17]

Thus, the GIH admission policy reflected the belief of saving girls before they became ruined. GIH managers confined their efforts to those they could "hope to improve" by planting the "good seed of early discipline." In so doing, managers could "prevent crime" by training "these little girls to lives of virtue and usefulness."[18] Because the majority of girls admitted to GIH came from neighborhoods where exposure to vice existed, managers knew that early influence was important. In 1854, the *Missouri Republican* printed a description of GIH that reflected this goal. Describing the girls in GIH as those whose circumstances usually led to a life of crime, the *Republican* stated: "the time to remedy the evil, is to nip it in the bud; before the evil habits mature and reformation seems almost impossible, is the proper time to correct it, and give the thought and habit another direction." This reflected the nineteenth-century attitude that girls beyond a certain age who had been exposed to vice were irredeemable.[19]

This attitude was very much gendered because it focused solely on girls, and specifically on a girl's reputation. Nineteenth-century attitudes about girls espoused the ideas that a good reputation insured the promise of a virtuous life. Thus, rescuing girls at a much earlier age than boys became vital to the protection of girls' futures. Managers declared their concern was those "unprotected girls, who need the restraining influences of judicious instruction to counteract the vicious propensities which often form their sole inheritance."[20] Girls represented the threatened group— boys could "take care of themselves," be reformed in the House of Refuge or workhouse, or find useful

employment running errands or selling newspapers in St. Louis. No such options existed for girls from similar backgrounds. At the National Conference of Charities and Corrections in 1878, rescuing girls at a young age was a topic of discussion initiated by Henry W. Lord, Secretary of the Michigan Board of Charities. In his report, Lord acknowledged the importance of a girl's pre-pubescent years arguing that a girl exposed to vice in these years would "in all probability become corrupt." But, "if rescued early from a demoralizing *environment*, and subjected to such sweet influence as prevail in a virtuous family, [she] will with a high degree of certainty grow up religiously and good."[21]

The importance placed on pre-pubescent training was evident in managers' emphasis on their role as "surrogate mother." The mother-daughter relationship represented a vital element in female socialization— the mother taught the daughter practical life skills.[22] In the absence of actual mothers, GIH managers accepted the task of molding these girls into young women, instilling in them the values and necessary skills usually provided by the family. GIH annual reports consistently emphasized both the importance of creating and maintaining a "homelike atmosphere" at the institution and the identification of GIH managers with the role of "mother." To emphasize the importance of family life in the rearing of the girls, GIH managers referred to their institution as a "home"— never an asylum, and rarely as an institution— and often described it as a "family." By acting as surrogate mothers, GIH managers provided the "good influences" that they believed girls needed to protect them from the temptations of vice.[23]

GIH's policy of prohibiting admission to delinquent girls also reflected the need to protect "dependent" girls from negative societal attitudes associated with "delinquent" girls. These attitudes specifically centered on girls because of the "delicate nature" of the female character, and because societal expectations for women placed them in a higher moral category than men.[24] GIH managers recognized this moral emphasis in the annual report in 1869 stating "men, by their nature, are prone to struggle— to fight, if you will allow so strong a term— for *any* cause, or for *no* cause. It is for woman to guide and counteract

this instinct, and, by the gentle amenities of life, to give a right direction to his powerful will."[25] Barbara Berg referred to this concept as the "woman-belle ideal." According to Berg, literature and art in the Antebellum era reinforced the image of woman as weak in mind and body, irrational and passionate, requiring the constant assistance of men, and unable to cope with politics or business. According to the prevailing attitude, along with the valuable reasons of educating children and maintaining a moral haven, women belonged in the domestic sphere for the practical reason of self-preservation.[26]

This attitude received national endorsement from social activists, medical doctors and federal officials. The National American Woman Suffrage Association, in their call for women's suffrage, argued that women would provide a "moral vote" on issues concerning education, social welfare, and child care. Mary Carpenter, a nationally-recognized child welfare reformer from England, maintained that girls needed care more than boys because of the delicate nature of the female mind and heart. A girl's risk for sexual exploitation led Carpenter to ask, "should not especial efforts be made for . . . [her] rescue?"[27] In the nineteenth century, medical doctors proposed that females had a more sensitive nervous system than males, making the female sex "'liable to more frequent and stronger impressions from external agents or mental influences.'"[28] Woodrow Wilson admitted that women deserved the right to vote because of their "noble sacrifices" made during World War I, rather than the recognition of legitimate citizenship. The societal expectation of moral superiority for women worked to define the appropriate and inappropriate roles for women in a moral structure rather than a political or economic one.[29]

To live up to this, women virtually had to live perfect lives. Reputation and character were vitally important to a woman's acceptance or rejection by society. For example, St. Louis city and county courts used reputation as evidence in prostitution cases. Single women living alone could be seen as suspicious, particularly if they lived anywhere near the Red Light District (usually the location of the cheapest housing). Girls arrested for begging or loitering gained a questionable reputation immediately. Vida Hunt Francis,

member of the Board of Managers for the House of Refuge in Philadelphia, noted that "the girl who has been once before the court has already become 'marked'" by the event.[30] All of a sudden, having a questionable reputation became legally dangerous rather than just socially unacceptable. In short, reputation became the key element in deciding what type of life a woman would have.

The environment in which a girl lived represented one of the worst threats to the maintenance of a virtuous reputation. Social reformers described crowded, poor neighborhoods as dens of danger and vice that exposed the innocent to the corrupt. Reverend R. W. Hill, in a report at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections in 1887, stated that "the most powerful incentive to vice" existed in the crowded environment of the city slums where "the vagrant habit, which is such a marked characteristic of many of the dependent children of the cities . . . is directly traceable to the influence of depraved associates."[31] A vivid example of GIH managers' attitudes toward "the influence of depraved associates" came in 1899 when they relocated their institution because the "alleys and by-ways" around their location had become unsafe. In their report, managers remarked that they feared the "baneful influences" of an encroaching city.[32]

GIH managers considered boarding houses and houses of prostitution as two of the worst environments for young girls. In August 1922, a mother petitioned GIH for admission of her daughter when forced to take up residence in a boarding house. The mother complained that her daughter needed "discipline" because the "boarders . . . spoil her, giving her money for picture shows & c.." GIH admitted the girl immediately.[33] Furthermore, numerous single men resided at boarding houses, representing a real threat to the innocence of a young girl. This threat led to the admittance of three young girls after an investigation found "men and girls (half-clothed) dancing" in one of the boarding house rooms where the girls lived. When GIH investigators asked the mother why she would live in such a place, she stated, "the reasonable room rate and the convenient location."

GIH admitted the girls and kept them for the next four and one half years, releasing them only when the mother remarried and moved out of the boarding house.[34]

GIH managers considered a poor home environment dangerous both for physical and moral reasons. One GIH annual report commented on two little girls "whose home presented [such] a scene of wretchedness" description was not necessary. Another report simply referred to one home as a "hovel." Visiting committee reports commented on "passing through an alley of accumulated filth," and visiting a "small and close heated room [that] seemed to have no place for happy childhood." The worst cases often involved some physical danger to the child. For example, one girl found in 1856 was "feeble, emaciated, unwashed, with [her] . . . feet actually frozen to her stockings."[35] Because of the importance of living environments, GIH visiting committee members paid close attention to detail in the homes they investigated. The records consistently reported un-kept houses, untidy rooms, and a lack of necessary furnishings and linens. A visit to a home in 1922 revealed the following filthy living conditions of one applicant: "Her bed did not have a sheet or pillow case on it— she lays on the filthy bare mattress and sleeps on a dirty uncovered pillow with one old dirty-comforter for covering."[36] For GIH managers, improper living conditions provided a suitable reason for removing a girl from the home and admitting her to the institution.

The criteria for approval of permanent homes for girls also reflected GIH managers' desire to safeguard a girl's reputation. Managers maintained a similar view to Charles Loring Brace, founder of the New York Children's Aid Society, who emphasized rural homes over urban ones when placing out children. Like Brace, GIH managers preferred country homes because they represented places "free from vicious associations."[37] Managers also required that the applicant be acquainted with members of GIH. Managers

outlined the importance of selection in their policy on obtaining a child:

> Any person desiring to take a child from the 'Home' for adoption, or to bring up to maturity, must communicate in person, or by writing, with the Superintendent, or some member of the Board, giving a full statement of the circumstances in which the child will be placed, if transferred from the 'Home' to his or her care, what position in the family such child will hold, what labor will be required, what advantages for education will be given, and what will be the religious privileges and training.
>
> These facts must always be accompanied with good and satisfactory recommendations, or the requests can receive no attention from the Committee charged by the Board with the responsibility of selecting homes for the children.

Most indenture contracts maintained clauses guaranteeing the proper care of the child, including appropriate moral and religious training and scholastic training of reading, writing, and arithmetic. They also insured some level of subsistence after the contract ended.[38]

Reputation also played an important role in acquiring employment for young girls, particularly in domestic service. Employers often required references that certified a girl's "good character" before hiring.[39] Procedures by organized charities for indenture also worked to protect a girl's reputation. Organizations rarely indentured a domestic servant to unmarried men, boarding houses, or taverns— environments seen as dangerous for a young girl. Cultural elements reinforced this fear. Literary works of the nineteenth century often told of white working-class girls seduced by middle-class businessmen. These men could be the domestic servant's employer or a boarder where the servant worked.[40] Organizations also hesitated placing children in homes where they would be regarded only as labor rather than members of the family. For GIH managers, industrial skills became a means to an end. Giving a girl skills made her attractive to a potential family, but the intent was "to choose homes where the guiding light of love and mutual labor would open the heart to its true duty"— meaning the permanent adoption of a child, not the indenture of a servant.[41]

Because insuring the self-sufficiency of the girls was one of the goals of GIH, maintaining a quality reputation became essential. Visiting committee reports and

investigations completed by the GIH social worker revealed an emphasis on reputation for both the applicant and parents or guardians. Investigations verified places of employment, marriage licenses, and questioned neighbors and relatives on the character of everyone involved. Negative investigations revealed such "immorality" as mothers who "ran around with men," fathers who were "fugitives of justice," and girls who "run the streets at all hours." Positive assessments lauded parents who were "hardworking," "newly married," and "generally interested in their children." According to nineteenth-century reformers, the latter environments provided a healthy upbringing for children. Many of these reports remarked on the physical environment as well as the moral.[42]

The importance of reputation was reinforced in the way reformers viewed recreational opportunities for young women. New activities made possible by the emergence of amusement parks, theaters, department stores, and the automobile, provided young women with the opportunity to socialize away from the confines of their home and the watchful eyes of chaperones. The "dangers" of these "cheap amusements" prompted nineteenth- and twentieth-century reformers to establish Working Women's Homes providing room and board and "more suitable" after-work activities for working women.[43] In a report given at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections in 1910, Mrs. Joseph T. Bowen, President of the Juvenile Protective Association of Chicago, argued that young working women needed an alternative form of recreation away from the cheap theaters, dance halls, and streets. According to Bowen, not only did these places serve as recruiting posts for bawdy houses, but also provided the means by which men easily seduced young women, pushing them toward their "first downward step." Bowen advocated the establishment of city-run dance halls "where there might be proper chaperonage," and where the girls could participate in "legitimate" amusements.[44]

Recreational activities at GIH exemplified the attempt to provide "legitimate" and fulfilling amusements while protecting the girls from dangerous influences. Annual reports referred to repeated excursions to the Exposition, viewing of the Veiled Prophet, steamboat

rides provided by the Fresh Air Mission of St. Louis, and outings to Forest Park and Shaw's Gardens.[45] Managers always approved and supervised out-of-home activities. In 1886, concerts, oratorios, church festivals, picnics, and lawn parties provided the girls with "as much of an outer life as is advisable for them."[46] In 1890 a special festival on May Day provided an opportunity for the managers and girls to meet with their counterparts from the Methodist Orphans' Home. Forest Park appealed to GIH managers because the location not only provided the girls with good outdoor exercise, but also insured the "watchful attendance of the police."[47] Managers allowed only *chaperoned* socialization with the opposite sex, necessary for the maintenance of the girls' reputations. In 1909 the older girls attended the showing of the Veiled Prophet at the Boys' Methodist Home under the supervision of the managers, and in 1917 the Automobile Club of St. Louis escorted the older girls and a matron to a nearby army camp where the girls "sang patriotic songs."[48]

These "good" recreational activities for young girls provided them with something to occupy their mind. This was part of the increased scientific emphasis on outdoor exercise for children in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. According to reformers, exercise deterred children from the temptations of vice. The Playground Association of America, organized by reformers in 1906, constructed playgrounds in urban areas where children could channel their energy and desires in a supervised setting.[49] Outdoor activity provided children with a healthy balance and reduced the criticism directed at institutions during the Progressive era. Progressive reformers began emphasizing a foster-care program over the institutional home, arguing that institutions resembled asylums not family homes— restrictive, dark, musty, and unsanitary. In an attempt to cast off such an image, GIH annual reports included an emphasis on outdoor activities for girls as well as descriptions of their "sunny dormitories, light and airy school-rooms, and beautiful landscaping."[50]

There are few reports after 1899 that failed to mention recreational activities. In 1906, GIH managers expressed appreciation to two gentlemen for "their generous present

of a playground to the children," and the Treasurer's Report for that year recorded $242 spent on the playground, most likely on equipment.[51] Pictures included in the annual report of 1914 revealed "children at play" in a large recreational area with a slide and numbered blocks. The new home on Enright Avenue appealed to GIH managers in 1899 not only because it provided a more safe location but also because it overlooked Forest Park which provided plenty of "sunshine and fresh air" for the girls.[52] The focus on outdoor exercise also reflected the increasing emphasis on maintaining self-control in children. Giving children a way to channel their energy prevented such immoral behavior as the "secret vice" of masturbation or the temptation of sexual experimentation.[53] Thus, even something as simple as an outdoor playground revealed a broader means to a more significant end.

By focusing on the importance of reputation for young girls, GIH managers exhibited prevailing middle-class attitudes about the futility of reformation for girls exposed to vice. Many reformers proclaimed it near impossible to restore a girl's reputation once tarnished. In contrast, a delinquent boy, who did not suffer the same vilification as a delinquent girl, could usually be reformed in a juvenile home. Vida Hunt Francis, a member of the Board of Managers of the House of Refuge for Girls in Philadelphia, reported at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections in 1903 that a delinquent girl "finds it a thousand times more difficult to straighten herself than the boy, and the delinquent girl must be preserved from the *opportunities* of temptation which are inevitably more fatal to her than to the boy."[54] Charles Loring Brace also believed that redemption remained unlikely for a "fallen" girl. He believed that girls exposed to vice inevitably became prostitutes and succumbed to a life of shame and loneliness. St. Louis Unitarian minister William Greenleaf Eliot admitted a similar danger for girls exposed to poverty. Eliot's fear centered on the inability of a poverty-stricken girl to receive an education and he stated that without an education, girls would become "frivolous, scatter-brained, self-indulgent, given to silly talk and scandal, and of no use to anyone."[55]

The GIH mission of education and training specifically targeted the prevention of girls becoming "of no use to anyone." Giving them industrial skills, a common education, and the emotional support needed in their adolescent years prevented "self-indulgence, frivolousness, scatter-brained characteristics, and vice." By insuring them a good reputation, managers prevented the life of "shame and loneliness." Domestic skills guaranteed them paid employment in something other than prostitution. In 1859, Elizabeth Clarke stressed the qualities of virtue and innocence for the girls at GIH, declaring "earnest and we trust effectual efforts have been made to engraft upon their young minds principles of virtue and integrity, that . . . they may be enabled to walk unscathed amid the fires of temptation that shall kindle about their future pathway."[56]

Because girls' reputations played a vital role in defining their status as "delinquent," girls were usually arrested more often for offenses of immorality than were boys. In 1927, a study by the Child Welfare League of America on the problem of juvenile delinquency in St. Louis revealed that immorality constituted 67 percent of female arrests but less than 1 percent for males. The report noted that even though "boys or men must have been implicated in all of these . . . cases," they were rarely arrested.[57] A report on the Chicago Juvenile Court from 1899-1909 revealed that the majority of girls appeared before the court for "perils besetting their virtue." From July 1, 1899 to June 30, 1909, 80 percent of female arrests in Chicago constituted immoral crimes, compared to only 2 percent of male arrests. The obvious discrepancy in numbers showed that gender constructs played a major role in arrests for offenses of immorality. In contrast to boys, girls' characters seemed to be the defining element in their labeling as "delinquent" or "non-delinquent."[58]

Because women and girls lived under these strict moral constructs, any deviation from societal expectations led to a damaged reputation and public scrutiny that could evolve into a label of delinquency. The St. Louis *Daily Morning Herald* listed various reports confirming the high moral expectations placed on women and girls. Reports in the mid-

nineteenth century told of women and girls caught in male attire which was not only in violation of a city ordinance, but noted as being quite "shocking" for the female sex. Drinking or swearing by women automatically earned them a description of being "un-ladylike" and "un-feminine," making them "specimens of drunken humanity in crinoline," and "representative[s] of the fallen nature of Mother Eve." In contrast, the newspaper did not refer to men arrested for drunkenness as being "un-gentlemen-like." One report even praised the owner of a new distillery for being a "perfect gentleman," yet scolded an intoxicated woman for being of "questionable virtue."[59]

When relating a story of a woman arrested for drunkenness, the *Herald* made a point to clarify that the arrested "Mrs. Cunningham" was not the "celebrated Mrs. Cunningham of Burdell notoriety." An act of adultery showed the distinction of virtue as well. While the *Herald* labeled the victim of the act "a young and confiding virtuous woman," the adulter was "a rough looking foul-mouthed female."[60] In his report at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections in 1878, Henry Lord argued that virtue applied to men and women differently. According to Lord, whereas, "men have been said to have many virtues: a woman that lacks one in particular is not credited with having any." Lord remarked that the following acts contributed to loss of virtue for women: profanity, intoxication in public, larceny, public disturbance, and generally anything that served to make a woman "unchaste." Clearly, reputation was important in social acceptance and in determining a person's status as a potential "delinquent."[61]

The societal expectations aimed at girls in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries found their way into the administration of GIH. Managers showed their prejudice toward delinquency in the 1880 Supplemental Schedule to the Census for Dependent and Defective Children. While other institutions provided a simple "yes or no" to the question of whether any person in the institution had ever been convicted of a crime, GIH managers answered with a lengthy and un-mistakable statement that affirmed their disdain for delinquency: "no arrests have ever been made since this home was incorporated in 1854."

The schedule for GIH also noted that girls rescued came from "poor" surroundings, not "criminal" ones.[62]

This disdain played a role in deciding who would be admitted to the institution. In 1922, the St. Louis Children's Aid Society requested admission to GIH for three sisters who were in "moral danger" due to their mother's "escapades." Managers refused admission to the oldest girl because she had been influenced by her mother who had a "very questionable character and . . . [was] known to have lived immorally." Managers admitted the two younger girls because they had been in foster care, away from the mother's influence. The message was clear— the oldest girl was beyond help, the younger ones were not.[63]

GIH managers also dismissed girls from the institution for illicit or "delinquent" behavior. In 1856, GIH managers sent a fourteen-year-old girl to the St. Louis House of Refuge for profanity. According to managers, the girl's removal prevented her from exerting an unhealthy influence on others at GIH.[64] This incident reveals two things about GIH: one, the fear that bad habits would be transmitted to the girls in the institution far outweighed the abhorrence that GIH managers had for the House of Refuge; and two, GIH managers believed that girls who had bad habits of profanity should be housed with juvenile delinquents.

In 1928 managers requested the re-location of a girl because of her disposition "to attract every man who comes on the premises" and her purposeful discussion of this with the other girls in the institution. In noting the detriment of such actions upon the other girls, managers requested the juvenile court place the girl somewhere else. In 1934 a doctor's investigation revealed one of the girls had "bad sex habits," and a problem of "bed-wetting." With the doctor's recommendation, GIH managers sought placement for the girl in the St. Louis Children's Aid Society because she "was not suited for group life." Clearly these girls exhibited characteristics contrary to the normal expectations for the female sex.[65]

An example of a report found in the GIH case records from 1925 showed that GIH managers did place importance on the subject of a girl's character. Entitled "Character Findings," the report revealed how the virtue of this girl's reputation was important. The categories for rating the girl included the following: affectionate, alert or interested, attentive, attractive, brilliant, calm, courageous, forward, happy-go-lucky, honest, industrious, interested in opposite sex, leader, logical, feminine, modest, neat, obedient, quiet, and social.[66] These categories revealed how much importance GIH managers (and social reformers, in general) placed on the societal expectations of a girl's character. These categories described sexual expectation, physical appearance, and moral development of a young girl, all apparently important in determining the nature of her character.

How Helen Gorse, GIH social worker, judged this particular girl tells us a lot about the importance of certain behavior in defining a girl as "delinquent." Gorse called this girl a "problem child." Her problems included: "enuresis, masturbation, stealing, truancy, scholastic difficulty, nail-biting, appetite disorders, [and] 'spells.'" Her character report noted the girl was "cold, slow, indifferent, repulsive in looks, dull, cowardly, bold [listed as rather sly in getting her way], deceitful, lazy, impulsive, tomboyish, self-centered, slovenly, unmanageable, seclusive, and queer." The report also noted that she "avoids the opposite sex."[67] The importance of character was clearly evident in this report. According to the prevailing attitudes about the nature of "delinquency," many of the "findings" would certainly constitute "problem characteristics" that could lead to potential "delinquent behavior."

The interesting thing about the GIH admission policy is the apparent ambiguity when dealing with questions of immediate physical or moral danger to a young girl. In most of these cases, character seemed unimportant and it is clear that managers did not have a precise definition on what constituted delinquency. For example, in 1927 GIH admitted two young girls after learning of an incestuous relationship in the family. The girls remained in GIH for over a year despite bad character reports calling one girl "untruthful

and deceitful" and claiming she "enjoyed hurting other children, and singing obscene songs." Managers released the girls once their mother re-married. Similarly, GIH admitted a nine-year-old girl in 1920 after suspecting her brother of "immoral relations" with the child. After a brief dismissal, GIH re-admitted her when found "running the streets after school hours." In 1923 GIH admitted a thirteen-year-old orphan who confessed to having sexual relations with a man. The psychiatric report completed at GIH upon admission revealed a "retarded mentality" and "strong sex development." The report recommended admission to "protect" the girl from future problems.[68] According to the prevailing attitudes, each of these cases showed characteristics of "potential delinquency." However, in the interest of "rescuing" a girl from emotional or physical harm, GIH managers approved admission.

The importance of "rescuing" a girl from harmful influences also superseded the negative attitudes about intemperance. In 1858, Elizabeth Clarke revealed that "foremost among the vices that have contributed to bring want and wretchedness to helpless childhood, stands intemperance." Excerpts from visiting committee reports in 1856 cited several examples of intoxicated parents who preferred getting drunk to taking care of their children or finding useful employment. One "wife and mother was in a constant state of inebriation," and in one apartment the managers had to "stumble over *four* persons too drunk to stand." In 1859, GIH managers drew up a temperance pledge "with a view to check . . . the dreadful vice . . . and to induce the children to enter early upon a course of abstinence from intoxicating drinks." The managers carried this pledge to parents as well "and were gratified to have it generally favorably received." Temperance remained an obstacle by 1886 when managers reported "more than two-thirds [of the girls admitted were] due to intemperance."[69]

In removing girls from such environments, managers believed they were protecting the girls from parents who would exploit them for economic gain. According to managers, intemperate parents, who were too irresponsible to earn their own income, forced their

daughters into the streets to beg for money. Managers lamented that failure to produce income brought swift punishment from "their guardians watching conveniently near to receive the results of their efforts."[70] Similarly, the danger presented by such neglect prompted Elbridge T. Gerry, President of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, to declare in 1892 that "children are driven into the streets by the conduct of their parents: particularly, the intoxication of either, surliness of temper and want of appreciation."[71]

Thus, the greed and idleness of the parents played a major role in the call for temperance to protect children. According to GIH managers, intemperance forced these girls into a life of destitution, including begging, peddling, and possibly prostitution. In 1854 the *Missouri Republican* printed a request for the denial of charity to parents or guardians known to force children to beg.[72] GIH managers recognized that while intemperance brought "disgrace and loss of all self-respect to the parents," it also involved "the innocent child in its consequent destitution." So, even though intemperance represented one of the most detestable vices to managers, they welcomed girls from intemperate homes. The justification was they saved them from the repressive actions of intemperate parents.[73]

Case records and visiting committee reports also revealed that the alleged immorality of parents played a major role in the admission of many girls. Managers expressed disgust at parents who "like a pestilence, contaminate the moral atmosphere, by teaching their own offspring the path of vice."[74] A GIH visiting committee report in 1857 commented on one father who trained his daughter in the "profession" of begging, earning her the sobriquet "Queen of the Beggars." In 1869, a father requested the removal of his daughter from GIH after she turned fifteen because he said "she was old enough to see *society*." Not long after her removal, managers reported an alarming change in the girl. Once described as a well-adjusted girl of humble character, she now donned "fashionable

attire" and displayed "dashing manners." Managers lamented that "*society* ere long may add one more to its endless list of victims."[75]

For these reasons, members of visiting committees occasionally attempted to persuade parents or legal guardians to relinquish control of their children because the legal process prevented managers from placing children without parental consent. To managers, it seemed as if the parents were responsible for contributing to the future delinquency of their children. Even then, managers requested the abandonment of parental control only when girls were exposed to a moral or physical danger. GIH managers would argue that their mission focused more on "rescuing" girls from dangerous environments than taking girls away from their parents. Annual reports revealed that managers accepted a girl immediately if she came to GIH, but if an inquiry revealed no moral or physical danger, managers dismissed her promptly. Because investigation played a major role in determining whether or not managers sought parental relinquishment, visiting committee reports and assessments by the social worker provided crucial information. In the reports, mothers usually represented a bigger obstacle than fathers. In 1856, visiting committee members requested that an intoxicated mother "give her children to our care for the present." Members "reminded" the mother of the tender care GIH provided for the children and how the mother's own neglect resulted in sickness for them. The report confessed that a plea of a "mother's love" resulted in no relinquishment.[76]

GIH managers did recognize the paradox that parents or legal guardians played in the admission and dismissal policy of the institution. In many cases, parents were responsible for admitting the girls to the institution. Yet, parental rights remained a legal obstacle in the proper care of girls once admitted.[77] For these reasons, GIH managers sought help from city officials in acquiring more legal control over the girls in their care (even when parents had not relinquished control). When these attempts failed, managers criticized the system that allowed parents to neglect their children yet still maintain control

over them. In 1874, Elizabeth Clarke criticized the "municipal regulations" that were "to blame for this neglect of parental duty."[78]

There is evidence that managers had good reason to criticize St. Louis policy on parental responsibility. In 1855, the mayor of St. Louis, Washington King, coincidentally the husband of a GIH manager, agreed that the city needed some municipal regulation with regard to parental control. However, King's plea represented more the goal of saving the citizens of St. Louis from rowdy children, rather than saving children from the effects of neglect. King applauded regulation "to compel parents and guardians to keep their children from running the streets at all hours of the night, congregating about theaters and other places of amusement, making the night hideous by their yelling and noise."[79] In 1917, the Missouri Children's Code Commission complained that no laws addressing the issue of child neglect existed in the entire state. Numerous examples of children running awry in the city littered the newspapers of the nineteenth century. The St. Louis *Daily Morning Herald* proposed that "parents who allow their children to run around railroad tracks and trains while they are in motion, ought to be punished instead of children." Another child drowned in a washtub after the mother left the child in the care of her oldest son, a boy of only eight. Thus, for GIH managers, much of their work in rescuing young girls from a life of destitution and delinquency began at home with the parents.[80]

The programs implemented by GIH reflected their task of "rescuing" girls from the "bad influences" that could harm their reputations forever. First, success required the permanent isolation of the girl from the dangerous threats of immorality. GIH managers did not allow girls in the institution to visit their parents because the homes were "too often dens of infamy and crime, and subject always to scenes of profanity, intemperance, and ribald songs."[81] According to managers, a visit could expose the girls to vice, corrupt their minds, and ruin their characters. Even a short exposure could damage a girl's reputation and reverse the work GIH managers had accomplished. Thus, they kept girls away from parents, relatives, and friends with "questionable backgrounds." GIH by-laws authorized

supervised visitations one day per month for girls residing in the institution, but did not authorize visits to the home. Managers also thoroughly investigated the homes where they placed girls and kept in contact with the family, reserving the right to remove the child if problems arose.[82]

Second, managers attempted to insure that all girls released went into a safe and moral environment. For this reason, follow-up visits and letters were a consistent practice by the management of GIH. In 1857, Elizabeth Clarke declared that "vagrant and careless habits are not to be overcome without repeated efforts." She admitted that nowhere else "but in books do we meet with instantaneous changes from extremes in vice to models of virtue."[83] Thus, it was a long process. A letter written by the juvenile court in 1925, threatened one mother whose daughters had been released to her on a trial basis from GIH, but were apparently not attending school. The letter warned the mother that her children were "wards of the court, committed to the Girls' Home." The court ordered the mother to put the girls back in school or they would be returned to GIH.[84]

Third, according to managers, all bad influences must be replaced with appropriate ones to insure good character. This policy reinforced the middle-class attitudes of the managers. They sought to "impress upon these little ones the importance of those 'cornerstones of character,' honesty, temperance, order, promptness, usefulness, [and] reverence."[85] All were elements that represented good, middle-class values. The institution provided the girls with a good common education instilling in them intelligence, and marketable industrial skills providing them with the means for self-sufficiency. All of this would enable the girls to "shun vicious companions" and "to do right from choice and not from compulsion."[86] In completing this process, GIH managers believed they did their part in preventing the "dependent" girl from becoming the "delinquent" girl.

While the mission of GIH included "rescuing" girls from bad environments, not all girls admitted to GIH needed protection from bad surroundings or improper influences. Many of them were simply dependent girls in need of shelter. Some of the girls came from

families that had recently experienced death or divorce. Some of the parents requesting admission for their daughters simply needed a place that provided adequate care and education for the girls while the parents stabilized their own lives. This too represented a goal of "saving" girls because, in the managers' eyes, they provided good influences for the girls while the parents recovered. In 1923, a widowed mother requested admission for her daughter. The mother stated that she worked as a maid in a hotel and could not manage work and her daughter. GIH admitted the girl and released her when the mother moved to Chicago. In 1924, GIH admitted two girls whose mother was a widow and worked as a laundress. The report stated that the girls should be admitted temporarily because the burden of providing for the girls was solely on the mother.[87]

In 1923, a widow sought admittance for her twelve-year old daughter because the woman managed a rooming house in a neighborhood unsuitable for children. The mother agreed to pay room and board for the girl in the amount of eight dollars per month. The girl remained at GIH for approximately five years before being released back to her mother. Two widowed fathers in 1924 petitioned GIH for admission of their daughters. One father placed his children with their grandmother after the death of his wife, but sought admission when the grandmother became ill. The father left St. Louis for New York during the Union Painters' strike, leaving the girls at GIH. Once settled, GIH managers sent the girls to New York. The other widowed father worked as a brakeman for the railroad and could not manage his two girls. GIH admitted the girls and released them when the father remarried two years later.[88]

By looking at the admission policy of GIH we can better understand the difficulty faced by reformers who wanted to aid "dependent" girls and rescue them from potential lives of "delinquency." First, reformers had to deal with the ambiguity of what constituted a "dependent" girl versus a "delinquent" one so as to offer the best method of aid— shelter or reformation. In the absence of a precise definition of female "delinquency," reformers turned to issues of character and virtue as a defining element which corresponded with the

high moral expectations for women and girls in society. Anyone deviating from the expected norm was classified as having "delinquent" characteristics and faced the danger of being permanently ruined. Second, the lines of even this vague definition blurred so often that many times "dependent" girls and "delinquent" girls were one in the same. For example, girls who suffered from physical or emotional abuse and were in need of emotional stability, often were mistaken for girls who, because of such abuse, were more to be dreaded than helped. Destitute girls who were begging on the streets often were arrested on vagrancy violations and placed in the houses of refuge for juvenile offenders. By the nature of this "arrest," the girls acquired reputations of "delinquent" behavior.

The overlapping of "dependency" and "delinquency" affected the admission policy of GIH. Four years after the establishment of the institution, managers revealed a sense of pride at being the "means of rescuing unfortunate children from misery and probable ruin." Specific themes dominated GIH records with regards to the objective of rescue. First, the mission reflected the goal of removing girls from bad environments, thus insuring the proper development of character and reputation. Second, it provided proper training to guarantee the girls lucrative employment after leaving the institution. This insured the girl self-sufficiency in a "respectable" profession. Third, managers reinforced the concept of isolating virtuous girls from ruined ones. According to GIH managers, these three objectives worked together to accomplish the larger goal of making these girls self-reliant by insuring them a productive life away from the dangers of vice. In 1874, Elizabeth Clarke celebrated the twenty-first anniversary of the institution by commending the "Christian women willing to spend and be spent for the noble objective of rescuing some little wanderers from sin and sorrow."[89]

Eliminating the temptation of vice in the lives of poverty-stricken girls was the mission of GIH managers. By eliminating the threat of "vice" from the very beginning, managers believed they saved "dependent" girls from becoming "delinquent" ones. Managers singled out certain "warning signs" of potential "delinquency." First, the

existence of intemperate and immoral parents presented an improper influence on young girls. Second, a poor home and neighborhood resulted in physical danger and provided little hindrance to the temptation of vice. Third, a girl's association with "bad influences" threatened her reputation and thus her future. Finally, a girl's inability to attend public school hampered the proper development of vital skills and knowledge crucial to the development of self-reliance. According to GIH managers, the solution was the eradication of the "frequent companion of vice." In 1859, Elizabeth Clarke praised this mission when she suggested that the most successful enterprises in child welfare were "those which contemplate the correction of vice in its incipient stages, schools of reform— where moral and intellectual instruction is blended with the training and discipline of domestic life."[90]

ENDNOTES

[1] The record stated that V.A.'s uncle placed her in the custody of the juvenile court in St. Louis to shield his sister's reputation. V.A.'s father was allegedly a married man from Baltimore, Maryland. V.A.'s mother, her step-father, and the five children resided in Clayton, Missouri.

[2] The letter from GIH to V.A.'s "mother" came after she inquired as to the treatment of V.A. at the institution. Apparently, V.A. had hinted at mistreatment, possibly to get the attention of her "mother." GIH responded by saying that V.A. was not treated differently because of her past, but if she was going to cause trouble, they did not want her at the institution. It appeared to be V.A.'s aunt that supported her emotionally. There are several letters from her aunt that encourage her to stay in school and study. One letter written to GIH asked for V.A. to have lessons to develop a talent in the arts. It is not clear how long V.A. remained at GIH, but in September 1932 she was attending Hadley Vocational School studying business. GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[3] GIH Tenth Annual Report (1863).

[4] Individuals who through no fault of their own became dependent made up the ranks of the worthy poor— widows, deserted parents, disabled and elderly persons, etc. Able-bodied individuals who preferred idleness to industriousness made up the ranks of the unworthy poor— intemperate persons, usually drawn from the newly-arrived immigrant populations, and criminals, for example. Mennel made his point by noting the large number of Irish children in reformatories in the nineteenth century, and the large number of black children in reformatories in the twentieth. Robert M. Mennel, *Thorns and Thistles: Juvenile Delinquents in the United States, 1825-1940* (Hanover, NH: The University Press of New England, 1973), xi-xii.

[5] St. Louis City Ordinance Number 2384, "Vagrants," (March 29, 1850); St. Louis *Daily Morning Herald* reported on this new law, printing the entire text on February 2, 1860.

[6] "An Act to Establish a House of Refuge in St. Louis," February 28, 1855, in *The Ordinances of the City of St. Louis, State of Missouri, Digested and Revised by the City Council of Said City, in the Years 1855-6* (St. Louis: George Knapp and Co., City Printers, 1856).

[7] The act to incorporate the House of Refuge listed the following city officials as "competent proof" — the mayor, the recorder of the city, any two alderman or any two justices of the peace. In 1857, GIH managers referred to their own institution as a "House of Refuge," but remarked crime was not the prerequisite for admission. Almost thirty years later, the managers were still critical of the House of Refuge. In 1885 managers reported they had petitioned the Provident Association, the Carondelet Relief Society, the Chief of Police, and past and present mayors of St. Louis to "give us such innocent children, coming within their control, that are being sent to that strange misnomer, 'The House of Refuge'" The report referred to this atrocity as the "slaughter of our defenceless [sic] innocents." "An Act to Establish a House of Refuge in St. Louis," February 28, 1855, in *The Ordinances of the City of St. Louis, State of Missouri, Digested and Revised*

by the City Council of Said City, in the Years 1855-6 (St. Louis: George Knapp and Co., City Printers, 1856), 176; GIH Third Annual Report (1856); GIH Fourth Annual Report (1857); GIH Thirty-second Annual Report (1885).

[8] Clara Barnard, "The Care of Children," *Journal of the Proceedings of the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions of St. Louis* (St. Louis: Commercial Printing Company, 1892), 92.

[9] Even though vagrancy was technically a juvenile crime according to St. Louis city ordinances, it clearly was contingent more upon the neglected or dependent status of a child than the delinquent status. I also find it interesting that vagrancy was listed as a separate category and not with violations of city ordinances. St. Louis House of Refuge, Records of Admission and Departures (1855-1899), Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[10] Less than one percent of the girls were committed for the following reasons: bad health, unhappy with place, wandering perjury, lazy habits, a bad conduct, instability, runaway, pilfering, in bad company, picking pockets, disturbing the peace, drunk on street, trespassing, and begging. St. Louis House of Refuge, Records of Admission and Departures (1855-1899), Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[11] The juvenile court system provided female matrons and female probation officers to deal with female children. It usually sent the children to a temporary shelter while petitioning local institutions for admittance. Although the juvenile court preferred to utilize city institutions, private institutions— like GIH— received children from the juvenile court as well. If a private institution received a child from the juvenile court, the city of St. Louis paid for the board and care of that child. "An Act to Establish a House of Refuge in St. Louis," February 28, 1855, in *The Ordinances of the City of St. Louis, State of Missouri, Digested and Revised by the City Council of Said City, in the Years 1855-6* (St. Louis: George Knapp and Co., City Printers, 1856), 174; House Bill Number 165 and Senate Bill Number 73 in the Missouri Legislature represented the "Juvenile Court Law" for St. Louis.

[12] St. Louis Provident Association, "St. Louis Directory of Charities and Philanthropies" (1909), Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[13] Vagrancy was a city ordinance in St. Louis, so children committing vagrancy were delinquent. State Board of Charities and Corrections of Missouri, *Ninth Biennial Report* (1913-14), 83. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[14] James Allison, "Juvenile Delinquents: Their Classification, Education, Moral and Industrial Training," in National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 25 (1898), 413.

[15] Edward Crapsey, "The Nether Side of New York; or, the Vice, Crime and Poverty of the Great Metropolis," in Wiley B. Sanders, editor, *Juvenile Offenders For a Thousand Years: Selected Readings From Anglo-Saxon Times to 1900* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1970), 432.

[16] GIH Seventh Annual Report (1860).

[17] Twelve to fourteen were the ages when most girls became domestic servants. GIH rarely indentured girls before the age of twelve because those years represented crucial training years. *Federal Census Records, St. Louis, Missouri*, (1860-1920).

[18] GIH Second Annual Report (1855); GIH Twelfth Annual Report (1864); GIH Nineteenth Annual Report (1872).

[19] *Thoughts About The City of St. Louis, Her Commerce and Manufactures, Railroads, & c.* (St. Louis, MO: Republican Steam Press Print, 1854), 31-32.

[20] GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859), 6.

[21] Henry W. Lord, "Report on Dependent and Delinquent Children, With Special Reference to Girls" National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 5 (1878), 184.

[22] Carroll Smith-Rosenberg and Barbara Berg both emphasis the role of mother as teacher in the home and the importance of developing these early socialization skills. The importance of the mother's role in providing the daughter with crucial socialization skills usually led to criticism of working mothers. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 30-35, 63-67; Barbara Berg, *The Remembered Gate: Origins of American Feminism, The Woman and the City, 1800-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 103.

[23] Elizabeth Clarke reported that the matron "has been watchful and judicious in her management, giving the children all the tender care, if not the love, of a mother." Many memorials to past managers refer to those individuals as "mothers" to the children. GIH Tenth Annual Report (1863).

[24] Republican Motherhood focused on women as educators of young children within the home and the cult of domesticity accompanied the ideology of separate spheres, placing women strictly in the private sphere of the home.

[25] GIH Sixteenth Annual Report (1869).

[26] Berg, *The Remembered Gate*, chapter four.

[27] Mary Carpenter, *Juvenile Delinquents, Their Condition and Treatment* (London: W. and F.G. Cash, 1853), 91.

[28] Carroll Smith-Rosenberg and Charles E. Rosenberg, "The Female Animal: Medical and Biological Views of Woman and Her Role in Nineteenth-Century America," *The Journal of American History* 60 (September 1973), 334.

[29] Jeanne Boydston defined the non-economic nature of women's work according to the new market economy in the Early National era. Jeanne Boydston, *Home and Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

[30] Vida Hunt Francis, "The Delinquent Girl" National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 33 (1906), 141.

[31] Rev. R. W. Hill, D.D., "The Children of 'Shinbone Alley,'" National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 14 (1887), 235.

[32] Interestingly in a 1927 report, the old location of GIH on Morgan Street revealed a high concentration of juvenile delinquency (100+ delinquents per 10,000 people), while

the new location on Enright Avenue had a low concentration (10-30 delinquents per 10,000 people). Apparently, manager's fears were accurate. "Report of a Study of the Nature of the Delinquency Problem in St. Louis, Missouri in 1927," Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[33] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[34] Ibid.

[35] GIH Second Annual Report (1855); GIH Third Annual Report (1856); GIH Fourth Annual Report (1857).

[37] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[37] Charles Loring Brace's New York Children's Aid Society preferred rural to urban environments— represented by the famous orphan trains sending children from New York to areas of the Midwest. GIH Eighth Annual Report (1861), 5.

[38] GIH Twenty-first Annual Report (1874).

[39] In St. Louis as late as the 1890s, the majority (58 percent) of women wage-earners worked as domestic servants. Faye Dudden commented that domestic service work "permitted unskilled women to be continuously self-supporting" thus it became a lucrative employment opportunity for those women unable to gain skills any place other than an institution. Katharine T. Corbett, *In Her Place: A Guide to St. Louis Women's History* (St. Louis, MO: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1999), 124-6; Faye E. Dudden, *Serving Women: Household Service in Nineteenth-Century America* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983), 203.

[40] See Berg, *Remembered Gate*, chapter 4; Mary E. Odem, *Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United Sates, 1885-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 16-17.

[41] GIH Sixteenth Annual Report (1869).

[42] Just because a negative investigation revealed parents and guardians of questionable reputation did not mean managers refused admission of a girl. In many cases, those type of environments forced managers to admit the girl based on their policy of "rescue." Investigations of positive environments reassured managers that admitted girls returned to good environments after dismissed. GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[43] In 1882 in St. Louis, the Women's Christian Association opened a home for working-class girls of "certified virtue." This home provided these women with a decent and affordable place to live (whereas employed women usually paid between three and four dollars for board, domestic servants paid only two dollars per week; unemployed women paid thirty cents per day while looking for work), industrial skills if desired, good meals, and literary activities to keep the women occupied.

[44] Mrs. Joseph T. Bowen, "The Need For Recreation" National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 37 (1910), 102-4. For information on how reformers perceived the danger to young working women, see the following: Joanne J. Meyerowitz, *Women Adrift: Independent Wage Earners in Chicago, 1880-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Kathy Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986).

[45] The Veiled Prophet began in St. Louis in 1878. It was an annual event, held in October, modeled on the tradition of Mardi Gras. The biggest event was the Queen of Love and Beauty pageant at the Veiled Prophet Ball. Girls from GIH usually received tickets to attend the pageant and ball.

[46] In 1910, Abby Todd stated that "play is considered necessary for the complete education of the children and is given our hearty support." GIH Fifty-seventh Annual Report (1910); GIH Thirty-third Annual Report (1886), 7.

[47] GIH Forty-fourth Annual Report (1897), 11.

[48] GIH Sixty-fourth Annual Report (1917), 13.

[49] The Playground Association of America began as a Progressive organization to offer children quality recreational facilities.

[50] Michael B. Katz, *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse: A Social Welfare History of Welfare in America* (New York: BasicBooks, Harper-Collins Publishers, 1986; reprint, New York: BasicBooks, 1996), chapter 5; GIH Annual Reports (1899-1918).

[51] The two gentlemen were Samuel Cupples and W.K. Bixby two long-time supporters of GIH. The letter thanked Mr. Bixby for his donation of playground equipment, including see-saws and a swing. GIH Fifty-third Annual Report (1906), 10; Letter to W. K. Bixby from Mrs. Charles Hale Scaritt, July 19, 1925, Bixby Collection, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[52] GIH Sixty-second Annual Report (1914); GIH Forty-seventh Annual Report (1899).

[53] See Michael Kimmel, *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (New York: The Free Press, 1996), chapter two.

[54] Vida Hunt Francis, "The Delinquent Girl," National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 33 (1906), 140.

[55] Calasha Gish, "The Petit Proletariat: Youth, Class, and Reform, 1853-1890," Ph.D diss. (New York University, 1994), 76; William Greenleaf Eliot, "Mothers and Daughters," February 12, 1871, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[56] GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859).

[57] Sixty-two percent of the girls brought before the St. Louis Juvenile Court in 1927 committed "immoral" crimes. Child Welfare League of America, "Report of a Study of the Nature of the Delinquency Problem in St. Louis, Missouri" (1928), 9, Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of

Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri; Child Welfare League of America, "The Juvenile Court of St. Louis, With Special Reference to the Volume of Work Assigned to the Probation Staff and the Handling of Neglect Cases, 1927" (1927), 26, Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[58] The specific numbers for male and female arrests for immorality are as follows: 113 of 169 girls arrested for reasons of immorality, and 5 of 477 boys arrested for reasons of immorality. Sophonisba P. Breckinridge and Edith Abbott, *The Delinquent Child and the Home* (New York: Arno Press, 1970), 17, 37-8.

[59] St. Louis *Daily Morning Herald*, September 3, 1857, October 23 1857, November 3, 1857, February 23, 1858, February 27, 1858, April 18, 1858, October 16, 1858, March 10, 1859, May 25, 1859.

[60] Ibid., September 3, 1857, October 23 1857, November 3, 1857, February 23, 1858, February 27, 1858, April 18, 1858, October 16, 1858, March 10, 1859, May 25, 1859.

[61] Lord, "Report on Dependent and Delinquent Children," 182.

[62] *Federal Census Records, St. Louis, Missouri, Supplemental Schedule For Dependent and Defective Children* (1880).

[63] Unfortunately, there were no ages listed for the girls in the report. The two youngest girls had been in foster care for the past two years. The report noted that the mother was known to live in the company of prostitutes. GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[64] GIH Third Annual Report (1856).

[65] In all likelihood, the "bad sex habits" were masturbation or homosexuality. GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[66] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ibid.

[69] GIH Fifth Annual Report (1858); GIH Third Annual Report (1856); GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859); GIH Thirty-third Annual Report (1886).

[70] GIH Fiftieth Annual Report (1903).

[71] This report originally printed in *The Independent* March 3, 1892. Elbridge T. Gerry, "Cause of Juvenile Delinquency," in Wiley B. Sanders, editor, *Juvenile Offenders For a Thousand Years: Selected Readings From Anglo-Saxon Times to 1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1970), 437.

[72] St. Louis *Missouri Republican*, February 15, 1854.

[72] GIH Twenty-fourth Annual Report (1877).

[73] GIH Fifth Annual Report (1858).

[74] Italics are original. Society in this case probably refers to prostitution. GIH Fourth Annual Report (1857); GIH Sixteenth Annual Report (1869).

[76] GIH Fourth Annual Report (1857).

[76] Based on the fifty-four cases found at the Edgewood Children's Center, parents sought admission in twenty, the juvenile court in six, and other charitable institutions in eleven. Twenty did not specifically record who petitioned on behalf of the girl. GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[78] GIH Twenty-first Annual Report (1874).

[78] This statement by Mayor King referred to the creation of the St. Louis House of Refuge— the purpose being to rid the streets of these rowdy children. *Mayor's Messages*, October 8, 1855, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[80] The *Herald* printed the "request" after reporting that two boys injured their feet and legs when they were run over by a train. Missouri Children's Code Commission. *Report of the Children's Code Commission.* (1917), 42, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; St. Louis *Daily Morning Herald* May 11, 1858.

[81] GIH Seventh Annual Report (1860).

[82] GIH Annual Reports; GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[83] GIH Fourth Annual Report (1857).

[84] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[85] GIH Thirty-fifth Annual Report (1888).

[86] GIH Eighteenth Annual Report (1871).

[87] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[88] Ibid.

[89] GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859); GIH Twenty-first Annual Report (1874).

[90] GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859), 5.

CHAPTER SIX

"'Uniting us more closely to our suffering and less fortunate sisters'": The Girls' Industrial Home and School and the Experience with Class and Child Neglect

"The programs offered through philanthropies such as orphanages, homes for children, and Catholic charity associations were a way to shore up what was perceived as the irresponsibility of the urban poor and/or immigrant families."
— Barbara M. Brenzel, *Daughters of the State: A Social Portrait of the First Reform School for Girls in North America, 1856-1905* (1983)

"One of Brace's most-enduring and most-problematic legacies to modern social services is that he made it acceptable policy to intervene in the lives of the poor on the grounds of protecting their children."
— Clay Gish. "Rescuing the 'Waifs and Strays' of the City: The Western Emigration Program of the Children's Aid Society" (1999)

In 1843, the New York Association for Improving the Conditions of the Poor (A.I.C.P.) stated that its goal was "'not merely to alleviate wretchedness, but to reform character, and as far as possible to exterminate from among us, the very germs of professional pauperism.'" This statement represents the most prevalent nineteenth-century attitude about the poor; it blamed poverty on individual moral flaws. In an era of optimism following the American Revolution, people began to question the very existence of poverty. In a nation with so much abundance and opportunity, poverty seemed to be a result of individual failure. This argument reflected the laissez-faire, individualistic attitude that accompanied the new industrialized world. The institution-building movement in the nineteenth century was representative of this attitude. Institutions provided a catch-all place to put the poor, a place where reformers could teach the poor industry, temperance, and religion. These three characteristics would override the individual flaws that led to pauperization and turn the poor into self-supporting and Christian citizens. This attitude also came from the Second Great Awakening and the idea of equal opportunity for all.[1]

According to reformers, poor relief contributed to pauperization by encouraging the vices of idleness, intemperance, and ignorance. Providing indiscriminate poor relief decreased wages and drove down the standard of living for everyone by taxing hard-working people while doing nothing to alleviate the problem. Beginning in the 1880s, the concept of social Darwinism reinforced the idea that the poor lived in poverty because of individual moral failure or lack of talent. In short, it was their fault. According to the concept, introduced in the United States by English sociologist Herbert Spencer, and reinforced by the teachings of Johns Hopkins economics professor William Graham Sumner, offering public relief upset the natural balance that depended on the "survival of the fittest." Poverty was inevitable and thus poor relief was a necessary obligation of the wealthier class.[2]

In the nineteenth century, some reformers, by virtue of their personal experience with the poor, began to question the individualistic argument. These reformers claimed that environmental factors, beyond the control of the individual, were the main causes of poverty. This view pointed out that financial depressions resulted in involuntary unemployment, periods of sickness or death deprived a family of its primary breadwinner, and societal prejudice limited individual achievement. The realization that environmental factors were a genuine cause of poverty prompted reformers to try and improve the system of public and private relief by organizing charitable aid under new methods based on scientific and rational means. Reformers also began participating in programs to improve housing reform, sanitation, and health care, and advocated the creation of juvenile courts and mothers' pensions. In addition, educated social workers assessed individual cases to determine the validity and extent of need. The ultimate goal of this relief was to help the individual attain, or return to, self-sufficiency. The solution to the problem was the systematization of charitable relief that could be distributed to those most in need during periods of crisis and "hard times."[3]

There were also reformers who began to question the very nature of poverty itself, criticizing a system that would allow the existence of such deprivation under any circumstances. They argued that the transition from craft production to mechanized industry in the years following the War of 1812 dehumanized and deskilled individuals. Likewise, the system turned workers into "wage slaves" and created a distinct lower class. Some reformers also expressed a growing fear that the system was widening the gap between classes, resulting in the growing animosity in society between rich and poor. Many of these reformers saw a fundamental problem in capitalism. Based on this assessment, a change in the system was necessary to alleviate poverty. Labor activists called for new laws that guaranteed a minimum wage, an eight-hour workday, and prohibited convict and child labor, thus protecting workers from economic exploitation and physical danger. Social reformers advocated increased government participation in creating a social welfare state that would ease the suffering caused by poverty. Even more radical reformers in the early twentieth century sought an entire overthrow of the system in favor of a more socialist policy that would eliminate the existence of poverty altogether.[4]

In the mid-nineteenth century, the prevailing attitude toward the poor was the individualistic argument that linked poverty, class, and ethnicity. Many of the poor, including wage laborers and newly-arrived immigrants, consolidated in the urban areas where they often lived in poverty-stricken neighborhoods out of direct contact with members of the middle and upper class. Historian Paul Boyer has suggested that this physical separation of rich and poor resulted in the labeling of the urban masses as "vicious," "immoral," and "dangerous." Boyer argued that the stereotypes reflected the "extent to which firsthand knowledge of actual human beings was being replaced by abstractions." The areas inhabited by the lower class were described as places where crime, corruption, and social disorder bred. The growing fear of the masses necessitated policies to control the disorder and protect mainstream society. For the most part, these attitudes remained constant until the increasing knowledge acquired from experience changed them.

This transformation came through personal contact between the middle-class reformers and the poor members of the lower class.[5]

Prevailing attitudes among reformers, although not for the middle- and upper-classes themselves, began to change through a process known as "friendly visitations." When social and benevolent reformers ventured into the living environments of the poor, it began to bridge the gap between the classes. Once these divisions had been breached, the poor were increasingly seen as human beings with real problems, rather than individuals with moral flaws. Reformers with this empathy believed that environmental factors caused poverty. The original purpose of "friendly visitation" was twofold: one, to assess the validity and extent of individual need to prevent the problem of indiscriminate poor relief; and, two, to uplift the poor by the example and teaching of the middle-class women and men who were the visitors. However, in the process of visitations, new class attitudes began to form. The ultimate example of the attempt to bridge the class gap came in the late nineteenth century when Jane Addams established the first settlement house in Chicago. The settlement house movement sought to accomplish the task of bringing the middle and lower classes together so that each could "know" how the other half lived.[6]

It was not until reformers began entering the lives of the poor that changes in reformers' views of poverty were made. "Friendly visitations" and casework investigations into the "depths of poverty" created a new type of knowledge that disrupted the old class paradigms based on bias and stereotypical attitudes. During these visits, reformers personally witnessed poverty and heard stories about unemployment, sickness, and death. In 1890, Jacob Riis published his photographic history *How the Other Half Lives* chronicling the wretched conditions of the tenement structures in New York City's East Side. His pictures not only brought attention to the poor living conditions, but also to the greedy landlords and indifferent city officials who allowed such conditions to exist. Amos Warner, former general agent of the Baltimore Charity Organization Society, published his seminal work *American Charities* in 1894 emphasizing the importance of

environmental factors as a cause of poverty. Warner concluded that poverty resulted more from physical disabilities of individuals than from moral ones. The end of the nineteenth century also witnessed the establishment of sociology as a discipline and the beginning of social work as a profession, highlighting the need for investigation and scientific study into the alleviation of poverty.[7]

Historian Robert Bremner argues that the changing economic and social structure of the United States between the mid-nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth century necessitated a change in attitude. He maintains that by the 1920s "the industrial causes of misery were recognized as more important than the moral; and social rather than individual reform was being urged as the appropriate remedy for want." The result was new attention to the "condition of labor and the standard of living of the population as a whole." The personal experience of entering the lives of the poor had much to do with this changing attitude. It gave reformers a glimpse at reality, and thus began to tear down some of the barriers of class biases.[8]

Like other nineteenth- and twentieth-century reformers, personal interaction with the poor affected Girls' Industrial Home and School (GIH) managers' attitudes. For the most part, managers did not break down class boundaries, but they did blur the lines a little. It is clear from annual reports and case records that managers applied middle-class biases to some individuals; however, managers also appeared to judge individuals on a case-by-case basis, using personal experience and investigation to determine the cause and extent of poverty. Some individuals, usually intemperate ones, were to blame for their lives of destitution; others were simply victims of environmental circumstances beyond their control, such as unemployment, death, sickness, and occasionally, the greed of government legislators.

These judgments were primarily directed at the parents of the girls residing at the institution. Throughout its history, GIH managers criticized parents who showed no willingness to improve their lives and the lives of their children. In contrast, managers

praised those who put full effort into overcoming the ills of poverty. As far as the girls themselves, managers believed in the inherent innocence of a child and until that innocence was in some way invalidated.[9] In short, managers, as early as the mid-nineteenth century, began assessing members of the poor based on their individual merit rather than pre-determined class prejudices. These assessments would not have been possible without the practice of visiting the homes of the poor or interacting on a daily basis with the girls cared for in the institution.

GIH managers' purpose for establishing the institution was to help young girls overcome the environmental and social deficiencies of poverty. The method was to teach them skills, specifically domestic, to insure that the girls leaving the institution would be self-sufficient. In this respect, managers reinforced the middle-class values of industry and self-reliance. Many historians of social reform in the nineteenth century argue that institutions such as GIH masked efforts at social and moral control of the poor by setting up programs to teach industrial and domestic skills that would relegate the lower classes to nothing better than the lowest-paying, lowest-skilled wage labor positions. Historians have also recognized that some reformers engaged in social control *unconsciously*, molding the poor, usually immigrant inmates in the image of good middle-class citizens. By doing so, the middle-class reformers not only maintained bourgeois power, but also removed a radical edge from the lower class by allowing some to escape poverty.[10] While the program at GIH emphasized training in domestic skills for self-sufficiency, and reinforced prevailing middle-class values, the institution showed no signs of conscious social control.

As early as 1856, GIH managers visited the homes of the poor in St. Louis. As one annual report described it: these women "laid aside the fastidiousness of drawing-room refinement . . . [and] fearlessly entered the abodes of squalid poverty."[11] By the mid-nineteenth century, St. Louis already represented a growing metropolis with a diversified population rivaling that of Boston, New York, and Chicago. Recently-arrived

German and Irish immigrants, largely farmers and artisans, settled in St. Louis, becoming part of the urban poor.[12] In 1859, Rebecca Hazard, interim secretary of GIH, described St. Louis as a "moral cess-pool," where the "masses congregated" and crime and corruption bred. She compared parts of the city to Five Points, the notorious slum in New York City, adding that in these areas "dwelt a population requiring the active exertion and sympathy of all who were disposed to aid them." The women who founded GIH were especially appalled by the large number of children seen begging on the streets.[13]

GIH managers used investigation by the visiting committee and later a paid social worker to determine the validity and extent of need. GIH by-laws stated a twofold purpose for the visiting committee. First, it was to visit the homes of girls attending the day school on a regular basis. Usually, if a girl was frequently absent from school, managers investigated the reason. Second, it was to investigate and decide whether children making application were suitable for admission to the home and school. This reflected the desire to admit only girls who were dependent and avoid admitting girls who were delinquent. The Second Annual Report indicated an additional benefit from visitations as "affording an occasional opportunity to speak a word" to the parents. This was important because there was restricted parental contact during the early years of operation.[14] After 1922, the on-staff social worker investigated girls, their families, and associates. GIH managers and social workers recorded their experiences in visiting committee reports and case records.[15]

Evidence from these reports and records showed that personal experience affected the GIH managers' attitudes about the poor and at times, overcame prevailing class stereotypes. For example, managers distinguished between those parents who were victims of environmental circumstances and those who were willfully idle and intemperate. In 1858, members of the visiting committee reported that a "sister-like" bond had formed

between the visitors and the wives and mothers encountered on visitations:

> The first impression on entering many of their abodes is unpleasant; the sight of so much squalid poverty is repulsive, but after seeing the care-worn face of the wife and mother, and listening to the tale of sorrow and misfortune unfolded by each, compassion takes the place of disgust, and we feel an added link to the great chain of human sympathy; uniting us more closely to our suffering and less fortunate sisters.[16]

The report listed such factors as sickness, death, accident, family size, and lack of jobs as causes of the family's condition, but also stated that "the greater part have the oft repeated story of an intemperate husband or son, and with many it is feared the misfortune extends to themselves."[17]

In 1867, Elizabeth Clarke began her annual report with an appeal to the public. As if confessing that her own attitudes had changed through personal experience, Clarke assured her audience that their attitudes "would assume a very different aspect" if they found themselves "homeless . . . with no friendly door as a shield from the chill damp of night." She pointed out that poverty was not always the "result of indolence or vice," asserting that "the poor and suffering have a certain right to relief from those who are able to help them." The result of such a change in attitude would be a humanitarian urge to aid "those who are fast sinking into hopeless despondency."[18] This was reflective of the prevailing middle-class, Protestant humanitarianism.

Through personal experience, GIH managers recognized that some parents were simply down on their luck or driven to neglect by factors such as disease, death, or problems caused by industrialization. In 1856, when the visiting committee went to the home of four children who came to GIH, members discovered a father with inflammatory rheumatism and a mother "sick with chills." According to the managers, from the moment these parents received the "voice of sympathy and the hand of relief" from visiting committee members, their situation began to change. The care provided to the children while at GIH gave the mother "some relaxation of frame and mind." In addition, the visiting committee convinced the father to sell a financial interest in a tenement structure,

giving the family some economic stability.[19] In 1885, Clara Barnard reported the closing of various factories in St. Louis. She wrote that in response, "the hospitalities of this Home were offered the children of such parents, as were for the time being deprived of their means of subsistence."[20] GIH case records reported numerous examples of widowed and deserted parents (both mothers and fathers) utilizing the institution as a temporary boarding house for their children. The children remained at GIH while parents searched for work or until they re-established financial stability.[21]

GIH managers looked favorably upon parents who showed a willingness to rescue their children from harm because that effort was comparable to GIH's policy of rescue. In 1856, Elizabeth Clarke recounted a visitation that took managers into the home of an absent student. Managers discovered the student sick and nearly frozen, with the mother "too dead with liquor to know what was passing." This negative view of the mother changed though after she became "so well convinced of our favorable intentions" that she relinquished parental control of not only the absent scholar, but her younger child as well.[22] In this case, the mother had two strikes against her from the beginning. First, she had placed her children in physical danger because of the poor living conditions; and second, she had placed them in moral danger because of her intemperate habits. The only way to receive favorable reviews from managers was to give up her children into the care of the institution indefinitely or until the mother recovered and stabilized her own life. In 1927, the GIH social worker commended a woman for leaving her husband following the discovery of incestuous acts with the oldest child. The report stated that the mother moved her three children to St. Louis from Kentucky after learning that the oldest daughter was pregnant as a result of the incestuous relationship with her father. The mother worked as a laundress to support her family, and "*never* neglected her children." Several St. Louis organizations were involved in this case— GIH, the Provident Association, the Caroline Mission, and the Girls' Protective Association— indicating the importance of the issue. The two younger girls resided at GIH from 1927 to 1932 when they were released to their

mother after she remarried. The girls did not receive favorable reviews while at the institution. Reports stated that one girl "enjoys hurting other children, and singing obscene songs"; and both girls were "saucy with little community spirit." Yet, they remained at GIH for approximately five years. The gravity of their situation had an impact on managers' decision to allow the girls to remain.[23]

Annual reports also favorably recorded instances of parents who showed an active interest in the improvement of their children's lives. In 1855, Charlotte Gough reported that the home of two Irish girls showed "an encouraging hope of improvement beyond the limits of the school." Before the evident changes witnessed by the visiting committee, the home had been a "scene of wretchedness." The 1864 annual report praised mothers who left their children at the day school while seeking "lucrative employment, which they would be otherwise . . . compelled to decline." In 1877, Elizabeth Clarke recognized that many "a hard working mother . . . spares part of her earnings to keep her child in the bounds of home influence."[24]

Managers also displayed empathy for parents too ill to care for their children. The 1879 annual report recounted the story of a widowed mother, in failing health, "who had vainly striven to keep the wolf of poverty from her door." Managers removed the mother to the institution, along with her three daughters. The mother died at the institution, surrounded by her daughters, "cheered by knowing that those so dear would be safely cared for." GIH received donations for a proper funeral and retained the girls in the institution after their mother's death.[25] In 1921, case records reported the admission of a fourteen-year-old girl whose widowed father was in an insane asylum. The Board of Religious Organizations sought admission for the girl. In 1925, she went to work as a mother's helper in Webster Groves, Missouri, receiving fifteen dollars per month. Managers officially closed the case in March 1926, stating that the girl simply "went to work." Throughout the girl's five year stay at GIH, managers commended the father for his active participation in the decisions for his daughter.[26]

In one of the most interesting cases, GIH managers needed only a loving reaction from the children to form an opinion of the mother. In 1860, Elizabeth Clarke recounted the story of a mother "entrapped into passing a single counterfeit dollar." Authorities arrested the woman and she served her sentence in the county jail and the state penitentiary. Clarke reported that GIH managers doubted the truth of the woman's story when she arrived at GIH to reclaim her children. Describing the woman as "haggard and weary" and beset with "wretchedness" and "abject poverty," managers permitted her access to look for her children. Once the children recognized their mother, they "sprang into her arms." Upon witnessing such a sight, Clarke declared, "our own tears bore witness to the feeling which the scene called forth." She then gladly reported that "mother and children are now far away in a distant state, never again we trust to experience the tender mercies of a county jail."[27] In this case, managers formed their opinion based solely on witnessing the favorable reaction the mother received from her children.

On the surface, these examples exemplify parents who neglected their children, exposed them to physical and moral danger, and exhibited negative characteristics that many nineteenth-century reformers associated with the actions of the lower class. Yet, GIH managers gave these parents the benefit of the doubt. Why then would some parents escape reproach by GIH managers, while others bore extreme criticism? The answer lies in the personal experience of visitation and investigation. Visiting the homes of the poor and encountering the parents gave GIH managers the opportunity to investigate the physical environment of inmates, giving managers evidence to establish their own attitudes about the poor. In 1867, Elizabeth Clarke expressed this view claiming that "the innocent are involved in the destruction of the guilty, as the brand of the incendiary not only destroys the noble building, but the pictures which adorn its walls."[28]

Reports and case records consistently showed that visitors paid special attention to what they saw. Visiting committee members reported that homes had unbearable odors and "dirty living conditions." Other homes were "neat and tidy." In some instances, reports

provided descriptions of rooms and furnishings. Reports also noted the physical appearance of parents: one was a "small and nice motherly looking woman"; another did not look her age of thirty-seven; and one "nice looking man" looked more German than Italian. A report of one mother visiting the superintendent of GIH in 1929, remarked that the "entire time . . . [the woman] was in the office she was tapping her foot, or moving uneasily in her chair." Although the woman supported herself only by taking in washing, she "was quite well dressed," leading to the supposition that "all was not right." These reports show that GIH managers paid close attention to detail, and placed much importance on physical descriptions of the places they visited and the people they encountered.[29]

The one situation when managers rarely gave parents a positive assessment was in the case of intemperance. Like other nineteenth-century reformers, GIH managers associated drunkenness with poverty and attributed intemperate habits to individual flaws.[30] The majority of the time, when addressing the issue of intemperate parents, GIH managers blamed child neglect on drunkenness. In 1858, Elizabeth Clarke stated that for most of the children, "whisky is a substitute for every necessary of life." That same year, a visiting committee report asserted that institutions such as GIH were "constantly called upon to feed, and clothe, and shelter, and comfort, those who have been deprived of natural protectors by this detestable vice [intemperance]."[31] From personally witnessing intemperance (and more likely, the negative effect it had on children), managers determined that drunken parents were the worst because they spent their money on liquor rather than food, left the children virtual orphans while recovering from a drunken stupor, allowed the children to associate with potentially-delinquent companions, and forced their children to beg for daily sustenance. The annual report of 1869 talked of children who knew "no culture but what is found in a dramshop" and who were "scourged by inebriate parents for not stealing."[32]

Yet, despite their general abhorrence for the vice, GIH managers also recognized a connection between poverty and intemperance. Despite their criticism of drunkenness,

GIH managers acknowledged that intemperate habits were not always caused by individual failure. Rather, intemperance could be an effect of poverty. In 1856, Elizabeth Clarke described one father as a "commentary on the dreadful effects of intemperance," because prior to his unfortunate run-in with liquor he had been a "respectable member of society." GIH managers also blamed city officials and "society" in general for their part in encouraging intemperance. In 1867, Clarke criticized those who greedily licensed saloons and liquor shops allowing these dens of vice "to plunder the last dollar [and] take the last loaf from the tottering father."[33]

What was important about GIH was how the managers reacted to witnessing the depths of poverty in the homes of children cared for in the institution. Seeing parents who were sick, uneducated, unemployed, neglectful, drunk, and abusive had an impact on the way managers perceived poverty. Managers saw beyond the trappings of poverty and dispelled the prevailing attitude that they were poor because of individual failure. In rare cases when managers offered aid (often in the form of advice), it was always to those who exhibited a willingness to help their children. In 1892, Clara Barnard made a statement that indicated an awareness that poverty was linked with an *inability* to provide, rather than an *unwillingness* to provide. Barnard appealed to the public for increased donations so that managers could re-locate their institution away from the increasing encroachment of the city. In the plea, Barnard lamented "there can be no more touching exhibition of our poverty than is displayed by our remaining here— simply from the inability to provide a better [home]." In this case, the poverty of the institution itself was the key element in delaying the move to a safer and better location. It is interesting that Barnard chose to link the words "poverty" and "inability."[34]

Although GIH managers based their opinions about the lower-class parents on experience and investigation, attitudes toward the children were, for the most part, unbiased. The sight of destitute and neglected children tended to invoke empathy from all social reformers. GIH managers were no different. Social reformer Robert Hunter argued

that poverty was a "monstrous and unnatural" thing for children because it denied them the growth and development necessary to secure a future livelihood. The GIH Second Annual Report made clear the importance of protecting children from the evil effects of poverty, indicating not only sympathy for the plight of the child, but also the impressionability of a young mind:

> It is true, the natural tendency of the heart being evil, that children yield more readily to corrupt than to good example, but perhaps the very undisguised exhibitions of depravity which the children of misfortune are doomed to witness, and the development of mind consequent upon the hard life of poverty and vice, prepare them better, in some instances, for the favorable reception of good influences than if they knew wickedness only in its less hideous forms, and had never *experienced* that 'the way of the transgressor is hard.'[35]

There were few set rules and regulations regarding the care of neglected, destitute, and delinquent children before the introduction of juvenile courts and regulated social welfare work in the late nineteenth century. Most wayward children received care in nineteenth-century private and public institutions such as orphanages, reform schools, and houses of refuge. Among the philanthropists and reformers managing these institutions, few universal ideas of child welfare existed.[36]

The prevailing attitude about child welfare in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was class biased. It maintained that children of the poor were more likely than children of the middle and upper class to become delinquent.[37] English reformer Mary Carpenter, famous for introducing the "ragged schools" for dependent children in England, argued in the mid-nineteenth century that "the great mass of juvenile delinquency is to be attributed to the low moral condition of the parents, and to their culpable neglect of the early training of their children." Social workers Sophonisba P. Breckinridge and Edith Abbott, in their study of the Chicago Juvenile Court from 1899 to 1909, also found direct links between poverty and juvenile delinquency. In 1915, the Missouri State Board of Charities and Corrections warned that failure to recognize social responsibility for a *neglected* child would result in a later recognition of that child as a *delinquent*.[38] Elizabeth Clarke

acknowledged this attitude in 1869 when she wrote, "the only wonder . . . [was] that among the very poor either boy or girl ever graduate[d] at any school but the House of Refuge or State Prison."[39]

For many reformers, poverty and lower-class status equaled an immediate danger to children, thus justifying the removal of children from poor living environments and the institutionalization of them in places where they would be protected. According to a report given at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections in 1887, children likely to become delinquent usually came from "poverty-stricken" homes with intemperate or idle parents; they repeatedly associated with persons of "questionable character and virtue," and often lived in close proximity to vicious characters in over-crowded urban neighborhoods. They also often failed to receive proper educational training because of financial or social obstacles. The children represented in the category of "likely delinquents," according to these characteristics, came from the lower class.[40]

GIH managers accepted the general theory that linked poverty with juvenile delinquency, believing that poor living conditions and parental influence played a large role in determining the outcome of a child's life.[41] In 1894, Clara Barnard asked "'what shall we do with the children— those whom vice, crime or confirmed intemperance has deprived of true parental care?'" She answered: "Social responsibility demands the legal protection of these from cruelty and willful neglect, and the compulsory use of the first twelve years of a child's life for moral and educational purposes alone." Barnard, quoting social reformer Francis E. Abbott, insisted that each child was "born with the right of being taught '*how* to live.'"[42] Accordingly, it was a social responsibility of those of higher status to protect a child from the danger of vice and essentially to instill in them the middle-class values of industry and self-reliance. In the absence of "appropriate" parental care and influence, social reformers became "surrogate parents" and took on the task of preparing a child for everyday life.

GIH managers acknowledged the basic goodness of children and believed that given the opportunity to learn, the children of the poor had just as much chance of success as the children of the privileged. Visiting committee reports boasted of students who performed "amazingly well," referring to them as "constantly improving pupils," despite having lived in "squalid conditions." Reports recounted success stories of girls who "married well" or obtained good employment and thus became self-supporting. Other girls left GIH to study nursing or attend business school, skilled professions considered to be above domestic service positions. Once GIH managers began sending the girls to public school, reports of their progress were always favorable.[43] Annual reports mentioned girls who returned to the institution when getting married, and those who brought their own children back to visit (managers considered themselves "grandmothers" to these children). The teacher hired for the summer classes at GIH in 1906 was a former student, herself studying teaching at the Normal School.[44]

The attitude that every child could succeed given the right environment was important because managers blurred the middle-class bias against members of the lower class. In 1892, while speaking at the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions in St. Louis, Clara Barnard expressed a goal of insuring that no child grew up in "ignorance or vice." Barnard remarked: "what more can society do for the child than make him [or her], and what greater wrong can society do for the child than to leave him [or her] half made?"[45] While this statement reflected a humanitarian ideal toward all children, it also suggested that in many cases, the "appropriate" environment in which a child could grow was best provided by GIH rather than the child's own home. Within the institutional setting, managers could provide not only a "homelike atmosphere" but also invaluable educational opportunities and skills that would enable the child to emerge from adolescence and young adulthood into the realm of self-reliance and self-sufficiency.

The acquisition of knowledge acquired from personal experience extended beyond class, also encompassing attitudes toward different ethnicities. During the early years of

operation, the majority of the girls residing at the institution were foreign born (see Table 10). Most of the girls came from the western European countries of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Germany. Others were Canadian, Prussian, Swedish, French, Spanish, and Swiss. By 1920, there was more of an eastern European influence, with a few girls from Italy and Bohemia. Several of the staff members, including the matron and servants, were also foreign born.[46] The interaction of these different groups must have had an impact on how people perceived each other.

Table 10: Ethnicity of women and girls residing at GIH, 1860-1920

Year	America	Ireland	Germany	Scotland	Other*	unknown	Total
1860	7	6	2	4	1	3	**23**
1870**	60	0	3	1	3	1	**68**
1880	43	20	9	0	10	2	**84**
1900	33	9	16	1	4	0	**63**
1910	83	0	1	0	0	0	**84**
1920	48	0	2	0	3	0	**53**

*Canada, England, France, Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, Italy, Bohemia
**The 1870 census does not list the nationalities of parents. Thirty-one of the residents had foreign parentage.
Source: *Federal Census Records, St. Louis, Missouri*, 1860-1880, 1900-1920.

Rare comments about the "foreign population," and its inadequacies, hereditary tendencies, and susceptibility to intemperance surfaced in early annual reports and case records from the 1920s and 1930s. In 1856, Elizabeth Clarke criticized not only the intemperance of the Irish, but their living conditions as well. She wrote that the visiting committee "often found [a] half dozen families of tall Irish cousins grouped in the same apartment, with a plentiful lack of everything but whiskey." Clarke also criticized the

"sons and daughters of the Emerald Isle," for resisting managers' "benevolent exertions to induce a change of life and habits."[47] Annual reports also periodically mentioned the children's "hereditary tendency to disease" caused by poverty, neglect, and "ignorance." Managers credited the medical staff for the low number of deaths at the institution in light of these "fatal tendencies of heredity." Annual reports even criticized foreign-born parents for not teaching their children patriotism. In 1892, Clara Barnard noted that the GIH taught "love and pride of country so essential to children of foreign-born parents."[48] Whether these judgments came as a result of interaction with these individuals is unclear. The attitude was not, however, a consistent theme in reports.

The location of the institution was also important in providing possible interaction between ethnic groups. From 1857 to 1899, the institution was located at Nineteenth and Morgan streets. Throughout this period, GIH was not more than four blocks south from the "Kerry Patch," a community of poor Irish immigrants. As Irish immigration to St. Louis increased in the mid-1850s, St. Louis philanthropist John Mullphany donated the land for settlement to the Irish who were unable to find good housing in the city. Following the Civil War, the "Patch" became a slum resembling Five Points in New York City. As late as 1878, reports referred to this area as a place of vice, complete with gangs and fighting. It remained a predominantly Irish community until after World War II. Just south of the "Patch" and north of GIH, a lower-class German community also existed. It is unknown from what part of St. Louis the girls in the institution came. However, because many were from the poor Irish population, it is likely they came from the "Patch."[49]

GIH also allowed the admission of girls from non-Protestant religious faiths. Because different denominational institutions existed in St. Louis, the law required the placement of children in institutions of like religious faith— i.e., Catholic children went to Catholic institutions, Protestant children went to Protestant institutions, and Jewish children went to Jewish institutions. This law limited the number of girls admitted to GIH

from non-Protestant religions. The mayor's office enforced this policy in 1888 with a letter sent to Clara Barnard at GIH requesting an investigation into the religious faith of certain children placed in the institution from the House of Refuge. The letter stated that the law prohibited the placing of children "into an institution of a different religious faith from that of their parents." The mayor's office requested the return of the children if an investigation revealed the parents were not Protestant. Despite the law, case records and visiting committee reports revealed Catholic girls residing at GIH, sometimes at the request of the parents.[50]

Placing children in institutions of their own religious faith reflected the fear that all religious institutions were out to convert children to a particular faith. This fear was not entirely unfounded. When Catholic girls resided at GIH, they attended Protestant church services and Sunday school. While located at Nineteenth and Morgan, the girls attended the near-by First Presbyterian Church; after moving to Enright Avenue, they attended Emanuel Baptist Church. GIH managers insisted that their institution remained non-sectarian (at least within the Protestant faith) throughout its life and the only association with these churches existed because of their proximity. The curriculum of GIH did not include any religious training and "church fellowship" was not a question asked upon admission. But, Elizabeth Clarke pointed out that "required presence at family worship, daily reading of Scriptures, attendance at Sabbath school and Protestant church, has turned away many an applicant."[51]

The interaction of the middle-class women of GIH and the lower-class girls cared for in the institution created a sense of "family" that crossed class and ethnic lines and began to blur class boundaries and intensify the acceptance of "community." Thomas Bender has defined community as an "experience" rather than a place. According to Bender, the concept of community involved social relations that included mutual interest, emotional bonds, shared understandings, and a sense of obligation to each other. In essence, there existed a sense of "we-ness" when defining the reality of community. He

argued that social reform and volunteerism, particularly the friendly visitations, were essential in creating the concept of community because it would "produce a . . . consensus on middle-class values."[52] Jane Addams intentionally located Hull House in a poor neighborhood of Chicago to experience firsthand the lives of the poor. Addams argued that "Hull-House was soberly opened on the theory that the dependence of classes on each other is reciprocal; and that as the social relation is essentially a reciprocal relation, it gives a form of expression that has peculiar value."[53]

The women who established and managed GIH recognized, as early as 1854, that society bore a social responsibility to aid the less fortunate, particularly those who were victims of environmental circumstances beyond their control. In 1892, Clara Barnard asserted, "the same law of justice holds alike for rich and poor." GIH managers made it their "bounden duty" to protect neglected children from dangerous environments, whether or not the parents were members of the worthy or unworthy poor.[54] Annual reports revealed that managers cared for girls of intemperate parents, even though managers placed those parents in the category of unworthy. Case records showed that managers admitted girls reared by "immoral" and "willfully neglectful" parents. Managers also cared for children of widowed parents and those who were victims of desertion. They took care of children while their parents looked for work or recovered from an illness.[55]

Even though visitations affected their opinions about the poor, GIH managers did not participate in programs to aid the poor. While managers offered a good home, educational opportunities, and industrial training to children, the parents received little direct support from the institution. GIH visiting committee reports, annual reports, and case records revealed few serious attempts to help parents find employment, learn about birth control, or improve parenting skills. Because their mission focused specifically on industrial and educational training for children, managers left the task of providing for the poor to other local charitable organizations in St. Louis. In 1859, Elizabeth Clarke expressed the hope that children would act as, "messengers of mercy to their parents,"

extending the lessons of virtue and industriousness to them. However, Clarke acknowledged that because managers acted "for the benefit of the child," parents became "secondary objects of interest."[56]

Long before definitive social work skills and how-to manuals on "friendly visitations" appeared, GIH managers investigated the homes of the poor and formed opinions based on those investigations. Although periodically falling into the trap of societal prejudice, the women of GIH evaluated the people they encountered on a case-by-case basis. Rather than accepting the view that inherent characteristic flaws caused poverty, managers recognized that environmental factors contributed to the state of destitution witnessed in St. Louis. Managers also showed insight into the psychology of poverty, realizing that it was difficult for some parents to admit they needed help. In 1910, Abby Todd, GIH secretary, acknowledged that the institution maintained a policy of requesting some payment for children who boarded. Todd stated, "even when but a little can be paid for their care we require it so . . . [the parents] may feel that their children are not living on charity." She acknowledged, "as most of these people generally need assistance our plan and purpose is to help them to help themselves."[57]

As early as 1854, GIH managers recognized that poverty, for many, was a misfortune, not a punishment. In 1855, Elizabeth Clarke expressed the view that managers exhibited toward parents when she described the type of children targeted by the institution: "children more unfortunate than orphans, whose parents, unable themselves to afford them the support and protection which their helplessness requires, are yet too fond, or ignorant in many instances, too depraved to yield them up to the control of those who would provide them with permanent homes and the comforts of life."[58] GIH managers did not break down class barriers in the sense that those barriers disappeared, initiating a new wide-ranging attitude about members of the lower class. They did, however, blur the lines of class by going beyond the boundaries of their middle-class sphere and experiencing firsthand the lives of the poor in St. Louis. By doing so, managers acquired new

knowledge about the causes and effects of poverty. Managers did not challenge the existing system of wage labor and market economy, although they realized that poverty was, in some cases, caused by the effects of industrialization, such as financial depressions and unemployment. Although their involvement with parents was less than with the children, managers realized that cruelty and neglect of children was not simply inherent in ethnic or class behavior. Rather, it was a product of individual behavior, regardless of class status or ethnic background.

Although they were not radical in their attempts to lessen the impact of poverty on a nation-wide level, GIH managers did provide educational opportunities and industrial training to thousands of girls in St. Louis throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Today, in an era that still debates the validity and necessity of social welfare programs and the causes of poverty, the women who established and managed GIH can be considered "forward thinkers" simply because they were willing to question the prevailing attitudes about the poor and determine for themselves the causes and effects of poverty. Managers chose to construct their own opinions based on investigation and rational evidence as early as the mid-nineteenth century, and did what they could to alleviate the suffering for at least some individuals. Perhaps their contribution to social reform pales in comparison to the national influence of Jane Addams and Charles Loring Brace, but their contribution to the community of St. Louis cannot be dismissed.

ENDNOTES

[1] In her study of the Baltimore Society for the Prevention of Pauperism, Blanche Coll argued that the society believed that "idleness was at the root of pauperism" and benevolent charity did nothing but encourage the continuation of idleness. The society also mentioned intemperance and ignorance in their causes of poverty. See David Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971), 161-165; Dorothy G. Becker, "The Visitor to the New York City Poor, 1843-1920," *Social Service Review* 35 (December 1961), 384; Blanche D. Coll, "The Baltimore Society for the Prevention of Pauperism, 1820-1822," *The American Historical Review* 61 (October 1955), 85-86.

[2] When Herbert Spencer applied Darwin's theory of evolution to society it discouraged charity for the poor, or the unfit, because not only did it provide an added burden to the "fit" of society (who were providing the charity), but it also encouraged procreation of the unworthy, which defeated the natural order. See the following studies on social Darwinism: Robert C. Bannister, *Social Darwinism: Science and Myth in Anglo-American Social Thought* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1979); Carl Degler, *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Mike Hawkins, *Social Darwinism in European and American Thought 1860-1945* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997); Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1944); Michael Taylor, ed., *Herbert Spencer and the Limits of the State: The Late Nineteenth-century Debate between Individualism and Collectivism* (Bristol, England: Thoemmes Press, 1996).

[3] Joseph M. Hawes quoted English reformer Mary Carpenter on the bringing together of rich and poor: "'the rich and titled . . . have felt their human sympathies awakened by coming into actual contact with the wanderers of the highways . . . [and] it has tended to establish the practical conviction that we are all of one human race." Joseph M. Hawes, *Children in Urban Society: Juvenile Delinquency in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 67; Robert H. Bremner, *From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States* (New York: New York University Press, 1956), 36, 52, 54; Timothy A. Hacsi, *Second Home: Orphan Asylums and Poor Families in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 76; Eric C. Schneider, *In the Web of Class: Delinquents and Reformers in Boston, 1810s-1930s.* (New York: New York University Press, 1992), 13; For information on the emergence of social work, see the following: John H. Ehrenreich, *The Altruistic Imagination: A History of Social Work and Social Policy in the United States* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985); Roy Lubove, *The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965); Walter I. Trattner, *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America* (New York: The Free Press, 1999).

[4] For views on labor and the working class, see the following: Paul H. Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978); Bruce Laurie, *Artisans Into Workers: Labor in Nineteenth-Century America.* (New York: The Noonday Press, 1989); Amy Dru Stanley, *From Bondage to Contract: Wage Labor, Marriage, and the Market in the Age of Slave Emancipation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Trattner, *From Poor Law*;

Sean Wilentz, *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788-1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

[5] Boyer, *Urban Masses*, 56.

[6] Ibid.; Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull-House* (New York: The Phillips Publishing Company, 1910; reprint, New York: The New American Library, 1960), 75-89; Bremner, *From the Depths*, 55.

[7] Among the social and environmental factors listed as objective causes of poverty were the following: inadequate natural resources; bad climatic conditions; defective sanitation; evil associations and surroundings; defective legislation and defective judicial and punitive machinery; misdirected or inadequate education; bad industrial conditions (including unemployment); unwise philanthropy. Chapter two of Amos Warner's study addressed the causes of poverty. In this chapter he mentioned the work of Karl Marx and Henry George in relation to social and environmental factors causing poverty. Marx blamed the capitalist system and the degradation of the worker; George blamed the landlord who exploited the tenant through the system of private property and accumulated wealth without labor. Amos Warner, *American Charities: A Study in Philanthropy and Economics* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1894), 28.

[8] Bremner, *From the Depths*, xiii.

[9] GIH Annual Reports (1854-1918); GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[10] Robert M. Mennel, *Thorns and Thistles: Juvenile Delinquents in the United States, 1825-1940* (Hanover, NH: The University Press of New England, 1973), 18-23; Anthony M. Platt, *The Child Savers: The Inventions of Delinquency* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969), 50-1; Rothman, *Discovery of the Asylum*, chapter 9;

[11] The majority of the women who founded and managed GIH were from the middle class. They lived in affluent neighborhoods in comfortable homes. Their husbands worked as bankers, clerks, insurance salesmen, and wholesale merchants. Some of their husbands owned their own business. Few were doctors, lawyers, or politicians. These women were not individuals who one would find in the "who's who" of St. Louis, or on the society page of St. Louis newspapers. For additional information on the women who established and managed the institution, see chapter one. GIH Third Annual Report (1856).

[12] Two groups of Germans populated St. Louis in the nineteenth century: the *Dreissigers* came in the 1830s and formed part of the middle-class business and intellectual society; the *Achtundvierzigers* came after the political revolution in Germany, many of them political refugees, farmers, and artisans. Many of the latter Germans became part of the St. Louis poor. The Irish population came as a result of the potato famine in Ireland (1845-1847), many of them poor peasants. They too became part of the city's poor. The peak of Irish immigration to America was 1854, not coincidentally, the peak of the anti-Catholic movements. Audrey Olson, *St. Louis Germans, 1850-1920: The Nature of an Immigrant Community and Its Relation to the Assimilation Process* (New York: Arno Press, 1980), 9; Hasia R. Diner, *Erin's Daughters in America: Irish Immigrant Women in the Nineteenth Century* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), 107.

[10] GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859), 5-6.

[14] GIH by-laws, Article VI outlines the specific tasks of the visiting committee; GIH Second Annual Report (1855), 7.

[15] In 1901, the GIH by-laws, changed slightly stating that the "visiting committee shall visit and investigate all cases, report the same to Board of Managers, and, as far as possible, keep in touch with the families of the children." Unfortunately, there are only three visiting committee reports (1856-1858) included in the GIH records. Annual reports from 1854 to 1914 do include accounts from visiting committee members, many incredibly detailed. Partial case records from the 1920s and 1930s also provide detailed information on investigations and visitations completed by the on-staff social worker. Case records are located in the private collection of the Edgewood Children's Center in Webster Groves, Missouri. The GIH Annual Reports and visiting committee reports are part of the Western Historical Manuscript Collection located at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. GIH Forty-eighth Annual Report (1901).

[16] GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859).

[17] Although not mentioned in the annual report or visiting committee report, 1857 was a panic year and probably contributed to an increase in unemployment in St. Louis. In the 1877 annual report, Elizabeth Clarke re-emphasized that some parents were "borne down by sickness" and unable to obtain good employment, and others owned "their degradation to the dominion of strong drink." GIH Twenty-fourth Annual Report (1877), 5.

[18] Elizabeth Clarke eloquently spoke of social and environmental factors causing poverty. She noted that "ill health will weaken the arm of the labourer; . . . a deficiency of adequate food or adequate clothing renders the struggle for life unequal, and mental or bodily strength is paralyzed by over exertion," GIH Fourteenth Annual Report (1867).

[19] GIH Fourth Annual Report (1857), 8-9.

[20] GIH Thirty-second Annual Report (1885).

[21] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[22] The fact that the father paid for the care of the girl also helped to change opinions. Receiving money for board was a constant problem for managers. GIH Third Annual Report (1856).

[23] The oldest girl never resided at GIH. She eventually married. GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[24] GIH Second Annual Report (1855), 6; GIH Eleventh Annual Report (1864), 4; GIH Twenty-third Annual Report (1876), 5.

[25] GIH Twenty-sixth Annual Report (1879).

[26] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s). Edgewood Children's Center Collection, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[27] GIH Seventh Annual Report (1860), 7.

[28] GIH Fourteenth Annual Report (1867).

[29] GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859); GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[30] In 1859, GIH drew up a temperance pledge to be signed by all inmates of the home and school. Elizabeth Clarke indicated that it was favorably received by both children and their parents. GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859).

[31] GIH Fifth Annual Report (1858), 7.

[32] There are repeated examples of criticism leveled at intemperate parents by members of the visiting committee and GIH managers. Most of the time, intemperance was connected with the concept of individual moral failure in the person. Parents who willfully neglected their children because of intemperate habits placed their children in moral danger. The children of intemperate parents were "accustomed only to the shanty, reeking with the fumes of tobacco and ardent spirits." Because the children grew up in this environment, "they care[d] little for the gentle amenities of life," and were "generally ready to fight *for* or *with* each other, as passion may dictate." These children, exposed only to "ill temper[s], or cross looks, or wicked words, or family dissensions," had little self-control because they failed to learn (through no fault of their own) the practical civility of everyday life. As early as 1858, Elizabeth Clarke wrote of the association of intemperance with children's lack of proper training. She noted that "a mother with mind and body besotted by liquor, physically predisposes her child for passions wild and violent, and generates a preponderance of the sensual and animal over the intellectual propensities." Louise J. Kirkwood of the Wilson Industrial School for Girls in New York City also commented on the failure of intemperate parents. She wrote that good intentions of parents were "worthless while in their homes are not found the springs of thrift and industry, which must water the fields of prosperity and respectability." GIH Third Annual Report (1856), 1; GIH Sixteen Annual Report (1869), 6; GIH Seventeenth Annual Report (1870), 6; GIH Fifth Annual Report (1858); Louise J. Kirkwood, "Methods of Industrial Training For Girls," National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 12 (1885), 220.

[33] Clarke went on to write that these "legal enactments become by reflex action, the cause of our crowded jails and overflowing alms-houses, and bring us . . . to plead the cause of those, who, but for these licenses, might not have been so far beyond the pale of reformation." GIH Third Annual Report (1856); GIH Thirteenth Annual Report (1867).

[34] In 1900, GIH moved to a location on the edge of Forest Park, considered at the time to be the suburbs. GIH Thirty-ninth Annual Report (1892).

[35] See, Bremner, *From the Depths*, 151-3 for a discussion of social reformer Robert Hunter; GIH Second Annual Report (1855).

[36] The National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* (1874-1916) and the National Conference on Social Work *Proceedings* (1917-1930) offers a wide array of opinions and attitudes concerning the poor. Sections on child welfare offer particular opinions on juvenile delinquency and child neglect; For the purpose of this paper, Reports of the State Board of Charities and Corrections of Missouri (1901-1914) offer more local attitudes by people in the state of Missouri; The Child Welfare League of America performed studies on child dependency and juvenile delinquency in St. Louis in 1928. The reports are part of the Health and Welfare Council Records at the University of Missouri-St. Louis; Reports by the Missouri Children's Code Commission in 1917-1918 also offer

opinions toward the poor, particularly addressing the issue of child neglect, child abuse, and parental responsibility; Although not a comprehensive list, see the following for general attitudes and opinions on the poor: Boyer, *Urban Masses*; Charles Loring Brace, *The Dangerous Classes of New York, and Twenty Years' Work Among Them* (New York: Wynkoop and Hallenbeck, Publishers, 1872); Bremner, *From the Depths*; Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward, *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare* (New York: Vintage Books, 1971); Henry W. Thurston, *The Dependent Child: A Story of Changing Aims and Methods in the Care of Dependent Children* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930); David Ward, *Poverty, Ethnicity, and the American City, 1840-1925: Changing Conceptions of the Slum and the Ghetto* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

[37] For attitudes on juvenile delinquency and poverty, see: Mary Carpenter, *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes, and for Juvenile Offenders* (London: C. Gilpin, 1851); Homer Folks, *The Care of Destitute, Neglected, and Delinquent Children* (New York: Macmillan, 1902); Hawes, *Children in Urban Society*; Anne Meis Knupfer, *Reform and Resistance: Gender, Delinquency, and America's First Juvenile Court* (New York: Routledge, 2001); Mennel, *Thorns and Thistles*; Mary E. Odem, *Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United States, 1885-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995); Robert S. Pickett, *House of Refuge: Origins of Juvenile Reform in New York State, 1815-1857* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1969); Platt, *The Child Savers*; Steven L. Scholssman, *Love and the American Delinquent: The Theory and Practice of 'Progressive' Juvenile Justice, 1825-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977).

[38] Mary Carpenter noted such problems as drunkenness, neglect of religion, poverty, and destitution as reasons for juvenile delinquency. Carpenter's solution was to remove children from this parental abuse and put them in schools where they can learn. She noted, however, that parents should bear the responsibility of paying for this care. Rev. R.W. Hill at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections listed the following as incentives to vice for young children: inherited tendencies, ignorance, association with depraved individuals, intemperance, and crowded living environments. Carpenter, *Juvenile Delinquents*, 155-6. Sophonisba P. Breckinridge and Edith Abbott, *The Delinquent Child and the Home* (New York: Arno Press, 1970), chapter four; D. L. Edson, Agent of the Children's Bureau, "Neglected and Dependent Children in Missouri," in State Board of Charities and Corrections of Missouri, *Tenth Biennial Report* (1915-1916): 205; GIH Second Annual Report (1855), 6.

[39] GIH Sixteenth Annual Report (1869).

[40] Rev. R.W. Hill, D.D. "The Children of 'Shinbone Alley,'" National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 14 (1887): 232.

[41] GIH managers maintained a policy of not admitting "delinquent" girls to their institution. I address this issue in chapter six. There was no standard definition of "delinquency" in the nineteenth century, particularly when applying it to women and girls. Similar to how they formulated their opinions of the poor based on experience, managers determined who was "delinquent" and who was not by investigating the girls' living environments.

[42] Clara Barnard is quoting Francis E. Abbott in this statement. She also emphasized that when the natural parents failed, it became the "self-appointed task" of the

managers of GIH to develop every "faculty" that the children "may be blest [sic] with." GIH Forty-first Annual Report (1894); GIH Thirty-seventh Annual Report (1890), 7.

[43] GIH Nineteenth Annual Report (1892); GIH visiting committee reports (1856-1858).

[44] GIH Fifty-third Annual Report (1906).

[45] Clara Barnard, "The Care of Children." *Journal of the Proceedings of the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions, of St. Louis.* (St. Louis: Commercial Printing Company, 1892), 91. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

[46] The 1870 census did not list the nationalities of parents, but is safe to assume that most of the native-born girls residing at GIH had foreign-born parents. This would follow the model of succeeding census statistics. *Federal Census Records, St. Louis, Missouri,* 1860-1880, 1900-1920; GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[47] GIH Third Annual Report (1856), 1, 2.

[48] GIH Thirty-ninth Annual Report (1892); GIH Forty-second Annual Report (1895); GIH Forty-eighth Annual Report (1901).

[49] Ellen Meara Dolan, *The Saint Louis Irish* (St. Louis: Old St. Patrick's, 1967), 39; William Barnaby Faherty, *The St. Louis Irish: An Unmatched Celtic Community* (St. Louis, MO: Missouri Historical Society Press, 2001), 48-49, 55-56, 177.

[50] Unfortunately census records do not include the religious affiliation of the girls residing at GIH, and it would be too presumptuous to assume all Irish girls were Catholic, thus it is impossible to determine the total number of non-Protestant girls at GIH. Other children's institutions in St. Louis also showed care when dealing with the issue of religious affiliation. The St. Louis Protestant Orphan's Asylum accepted Catholic children only when no Catholic organization was available to help them, and they transferred the children to Catholic institutions when one became available. As well, the Asylum did not place Protestant children with Catholic families. Similarly, in the first one hundred years of operation, the Orphan's Asylum admitted only two Jewish children. Both the House of Refuge Admission and Departure Records and records from the Orphan's Asylum showed close attention to the religious affiliation of the admitted child. The House of Refuge listed religious affiliation and dismissed children to like religious organizations— Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish. D.R. Francis, Mayor's Office to Mrs. J.H. Barnard, Secretary of GIH, 24 May 1888, David R. Francis Letterbooks, vol. E., Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri; GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[51] Reading of the scripture was not a part of the daily curriculum of the institution, and Clarke may have been referring to the prayer required before mealtime. GIH Twenty-fifth Annual Report (1878), 10.

[52] Thomas Bender argued that "without volunteers from the respectable classes in personal contact with the unfortunate, community was impossible." Thomas Bender, *Toward and Urban Vision: Ideas and Institutions in Nineteenth-Century America* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1975), 6, 132, 151.

[53] Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull-House*, 76.

[54] GIH Forty-first Annual Report (1894).

[55] GIH Annual Reports (1854-1918); GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s), Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

[56] Beginning in 1867, the Provident Association worked to distribute aid to the poor in St. Louis. According to their records, they attempted to assist only those poor not receiving aid from other public or private organizations in the city. Perhaps managers' ambivalent attitude toward parents stemmed from personal experience as well. In 1856, Elizabeth Clarke wrote about an encounter by the visiting committee with an Irish woman. The report described the woman as healthy, "little past the prime of her life." When the visiting committee members proposed that the woman find employment, she replied, "'Days' works, indade! it'n ever a one I've done since I came to Ameriky.'" Clarke asserted that after this encounter, managers felt the "most difficult task was with the parent, not the unfortunate child." GIH Seventh Annual Report (1860), 5-6; GIH Sixth Annual Report (1859), 10; GIH Third Annual Report (1856).

[57] These quotes show interesting insight similar to what will be seen in the Great Depression era through the rhetoric used by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. GIH Fifty-seventh Annual Report (1910), 13.

[58] In this quote, Clarke mentions parents who are unable and unwilling, and too ignorant and depraved to help their children. GIH Second Annual Report (1855), 5.

CONCLUSION

"True, we have, as yet, accomplished but a very limited portion of what we wished in the past, or hope for in the future; yet we feel that we have not been wholly idle or useless, when the number of those who have been daily fed from our not always refined or elegant, but usually sufficient table, has been an average of about ONE HUNDRED."
— Girls' Industrial Home and School Third Annual Report (1856)

"We may not have done all that was required, perhaps less than others would have done; still we have done something— in our own quiet and unpretending way, we have performed our work."
— Girls' Industrial Home and School Ninth Annual Report (1862)

In the nineteenth century, the United States witnessed one of the most widespread reform movements in its history. Evangelical reformers sought to better society through moral and religious training that attacked the institution of slavery and the "vice" of intemperance. Women's benevolent associations endeavored to use their elevated moral status to protect destitute children and help "fallen" women. Education reformers began free public schools so that all children would have the opportunity to achieve basic literacy. Social reformers pursued new ways to improve conditions in the urban areas by advocating better sanitation and housing and offering places where the less fortunate could learn skills that would enable them to be self-supporting. These reform movements sought answers to the economic and social problems created in a society that professed to have so much abundance and opportunity.

Taken at face value, these reform movements were based on a genuine humanitarian concern for the problems facing society. Many of the reforms began as a reaction to events that shaped the United States during the early years of its formation. Industrialization created a growing number of wage workers who seemed to contradict the independent property ownership of "republicanism." These workers, many who had previously been self-employed, faced low wages, dangerous working conditions, and the psychological trauma of being relegated to the position of unskilled laborer.[1] Joining the new native,

white working-class laborers was an influx of immigrants. These groups contributed to the creation of a lower-class community that congregated in the urban areas and lived in poverty and destitution. The growing poverty in the urban centers not only necessitated the need for charitable aid to relieve suffering, but also initiated a reaction to what reformers believed were vices and dangers bred in the cities. The religious fervor of the Second Great Awakening beginning in the 1820s, inflamed the benevolence of many who believed it was their Christian obligation to assist those less fortunate.

However, as historians have long pointed out, the reformers had other motives than humanitarianism and Christian charity. Some sought only the maintenance of bourgeois power through their ability to control the "undesirable elements" in society and reign in the problems that poverty created. By teaching the lower class *how* to live properly, middle- and upper-class reformers hoped to create a world with a defined hierarchical structure and traditional order. The influx of institution building in the nineteenth century can be seen as part of this method. By creating places that taught industrial skills to the poor, reformed the delinquent, and protected the less fortunate, reformers not only fulfilled their Christian obligation, but also consolidated their control behind the secure walls of "well-ordered asylums."[2] Although there were indications of "social control" in the nineteenth-century reform movements, promoting the theory as the motivating factor defeats the progress made through the reform efforts, and belittles the genuine humanitarian impulse and basic good intentions of the reformers themselves.

The Girls Industrial Home and School (GIH) was part of this reform impulse. It began in 1853 as a home for abandoned and neglected girls, a place that offered shelter, clothing, food, and basic education for any child (male or female) who walked through the doors. As a home for neglected girls and a school for less fortunate children, the women of GIH offered custodial care and basic education services. By the turn of the century, GIH was a vocational training center focused on developing marketable skills for young girls. Still existing as a custodial-care facility, it then focused solely on training girls in

domestic skills that enabled them to eventually become self-supporting. By the mid-twentieth century, GIH had become a clinically-oriented residential treatment facility for emotionally-troubled girls and their families. No longer focusing on custodial care, GIH emphasized therapeutic treatment by incorporating the disciplines of sociology, psychology, and psychiatry. Throughout its entire history, GIH remained an independent, private association.

The managers of GIH were essentially middle-class women who did not fit neatly in the middle-class sphere. They lived and operated within the prevailing nineteenth- and twentieth-century attitudes about gender. As women, they were restricted in their action, both legally and socially. Because the women of GIH worked within the realm of reform, particularly child welfare, their work was generally accepted as appropriate. The women who participated in GIH, however, did not merely represent an extension of the private sphere. They established and managed an enterprise that resembled many male businesses of the nineteenth century. It maintained a hierarchical structure, written by-laws and rules, salaried workers who received pensions by the early twentieth century, and financial investments that insured the longevity of the enterprise.

These women operated within certain parameters to obtain a broader understanding of poverty, but there was little movement on their part to evoke a radical critique of what they saw. For this reason, the history of the institution underscores the lengthy period of time it takes for a society to alter its thought pattern. The institution that began in 1853 looked very different than the one that existed in 1978. This reflected the changing nature of child-welfare and social-reform methodology over a 125-year period. Essentially, social reform throughout the nineteenth century and most of the twentieth century occurred at the local level. It was accomplished gradually by individual groups that established and managed both public and private charitable organizations throughout the nation. The local organizations, by virtue of their daily involvement in the lives of the poor brought attention to the reality of poverty. For many of the individual reformers, biased attitudes about the

lower class and the causes and effects of poverty began to change. As these reformers began to acquire more knowledge, it became more difficult to dismiss poverty as individual failure. But, these attitudinal changes occurred individually and did not represent a changing national attitude toward poverty.

GIH illustrates the pace of social reform over 125 years. Reformers addressing issues of poverty had to work within the prevailing attitudes about gender, class, and ethnicity. For some, these parameters determined the way their associations would operate. The programs offered by GIH and the way that they were implemented and changed over time shows the difficult task faced by reformers trying to operate within the limitations of existing biases. While GIH managers worked within the system that created poverty, looking at the programs offered and the clientele targeted tells us much about who and what managers viewed as immediate and crucial problems in the city and the way managers believed those problems could best be alleviated.

The institution's sole focus on girls demonstrated a consistent belief that girls, more than boys, needed educational opportunities and training that would enable them to find employment and become self-supporting. This attested to the reality that women and girls lived under certain social, economic, and political disabilities. Patriarchal order relegated the female sex to second-class status and economic dependence on men. The ideology of "separate spheres" socially limited women to life in the private sphere of the home, away from the market economy and political activity. The "cult of true womanhood" elevated women and girls to the impossible standards of piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity and emphasized the importance of marriage and family.[3]

In making the decision to focus solely on girls, rather than all children, managers made the conscious decision to aid a group that was disproportionately excluded from opportunities for education and wage-earning employment positions. For the first sixty years of operation, GIH maintained a day school that offered an elementary curriculum to children who were omitted from the public school system for financial or social reasons.

Managers consistently emphasized the importance of this aspect of their program indicating a strong belief in the value of literacy. The industrial element of the program offered girls the opportunity to learn domestic skills that would enable them to become working women, and thus self-supporting. In focusing on domestic training, managers prepared girls for a life in domestic service, believing it was the safest and most respectable position for young women.

Managers rarely questioned the exploitation of the position, such as low wages, lack of independence, and possible sexual abuse by the master of the household. Although managers had the best intentions, by training the girls in domestic skills and placing them as domestic servants, they reinforced the existing class biases by relegating members of that class to low-paying, low-skilled, wage-labor positions. The consistent focus on domestic skills for girls also reinforced the connection between "femaleness" and "domesticity," accelerating the assimilation process to middle-class lifestyles for newly-arrived immigrants and lower-class native whites. Nevertheless, managers clearly believed that self-reliance for women was a crucial aspect to happiness, safety, and independence in the sense that they would no longer be dependent on charitable aid or male members of the household. These women had a sense of independence beyond the concept of "separate spheres" or the "cult of domesticity."

In establishing the policies of the institution, managers also acknowledged that the female sex was held to an elevated moral standard. By institutionalizing girls, managers believed they protected the girls from the temptations of sexual activity that would ruin their reputations and result in a loss of virtue. Throughout most of its history, GIH held to a policy of not admitting "delinquent" girls for fear that they would intermingle with the "good" girls and introduce them to immorality. Girls who had been sexually active were considered the worst influences and rarely admitted to the institution. The minimum age for admission to GIH was three, indicating the necessity of protecting girls early when their minds were most impressionable. By distinguishing between "delinquent" and "non-

delinquent" girls, managers reinforced the prevailing attitude that "bad" girls were beyond saving.

Prevailing biases also determined attitudes about the lower class. As early as 1855, managers visited the homes of the poor in St. Louis and passed judgment on the living conditions of their students and residents. While managers did exhibit class prejudice toward the parents they encountered on visitations, managers also made distinctions between the parents who willfully neglected their children and those they believed unintentionally neglected their children because of environmental conditions. The ability to distinguish between parents resulted from the visitations and investigations completed by managers themselves and the social workers employed after 1922. Through the experience of visiting the poor in their own environment, GIH managers gained new knowledge that began to blur the lines of class prejudice and create new attitudes about poverty based on personal observation. Overall, GIH managers' choice to focus on certain programs was dictated by the social and cultural parameters of society.

Since the 1970s, women's history has struggled to deal with the paradoxes produced by women's participation in reform activity in a world defined by the "cult of true womanhood" and the ideology of "separate spheres." On one hand, participation in reform efforts seemed to contradict the ideal of "separate spheres" because it brought women into the public world of politics through petition campaigns and lobbying efforts. Taking part in these activities gave women organizational skills that would aid them in their fight for married women's property laws, suffrage, and equal economic opportunity in the workplace. On the other hand, reform activities seemed to reinforce "separate spheres" because the activity represented "women's work," thus it was domestic, pietistic, moralistic, and non-economic. In this sense, women's activity was an extension of the private sphere and represented nothing radical or different.[4]

Other paradoxes emerged from the specific focus of historians themselves. Some saw women's activity in benevolent associations as driven by morality that bonded women

together (although not beyond class lines) and united them in a female consciousness. Their work benefited other women who were "fallen" or destitute, or children who lived in poverty. Other historians saw reform activity as advancing the cause of feminism as early as the second decade of the nineteenth century. They argue that even if association women were not standing on the front lines of the woman's movement, they advanced feminist ideas through their organizations. For example, Nancy Cott has shown that benevolent societies had a dual effect: one reinforced cultural stereotypes of women, the other helped them obtain consciousness as a group. Although Nancy Hewitt recognizes feelings of sisterhood between women of associations, she sees class and kin, rather than femaleness, as the driving factor. Anne Firor Scott argues that associations provided women with business skills and acted as an "early warning system" for social problems, elevating women to the role of social critics. Barbara Berg contends that the origins of American feminism can be found in the benevolent reform associations of the early nineteenth century where women advanced the ideas of individualism and self-independence.[5]

Historians tend to agree that there was a gendered space, although it was not as simple as the ideology of "separate spheres." Paradoxically, the "space" determined the actions of women by imposing cultural and social "appropriateness" on conduct, and was simultaneously defined by women who used it to participate in the public sphere on their own terms and benefit from the experience in their own way. The "space" was fluid, and in it, women were both active and passive. Most historians who study women's involvement in reform associations have limited themselves to two extremes: either women were driven by Christian morality and benevolence that reinforced the ideology of "separate spheres" and endorsed the role of women as moral superiors, or women were driven by the liberal ideas of feminist thought that rejected the ideology of "separate spheres" in favor of a more equalized environment between male and female.[6]

Studying GIH offers a different perspective on women's involvement in benevolent associations. The activity does not have to be either an example of benevolent moralism or

liberal feminism. The women of GIH were pragmatic individuals dealing with pressing problems in society. They dealt with issues on a local level and provided immediate solutions. According to GIH managers, they provided educational opportunities to girls so that they would become literate, provided training in domestic skills so that girls would acquire employment, and provided food and shelter to girls who would otherwise be forced onto the streets. Their main focus was not necessarily women's rights, but women's opportunities. Through participation in their institution, managers gave themselves the ability to exercise individual rights as women on a daily basis within the walls of the institution. When there, they could own property, vote in elections, and manage their own money. The association became an ungendered space where women could act differently than they could outside it. The girls who received training in the institution learned skills that gave them the opportunity to become self-supporting in jobs that were available to women outside the private sphere.

The women of GIH also challenged the idea that women's work in non-profit organizations was non-economic. Jeanne Boydston has shown that as industrialization created a wage economy, women's work within the home became essentially non-economic because it did not produce monetary reward. This concept has been applied to women's work outside the home as well. Alice Kessler-Harris defined a gender-segregated workplace, that regarded women as "not really at work." These attitudes devalued women's labor, both paid and unpaid. However, women's participation in reform associations was anything but non-economic. The women of GIH not only raised the funds needed to administer the institution, but also managed the money. They invested it to secure interest, they distributed it to the various committees within the institution, and they made sure they accounted for every penny each year when they submitted their treasurer's reports to the public. Their work also indicated an awareness of the larger world outside of GIH and their ability to participate in it.[7]

Although it occurred on the local level, the combination of all private and public charitable organizations throughout the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries acted as a nation-wide effort to assess the causes and effects of poverty and offer both immediate and long-term solutions. More importantly, these local organizations served as a starting point for discussions about the existence of poverty. In a way, they were experimental laboratories for future solutions. But, they did not evoke immediate nationwide attitude changes. Even as "friendly visitations" began to break down class barriers in the early nineteenth century, the prevailing attitude about poverty continued to be that it was a result of individual failure. As scientific and rational investigation brought attention to the environmental causes of poverty in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the concept of social Darwinism claimed that poverty was inevitable and a natural product of the "survival of the fittest." When New Deal legislation made it a national obligation to aid the less fortunate by creating a social welfare state in the midst of the Great Depression, critics denounced the aid as dangerous to individual self-reliance and suggested that charity would encourage idleness. Even as a new century unfolds, the question of social welfare and poverty provokes intense argument and controversy. Apparently, still today, our society cannot decide on the proper methods of social welfare or the causes and effects of poverty. The shortcoming of social reform efforts in the nineteenth century was its continued focus on individual reform bypassing any wide-scale attack on the system that created poverty itself.

GIH began as a genuine attempt to ease the suffering of young girls who lived in poverty in St. Louis. The purpose was to train them in industrial skills so they could earn a "respectable living," and educate them in an elementary curriculum that would provide them with basic literacy. In 1925, a mother expressed her gratitude to GIH for the care taken to insure the safety of her children on a trip to New York. The letter expressed her appreciation: "I hope you will believe me when I say you have my sincerest and deepest gratitude for all your kindness. I truly hope the girls will enjoy what we have all worked

so hard to give them." Ironically, the oldest girl never returned to GIH. She ran off with a twenty-one year old and ended up in California. A letter to the mother from GIH stated that the girl had been picked up in California by the juvenile court and was being cared for at the YWCA. This case was representative of the history of GIH.[8]

Like other reformers in other nineteenth-century institutions, managers usually had the best intentions, but often received less than joyful results. Of the thousands of girls cared for at GIH throughout its 125-year history, some benefited from the instruction provided, while others did not. Girls succeeded in employment endeavors and others became wives and mothers. Some disappeared from GIH records without a trace. The institution itself was not known beyond the confines of St. Louis, except through periodic involvement in the National Conference of Charities and Corrections. The women, and later men, who participated in the operation of GIH throughout its long history completed their task with humility and purpose. They spoke with pride about the institution they had created and maintained. They also adapted to changing forces and continued to provide a useful and viable service to the community of St. Louis. All was done to benefit the local population. What stands out about the women of GIH was their pragmatism and idealism, not their feminism or class consciousness.

ENDNOTES

[1] Sean Wilentz, *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788-1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

[2] David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971).

[3] Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860," *American Quarterly* 18 (Summer 1966), 1512.

[4] Lori Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the Nineteenth-Century United States* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990); Nancy A. Hewitt, *Women's Activism and Social Change, Rochester, New York, 1822-1872* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984); Julie Roy Jeffrey, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998); Mary P. Ryan, "The Power of Women's Networks: A Case Study of Female Moral Reform in Antebellum America," *Feminist Studies* 5 (Spring 1979): 66-85.

[5] Nancy Cott, *The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977), 154-157; Hewitt, *Women's Activism*; Anne Firor Scott, *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 3.

[6] See, Estelle Freedman, "Separatism as Strategy: Female Institution Building and American Feminism, 1870-1930," *Feminist Studies* 5 (Fall 1979): 512-529; Linda Kerber, "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History," *The Journal of American History* 75 (June 1988), 9-39; Rosalind Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982).

[7] Jeanne Boydston, *Home and Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Kerber, "Separate Spheres," 28; Alice Kessler-Harris, *Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).

[8] GIH Case Records (1920s-1930s). Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

EPILOGUE

The Therapeutic Years of the Girls' Home 1936-1978

> "To care for and treat girls who are unable to be maintained in their own homes by reason of their emotional maladjustment."
> — Objectives of GIH Programs, Agency Narrative by The United Fund of St. Louis (1964-7)

> "To provide in a group care therapeutic environment treatment for adolescent girls who cannot be effectively treated in their own homes, in another family, or in other, less intensive treatment oriented child care facilities."
> — Service goals of The Girls' Home, Agency Narrative by The United Fund of St. Louis (1972)

By the second half of the twentieth century, the Girls' Industrial Home and School (GIH) had become simply the Girls' Home. The new name reflected the change in the basic structure of the institution. No longer was the Girls' Home an institution that focused on industrial training and custodial care for neglected and destitute girls between the ages of three and sixteen. Now, it had become a therapeutic care facility catering to emotionally-troubled adolescent and teenage girls. This change reflected the managers' mission that the institution remain viable after the original purpose became obsolete. A 1972 report indicated that the change came from within the association and reflected the need for self-preservation:

> The change in function from the days of the Industrial Home Movement came about internally, rather than from pressure or influence from without. It was the Board of Directors who recognized that the function of the Home was being duplicated more and more by the public sector as the Federal and State governments began to get more involved in vocational rehabilitation and employment security.[1]

Although the essence of the institution continued to reflect a goal of helping unfortunate girls in need, the basic structure of it changed, from a place that taught elementary

education and industrial skills to one that emphasized emotional stability and therapeutic aid.

In the early decades of the twentieth century, GIH managers began to realize that their original purpose was no longer viable. Rather than disband their association and close their institution, the board chose to adapt to the changing nature of child care. In her "History of the Girls' Home," board member Mrs. Richard S. Jones emphasized that "the current stresses of urban living increase the necessity of planning for girls whose parents are divorced, separated, drunkards, immoral, mentally retarded, or perhaps dead."[2] Ironically, this sounded familiar. The girls cared for in the Girls' Industrial Home and School were also often victims of divorce or separation. Often they had "immoral" or intemperate parents. By the early decades of the twentieth century, though, these children would not need shelter and training away from the influence of the family. Now, they needed emotional support to deal with the psychological problems created by broken homes, abusive parents, or the death of a loved one. Reinforced by the professionalization of social work, GIH managers turned to a program that would aid these girls in establishing emotional balance that would allow them to function successfully beyond the institutional setting.

By the mid-1930s, GIH was experiencing pressure from the increasing emphasis on public welfare and the changing nature of child care in general. It is obvious from the 1935 annual report that the New Deal policies of public relief had begun to affect GIH. Eleanor Scott, recording secretary, reported that one of the dormitories at the institution remained closed for the entire year because "the number of children . . . served each month was considerably lower than in previous years." Scott traced this decline to "Federal Relief keeping children in their own families."[3] The focus of keeping children within the family rather than institutionalizing them came from the Progressive Movement. Fearful of the negative institutional affects on children, Progressives fought for new welfare policies that allowed aid to poor families without removing the children from the home. These new

ideas, coupled with the increasing emphasis on public welfare in the 1930s, resulted in a decline in the number of resident girls at GIH. By the 1930s, children's agencies preferred to keep families intact if possible. If that system failed, foster care, rather than institutional care, became the second most desirable option.[4]

As early as 1935, the GIH annual report showed the beginning of change in the basic structure of the program, emphasizing the "emotional needs of girls" along with the industrial training. In 1935, GIH also began receiving monetary aid from the Municipal Psychiatric and the Child Guidance Clinics, two organizations that provided psychiatric evaluations to girls being admitted to GIH. Because of the continued problems of high unemployment, there was still a need for a custodial care institution that could provide shelter, food, and education during a period of hard times. Helen Gorse, GIH social worker, commented on the lack of reliable employment for parents, stating that "most of them have only part time employment," making them unable to provide adequate care for their children. The emphasis on giving girls skills remained in 1935 as well. Pearl Micel, GIH superintendent, remarked on the continued importance of "well-rounded training" that would enable the girls to become "efficient working women." Perhaps reflecting on the poor nature of the economy and thus, the job market, she added that the skills would also aid the girls in becoming "good mothers" and homemakers.[5]

The devastation created by the Great Depression beginning in 1929 had necessitated a change in the fundamental nature of social welfare. By the end of 1935, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt had introduced the Social Security Act. Through this policy, Roosevelt not only acknowledged that environmental factors (in this case, an economic depression) caused poverty, but also admitted that the government bore a responsibility to aid those adversely affected. It would change the nature of social welfare from that moment, emphasizing public support over private. In an ominous statement in her 1935 annual report, Helen Gorse hinted at this change almost as if she knew that her role as a

social worker would be the catalyst for a fundamental restructuring of the institution. Gorse remarked:

> in former years changing methods in Social Work could be traced to a natural, gradual outgrowth; the past year has seen over-night passing from one form to another, so what is good planning for one day is out of date for the next. All this may be summed up in the words of Walter Lippman: 'So much as been happening we do not know what has been happening.' To meet this revolution our own policy has had to be very elastic and we have constantly kept before us the thought of a common good for all organizations.[6]

Throughout the next few decades, GIH managers struggled to find a new mission that continued to offer a useful service to the community of St. Louis. They also became members of the United Fund, an organization designed to consolidate all public and private charitable associations into one efficient body of relief.

By 1940, GIH had clearly expanded its program to emphasis the importance of teaching troubled girls how to function successfully beyond the institutional setting. The annual report from that year reported that the institution "assumes responsibility for . . . [girls'] physical and moral development, education, vocational training and by quality of service promotes character building in preparation of their return to the community." The report noted that of the twenty-three girls received in the institution that year, ten were tested at the Municipal Psychiatric or the Child Guidance Clinic to better understand the emotional problems facing each girl. The only mention of industrial training pertained to summer courses in "personal hygiene, plain sewing, mending, laundering, cooking, and other subjects— covering all phases of homemaking." The goal of the courses was to instill in the girls "either definite ideas of homemaking . . . or the vision of what they thought a real home should be." There was no mention of giving girls skills to make them self-sufficient. The focus now was on creating emotional stability so that the girls could function successfully in society. The report implied that success came from fulfilling a woman's traditional role as wife and mother.[7] It was clear by 1940 that the goal of the institution was beginning to change, but it was still in its formative stages. In 1940, the

institution had not yet begun to focus on adolescent and teenage girls, as the report still noted the minimum age for admission was three.

The crucial point of change came in 1953 when the St. Louis Social Planning Council proposed a merger between GIH, the Forest Park Children's Center, and the Edgewood Children's Center (formerly the St. Louis Protestant Orphans Asylum). The Council suggested the merger because all three institutions maintained similar programs of dealing with emotionally-disturbed children. The Council also reported that each agency lacked certain aspects of therapeutic support that could be remedied if the three merged. The suggestion implied that GIH had outlived its usefulness.[8]

The Council saw serious flaws in GIH, particularly pertaining to its attempt to establish the institution as a therapeutic-care facility. For example, Helen Hagan, consultant for the Child Welfare League of America, criticized GIH for its lack of on-site psychiatric care, stating "when children need treatment, both casework and psychiatric service need to be integrated with the service of the living staff and it should not be necessary to send children out to clinics for therapy." GIH did not employ an on-staff psychiatrist or psychologist. The Council insisted that a merger between the three institutions would allow for a larger number of children to be treated in a facility that could offer not only social services, but also on-site psychiatric care and remedial education programs.[9]

Because GIH's Board of Directors (formerly called managers) continued to insist on the usefulness of their association as an independent institution, they resisted the merger. At a second meeting in February 1954, Mrs. John M. Hadley, president of GIH, communicated the board's "interest and open mindedness," but indicated three specific concerns. First, GIH had built a substantial endowment that provided the institution with approximately 50 percent of its annual funding. GIH board members expressed concern over the legal aspects of merging their endowment with other organizations. The GIH Charter of 1855 represented an additional question. Hadley commented on the possible

legal problems of changing the charter and specifically the loss of GIH incorporation status. Finally, Hadley expressed a fear that the Board of Directors of GIH would lose its individual identity once it became part of a larger conglomeration.[10]

GIH board members seemed offended by the suggestion that their association had outlived its purpose. In a letter to Frances Goodall, Secretary of the St. Louis Social Planning Council, Mrs. Myron Hickey, President of Board of Directors of GIH, indicated that the board still believed in the usefulness of their association. Hickey wrote that the board remained "convinced there still is a need for the Girls' Home in the community" because of the focus on the "teen-age and adolescent girl." Hickey asserted the board's intent to "continue to build the best available program for this age group." She reaffirmed the importance of GIH stating: "All of those who come to us . . . are disturbed to various degrees, but we can see no foster home or institutional program that can offer more adequate care or has the facilities to provide the necessary space at the present time." Accordingly, GIH rejected the proposed merger in May 1955, by a vote of twenty-three to six.[11]

The discussion created by the proposed merger identified inadequacies in the GIH program that needed to be addressed. Over the next two years, GIH board members attempted to implement many of the changes suggested by the Social Planning Council. One of the obvious was the existing building. The institution had existed in its structure since 1900. The only improvement to the site came in 1926 when a substantial donation enabled managers to construct an additional building named Butler Hall. By 1953, the structure was inadequate to serve as a therapeutic treatment facility.

Helen Hagan addressed the problems of deterioration and location in the discussion of the merger. Hagan referred to the GIH as having "serious limitations for remodeling," and noted that a county location, like the Edgewood Children's Center, was preferable to a city one, like GIH.[12] At the second meeting for the merger, Mrs. John Hadley refuted Hagan's earlier criticism stating that managers found it "hard . . . to believe that their

building is useless and that it cannot be remodeled suitably." Hadley also expressed concern over the choice of a county location over a city one. GIH members continued to insist that their location put them at the heart of an urban problem. Some of the changes that GIH managers implemented were a remodeling of their structure to accommodate the change to a therapeutic care facility.[13]

In 1957, GIH board members made application to the St. Louis Social Planning Council to remodel its current structure at 5501 Enright Avenue. The plan was to remodel Butler Hall into a three story modern building that could accommodate a maximum of eighteen girls. The ground floor would serve as office space for the director and caseworkers, and the third floor would serve as a schoolroom for girls whose behavior precluded them from attending public school. The first and second floors would house new "apartments" that consisted of a kitchen, laundry facilities, and common living area on each floor. Housemothers would supervise the new family-style living. The Social Planning Council rendered its approval, praising GIH board members in their "effort to make changes, as they have been needed, in line with modern child care standards." The Council singled out GIH for its continued focus on adolescent girls between the ages of twelve and sixteen, indicating that "there is a community need for good group care to this age girl with certain kinds of problems."[14]

In reviewing the application to remodel, the Council took time to assess the current programs offered at GIH and make recommendations for future changes. The committee specified care for the following types of girls: a) girls who have difficulty adjusting to school or parental authority; b) girls with emotional problems treatable by casework; c) girls with behavioral problems treatable by casework; and d) girls who need intermediary care following a period of institutionalization. These were the programs that GIH implemented over the next few years, changing it officially from a custodial-care institution to a therapeutic-care facility. The Social Planning Council referred to these types of programs as a "reaching-out" service aimed at "girls who are amenable to casework help

and who need a protective, controlled, therapeutic kind of setting." The emphasis on social services was evident by the list of employees at GIH— the positions of director, caseworker, and groupworker all required a Master's degree in Social Work. In 1964, the services offered by GIH included "casework services with psychiatric consultation [and] groupwork program[s]."[15]

A major change in the traditions of GIH was the decision to elect a male director for the first time in 1950. All that is known about Francis Murphy is that he "came from the east." Murphy served as director for three years before resigning to take a position at another institution in New Jersey. The successor to Murphy was Charles Farris, former acting director of Bellefontaine Farms in St. Louis, a public institution established in 1913 as a detention home and training school for boys. Bellefontaine Farms closed in the 1950s, corresponding with Charles Farris's employment at GIH. Successive male directors followed.[16] The director, similar to the matron position of the nineteenth century, supervised the housemothers, social workers, and the various staff members of the institution. Despite this change, the officers and board of directors remained women.

The "radical" change also did not disrupt GIH's long tradition of limited discipline and rigid standardization. The first male director, Francis Murphy, remarked that he "threw out the idea of prizes or bonuses for good conduct" when he first arrived. Murphy insisted that "bad behavior is not to be met by direct attack, but by trying to ascertain what is behind it." In addition to maintaining the GIH policies of no corporeal punishment, this reflected the beginning transition to a therapeutic-support institution. Murphy reported that "punishment" at GIH "might consist of confining a girl to the building for the week-end" which meant "no movie or shopping down at the corner." The tradition of maintaining a girl's reputation continued as well, as girls complained that their dates had to be introduced to the director and housemother. Periodically, the girls would also still be chaperoned.[17]

Individualism remained an active part of the mission as well. In 1974, Frank Hall, GIH director, remarked that "choice" was an "essential part of the home's operation."[18]

That same year, GIH reported it endeavored "to include each individual girl in the decision making process as to whether or not she will utilize the treatment services at The Girls' Home." GIH lauded its effort to involve each girl in the admission process and the decision-making throughout that process. Upon application, the girl was brought to GIH, given a tour of the facility and a thorough explanation of all programs, and an ad hoc committee of caseworkers was assigned. The girl then made several return trips to the institution until final approval of admission. It was clear to the girl that "placement was voluntary" and she had the right "to withdraw from the plan at any time during the intake process."[19]

Another major change occurred when GIH became a racially-integrated facility for the first time in the 1960s. GIH annual reports never indicated an intent to keep non-white girls from attending the day school or residing in the institution. The existence of public and private agencies serving the non-white child may have delayed integration before the 1960s. The 1954 Supreme Court decision, Brown v. Topeka Board of Education, ordering integration in the public schools, most certainly influenced the decision. It is clear by 1958 that the Board of Directors at GIH realized the need to integrate. In the midst of their transition to therapeutic care facility and their remodeling of the institution, the board of directors expressed a preference to wait until completing the re-modeling and stabilizing its program before "developing an inter-racial service." The Social Planning Council recognized this as a legitimate concern, but suggested the board "adopt the recommendation to serve the non-white child as soon as it is feasible and sound."[20] By 1964, 20 percent of the girls receiving care at GIH were non-white and non-Protestant. In 1971, ten of the thirty-two girls residing at the facility were black.[21]

Perhaps the most fascinating change in the fundamental policies of GIH was the change in admission policy. By the 1960s, GIH had become a facility with a reputation "of serving the 'hard-to-place' adolescent girl." It worked closely with the St. Louis Juvenile Court, meaning most of its admissions came from that agency. This indicated that GIH

now accepted girls who might be considered "delinquent." By 1972, an overwhelming majority of the girls receiving treatment at GIH were those rejected by other institutions for bad behavior. In 1973, the United Fund reported that "with very few exceptions, all of the girls referred to the Home [GIH] for residential treatment services have been rejected or dismissed from other institutional programs because of their behavior." The report indicated that over the previous five years, GIH experienced a 300 percent increase in admission requests from other agencies. When GIH opened its crisis center in 1973, the purpose was to "identify girls in need of help before they have become involved in overt delinquent behavior."[22]

This change might have reflected the need for self-preservation. Shortly after GIH board members rejected the proposed merger, the Social Planning Council conducted a study to assess the needs of emotionally-disturbed adolescent girls in St. Louis. The study focused on adolescent girls because few facilities served that age group. The study concluded that a "diminishing number" of institutions in the city would accept girls twelve and over. Apparently, the belief that girls beyond the adolescent period were beyond reform still existed amongst social reformers. The Council reported that of the ninety-four adolescent girls referred for institutional care in 1957, sixty-two were rejected by the various institutions offering therapeutic treatment. The reasons for rejection reflected a continuing bias against older girls with possible "delinquent" behavioral problems. In its 1958 review of GIH, the Social Planning Council proposed that GIH consider developing a program that would serve this client group. Shortly thereafter, GIH became a therapeutic facility serving the "hard-to-place" adolescent girl.[23]

This change in the admission policy represented a fundamental change in the way GIH managers looked at female delinquency. As a nineteenth-century day and industrial school for neglected and destitute girls, GIH managers adamantly rejected the admission of any girl with a delinquent arrest record or delinquent characteristics. The definition of "delinquency" was definitely gendered. Because of the nineteenth-century emphasis on

female virtue, any brush with vice (no matter how small or insignificant) was seen as detrimental to a girl's reputation. This created an automatic association between the concept of delinquency for girls and the abstract notion of immorality. Any girl exposed to vice became immoral and thus irredeemable. This attitude played a prominent role in GIH managers' adamant refusal to admit any girl with a delinquent arrest record or one exhibiting "delinquent characteristics." These girls represented a threat to the "good" girls residing at the institution. GIH managers were also quick to expel any girl who exhibited "delinquent" behavior after admission.

The other explanation for the change in admission policy was the institution's own need for self-preservation. In a period of increasing competition from publicly-funded vocational rehabilitation schools and the changing nature of child care, GIH faced near extinction as more and more of its services became obsolete or duplicated by other institutions. To maintain its viability and usefulness, GIH targeted its attention on a group of girls in the "hard-to-place" category. Most of the girls in this category had behavioral problems that indiscriminately placed them in a class of "likely delinquent." Many of the girls had been refused admission to foster-care programs, other institutions, and even the public school system. These were the very qualities that GIH managers tried to avoid in their admission policy throughout most of the institution's history. In 1974, Frank Hall remarked "our girls aren't 'bad girls.'" He suggested calling them "'wayward,'" but indicated that the title was a bit harsh. Hall referred to them as girls who had been displaced from other group homes, from foster care, or from parents. Reports from the United Fund indicated they were girls who had been "kicked out" of other programs due to bad behavior.[24]

A 1972 report, completed by the United Fund of St. Louis, showed a continuing effort on the part of GIH to reshape its association to fit the needs of the community. In January 1973, GIH opened a twenty-four-hour crisis center, paid for by a grant from the St. Louis Juvenile Court. The center's purpose was to offer a "preventive program [by]

supplying intervention" before residential treatment became necessary. The program offered counseling and emergency shelter to teen-age girls in "acute distress." Anyone with concern could call the twenty-four-hour crisis line. Seven graduate students (most likely from Washington University in St. Louis), specializing in social work, staffed the center. The Law Enforcement Administration provided a three-year grant to the center, during which time it would serve as a "demonstration project." The United Fund praised the program as a "beginning step in moving into the area of prevention, making more efficient use of the corps of professional skills that are already collected for the traditional in-patient residential programming."[25]

The 1972 report also indicated that GIH planned to add a halfway house to its current programs. This would assist girls in making "the transition from the residential program to independent living." The halfway house would offer living arrangements to girls who had "graduated" from any residential treatment program but had no family assistance to aid them in the transition. For example, in 1973, GIH reported that only ten of the resident sixteen girls had families that could assist them with living arrangements after their discharge. The halfway house program also allowed the girls to continue their education or vocational training until they "reached a level of independence which allows them to move out into the community on their own as productive citizens." In 1974, the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* reported that GIH had purchased several apartments around the institution, possibly for the halfway house.[26]

By 1974, GIH continued to show signs of plans for future innovations. There was also clear problems developing with finances. The St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* reported that GIH spent $6,000 planning a new facility that would accommodate up to forty residents in the treatment program, twelve to sixteen in the crisis center, and twenty to thirty in a day program. At the time, the facility had space for a maximum of eighteen girls as residents and eight beds in the crisis center. The problem of proceeding seemed to be money. In 1973, GIH operated on a budget of $214,000 with a deficit of $36,000. Only

22 percent of the budget came from the United Fund in the form of public aid. GIH managers and board of directors had long argued that a girl admitted to the institution on recommendation by a public agency required some public funding for her support. That battle continued in the 1970s when the majority of girls admitted to the therapeutic program at GIH came by recommendation from the juvenile court or other public agencies.[27]

Beginning in 1968, GIH actively supported House Bill 660 in the Missouri State Legislature. According to the bill, partial funding for children referred to group care homes by the state should come from public funds. In 1973, the bill failed to pass. The Board of Directors of GIH was clearly disappointed in the bill's failure, referring to it as a "vital piece of legislation." The board commented that "the State of Missouri must become more involved in fiscal support of programs like ours if they are going to survive." The board assured that it did not intend to minimize the monetary support received from agencies like the United Fund, but stressed that the lack of state funding was "a recognition that the cost of these services is greater than the voluntary sector can handle by itself." In 1974, Frank Hall, GIH director, reported that "currently Missouri law does not provide for the dispersal of public sector money to institutionalized group foster care centers."[28]

The longevity of GIH can be attributed to its ability to change with the times and adapt its mission to the needs of the surrounding community. The basic mission of GIH changed only superficially over its 125-year history. The goal remained to help the poor, the disadvantaged, the endangered, and the emotionally scarred. In 1929 the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* reported that "it would seem this organization doesn't especially care to know how many they help; only to know they help all they can."[29] The goals of preventing delinquency and building self-reliant women remained as much a part of the mission of GIH in the 1970s as the 1850s. Rather than receiving industrial training and being indentured as a domestic servant, the girls received therapeutic treatment from educated and experienced social workers. The means changed; the end goal remained the same. A 1972

description of the association revealed that the "purpose has not changed [since 1853], although methods of treatment and care have broadened and altered dramatically."[30]

The women who established GIH did so with longevity in mind. First, within a year of establishing a permanent institution with the purchase of the brewery, managers indicated their interest in building an endowment fund that would enable them to secure financial stability for the future. They successfully accomplished this task beginning with their first substantial legacy in 1861 and ending with a substantial endowment in 1978 when the institution merged with the Edgewood Children's Center. Second, the women adapted their mission to insure the institution remained viable even after the need to help destitute children lessened. By the early decades of the twentieth century, GIH faced increasing competition from state-funded vocational schools and other public agencies. The girls were attending public schools so their elementary school curriculum also ceased to be necessary.

Rather than disbanding, the managers restructured their mission from a custodial care facility to a therapeutic one. They also utilized the services of the public institutions by sending the girls to vocational training facilities when applicable. In a sense, the managers continued to believe in the importance of industrial skills, they just did not perform the training themselves. Finally, GIH changed its admission policy to accommodate the group of girls most in need. Throughout the nineteenth and much of the twentieth century, GIH held to a policy of not admitting girls with delinquent habits. By the mid-twentieth century, this policy reversed to one that only admitted girls with behavioral problems that could be linked to delinquency. This shift finalized GIH's transition from custodial-care institution to therapeutic-treatment facility. The ability to adapt to the changing nature of child welfare enabled GIH to exist as a useful independent facility until 1978. Through the Edgewood Children's Center, the Girls' Home continues to exist even today.

ENDNOTES

[1] United Fund of St. Louis, Agency Narrative of Girls' Home (1973-4), 2-3. Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[2] Mrs. Richard S. Jones. "History of the Girls' Home" (March 1965). Edgewood Children's Center Collection, Mercantile Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

[3] GIH Seventy-eighth Annual Report (1935-6), 7.

[4] The average number of girls residing at GIH continued to decline throughout the remainder of its history. Between 1953 and 1978, GIH reported an average of twenty girls residing at GIH each year. The decline in average yearly totals represents both the competition from other institutions and the changing nature of the GIH program.

[5] Mrs. Richard Jones, "History of the Girls' Home," 3.

[6] Report of the Social Service Department, GIH Seventy-eighth Annual Report (1935-6).

[7] The de-emphasis of self-sufficiency may reflect the poor job market at the end of the decade. The Great Depression was still causing high unemployment by 1940. It is clear by 1940 though that the mission of GIH has become different. No longer focused solely on industrial training for self-sufficiency, the reports indicate an emphasis on therapeutic aid allowing the girls to function in normal society. Girls' Home Annual Report (1940).

[8] The St. Louis Social Planning Council began in 1911 as a voluntary association. It brought together various governmental and voluntary agencies, institutions, and organizations within social welfare, health, and recreation programs.

[9] Minutes of the Meeting of Committee on Affiliation of Edgewood Children's Center, Girls' Home, and Forest Park Children's Center, (December 18, 1953), Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[10] Minutes of the Meeting of Committee on Affiliation of Edgewood Children's Center, Girls' Home, and Forest Park Children's Center, (February 18, 1954), Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[11] In 1978, GIH merged with the Edgewood Children's Center and removed to the site of that institution in Webster Groves, Missouri. The structure that had existed simply as "The Girls' Home" was torn down shortly after the merger. Letter to Frances Goodall, Secretary of the St. Louis Planning Council, from Mrs. Myron Hickey, President, Board of Directors, GIH (May 20, 1955), Edgewood Children's Center Records, Mercantile Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

[12] Hagan liked the Edgewood Children's Center, located in Webster Groves, Missouri, because of its out-of-the-way location. She commented that it would be hard to find a suitable building large enough to merge the three institutions within the city because "disturbed children are 'hard on the neighbors.'" Minutes of the Meeting of Committee on Affiliation of Edgewood Children's Center, Girls' Home, and Forest Park Children's Center, (December 18, 1953).

[13] Minutes of the Meeting of Committee on Affiliation of Edgewood Children's Center, Girls' Home, and Forest Park Children's Center, (February 18, 1954).

[14] Report of the Study Committee on the Girls' Home (April 18, 1958); United Fund, Agency Narratives of The Girls' Home (1964). Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[15] Another change was the application for membership in the Child Welfare League of America. GIH at the time of the report still had only provisional status, indicating that the League was waiting for changes to be complete. In the event that a girl needed more treatment beyond simple casework, GIH sent the girl to a psychiatrist or psychologist.

[16] St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* May 3, 1953.

[17] St. Louis *Post Dispatch* May 3, 1953; St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* March 21, 1974.

[18] St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* March 21, 1974.

[19] United Fund of St. Louis. "Agency Narratives- Girls' Home" (1973-4), Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collections, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[20] Report of the Study Committee on the Girls' Home (April 18, 1958), Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[21] United Fund of St. Louis, Agency Narrative of the Girls' Home (1964-7); United Fund of St. Louis Agency Narrative of Girls' Home (1972), Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[22] United Fund of St. Louis, "Agency Narratives- Girls' Home" (1973-4), Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collections, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[23] Institutions listed the following behavioral problems as reasons for rejecting admission: too disturbed, runaways, truancy, and mental retardation. Report of the Study Committee on the Girls' Home (April 18, 1958), Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri; United Fund of St. Louis, Agency Narratives of Girls' Home (1972, 1973-4). Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[24] St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* March 21, 1974; United Fund of St. Louis. "Agency Narratives- Girls' Home" (1972, 1973-4), Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collections, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[25] United Fund of St. Louis, Agency Narratives of Girls' Home (1972, 1973-4), Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

[26] Ibid.; St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, March 21, 1974.

[27] Included in the approval for remodeling in 1958, the United Fund suggested that GIH make future plans for enlarging their institution to accommodate more than eighteen girls. St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, March 21, 1974.

[28] St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* March 21, 1974; United Fund of St. Louis, Agency Narratives of Girls' Home (1973-4).

[29] St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* November 24, 1929.

[30] United Fund of St. Louis, Agency Narratives of the Girls' Home (1973-4). Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

APPENDIX

Available statistics on admissions and dismissals from GIH

Year	day school attendance	received/served in year	dismissed	# in Home
1858	55			
1859		52	6 adopted	22
1860		50		27
1862			100 dismissed since 1854	37
1863	80	75	25	24
1865	60 average	70	15 indentured	
1866	163		250 dismissed since 1854 25 adopted since 1854	
1867		94	140 28 adopted since 1854	
1868	60 average	65 (100 fed)	73 4 adopted	
1869		70	29	60
1870		115 (62 regulars) (53 varying time) 11 entire orphans; 37 half orphans	40	65
1871		74 75 took daily meals 40 totally dependent	63	64
1872		75	50	58
1873		60	45	75
1874		80	60	75
1875				80
1881		80	56	60
1882		average 55-70 girls (ages 1-16)		
1883		235	233 15 adopted (7 infants)	75
1884		195	72	75
1885		149	85	64
1886		143	85	58
1887		97	42	55
1888		56	44	55
1889		42	49	47
1890		59	61	58
1891		65	54	59
1892		67	54	62
1893		87	59	63
1894		86	84	74
1895		113	48	65
1896		120	60	60
1897		102	40	62
1898		53	50	60
1899		60	53	60
1900				70

Available statistics on admissions and dismissals from GIH— Continued

Year	Day school attendance	received/served in year	dismissed	# in Home
1901	14 (kindergarten)			
1902	10-14 (kindergarten)			
1903	16 average daily attendance in kindergarten			
1904		51	48	82
1905		57	49	
1906				85
1907				80
1909	kindergarten is "full"			80
1910	20 in kindergarten; 60 in Clark Public school			88 (ages 3-14)
1911		28	37	70
1913	kindergarten discontinued for one year because of low attendance			
1914	12 in cooking class; 20 in sewing class			
1916			35 dismissed to parents	74
1917	kindergarten discontinued because age for public school lowered to five			
1935	94 total received care	18 new admissions	15 dismissed to parents 9 dismissed to other org. 2 dismissed to school homes	76-1/1935 68-12/1935

* attended since opening— 1858— 600; 1859— 80 average per day; 1862— 200 (800 temporary homes); 1866— 3000; 1892— 7000; 1901— 9000; 1911— 10,000 (periods ranging from 3-5 years).
Source: GIH Annual Reports (1858-1917, 1935).

PRIMARY SOURCES

NEWSPAPERS

New York Times, September 6, 2000

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania *Public Ledger* March 6, 1844, December 24, 1847.

St. Louis, *Missouri Republican.* 1850-1900.

St. Louis, Missouri *Daily Morning Herald.* 1852-1860.

St. Louis, Missouri *Globe-Democrat.* 1850-1900, Novemeber 24, 1929, March 21, 1974.

St. Louis, Missouri *Post Dispatch* May 3, 1953.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

Federal Census Records, St. Louis, Missouri. 1860-1880, 1990-1920 (no census available for 1890).

Federal Census Records, St. Louis, Missouri, Supplement Schedule of Defective, Dependent, and Delinquent Persons, 1880.

Laws of the State of Missouri. St. Louis Public Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

Missouri Children's Code Commission. *Report of the Children's Code Commission.* 1917, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

St. Louis City Directories. 1850-1900. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

St. Louis City Ordinances. 1850-1900. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

MANUSCRIPTS

A. F. Shapleigh Hardware Co., Vertical File. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Additon, Henrietta. "Delinquency Prevention Measures in St. Louis," December 1935. Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

Blair, John. "An Act to Regulate the Treatment and Control of Dependent, Neglected, and Delinquent Children," 1904 (?). Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Blair, Hon. James L. "The Child vs. The State of Missouri: The Great Case of Humanity to Juvenile Delinquents Which Was Tried Before the Missouri Legislation in 1903." Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Board of Commissioners, Department of Police, St. Louis. "The Juvenile Delinquency Problem in St. Louis," (August 25, 1949). Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

A Brief History of the Convent of the Good Shepherd, circa 1922. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Child Welfare League of America, "The Juvenile Court of St. Louis, With Special Reference to the Volume of Work Assigned to the Probation Staff and the Handling of Neglect Cases, 1927." Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

_____, "Report of a Study of the Board of Children's Guardians, St. Louis, Missouri," 1934. Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

_____, "Report of a Study of Child Dependency in St. Louis and St. Louis County," 1928. Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

_____, "Report of a Study of Child Welfare Work in St. Louis, Missouri," 1934. Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

_____, "Report of a Study of the Nature of the Delinquency Problem in St. Louis, Missouri," 1928. Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

_____, "Report of a Study of the Work With Delinquent and Neglected Children in the Public Schools of St. Louis, Missouri." Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

_____, "Report on the Child Welfare Work of St. Louis, Missouri, and Recommendations Leading to the Development of a Community Plan on Children's Work," 1928. Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

Crawford, Ruth, "The Immigrant in St. Louis: A Survey," 1916. Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

Eliot, William Greenleaf, "Lectures to Young Women," 1853. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Female Charitable Society of St. Louis, *Constitution* 1824. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Girls Industrial Home and School. *Annual Reports*. 1854-1918. Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri

_____. *Charter, By-Laws, and Rule for the Government of the Home and School.* February 13, 1855. Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri

Girls Industrial Home and School Case Records 1920s-1930s. Edgewood Children's Center, Webster Groves, Missouri.

Health and Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis. "Background Material for Steering Committee in Financing Children's Institutions," 1960. Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

Hickey, Mrs. Myron, President, Board of Directors, GIH, to Mrs. Frances Goodall, Secretary, St. Louis Planning Council, 20 May 1955. Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

Jones, Mrs. Richard A. "History of the Girls' Home," (March 1965). Edgewood Children's Center Collection, Mercantile Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

Mayor's Messages, October 8, 1855. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

McLean, Francis. H. "Survey of Charities in St. Louis, Summary of Important Findings and Recommendations, 1916." Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

"Notebook of Instructions for Teaching Girls' Class in Household Administration," 1922 (?). A. C. Hoskins Collection, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

"One Hundred Years of Growth." Shapleigh Hardware Company, St. Louis, Missouri. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Planning Committee on Children's Institutions, "Report of the Study Committee on The Girls Home, April 18, 1958, For Proposed Renovation to Their Present Building." Health and Welfare Council Records, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

St. Louis Provident Association, "The St. Louis Directory of Charities and Philanthropies," 1909. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

St. Louis Protestant Orphans' Asylum Records, 1834-1940, 70 vols. Western Historical Manuscript Collection, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri.

PUBLISHED SOURCES

Abbott, Edith. *Women in Industry: A Study in American Economic History*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1916.

Adams, Nathaniel. *Annals of Portsmouth, New Hampshire*. Portsmouth: C. Norris, Printer, 1825.

Addams, Jane. "The Child at the Point of Greatest Pressure." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* (39), 1912.

_____. *Democracy and Social Ethics*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907.

_____. *Spirit of Youth and the City Streets*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926.

_____. *Twenty Years at Hull-House*. New York: Phillips Publishing Company, 1910. Reprint, New York: The New American Library, 1960.

Addams, Jane, et. al. *The Child, the Clinic, and the Court*. New York: New Republic, Inc., 1927.

Allison, James. "Juvenile Delinquents: Their Classification, Education, Moral and Industrial Training." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 25 (1898), 411- 423.

Baldwin, Roger N. "Community Organization for Children." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 39 (1912), 48-53.

_____. "Statistics Relating to Juvenile Delinquents." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 37 (1910).

Barnard, Clara. "The Care of Children." *Journal of the Proceedings of the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions, of St. Louis*. (St. Louis: Commercial Printing Company, 1892): 88-92. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

_____. "Report of Girls' Industrial Home." *Journal of the Proceedings of the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions, of St. Louis*. (St. Louis: Commercial Printing Company, 1892): 66-70. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Brace, Charles Loring. *The Dangerous Classes of New York, and Twenty Years' Work Among Them*. New York: Wynkoop and Hallenbeck, Publishers, 1872.

Bulletins of the State Board of Charities and Correction of Missouri, 1910, 1913, 1914. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Carpenter, Mary. *Juvenile Delinquents, Their Condition and Treatment*. London: W. and F.G. Cash, 1853.

_____. *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes, and for Juvenile Offenders*. London: C. Gilpin, 1851.

Charitable and Philanthropic Organizations of Saint Louis. For Use During 1919. Published by the Charities Committee, St. Louis Chamber of Commerce. In Mary McKittrick Markham Journals and Diaries, vol. 2, 1910-1923. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Crossland, William August. *Industrial Conditions Among Negroes in St. Louis.* In Studies in Social Economics vol. 1. St. Louis, 1914.

Dacus, J. A. and James W. Buel. *A Tour of St. Louis.* St. Louis, MO: Western Publishing Company, 1878.

De Bolt, Mrs. L.N. "Industrial Employment as a Factor in the Reformation of Girls." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 27 (1900), 214-220.

Delaney, John J. "Catholic Reformatory Agencies." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 24 (1897), 131-138.

Francis, Vida Hunt, Member of Board of Mangers of House of Refuge for Girls, Philadelphia. "The Delinquent Girl." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 33 (1906), 138-145.

Hill, Rev. R.W., D.D. "The Children of 'Shinbone Alley.'" In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 14 (1887), 229-235.

History of Child Saving in the United States at the Twentieth National Conference of Charities and Correction in Chicago, June 1893, Report of the Committee on the History of Child-Saving Work. Boston: Geo. H. Ellis, 1893.

Journal of the Proceedings of the Conference of Charitable and Philanthropic Institutions, of St. Louis, Held in the Lecture Room of Centenary M. E. Church, February 23, 24, 25, and 26, 1892. With the Reports Presented and Papers Read. St. Louis: Commercial Printing Company, 1892.

Kennard, Beulah E. "Emotional Life of Girls." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 39 (1912), 146-148.

Kirkwood, Louise J. "Methods of Industrial Training For Girls." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 12 (1885), 219-222.

Leonard, Clara T. "Family Homes For Pauper and Dependent Children." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 6 (1879), 170-178.

Lord, Henry W. "Report on Dependent and Delinquent Children, With Special Reference to Girls." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 5 (1878), 168-187.

Lowell, Josephine Shaw. *Public Relief and Private Charity.* New York: Putnam, 1884.

McKeever, William A. *The Industrial Training of the Girl.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914.

_____. *Training the Girl.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916.

Milligan, J. L. "Control of Viscous and Criminally Inclined Females." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 9 (1882), 176-184.

Missouri State Conference of Charities and Corrections, *Reports*, 1901-1903, 1912, 1914, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Monthly Bulletin State Board of Charities and Corrections of Missouri, 1917-1920, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

National Conference of Charities and Corrections, *Proceedings*, volumes 1 (1874), 4-9 (1877-1882), 11-12 (1884-1885), 14-16 (1887-1889), 21 (1894), 24-28 (1897-1901), 32-43 (1905-1916).

The Organization of Charities, Being a Report of the Sixth Section of the International Congress of Charities, Corrections, and Philanthropy, Chicago, June, 1893. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1894.

Paddock, Sarah Sands. "Industrial and Technological Training," In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 11 (1884), 207-212.

Richmond, Mary E. *Friendly Visiting among the Poor; A Handbook for Charity Workers.* New York: Macmillan, 1899. Reprint, New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1969.

Riis, Jacob. *How the Other Half Lives.* New York: Scribner's, 1890.

Sickles, Lucy M. "Industrial Training in Girls' Schools." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 24 (1897), 127-131.

Spalding, Warren F. "Some Methods of Preventing Crime." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 7 (1880), 60-74.

Spencer, Anna Garlin. "'What Machine-Dominated Industry Means in Relation to Woman's Work: The Need of New Training and Apprenticeship for Girls." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 37 (1910).

State Board of Charities and Corrections of Missouri, *Biennial Reports*, 1899-1918, 1923-1930, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Stewart, William R. *The Philanthropic Work of Josephine Shaw Lowell.* New York: Macmillan, 1911.

The Convent of the Good Shepherd. An Appeal on Behalf of the Reformatory Classes and Protectorate for Children and Young Girls. St. Louis: John J. Daly and Co., Printers, 1880. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Thoughts About the City of St. Louis, Her Commerce and Manufactures, Railroads, &c. St. Louis, MO: Republican Steam Press Print, 1854.

Tolman, William H. *Municipal Reform Movements in the United States.* New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1895.

Wardner, Mrs. L. R. "Girls in Reformatories." In National Conference of Charities and Corrections *Proceedings* 6 (1879), 178-188.

Warner, Amos G. *American Charities: A Study in Philanthropy and Economics.* New York: Crowell, 1894.

Wines, Frederick. *Report on the Defective, Dependent, and Delinquent Classes of the Population of the United States.* New York: Norman Ross Publishing, Inc., 1880.

SECONDARY SOURCES

BOOKS

Alexander, Ruth M. *The 'Girl Problem': Female Sexual Delinquency in New York, 1900-1930.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Anbinder, Tyler. *Five Points: The Nineteenth-Century New York City Neighborhood That Invented Tap Dance, Stole Elections, and Became the World's Most Notorious Slum.* New York: The Free Press, 2001.

Aries, Philippe. *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life.* New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Ashby, LeRoy. *Saving the Waifs: Reformers and Dependent Children, 1890-1917.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984.

Baart, Rev. Peter A. (S.T.L.). *Orphans and Orphan Asylums.* Buffalo, NY: Catholic Publication Company, 1885.

Barker-Benfield, G. J. *The Horrors of the Half-Known Life: Male Attitudes Toward Women and Sexuality in Nineteenth-Century America.* New York: Routledge, 2000.

Bender, Thomas. *Community and Social Change in America* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1978.

_____. *Toward and Urban Vision: Ideas and Institutions in Nineteenth-Century America.* Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1975.

Berg, Barbara J. *The Remembered Gate: Origins of American Feminism, The Woman and the City, 1800-1860.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Berry, Brian J. L. *The Shapleigh, Shapley, and Shappley Families: A Comprehensive Genealogy.* Baltimore, MD: Gateway Press, Inc., 1993.

Berry, Mary Frances. *The Politics of Parenthood: Child Care, Women's Rights, and the Myth of the Good Mother.* New York: Viking Penguin, 1993.

Billington, Ray Allen. *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938. Reprint, Chicago: Quadrangle Paperbacks, 1964.

Bliss, William D. P. and Rudolph M. Binder, editors. *The New Encyclopedia of Social Reform, Including all Social-Reform Movements and Activities, and the Economic, Industrial, and Sociological Facts and Statistics of all Countries and all Social Subjects*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1908.

Boan, Fern. *A History of Poor Relief Legislation in Missouri*. Chicago: The University of Illinois Press, 1941.

Boydston, Jeanne. *Home and Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Boyer, Paul. *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Brandt, Lilian. *Growth and Development of AICP and COS (A Preliminary and Exploratory Review)*. Report to the Committee on the Institute of Welfare Research, Community Service Society of New York, 1942.

Breckinridge, Sophonisba P. and Edith Abbott. *The Delinquent Child and the Home*. New York: Arno Press, 1970.

Braude, Ann. *Radical Spirits: Spiritualism and Women's Rights in Nineteenth-century America*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1989.

Bremner, Robert H., editor. *Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History*, vol. 1 (1600-1865), vol. 2 (1866-1932). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970, 1971.

_____. *From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States*. New York: New York University Press, 1956.

Brenzel, Barbara M. *Daughters of the State: A Social Portrait of the First Reform School for Girls in North America, 1856-1905*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1983.

Brumberg, Joan Jacobs. *The Body Project: An Intimate History of American Girls*. New York: Vintage Books, 1997.

Carpenter, J. Estlin. *The Life and Work of Mary Carpenter*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1879.

Cavallo, Dominick. *Muscles and Morals: Organized Playgrounds and Urban Reform, 1880-1920*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.

Chambers, Clarke A. *Seedtime of Reform: American Social Service and Social Action, 1918-1933*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963.

Chesney-Lind, Meda, and Randall G. Sheldon. *Girls, Delinquency, and Juvenile Justice*, 2nd ed. Contemporary Issues in Crime and Justice Series. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1998.

Cogan, Frances B. *All American Girl: The Ideal of Real Womanhood in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1989.

Cohen, G. A. *Karl Marx's Theory of History, A Defense*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Corbett, Katharine T. *In Her Place: A Guide to St. Louis Women's History*. St. Louis, MO: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1999.

Cott, Nancy. *The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977.

D'Emilio, John, and Estelle B. Freedman. *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America*. New York: Harper and Row, 1988.

Degler, Carl N. *At Odds: Women and Family in America from the Revolution to the Present*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Dewey, Mary E., editor. *Life and Letters of Catharine M. Sedgwick*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1871.

Diner, Hasia R. *Erin's Daughters in America: Irish Immigrant Women in the Nineteenth Century*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Dolan, Ellen Meara. *The Saint Louis Irish*. St. Louis: Old St. Patrick's, 1967.

Drucker, Saul and Maurice Beck Hexter. *Children Astray*. New York: Arno Press, 1974.

DuBois, Ellen Carol. *Feminism and Suffrage: The Emergence of an Independent Women's Movement in America, 1848-1869*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.

Dudden, Faye E. *Serving Women: Household Service in Nineteenth-Century America*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983.

Ehrenreich, John H. *The Altruistic Imagination: A History of Social Work and Social Policy in the United States*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Ehrlich, Walter. *Zion in the Valley: The Jewish Community of St. Louis*, vol. 1, 1807-1907. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1997.

Eliot, Charlotte C. *William Greenleaf Eliot: Minister, Educator, Philanthropist*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1904.

Elster, Jon. *An Introduction to Karl Marx*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Faherty, William Barnaby. *The St. Louis Irish: An Unmatched Celtic Community*. St. Louis, MO: Missouri Historical Society Press, 2001.

Fass, Paula. *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Fass, Paula S. and Mary Ann Mason, editors. *Childhood in America*. New York: New York University Press, 2000.

Folks, Homer. *The Care of Destitute, Neglected, and Delinquent Children.* New York: Macmillan, 1902.

Foster, Edward Halsey. *Catharine Maria Sedgwick.* New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1974.

Freedman, Estelle B. *Their Sisters' Keepers: Women's Prison Reform in America, 1830-1930.* Women and Culture Series. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1981.

Frisch, Michael H. *From Town to City: Springfield, Massachusetts, and the Meaning of Community, 1840-1880.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Gamber, Wendy. *The Female Economy: The Millinery and Dressmaking Trades, 1860-1930.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997.

Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. *The Living of Charlotte Perkins Gilman, An Autobiography.* New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935.

_____. *The Man-Made World or, Our Androcentric Culture.* New York: Charlton Company, 1911. Reprint, New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1971.

_____. *Women and Economics: A Study of the Economic Relation Between Men and Women as a Factor in Social Evolution.* Boston: Small, Maynard, and Company, 1898. Reprint, New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966.

Ginzberg, Lori D. *Women and Antebellum Reform.* Wheeling, IL: Harlan, Davidson, Inc., 2000.

_____. *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the Nineteenth-Century United States.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.

Glickstein, Jonathan A. *American Exceptionalism, American Anxiety: Wages, Competition, and Degraded Labor in the Antebellum United States.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002.

Goldin, Claudia. *Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of American Women.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Gordon, Linda. *Heroes of Their Own Lives: The Politics and History of Family Violence, 1880-1960.* New York: Viking Press, 1988.

Gordon, Milton M. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1964. Reprint, New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Greven, Philip. *The Protestant Temperament: Patterns of Child-Rearing, Religious Experience, and the Self in Early America.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.

Griffin, Clifford S. *The Ferment of Reform, 1830-1860.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1967.

Griffin, Clifford S. *Their Brother's Keepers: Moral Stewardship in the United States, 1800-1850.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1960.

Hammond, Otis G. *Notices From the New Hampshire Gazette, 1765-1800.* Lambertville, NJ: Hunterdon House, 1970.

Handlin, Oscar. *Boston's Immigrants, 1790-1865: A Study in Acculturation.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941.

Handy, Robert T. *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Hart, Jim Allee. *A History of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1961.

Hacsi, Timothy A. *Second Home: Orphan Asylums and Poor Families in America.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Hawes, Joseph M. *Children in Urban Society: Juvenile Delinquency in Nineteenth-Century America.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Hawes, Joseph M. and N. Ray Hiner. *American Childhood: A Research Guide and Historical Handbook.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985.

Hewitt, Nancy A. *Women's Activism and Social Change, Rochester, New York, 1822-1872.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984.

Hewitt, Nancy A. and Suzanne Lebsock. *Visible Women: New Essays on American Activism.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

Hofstadter, Richard. *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to FDR.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

Horn, Margo. *Before It's Too Late: The Child Guidance Movement in the United States, 1922-1945.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989.

Huggins, Nathan Irvin. *Protestants Against Poverty: Boston's Charities, 1870-1900.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Pub., 1971.

Hunter, Robert. *Poverty: Social Conscience in the Progressive Era.* New York: Macmillan, 1904. Reprint, New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Huston, James L. *Securing the Fruits of Labor: The American Concept of Wealth Distribution, 1765-1900.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998.

Jeffrey, Julie Roy. *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism: Ordinary Women in the Antislavery Movement.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Jensen, Joan. *Loosening the Bonds: Mid-Atlantic Farm Women, 1750-1850.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1986.

Katz, Michael B. *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse: A Social History of Welfare in America.* New York: BasicBooks, Harper-Collins Publishers, 1986. Reprint, New York: BasicBooks, 1996.

_____. *The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.

_____. *The Undeserving Poor: From the War on Poverty to the War on Welfare.* New York: Pantheon, 1989.

Katzman, David M. *Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Keller, Morton. *Affairs of State: Public Life in Late Nineteenth-Century America.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977.

Kelley, Mary, editor. *The Power of Her Sympathy: The Autobiography and Journal of CatharineMaria Sedgwick.* Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993.

Kerber, Linda K. *No Constitutional Right to Be Ladies: Women and the Obligations of Citizenship.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1998.

_____. *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America.* New York: Norton and Company, 1980.

Kessler-Harris, Alice. *Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

_____. *Women Have Always Worked: A Historical Overview.* New York: The Feminist Press, 1981.

Kett, Joseph F. *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America 1790 to the Present.* New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Knupfer, Anne Meis. *Reform and Resistance: Gender, Delinquency, and America's First Juvenile Court.* New York: Routledge, 2001.

Koven, Seth and Sonya Michel, editors. *Mothers of a New World: Maternalistic Politics and the Origins of Welfare States.* New York: Routledge, Inc., 1993.

Kuhn, Anne L. *The Mother's Role in Childhood Education: New England Concepts, 1830-1860.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1947.

Kunzel, Regina G. *Fallen Women, Problem Girls: Unmarried Mothers and the Professionalization of Social Work, 1890-1945.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.

Laurie, Bruce. *Artisans Into Workers: Labor in Nineteenth-Century America.* New York: The Noonday Press, 1989.

Lebsock, Suzanne. *The Free Women of Petersburg: Status and Culture in a Southern Town, 1784-1860.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1984.

Locke, John. "Some Thoughts Concerning Education: And, of the Conduct of the Understanding." In *Childhood in America*, ed. Ruth Grant and Nathan Tarcor. Indianapolis: Hacket Publishing, 1996.

Lubove, Roy. *The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Mahoney, Timothy R. *River Towns in the Great West: The Structure of Provincial Urbanization in the American Midwest, 1820-1870*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Mason, Mary Ann. *From Father's Property to Children's Rights: The History of Child Custody in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

McCarthy, Kathleen D., editor. *Lady Bountiful Revisited: Women, Philanthropy, and Power*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

_____. *Noblesse Oblige: Charity and Cultural Philanthropy in Chicago, 1849-1929*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Mennel, Robert M. *Thorns and Thistles: Juvenile Delinquents in the United States, 1825-1940*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1973.

Meyerowitz, Joanne J. *Women Adrift: Independent Wage Earners in Chicago, 1880-1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Milkman, Edith, editor. *Women, Work and Protest: A Century of U.S. Women's Labor History*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.

Mintz, Steven. *Moralists and Modernizers: America's Pre-Civil War Reformers*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Nathanson, Constance A. *Dangerous Passage: The Social Control of Sexuality in Women's Adolescence*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.

Niehaus, Earl F. *The Irish in New Orleans, 1800-1860*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965.

Odem, Mary E. *Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Female Sexuality in the United States, 1885-1920*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.

Olson, Audrey L. *St. Louis Germans, 1850-1920: The Nature of an Immigrant Community and Its Relation to the Assimilation Process*. New York: Arno Press, 1980.

Palmer, Phyllis. *Domesticity and Dirt: Housewives and Domestic Servants in the United States, 1920-1945*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989.

Pascoe, Peggy. *Relations of Rescue: The Search for Female Moral Authority in the American West, 1874-1939*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Peiss, Kathy. *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.

Pessen, Edward. *Riches, Class, and Power before the Civil War*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1973.

Pickett, Robert S. *House of Refuge: Origins of Juvenile Reform in New York State, 1815-1857*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1969.

Pivar, David J. *Purity Crusade, Sexual Morality and Social Control, 1868-1900*. Contributions in American History. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1973.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare*. New York: Vintage Books, 1971.

Platt, Anthony M. *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency*. Urbana: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Primm, James Neal. *Lion of the Valley: St. Louis, Missouri, 1764-1980*, 3d ed. St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1998.

Reeves, Margaret. *Training Schools for Delinquent Girls*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1929.

Rosenberg, Rosalind. *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982.

Rothman, David J. *Conscience and Convenience: The Asylum and its Alternatives in Progressive America*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1980.

_____. *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971.

Ryan, Mary P. *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

_____. *Women in Public: Between Banners and Ballots, 1825-1880*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Salmon, Lucy Maynard. *Domestic Service*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901.

Sanders, Wiley B., editor. *Juvenile Offenders For a Thousand Years: Selected Readings From Anglo-Saxon Times to 1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1970.

Scholssman, Steven L. *Love and the American Delinquent: The Theory and Practice of 'Progressive' Juvenile Justice, 1825-1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Schneider, Eric C. *In the Web of Class: Delinquents and Reformers in Boston, 1810s-1930s*. New York: New York University Press, 1992.

Schwartz, Joel. *Fighting Poverty with Virtue: Moral Reform and America's Urban Poor, 1825-2000*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.

Scott, Anne Firor. *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991.

Sklar, Kathryn Kish. *Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1973

Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Smith, Timothy L. *Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1957.

Stanley, Amy Dru. *From Bondage to Contract: Wage Labor, Marriage, and the Market in the Age of Slave Emancipation*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Stansell, Christine. *City of Women: Sex and Class in New York, 1789-1860*. New York: Knopf, 1986.

Steinberg, Stephen. *The Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America*. New York: Atheneum, 1981.

Steinfeld, Robert J. *The Invention of Free Labor: The Employment Relation in English and American Law and Culture, 1350-1870*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Stott, Richard B. *Workers in the Metropolis: Class, Ethnicity, and Youth in Antebellum New York City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Sutherland, Daniel E. *Americans and Their Servants: Domestic Service in the United States From 1800 to 1920*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981.

Theriot, Nancy M. *Mothers and Daughters in Nineteenth-Century America: The Biosocial Construction of Femininity*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996.

Thernstrom, Stephan. *Poverty and Progress: Social Mobility in a Nineteenth-Century City*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Thomas, William I. *The Unadjusted Girl, With Cases and Standpoint for Behavior Analysis*. Criminal Science Monograph. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1923. Criminology, Law Enforcement, and Social Problems. Reprint, New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1969.

Thompson, E. P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1963.

Thurston, Henry W. *The Dependent Child: A Story of Changing Aims and Methods in the Care of Dependent Children*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1930.

Tiffin, Susan. *In Whose Best Interest? Child Welfare Reform in the Progressive Era*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982.

Trattner, Walter I., editor. *Biographical Dictionary of Social Welfare in America*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.

Trattner, Walter I. *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America*. New York: The Free Press, 1999.

_____., editor. *Social Welfare or Social Control? Some Historical Reflections on Regulating the Poor*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983.

Troen, Selwyn K. *The Public and the Schools: Shaping the St. Louis System, 1838-1920*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1975.

Tyler, Alice Felt. *Freedom's Ferment*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962.

Vicinus, Martha. *Independent Women: Work and Community for Single Women, 1850-1920*. Women in Culture and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Wade, Richard C. *The Urban Frontier: The Rise of Western Cities, 1790-1830*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Walters, Ronald G. *America's Reformers, 1815-1860*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978.

Ward, David. *Cities and Immigrants: A Geography of Change in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

_____. *Poverty, Ethnicity, and the American City, 1840-1925: Changing Conceptions of the Slum and the Ghetto*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Watson, Frank D. *The Charity Organization Movement in the United States*. New York: Macmillan, 1922.

Wiebe, Robert H. *The Search for Order, 1877-1920*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.

Wilentz, Sean. *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788-1850*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *Thoughts on the Education of Daughters, with Reflections on Female Conduct, in the More Important Duties of Life*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1974.

_____. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman, with Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1967.

Woods, Robert A. and Albert J. Kennedy, editors. *Young Working Girls: A Summary of Evidence From Two Thousand Social Workers*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913.

ARTICLES

Adler, Jeffrey S. "Streetwalkers, Degraded Outcasts, and Good-For-Nothing Huzzies: Women and the Dangerous Class in Antebellum St. Louis." *Journal of Social History* 25 (Summer 1992): 737-755.

Adler, Jeffrey S. "Vagging the Demons and Scoundrels: Vagrancy and the Growth of St. Louis, 1830-1861." *Journal of Urban History* 13 (November 1986): 3-30.

Baker, Paula. "The Domestication of Politics: Women and American Political Society, 1780-1920." *American Historical Review* 89 (June 1984): 620-647.

Banner, Lois W. "Religious Benevolence as Social Control: A Critique of an Interpretation." *Journal of American History* 60 (June 1973): 23-41.

Becker, Dorothy G. "The Visitor to the New York City Poor, 1843-1920." *Social Service Review* 35 (December 1961): 382-396.

Beisel, Nicola. "Class, Culture, and Campaigns against Vice in Three American Cities, 1872-1892." *American Sociological Review* 55 (February 1990): 44-62.

Bowler, Alida C. "A Study of Seventy-five Delinquent Girls." *The Journal of Delinquency* 2 (May 1917): 156-168.

Brace, Charles Loring. "What is the Best Method for the Care of Poor and Vicious Children?" (1880). In Robert H. Bremner, editor. *Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History*, vol. 1, 1600-1865. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Brenzel, Barbara. "Lancaster Industrial School For Girls: A Social Portrait of a Nineteenth-Century Reform School For Girls." *Feminist Studies* 3 (Spring 1975): 40-53.

Clement, Priscilla Ferguson. "Children and Charity: Orphanages in New Orleans, 1817-1914. *Louisiana History* 27 (Fall 1986): 337-351.

Cole, Arthur C. "Nativism in the Lower Mississippi Valley." *Proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association* 6 (1912-1913): 258-275.

Coll, Blanch D. "The Baltimore Society for the Prevention of Pauperism, 1820-1860." *American Historical Review* 61 (October 1955): 77-87.

Cott, Nancy F. "Passionlessness: An Interpretation of Victorian Sexual Ideology, 1790-1850." *Signs* 4 (Winter 1978): 219-236.

Demos, John. "The Rise and Fall of Adolescence." In *Past, Present, and Personal: The Family and the Life Course in American History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Deutsch, Sarah. "Learning to Talk More Like a Man: Boston Women's Class-Bridging Organizations, 1870-1940." *The American Historical Review* 97 (April 1992): 379-404.

Dudden, Faye E. "Experts and Servants: The National Council on Household Employment and the Decline of Domestic Service in the Twentieth Century." *Journal of Social History* 20 (Winter 1986): 269-289.

Fahrni, Magda. "'Ruffled' Mistresses and 'Discontented' Maids: Respectability and the Case of Domestic Service, 1880-1914." *Labour* 39 (Spring 1997): 69-97.

Freedman, Estelle. "The New Woman: Changing Views of Women in the 1920s." *Journal of American History* 61 (September 1974): 372-393.

_____. "Separatism as Strategy: Female Institution Building and American Feminism, 1870-1930." *Feminist Studies* 5 (Fall 1979): 512-529.

_____. "Sexuality in Nineteenth-Century America: Behavior, Ideology and Politics." *Reviews in American History* 10 (December 1982): 196-215.

Gilman, Amy. "From Widowhood to Wickedness: The Politics of Class and Gender in New York City Private Charity, 1799-1860." *History of Education Quarterly* 24 (Spring 1984): 59-74.

Gish, Clay. "Rescuing the 'Waifs and Strays' of the City: The Western Emigration Program of the Children's Aid Society." *Journal of Social History* 33 (Fall 1999): 121-141.

Gordon, Linda. "Single Mothers and Child Neglect, 1880-1920." *American Quarterly* 37 (Summer 1985): 173-192.

_____. "Social Insurance and Public Assistance: The Influence of Gender in Welfare Thought in the United States, 1890-1935." *American Historical Review* 97 (February 1992): 19-54.

Griffin, Clifford S. "Religious Benevolence and Social Control, 1815-1860." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 44 (December 1957): 423-444.

Grob, Gerald. "Reflections on the History of Social Policy in America." *Reviews in American History* 7 (September 1979): 293-306.

Grob, Gerald. "Welfare and Poverty in American History." *Reviews in American History* 1 (March 1973): 43-52.

Gross, Stephen. "Domestic Labor as a Life-Course Event: The Effects of Ethnicity in Turn-of-the-Century America." *Social Science History* 15 (Fall 1991): 397-416.

Hoy, Suellen. "Caring for Chicago's Women and Girls, The Sisters of the Good Shepherd, 1859-1911." *Journal of Urban History* 23 (March 1997): 260-294.

Johnson, Kate Burr. "Problems of Delinquency among Girls." *Journal of Social Hygiene* 12 (October 1926): 385-397.

Kerber, Linda K. "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History." *Journal of American History* 75 (March 1988): 9-39.

Kett, Joseph F. "Adolescence and Youth in 19th-Century America." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 2 (Autumn 1971): 283-298.

Klebaner, Benjamin J. "Poverty and Its Relief in American Thought, 1815-1861." *Social Service Review* 38 (December 1964): 382-399.

Koven, Seth. "Borderlands: Women, Voluntary Action, and Child Welfare in Britain, 1840-1914." In Seth Koven and Sonya Michel, editors. *Mothers of a New World: Maternalistic Politics and the Origins of Welfare States*. New York: Routledge, Inc., 1993.

Lasser, Carol. "The Domestic Balance of Power: Relations Between Mistress and Maid in Nineteenth-Century New England." *Labor History* 28 (Winter 1987): 5-22.

Leiby, James. "Amos Warner's American Charities, 1894-1930." *Social Service Review* 37 (December 1963): 441-455.

Mangan, Sister Mary. "The Sisters of Loretto: St. Louis, 1847-1997." *Gateway Heritage* 18 (Winter 1997-1998): 26-35.

McCarthy, Kathleen. "Parallel Power Structures: Women and the Voluntary Sphere." In Kathleen D. McCarthy, editor. *Lady Bountiful Revisited: Women, Philanthropy, and Power*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

McIntyre, Stephen L. "'Our Schools Are Not Charitable Institutions': Class, Gender, Ethnicity, and the Teaching Profession in Nineteenth-Century St. Louis." *Missouri Historical Review* 92 (October 1997): 27-44.

Morris, Ann N. "The History of the St. Louis Protestant Orphan Asylum." *Missouri Historical Society Bulletin* 36 (1980): 80-91.

Neff, Charlotte. "The Use of Apprenticeship and Adoption by the Toronto Protestant Orphans' Home, 1853-1869." *Histoire sociale* (*Social History*) 30 (1997): 334-385.

Ordahl, Louise E. and George. "A Study of Delinquent and Dependent Girls." *The Journal of Delinquency* 3 (March 1918): 41-73.

Perkins, Elizabeth A. "The Forgotten Victorians: Louisville's Domestic Servants, 1880-1920." *Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 85 (1987): 111-137.

Rapson, Richard L. "The American Child as Seen by British Travelers, 1845-1935." *American Quarterly* 17 (Autumn 1965): 520-534.

Rauch, Julia. "Women in Social Work: Friendly Visitors in Philadelphia, 1880." *Social Service Review* 49 (June 1975): 241-259.

Romanofsky, Peter. "The Public is Aroused: The Missouri Children's Code Commission, 1915-1919. *Missouri Historical Review* 68 (January 1974): 204-222.

Rosenberg, Carroll-Smith, and Charles E. Rosenberg. "The Female Animal: Medical and Biological Views of Woman and Her Role in Nineteenth-Century America." *The Journal of American History* 60 (September 1973): 332-356.

Rosenberg, Charles E. "Sexuality, Class, and Role in Nineteenth-Century America." *American Quarterly* 25 (May 1973): 131-153.

Ryan, Mary P. "The Power of Women's Networks: A Case Study of Female Moral Reform in Antebellum America." *Feminist Studies* 5 (Spring 1979): 66-85.

Scott, Anne Firor. "Women's Voluntary Associations: From Charity to Reform." In Kathleen D. McCarthy, editor. *Lady Bountiful Revisited: Women, Philanthropy, and Power*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

Sears, Frederic W., M.D. "The Wayward Girl." *Vermont Medical Monthly* 18 (January 15, 1912): 7-9.

Sklar, Kathryn Kish. "The Historical Foundations of Women's Power in the Creation of the American Welfare State, 1830-1930." In Seth Koven and Sonya Michel, editors. *Mothers of a New World: Maternalistic Politics and the Origins of Welfare States*. New York: Routledge, Inc., 1993.

Stanley, Amy Dru. "Beggars Can't Be Choosers: Compulsion and Contract in Postbellum America." *The Journal of American History* 78 (March 1992): 1265-1293.

Stansell, Christine. "Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets: Class and Gender Conflict in New York City, 1850-1860." *Feminist Studies* 8 (Summer 1982): 309-335.

Still, Bayrd, "Patterns of Mid-Nineteenth Century Urbanization in the Middle West." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 28 (September 1941).

Sutherland, Daniel E. "The Servant Problem: An Index of Antebellum Americanism." *Southern Studies* 18 (1979): 488-503.

Sutton, John R. "Social Structures, Institutions, and the Legal Status of Children in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 88 (March 1983): 915-947.

Van Ravenswaay, Charles. "'No Elysium,' Prosperity and Hard Times in 1830s St. Louis." *Gateway Heritage* 12 (Fall 1991): 4-21.

Walkowitz, Daniel J. "The Making of a Feminine Professional Identity: Social Workers in the 1920s." *The American Historical Review* 95 (October 1990): 1051-1075.

Welter, Barbara. "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860." *American Quarterly* 18 (Summer 1966): 151-174.

Woodward, Professor C. M. "The City of St. Louis." *New England Magazine* 5 (September 1891-February 1892): 588-623.

THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

Baumgarten, Nikola. "Immigrants as Democrats: Education in St. Louis Before the Civil War." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1993.

Blum, Carol Jean. "Women's Culture and Urban Culture: Cincinnati Benevolent Women's Activities and the Invention of the 'New Woman,' 1815-1895. Ph.D. diss., University of Cincinnati, 1987.

Boyd, Robert C. "Literary Activity in Antebellum St. Louis, Missouri. Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1989.

Doepke, Dale Kay. "St. Louis Magazines Before the Civil War, 1832-1860." Ph.D. diss., Washington University, 1963.

Gish, Calasha. "The Petit Proletariat: Youth, Class, and Reform, 1853-1890." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1994.

Kellner, George Helmuth. "The German Element on the Urban Frontier: St. Louis, 1830-1860." Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri at Columbia, 1973.

Kennedy, Devereaux. "The Historical Emergence and Early Development of Juvenile Delinquency as a Social Category." Ph.D. diss., State University of New York at Binghamton, 1982.

Pisciotta, Alexander W. "The Theory and Practice of the New York House of Refuge, 1857-1935." Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 1979.

Porter, Susan Lynne. "The Benevolent Asylum— Image and Reality: The Care and Training of Female Orphans in Boston, 1800-1840. Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1984.

Rosen, Richard Allen. "St. Louis, Missouri, 1850-1865: The Rise of Lucas Place and the Transformation of the City From Public Spaces to Private Places." Master's Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1988.

Sandweiss, Eric Todd. "Construction and Community in South St. Louis, 1850-1910." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1991.

Stewart, Joseph Mark. "A Comparative History of Juvenile Correctional Institutions in Ohio." Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University Press, 1980.

Wingate, John Arthur. "Juvenile Delinquency and Associated Factors in Saint Louis." Master's Thesis, Washington University, St. Louis, 1937.

Wunsch, James. "Prostitution and Public Policy: From Regulation to Suppression, 1858-1920." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1976.

VITA2

LISA G. GUINN

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: "'BUILDING USEFUL WOMEN' FROM THE DEPTHS OF POVERTY: A SOCIAL HISTORY OF THE GIRLS' INDUSTRIAL HOME AND SCHOOL IN ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, 1853-1935"

Major Field: History

Biographical:

Education: Graduated from Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kansas with a Bachelor of Science degree in American History in 1990. Graduated from Pittsburg State University in Pittsburg, Kansas with a Master of Arts in American History in 1996. Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree in History from Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, Oklahoma (May, 2003).

Experience: Teaching Associate in the Department of History at Oklahoma State University in the Fall 1999, Fall 2000, Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Spring 2003 semesters. As a Teaching Associate, I taught HIST 1103 U.S. History Survey. Adjunct Faculty for the Fall 2001 and Spring 2002 semesters at Rose State College in Midwest City, Oklahoma. At Rose State, I taught HIST 1493 U.S. History Since 1877. Teaching Assistant in the Department of History Oklahoma State University from August 1997 to August 1999. Historian for the National Park Service at Ulysses S. Grant National Historic Site in St. Louis, Missouri, in the summer of 1995. Graduate Assistant in the Department of History at Pittsburg State University from August 1994 to May 1995.

Professional Organizations: Organization of American Historians, Southern Association of Women Historians, Phi Alpha Theta History Honor Society.