

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE CONCEPT OF USEFULNESS AMONG COLLEGIATE WOMEN

IN THE UNITED STATES FROM 1837-1922

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

SARAH MOORE

Norman, Oklahoma

2026

THE CONCEPT OF USEFULNESS AMONG COLLEGIATE WOMEN
IN THE UNITED STATES FROM 1837-1922

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

BY THE COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF

Dr. Roxanne Mountford, Chair

Dr. Kalenda Eaton

Dr Bill Endres

Dr. Rachel Jackson

Dr. Susan Kates

© Copyright by SARAH MOORE 2026

All Rights Reserved.

Table of Contents

Title Page	I
The Committee Page	II
Copyright Page	III
Table of Contents	IV
Abstract	V
Acknowledgments	VI
Chapter 1: The 19th Century as a Time Ripe for Useful Women.....	1
Chapter 2: Widening Awareness of Social Need as a Way to Represent Usefulness: Matilda Joslyn Gage.....	32
Chapter 3: Confrontation and Assertion as a Way to Represent Usefulness: Laura Cornelius Kellogg.....	81
Chapter 4: Establishing Sites of Usefulness: The Cherokee Female Seminary.....	133
Chapter 5: The Complexity of Women Finding and Being Useful.....	182
Works Cited.....	210

Abstract

Scholarship about women in the 19th century concludes that few women attained a college education, and prejudices against women speaking in public prevented them from participating in public life. Scholarship by Nan Johnson suggests that the few women who did have collegiate aspirations were instead encouraged to remain at home and receive a form of “parlor rhetoric” as an elite education. Research by Lindal Buchanan argues that the few women enrolling in collegiate programs were enrolled in domestic courses and were taught a feminine style of speaking. Nevertheless, biographers have documented intriguing outliers: women who pursued a college education and then went on to enter public life and do useful rhetorical work.

This project challenges existing scholarship by exploring colleges’ efforts to enroll women into mainstream coursework, including the rhetoric courses that would allow women to become public activists for social issues. Introducing the term “rhetorical usefulness,” the dissertation examines the educations of two specific collegiate women who later advocated for public causes and one educational site that trained women for public life. As early as 1837, university administrators invited women to enroll in college by calling on them to be “useful,” exposing them to the same educational opportunities as men. “Rhetorical usefulness” is defined as rhetorical training that empowers women to speak on civic issues in public spaces. Using archival sources, the core chapters examine Matilda Joselyn Gage, Laura Cornelius Kellogg, and the Cherokee Female Seminary as representatives of rhetorical usefulness. Gage, Kellogg, and the Seminar have received very little scholarly attention, despite their impact. Their examples and evidence of colleges’ efforts to recruit women illustrate that in the 19th and early 20th centuries, many colleges sought to train women in rigorous coursework that enabled women to have activist careers in public life.

Acknowledgements

The many people and institutions that assisted in this journey is endless, and I sincerely regret and apologize if I do not give due credit to anyone that helped me along the way. It was not purposefully done. This was a journey of many many years and the memories are invaluable. To my parents George and Debbie Moore, the both of you instilled in me an insatiable and unquenchable thirst for knowledge. My love and respect for education was solely because of the two of you. Dad, between the football games on Saturdays to chess matches on school nights after dinner, our conversations about how competition plays out in life were so vital to my life. Mom, you filled my life with remarkable women: Erica Cain, Julia Sugarbaker, you. I am a feminist because you taught me that I should never be complacent, never be ambivalent; I have a voice and an opinion and it has value. I owe so much to the two of you. Dad, thank you so much for everything you've sacrificed. Mom, I miss you so much, everyday. Steph and John, your support has meant so much to me. The two of you have been there for everything. Thank you so much for the vacation memories, the holiday memories. You're both two of the most important people in my life, and I couldn't have gone as far as I have without the two of you. Dr. Nathaniel Goodwin, you are my SuperMan. You are my partner, my teammate. We've gone on this journey together, for both your dissertation and mine. I think about all that we have shared, all that we have gained, my life has been bettered because you're in it.

I am forever indebted to the mentorship, guidance, and wisdom of Dr. Roxanne Mountford. I don't know how this process would have ever happened if not for your patience and knowledge. I've learned so many things and I hope to say that I want to aspire to being the teacher you are. I will forever remember my time working and know its impact is lasting.

My other committee members, Dr. Susan Kates, Dr. Rachel Jackson, and Dr. Kalenda Eaton have given me so much. From inspiration to advice, I have loved every moment of this process. Dr. Kates, your 19th century class on feminist writing led me down so many paths; I cannot begin to thank you enough for your motivation. Dr. Jackson, I wish I could bundle up all of your stories and listen to your words again and again. I will never forget the afternoons spent at the coffee shop and sharing research ideas. Dr. Eaton, you pushed me to think in other ways, to question what I thought were accepted concepts; thank you so much for your support. Dr. Endres, thank you so much for stepping in at the last minute for my defense. I've always enjoyed your insights and knowledge.

There were many institutions, groups, and individuals who assisted me in the research process for this dissertation. Thank you to the University of Oklahoma Bizzell Library Research Assistants for their many efforts to answer my questions on Oklahoma history and finding source material. Thank you to specifically Hanna Ahn at Stanford Library Research Assistants for pulling information and history on Stanford University. Thank you to Paul Doty at St. Lawrence University Library for pulling information and research on the University of Wisconsin. Thank you to Dawn Burdick at the Clinton Historical Society for being very helpful and supportive in researching the Clinton Liberal College. A special thanks to the Cherokee Nation Historical Association in Tahlequah, Oklahoma and the Oklahoma Historical Society in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma for answering my questions on the Cherokee Female Seminary.

Chapter 1:

The 19th Century as a Time Ripe for Useful Women

Introduction: The Research on 19th-Century Women Thus Far

In May 1913, Congressional legislators met to discuss the Indian Appropriations Bill [H.R. 1917] on the House of Representatives floor. This bill would remove the ability for the surrounding Indigenous tribes to have water and fishing rights, also regulating federal control over the Great Lakes region. An Oneida woman, Laura Cornelius Kellogg, in full Oneida regalia, with her long and beautiful hair down and braided, with Oneida beadwork and tribal insignia proudly displayed, stood in front of a select group of representatives to argue on the piece of legislation. Kellogg argued on behalf of not only her tribe, the Oneida, but also the other members of the Five Nations. Highly educated in the 19th century, Kellogg was an Indigenous woman who spoke on a civic issue.

The story of Kellogg is in direct contrast to what researchers have led us to believe about many women in the 19th century. This dominant narrative of 19th-century women's history has been one primarily characterized by "frail[ty]," but as Kellogg and other examples will reveal, there is another story that needs telling (Welter 152). Women's history scholar Barbara Welter has portrayed women as confined to the home and as "passive, submissive responders" (159). But this is not representative of Kellogg; in fact, this characterization is not representative of many women from the 19th and early 20th centuries. Nan Johnson and Lindal Buchanan have characterized women as complacent in the face of social injustice and ambivalent to collegiate

aspirations. But Kellogg and other examples disprove this stereotype. Kellogg was a collegiately educated, Indigenous woman who actively pursued civic issues in the public. This dissertation will focus on a group different from the dominant narrative—one of collegiate women. This dissertation will refocus the lens on 19th and early 20th century collegiate women and the extraordinary work they performed in activism. They were aided by the colleges and universities they attended, through rigorous rhetorical training programs. My research reveals that, because of their education and encouragement to be useful, collegiate women may have been the dominant force in activism. I will argue that the true narrative of how their collegiate curriculum shaped their public work illustrates a far more complex truth about women's history.

The narrative on women's 19th-century history thus far has been one of either the factory or the parlor. Factory women have been extensively researched: they were working and immigrant women who were appallingly taken advantage of due to any number of circumstances. Parlor women have also been extensively researched: they were the wealthy white women who believed in their inherent role and expectation of inferiority in life. And unfortunately, it is the research on parlor women that has continued to plague women's history.

The 19th-century parlor was a place of confinement, a place where women proved their domestic capabilities. Researchers have gathered primary evidence on what women said and did in their domestic spaces. This evidence has been the basis for many scholars to critique the culture of 19th-century feminine life. Barbara Welter's definition of "the cult of true womanhood" frames wealthy white women into a life of contentment with their subordinate positions (152). Welter suggests that women were complicit and satisfied with the confines bred into them, the confines of "piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity" (152). It was an

American ideology of elitism, and it shaped the notion that the parlor was the only true place for women. The parlor was the only respectable place for a respectable woman.

Rhetorical scholar Nan Johnson builds on Welter by adding to the restrictions women faced in negotiating space and gender. Johnson argues that the entire upper-class society was molded and “contextualized by the power of gender ideology,” where men represented the power outside the home, and women represented power inside the home (*Gender* 4). Women were constrained to parlors, and this included their words, thoughts, actions, and bodies. If they left the confines of the home to receive an education that was designated to be a man’s education, a woman’s sexuality could be questioned. Johnson has noted that the beginnings of their social education began with what she defines as a parlor education. The parlor education was shaped by “influential discourses about the principles of rhetorical performance: how to speak, to whom to speak, and what to speak about” (Johnson *Gender* 20). This research adds to Welter’s scholarship that a respectable woman was “submissive” to any patriarchal institution (Welter 152). Johnson goes on to explain:

Rhetorical training was given top priority in this curriculum for the home learner. Letter writing, public speaking, and composition were typical entries in tables of contents not only of rhetoric manuals but also of encyclopedias and conduct books that focused on general information as well as the lessons of leading a happy and useful life. (*Gender* 20)

Johnson argues that parlor educations, in the hierarchical order, were considered the top priority a woman could achieve. A parlor was where a woman learned the most important life lessons. And a respectable woman never left the safety of a parlor. But, there is a problem with Johnson’s

research, because historians know that women did leave the parlor to pursue a more fulfilling education, a true collegiate and rhetorical education.

Extending Welter and Johnson's research, 19th-century scholar Lindal Buchanan also discusses the lives of 19th-century women and how they correlated to their femininity. Her book *Regendering Delivery: The Fifth Canon and Antebellum Women Writer's* argues and explains the steps wealthy white women had to take to protect their feminine image. Just as the parlor was a key place in 19th-century women's lives, historians know education was a key aspect of 19th-century life (Buchanan 11). Being well-read was a characteristic that signified privilege, but it is vital to understand that a significant difference in women's education was how elocutionary training was so prominent (Buchanan 12). Young women were expected to read and recite, not argue. In their parlors, young women were expected to train using conduct manuals. Their respectability was tied to a social education that taught young women that they were not gifted enough to learn critical thinking skills (Buchanan 13). A social education that implied if being able to argue implied dominance, then women were instructed in elocution, not privileged in oratory or rhetoric (Buchanan 14). However, historians do know that eventually women did leave the protection and respectability of parlors and enrolled in universities.

The first evidence of women entering collegiate settings reveals that the parlor was not the only place women could seek out respectability. Education for both young men and women beyond elementary school was sporadic in the 19th century, but it quickly became an American investment. Nineteenth century educational scholar Frederick Rudolf tells us that "the collegiate way" was more than just attending classes and finishing curricular work; instead, it was an understanding that college could divine something within a person (87). Though both young boys and girls were receiving a primary education through their local schools, the curriculum

varied greatly, and attendance was not consistent. This led to massive gaps in literacy. Many young aristocratic boys and girls were educated through private tutors at home or went to boarding schools. However, with the rise of colonial colleges and Ivy League schools privileging an image of Americanization, a renaissance of education took place (Rudolf 23). The primary school system enabled many to add skills that they otherwise would not receive, but one must note that a thorough rhetorical education was never a part of any curriculum unless you were a man attending a public university (Rudolf 25). Public universities were gender segregated. This allowed for such places as the Seven Sisters to open up other opportunities for women to receive a college degree.

Wealthy white women had been attending the famous Seven Sister's Colleges since 1837. These private institutions were considered the next step for a woman who had been bred in aristocratic notions of respectability. However, the elite institutions were not alone in offering women private settings for a collegiate education. Seminaries and normal schools opened their doors, and slowly, a "coeducational-academy idea" began (Rudolf 310-311). This idea was fraught with many pushing back and questioning why well-bred young women would want to leave the home and pursue academics (Rudolf 313). Yet this criticism was nothing compared with the "numbers [that] would appreciably [swell] after the war, becom[ing] a torrent in the twentieth century" of aspiring young women wanting to be useful for their communities, not just the home (Rudolf 313). Along with these opportunities, colleges designed for Black students and founded by Black citizens enabled a higher education for young men and women who wanted more robust academics (Rudolf 488-489). Through collective efforts from prominent Black leadership in metropolises, college attendance for young Black men and women mirrored the efforts to question systemized policies and mindsets that were both sexist and racist (Rudolf

489). Indeed, the “collegiate way” was more than just a movement; it enabled an agency in others that had been relatively silent up until the early 19th century (Rudolf 87).

Welter argues “the kind of knowledge found in a true woman’s education, ‘a thorough religious *useful* education’” was her foundation (168). This was the foundation many universities set up when they decided to allow women’s entry into collegiate settings. In the early decades of antebellum society, collegiate education was segregated by gender. Primary education in literacy and arithmetic was offered in schools, with both genders in the same classrooms. Yet, as young women reached a particular age, their gender called on them to follow lessons in housewifery, while young men remained in classrooms rigorously studying more advanced academics. Higher education became a beacon for privileging one gender over the other. In her *Regendering Delivery: The Fifth Canon and Antebellum Women Rhetors*, Lindal Buchanan argues for the existence of this educational privilege. The form in which education was provided was created by gender exclusion:

Privileged realms of knowledge, including the classical languages and oratory, were culturally coded as masculine and reserved exclusively for boys. During the colonial period, this was also the case with writing instruction... Thus gender determined the extent of children’s schooling as well as their access to socially valuable forms of knowledge like Latin and composition (Buchanan 14).

This argument from Buchanan presents the idea that knowledge and the acquisition of knowledge were gendered and, based on gender, inaccessible to many. Speaking and writing were not standards considered necessary for a woman’s education. For young women, a privileged education was not conducive to their gentle gender. Yet, as my research will uncover throughout this dissertation, collegiate training was not always gender segregated.

Colleges still conformed to the patriarchal notion of “manly” and “gentle” when it came to their expectations of their male and female students (Johnson *Gender* 29, 25). In fact, historians have noted that once women entered rhetorical classrooms at public colleges, the teaching of “verbal dominance was no longer comfortable or desirable,” and the curriculum essentially changed to “nonconfrontational activities” (Buchanan 55). This drastic curriculum shift was due in part to administrators and instructors believing that “rhetorical space [was] a place where only exemplary men give speeches and write essays that change events and persuade others to the truth” (Johnson *Gender* 30). It seems that “coeducation deprived women of some of their infinite charm and gentleness and robbed men of some of the sternness and ruggedness” previously employed in their separate educational spaces (Rudolph 327). However, my research from several different co-ed collegiate institutions does, in fact, dispel both Johnson, Buchanan, and Rudolf’s scholarship that collegiate women were not offered the same educational opportunities as men students. Other researchers of the 19th century have also challenged previous scholarship when exploring the landscape of antebellum universities

The Binary: The Domestic Woman and The Collegiate Woman

However, what Welter, Johnson, and Buchanan’s research does reveal is how popular culture reinforced these ideologies about women. Archival evidence from 19th-century magazines such as *The Young Lady’s Book: A Manual of Elegant Recreations, Exercises, and Pursuits* and *The Pioneer* reveal how women navigated domestic spaces and public spaces. Both women’s magazines are vital for understanding that many women were indeed eager to move beyond the confines of domesticity, but did not know how. This duality of being both constrained by domesticity and freed by activism suggests that 19th-century women were bound by duties

and obligations that molded every inch of their lives. This is why a more minute examination must take place to explore the choices and decisions that aspiring women confronted.

A collegiate education had the potential to break the limits of true womanhood. But what were the repercussions? For Black women, working white women, Indigenous women, and wealthy, white, ambitious women, the perspective that education enables options was incentivizing. Many women were “beginning to ask more of [themselves], and in the asking [were] threatening” an understanding that had built much of 19th-century gender roles (Welter 158). Men were the home’s breadwinners, likely to be more educated overall, and were considered the public family representative. Women, on the other hand, based on their socially stipulated role, were expected to remain in the home, representing a more domestic identity (Welter 162). Though women were educated, their education was supplemented with a women’s course along with a classical course, unlike men’s higher education. For example, one of the more widely read feminine conduct books from the 19th century, *The Young Lady’s Book: A Manual of Elegant Recreations, Exercises, and Pursuits*, treats formal education as a supplement to domestic education. Teaching its young feminine readers:

Mental improvement should always be made conducive to moral advancement: to render a young woman wise and good, to prepare her mind for the duties and trials of life, is the great purpose of education. Accomplishments, however desirable and attractive, must always be considered as secondary objects, when compared with those virtues which form the character and influence the power of woman in society. (*The Young Lady’s Book* 23)

The Young Lady’s Book conveys the same understanding that Welter argues for, that moral fortitude constructs true womanhood, not formal education. The fact that this highly circulated

book argues that anything that distracts from a woman's aim to be virtuous is "secondary" reveals why many women were hesitant to enroll in public universities (*The Young Lady's Book* 23). A woman's virtue was "power[ful]" if she remained at home (*The Young Lady's Book* 23). Literature like *The Young Lady's Book* was not alone in its purpose to keep women constantly trying to prove themselves virtuous. Other journals also argued that "girls *could* be ruined by a book" (Welter 166). Still, a select and distinct group of women didn't mind the stigma of pushing back against whether or not they were considered true women—they knew they were. They also knew that they wanted a college diploma.

One of the more widely read newspapers from the 19th century, *The Pioneer* championed women entering new spaces. This newspaper recognized, as I also argue, that history was in the making and women were moving beyond just domestic confines. One editorial that examined the female mind and its lack of intellectual nourishment:

While the working classes are looking in a thousand ways for the means by which to extricate themselves from poverty, and all the miseries and vices attendant thereon, one of the most fruitful sources of these evils is seldom thought of: — THE EDUCATION OF OUR FEMALE POPULATION: — for what is termed education, is so little suited to their wants—so ill-calculated to prepare them for the important stations they fill in society—that it is unworthy of the name. (D. 169)

Three significant points are made by D in this editorial: one, that women have made the bold and ambitious move to remove themselves from lives they do not want; two, that women are treated as second-class citizens and very rarely considered; and three, that women should be at the center of society's consideration. This editorial argues that men's education and status have superseded

women's education and women's place for far too long. And, as D continues their harangue, it becomes obvious how they feel about the domestic education most women receive.

D defines a woman carefully: "The women of to-day, are to be the wives, the helpmates, the companions of the men of to-day; — and more, to be the mothers, the nurses, and the first instructors of those who will be the men of to-morrow" (169). It almost makes you wonder about the gender of D; is this a man writing on behalf of his unsung hero, or a woman attempting to point out what little credit women are given in everyday life? After D recognizes the Herculean role women fulfill in society, they then go on to frame how a woman's domestic education does little to prepare them for their true life:

And in what consists the superiority of the education afforded to the females of the middle classes? They are these: — in addition to reading and writing, they are taught to play a few trifling pieces on the pianoforte, to dance, and perhaps to gabble a few sentences of bad French; or to translate them into worse English. And in exchange for these *accomplishments* (which are seldom used after leaving school) they are taught to despise every useful employment; and often treat with indifference approaching to contempt, their industrious parents who toil day and night to give them this *superior* education. (D 170)

This diatribe, riddled with sarcasm and wit, magnifies that women are being made to be an embarrassment to themselves. D's use of the word "gabble" resonates with a woman being a "babbl[er]", where both adjectives convey foolhardy nonsense (D 170, Johnson "Reigning" 274). This writing from *The Pioneer* presents a different narrative, one behind the reason educationally aspiring women entered collegiate settings. But what *The Pioneer* always had to bend to was the

reinforcement of archaic ideologies from magazines like *The Young Lady's Book*, which worked against them and hammered into women that they were to be gentle and unambitious.

Literature like *The Young Lady's Book* argued for young white women to seek “Piety, integrity, fortitude, charity, obedience, consideration, sincerity, prudence, activity, and cheerfulness, with the dispositions that spring from, and the amiable qualities which rise out of them, may, we presume, nearly define those moral properties called for in the daily conduct and habitual deportment of young ladies” (24). No where do we read intelligence or the acquisition of knowledge as encouraged behavior in “daily conduct” (*The Young Lady's Book* 24). This speaks volumes about what was expected of young wealthy white women. Because education was privileged and because the social identity of being a lady was racialized, scholars can begin to trace the differences and gaps in the types of collegiate education expected of men and women. Lady-like women were not expected to learn oratorical behaviors. Lady-like women were not expected to read classical rhetoric. And yet, as my research shows, some did.

In her essay “Reigning in the Court of Silence: Women and Rhetorical Space in Postbellum America,” Nan Johnson analyzes the juxtaposition of public/educated women versus parlor/silent women. In her analysis of articles from *The Ladies Repository* from 1868, Johnson describes “the icon of the American woman as angel of the hearth, this portrait deifies the quiet woman and demonizes the other possibilities: the enthusiastic woman, the talkative woman, the brilliant woman, and the babbling woman” (“Reigning” 274). These adjectives of “enthusiastic,” “talkative,” “brilliant,” and “babbling” are intriguing because though the first three adjectives connote a positive association with these terms, the final adjective connotes an imbecility that reflects an absurdity in women (Johnson “Reigning” 274). Meaning, women who are “brilliant,” or possibly educated are also foolish and possibly unladylike (Johnson “Reigning” 274). She

argues, “The mild and mellow queen of the ‘Court of Silence’ is graceful, calm and, most important of all, silent. In this characterization, an idealized woman is defined as necessarily rhetorically meek” (“Reigning” 274). These descriptions from *The Ladies Repository* reveal a fervent stereotyping of educated women in 19th-century America, which also supports Buchanan’s argument for privileging education (“Reigning” 274, Buchanan 14). Like *The Ladies Repository*, *The Young Lady’s Book* also distinguishes “the enthusiastic woman,” as “She, who has, from a sense of duty, and the force of good principles conquered this lethargy of the mind, is therefore entitled to the highest praise; and her future activity and cheerfulness may indeed may be ranked in the list of virtues (“Reigning” 274, 31). A rhetorically educated woman was not only perceived as one who talks nonsense, but, more importantly, she would openly challenge the ingrained gender roles.

Unfortunately, women’s magazines were not the place where women were openly discouraged from seeking a collegiate education. One of the most trusted professions, physicians, became a powerful authority in attempting to sway women from entering the collegiate sphere. In his book *Sex in Education; or, A Fair Chance for the Girls*, Edward Clark insists that a woman’s body is not physically fit and too vulnerable for an elite education. Clark claims a woman, “is dowered with a set of organs peculiar to herself,” that “[i]f neglected and mismanaged, [. . .] retaliate upon their possessor with weakness and disease, as well of the mind as of the Body” (Clark 33). This statement was one of many made by physicians in the 19th century that would persuade society that women were not physically capable of withstanding rigorous coursework. Clark continues his observations of a woman’s anatomy with an extensive discussion of the ovaries. He claims that the development of reproductive organs requires a great deal of energy and any other task would impede their growth (Clark 37). In other words, “no

extraordinary task” such as learning rhetoric or calculus should be in a young woman’s daily life; her reproductive future is far too “delicate” for higher learning (Clark 37). This evidence from medical professionals is alarming, due in part to the fact that so many families trusted this advice and acted on it. The fact that a woman’s physiological makeup was so extensively and openly discussed in public literature reflects the sense that there was a guiding force that wanted to prevent them from seeking an education.

Because of these prevailing attitudes about women’s ambitions, college administrators had to be careful and wise in how they recruited women to enroll in their college programs. The words “useful” and “usefulness” appeared repeatedly in 19th-century educational documents. College administrators were utilizing this word to encourage women to enroll in their classical departments. Ingenuously, they recognized that there was a broad, ambiguous, and nonthreatening element to this word that could appease public prejudice and still entice women to apply for college entrance. The word useful could mean a variety of things to a variety of people, making it safe cover for college administrators as well as the women collegians. Usefulness for women could apply to useful activist causes or domestic roles. The word can be both a noun and a verb, so it disguises intentionality brilliantly. This word complicates the 19th-century educational field by meaning one thing for male administrators and another for women collegians. With one word, male administrators began a recruitment journey forged on bringing in women for educational training; while with the same word, women students entered a rhetorical journey that would lead them towards many new opportunities. The word “useful” became a vehicle enabling collegiate gendered education to shift. This shift would begin in the early 19th century, and its effects would reach far into the 20th century. But first, educationally

aspiring women need a space to challenge their ingrained gender roles, and that educational space would be fulfilled in a campus in Oberlin, Ohio.

The Beginning: Oberlin and Usefulness

At the beginning of the 19th century, collegiate education privileged men for rhetorical training and oratory skills based on gender roles (Buchanan 14). Private women's colleges helped narrow the gap in oratorical training, but when the textbooks and classroom practice were based on women remaining in their socially stipulated role, little headway was made in the early efforts to teach women rhetoric. Researcher Christi M. Smith has researched this discrepancy in "...horizontal (field of study) and vertical (level of study). Universalistic mandates more directly undermine vertical rather than horizontal inequalities" (Smith 145). Regardless of what young women wanted, "Elite colleges designed gendered organizational forms to educate women in strictly monitored settings and demanded discursive allegiance to traditional roles" (Smith 145). So, how did women push back against the assumptions of their gender to receive an equitable rhetorical education? What changed in the collegiate classroom to give more opportunities for women? Nothing, at least, at first.

Rudolf reminds us that female seminaries and normal schools were safe spaces for young, ambitious women to attain a more fulfilling education. But these places of higher learning didn't necessarily have the rigorous curriculum that many privileged women yearned for (Rudolf 314). Early discussions from multiple founders and administrators at Oberlin College reveal the contentious nature of enabling a coeducational space for women. Charles Finney, Henry Cowles, James Dascomb, James Fairchild, John Morgan, and James Monroe were the men having such contentious discussions (Hogeland 163). What would happen to a woman's femininity if she sat next to a man in a classroom? What would happen to a man's masculinity if he sat next to a

woman in a classroom? Ultimately, it is Finney who proclaims Oberlin's purpose "to educate here men *and women* for God and God's cause" (Hogeland 163). This moralistic design certainly influenced the treatment of women on campus.

The first women to enroll at Oberlin were relatively welcome because they were segregated to the women's course and white female-only dormitories. Faculty members were cognizant of their male students' prankish behaviors and sexual appetites, which is why women students were guarded and scrutinized for the slightest perturbation in morality (Hogeland 168). Administrators always maintained that the mission of Oberlin was for training future missionaries, and due to this, Lucy Stone, an early enrollee, observed that women were essentially "female appendages" (Hogeland 172). This metaphor reflects that administrators did not consider the classical course study appropriate for them. This consideration of what was or was not appropriate was the basis that:

The world at large needed proof that women deserved a collegiate education, proof that would never be supplied if college girls were served up a set of courses catering only to female needs: the management of domestics, for instance, or the science of the home; homemaking as a career; challenging problems in needlework; the home a thing of beauty, horticulture and interior decorating as ways to a man's heart. (Rudolf 317)

So, colleges were forced to shift the tangible and intangible frames that shaped their institutions. Tangible items like the course catalogs had to now be reprinted to offer women the classical course, which I will review and discuss. Intangible items like faculty members' expectations and prejudices against a woman's capacity to argue against a man also experienced a significant change.

This shift in educational artifacts reflects a moment in women's educational history that I will examine slowly because the spaces they occupied and the sources they worked with are evidence that women were making themselves useful. College women wanted to apply themselves and enrolled in the classical course once it was available and regardless of the prejudices against them. Rudolf points out that "All of the institutions incorporated some studies, some emphases, that were feminine in inspiration, but the main lines of curricular development in the new eastern women's colleges derived from the old prewar classical course of study as it had been perfected at such places as Yale, Princeton, Amherst, and Williams" (317-318). These academic paradigms instituted high standards. Many administrators, whether driven by the cynicism that college women could not compete with men in the classical course, routinely challenged women academically; this also reflects a shift against Welter's "cult of true woman" (152). If the emphasis for women was no longer submissiveness within the home, then a woman's focus became recentered on academics. Still, other administrators, though allowing women to engage with the classical course, knew that mainstream America wanted a submissive woman in the home. This is why "As the board of visitors of the University of Wisconsin proclaimed as early as 1872: '...Whatever shall make her wiser and better, that she may learn; whatever knowledge she may be able to use, either in adding to her own happiness, or in promoting the happiness of others—that knowledge she may rightfully acquire'" (Rudolf 319). Women who enrolled at the University of Wisconsin were thus encouraged to find happiness in rigorous academics while also encouraged to embrace the domestic role that was ingrained in them. This duality of home life versus academic life played out in different ways and different spaces. And it would be one institution and an irrepressible push from a particular university

president that would embed the belief that women could be taught rhetoric in the same manner as men. Enter Oberlin College.

Women profited from collegiate space at private women's colleges beginning in 1837. Oberlin, on the other hand, founded in Ohio in December 1833, officially welcomed women in 1835 (Buchanan 56, Conway 205). Many public universities had been debating whether or not to admit women for some time. The first two presidents at Oberlin were wary of the admission of women, again, guided by a "cult of true womanhood" dictum (Welter 152). Yet, when Oberlin's third president, James Fairchild, announced a strong and unwavering push to begin admitting women to Oberlin, he argued that the campus could benefit from coeducation. His reasoning was clear and concise:

Fairchild's defense of the coeducational experiment centered around two points. In the first place he argued that society had an obligation to educate its women as fully human beings. In direct conflict with the conventional wisdom of his day—"the Cult of True Womanhood"—the newly elected president observed that the history of Oberlin College demonstrated that women (or at least, maidens) had both the physical and mental capacity successfully to pursue an academic program... The second argument for coeducation which permeated both his 1852 and 1867 discourses is not unlike the contention held by Fairchild's fellow Congregationalist, Henry Ward Beecher, namely, that the presence of women in public life—be it the market place or the school—would be beneficial to men. (Hogeland 164-165)

Fairchild's justification is premised on the basic idea that women can achieve academic betterment, but moreover, their presence would better men. In this case, the addition of women to

Oberlin's campus would serve as a rhetorical tool for men on campus while women learned how to use rhetorical tools in the classroom. Historical scholar Ronald Hogeland points out that the key adjective in Fairchild's premise is "beneficial" (Hogeland 164-165). The president had frequently observed and been forced to discipline the childish pranks of the young men on his campus; fed up, he turned to a plausible solution (Hogeland 165). His male students would benefit, morally, by being around proper behavior daily, and female students would benefit by being able to stretch their academic acumen.

But, by far, Fairchild's defense of coeducation from his *Oberlin: The Colony and the College, 1833-1883*, chronicles his steadfast belief in equality. Fairchild begins the book's history with the cofounder of Oberlin, John Jay Shipherd, who proudly stated in a published circular in 1834 "The grand objects of the Oberlin Institute are, to give the most useful education at the least expense of health, time, and money; and to extend the benefit of such education to both sexes and all classes of the community, as far as its means will allow" (Fairchild 40-41). This public demonstration of support is vital because it reveals that powerful men in administration were not only willing to fight battles against sexism but also against elitism. Fairchild, in fact, refers to an "Americanism" in "Oberlin [being] called to lead the way" not just in "the common-school of New England [that] brought boys and girls together," but in "embrac[ing] [the] arrangement of their ideal school" (173). Fairchild's conviction in the possibility served multiple purposes. On the one hand, women were eventually offered classes in the Collegiate Department, whereas many Female Departments across the country only offered women sewing and needlework in the women's course. On the other hand, universities across the country witnessed how campus life and curriculum development could grow when administrations engaged with the idea of usefulness.

Oberlin and coeducation flourished. The first year of women enrolling at Oberlin witnessed 38 students of a student body of 101 (Fairchild 176). Their numbers continued to rise, along with their desire for a more rigorous education. In Oberlin's catalog from 1838, the Ladies Course was presupposed on both "female seminaries" at the time and "common-school" education (Fairchild 177). Though the Ladies Course was a predetermined staple for enrolled women, the College Course was where "the young ladies attend the regular recitations" (Fairchild 177-178). Reciting was what many young women had learned in their parlor training from elocution classes, so this backbone in speech and enunciation helped them later in public performance. By coupling domesticity classes with academic courses, Oberlin bridged the gap in coeducation. Fairchild acknowledged "That coeducation at Oberlin was not undertaken as a radical reform, but as a practical movement in harmony with the prevalent idea of woman's work and sphere, and thus it has been carried forward, carefully adjusting itself to the new conditions, as they have arisen" (182). It is this upward and outward advancement that makes Oberlin so fantastical in its revolutionary moment in women's history. The school and its administrators were well aware of the historical context of the moment and thus merged the women's sphere with an academic sphere.

Fairchild knew and understood the public arguments against breaking the seal of "the cult of true womanhood" by loosening the bonds that kept women tied to their domesticity (Welter 152). But, as Hogeland points out "The chief emphasis of female education at Oberlin was to prepare young women to be *useful*—not to graduate a 'company of Butterflies, to glitter a while, and then to vanish, but to send out a set of pious well educated and genteel (not fashionable) young Ladies to be useful in any circumstances'" (167). This key term here—"useful"—

is the backbone and rhetorical frame of my thesis and is what I will argue enabled women to broaden their rhetorical reach in the 19th- and early 20th-centuries (Hogeland 167). To be *useful* for someone or something or some cause allowed women the opportunity to earn a rhetorical education. Fairchild was not the only university president to discern a woman's *usefulness*. No, instead, I will point to other examples from the 19th century that called on women to do more, be more, and accept that *usefulness* could benefit women in many ways. *Rhetorical usefulness* has multiple components to it and needs space to explore it to its fullest. This term will be parsed out with multiple examples. However, first, an exploration of Oberlin's curriculum for its first women students needs space because, in researching the early history of classical courses and women's courses, I argue that they set the stage for teaching women, inadvertently, the power of argument.

Traditionally, male students at Oberlin followed an exact structure for their education:

The grand (but not exclusive) objects of the Oberlin Institute, are the education of gospel ministers and pious schoolteachers. To fit them thoroughly for the important services, they will be furnished with academic, collegiate, and theological privileges...The system of education in this Institute will provide for the body and heart as well as the intellect; for it aims at the best education of the *whole man*. (Fletcher 119)

The idea of the "*whole man*" is intriguing here because it is based on a man's "body" being completed through education, through "verbal dominance" (Fletcher 119, Buchanan 55). This "*whole[ness]*" could only be achieved once a woman asserted her "*useful[ness]*" (Fletcher 119, Hogeland 167). At Oberlin, men were being trained to be "ministers and schoolteachers" and given the opportunity to take the classical course in rhetorical studies (Fletcher 119). Once

women entered Oberlin, the catalog revealed a two-track option in either “the literary or ladies course” (Buchanan 57). Fletcher further explores the narrow options for women:

This Institution is also to have a Female Department, on the Manual Labor Plan, for the same reasons that it is adopted in the Male Department. Housekeeping, the manufacture of wool, the culture of silk, the appropriate parts of gardening, particularly raising and fitting seeds for the market, the making of clothes, &c; will furnish them employment suited to their sex, and conducive to their health, good habits, and support. (Fletcher 120)

These details of the women’s course reveal an ingrained nod toward domesticity, still. Buchanan argues that even though Oberlin admitted women, its catalog was still designed to “[support] emerging domestic ideology by situating women’s primary purpose within the home” (57).

Though this curriculum might seem disappointing, it must be pointed out that Oberlin was the first to begin coeducation, and it must also be pointed out that Oberlin’s catalogs did not stay based on gender ideologies for long.

By 1837, Oberlin followed the recommendations of many professors and the requests of many students and shifted its catalog to reflect an altered ideology. Rhetoric and Mental and Moral Philosophy were eventually offered to women, though women were still separated from the men’s classes (Buchanan 57-58). Like other colleges, “In Oberlin’s early years...the Institute reduced considerably the amount of Greek and Latin classics studied and substituted Hebrew, English Literature and other subjects instead...The Oberlin freshman studied Cicero and Livy and, in the sixties, Latin prose Composition...The second year student read Cicero, Tacitus and Latin poetry” (Fletcher 695). These are not the courses of needlework and housewifery common in the Ladies Course. This is classical training in logical argument. Women were being prepared

to face men rhetorically, though their recitations and graduation speeches were still not read aloud by them (Buchanan 59-62). A woman's education at Oberlin reflected a push against what was once assumed about their weaker gender. Oberlin set the bar, and others would follow eventually, but it became clear throughout history that a collegiate education could no longer exclude one gender. Oberlin advantaged women by making them *useful*, and this tactic began to spread among other administrators as well.

In her work, *The Higher Education of Women in England and America 1865-1920*, Elizabeth Seymour Eschbach also argued that in various places, women's supporters were calling on them to be *useful*. She pointed out, "Activists working for women's greater participation in intellectual life would continue throughout the nineteenth century to see the aspiration of idleness as one of the greatest threats to women" (42). A 19th-century woman could not be ambivalent about everything going on in the country and could not be "[idle]" (Eschbach 42). Women fought back against "the cult of true womanhood" and became *rhetorically useful*. Their education was their means.

19th Century Educational Design

Coeducation began for men and women students in 1835 with Oberlin's groundbreaking decision. And though rhetorical training at Oberlin would come later for women students, the women's course was the primary course of study at the beginning of their entrance. But this delay in rhetorical training was not consistent with one other colleges. Women students were studying rhetoric at Mount Holyoke, founded in 1837. This elite private women's college immediately offered both classical courses and women's courses as a way to advance women's academic endeavors. Oberlin was not long behind. I argue that based on the catalogues and syllabi from 19th-century colleges that I studied, university faculty were encouraging women to

learn how to argue, which then motivated collegiate women to be useful and beneficial for activist causes.

Both Johnson and Buchanan have extensively framed many of the conceptions of what history perceives about the early classroom, at least for wealthy white women. For my research, I am pushing back against parts of what Johnson and Buchanan have previously published on the spaces and education for educationally aspiring women. Johnson claimed that white women were remaining in parlors and retaining much of the rhetorical knowledge and energy from elocution and conduct manuals (*Gender* 19-27). I will offer a different story. Buchanan claimed that the few white women who did enter collegiate spaces were given gender specific training, only being taught how to stay meek and mild and not learn how to argue. I will tell a different story (77-91). Research has revealed a fairly segregated story of how collegiate classrooms were set up for women in the 19th century. But how these women students overcame these challenges and how these women students then went on to work publicly is a story that is still unfolding. The glimpses of collegiate education that I will add to the dominant narrative reveal that there is more to the story than has been told.

When I say that research has revealed a fairly segregated story of education for 19th-century classrooms, this includes textbooks and curriculum. The early women's courses used the parlor training materials of conduct manuals as part of their curriculum, but quickly, women students themselves demanded that they could handle more than just more parlor training in collegiate classrooms—they wanted more rigor. From the early women's courses, one of the more widely used conduct manuals, *Elegant Lessons for the Young Lady*, written by Samuel Whiting in 1824, strictly guarded the female mind with lessons of decorum and respectability (Johnson *Gender* 24). Though this manual was primarily found in the home for young women to

train to be the best housewives, its lessons reverberated a knowledge that women ought to conduct themselves in the utmost respectable terms, which included speaking skills. Indeed, speaking skills and writing skills became the backbone of skills when the Seven Sisters Colleges opened their doors, finally, for young women to begin their collegiate education. The skills would eventually expand to argument, and a rhetorical education would become a staple for these seven colleges. Their curriculum and textbooks showcase this change.

Two such textbooks similar to Whiting's manual and highly popular were the textbooks *The Herman's Reader for Female Schools* and *The American Orator's Own Book*, which appeared consistently in college classrooms (Johnson *Gender* 24-25). However, as was made clear, these textbooks still discerned that "femininity and rhetorical action were seen as mutually exclusive" (Zaeske 234). In *The Herman's Reader for Female Schools*, the textbooks demonstrated that its duty was "the cultivation of the female mind and heart, the development of correct sentiments and taste, the encouragement of gentle and amiable feelings, and the regulating and maturing of the social affections" (Johnson *Gender* 25). The adjectives in this college classroom textbook are indicative of their specialized training: "correct taste" and "gentle[ness]" not rigorous and robust rhetorical training (Johnson *Gender* 25). This is important because, as historians examine the language and purpose in early 19th-century rhetorical textbooks designed for women against those designed for men, it becomes apparent that the needs and requirements were diverse.

If *The Herman's Reader for Female Schools* had respectability in mind when instructing young women in speaking and writing skills, then G. P. Quackenbos's *Advanced Course of Composition and Rhetoric* framed young men with rhetorical weapons of understanding the rhetorical situation (Johnson *Gender* 29). Quackenbos introduces his readers to the key concept

that all speaking and composition must be “solid and convincing” (Johnson *Gender* 29). This lack of “gentle[ness]” as *The Herman’s Reader for Female Schools* taught was also shaped in John Franklin Genungs’ *The Practical Elements of Rhetoric* where young masculine arguments were “Not with cringing or flattery, not with any brow-beating air of superiority, but with a manly, self-respecting frankness, he is to approach his audience as men occupying a common ground with himself” (Johnson *Gender* 25, 29). There is a distinct difference in how 19th-century rhetorical textbooks approached teaching men and women the art of persuasion.

Men were to be “manly,” and women were to be “gentle” (Johnson *Gender* 29, 25). Societal gender roles were now being reflected in the writing of college textbooks. Textbook publishers assumed that not only could women not handle an advanced rhetorical argument, but that they wouldn’t want to. Their femininity would keep them from true oratorical practice. Because true oratorical skills involved logical thinking and no well-bred woman would dare to reveal that she could outwit a “promiscuous audience”, often, many of the more rhetorically gifted women speakers went unheard (Zaeske 236). Early 19th-century college classrooms grappled with this dilemma: How to shape a young woman’s college education at a co-ed university. For it was one thing for women to read and recite verse and prose at a female-only institution, but would a woman truly want to read, write, study, and stand up to a man in a rhetorical classroom and challenge his arguments?

The outcry for institutions to open the gates for coeducational rhetorical training, so to speak, began a movement in education not seen for centuries. Rudolph explains the history of public education: “The extension of women’s education was the function of two agencies: the land-grant colleges and state universities where coeducation took hold; a trio of new women’s colleges which contributed heavily toward elevating the standards and the reputation of

collegiate education for women” (314). As more colleges began to question gender assumptions in why they were preventing women from entering, they also began to question how they would train them. Essentially, women demanded opportunities in furthering their education, and the public demanded earnestness or seriousness in their education. No more of “the babbling woman” (“Reigning” 274). And if the public was demanding seriousness in collegiate education for women, it was brought on by a call for serious women, or the professional woman. If colleges were going to move forward with a true rhetorical education for both genders, then they would need to redesign their curriculum. However, as we shall see, the majority of colleges were hesitant at first to fully incorporate a classical course with a women’s course. Both courses may have been available to women students, but research reveals that not all women were encouraged to enroll in the classical course. Colleges (and the public) wanted “proof” that their efforts would not be in vain if collegiate women were given rhetorical training (Rudolf 317). But as my research reveals, the college catalogues did start to reflect a shift in gender expectations. Collegiate women became fully embedded within the classrooms, curriculum, and rhetorical training of their fellow male students. The entrance of women into collegiate settings had begun.

The Story Behind the Research, Past and Present

I could never form research questions and develop a dissertation around all of the components surrounding 19th-century collegiate women. Regardless of what previous researchers have conveyed, I argue that archival evidence reveals more women were enrolling in collegiate rhetorical training programs and graduating than has previously been established. Welter and Johnson convey that women remained in parlors and received their education from this setting, yet evidence shows that many women willingly left their parlors and graduated from Classical Programs. Buchanan argues that the few collegiate women received a gender-specific

education that limited them to letter writing and elocution exercises, yet evidence shows that the specific women I researched—Matilda Joslyn Gage and Laura Cornelius Kellogg, and the site, the Cherokee Female Seminary—did no such thing. Joslyn Gage, Kellogg, and the Seminary are representative of a robust and serious rhetorical training program. These three examples show that some 19th-century collegiate women studied the same curriculum as men and they made themselves useful post-graduation.

Because so much happened in American history during the 19th century, we should examine these rhetorical sites as “historical actors” where the students, instructors, and colleges themselves promoted civic awareness (Kelley 17). Joslyn Gage attended the Clinton Liberal College. Kellogg varied her education considerably, so I examine her education at two specific sites, the University of Wisconsin and Stanford University. The final site is the Cherokee Female Seminary, where several students published essays in the newspaper *The Rosebud* and instructors worked with them to couple their rhetorical education with social responsibility. Each of these three examples illustrates the different constraints and resistances collegiate women faced both in the classroom and afterwards in the public.

Aware of how history affected her education and her rhetorical situation, Joslyn Gage utilized identification and omission in her arguments. Joslyn Gage was fearless and unconventional in the sense that she willingly wrote and spoke about issues that were not often discussed in feminine, respectable circles. She called out villains and perpetrators that she felt needed identifying. In contrast to this technique, I also point out that Joslyn Gage utilizes omission and purposely omits pertinent or relevant information in her writing. By doing this, she opens space for women to engage with context and write their stories for engagement. She performs both identification and omission in the National American Women’s Suffrage

Association newspaper, *The National Citizen and The Ballot Box*. She recognized that as an educated, elite, white woman, she could control a public platform and speak on subversive issues where others did not have that same leeway. She was educated and privileged and used her skills on behalf of the cause.

Kellogg used narration or storytelling as a weapon in her work. Kellogg was a prominent leader in the Oneida tribe that lived in the Wisconsin and New York area. She was raised on the power of storytelling and utilized this rhetorical tactic when she wrote her book *Our Democracy and the American Indian*. Kellogg used storytelling and argument in her book and used argument before Congress. Jo-Ann Archibald and Q'um Q'um Xiiem have characterized Indigenous storytelling as brilliant rhetoric. Archibald and Xiiem argue, "One cannot be said to have wisdom until others acknowledge an individual's respectful and responsible use and teaching of knowledge to others...I coined the term 'storywork' because I needed a term that signified that our stories and storytelling were to be taken seriously" (3). Storytelling takes on a form of communication or teaching, where the teacher relates something significant through a different approach: an intimate conversation. Kellogg wanted to reflect her tribe's stories but, at the same time, fought for her people's struggles.

This fight for her people's struggle is also illustrated through her writing, and I apply Scott Richard Lyons' term "rhetorical sovereignty" to Kellogg's work. Lyons conceptualized his term to represent the active and deliberate public work performed by Indigenous peoples in an effort to claim power and authority. Their claims can be performed through cultural and political writing that combines the stories of their people and their struggle to exist. This can be seen through Kellogg speaking in front of Congress, arguing for the water sovereignty rights of the Great Lakes region. Kellogg received a wide variety of rhetorical training from a wide variety of

colleges, and this helped her apply different tactics when pushing for power and authority. The rhetorical education and then public work from both Joslyn Gage and Kellogg are intriguing, because this evidence proves that women were gaining argumentative powers in classical courses and then moving into public work. But there is another narrative that can further push the dominant narrative of collegiate women, and that is the story of the Cherokee Female Seminary.

The Seminary has certainly been neglected from the story of collegiate women, let alone rhetorical training programs. But the Seminary was not alone in its efforts to be a site for women to gain rhetorical prowess. Susan Kates has researched and explored the rhetorical training programs from Smith College, Wilberforce University, and Brookwood Labor College. These sites are interesting, because not only were they unconventional for their ability to welcome a wide variety of women as collegians, but moreover, these sites encapsulated what Kates terms “activist education.” The colleges that were offering women rhetorical training in classical courses Kates terms “mainstream education.” The activist sites that Kates researched did something radical. They pulled specific women from labor unions and job sites to train them in rhetoric and then returned them to their labor unions to fight publicly for their unions’ causes. My chapter on the Seminary adds to Kates’s research, because although the women students from the Seminary did not enroll at the Seminary for activist causes, many of these collegiate women did move on to activist careers. I am adding to Kates’s scholarship by demonstrating that collegiate women, after being given rhetorical training, were empowered to contribute to activist causes.

Historians have collected mountains of evidence that women were under inherited social obligations to be submissive, to be respectable, and to be appealing. But, in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, in a post-Civil War world, in a society reeling with presidential

assassinations, and in cities gripped with poverty and indifference, many knew that men could not do it all. There was a place and a position for women. College administrators and the media called on women to be more than just housewives. They called on them to attain a college education, one that embedded a firm rhetorical curriculum within it. And women listened. Both Welter and Johnson were correct in their arguments that women were under the enormous pressure of a “cult,” but that, I argue, was lifted when they became *rhetorically useful* for their wider communities (152, *Gender* 4-5). They were very much still women, very much still feminine, but now rhetorically educated. To be *rhetorically useful* is to still be a woman, but femininity was no longer inconsistent with academic achievement.

The linchpin to my research is the term usefulness. I discovered this term in primary documents. College administrators were using it. Newspapers and journals drawing on it. There was a noticeable call for women to stop being complacent in their daily lives and to move into collegiate spaces to do more and be more. Many in society, men and women, acknowledged that the life of domesticity was not enough for women. Colleges opened their full curriculum to women, which led to the achievements of women I explore in this dissertation. I analyze the coursework and syllabi that 19th century women were exposed to and then explore how this rhetorical training translated into 20th century activist public spheres. There is evidence that the collegiate education 19th century women were given then elevated 19th- and 20th-century civic work, and I will examine this. *Rhetorical usefulness* is defined when a woman, having received a collegiate rhetorical education, purposefully moves into public work, thereby widening the typical issues many women spoke and wrote on and entering into often unwelcoming or hostile public spaces to bring awareness to her causes.

For far too long, the trope of wealthy, white parlor women have dominated the idea of 19th-century feminine culture. This image has framed a certain type of woman as being delicate and silent, and practically afraid to engage with anything other than parlor conversations. This woman found solace in the safety of parlors; this is where she demonstrated her manners and her affability. This narrative has resided in history and been reiterated for too long. When the stories of Joslyn Gage, Kellogg, and the Cherokee Female Seminary are juxtaposed with the dominant narrative, history can be viewed differently. These stories shift the narrative, revealing the role that collegiate education had for women of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Throughout this dissertation, I examine what collegiate women studied during college and what they then did with that education post-graduation in activist public spheres. In Chapter 2, I focus on Matilda Joslyn Gage. I present her biography and college experience, then discuss her writing in newspapers, a book, and a posthumously published scrapbook. In Chapter 3, I examine the life and work of Laura Cornelius Kellogg. I analyze Kellogg's life, her rhetorical training at two of the colleges she attended, and her public work, including her speeches before Congress and her book. In Chapter 4, I shift the lens of collegiate work and activism by researching the Cherokee Female Seminary in Tahlequah, Oklahoma. At this Seminary, the teachers and students worked closely with the Cherokee tribe to create a rhetorical education that would prepare the women students for a wide range of activist work, if they so wished. Finally, in Chapter 5, I discuss why the story of collegiate women's history needs to be expanded, and how my term *rhetorical usefulness* applies to women's changing position in history.

Chapter 2:

Widening Awareness of Social Need as a Way to Represent Usefulness:

Matilda Joslyn Gage

Introduction

In 1848, at the foothills of Seneca Falls, New York, thousands of women and their male supporters gathered to address the legal status of women, including ways that suffrage would better the lives of women. For far too long, women of various ages, races, socio-economic statuses, and education had experienced crime, abuse, and other outrages without recourse. These women could not vote in local school board elections or national presidential campaigns. Their sex, their inability to own property, and their assumed physically weaker bodies were all reasons given for withholding the vote from women. Research of early 1900s propaganda reveals the prevailing antisuffragist movement was strongly led by the belief that a woman's place was ultimately in the home, and the distinct roles between a husband and wife would be upended if women got the vote (Finneman 136-137). However, suffrage was not the only issue that drew these women together at Seneca Falls.

Better working conditions with a safe environment and equal pay, access to public education for children of all ages and socio-economic statuses, and the ability to file for divorce simply for being in a loveless marriage were all issues addressed in speeches during the Seneca Falls Convention. The various speakers argued that through suffrage, these injustices could be resolved, so the ability to vote united these women. Speakers such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Frederick Douglass argued that suffrage could better all Americans. Participants listened to how

these injustices all connected to women's inability to vote, and they declared enough is enough. The participants pledged to work together both in rallies and in print media to fight all inequalities that placed a woman in an inferior position (Stanton and Douglass 22). By the end of this convention, a resolution was agreed that a campaign primarily for suffrage would benefit the multitudes. Delegates and participants signed twelve resolutions that declared, "That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their sacred right to the elective franchise" (Johnston). Suffrage was necessary for all women so that any effort to position them in inferior roles could be thwarted. Seneca Falls was the beginning of the fight for equality, voice, and bodily autonomy (Campbell 4). So beginning in 1848, women went to work: they gathered in New York in what became, at the time, the largest gathering of female voices to fight for a cause. This gathering marked the beginning of the Women's Suffrage Movement.

Lasting almost a century from 1848 until 1920 with the passing of the 19th Amendment, the Women's Suffrage Movement was not one movement but several. Women from varying backgrounds, education, ages, and races stood behind the idea that their sex should not impede their right to vote. The movement was a vast collection of groups, clubs, conventions, and organizations that fought for women's rights. Formerly enslaved Black women, poor white working mothers, and young Indigenous collegiate graduates all shared in this collective history of fighting for women's rights and human rights. The women involved in suffrage history, though anchored by desiring the vote, were able to voice their concerns for human rights issues as well. Many stood on street corners, screaming for better working conditions. Many passed out pamphlets to the all-male members of Congress, attempting to draw attention to child welfare. The women who fought for the cause of suffrage recognized how being able to vote could dramatically affect so many other injustices in society. This is why the movement drew so many

in. However, to understand the vastness and power behind the movement, we must explore not only how the movement spread across the country but also who had the power to stand on platforms and give speeches.

At the Seneca Falls 1848 Convention, a “Declaration of Sentiments” was written, voted on, and signed that essentially spelled out the plight of 19th-century women. Primarily written by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Matilda Joslyn Gage¹, the “Sentiments” listed sixteen grievances and was modeled after the Declaration of Independence. The “Sentiments” united women under a common cause: equality. It was the idea of equality for women in all aspects of their lives that shaped the movement. The fight for safety in working conditions and the fight for equality in social conditions drove other states to host women’s conventions for suffrage rights. After Seneca Falls, the next major convention was held in Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1850, where Lucretia Mott and Lucy Stone became prominent (“More Women’s Rights Conventions”). The third convention was also held in Worcester, and the fourth convention moved to Cleveland, Ohio, in October 1853, where a large crowd of over fifteen hundred participants attended, possibly due to the nature of the speakers' radical addresses (“More Women’s Rights Conventions”). For the first time, speakers were promoting the right to divorce abusive husbands and tax exemptions for widows (“More Women’s Rights Conventions”). This geographical shift in place, a surprisingly large crowd, and diversity in speech topics illustrate that the fight for women’s suffrage was beginning to draw more people in. The fifth national convention would return to the East Coast, hosted in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and it is at this point in women's suffrage history that we begin to see an unfortunate pattern. Every national convention, until the eighth held in New York in 1858, where Frederick Douglass spoke openly

¹ I will refer to Matilda Joslyn Gage as Joslyn Gage throughout the entire dissertation, though there are biographies and texts that refer to her as Matilda or Gage.

on the need for universal suffrage, was led by wealthy white women (“More Women’s Rights Conventions”). Though equality was what drew so many in, many nonwhite women found their voices ignored or silenced, which caused a breakup in the organization. Black women began to host conventions and gatherings where they spoke on issues they felt needed visibility. In 1893, Fannie Barrier Williams, a Black activist and educator, helped establish the National League of Colored Women, which increased Black women’s participation and activism in education, vocational training, and suffrage work (Williams 54-55). Though the fight for suffrage was spreading nationally, ideological differences were causing separation within the movement. This problematic history reveals the systemic racism and elitism controlled by prominent leaders within the movement.

Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton are the two leaders synonymous with the Women’s Suffrage Movement. They traveled the country encouraging the spread of state organizations to host public and private gatherings. The two women helped form the National Women’s Suffrage Association (NWSA), along with Joslyn Gage, for which Stanton became the first president in 1869. NWSA worked to promote a federal amendment to the Constitution, believing that eliciting Congressional legislation was the best way to fight for suffrage. This mindset worked against the American Women’s Suffrage Association (AWSA), led by Lucy Stone, which believed that enfranchisement would be better gained by working state by state. To better serve the suffrage cause, the NWSA and AWSA eventually merged and became the NAWSA in 1890. Though this merger created bonds between many women who had not yet worked together, it also divided women on an ideological issue that many refused to concede. AWSA supported the 15th Amendment when it was ratified; NWSA did not. The 15th Amendment gave Black men the power to vote. Stanton adamantly refused to support the 15th

Amendment, even going so far as to use her editorial in the NWSA newspaper, *The Revolution*, to compare Black men with lunatics and the uneducated, implying that educated white women would better serve the voting community. Joslyn Gage did support the 15th Amendment, finding that every step towards equality would eventually benefit everyone. After the passage of the 15th Amendment, Joslyn Gage and Stanton eventually stopped communicating on NAWSA business and even as close friends. This ideological disagreement between Stanton and Joslyn Gage would, unfortunately, last a lifetime, as they were never able to mend their relationship (Leach 162). Divisions like Stanton's and Joslyn Gage's over the 15th Amendment reflect that many suffrage participants did not agree on every issue. One powerful fact that historians have uncovered is that, though suffrage was the main foundation of the movement, other issues that had been ignored up until this time were able to be made public through the movement.

In fact, this need to further uncover the tremendous effort undertaken by many of the unexplored voices of the Women's Suffrage Movement lends historians to continue archival work. In their work, they are uncovering many of the women who did backbreaking work without recognition or reward. As the suffrage cause migrated across the country, more voices rose to speak on platforms that inspired the uplifting of communities. This is reflected in the essay "To Help Indians Help Themselves," in which Gertrude Simmons Bonnin analyzes the many civic issues that Indigenous women fought for, like Laura Cornelius Kellogg (who will also later be explored) in her fight for Oneida rights, and Stella Atwood, who fought for Native American reform, but were also either ignored or slighted by wealthy white women who believed suffrage was the main issue the movement needed to concentrate on (243-246). And yes, suffrage was what drew many to convention halls and public rallies, but at the same time, and as my dissertation will analyze, the movement included a broad range of civic activism.

The civic issues that were argued by speakers reflect the capability of the movement to sometimes widen the lens of its main campaign of suffrage. This can be seen in some of the speeches given by suffrage leaders. For example, in 1851, formerly enslaved Black mother Sojourner Truth gave her famous, “Ain’t I A Woman?” speech at the Akron, Ohio Women’s Rights Convention. Her speech’s theme highlighted a 19th-century stereotype that was readily visible within the movement: Black women were consistently dehumanized. Truth revealed the many masculine roles she had undertaken throughout life, displaying her masculine arm and many scars on her back. Yet, wasn’t she a woman, she asked. Indigenous women were also denied platform opportunities and instead pushed into laborious roles. Truth was willing to widen the scope of suffrage by questioning the conventional roles of Black women. Many suffrage leaders recognized the power to extend suffrage into other causes, such as women’s roles. One such leader, Joslyn Gage, firmly believed in the power of spreading the movement, but she was also intelligent enough to see what was the underlying cause of much of women’s oppression.

Utilizing both the NAWSA’s newspaper, *The National Citizen and the Ballot Box*, and writing a book, *Woman, Church, and State*, Joslyn Gage identified one of the most powerful forces of patriarchy: the Catholic Church. Joslyn Gage extended the suffrage cause to marriage, reproduction, and child rearing, blaming the Catholic Church for women’s oppression. Anthony, unwilling to ostracize such a powerful force as the Catholic Church, publicly separated herself from Joslyn Gage by withdrawing her editorial duties from NAWSA’s newspaper (Paquet). Joslyn Gage eventually went her own way without her two most loyal friends and founded the Women’s National Liberal Association. This theme of supporting unpopular civic causes that were not in the mainstream of the suffrage cause, I argue, came about because Joslyn Gage saw

herself as *rhetorically useful*, empowered through her collegiate education. And though Joslyn Gage began her own organization to support many unconventional and non-mainstream issues, she also supported the ongoing effort to fight for women's suffrage. Her approach was to frame women's suffrage as a means to address many unconventional and non-mainstream issues.

For the fight was not over. Far from it. In fact, even though the cause began as an East Coast effort and slowly spread west across the country, remarkably, the western state of Wyoming in 1869 was the first to grant women the vote (Loria and Von Zumbusch 20). Following Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, and Utah Territory were the next to grant women suffrage (Loria and Von Zumbusch 21). Finally, as more states signed onto legislation conceding women's enfranchisement, President Woodrow Wilson asked Congress to vote for the 19th Amendment, which was ratified in 1920 (Loria and Von Zumbusch 23-24). Women became voting citizens.

This century was defined by many who challenged the status quo, rejected the elitist terms shaping the previous generation, and raised the question of why communities weren't living better. The women activists enabled this questioning of inherited systems of power, inherited systems of oppression. Many authors and speakers rose to historical fame through their ability to apply their rhetorical skills to push for social justice. One such historical writer and speaker, Joslyn Gage, is the central focus of this chapter. Both her biography and writing represent a nuanced category of my thesis of *rhetorical usefulness*, where, through her rhetorical education at Clinton Liberal Institute, she gained rhetorical skills and broadened the mission of the Women's Suffrage Movement. Joslyn Gage worked both inside and outside of the Women's Suffrage Movement, editing and writing, and fighting for an expansion into what she viewed as pertinent to civic reform—the beginning frame of *rhetorical usefulness*.

I will apply my definition of *rhetorical usefulness* to the collegiate education and public work of Joslyn Gage. She, by earning her degree, was able to master a wide collection of rhetorical weapons that she then chose where and when to apply. This ability to choose is an element I will discuss as to how Joslyn Gage's education, work, and usefulness, differs from Susan Kate's concept of activist rhetorical instruction. Many 19th-century women enrolled in rhetorical programs with the aspiration of moving beyond the parlor and become public activist and many did not. Many 19th-century women understood the concept of activism as intimidating and chose not to work publicly. Joslyn Gage was not one of these women. Though she was not trained with the endgoal in mind as to publicly serve, she did eventually publicly serve. Joslyn Gage, through her collegiate education, worked to widen what was expected of the arguments from the Women's Suffrage Movement, while also challenging oppressive systems of power. Both of these skills make her useful not only to the Movement's history, but women's history but most importantly, women's collegiate history.

The Life of Matilda Joslyn Gage: "Great wrongs accumulate..."

Joslyn Gage was born on March 24, 1826, and died on March 18, 1898² (Brammar 1-2). Her seventy-two years were a whirlwind of writing and activism. Her father, Dr. Hezekiah, and mother, Helen Leslie Joslyn, were abolitionists and scholars in the New York area, raising Joslyn Gage in a fervent academic home (Corey 12-13). Even at a young age, Joslyn Gage's parents pushed her to research and consider many social reforms such as "abolition, temperance, woman's rights, and free thought" (Corey 12-13). This awareness of civic need was based on the geographical context of where and how she lived. Growing up and living her entire life in the state of New York blessed Joslyn Gage with many rewards: her family home was a stop on the

² For this biography, I rely on the historical research of Leila R. Brammer, Mary E. Corey, Ellen DuBois, William Leach, Sally R. Wagner, Mari Jo Buhle and Paul Buhle, Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, Laura Byrne Paquet, and Barbara Welter.

Underground Railroad, and she regularly visited and interacted with the neighboring Iroquois tribes (Brammer 1-2). These diverse experiences helped develop a capricious worldview and led her to value education throughout her entire life.

From her parents' influence, Joslyn Gage knew education was an outlet that would help her accomplish her goals in life. Her father pushed Joslyn Gage to argue civic issues that she was passionate about, and to further explore research topics she needed more information on. When Joslyn Gage applied to and was rejected from Geneva Medical School in both 1843 and 1844, “both times because she was a woman,” Joslyn Gage further saw the need to better understand how discrimination works (Corey 13). Understanding her place in society became another pivotal moment in her life when she attended Clinton Liberal Institute and studied rhetoric. After graduating from Clinton Liberal Institute, Joslyn Gage married a man who would unconditionally support her in her activism. She married Henry Hill Gage on January 6, 1845, and began the life of service for noble causes (Corey 13). Joslyn and Henry Gage lived a happy life, raising five children primarily in Fayetteville, New York, while Joslyn pursued her quest to end oppression and discrimination (Dubois 25). Her lifelong activism for women’s issues, Indigenous reform, and human rights can be seen through her writing and speeches.

At the beginning, Joslyn Gage engaged with newspapers, advocating for more women to get involved with local issues of importance in the Syracuse and Onondaga County areas (Corey 13). Writing for journals such as *The Aberdeen Saturday Pioneer* and *The Liberal Thinker* enabled Joslyn Gage to voice her opinion on unconventional or controversial topics without having to present them publicly. This mode of writing worked for her, but eventually, she was asked to take her bold ideas to the platform. At her third women’s rights convention at Syracuse in 1852, she spoke at length on women acquiring political knowledge to better serve their gender,

though she literally “‘trembl[ed] in every limb’” (DuBois 24). This speech was the start of her public performance; she would not always “tremble” and would confidently grace any stage speaking on many civic issues (Dubois 24). Writing and speaking on women’s rights became a daily practice for her. Early in 1860, she began writing and editing *The Revolution*, which would extend her further into public recognition when she dedicated many of the pages to the various and diverse careers of women (Leach 162). At this same time, she also helped Stanton to edit *History of Woman’s Suffrage*, though, unfortunately, when Joslyn Gage parted ways fundamentally with Stanton over the 15th Amendment, she was credited as simply being a contributor to the book (Leach 162). The 15th Amendment enabled Black men to vote but not women, and this fundamental difference caused strife between Stanton and Joslyn Gage that would never mend. But this unfortunate parting did not stop Joslyn Gage from writing about women’s issues and women’s achievements; according to Corey, “She can best be assessed as an historian, a pioneering advocate of women’s history, and the author of the only monograph on women’s history to emerge from the 19th-century suffrage movement” (16). Archival work of women became one of Joslyn Gage’s most important goals as she spent much time making the public aware of the many contributions women have made. In addition to publicizing women’s accomplishments and advocating for women’s issues, Joslyn Gage developed a lifelong and earnest relationship with the neighboring Indigenous tribes.

Living her entire life in the New York area, she regularly interacted with the Haudenosaunee tribes and witnessed the many injustices that befell them. Joslyn Gage took it upon herself to further her education by understanding not only the structural makeup of the Haudenosaunee but also to understand that as a prominent member of society, she could help them. Studying for years with them, she discovered a key teaching of theirs: the Matriarchate.

She later wrote, ““Never was justice more perfect, never civilization higher than under the Matriarchate”” (Wagner). This type of Indigenous structure gave women a larger voice in tribal decisions and autonomy over their lives. By understanding this concept of the Matriarchate, Joslyn Gage began to see governmental structures and other patriarchal systems in a new light, as condescending and patronizing. Wagner describes the history of Joslyn Gage’s relationship with the Iroquois as follows:

It began in the 1870s when, as President of the National Women Suffrage Association, she published a series of articles on the Iroquois which were featured prominently in the New York Evening Post and reprinted in several other papers in the state. Gage believed that ‘under [Iroquois] women the science of government reached the highest form known to the world.’

By understanding the Matriarchate structure, Joslyn Gage better understood the power women could hold if given the opportunity. She wrote that Iroquois women consistently commanded a “superiority in power” in all familial issues and, impressively, “women exercised controlling power in peace and war” (Wagner). In her articles, Joslyn Gage illustrated that Iroquois women were not confined to domesticity; their roles and expectations in life exceeded what white society expected of white women (Wagner). The bond she developed with the Haudenosaunee helped her to realize that women could effectively serve in other roles, roles that were stipulated not solely based on sex.

Joslyn Gage continued to champion causes that many of the upper echelons of the movement did not favor, but she did not care. As an abolitionist who passionately fought for women’s rights and Indigenous rights, she knew that her privileged collegiate education could benefit many. As Brammer argued “The only contempt that she showed was for women who

knowingly participated in the oppression of others of their sex and for all who refused to see the oppression under which women lived” (40). Joslyn Gage knew ““Great wrongs accumulate until society becomes sick and in the effort to throw off the disease, terrible social corruptions occur”” (Leach 21). She wanted to devote the final years of her public life to addressing these “great wrongs” (Leach 21). She found an outlet for confronting these civic issues in writing and editing *The National Citizen and The Ballot Box* from 1878 to 1881 (Campbell 339). Joslyn Gage used her editorials to make visible what others were apprehensive to discuss publicly.

It is at this time, in 1881, that Joslyn Gage wrote a column titled “Preceding Causes,” which became preliminary work for her penultimate book, *Woman, Church, and State*. In this text, she begins to argue that:

The twin barriers to human rights...are the Church and the State. Both conspire to limit freedom. The Church stifles free inquiry and the State maintains artificial order through a temporary sanction. Woman is the greatest victim in this tyranny because she is more socially helpless than man and more subject to the sway of superstition. (Buhle and Buhle 49)

Woman, Church, and State is emblematic of a lifetime's work. Her work with *The Revolution*, *The National Citizen & The Ballot Box*, her many speeches at conventions and public rallies, and connecting with the Iroquois and advocating for them all contributed to this masterpiece. This work reflected how Joslyn Gage developed the connection between women's oppression, democracy, and the Catholic Church. For ten chapters, Joslyn Gage breaks down how patriarchal institutions systematically control women. The book was a trying experience and led to much criticism from many who were close to her, but it did not deter her from continuing her public work. In 1890, she helped found the National Women's Liberal Association and gave the speech

“The Dangers of the Hour” at the February 24, 1890, convention in Washington, D.C. (Campbell 339). In 1893, she was adopted into the Wolf Clan of the Mohawk Nation and began dedicating more of her writing towards the visibility of injustices committed on the New England Indigenous tribes (Paquet). Much research has revealed that many communities, such as the New York Indigenous communities and the members of the National Women’s Liberal Association, found solace in Joslyn Gage’s courageous writing and the relationships she formed with her Indigenous neighbors.

The research on Joslyn Gage can be found in two larger biographies and many supplemental articles about her relationship with Indigenous groups. Scholars such as Leila R. Brammer and Mary E. Corey have dedicated biographies solely to Joslyn Gage’s life. Joslyn Gage has been mentioned in suffrage history anthologies and within New England Indigenous feminist writing. And though both Brammer and Corey’s research present Joslyn Gage in an irreplaceable light for the suffrage movement, many still do not know Joslyn Gage’s name when placed in context with Anthony or Stanton. Even though Joslyn Gage contributed an entire chapter of the *History of Women’s Suffrage*, Stanton is typically credited as the author of this epic work. And though Joslyn Gage fully understood the consequences of writing *Woman, Church, and State*, she, arguably, has not been credited for her contributions to women’s suffrage. These lessons in writing on difficult or sticky civic issues reflect that Joslyn Gage may not be more widely known until we begin to appreciate the actions she took as an outlier for women’s rights.

Her outlier life and writing are emblematic of what I define as *rhetorical usefulness*. This is a term I created after studying many educational documents from collegiate administrators who were calling on 19th-century women to be useful, beneficial, or effective. Collegiate administrators were essentially calling on 19th-century women to ignore the domestic confines

of “the cult of true womanhood” and get an academic education (Welter 152). They extended the sphere of women and encouraged them to do or be something useful other than just a housewife. So, this framing of my definition of *rhetorical usefulness* begins with a call from collegiate administrators who recognized the potential of young academically aspiring women. I then began examining the course catalogues, syllabi, and textbooks of particular higher institutions. There were similarities among many of the classical programs. Based on this collegiate research and coupling it with research on women leaders I chose to study, I developed a definition that encapsulated what happens after a woman decides to step beyond domesticity and through a collegiate education. *Rhetorical usefulness* is comprised of widening the visibility of civic issues that were presented at women’s rights conventions, negotiating spaces that were often socially unacceptable for a 19th-century woman, and finally, utilizing the rhetorical training learned in a collegiate setting and applying that training in public work.

Prior to the beginning of the 19th century, there was a common trope of wealthy white women lounging all day in parlors, where the cares and stresses of society were of no concern (Johnson *Gender* 21-22). Of course, this trope never applied to others. Civic issues were not a part of a woman’s daily life. This changed. Due to many circumstances, both public and private college administrators realized that women did not need to be confined within their domestic spheres. An academic woman could also be a mother and demonstrate her domestic duties. This is why college administrators encouraged white, Indigenous, and Black women to enroll in higher institutions and pursue an education in courses other than domestic science. Colleges trained women in rhetoric. Colleges trained women to argue. And women used this training in the public sphere.

In developing the definition of *rhetorical usefulness*, I consider women's contributions, both stylistically and spatially, while also pushing on the scholarship of Lindal Buchanan, Nan Johnson, and Barbara Welter. For *rhetorical usefulness* begins with broadening the terrain. It reflects a woman rhetor willing to confront topics and argue in ways that are not typical of what would be expected of her station in life. It also reflects a woman rhetor venturing into public spaces that may make her both emotionally and physically vulnerable, spaces that may not necessarily welcome her. *Rhetorical usefulness* can be represented in both how and where the rhetors were working. And, because the situational context pushed an educationally aspiring woman to be more visible and more vulnerable, there is another layer of *rhetorical usefulness* that I will examine in all of my examples as well: fearlessness. The examples I explore for illustrating *rhetorical usefulness* reflect contributions to women's suffrage history that have been researched but are not as well-known as other examples. Joslyn Gage, for example, has multiple biographies written about her, as does Kellogg. In addition, the Cherokee Female Seminary is less well known as a space for higher education in Oklahoma, especially now that it is known as Northeastern State University. Also, because my definition of *rhetorical usefulness* reflects the collegiate catalogues and how classical programs trained women to dominate arguments, I will present both Joslyn Gage and Kellogg and the Seminary in nuances that have not been analyzed before. *Rhetorical usefulness* is a lens scholars can use to appreciate how 19th-century women first gained collegiate training, then moved into public spheres, advocating for often unexplored civic issues.

Clinton Liberal Institute

Education was deeply important to Joslyn Gage. It begins in her home, with her father and mother pushing her to challenge and engage with civic reform. When she enrolled at Clinton

Liberal Institute in 1841 and graduated in 1845, she began her training for a career in rhetorical work (“Gage, Matilda Joslyn (1826-1898)” 268). There she learned the basics of rhetorical structure. There she learned the research process and how a well-turned phrase was integral to connecting with her audience. The Institute was founded in 1831 by the Universalist Church and patroned consistently by about a hundred or so well-regarded families that sought a site for liberal education (Smith 284). At Clinton Liberal Institute, Joslyn Gage learned that her sex would not impede a well-deserved education. The courses, catalogues, and textbooks represent a design in classical education used by many other 19th-century colleges. And though a classical education was historically meant for male students, when college administrators opened the door for women to enter collegiate programs and acquire a classical education, they opened the door to their *rhetorical usefulness*.

Though originally founded in 1831, the Institute did not open its doors until 1832, welcoming both men and women for a three-term school year (“Catalogue of the Officers (1837)” 10-11). Students could expect to pay a \$4.00 tuition fee per term for “the Latin language, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Rhetoric, Algebra, Surveying, Geometry, etc., for any and all of these, \$6.00 per Term; — for the Greek, Hebrew, French or German languages, Intellectual Philosophy, the highest branches of Mathematics” (“Catalogue of the Officers (1837)” 11). Beneath an extensive description of the campus grounds, the Institute Catalogue includes a specific note that “every student is received on the implied promise of diligence and strict application to his studies, and of gentlemanly conduct and moral propriety,” a cautionary statement that reminded all students that their decorum was always monitored (“Catalogue of the Officers (1837)” 11). The 1837 Catalogue then proceeds to describe the specific departments the Institute offers: a Juvenile Department, the Classical Department, and the Women’s Department,

all of which list specific books and curricula (“Catalogue of the Officers (1837)” 11). For example, the Classical Department lists its principal books and studies in “Adam’s Latin Grammar, Gould’s edition; Jacob’s Latin Reader; Caesar; Virgil; Sallust; Cicero’s Orations; Livy Folsom’s edition; Horace, Anthon’s edition; Tacitus; Cicero de Oratore; Goodich’s Greek Grammar; Jacob’s Greek Reader; Graeca Majora; Leevizae’s French Grammar; and Voltaire” (“Catalogue of the Officers (1837)” 11). Though this is the 1837 Catalogue, when Joslyn Gage attends the Institute from 1841 to 1845, the Catalogue for 1840 expands in departments and curricula.

By 1840, the Clinton Liberal Institute was evolving. The departments then included the Languages Department, Mathematics Department, English & Classical Department, the Female Department, and the Music Department (“Catalogue of the Officers (1840)” 3). In the span of three school years, the expansion of the faculty at the Institute had increased so rapidly that students were now being offered a wider variety of options. Because Joslyn Gage had such an early exposure to argument in the home, it is likely that she took courses in the English and Classical Department (Corey 12-13). The English & Classical Department added new books to its syllabi, including:

Adam’s Latin Grammar; Jacob’s Latin Reader; Caesar; Virgil; Sallust; Cicero’s Orations; Livy; (Folsom’s edition,) Horace; (Anthon’s edition,) Tacitus; Cicero de Oratore; Anthon’s Greek Grammar; Jacob’s Greek Reader; Graeca Majora; Greek Testament; Bush’s Hebrew Grammar; Levizac’s French Grammar; Voltaire’s Charles XII., Davies’ Arithmetic; Day and Young’s Algebra; Davies’ Calculus; Young’s Mechanics; Norton’s Astronomy; Young’s Trigonometry; Brown’s English Grammar; Comstock’s Natural Philosophy; Comstock’s Chemistry;

Smith's Geography; Blair's and Whately's Rhetoric; Whately's Logic; Wilson's Political Economy; Say's Political Economy; Abercrombie on Moral Feelings and Intellectual Powers. ("Catalogue of the Officers (1840)" 11)

This curriculum is intriguing for several reasons. Not only did the Institute exponentially raise the level and number of grammar books it expected its students to study, but now, it adds very specific lectures on "Rhetoric, Logic, Political Economy, Moral Feelings and Intellectual Powers" ("Catalogue of the Officers (1840)" 11). I argue that between the school years of 1841 and 1845, when Joslyn Gage was a student at the Institute, more professors and administrators knew the value of civic argument. Historically, at this moment, the country was in conflict. The Mexican-American War was raging in the southwest, the country was coming out of an economic panic in 1837 from the price drop in cotton, and the shortest-term president, William Henry Harrison, died in office after only serving one month. I speculate that collegiate education was being shaped by larger ideas. Collegiate administrators were considering the impact of moving women into college spaces. Clinton Liberal Institute looked at other higher institutes and saw women entering and excelling in rhetorical programs. The Institute grappled with economic, political, and social changes, and their 1840 Catalogue reflects an emphasis on these changes.

When the 1840 Clinton Liberal Institute faculty added courses and textbooks such as "Blair's and Whately's Rhetoric, Whately's Logic, Wilson's Political Economy, Say's Political Economy, Abercrombie on Moral Feelings and Intellectual Powers" they weren't just expanding the university's curriculum for enrollment purposes; they were also expanding the resources students had for fulfilling promising careers in public performance ("Catalogue of the Officers (1840)" 11). Two of these sources, Hugh Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* and the textbook *Political Economy* by John Bascom, became staples for many universities. In fact,

[John Bascom]’s very first book, *Political Economy* (1859), was used as a textbook at Yale and in other colleges...The economic and social philosophy of Bascom in this, his first formal exposition of the subject, was obviously tinged strongly with laissez-faire individualism and with an apologetic for capitalism that is suggestive of the elaborate rationale that was even then being formulated in business circles. (Curti 283)

These two anchor textbooks taught students a wide variety of content, including civic duty in all things and competition in economics. The textbooks taught students both oratory and composition. From Blair’s textbook, students were regularly given:

The study of rhetoric and belles lettres as including the traditional divisions of ‘Oratory and Public Speaking’ (eloquence of popular assemblies, the bar, and the pulpit) and ‘the most distinguished kinds of Composition both in prose and verse’ (historical writing, philosophical writing, dialogue, epistolary writing, fictitious history, and pastoral, lyric, didactic, descriptive, epic, dramatic, and comic poetry). (Johnson *Nineteenth-Century* 33)

Seeking out “knowledge of ourselves” was a theme for many classical students when they were asked to consider different perspectives and, regardless of their gender, eventually, asked to defend their positions and claims against students and professors (Johnson *Nineteenth-Century* 35).

The 1840 Catalogue was just the beginning of another expansion in curriculum. By 1850, Joslyn Gage had already graduated, and women enrolling in Classical programs were not nearly as unconventional as previously considered. The 1850-51 Catalogue differs slightly from the previous decades. Here, the Courses of Study are branched into First, Second, Third, and Fourth

Classes, and though writing and grammar are consistent throughout the First class, it is in the Second Class when argument is addressed (“Catalogue of the Officers (1850-51)” 21). In the Second Class, students were expected to take “Caesar’s Commentaries; Writing and Latin; Themes and Declamation; Xenophon’s Anabasis; and Moral Philosophy” (“Catalogue of the Officers (1850-51)” 21). The Third Class introduced “Whately’s Rhetoric; Political Economy, Cicero’s Orations,” and the Fourth Class listed “Anthon’s Horace; the Odes; Thucydides; Philosophy of the Mind; Original Essays; Satires and Epistles; Evidences of Christianity; and German, Latin, and Greek Lectures” (“Catalogue of the Officers (1850-51)” 21-22). After this robust course list, several explanations are given on qualifications and expectations for entrance. And, although nothing is untoward, a note is written in the 1850-51 Catalogue:

For females in general this must differ somewhat from the course now given, but it is intended so to adapt it that every lady may obtain just such an education as she pleases. Ladies will be able to pursue the Languages, the Mathematics, and the Natural Sciences, to any extent they may wish; and, in both Departments, the aim will be to render education as complete as three years can make it.

(“Catalogue of the Officers (1850-51)” 22)

It would seem that Clinton Liberal College was similar to Oberlin College in that both faculty and administrators believed in the academic ability of women. Both universities viewed collegiate women as being more “complete” after having attained a college degree (“Catalogue of the Officers (1850-51)” 22). Clinton Liberal Institute’s catalogues from 1837-1851 detail an increasing awareness of fulfilling student needs and demand. Courses continued to increase in academic challenge, and women continued to enroll in them. Textbooks transformed how lessons were taught as newer editions introduced a variety of methods. This evolution in courses and

textbooks illustrates that a bigger pattern was underway. By offering women courses in Rhetoric, Political Economy, and Moral Philosophy, colleges were teaching and encouraging women to learn the structure of argument (Johnson *Nineteenth-Century* 167).

This evidence that women were being taught and encouraged to learn how to argue is complex. If based on the university catalogues that I present in this dissertation, which all have similar approaches in their Classical program (Rhetoric, Logic, and Political Economy), then we need to expand on the research presented so far on 19th-century collegiate education. In her book, *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life, 1866-1910*, Nan Johnson argues:

Nonacademic or *parlor* traditions of rhetoric and popular constructions of rhetorical performance after the Civil War helped to sustain the icon of the white, middle-class woman as queen of her domestic sphere by promoting a code of rhetorical behavior for women that required the performance of conventional femininity. (2)

The parlor was an interesting place for women. It included a particular set of expectations for behavior in women: respectability, and it also excluded women from participating in anything outside of the borders of domesticity. Within the parlor rhetoric, which “represented prestige,” women were taught “elocution and speaker manuals” that “centered on domestic themes and entertainment,” and was the opposite of classical rhetoric “that linked oratory and argumentation only to white men” (Johnson *Gender* 15). These binaries of parlor rhetoric versus academic rhetoric presupposed that it was unwomanly for a woman to learn oratory and argumentation because it would pull her out of her acceptable sphere. By identifying domesticity and parlors with femininity, Johnson is claiming that anything outside of these bounds, as in a college classroom, was masculine. A woman shouldn’t learn “Caesar’s Commentaries; Writing and

Latin; Themes and Declamation; Xenophon's *Anabasis*; and Moral Philosophy" not only because was it physically outside of the confines of her parlor, but also it went against what was respectable conversation for her ("Catalogue of the Officers (1850-51)" 21). My research of these catalogues expands our understanding of what women were learning and how women negotiated what were respectable spheres for them to work in. Arguably, by acquiring more classical rhetorical training, 19th-century collegiate women were empowered to push back against the once nonnegotiable confines of the parlor. But what did this training in Rhetoric and Logic entail? Let's take a closer look at this training.

From the Clinton Liberal Institute 1840 Catalogue, we see "Blair's and Whately's Rhetoric; Whately's Logic" listed as required courses ("Catalogue of the Officers (1840)" 11). Both Blair and Whately were rhetorical giants. Hugh Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* and Richard Whately's *Elements of Rhetoric* were reflections of the pedagogical forces in rhetorical collegiate instruction. Johnson argues that 19th-century rhetorical education was shaped by "three overt influences: 'firm classical foundations,' belletristic interests in 'criticism and literary taste,' and epistemological approaches to rhetoric as a 'science' closely related to the study of the 'mental faculties'" (*Nineteenth-Century* 14). These structures posited a concrete basis of elitism in argument. Blair, in his textbook, presented "eloquence of the bar, eloquence of popular assemblies, and eloquence of the pulpit," so whether a rhetor was training for litigation, legislation, or theological studies, their rhetoric was based in precision and effectiveness (Johnson *Nineteenth-Century* 32). Like Blair, Whately asserts that rhetoric was "the art of writing and speaking," which framed "the rhetorical process follow[ing] from the investigative procedures of logic" (Johnson *Nineteenth-Century* 51). Both of these textbooks gave collegiate women a firm grasp of how to approach opposing arguments, despite the fact that arguing was a

masculine construct. And by enabling a variety of advanced curricula, college administrators implied that classrooms and courses were reshaping the landscape of women's sphere. The concept of "true womanhood" is something I contest (Welter 152).

College administrators were aware of the delicacy of expanding curriculum offerings. Many women students wanted more rigorous courses, but based on the social expectations of women in the 19th century, many administrators were hesitant to offer such courses. David Gold and Catherine L. Hobbs posit this dilemma in *Educating the New Southern Woman: Speech, Writing, and Race at the Public Women's Colleges, 1884-1945*. The authors point out:

At the same time, campus officials had to honor traditional ideals regarding their state's young white daughters, especially given the sometimes shaky initial legislative support for their institutions. In numerous examples of early catalogue copy and other communications, college leaders explicitly strive to find a balance between old South traditions and new South needs. In an 1887 report to the board of trustees, Mississippi State College for Women president Richard W. Jones assured board members, 'We are not teaching women to demand the 'rights' of men nor to invade the sphere of men' but rather offering the 'high training' of the mind, taste, and morals 'which fits her for the ways of modest usefulness.' (Gold and Hobbs 27)

Here, again, we see more college administrators arguing for 19th-century women to be useful. Or "modest[ly] useful" (Gold and Hobbs 27)! Yes, they were walking a fine line between admitting that their women students were receiving "'high training' of the mind," but at the same time walking back the idea that they were not encouraging these same students from entering places where they were not wanted (Gold and Hobbs 27). Understandably, Gold and Hobbs' study

focuses on Southern colleges, and here we see Welter's influence of the "cult of true womanhood" being applied to only "young white daughters"; but, I argue, the same positionality is being placed on all women (152, Gold and Hobbs 27). Throughout my research I will challenge this concept by presenting different examples that push back against this idea. A "modest[ly] useful" woman is a step in the right direction (Gold and Hobbs 27). A "modest[ly] useful" woman steps outside of the confines of domesticity and seeks out higher academic training. She places her "mind" first, and finds an education that "fits her" or serves her (Gold and Hobbs 27). Similar to Oberlin's President Fairchild, President Jones understood the position of a woman wanting "high training" to have a high mind (Gold and Hobbs 27). But some collegiate women were far more than "modest[ly] [useful]" (Gold and Hobbs 27). Such was the case with Joselyn Gage.

And the "modest usefulness" young collegiate women learned when attending rhetorical training programs was the objective purpose for many college administrators, unlike the activist rhetorical instruction Susan Kates discusses in her *Activist Rhetorics and American Higher Education* 1885-1937. Kates juxtaposes activist training with mainstream training by defining activist training with rhetorical instruction based on the racist, sexist, and unjust embodied experiences that 19th-century women lived daily (9-10). Rhetoric instructors recognized that there were many "specific disenfranchised groups" that were ironically also collegiate women hoping to become more active "civic participants" (Kates 10). Activist training was, according to Kates, rare for universities; instead, many relied on mainstream rhetorical training that was "entirely uniform or monolithic" (9). The catalogues for Clinton Liberal College reveal a mainstream rhetorical education. The difference here between activist training and *rhetorical usefulness* is with activist training college faculty had an end goal of seeing their female

collegians moving into civic participation and publicly performing, whereas with *rhetorical usefulness* college faculty called on collegiate women to do something purposeful, public or not, with their degree. The purpose was to leave the parlor and after acquiring a rhetorical education to live a purpose-driven life. With activist training, Kates points out that the women collegians were always aware that after graduation their lives would be filled with activist public work. Through my research and concept of *rhetorical usefulness*, I add on to Kates concept and push that there were women who received a mainstream collegiate education and decided, voluntarily, to move into activist public work. I will push that the institute, curriculum, and possibly instructors many collegiate women received influenced their decision to move publicly, but ultimately they were given the freedom to decide. Joslyn Gage, by attending Clinton Liberal Institute, was given the tools of a mainstream rhetorical education; she deliberately chose a life of radical activism.

Writing as a Call for Identification and Omitting

Between 1878 and 1881, Joslyn Gage wrote and edited for the NAWSA newspaper, *The National Citizen and Ballot Box* (Boland 30). The paper became a springboard for men and women to question American traditions, ask for reforms to different issues, and also advertise for rudimentary items. Though the paper is a treasure trove of archival evidence of women writing in the 19th century, only two of Joslyn Gage's original columns have survived: "Matilda Joslyn Gage on the Right of Habeas Corpus" and "Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box." I will analyze each through identification and the use of omission as a devices to give space to women and issues Josyln Gage saw as needing visability. Joslyn Gage was a wealthy, educated, white woman who, having worked with Indigenous tribes for many years and being a first-hand witness to enslaved people escaping to the North, did not want to speak on behalf of women

when she had not necessarily experienced much of their pain, sorrow, or traumas. Joslyn Gage's use of omission as a way to enable herself and other women to engage with the issues they wanted to, but still convey anonymity, if needed. By deliberately omitting details or other information, Joslyn Gage encouraged women in their agency.

This is why I will argue for Joslyn Gage, who both names and omits in the newspaper, and will evaluate this strategy for its coupling with *rhetorical usefulness*. Joslyn Gage willingly placed herself amongst vulnerable people and chose to listen to their stories in order to be a vehicle for writing their stories. In the pages of the newspaper, Joslyn Gage both encouraged women to *name* the issues that oppressed them, while also omitting specific details of issues that other women found exploited them. Rhetorical scholar Edward P. J. Corbett discusses the relevance of rhetorical omission and how its schemes can assist with drawing attention to areas that authors want readers to hone in on. He argues that this practice can be both “artful and arresting” and can slow down a “hurried rhythm in the sentence” when a reader is forced to fill in the blanks (432-434). By omitting information, Joslyn Gage asked her readers to pause and consider the themes of her writing and their implications. In addition to these two tasks, Joslyn Gage demonstrated her rhetorical education throughout the newspaper. Based on the catalogues from Clinton Liberal Institute, we know that the students who enrolled in the classical course were instructed in rigorous training. Because the study of Cicero, Livy, and Horace was required at the Institute, we can surmise that Joslyn Gage learned the rhetorical reasoning that is abundantly demonstrated in her columns.

The 1876 *National Citizen and Ballot Box* issue covers many illuminating topics, including suffrage education and letters directed to Privy Council members. Joslyn Gage's column, featured on the front page and as the first editorial in the paper, reflects the mission

statement that suffrage was the main purpose of the newspaper. Written for the November 1876 print and published in Toledo, Ohio, her editorial titled “Matilda Joslyn Gage on the Right of Habeas Corpus” opens with an examination of an American tradition that should be natural to all citizens. She argues that “The protection of the writ of Habeas corpus is denied married women in every State of this Union, notwithstanding the Constitution of the United States declares it shall not be suspended except when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety demands it” (Gage “Matilda Joslyn Gage on the Right of Habeas Corpus”). She states the facts: the Constitution, which governs our country and by which our laws are checked and kept in balance, does not state that if you’re a married woman, habeas corpus does not apply to you. Yet, she does not come out and name who is denying women habeas corpus; she leaves the culprit nameless, allowing her readers to name them. Instead, she does blame “The newspapers, [though] so vigorous in their objection to its necessary suspension during the war, have never protested against its illegal, unjust, and unconstitutional suspension in case of married women” (Gage “Matilda Joslyn Gage on the Right of Habeas Corpus”). Why blame the newspapers? Why blame a nameless entity, one that cannot be held accountable? Because Joslyn Gage knows that those who control print media also have unchecked power, power that extends into many political spheres. Joslyn Gage knows what she was doing by identifying and omitting in this case.

Following this identifying and omitting in the introduction, Joslyn Gage lists two historical examples that reflect her weapon of identifying and omitting. She writes, “Runnymede was a protest against such unjust exercise of power. The horrors of the French Revolution were largely brought on by the unlimited exercise of this power by the king and the nobility” (Gage “Matilda Joslyn Gage on the Right of Habeas Corpus”). Interesting that Joslyn Gage would reference a time in England’s history when King John was forced to recognize that even his

powers are limited, and a time in France's history when the French court was all but wiped out by the working class due to their ostentatious behaviors. Is Joslyn Gage arguing that women will rise to positions of power and relinquish control to men? Her references are telling, especially in their implicit ability to name without name. This is useful because the men and women reading this newspaper, if they know their world history, know the outcomes of both of these world events and know that male-dominated aristocracies fell.

However, one of her most poignant examples from the 1876 edition of omission is a paragraph on personal rights, where Joslyn Gage uses repetition to illustrate the many grievances women encounter. She states:

Personal liberty stands first in order of all rights. Without the control of one's own person, liberty of conscience is impossible. Without the control of one's own person, education is impossible; mental growth is impossible; without the control of one's own person, the opportunities of the world, which are only means of development, cannot be used. The value and right of personal freedom were recognized when our government was framed. (Gage "Matilda Joslyn Gage on the Right of Habeas Corpus")

Her repetition creates a duality: control and personhood. True citizens can control who they are, what they want out of life; they are free to make decisions. This is in contrast to the image Joslyn Gage sets up for the reader. She also explains what life is like for someone who does not have personal freedom: they are without any sense, without intellectual stimulation, and without economic opportunities. She paints a grim picture, but this was the reality for many. She does not name names. Nor does she state specific examples. Still, this level of ambiguity works because so many people fall under these circumstances and can relate to what Joslyn Gage is writing

about. Who wouldn't want to control their life? But here, Joslyn Gage argues that elected officials are controlling women's liberties. Her column "Matilda Joslyn Gage on the Right of Habeas Corpus" is evidence that *rhetorical usefulness* could be seen through identifying and omitting, a strategy that helped Joslyn Gage in her literary work for the movement.

In the 1878 issue, the *National Citizen and Ballot Box*, covers topics of specific convention news, suffrage leaders' retirement, temperance advice, and a plea for more canvassers. From the May 1878 issue, the column titled "Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box," Joslyn Gage explains how the newspaper will assist the suffrage cause. After noting the change in editorship, Joslyn Gage opens with the statement "The National Citizen will advocate the principle that Suffrage is the Citizen's right, and should be protected by National law, and that while States may regulate the suffrage, they should have no power to abolish it" ("Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box"). This declaration is straightforward and calls for federal protection of suffrage. It draws attention to the ability of states to manipulate their policies against suffrage rights. This was evident at the time, with many states enacting literacy tests and poll taxes as ways against universal suffrage. Joslyn Gage is exhibiting her knowledge of how the government operates when she utilizes the word "regulate", demonstrating her collegiate knowledge ("Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box"). This knowledge could be credited to her education at Clinton with the required course in Political Economy.

Because suffrage is central to the paper's mission, Joslyn Gage argues, "Its especial object will be to secure national protection to women citizens in the exercise of their rights to vote; but it will also touch upon the woman question in all its various aspects; it purposes a general criticism of men and things" ("Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box"). The

newspaper is directing its time and effort to the conflicts and constraints that women endure daily. When she ends her mission statement with “men and things,” she is both identifying and omitting the causes of women’s oppression (Gage “Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box”). Though, it is possible she is using the universal masculine in this case. Men are tangible; things could represent anything. This is intriguing because she declares men are a direct impediment to women’s suffrage, but then leaves space available for everything else. She is identifying a gender but not identifying specific examples. As with her repeating “without the control of one’s own person,” she is utilizing ambiguity but simply saying “things” are what destroy a woman’s freedom, “things” are what harm a woman’s personhood (Gage “Matilda Joslyn Gage on the Right of Habeas Corpus”; “Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box”). She doesn’t have to name concrete items because she’s giving agency to nonwhite and working women to fill in the blank with what they feel should be criticized. Joslyn Gage paused in her writing to allow for breathing room for others to state their complaints.

This rhetorical pausing is a tool she utilizes in the 1878 column as a way to give women space to find their voice. It is a strategy in omitting that works, because it gives power back to the oppressed woman. In the 1878 column, she argues:

As the first process towards becoming well is to know you are ill, one of the principle aims of the National Citizen will be to make those women discontented who are now content, — to waken them to self-respect, and a desire to use the talents they possess, — to educate their consciences aright, — to quicken their sense of duty, — to destroy morbid beliefs, and make them worthy of the life with which their Creator has endowed them. (Gage “Matilda Joslyn Gage on the Right of Habeas Corpus”, “Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box”)

Observe her use of omission with “those women” and “them” (Gage “Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box”). Joslyn Gage does not specify here who she is alluding to; instead, by omitting, anyone could feel this passage applies to them. Understandably, there may be many women who have felt “[discontent]” or “[dis]respect[ed]” but were not willing to openly say this out loud (“Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box”). They could not name their grievances. Or, what’s worse, they may not know that their grievances were not normal. Also, note her syntactic pausing with carefully placed dashes. This punctuation move enabled women to fill in the blanks of what troubled them, metaphorically. But, by beginning with the metaphor of “ill[ness]”, Joslyn Gage is implying that what has historically plagued women is temporary and will not forever sicken them—they will heal and recover, and more will “waken” and join the cause (“Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box”).

In Joslyn Gage’s final pronouncement for the newspaper, she closes with the statement, “As nothing is quite as good as it may yet be made, the National Citizen will, in as far as possible, revolutionize the country, striving to make it live up to its fundamental principles and become in reality what it is best in name—a genuine Republic” (“Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box”). Here, Joslyn Gage does not name the moments our country has not lived up to its ideals. It is 1878, and the country was struggling with the end of Reconstruction. Jim Crow laws were beginning to blanket the South, and segregation was seeping into every state policy. So, rather than name the times that our country had failed, Joslyn Gage names our country “a genuine Republic” where equality is a birthright (“Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box”). By doing this, Joslyn Gage is revealing what the course Political Economy taught her about the basic tenets of a democracy. Her rhetorical education at Clinton Liberal Institute is reflected in this writing from *The National Citizen and Ballot Box*, where Joslyn Gage

conveys her *rhetorical usefulness* by both identifying and omitting the persecutions that haunt women and the cause. *The National Citizen and Ballot Box*, along with the other speeches and work with *The Revolution*, were the beginnings of her future odyssey, writing the work that would cement her legacy: *Woman, Church, and State*. In this fascinating work, she did name names.

Woman, Church, and State as a Way of Looking at the Long View

Woman, Church, and State may have been her climactic opus, but many of her speeches and other texts led her to this moment. The book is a comprehensive outline of how women were once some of the most powerful public figures in history, but sadly were diminished due to Christianity's influence. The book works slowly through not only history but also thematically through women's lives, for example a woman's education and reproduction. The book also clearly argues that historically, through the means of patriarchy, state governments have been linked to Christianity and this enabled the oppression of women.

In her 1890 speech "The Dangers of the Hour," given to the Women's National Liberal Convention, we begin to see her delineating the Church and State as the main perpetrators of women's oppression. She argues:

The authority of the church over marriage has always been especially prejudicial to woman; it is from the teachings of the church, that in the family, power over the wife is given to the husband. It is the church and not the state, to which the teaching of woman's inferiority is due; it is the church which primally [sic] commanded the obedience of woman to man. It is the church which stamps with religious authority the political and domestic degradation of woman. It is the church which has placed itself in opposition to all efforts looking towards her

enfranchisement and it has done this under professed divine authority, and wherever we find laws of the state bearing with greater hardship upon woman than upon man, we shall ever find them due to the teachings of the church. (Gage “The Dangers of the Hours” 347-348)

We can observe her keen use of repetition of “It is the church,” no longer omitting a patriarchal institution; instead, Joslyn Gage willingly names the source of women’s subjugation (Gage “The Dangers of the Hours” 347-348). This boldness reveals her intuition that her listeners wanted and were ready to hear her true thoughts. Ten years later, she would expand on this idea in *Woman, Church, and State*. Though this book took years of her life (she began writing it in 1886 and it was published in 1893), and came about after isolation and tribulation, Joslyn Gage was trained to rhetorically fight (Gage *Woman* 6). In the Preface, she boldly stated, “This work explains itself and is given to the world because it is needed,” and then continues, “Do not allow the Church or the State to govern your thought or dictate your judgment” (Gage *Woman* 6). Her forewarning is a matter of fact and reflects her sense of conviction. She recognizes that there is a “need” for women to be reminded who can control their thoughts and feelings (Gage *Woman* 6). This is not a patronizing judgment but a sincere acknowledgement that women of different ages, races, and education have fallen under the control of both “the Church [and] the State” (Gage *Woman* 6). In the pages that follow, Joslyn Gage makes her case, revealing her rhetorical dexterity.

The work includes a total of ten chapters where Joslyn Gage analyzes subjects such as “Chapter V: Witchcraft” to “Chapter VII: Polygamy.” I will examine four specific chapters: “Chapter I: The Matriarchate”, “Chapter VI: Wives”, “Chapter VIII: Woman and Work”, and “Chapter IX: The Church of To-day” through the lens of *rhetorical usefulness*, as a call to vocation in public life. What did Joslyn Gage discuss in these sections that would be useful for

marginalized people? How did she appeal to her readers? *Woman, Church, and State* was her defining work, which pulled together her speeches and newspaper editorials.

In the opening chapter, “The Matriarchate,” she sets an immediate tone of matter-of-factness that explains why much of the reason our current government is structured like a patriarchy is that no one knows any better. She begins with, “Woman is told that her present position in society is entirely due to Christianity; that it is superior to that of her sex at any prior age of the world, Church and State both maintaining that she has ever been inferior and dependent, man superior and ruler” (Gage *Woman* 11). The opening sentence describes who is responsible for a woman’s subservient position in life: “Christianity” (Gage *Woman* 11). For the 19th-century women who were raised to unfailingly follow and never question their local minister, this realization could seem troubling. She adds, “Such assertions are due to non-acquaintance with the existing phase of historical knowledge, whose records the majority of mankind have neither time nor opportunity of investigating” (Gage *Woman* 11). Woman has simply fallen in line because, for the past several generations, everyone else has done the same, a systematic process of following what you are told. Joslyn Gage is creating an image of a woman being “inferior and dependent” not because she is, but because she has been “told” she is through the teachings of “Christianity” (Gage *Woman* 11). This then conveys that man is dependent on woman adhering to this patriarchal ideology. This also, as Gage states, illustrates that few are “[acquainted] with the existing phase of historical knowledge” because if legislators had understood other systems of government, they would understand that many nations have a matrilineal system wherein leadership and property ownership is conducted through the woman/wife, not the man/husband (Gage *Woman* 11). This is a skillful argument because it advances a mis-education of women and men, even though Joslyn Gage, a collegiately educated

woman, is attempting to properly educate her readers. Here, Gage uses her experiences of not only working with the Haudenosaunee and Mohawk tribes but also her likely study of Political Economy at Clinton Liberal Institute.

Joslyn Gage offers the reader information not only of the many Indigenous tribes that govern through matrilineal lines but also the global governments that find female leadership characteristic of successful systems (Gage *Woman* 11). She reminds her readers that:

The whole ancient world recognized a female priesthood, some peoples, like the Roman, making national safety dependent upon their ministration; others as in Egypt, according them pre-eminence in the priestly office, reverencing goddesses as superior to gods; still other as the Scandinavians, making no distinction in equality between gods and goddesses; others governing the nation's course through oracles which fell from feminine lips; still others looking to the Sibylline Books for like decision. Those historians anxious to give most credit to the humanizing effect of Christianity upon woman are compelled to admit her superiority among pagan nations before the advent of this religion. (Gage *Woman* 42)

This argument presents examples that illustrate women in positions of power and trust. “Rome” and “Egypt” looked to women as markers for authority, practically “reverencing [them as] goddesses” (Gage *Woman* 42). She is setting up a distinction between how women were treated before Christianity took a stronghold and the aftermath of Christianity's effects. By using this comparative claim, Joslyn Gage is illustrating to women that they were treated better prior to the introduction of Christianity. Note that in the opening paragraph, Joslyn Gage argues women's present position is “inferior and dependent,” due to Christianity, but historically women occupied

positions that were “superior” (Gage *Woman* 11 and 42). This contrast reflects a remarkable shift in who held power once Christianity was introduced. One of her most significant claims concerns Christianity's power to “[humanize]” women (Gage *Woman* 42). She posits that prior to Christianity, women were superior to men and only after the religion’s introduction were women placed on the same level as men. Gage is engaging women directly here and asking them to consider what they know of world history, including the leadership positions women once held. Though Joslyn Gage’s audience may be general, her intended audience is for women. She’s asking women to rhetorically question how life has changed for them since Christianity became the guiding force in Western countries. Have their lives been better from this structural shift? Gage leaves the question available for women to answer on their own.

Giving women agency is another device Joslyn Gage uses when she writes her chapter on “Wives.” This is where she defines the history of housewifery and asks, Is this applicable? In her opening history of wifery, she explains:

Under Roman law before Christianity had gained control of the empire, a form of marriage existed known as ‘Usus,’ which secured much freedom to wives. It was entered into without the terrifying religious ceremonies which made ‘Confarreatio,’ practically indissoluble and the wife the veritable slave of the husband, who held power even over her life. Neither did it possess the civil formality of ‘Coemptio’ under which the bride purchased entrance into the marriage duties and her husband’s household by the payment of three pieces of copper. ‘Coemptio’ like ‘Confarreatio’ gave the husband entire power over the person and property of the wife, while ‘Usus,’ a form of simple consent, left the

wife practically free, keeping her own name and property. The real origin of this form of marriage is not fully known. (Gage *Woman* 295)

Gage defines these three different forms of marriage to ask women to rhetorically question what type of marriage they are currently in. What have they married into? Is consent present? Again, this is Joslyn Gage proving her rhetorical power by not only demonstrating her world knowledge but also appealing to women by identifying and omitting the conditions they currently find themselves in. Joslyn Gage presents this history to demonstrate the damaging effects of Christianity on a married woman's autonomy.

Joslyn Gage continues to present the many wrongs Christianity has committed against women of all ages. She knows they're expected to follow unwritten rules, unquestioningly, from an early age. She describes the experience of women in the 19th-century with:

A girl was simply a piece of family property to be disposed of as the family thought best. Although wives were simply the slaves of husbands, yet the condition of an unmarried woman was even more deplorable. Deprived of the society of young persons of her own sex, not allowed speech with any man outside of her own family, she was fortunate if she escaped personal ill-treatment in her father's house. (Gage *Woman* 307)

The isolation Joslyn Gage describes is one many 19th-century women probably understood, having been expected to abide by "the cult of true womanhood" for much of their lives (Welter 152). Though, as my research continues to push back against this ideology, I speculate that only a limited group in society truly believed in this concept. One of the more remarkable phrases in this passage is when Joslyn Gage writes "if she escaped," which reveals that some women were treated well within their father's home, but certainly not all (307). A few women did "[escape]

personal ill-treatment” through luck, but again, these terms did not apply to all women (Gage *Woman* 307). By beginning her last sentence from the passage with “deprived,” Joslyn Gage reflects the disposition of a woman treated her whole life as simply “property” (Gage *Woman* 307). These descriptions are an effort to both name and un-name the dilemmas of being a 19th-century woman.

In her chapter “Woman and Work,” she begins with the Biblical figure of Adam, from the book of Genesis, who commands men to live a dutiful life of work (Gage *Woman* 433). But Joslyn Gage quickly mocks the many men she regularly sees spending their time and money in less than respectable situations, such as a pub or gambling on the streets (Gage *Woman* 432-433). She reminds her readers:

We must also recall the opposition of the church through the ages to all attempts made towards the amelioration of woman’s suffering at the time of her bringing forth children, upon the plea that such mitigation was a direct interference with the mandate of the Almighty and an inexcusable sin...Man, ever unjust to woman, has been no less so in the field of work. He has not taken upon himself the entire work of the world, as commanded, but has ever imposed a large portion of it upon woman. (Gage *Woman* 433)

In reference to Adam’s orders to be an example of diligence and ambition, Joslyn Gage examines how antithetical men currently are. Though “commanded” by “the Almighty” to ease just a few of the burdens women labor under, man has cost woman more “suffering,” ignoring the silent work that mothers and wives routinely take on without any excuse or objection (Gage *Woman* 433). By comparing the 19th-century man to Adam, Joslyn Gage is juxtaposing “the work of the

world” and what has changed, if at all (Gage *Woman* 433). She finds current men coming up short, lackadaisical, and found wanting in their comparison to Adam.

Joslyn Gage is purposely using Adam as an example to prove the deficit in men’s accomplishments through the systems of Christianity. She is rhetorically using Biblical examples and referencing church doctrine to prove its inefficiencies in constructing man as superior and woman as inferior. This false hierarchy is repeated in a narrative she adds to Chapter IX. In her chapter “The Church of To-Day,” she writes of a most disturbing incident:

The strangest sermons, most insulting to woman and too indecorous for quotation, were constantly preached: while her inferiority and incapacity for understanding even the gospel was also as constantly declared from the pulpit. An old Presbyterian preacher, Rev. David Douglas, discovering a woman weeping in the kirk, pointed toward her, crying, ‘Wife, what makes you weep? I am sure thou understandst not what I am saying; my discourse is directed to the brethren and not to the like of you’. (Gage *Woman* 467)

Joslyn Gage writes that this incident was just one example of women being degraded by clergymen. This passage reflects that, possibly, many clergymen naturally assumed that women were intellectually inferior. Joslyn Gage named this one occasion, probably because other women have also felt the stings of insult from clergymen as well. She intentionally named this situation for other women to relate their deprecating experiences.

Woman, Church, and State appeals to women on many levels. It is a deeply sincere tribute to the many oppressions that women of all ages, education, and socio-economic statuses feel daily. It both names examples of oppression and gives space to women for their decision to not name their oppression. The few passages I cite reveal Joslyn Gage attempting to point out to

women that religion has not always treated women this way. There were many times when women were treated with respect and equality, not as servants to the Church and State. She is arguing, through an historical lens, that times have shifted for women since the advent of Christianity. This shift in history relates to Joslyn Gage's understanding that culturally and historically, movements in systems of power naturally happen. Joslyn Gage is seeing history bigger patterns, and comprehends that the current church leadership may not always view women in such derogatory terms. She is anticipating a shift in women's roles when it pertains to their relationship with the Church and State, and is historicizing what was the past so women can anticipate the future. By making her readers aware of religious world history and how the definitions of women have shifted over time, she is arguing that the roles of women have been degraded due to Christianity's influence.

Though *Woman, Church, and State* was published in 1893, it would not receive any critical reception until Rosemary Radford Ruether would critique the book in 1983. In her essay, Ruether admits "that many of the issues of this book are still as timely and radical today as they were when the book first appeared in 1893" (358). This "timely[ness]" points to the lasting legacy of Joslyn Gage's observations in the 19th-century (Ruether 358). The same pitfalls that affected women's lives in the 19th-century are still readily apparent in the 21st century. Ruether's short, four-paragraph review of the book delves deep into Joslyn's Gage's main point that it is only, "The state must thus be liberated from this influence of the church in order to shape a new society where the civil liberties and human dignity of women can be recognized" (359). This review accurately claims Joslyn Gage's writing as universal. And along with Ruether, later dissertations by Stacey Ann White and Melinda E. Grube would also argue the universality of Joslyn Gage.

The War Scrap Book as a Means for Storytelling

The *War Scrap Book* is, without doubt, one of the most compelling compilations of Civil War history because it brings together a variety of stories not often seen together. The scrapbook is over 111 pages and introduces a wide range of subjects from both before and after the Civil War (*The 'War Scrap Book'* xv). It is currently being held in the Fayetteville Free Library in Fayetteville, New York. "The ledger [which] is 12 ½ inches tall, 7 ½ inches wide, and 2 inches thick, with unlined pages and marbled pasteboard covers" preserves a history unlike many testimonials from the 19th century (*The 'War Scrap Book'* xxi). If storytelling and preservation were Joslyn Gage's goals, then she accomplished that feat with a keen sense of awareness that many of these artifacts could be lost to history.

Fortunately, the *War Scrap Book* did survive time through the careful consideration and help of Peter Svenson and Sally Roesch Wagner. It is through the hard work of Svenson and Wagner that the *War Scrap Book* was restored, and the two scholars carefully separated the collection into what they felt were logical chapters. The *War Scrap Book* came to be in their hands after it sat forgotten for over a hundred years in the dust. Joslyn Gage specifically directs "in her Last Will—written in July 1897" to take care with her life's history, "but specifically gives Maud, her youngest, 'all of my woman suffrage papers, books and documents of whatever character except my scrap books, which latter I desire that shall deposit in some permanent public library'" (*The 'War Scrap Book'* xix). By passing the scrapbook down through her family lineage, and then stating explicitly that the *War Scrap Book* is to find a home in a public library, she conveys the idea that she had built a library of her work and wanted to house her "Library" in a library (*The 'War Scrap Book'* 1).

In her *War Scrap Book*, Joslyn Gage shifts our attention away from what we've previously expected of Civil War memorabilia and scrapbooks, and gives us a catalogue of something fresh, something unseen. Her scrapbook is a compilation of Union, Confederate, and civilian narratives that she found in newspapers. These were stories that she found interesting, often ignored, but still relevant to the truth behind the Civil War. Through the application of *rhetorical usefulness*, Joslyn Gage not only broadens the scope of who gets to tell their story of the Civil War, but by using the vehicle of a scrapbook, Joslyn Gage is placing these stories together, each getting their opportunity for voice and recognition. Scrapbooks were a common genre for many women in the 19th century. It was a domestic skill that many women would value, collecting the artifacts of their childhood and adolescence as a way to remember special times. Joslyn Gage is utilizing materiality by compiling a mixture of many genres to publish these hidden stories; her scrapbook is a rhetorical outlet for argument.

Nineteenth-century women applying material rhetorics to broaden how they write their or others stories has become a fascinating topic for researchers today. In her essay "'But a quilt is more': Recontextualizing the Discourse(s) of the Gee's Bend Quilts," Vanessa Kraemer Sohan explores the meaningful ways many women used domestic skills, such as cookbooks, needlework, and scrapbooking, as a means to communicate. Sohan references Maureen Goggin's scholarly work on the value placed on written texts over other material texts, in this case quilting, and continues this conversation by studying three quilt makers of the Gee's Bend community (295). Sohan argues that for Mensie Lee Pettway, Mary Lee Bendolf, and Annie Mae Young, writing does not always have to be placed hierarchically above other forms of communication, as "the power of the needle as pen" is just as convincing as other conversational methods (296). By reconceiving what receives preference in rhetoric studies, Sohan argues that quilting becomes

another way to view women's conversations (296-297). This mindset enables us to view Joslyn Gage's work with the *War Scrap Book* as a means of 19th-century conversation and argument. The stories were not hers; she was interpreting what she saw as needing visibility, and, in doing this, was adding to the conversation through scrapbooking.

Scrapbooking was a means of storytelling that many 19th-century wealthy women have been leisurely exploring for quite some time. Amy Mecklenburg-Faenger notes the long history of scrapbooking; dating back to 1825, she "defines a scrapbook as a blank book in which pictures, newspaper cuttings, and the like are pasted for preservation" (92). This work rendered certain stories essential and deemed others irrelevant, depending on the author. In a sense, scrapbooking gave control and authority to the author of the book. Mecklenburg-Faenger argues that "[s]crapbooking was a more efficient means of recording one's textual interaction with the culture in which one lived" (92). So, the stories viewed in Joslyn Gage's *War Scrap Book* created new life for new voices. It offered an opportunity for not only often-ignored voices to be heard, but it also offered Joslyn Gage an opportunity to present an argument in different ways. For Joslyn Gage, the *War Scrap Book* was a way to carry on a conversation.

The *War Scrap Book* is Joslyn Gage's "Library" of artifacts from the Civil War (*The 'War Scrap Book'* 1). It is a memorial of what happened, dating from the 1850s to the late 1890s. It is also her late husband Henry's ledger from his dry goods store (*The 'War Scrap Book'* xiii). This multi-facetedness reflects Joslyn Gage's ability to save and store, but more importantly, to tell a story. The terms "storytell" and "storywork" are defined by Joann Archibald and Q'um Q'um Xiiem to illustrate the connection that happens between a talker and their receiver (3). Storytelling and storywork are a bonding experience. It creates an intimacy between the talker and the receiver, when they communicate a message they find valuable or meaningful. In this

case, Joslyn Gage was creating an intimacy with her scrapbook by working to tell an unknown audience meaningful Civil War experiences. The *War Scrap Book* created a collection of stories all bound together by Joslyn Gage.

This element of library work defines Joslyn Gage's ability to storytell. Storytelling is a unique way to argue for a woman who had spent the previous decades of her life fighting for suffrage through speeches and newspaper articles. If Archibald and Xiim argue that storywork is a process by which a giver and a receiver communicate messages of relevance and meaningfulness, then Joslyn Gage is working, through her *War Scrap Book*, to communicate the plurality of the war (3). Because it seems that Joslyn Gage is creating a cornucopia of memories from this period, there is no authority within the scrapbook; no central voice is pushing one particular perspective. As I examine just a few selections for this dissertation chapter, I will couple Joslyn Gage's engagement with storytelling with her ability to be *rhetorically useful*.

Because this document was originally Henry Gage's ledger for keeping records of incoming and outgoing merchandise, the opening flyleafs still proudly hold his first invoices of sale. Her first story or "clipping, source and date unknown, refers to a financial scandal during the impeachment of Andrew Johnson, Abraham Lincoln's successor as president" (*The 'War Scrap Book'* xix, 1). In the first several pages of the scrapbook, which Svenson compiled together into Chapter 1, there are notations of Union glory. A notice from the *Standard Bulletin* on July 5, 1863, exclaims, "Important for General Meade's Army. No Fighting on Saturday. THE REBELS IN FULL RETREAT! Our Forces Rapidly Pursuing! Gens. Longstreet and A.P. Hill Prisoners" (*The 'War Scrap Book'* 2). Then alongside this clipping, Joslyn Gage pasted a poem, "To the Illustrious Lawrence, Chief Law Officer of the Crown of Syracuse" (*The 'War Scrap Book'* 2-3). To the modern reader, the story of Chief Law Officer Lawrence may not convey the

irony and sarcasm that Joslyn Gage was wishing to demonstrate. While an officer in the Confederate army, Lawrence also willingly chose to enforce the Fugitive Slave Act and hunted down runaway slaves for a bounty (*The 'War Scrap Book'* 2-3). In the authorless poem, Joslyn Gage probably scoffed and smiled when reading the lines “Oh, sordid Lawrence! / All this you doubtless saw / Yet lent your talents to enforce / Those wretched lies, as Law! / To rob your brother of his rights, / The rights you prize so high, / And punish kind and generous acts / As crimes of darkest dye” (*The 'War Scrap Book'* 3). By placing these clippings at the forefront of her scrapbook, Joslyn Gage is arguing that the Confederacy wronged the nation. She is taking a stance against officers who fought on the side of the Confederacy and anyone who stood for slavery. But, interestingly enough, Joslyn Gage, through her selections, makes room for her readers to interpret their reading of the scrapbook.

In the editor's Chapter 7, she places first a prose piece “Phantoms of the Battle Ground of Nashville”, then another short story “GONE ‘OVER THE HILL’ A Brave Old Soldier Knocks at the Poor House Door”, then after various letters home from Union soldiers, Joslyn Gage adds the two-paragraph editorial from the Chicago Ledger “FILLED WITH PATRIOTISM. Young Women who Went to War Disguised in Male Attire” (*The 'War Scrap Book'* (84-95). This is Joslyn Gage collecting and magnifying what she feels deserves prominence. The first piece, “Phantoms of the Battle Ground of Nashville,” though only one paragraph, reveals the horrific imagery of the lasting effects of wartime. The paragraph is the aftermath of battle, “Let anyone who is desirous of witnessing a most startling natural phenomenon...[where] he will see other hills, palpable even to grass clumps and little stones, gradually rising in the air” (*The 'War Scrap Book'* 84). There are not enough discussions about what happens to the land itself after a war has been fought. There are not enough discussions about what happens to the earth, mountains, rivers

when the fallen remain for days, and the place of a battle begins to tell its story. Joslyn Gage is arguing just that. The effects of land after a war are an ecological argument that was not often heard in the 19th century. This, along with a 19th-century Veterans Affairs essay, reflects that Joslyn Gage wanted to draw attention to the stories that were often marginalized. In “GONE ‘OVER THE HILL’ A Brave Old Soldier Knocks at the Poor House Door,” the single paragraph written in Aberdeen, South Dakota, November 3rd, tells the story of “Punches,...76 years of age and broken down in health” (*The ‘War Scrap Book’* 85-86). The story offers sympathy to old and disabled veterans who are suffering, and its placement in the scrapbook subtly argues for federal assistance for abandoned veterans (*The ‘War Scrap Book’* 86). Her final clipping was a newspaper story “FILLED WITH PATRIOTISM. Young Women who Went to War Disguised in Male Attire.” Historians have slowly increased the documented cases of women who served in battle, dating back to the American Revolution, while dressed in male attire. Whether dressed as actual soldiers and fighting in combat or performing the service of nursing, an unknown number of women participated in 18th and 19th-century warfare. This Chicago Ledger editorial documents two anonymous women, one of whom served as a nurse after being ousted for dressing in men’s clothing, who “cared nothing then for exposure,” and another woman who “was my recruit with the lady-like hands” (*The ‘War Scrap Book’* 94-95). Both stories bear witness to the fact that women willingly placed themselves in positions of danger for valiant reasons or romanticized notions of the war. These women were brave, if not somewhat misguided, as both narratives describe the women being shocked by the violence and atrocities of the battlefield. But Joslyn Gage is telling us the stories of settings, the elderly, and women who fall to the wayside of mainstream war stories. That is what makes her *War Scrap Book* useful; she doesn’t want the spotlight continuously on what has already been heard or

documented. Joslyn Gage used her *War Scrap Book* to engage with the silent and the forgotten, and in so doing developed a niche of storytelling that shapes the viewer's sense of the war. This unique niche also condemned the Confederacy's actions and its sympathizers. In multiple ways, her *War Scrap Book* broadened civic awareness of what happened during the Civil War, still needing visibility.

Scrapbooking was a means for Joslyn Gage to compile different stories from the Civil War, while also implicitly making activist arguments for civic reform. Scrapbooking was also a common domestic activity for many 19th century women to collect important aspects of their daily lives. By coupling scrapbooking with activist arguments, Joslyn Gage is widening the means with which antebellum women were able to argue publicly. She is making this domestic art more useful for women. Joslyn Gage is arguing the extension of scrapbooking as valuable for women to memorialize their life and make public arguments. It can be both domestic work and activist work.

Conclusion

According to her obituary, Matilda Joslyn Gage passed from a stroke on March 18, 1898, at the age of 72 ("Gage, Matilda Joslyn (1826-1898)" 269). Joslyn Gage was a rarity among women in the 19th century, an outlier. She navigated issues that were not considered becoming of a white woman, such as working on sovereignty issues with Indigenous tribes. After spending years with the New York area native populations, she was renamed "Sky Carrier" by the Mohawk after her adoption into their tribe, and then she continued her long service towards Indigenous tribes in the New England area for her whole life. This was just one example of her long fight for those whose needs were not a part of the acceptable agenda for NAWSA. Joslyn Gage did not view others' oppression as beneath her; instead, she pivoted and did what many

would not expect of a woman of her class. She drew attention to issues that deserved visibility, even in her private scrapbook. Working in newspapers, writing a book, and then finally, scrapbooking became her weapons of choice in fighting against the Catholic Church, anti-suffragists, and other means of oppression. Joslyn Gage was privileged by education and socio-economic status, but her conditions in life did not prevent her from devoting herself to making other women's lives better. She used her collegiate knowledge to be useful to other women and the Mohawk.

There are conclusions we can reach based on this research of Joslyn Gage's rhetorical education and public work to fight for others and just causes. We know that Blair and Whately were required courses at Clinton Liberal Institute. Both Blair and Whately taught the rhetorical principles that a sound argument is based on rational thinking. While at the Institute, I speculate that Joslyn Gage regularly studied Blair's ideas that taste was defined as "sublimity, grandeur in subject, passion, and/or form that fills the mind with 'great ideas'" (Johnson *Nineteenth-Century* 36). Coupling these "'great ideas'" with Whately's emphasis that "the rhetorical process follows from the investigative procedures of logic," Joslyn Gage was instructed to seek out higher ideals and study them to the best of her ability (Johnson *Nineteenth-Century* 51). She was instructed to question inherited stipulations. And she was instructed to work through arguments "'by installments,'" which is moving through each of her claims thoroughly and acknowledging prejudices and moving past them (Johnson *Nineteenth-Century* 51). Joslyn Gage fulfilled these principles through her publications. Her editorials in the *National Citizen and Ballot Box* and, most especially, her work *Woman, Church, and State* demonstrate her ability to logically reason her convictions with examples and evidence.

In the final chapter I analyzed of *Woman, Church, and State*, Joslyn Gage was demonstrating the critical relationship a young woman can have when her trust is broken with her minister. The young woman in Joslyn Gage's example was also possibly attempting to rationalize and relate the sermon to something in her life, and by the minister's patronizing reaction, likely felt betrayed and infantilized. This example was not only a logical example for what many women might experience daily, but it also demonstrates Joslyn Gage's training in precision and effectiveness. She was searching for other ways that could assist her in pushing back against women's oppression. Her collegiate training helped her to explain to other women that oppression should not be a naturally accepted aspect of life. Through her rhetorical efforts, she argued for women's equality.

Joslyn Gage illustrates the *rhetorical usefulness* of college-educated women. She decisively left her home, got a rhetorical education, made radical arguments against patriarchy, and performed in spaces that were unexpected for a 19th-century woman. It was not expected of a wealthy, white woman to write a book that openly criticizes, arguably, the most powerful organized religion in the United States—the Catholic Church. It was not expected of a collegiate woman to utilize a scrapbook to memorialize the needs of a homeless and aging Civil War veteran. It was not expected of a wealthy, white collegian woman to advocate publicly for Indigenous tribes, such as the Mohawk. But she did anyway. A distinct level of fearlessness enabled all of these behaviors. Regardless of why historians have neglected her in suffrage history, examining her *rhetorical usefulness*, it becomes evident that her character and writing were effective for the Women's Suffrage Movement and beyond.

Chapter 3:

Confrontation and Assertion as a Way to Represent Usefulness:

Laura Cornelius Kellogg

Introduction

The previous chapter discussed Maltilda Joslyn Gage, her extensive writing, and why her engagement is useful to both feminist and human causes. Though I only analyzed her written texts, Joslyn Gage's career included both written and oral expressions of civic argument. Indeed, the Women's Suffrage Movement was a pluralistic movement that flowed between newspapers, pamphlets, and journals to street corners, lyceum halls, and public rallies. The movement needed this diversity because it needed to occupy many spaces. Speaking, both in private and public spaces, was different from writing for women because the expectations and consequences of public performance could have dramatic effects on both their personal lives and those of their families.

Nineteenth-century women recognized the power of the public platform: a speaker could reach a greater number of listeners as opposed to staying in private spaces, such as a parlor. However, by stepping onto a public platform, a woman made herself vulnerable to public criticism, both through her words and by presenting herself to a public audience. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell writes about this conundrum, in which many of the early feminists sought public spaces to "demonstrat[e] expertise, authority, and rationality" but often found their "competence" and "credib[ility]" questioned and denied (12). The speakers sought to advocate for social issues that required visibility. Still, they found that when they stepped onto a stage, it was their femininity that interested audiences and not their ideas. Many of these speakers, of varying ages,

races, and socioeconomic statuses, were labeled as masculine for their public delivery tactics on platforms. Campbell argues that due to this masculine stigma, many speakers altered their rhetorical behaviors to counteract this unfeminine charge (12). They may have their husbands or local ministers appear on stage with them, or even move their speeches inside churches to prove their morality. By altering their delivery tactics, speakers were able to maintain their respectability and still present their argument. The speeches that were presented during this time reveal a deep awareness of space and place, as the speakers made themselves useful for civic causes. This was especially true for Indigenous women who sought out the platform to engage with social injustices. The constraints Indigenous women confronted when performing publicly shaped the genre they chose and the context in which they practiced. Kellogg may or may not have encountered such difficulties, research isn't revealing on this. However these practices, between where an Indigenous woman spoke and how she argued her message, are the subject of this chapter.

Because it was important to them that they worked to alter their delivery, Indigenous women understood the social conventions that applied to them when they worked publicly. They needed to appear competent but not too forceful; they needed to seem sincere but not too emotional. Lindal Buchanan discusses how complex their delivery style was and needed to be to maintain respectability. Buchanan juxtaposes both a feminine and a masculine delivery style based on social context and available genre, but also argues that all public performance was inevitably deemed masculine (78). The situational context of a woman's performance was tricky: a respectable woman shouldn't appear in rowdy and aggressive places. And how she delivered her speech mattered as well: a respectable woman might choose a poem or letter over a diatribe. Both the context of where a woman spoke and the genre she chose caused a woman special

concern as to whether or not she was perceived and received as credible. This is why, as Buchanan points out, “Women rhetors had to discover means to justify their speech and participation in extradomestic affairs, a task that required considerable ingenuity” (Buchanan 78). They often had to perform their work “‘quietly,’” which was the premise behind the feminine style—not too forceful, not too brash, simply make pleasing suggestions (Buchanan 79). However, many white and nonwhite women did not want to work “‘quietly’”; they had a job to get done and stepped into public spaces, which could often be uncomfortable, sacrificing their respectability and reputation but honorably being useful to the cause (Buchanan 79).

In her essay “Gender and Public Access: Women’s Politics in Nineteenth-Century America,” Mary P. Ryan argues this same distinction between “quiet” performance and masculine performance, but adds the ability for women to gain credibility based on the context of where they performed (Buchanan 79). Nineteenth-century women, Ryan argues, negotiated their access to respectability when making the conscious decision to perform in places of respectability. In other words, women activists could gain respectability and citizenship when they selected places such as churches, libraries, or, in Laura Cornelius Kellogg’s instance, the halls of Congress to argue in a masculine style. Ryan points out, “The same stroke that inscribed gender differences on the public as a principle of exclusion placed a mark of selective social identity on citizenship in general. Republican ideology held that the female sex embodied those uncurbed human passions that inevitably subverted the rationality and self-control required of citizens” (201-202). When women activists argued in conservative public places, they were able to maintain the American ideology of women while also presenting their arguments on social justice. Kellogg argued in front of Congress twice, both in 1913 and in 1916. In both instances, as a highly educated Oneida woman, Kellogg confronted the federal policies of Congressmen in

a nonquiet way—she argued. And as we shall also see, Kellogg had the rhetorical backing of some of the finest rhetorical training in collegiate programs from across the country. This stipulation, a college degree, along with the context of where she chose to speak, enabled Kellogg to assert her sovereignty claims—an issue she would spend her life fighting for.

A collegiate education would assist women in their quest for credibility while performing in public spaces. We know that women entered the collegiate sphere in 1833 at Oberlin College, a public institution, but rapidly, both private and public colleges assisted collegiate women with their quest to gain rhetorical training. By gaining rhetorical training, both white and nonwhite women mastered the skills they needed to enter public spaces. Though these skills can be found in the catalogs and syllabi that I analyze throughout this dissertation, I must pause to acknowledge the lengths many nonwhite women went to enter collegiate spaces. Both pre- and postbellum nonwhite women fell under severe constraints to attain a collegiate education. Many were attacked both on and off campus in their quest to gain a collegiate education. These attacks could come in the form of publicly rebuking collegiate women in newspapers and pamphlets or encouraging college administrators and legislators to publicly condemn women for seeking a collegiate education. But this vitriol did not deter many from understanding how vital a college degree would be in fighting for women's rights and Indigenous sovereignty.

Historically, colleges and universities were male-dominated spaces, teaching a traditional curriculum that emphasized argumentation—a curriculum often seen as masculine. Masculine because students were taught aggressive and loud oratorical skills that confronted and asserted opinions. Yet, based on the documents that I have researched so far, and more will be presented, college administrators called on women, white and nonwhite, to enroll at their institutions. They knew women could provide some type of need, whether it be a moral compass or financial

backing. College administrators called women to come and enroll in their institutions. At these institutes, a curriculum was typically separated between a Classical Department and a Women's Department. Men attended classical courses that taught traditional rhetorical training in aggressive argument tactics, while women attended domestic training in needlework and homemaking lessons (Buchanan 14). However, this segregation in education would not last long due to a high demand for rigorous curriculum. The working and nonwhite women who had been subjected to social situations such as job discrimination and decrepit housing conditions desired an education that would train them to argue and train them to be useful for civic engagement (Kates 9-10).

As discussed in chapter 2, this training would come in what Kates defines as mainstream versus activist education. Activist education was a methodology where instructors were socially and historically cognizant in their rhetorical and compositional practices, where assignments addressed injustices their students witnessed and experienced daily (Kates 8-10). Many institutes were influenced by the Progressive Movement in a post-Civil War era, where more Americans were pushing for reforms in public education and civil rights, and their curriculum matched this need to train their students to argue effectively—an activist education. And although more women, both white and nonwhite, in the postbellum era began to attend public colleges that taught activist training, mainstream colleges taught a classical curriculum and offered a Women's Department to teach domesticity for women. In opposition to activist colleges, mainstream college administrators claimed “that women were intellectually incapable of the analytical skills on which the logic and development of argumentation and oratory depended and that women were delicate (or worse, beguiling) and lacked the emotional and moral forces to convince others of their ideas” (Johnson *Gender* 24). This argument, pushed by Johnson, claims that women

were not taught rhetoric because they were too frail for it, I will push the opposite. But not every institution followed this gender-segregated pattern, based on the evidence I have presented.

Liberal colleges that encouraged activist training:

chose to organize their goals around the interests of their specific student populations, they endorsed curricula that could be promoted in an ideological spirit. As a result of their dedication to students whose gender, race, or class may have prevented them from attending or succeeding in other schools, educators at these sites designed and taught rhetoric courses that took up language conventions, an interrogation of social position, and the role of service as crucial components of rhetorical study. (Kates 13)

These were sites where working and nonwhite women dismantled traditional and patriarchal bias in education. These were sites where working and nonwhite women pushed the boundaries of gender expectations by confronting their fellow male students in class with heated discussions. These sites of activist education, where women learned how to be useful, were complex. Though Kellogg did not attend a college specifically geared towards activist training, her five different sites of rhetorical education provided her with a lifetime of valuable insight. Though we do not have her precise transcripts from the institutes, we can gather the syllabi available at the time to garner how and why she approached public performance the way she did in her post-collegiate endeavors. We can also, in studying the available syllabi from the institutes she attended, know the leading rhetorical theorists that she learned from.

The leading rhetorical theorists of the latter half of the nineteenth century were Henry N. Day, Alexander Bain, A. S. Hill, and John F. Genung, who developed the premise behind rhetorical occasion as the primary motivator for how and why someone chose to argue (Johnson

Nineteenth-Century 227). The rhetorical situation, often also called situational context, allowed a rhetor to examine who they are in that moment. The rhetorical occasion also allowed rhetors to examine why certain issues affected them. Both Hill and Genung encouraged their students to adapt the ways and means of argument to any situation present so that the rhetor could step into any space available. Both Hill and Bain focused their instruction on correctness. Both theorists readily acknowledged that “public rhetorical space [was] a place where only exemplary men give speeches and write essays that change events and persuade others to the truth” (Johnson *Gender* 30). Even if women activist students were being trained in rhetoric, the spaces they wished to enter were still not socially accepting of them—even their professors knew this.

If rhetorical training was what drove many collegiate women to enroll, then rhetorical occasion inspired many women at public platforms. However, as Campbell reminds us, “No ‘true woman’ could be a public persuader” because “femininity and rhetorical action were seen as mutually exclusive,” though this gender assumption did not stop all women from public service (Campbell 9-10). Working and nonwhite women were excluded from this definition of true womanhood because many believed they could not physically, intellectually, or morally be true women. But being denied true womanhood was not the only prejudice working and nonwhite women faced daily. Their femininity, education, and intelligence were frequently also questioned. The prejudices many working and nonwhite women faced inspired them to advocate for social reform and to train in classical departments for a more robust collegiate education, once these classes were made available to them. Through activist education and rhetorical occasion, collegiate women were taught the basic tenets of “perspicuity, force, and ornament” as the solid foundation of nineteenth-century rhetoric (Johnson *Nineteenth-Century* 228).

The classical or activist education that collegiate women received trained them to argue. An argument was considered a masculine characteristic (Buchanan 79-80). The conflict between how women were perceived, what they said, and where they performed was difficult for them. This is why their collegiate education offered both classical and women's courses for the first several years of women's entrance into colleges, because of this conflict. As Nan Johnson argues, "Nowhere is this conflicted energy more clear than in influential discourses about the principles of rhetorical performance: how to speak, to whom to speak, and what to speak about" (*Gender* 20). Collegiate women were caught by having a rigorous training that they could not use in particular spaces. Caught because they were trained in masculine rhetorical practices, but expected to perform in feminine ways. This is why their instructors trained them in recognizing rhetorical occasions. So it seems "In nineteenth-century rhetoric, rhetorical occasion was not defined strictly in contextual terms but in terms of what effect the writer or speaker would characteristically be seeking in that setting" (Johnson *Nineteenth-Century* 228-229). And for Indigenous women, rhetorical occasion meant stepping into spaces to reveal rhetorical gifts which would prove exceptionally useful.

Laura Cornelius Kellogg was rhetorically gifted. Trained at multiple universities to argue, she spent her lifetime arguing for sovereignty. The term sovereignty has evolved and progressed. Scott Richard Lyons introduces this scholarship with the idea that "Sovereignty...denotes the right of a people to conduct its own affairs, in its own place, in its own way" ("Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do" 454). There is an element of control and authority here that Lyons asserts in claiming that Indigenous communities have a right to establish their way of living the way they want to. Unfortunately, the right to establish the ways Indigenous communities wished to live was always in conflict with federal policies. Lyons points out that "From the early moments

of first contact on this continent, the construction of Indian and non-Indian senses of sovereignty was a contested and contradictory process” (“Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do” 454). So the control and authority of culture has historically been argued from a stance of superior versus inferior perspectives: the federal government implementing policies it feels will better the lives of Indigenous communities because they are of a lesser status. Accordingly, many Indigenous activists, including Kellogg, would rhetorically fight against such federal policies that placed her community in positions of inferiority. Kellogg traveled and lectured on the Oneida culture and how Americans perceive the 19th-century Native American versus perceptions of the past. Her lectures are part of what Lisa King and Resa Crane Bizzaro argue creates another facet of rhetorical sovereignty.

King and Bizzaro added onto Lyons’ scholarship of rhetorical sovereignty. The authors expanded the idea of rhetorical sovereignty by exploring not just the rhetors texts but also the situation. King and Bizzaro explain, “Every new site, new context, new speaker, and new goal will require a shift in what sovereignty means, remaining rooted in its histories but also looking forward to preserve the integrity of indigenous nations and communities” (21). Kellogg does just this. In her work, *Our Democracy and the American Indian: A Comprehensive Presentation of the Indian Situation as It Is Today*, published in 1920, she opens with a history lesson: she instructs Americans on the myths about Native Americans and the modernity of Native Americans. King and Bizzaro argue, “To claim rhetorical sovereignty is to claim the right to determine communicative need and the right to participate in the process of public image making and meaning making” (26). Kellogg does this in multiple ways. I will analyze not only Kellogg’s book but also her two public addresses to Congress, where she confronts federal policies being

placed on her Oneida community, while also asserting her right as a woman Indigenous activist to claim citizenship.

Citizenship was contested in the 19th century. The history of the Oneida tribes, with treaties dating back to 1790, in New York, Wisconsin, and Canada, reveals a tug-of-war relationship with the federal government (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 2). This large settlement is in part due to an 1821 removal from New York to Wisconsin with a loss of millions of acres of land, and because of the widespread community, the Oneida agreed to three distinct nations (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 2-3). Following this partition, between 1821 and 1934, the Oneida Nations would succumb to a disastrous loss of land, leading to only ninety acres remaining of their original holding (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 3). The federal government confiscated this land, as federal Indian agents pushed for resettlement. This injustice would root in Kellogg a firm belief in arguing for sovereignty. In Kellogg's speeches, she called for the ability of the Oneida to control its fate and its land. She also desired to help Americans reimagine the image of the Oneida and why their land restoration was vital.

The Oneida formed one component of the Six Nations Confederacy, and Kellogg thrived in the strong Haudenosaunee heritage of a matrilineal structure (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 3). She openly advocated for the Wisconsin Oneida reservation to be a site of "refuge for Native people" while also attempting "to reframe the reservation as a place of opportunity and community" (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 10). Community became an integral component of the Wisconsin Oneida. "Oneida members of the Longhouse began publicly practicing ceremonies and advocated for community recognition, culminating with the Wisconsin Oneidas receiving part of the Katsistowan^ in 2005, an essential

ceremony that confers Haudenosaunee spiritual and political legitimacy” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 20). Community is also present in the storytelling traditions that Kellogg uses in her work, *Our Democracy and the American Indian: A Comprehensive Presentation of the Indian Situation as It Is Today*, examined later in this chapter, which reflects the Oneida “meeting of old and new” to cultivate rhetorical sovereignty (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 21). Kellogg represents a radical Indigenous activism that proved useful for advocating for sovereignty, but in exploring her rhetorical efforts, we must analyze how she confronted and asserted her ideas in a deeply contested space.

In this chapter, I argue that the Indigenous and feminist activism of Kellogg embodied an awareness of sovereignty and usefulness so that she could confront and assert her ideas in often complicated spaces. Suppose *rhetorical usefulness* was broadening the scope of the Women’s Suffrage Movement to better appeal to a greater audience, along with employing diversifying devices such as storytelling and identifying, and omitting to appeal to civic reform. In that case, this chapter will present Kellogg, who applied *rhetorical usefulness* to spaces that were often hostile and often uncomfortable for Indigenous women. This chapter is about an Indigenous woman, Laura Cornelius Kellogg, who reshaped the definitions of acceptable spaces for public work and education. Kellogg, as a Oneida woman, wrote and published a work defining who claims Indigeneity and restructuring sovereignty. She also stepped into the halls of Congress and challenged hundreds of white men to listen to her arguments. Kellogg was useful by navigating spaces that were often considered off limits to not only her gender but also her race. I challenge this assumption of place and respectability, and argue that Kellogg maintained the highest level of femininity while also demonstrating rhetorical mastery.

The Life of Laura Cornelius Kellogg:

“I am not the new Indian; I am the old Indian adjusted to new conditions.”

Much of the scholarship devoted to Kellogg's life and work can be credited to two specific women who painstakingly compiled her biography with her work into the book: *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy and the American Indian and Other Works*: Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu. Both Ackley and Stanciu have also chronicled Kellogg's life in other published articles. Along with Ackley and Stanciu, Hannah Manshel has also published valuable research on Kellogg. All three historians have written about Kellogg's brilliant contribution to Indigenous feminism: *Our Democracy and the American Indian: A Comprehensive Presentation of the Indian Situation as It Is Today*. No doubt, this book is Kellogg's biggest success and illustrates both her education and advocacy.

Laura Cornelius Kellogg was born in 1880 and passed in 1947 (Manshel). The daughter of Adam Poe and Cecilia Bread Cornelius, she wrote, spoke, protested, was a student, was a teacher, and spent her life fighting for Native sovereignty (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 2). Often referred to as Minnie Kellogg, the Oneida leader would work not only in the Iroquois community and Canada, but also in the halls of Congress (Hauptman 133). Kellogg was a descendant of Chief Daniel Bread and Chief Skenandore; both chiefs were renowned for their leadership within the Oneida communities (Hauptman 135). Kellogg was raised on the Oneida reservation in the Wisconsin and New York area, where she lived her whole life. It was on this reservation that her beliefs would form around activism, femininity, education, and sovereignty.

Kellogg was raised to believe that education, both secondary and post-secondary, was not a question for a successful life. Kellogg understood that if she was to take her place as the granddaughter of chiefs, she needed to prove her academic worth, as Hauptman writes:

She was educated at Grafton Hall, a private boarding school at Fond du Lac administered by the Episcopal Diocese. The school was within sixty miles of her home at Seymour, Wisconsin, and provided a setting that included mostly non-Indian women, which was far different from the segregated regimen of military discipline in far-off Indian boarding schools. (Hauptman 136)

Kellogg and her parents chose not to send her to the typical Carlisle Indian Industrial Schools that were springing up nationwide. Instead, by attending Grafton Hall, Kellogg would receive a white education but learn how to apply it to her Indigenous community.

After graduating from Grafton Hall in 1898, Kellogg began her academic journey, which would lead her farther across the country and further in education. Kellogg had mastered the languages of Oneida, Mohawk, and English, and left the reservation for what became her educational odyssey. The formal collegiate education she received was diverse and inspiring, because:

She attended several prestigious universities (Stanford University, Barnard College, and the University of Wisconsin), and lived in Europe to round out her education and to learn about social and economic models she would later try to implement at Oneida (especially the German model of industrial villages).

(Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 6)

Along with Stanford, Barnard, and the University of Wisconsin, Kellogg also attended Cornell University and the New York School of Philanthropy (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 16). At these five differing institutions, Kellogg would learn rhetorical structure and argument. She began her rhetorical career by publishing in *The Church's Mission to the Oneidas* in 1902 (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 6). In 1903, she would learn the

rewards of writing and navigating Indigenous issues at historically white colleges, and framed these complexities in her only known poem, “A Tribute to the Future of My Race” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 6). Through her rhetorical education, Kellogg would come to reshape and redefine Indigenous women’s spaces by demonstrating that nonwhite women can have powerful voices that discuss issues that were often not considered feminine, sovereignty, for example.

Kellogg served as the Vice President for the Society of American Indians between 1911-1913, and used her education to write and speak on behalf of her community (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 3). According to Ackley, “Kellogg had strong views about how increased tribal self-sufficiency could remake the reservation a sustainable place” (117). Every day, Kellogg viewed the displacements and taxation policies that were bankrupting her Oneida community, and she chose to no longer sit and watch. So, taking an activist approach, she began a series of testimonies in front of both houses of Congress between 1910 and 1920 (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 3). Both her speech in front of the House of Representatives and her testimony in front of the Senate will be examined later within this chapter.

Kellogg married Orrin Kellogg in 1912. He was not as active in Indigenous advocacy as she, but as a lawyer assisted her in her endeavors (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 5). The two collaborated on solving Oneida reforms involving both the state government and the federal government. It is at this time that Kellogg taught at the Sherman Indian Institute in Riverside, California, for two years (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 11).

She lectured heavily across the Six Nations reservation between 1910 and 1920, arguing “that contrary to dominant settler belief at the time, Indigenous people *are* political, and that these politics both predate and inform American democracy” (Manshel). In 1919, Kellogg appeared before the League of Nations to testify on the leadership skills of Indigenous women (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 3). And, after extensively traveling and lecturing on Indigenous issues throughout New York, Wisconsin, and Canada, in 1920, Kellogg published her only book that chronicled her ideas on sovereignty, *Our Democracy and the American Indian: A Comprehensive Presentation of the Indian Situation as It Is Today* (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 4). This work will be explored later in the chapter.

Between 1910 and 1920, Kellogg moved to Washington, D.C., and worked extensively with the Society of American Indians, while also promoting the ideas she published in her book *Our Democracy and the American Indian: A Comprehensive Presentation of the Indian Situation as It Is Today*. Kellogg worked to re-educate the misunderstandings about Native Americans. While visiting a reservation in 1920, “At the inaugural meeting of the Sai, Kellogg proclaimed, ‘I am not the new Indian; I am the old Indian adjusted to new conditions’” (Ackley 118). This merging between the past and present, coupled with her formal education, enabled her to write in 1920 what would be her legacy: the Lolomi plan. The Lolomi plan, which is the basis of chapter 3, “The Lolomi Program of Self-Government,” was a declaration of sorts to insist that interrelationships between Indigenous communities and the federal government can exist. The plan allowed for full tribal sovereignty while still maintaining a healthy and working relationship with federal officials. Kellogg firmly believed:

The Lolomi plan is a last resort to preserve Native ways of life. The settler society has forced Native people to contend with financial structures of taxation, credit,

and property ownership but has denied them access to the privileges these structures can afford white citizens...If Native people are forced to live in a society governed by credit, the Lolomi plan offers a way for them at least to do it on their own terms. (Manshel)

This plan, though sadly never adopted by the Oneida, would have resolved failures of the past and moved Indigenous Americans into the future (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 80). This plan defined “the good things and the shortcomings of the Red man, as well as the good things and the bad of the Paleface and his civilization” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 81). In her 1920 publication, Kellogg understood that change was needed if the Oneida were to survive well into the twentieth century.

In 1919, Kellogg returned to her home on the Oneida reservation from Washington, D.C., where she continued promoting the Lolomi structure (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 30). Because her Lolomi structure differed so greatly from the system enforced by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Kellogg was labeled a rogue figure to federal interests (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 37-38). Her hostile relationship with the Bureau of Indian Affairs worsened when a federal Indian boarding school’s conditions became beyond tenable; it had originally been built on Oneida land in 1893 and was now barely functional (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 41-43). In 1920, Kellogg, began a letter-writing campaign to the Department of the Interior to raise funds to save the building, advocating the need for strong academics on the reservation lands (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 43). The federal government agreed with her and, with the assistance of the Oneida Business Committee, raised funds, and the federal government negotiated land for the school to be sold to the Oneida tribe (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy*

44-45). However, after two years, the sale was not fully funded, and the tribe lost its deposit of five percent to the federal government (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 45).

And because in Kellogg's letter-writing campaign, she argued on behalf of her tribe, seeming to place herself as the spokesperson for the entire tribe, many on the reservation placed the blame for the lost funds directly at her feet (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 45).

Ultimately, the Catholic Church bought not only the land but also the school, though the Oneida fought against this injustice (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 45-46).

Unfortunately, the entire campus closed in 1954, and many on the reservation saw Kellogg as the reason for this loss of the school (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 46).

Regardless of the loss of the Oneida Boarding School, Kellogg continued her advocacy on the reservation and worked with the Six Nations Club (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 47). Knowing that many tribes were losing their land rights, Kellogg worked with the Haudenosaunee community to fight for their New York lands (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 48). Fortunately, federal courts honored the original treaties with the Six Nations Tribes, and the Oneida tribes did not leave their New York, Wisconsin, and Canada homelands. This win in the courts encouraged Kellogg to push for more reform within the Six Nations Club, and in 1920, she pushed for raising funds to institute her Lolomi program and to also restore other previously ceded lands (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 48-49). She ended up raising a substantial amount of funding; however, in her efforts to advocate for the Oneida, she included and expanded her definition of the Six Nations Tribes "as Haudenosaunee, including in her talks potential members outside New York State, such as the Wisconsin Oneida, the Stockbridge-Munsee and Brothertown tribes in Wisconsin, the Cayuga of Oklahoma, and Six Nations members in Canada" (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our*

Democracy 50). Ultimately, this plan failed. The federal government published reports arguing that this plan was “suspicious” and “illegal,” which greatly damaged Kellogg’s reputation (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 50-51). And between the loss of the Oneida Boarding School and the fundraising loss for reclaiming land, Kellogg has a complicated legacy with her people. Despite the fact that she traveled endlessly on behalf of her people, actively promoting the Lolomi system that would enable Oneida sovereignty, Kellogg has been neglected in Indigenous women’s history (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 61). Though recent efforts by scholars such as Ackley and Stanciu are raising awareness of Kellogg’s contributions, further attention is needed for Kellogg’s work and efforts to reclaim her position in history.

The University of Wisconsin and Stanford University

The University of Wisconsin and Stanford University set the bar high when it came to expectations for their women students. The University of Wisconsin allowed Kellogg to stay near her family but also embrace academic scholarship. The University established “a classical curriculum, although courses in chemistry, international law, and political economy” were the main programs of study when the first courses were published in 1851 (Curti 83). This offered women a variety of subjects to study, not forcing them into a Women’s Department, unlike other public institutions. Though all programs were available to women, many enrolled in the classical course, which offered “mental philosophy, logic, rhetoric and English literature” and was designed “to ‘treat of the powers and capabilities of the human mind, the modes in which knowledge is acquired and communicated, the use of language in convincing and persuading men” (Curti 73). The course description was created specifically for men students; this condition did not prevent women from enrolling. The University of Wisconsin wanted to grow and expand,

and in an antebellum sphere, women, though not yet necessary, would soon become the focal point of administrative discussions.

In 1860, administrators created a very short-term teacher-training program that would host a variety of opportunities for women students. Though the University did not have any women faculty or administrators, this teacher-training program was basic at best (The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System *Transforming* 1). Women students on campus would not see any layer of women's representation for quite some time, whether through faculty, administration, or the Board of Regents; essentially, they were alone and isolated from anyone who could advocate for them. The numbers for the first enrollees were:

In 1860, 30 women and 29 men were admitted to this new department for a ten-week course of lectures, but this experimental program was suspended after its first term and did not resume until the Civil War began to drain young men away from university classrooms. After the war started in April 1861, the debate over women's access to the University was renewed, and the shortage of students, rather than a change in sentiment, was the key factor in the decision to admit women students to the University. (The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System *Transforming* 7)

This cultural and historical moment is momentous to understanding the spatial dynamics at the University. Kellogg might have faced hostility in many forms. Research reveals that:

The new policy was clearly an example of 'separate but unequal' education, since the course of study for the students in the Female College was considerably watered down from that for male students in the regular University. Higher mathematics, Greek, and Latin were eliminated, and the emphasis was put on

music and the fine arts, traditional areas of study for women. (The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System *Transforming* 8)

Regardless of the “watered down” nature of the course selection, Kellogg still enrolled in the courses that would shape her future argument (The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System *Transforming* 8).

Though the introduction of women to the University of Wisconsin was not always smooth or pleasing, it did stick. Women students could be met with disgruntled men students and faculty. Because after the Civil War and concluding two full preliminary terms of the Normal Course for women, the Board of Regents released the statement, ““The result thus far has abundantly established the practicability and usefulness of the department, and also that the advantages offered will be duly appreciated by those seeking to become teachers or thorough scholars”” (Butterfield 100). Note the applicability of “usefulness” in the Regents comments (Butterfield 100). The research was illuminating to the point that the Regents opened up larger opportunities for women.

The University of Wisconsin knew that in a post-Civil War environment, women were integral to the health of the campus. This is why an entire Female College was opened in 1863, the teacher-training program was expanding, and tuition costs were reduced to free for all (Allen 28). After two years with these new accommodations, the University faculty reported, ““The Faculty are of the opinion that the normal department has made the University a more useful institution, during the past three years, than otherwise it would have been”” (Allen 28). Here again, we see the lens of “useful[ness]” and not only for women but also their program (Allen 28). In a published faculty report, they then go on to defend not only their choice in women being admitted but also the “useful[ness]” of women students, ““There has been an apprehension

that the standard of culture would be lowered in consequence. No reason whatever has as yet existed for this apprehension. ” (Allen 28) The Faculty are not discussing a standard of academics but a “standard of culture” (Allen 28). The Faculty knew they wouldn’t need to lower the academic demands with women’s entrance to their campus. Kellogg was a part of this entrance, this “useful[ness],” and she would utilize the program for her future endeavors (Allen 28).

The catalogues from the University of Wisconsin from the years 1853, 1862, and 1900 reveal many interesting details about how the University developed its curriculum over several decades. In the year 1853, the Collegiate Department listed the following courses:

Roman History-Livy, Roman Antiquities-Fisk, Greek Historians-Xenophon, Herodotus, Latin poetry, with Prosody-Horace, Greek Orators-Demosthenes, Lysias” for the Freshman Class; “Rhetoric and Elocution-Whatley, Philosophy of Language-De Sacy” for the Sophomore Class; “Mental Philosophy-Upham, Logic-Whateley, Mechanical Philosophy, Classical Languages and Literature” for the Junior class and finally, “Ethics-Wayland, Civil Polity, Constitutional Law, Duer” (“Catalogue of the Faculty and Students of Wisconsin University-1853”).

The Catalogue for 1862 shifted slightly, wherein the Classical Department added:

Latin-Livy, Lincoln’s,” for the First Year; “Horace-Satires, Epistles, Homer or Aeschylus, Prometheus,” for the Second Year; “Rhetoric-Blair, English Literature-Shaw and Chambers, Tacitus and Juvenal,” for the Third Year; and “Ethics-Haven, Chris’n Evidences-Lectures, Internat’l Law-Kent, Hist. of Phil’phy-Lectures, Polit’l Economy-Say’s” for the Fourth Year (“Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Wisconsin-1862”).

By 1900-1901, the University of Wisconsin had expanded exponentially to the point that the university needed entrance requirements. Entrance requirements were set for the Ancient Classical Department, Modern Classical Department, Civic Historical Department, General Science Department, Engineering Department, Pharmacy Department, and the English Department (“Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Wisconsin-1900”). Requirements could range from knowledge of a particular textbook to being able to recite Latin prose. The 1900-1901 also listed for the first time the University's extensive faculty, which covered a four pages of the Catalogue. This research reflects that Kellogg was immersed in an environment that encouraged deep rhetorical thought and pushed its students to argue methodically and logically.

At Stanford, Kellogg enjoyed many of these same academic opportunities. However, the history leading to Stanford's founding and inclusion of women does convey a strikingly different turn. Leland Stanford was the founder of Stanford University and resolved that this was to be “‘a university of high degree,’ and it should be open to all of California's children” (Mirrieles 14, 21). The University opened in 1891 and set admissions standards at what could best be described as competitive (Mirrieles 47). At the beginning of the University's founding:

Admissions at Stanford had, in general, followed the pattern set by the University of California. The State University admitted applicants in three classes—those possessed of certificates of graduation from high school; those passing a sufficient number of entrance examinations; and this with neither qualification, the specials. These last at the University of California came in, however, under four restraining conditions: They must offer some proof of competence—perhaps a recommendation from an employer; they must concentrate on one field of study;

they must have the consent of the professor under whom their work would be done; and they must be mature.” (Mirrieles 59)

This system proved fruitful in creating an atmosphere of high demand but also elitism. Stanford admissions requirements were rigorous and extensive. The Catalogues from 1896-1897, 1902-03, and 1912-1913, illustrate the academic rigor steadily advancing.

Stanford’s Catalogue from 1896-1897 offered over thirty different courses of instruction, with English, Ethics, Law, and University Extension being highlights for both male and women students. In the English Literature and Language Department, the following courses were offered: Physiological Phonetics, Elocution, English Composition, Forensics, Essayists of the Nineteenth Century, Spenser, Thesis, Wordsworth and his Contemporaries, Shelley and Browning, and Milton (“The Leland Stanford Junior University Sixth Annual Register-1897”). This training then expands with the 1902-03 Catalogue, making an Undergraduate Course available with the Principles of Vocal Expression, Vocal Training, Vocal Interpretation of Literature, Public Speaking, Introduction to Prose, Exposition and Argument, Oral Debate, Narration and Description, Prosody, Formal Prose of the Nineteenth Century, Thesis, and Literary Criticism (“The Leland Stanford Junior University Sixth Annual Register-1902-03”). The space made available for elocution studies and argument training is noticeable. Then, in the 1912-1913 Catalogue, not only are Teachers’ Recommendations for Certificates added, but a General Course is listed: News Writing, Public Speaking, Oral Debate, Argument, Current Newspapers, and Prosody and Language (The Leland Stanford Junior University Sixth Annual Register-1912-1913).

Though we do not have Kellogg’s transcripts, we do have the catalogs from 1898-1910, the years she attended five different universities. We can analyze both the rhetoric courses and

the elocution courses. We can view the course descriptions and see the renowned faculty that led students through argument training. And then we can speculate as to how Kellogg was inspired to move from these universities to return to her reservation and fight for sovereignty. Both the University of Wisconsin and Stanford assisted Kellogg in her rhetorical training. In her post-collegiate training, Kellogg goes on to confront an institution, Congress, that had denied her tribe sovereignty for centuries. Coming from a line of Oneida chiefs and now having received the gifts of rhetorical training, Kellogg prepared to become a woman Indigenous activist.

Stepping into Spaces for Usefulness: The House of Representatives and Senate

In 1915, Kellogg published her sentiments on suffrage in the *Washington Herald*. This article was ripe with her willingness to call out American women for their complacency in suffrage, while also addressing obvious injustices in society that harm Indigenous women. Kellogg began with, “The idea that the Indian woman was nothing but a beast of burden, a slave of her husband, is, like a good many other ideas in circulation about the Indians, a mere fiction. The word squaw was not known till the white traders came among us” (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”). Her metaphors address many of the stereotypes concerning Indigenous women. Kellogg is addressing the stereotype of how Indigenous women are perceived in American society, as “a beast of burden” or worse, “a slave” (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”). Instantly, Kellogg dispels these as “mere fiction” by claiming that never were Indigenous women treated in such an abhorrent manner until their communities were colonized (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”). This reflects the matriarchal structure that many Indigenous communities utilized until they were subjected to lesser forms of influence. And by criticising the use of the “word squaw,” Kellogg is creating a binary of what “white traders” consider Indigenous women

and how they view themselves (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”). She does this by then stating, “It is not a pure Indian word but a corruption of some provincial expression” (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”). Kellogg indicates that colonization has “corrupt[ed]” the language that refers to Native women (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”). This comparison between “pur[ity]” and “corruption” is Kellogg juxtaposing one way of life against another.

Kellogg continues this comparison and her use of metaphor when she reflects on relationships between husbands and wives. Kellogg boldly argues:

The idea that many white people have of the Indian woman being a slave to her husband, who waits on him hand and foot, and acts as his hunting dog to fetch the game that he has shot down is no more true to the facts than it would be to assume that all you American women were kitchen drudges, just because a few of you do have to spend your lives in a hopeless maze of housework. (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”)

With her use of repetition in “slave” and adding “his hunting dog,” Kellogg is not only reminding her audience of the American slavery system that stained the country’s history, but she is also arguing that the Indigenous woman is not the stereotype that society has of her (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”). Kellogg is rewriting history and also directly speaking to the American housewife. She again uses repetition by directly addressing her audience of “you American women” and “a few of you” (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”). This creates an interesting comparison, where Kellogg is essentially sympathising with the “American housewife” and her “hopeless maze of housework” (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”). In contrast, the Indigenous

woman is implicitly better off living a much more useful life (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”).

This sympathy, or mockery, is then reflected when Kellogg ends her article with the statement, ““We Indian women have always had equal suffrage” (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”). She’s distinguishing between the privileged and the less than. And if this were not enough of an insult, Kellogg then goes on to say, ““We women have always had equal civil powers with the men. And it is a cause of astonishment to us that you white women are only now, in this twentieth century, claiming what has been the Indian woman's privilege as far back as history traces”” (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”). It’s a us-versus-them: Indian women can vote and American women cannot. Yet Indigenous women are compared to “slave[s]” and “hunting dog[s],” clearly she is pointing out the obvious discrepancies in a superior American society (Kellogg “Laura Kellogg, Daughter of Long Line of Indian Chiefs”). Kellogg’s effectiveness is in her wit and sarcasm. Her resentment of how society views her fellow tribeswomen is reflected in her implication to point out that Indigenous women are elevated, whereas American women are confined. Kellogg’s argument in the *Washington Herald* represents her fearlessness in addressing the serious issue of the treatment of Indigenous and American women. This article was published after her speech before the House of Representatives in 1913, but before her Senate testimony in 1916. All three texts represent her mastery of rhetorical skill, and her public performances in front of Congress reflect her shift into utilizing the rhetorical jeremiad.

In his essay, “The Enduring Black Jeremiad: The American Jeremiad and Black Protest Rhetoric, from Frederick Douglass to W. E. B. Du Bois, 1841-1919,” David Howard-Pitney explores the history of the Black jeremiad and how its continuation through 20th-century protest

literature reflects the effective use of the skill. Howard-Pitney argues that the Black jeremiad was an essential tool both before and after the Civil War for abolitionists, but became even more prominent when other rhetors used this weapon for civic issues (481). Though the American jeremiad dates back to the seventeenth century, with Puritan sermons, “jeremiads deplored a long list of perceived social ills, denounced the people for their sins and misconduct, and warned of worse tribulations and divine punishments to come if they did not quickly repent and observe their social covenant” (Howard-Pitney 482). This criticism would then shift to a hopeful possibility if the perceived wrongs were righted. Howard-Pitney cites Sacvan Bercovitch in describing the three basic components of the jeremiad with “citing of the promise, lamentation of present declension, and a prophecy of the promise's imminent fulfillment” (482). Howard-Pitney uses this template to examine how Frederick Douglass and W. E. B. Du Bois utilized the Black jeremiad to convey to white Americans the sins of slavery and segregation and their obligation to justice (483). I will add to Howard-Pitney’s exploration of the Black jeremiad by examining Kellogg’s speech and testimony in front of Congress as an argument for the duty of the federal government’s fair treatment of Indigenous tribes. Not only does Kellogg cite wrongs committed by the federal government through removal and assimilation, but she then turns to the skill of prophecy to claim space for Indigenous groups to move forward in 20th-century America.

As I take Kellogg’s work in front of Congress and her book piece by piece, examining how it reflects the style of the American jeremiad, one thing I must also point to, which has been an overarching element throughout this research, is her obvious antithesis of Buchanan’s scholarship on the feminine style and masculine style. If Buchanan argues that “the feminine style disguised the fact that women were engaged in public discourse, and the masculine style enacted their right to do so,” then, I argue, Kellogg represents the ability to dismantle this binary

(80). I opened Chapter 1 by describing the feminine traits that Kellogg ingeniously displayed before the House of Representatives in 1913: she wore a dress, her braided hair was down, and her Oneida jewelry was on display. Yet, Buchanan argues that because Kellogg “engaged” with a public argument, this was automatically labeled as unfeminine and now masculine (80). I would argue that examples like Joslyn Gage and Kellogg reveal that after a collegiate woman was rhetorically trained and proceeded to “engage” with public work for activist causes, the binary of Buchanan’s feminine style or masculine style was deconstructed (80). Rhetorically trained collegiate women had the skills to move in multiple spheres, and as I will show, Kellogg was not about to let societal pressure or stereotypes she didn’t believe in disrupt her ability to argue for a civic cause.

The Lolomi plan is a last resort to preserve Native ways of life. The settler society has forced Native people to contend with financial structures of taxation, credit, and property ownership but has denied them access to the privileges these structures can afford white citizens...If Native people are forced to live in a society governed by credit, the Lolomi plan offers a way for them at least to do it on their own terms. (Manshel) In this address, before Senator Townsend, Senator Ashurst, Senator Owen, Commissioner Abbott, and the Chairman of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Cato Sells, the committee discussed the Indian Appropriations Bill [H.R. 1917], May 8-9, and the 12th of 1913. This bill would appropriate tens of thousands of dollars for stimulating fisheries in the Great Lakes area (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 173). The committee was voting to move more than \$10,000 into Indigenous fishing land so that natural habitat resources could be restored and the Six Nations would benefit from the economic stimulus (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 173). Kellogg was vehemently opposed to such actions, feeling that further appropriation of the land would disrupt and pollute

the natural resources that were already harmed by invasive mining and land encroachment.

Kellogg introduces her thoughts with:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this matter of the investigation of Indian conditions is one of the most neglected in the whole Indian service, and when the Senator from Oklahoma said that it should be left to inspectors who are already an institution in this Bureau, I want to say from the Indian standpoint that it has been left to the inspectors for over 30 years with the result that there is actually no accomplishment in the way of getting at an intelligent understanding of the social conditions in the Indian situation, and that the social service side which is rendered by this Board of Indian Commissioners (in which service is associated Mr. Moorehead, of Andover-William University, and men of that kind) is one of the greatest needs of the day, if you are ever going to settle the Indian problem” (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 173).

This opening statement serves as a buffer for her: she wants the representatives to know that she has witnessed the inadequacies of the Board of Indian Commissioners, and the time for tolerance for their ineptitudes has long passed. She is straightforward and factual in her remarks that the Bureau has had more than “30 years” of working in Indigenous affairs, yet has accomplished little to nothing (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 173). She then adds sarcasm with the remark, “If you are ever going to settle the Indian problem” (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 173). This citing of deficiencies within the Bureau is the first step in the prophetic style; Kellogg is laying bare all of the many ways the Bureau has let Indigenous tribes down.

She does this by listing, in detail, the faults and inadequacies of the Bureau. Kellogg points this out by:

I know what the inspectors in the Indian service do. They go to these Indian schools, and they are entertained, and when they leave that place, they do not know anything more about what is going on than they did when they came. You will find in every Indian reservation—and disinterested people in every reservation will agree with me—that their service is wholly inadequate to meet the demand. (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 174)

Two incredibly important details emerge in her speech here: her use of “entertained” and “disinterested,” which both show the reality of what is going on when Bureau inspections occur (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 174). Her metaphor implies that the Bureau inspections are mere “entertain[ment],” a show, theatre, or even amusement for federal bureaucracies to claim they know what is going on at reservations (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 174). Yet the inspectors are blind; blind to their failings and blind to the ambivalence from the tribal members. It is a lose-lose situation. Kellogg makes one of her more vibrant remarks next in the speech with a prophetic remark about the future of Native people.

Kellogg argues that the present ideology of removal and assimilation is erasing her fellow tribesmen's culture and existence. While in front of these representatives, she has to instill sympathy for the survival of her friends and family, and at the same time present herself as an articulate representative of the Oneida. Kellogg utilizes repetition and imagery to lament the future of her people. She states:

The present plight of the American Indian in this country has reached a point where he is face to face with the problem of race deterioration and extinction. And by extinction I do not mean the assimilation of one race by another, the contemplated end of this Government's policy in Indian relations; I mean that

wholesale demoralization to which death is the redeeming end. (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 176)

Her repetition of the word “extinction” is not an exaggeration, as a few in her audience may consider it (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 176). Instead, it is prophesying the inevitable for all Indigenous communities if federal policies are not changed. In fact, Kellogg clarifies her point so as not to leave any wiggle room for interpretation when she states that it is not “assimilation” but “demoralization” that will be the “death” of the American Indian in this country (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 176). This climactic statement might have concluded her speech, but Kellogg wasn’t finished with why federal policies have broken down reservations so abominably.

Here is where I add onto Howard-Pitney’s exploration of the jeremiad. For where Howard-Pitney explains that the Black jeremiad, seen through Douglass and Du Bois’ work, systematically lists countless crimes against the Black Americans and then prophesies what will happen to American society should these wrongs not be redressed, Kellogg reverts back and forth between lamentation and prophetizing. After claiming the American Indian will end in “extinction” should their path not be forked, Kellogg returns to the recriminations of the federal policies (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 176). She points out:

It is a well-known fact to all who know Indian reservations that the intrusion of palefaces and negroes into the allotment rolls in recent years has a great deal to do with the sudden increase of the Indian population. A great number of the negroes who have been thrust upon the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, for example, tell vivid stories of how they came from Louisiana and Texas, Georgia, and Alabama in colonies, solicited by paleface investors prior to the allotments among

these Indians, and that they were paid so much money to claim connection with these people, whom they had never known before. (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 177)

Kellogg begins her point by stating that her speech is not circumstantial but, in fact, based on evidence; the men in front of her cannot argue against her when they have the concrete evidence as well. By referring to the federal officers as “palefaces” and “negroes,” she is narrating the story of race relations in our country that the “palefaces have oppressed not one but two races in history (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 177). Her ability to sympathize with the treatment of Black Americans is similar to her next move in the speech, where she discusses the problems of Indigenous youth.

Kellogg had visited many reservations all over the country and knows what is killing off Native peoples. She argued, “What response shall we expect from the youth whose energies are eaten out with disease and misery? What spirit, what initiative so necessary for the trials of civilization, are we making for the foundation of independence and civic pride under these conditions?” (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 178) By asking these rhetorical questions, Kellogg is demanding that these Congressional leaders hold themselves and their actions accountable. In using the metaphor of “eaten out with disease and misery,” Kellogg implicitly refers to the past Trail of Tears and current reservation conditions where millions of Native peoples died and are dying from starvation, disease, and misery (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 178). Then in referring to America’s “foundation of independence” she is conveying the same independent sovereignty should be granted for the Six Nations tribes (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 178). These rhetorical skills were arguably

masculine, based on Buchanan's reasoning, but effective, and proved successful in allowing her to reach men who had no foundation for her way of life.

Kellogg then moves back into powerful imagery and sarcasm. She claims, "When such barbaric conditions as the scientific investigation of the Indians' health has disclosed emanate from the institutions for the so-called 'civilization of the Indian,' I am alarmed at the mention of any new ground to be broken" ("Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917" 178). Kellogg contrasts two key words against each other, "barbaric" and "civilization," and by doing this her sarcasm towards the representatives reflects her genuine disdain for them ("Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917" 178). This is one of many examples she laments in her speech to educate the representatives that their actions to "civiliz[e] the Indian" have failed ("Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917" 178). She is using the evidence found by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to evoke a response.

Now she moves to a specific tribe, the Navajos, and describes their plight in federal treatment. She uses the Navajo as an example of a tribe of resistance. They fought back against federal assimilation and are surviving. She describes the conditions of the Navajo:

And unless a totally different course in education is to be pursued in the introduction of school facilities for Navajos, there is the danger of contaminating and demoralizing one of the last few groups who have maintained their superiority because they have resisted the paleface's civilization so far. The Navajos are full-bloods. Out of a population of 10,000 they have only 75 disabled people: 11 per cent have tuberculosis, 15 per cent trachoma, being smaller percentages than other Indian populations of this size. They are in the height of

native development of the pastoral stage of ethnic culture. (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 178)

Kellogg examines what a solid education can do for Indigenous communities. Kellogg is alluding to the fact that the federal government’s Carlisle education is “demoralizing” many Indigenous communities, and she is also applying repetition to this verb to reflect their mental state after their forced white education (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 178). Kellogg, after this statement, then reminds her listeners that the Navajo were a community “freest of the hand of paternalism” and they have survived and thrived (“Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917” 179). By using the Navajo as an example of how Indigenous communities can prosper when the federal government stops its overreach, Kellogg is prophesying the rebirth and renewal of Indigenous communities if they are given opportunities and, most importantly, sovereignty. Kellogg’s appearance before the House of Representatives in 1913 would not be her only visit to Congress, for she returned in 1916. This time, however, her intentions and purpose for clear-cut legislation to assist her Native populations were evident.

In 1916, before Senator Curtis, Senator Page, Senator Johnson, Senator Clapp, and Senator Walsh, Kellogg would respond to Senator Johnson’s bill [H.R. 13072] and Senator Lane’s bill, which was based on a Supreme Court filing, by presenting her own bill. Senator Johnson’s bill would reshape the management of federally recognized tribes by replacing all Bureau of Indian Affairs agents who work with the tribes with representatives directly from each tribe. Senator Lane had filed a joint resolution based on the Supreme Court case *Lane v. Morrison*, where the Interior Department’s funds appropriated for federally recognized tribes were not allowed to be transferred into the next fiscal year. Kellogg spoke in front of this group of men, where she addressed previous proposed legislation and then presented her thoughts on

how to resolve issues. Kellogg did want tribesmen representing their tribes. She also wanted to properly fund all reservations so that their survival was guaranteed. In her text, the full weight of her willingness to challenge these senators, willing to go toe-to-toe with the complacency and stagnation that had all but killed off her tribesmen, is evident in her sarcasm and wit. She opens with remarks on the bill that she is proposing:

Mr. Chairman, I have a bill that I think is apropos to this discussion here. I do not intend to introduce it for the next 30 days. I have been working on it for many years, and I want to say with regard to Senator Johnson's bill and Senator Lane's bill that my plan does not subscribe to theirs, while I think the spirit of their bill is very splendid and is something that is bound to come. But it seems to me rather piecemeal legislation. It does identically the thing that Senator Page has mentioned—it proposes to try it out on a group of Indians who are very well prepared for this sort of thing. My bill goes back to the principle that was suggested by somebody else, that you cannot make any kind of gain with respect to the Indian situation without getting radically down to the root of the evils”

(“Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs” 197).

She counters Senator Page, where she attacks his attempt to control specific tribal trust funds and resources. She does this by ending her opening address that they must get “down to the root of the evils,” implying that not all of the men present have the best of intentions for the reservations (“Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs” 197). Not only is she suggesting that past actions have been deplorable on certain senators' parts, but her engagement with direct confrontation of these men reflects her willingness to step into any space and fight for a civic cause.

By opening her testimony with conceding other senators' efforts, Kellogg is still, in the prophetic style, lamenting that federal efforts to assist reservations have been half-hearted. All three men, Senators Johnson, Lane, and Page, proposed legislation that would directly affect the Six Nations tribes, without having visited the reservations. The men made blind assumptions, and Kellogg, being a Oneida woman activist, called them out on it. "You cannot do it [propose legislation] unless you make a house-to-house campaign and count the evils and count the number of times they appear and take into consideration the conditions with respect to them" ("Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs" 198). She is illustrating the many times federal agents have in the past made assumptions about reservation life without any basis of understanding, yet another fault of Congress. Kellogg specifically addresses one senator in particular, "As to [. . .] Senator Lane's bill, I have found a public sentiment that is as much on the side of the bill as it is against the parties we are hearing from in the press" ("Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs" 198). By specifying one senator's bill, in particular, she adds their name to the list of those who speak blindly for Native peoples. Structurally, she has performed these last steps to ready her audience for a future fulfillment.

Having criticized the proposed legislation and pointed out specific senators and their failures, Kellogg now prophesies the future. She begins:

"The public sentiment in this country is ready to condemn the Indian situation in the hands of the Government, and what is more, we are not going to subscribe to it. We are not going to be indefinitely the puppets of another race, and that is exactly that we have to look forward to nothing but pauperism" ("Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs" 198).

Kellogg begins this statement by letting the senators know “the public” is willing and “ready to condemn” their conduct (“Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs” 198). By using the repetition of “We,” she is gathering all collective tribes together and reminding the senators of the power and authority behind their strength (“Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs” 198). But, arguably, her most powerful moment is her referring to Indigenous tribes as “the puppets of another race” that is being reduced to “pauperism” (“Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs” 198). These metaphors of “puppets” and “pauper[s]” point to where blame should be placed for causing the “pauperism” of the tribes, at the hands of the federal agents in the first place (“Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs” 198). She is asserting the tribe’s willingness to take back control. By utilizing such rhetorical strategies, Kellogg is identifying herself as an Indigenous woman able to confront federal injustice and assert sovereignty, while also presenting the future if her lamentations are not addressed.

Later in the testimony, Kellogg addresses one specific senator, Senator Curtis. Throughout this lengthy testimony, the two have routinely rhetorically sparred, and finally, Kellogg is quick to question if Senator Curtis is honest in his concerns for the reservations:

Senator Curtis: I judge, Mr. Chairman, from what Senator Page said a moment ago, that he thought perhaps I was in favor of this measure. I want to state that I have not committed myself to this measure at all. I want to help the Indians, if I can do so, get in a position where they could file their complaints and be heard without danger. [. . .] Mrs. KELLOGG: Senator Curtis, I want to ask what is the objection to keeping an Indian an Indian provided he is a better Indian than he is a white man? (“Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs” 199)

Kellogg is claiming space here by contrasting the “Indian” with a “white man” (“Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs” 199). The rhetorical question is effective because Kellogg is asking these men a universal question that they will refuse to answer.

Not only is Kellogg asking these senators rhetorical questions they are unwilling to answer, but in examining her structure through the jeremiad style, she is criticising each senator one by one to illustrate their wrongs. After Senator Curtis, she moves on to Senator Walsh and asks him:

Senator Walsh, you might mention another point there, that when you classify the Indians, you have Indians who believe in communities, Indians who want allotments, Indians who want their funds outright, and Indians who want citizenship right away, so you cannot always go on the basis of competency as other things come in. (“Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs” 200)

Similar to Senator Curtis, she criticizes Senator Walsh for categorizing all Indigenous groups and not crediting them with individual sovereignty. By singling out each senator and addressing them individually, Kellogg is reflecting how they could better serve the reservations by working closely with them and not stereotyping them. In the jeremiad style, Kellogg has separated several of the senators from the group testimony to illustrate their wrongs, but now, she chooses to present her plan for the future.

Kellogg traveled widely across the Six Nations reservation, speaking with tribal leaders to better understand the depths of their troubles. And for the last several pages of this testimony, she both individually and collectively pointed to the problems that dwelled within Native communities. One problem, the fraud associated with Bureau agents controlling Indigenous finances, she has a solution for. She argues:

The organization as it goes on has a banking system attached to it out of the Indian moneys, and it carries with it also a life insurance, and in that way we are not speculating with the Indian's money. Also, with regard to the men who have perhaps \$500 or \$1,000 or \$2,000, whatever it may be, we start them according to their own abilities but with that foundation, and we will be eventually able to take care of the Indian who has not anything but himself if he is a good man.

(“Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs” 201)

Here is her plan. Here is her resolve to move the struggling Native communities into the future. Kellogg purposely applies repetition of “we” again and again, intentionally and sincerely showing that hopefully everyone present has the same mindset—they all want what’s best for Indigenuity. The fact that Kellogg was willing to criticize a group of men, openly, in a senate testimony, and then propose new legislation that she felt outweighed their original plans, reveals that Kellogg was a woman who engaged with masculine arguments in a masculine setting but still maintained her femininity. Kellogg is an example that collegiate women can be rhetorically effective in often hostile positions.

Because she was a descendant of chiefs and because she had such a diverse training in rhetorical awareness, Kellogg confronted what she felt were the misappropriations and missteps of Congressmen in their treatment of the Six Nations. After her 1913 and 1916 visits to Congress, Kellogg would continue traveling and lecturing on making Americans aware of the need for Indigenous sovereignty. This activist work would culminate in the publication of her book *Our Democracy and the American Indian* in 1920, where she addresses the mythologies Americans believe about Indigenous persons and how to move Indigenous tribes forward through survival work. Kellogg would argue that her structural program, Lolomi, would become

the groundwork for this movement. And her continued efforts to dismiss the constraints of feminine style while applying a jeremiad structure to her arguments demonstrate her rhetorical value.

Our Democracy and the American Indian:

A Comprehensive Presentation of the Indian Situation as It Is Today

Her only book, *Our Democracy and the American Indian: A Comprehensive Presentation of the Indian Situation as It Is Today*, published in 1920, explores the complexities between the 20th-century American and the 20th-century Native American, and illustrates the workings of Kellogg's structural program, Lolomi, and how the Native American can utilize it in the 20th century to modernize reservations. The book has four chapters: "To the American People", "To the American Indian", "The Lolomi Program of Self-Government", and "How the Lolomi Handles the Social Side of the Problem." Kellogg's book is her attempt to influence what many Americans imagined, often wrongly, about 20th-century Native Americans, recognize that too many Indigenous reservations across the United States were being exploited by federal Indian agents, and offer a new way to revolutionize the relationship between the Indigenous reservations and the federal government. The Lolomi program was Kellogg's unique methodology of creating and fostering working relationships amongst many groups, and though the program was not adopted by any known tribe, it reflects Kellogg's willingness to resolve deeply embedded and entrenched conflicts.

Similar to her speeches before Congress, Kellogg utilizes the rhetorical skill of a jeremiad style for her book. However, here is where I argue, Kellogg's work shifts the American jeremiad to something new; she incorporates storytelling into the jeremiad to add the story of the Native American into prophesying. Kellogg incorporates the story of the Native American warrior into

her book to detail their history and legacy, but then moves into how modernity and progression have shifted the amicable relationships between Americans and Native Americans. She criticises the tension and conflict, but Kellogg can optimistically state that she sees these two groups working together for the betterment of the country. She does this by addressing chapters 1 and 2 to these two audiences. This Indigenous jeremiad enables Kellogg to couple the crimes committed against Native communities with a prophecy of the future of how Native Americans will move forward in the 20th century.

In her first chapter, “To the American People,” Kellogg opens the entire book with the historically known fact that Native American structures have widely influenced other countries and cultures. Her opening sentence, “The idea of the League of Nations and Democracy originated on the American Continent about 600 years ago. It came from an American Indian,” is her proclamation that many of the most celebrated and renowned examples of successful government structures came from Native American culture (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 71). She is telling the story of the American Indian, a story that has existed longer than the federal government. This historical context continues in the next paragraph by reiterating that Benjamin Franklin had specifically met with representatives of the Five Nations to better understand constitution-making (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 72-73). Kellogg narrates the intimate moment between Franklin and the Five Nations chiefs with:

Their head chief took the wampum, that sacred strand, the touch of which was necessary to give oath. ‘This strand is the record of the Galiwhago,’ he said, ‘these five figures of men holding hands means that in times of peace each Nation is free unto itself like a man. But when the eagle, which scans the heights and the

valleys over the home of the Nations, gives the cry, then are they, one heart, one head, one man.’ (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 72-73)

This story conveys several purposes for Kellogg. It illustrates the trusting relationship between one of our most revered Founding Fathers and Native Americans. It illustrates the educational relationship between one of our most revered Founding Fathers and Native Americans. This story also serves to create the rhetorical sovereignty that Kellogg established in comparing the relationships between groups. By beginning her opening paragraph with the declaration that “Tradition says Franklin brought his hand down on the table and said: ‘That’s the greatest wisdom I have heard among the nations of men,’” Kellogg is establishing Indigenous wisdom and authority as the birthplace of our nation (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 72-73). Kellogg’s ability to tell stories to begin her jeremiad reflects her engagement with both Native and non-Native Americans.

This story of the birth of democracy soon shifts to her jeremiad criticism, where Kellogg strings together a list of rhetorical questions that present American democracy as a failure. An entire paragraph of rhetorical questions, such as, “But what shall I say to you now, Americans of my America? Shall I make soft speeches here for the acts of a Nation in which an individual would forever have forfeited liberty? Shall I fawn upon you with nauseating flattery, because you are rich and powerful?” leads to Kellogg arguing that Americans willingly watched the atrocities of World War I and waited, pushing for noninvolvement until it became necessary (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 73-74). Kellogg is blunt with who her audience is here, “Americans of my America?” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 73-74). She purposely ends this remark as a question, implying who is to blame for the position the country is in. She then points out the over-involvement in Native reservations with, “The

American Indian cannot understand—Aye—have you not robbed my people of a real god for your million ‘golden calves’ of hypocrisy?” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 73-74) Between the rhetorical questions and her allusion to the “golden [calf]” referencing the Biblical story of the Jews creating a false god in the book of Genesis, Kellogg is illustrating the contradicting actions of the American people. Revealing the American ideology to be “rich and powerful” and the ultimate Big Brother to the world, but in reality, “robb[ing]” the American Indian of their sovereignty (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 73-74).

Throughout this chapter, Kellogg has combined several stories together to begin her jeremiad structure with a criticism of American democracy.

Her next chapter, “To the American Indian”, not only confronts a history of complacency but calls to action all tribes to do better. This structure, similar to her speeches in Congress, alternates between back-and-forth criticism and assertions about the future. She argues:

If I did not believe there were enough left of my Red clan to make it worthwhile to say the last word, I should not speak. If I did not believe enough of you remain staunch to our ancestral standards of truth, to stand the ugly facts that concern us now, I should not speak. If I did not think there remained in you the mettle of men who smiled at death itself, I would not speak the burning word of criticism before the world. If I did not believe the spark can still be struck out of your dormant souls, I should not act. For the drama we have been enacting is a tragedy, nearly ended. (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 75)

This opening paragraph speaks to a general mentality Kellogg observed from her many travels across reservations. Kellogg applies an anaphora, repeating her firm belief that “If I did not think [or] believe,” meaning she knows her fellow Native Americans can change and can move into

the 20th-century way of living (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 75). Her harsh criticism is only to motivate her Native communities to resist demoralization, which was part of her prophecy in her Congress speeches.

Speaking directly to her fellow tribesmen, Kellogg argues that their stoicism and refusal to acknowledge modernity have gotten them nowhere. She concedes, then instantly rebuts the traditional Indigenous mindset, “There was a time, my Red brothers, when our racial training taught us that to endure pain was a virtue, when silence meant self-containment and the unflinching endurance of pain the better part of manhood. But that is past” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 75). Kellogg carefully lists the virtues of the past Native American: “silence” and “endurance,” but with perfect fragment refutes that ideology (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 75). She repeats this same back-and-forth jeremiad structure, with, “And we will take the blame upon ourselves to the extent that we have been too long dazed in the chaos which surrounds us. We have presented no respectable comprehensive measure, which is capable of solving our embarrassment” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 75). Kellogg is confronting the lackadaisical behaviors of past and current Indigenous tribes, but also asserting that new programs must be enacted to counter the current breakdowns happening on reservations. By applying this back-and-forth structure in the jeremiad style, Kellogg is enabling her fellow Native Americans to absorb the knowledge of what she criticizes in their culture and then prepare themselves for future approaches to the 20th century.

She ends Chapter 2 with a resounding prophecy. Combining rhetorical questions, historical allusions, and powerful imagery, Kellogg’s last paragraph reminds her fellow tribesmen that now is the time to act. She proclaims:

Where are the sons of the race who did not steal, who did not lie? Where are the sons of the race who fell defending their homes, their children, their country?

Where are the sons of the men who bled for Liberty—I hear a cry from the vastness of the wilderness. I see the fires over the tops of the mountains. Bring me the buckskin robe embroidered in the art of the people I love. Bring me the eagle plume that stands for vision and valor. I want to be with the fraternity, for it is very dark before the dawn—and tomorrow, emancipation. (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 78)

Kellogg's rhetorical questions, which also utilize anaphora, "Where are the..." imply that the honorable and noble warriors are silent and have disappeared (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 78). She does this to sarcastically motivate the younger men of the reservations. This criticism then moves to a prophecy that also conveys Indigenous storytelling. She presents the stories of the past, "I hear a cry...I see the fires...I want to be with," as a way to recall collective memories that are just on the horizon (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 78). And by ending the chapter with a climactic statement, "and tomorrow, emancipation," this is Kellogg prophecising the future for Indigenous communities (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 78). This chapter is structurally vital because it sets up the path for her to present her governmental creation, the Lolomi, that will bring her fellow tribesmen into the future.

Her chapter, "The Lolomi Program of Self-Government," is the best example of Kellogg doing just that by asserting activism for rhetorical sovereignty. After years of traveling and lecturing on different reservations, Kellogg demonstrates her cultural knowledge when she states, "Years of search brought me the Indian word which means just what I wish to bring to the race.

Lolomi is a Hopi term and it means ‘perfect goodness be upon you’” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 79). This statement demonstrates her “years of search[ing]” and years of study (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 79). This Hopi term reflects the positive relationships that Kellogg wanted to cultivate, not just between tribes but also between the tribes and the federal government. Her Lolomi program, as described by Kellogg, “Is diametrically opposed to Bureaucracy in all things. It carries an order of protected self-government by means of a Federal incorporation into industrial communities” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 81). Kellogg wanted autonomy for Indigenous communities to control their livelihoods.

Kellogg began this pivotal chapter by translating the meaning behind Lolomi, and then instantly began her storytelling of why “‘perfect goodness be upon you’” is essential to fostering peaceful relationships between Indigenous groups and the federal government (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 79). She narrates an entire paragraph of what Native Americans have succumbed to: a life of drudgery. She laments, “So long has this race had Siberian exile, that the only order which can in any way atone for crushed spirits, broken hopes, plundered fortunes, wasted lives is one which can obtain, secure, and maintain real independence in modern times. I emphasize the modern times” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 79). Her metaphor of “Siberian exile” reveals the frozen wasteland to which Native Americans have been removed, not only a wasteland, but now they have “wasted lives” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 79). This repetition emphasizes Kellogg's acknowledgment of the depths of the Native American sorrow. Her lamentation of “crushed,” “broken,” and “plundered” continues for a full page until she begins her plan to resist demoralization (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 79).

Kellogg's plan, the Lolomi, is revolutionary for several reasons. As an Indigenous woman, creating a plan of racial uplift, Kellogg is radical in her efforts to improve her and other communities. She argues, "The Lolomi policy is diametrically opposed to Bureaucracy in all things. It carries an order of protected self-government by means of a Federal incorporation into industrial communities" (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 81). Kellogg acknowledges how the reservations have been victims of the "Bureaucracy" and counters these missteps ingenuously (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 81). In fact, for several paragraphs, Kellogg personifies how the "Bureaucracy" has destroyed the character, spirit, and culture of Native Americans. She argues:

The Bureau as a school for sycophants has a method of destroying natural leadership in the race which has no equal. With few notable exceptions, this breed of them is recruited from the Indian schools. With such English as they have acquired there they cannot become very dangerous to it, as they command no great respect for their knowledge of anything. (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 86)

Kellogg actually spent two years working for the Carlisle Indian Industrial School in California, so she knows the assimilation techniques and racial cleansing that were a part of the "Bureau['s]" ways of demoralization (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 86). Her metaphor of "breed" reflects her comparing this new class of Native Americans who leave the Carlisle schools to something unlike anything Native (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 86). This chapter was Kellogg's longest, where she attacked and lamented the federal government's treatment of the reservation, applying both personification and metaphors to illustrate its far-reaching impact.

In her final chapter, “How the Lolomi Handles the Social Side of the Problem,” Kellogg acknowledges many of the Native American myths that trouble their stability while also encouraging the Native Americans that there is hope. Kellogg argues, “So interdependent are the business and social problems of the Redman, they cannot be separated in his life. Lacking a stable income or credit on the business side, the task of the social survey is to see how these things affect his health, his psychology, his morals, his efficiency, his opportunities” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 99). All of these problems are solvable, and they are all interrelated. I find it striking how and why Kellogg begins this chapter by referring to the Native American as “the Redman,” even though she is actively discussing the Native American’s future possibility and capability. She does this to connect to her statement, “they cannot be separated in life,” just as the problems of the Native American are inevitable, the archaic stereotypes of “the Redman” are inevitable (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 99). But Kellogg wants Native Americans not to accept these inevitabilities, not to accept the mythologies, not to accept the past as the future.

In her final paragraphs, Kellogg ends her book with a thoughtful reconciliation of the American country. She is no longer lamenting; now her jeremiad has shifted to one of hopeful uplift. She knows that “As I travel over the country and see the beautiful spots of our beloved native land and compare them to the dismal hopelessness of the Indian’s home, I wonder if anyone can ever know the heaviness of our environment upon us” (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 100). The “heaviness” is a monumental metaphor for the weight the Native American feels as the 20th century moves forward. The “heaviness” is the suffocating metaphor for the pressures the Native American must contend with to keep their tribe surviving and thriving (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 100). Kellogg acknowledges

that “Before they are all gone, I wonder if this country will ever see the situation as it really is!” which implies that the “heaviness” is blinding to both Native and non-native Americans (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 100). Sadly, Kellogg realizes the disappearance of Indigenous culture, and sadly, realizes that both Native and non-native Americans will not be able to stop “the situation” before it is too late (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 100). But I would also argue that in presenting her Lolomi structure, she is attempting to slow down “the situation” before it wipes out all evidence of Indigenous heritage (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 100). These final reflective moments then move her back to her storytelling, where she seals her argument with finality.

Storytelling is an extensive component of Kellogg’s rhetorical work. It is compelling how Kellogg combines both storytelling and argument together in *Our Democracy and the American Indian: A Comprehensive Presentation of the Indian Situation as It Is Today*. She begins all four of her chapters with a story. Whether it be a warrior being reborn at a new dawn to fight for his community or that same warrior traveling in a canoe to find peace and strength in his tribe, Kellogg intentionally inserts stories before she addresses the claims she wishes to make concerning the American stereotypes of Native Americans or Lolomi Program (*Our Democracy* 71, 79). This merging of old and new gestures towards Kellogg’s claims of old and new ways for her people. The old stories are still a part of her community but she realizes that new arguments must be utilized for her people to prevail in life today. This juxtaposition between old and new also gesture towards Archibald and Xiiems’ claims that a, “respectful and responsible use and teaching of knowledge to others” is vital part to storywork (3). By coupling stories with arguments, Kellogg is instructing her audience to see the rhetorical merits of Indigenous efforts.

Kellogg was an Oneida, but the crimes committed against her brethren tribe the Osage, were commonly known. Her words grasp the full weight of the history of exploitation:

A story is told of how a certain physician and speculator went about with the thumb of an old Osage Indian in his pocket, after the Osage he had attended was dead. It was the practice of the Government of late years to get signatures of Indians who cannot write, sealed with the thumb mark. The Osage had considerable property which would become alienable upon his death. After his death, the records suddenly appeared with papers thumb-marked over to this doctor. But it would take many volumes to tell all that happened to the Osages.

(Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 101)

This story is shocking. This story is grotesque. But it is also the story Kellogg purposefully chose to close her book with. The story is the close of her jeremiad because it is her way of proclaiming that many were aware of the corruption that had plagued the Osage, and now, as an educated Indigenous woman, Kellogg had put their story into print for the world to know, for the world to see what “the Government” had done to many reservations (Kellogg *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy* 101). Kellogg refused to bend her arguments to any notion of feminine style; she knew the complicated needs of taking on “the Government” and was fearless in her rhetorical skill. Kellogg is the epitome of *rhetorical usefulness*, where she applied her collegiate training to a cause she knew was needed and worthy of visibility. Regardless of the social stereotypes or repercussions, Kellogg stepped into a vulnerable space and argued effectively.

Conclusion

The regents at the University of Wisconsin recognized the need for women students to supplement their male students during the Civil War. Kellogg knows that when physical spaces

are created for educational options in often neglected communities, then persons who might not have recognized the value in a rhetorical education find its meaning inestimable. It begins with the rhetorical education.

In the previous chapter, I spoke of Joslyn Gage being useful for her rhetorical efforts to counter the narrative that Anthony and Stanton had wanted to maintain as the movement's sole focus. Joslyn Gage not only reversed their position that the Women's Suffrage Movement was a singular movement based solely on women attaining the vote, but she also widened how women communicated. She is a symbol for women's history that acknowledges the branching off of issues that can happen from a main trunk; doing so does not limit, but instead enhances the appeal of the movement. She is a symbol for women's history that creativity in how authors speak, write, and listen can allow those who are often silenced to have a voice.

Kellogg was useful by not accepting the status quo. If very few Indigenous women had entered the halls of Congress up until 1913, then Kellogg said I'll come back in 1916. If very few Indigenous women had published a book creating a new government system for sovereignty, then Kellogg did just that. Kellogg traveled great distances to understand the problems that many Native communities were suffering from. Kellogg spoke with chiefs and reservation members to hear their stories. And Kellogg was highly educated. She had the rigorous coursework of multiple universities behind her. She is the embodiment of a 19th century Indigenous feminist activist. She also stands against the scholarship of Buchanan by advocating for sovereignty in ways that were deemed masculine. And with the two examples of Joslyn Gage and Kellogg, the glimpses of how 19th century collegiate feminist activists worked in public spheres gets a little more clear. The dominant narrative of very few collegiate women enrolling in rhetorical training programs becomes a little less accurate. The dominant narrative of very few collegiate women

working publicly post-graduation on civic causes becomes a little more questionable. Both Joslyn Gage and Kellogg represent a narrative that adds to what historians have written, and it begins with their collegiate experience. Their rhetorical education led them into different terrains of argument, and these new landscapes proved their merit by enabling them to be *rhetorically useful*.

Chapter 4:

Establishing Sites of Usefulness: The Cherokee Female Seminary

Introduction

Throughout my research and writing, I have found multiple instances where public officials called on women not to accept that domesticity was their inherent expectation in life. At the same time, I also uncovered writing reflecting the arguments against a woman choosing a collegiate education over domesticity. It was in my introductory chapter where I highlighted the feminist newspaper *The Pioneer*, which exposed the ironies in instructing middle-class women in a “superior education” that was often fraught with domesticity, ultimately teaching them to “despise every useful employment” (D 170). Then, in my next chapter, I referenced Mississippi State College president Richard W. Jones, who remarked that encouraging women to attain collegiate training does indeed serve a purpose for the uplifting of both “mind” and “morals,” just as long as women do not trespass into the terrain of men (Gold and Hobbs 27). Under both circumstances, women were caught by educational constraints. Neither of these calls for women to be rhetorically trained for usefulness falls under my definition of *rhetorical usefulness* because they do not allow the collegiate woman to be truly useful to herself or her community. Neither of these examples enables a collegiate woman to be intellectually free.

Because to be *rhetorically useful*, my definition is not just framed in terms of rhetorical work, like Joslyn Gage's widening issues and ways to argue; my definition of *rhetorical usefulness* also extends a woman's body into spaces that ask for her visibility, making her vulnerable, which Kellogg did. To be *rhetorically useful*, a woman applies her rhetorical education to public performance. This dynamic is represented in this chapter with an exploration

of the Cherokee Female Seminary in Tahlequah, Oklahoma. The Cherokee Female Seminary, I argue, is an example of what happens when administrators, faculty, and students come together to provide women students with rhetorical training and then encourage them to move into public spheres. Thus far, I have not found research indicating that the institutions either Joslyn Gage or Kellogg attended openly encouraged their women graduates to work publicly after graduation. The Cherokee Female Seminary did.

And this is one of several reasons why the Cherokee Female Seminary warrants more research. Because something special was happening at this institution that hasn't yet received the visibility it deserves. This institution, based on its catalogs, taught a mainstream education, which could be considered radical in its approach to encouraging young Indigenous women to argue through its newspaper, *The Cherokee Rose Buds*, on issues of social injustice. I specifically chose this site to demonstrate that the Cherokee Female Seminary purposefully designed its curriculum to not teach any domestic courses, instead only rigorous rhetorical training. This approach encouraged its female students to take more of an interest in civic work. Thus far, I do not have research that the institutions either Joslyn Gage or Kellogg attended published a newspaper that enabled their women students to challenge or defend issues of social injustice. The Seminary's short-lived history has been researched and published minimally: a detailed list of students, buildings, and the history of how the Seminary worked within the Tahlequah community. Also, from *The Cherokee Rose Buds*, my research has found only one mention of one of the published student essays, Qua-Tsy's "Female Influence," and knowing that there are many more published essays to analyze leads me to push for more rhetorical attention to the two known editions. In addition to these gaps in Seminary attention, based on my research, no one, so far, has analyzed the original *The Journal of Ellen Whitmore*, with the Seminary's history, and

with *The Cherokee Rose Buds*. Meaning, a comprehensive pulling together of perspectives from instructors, students, catalogs, and Cherokee histories has not happened. And though I acknowledge that one chapter of my dissertation will not be able to include all of the time and space needed to give the Seminary a thorough examination, this chapter will, hopefully, give a different insight into other aspects of what was happening there. I hope to add to the ongoing research about this unique place, arguing that when collegiate institutions from the 19th century offered all women the opportunity to rhetorically train, they enabled them to understand that a woman's academic contributions can work with and not against her domestic contributions.

This chapter is unique to my dissertation thus far because chapters 2 and 3 analyzed the rhetorical work of individuals, Joslyn Gage and Kellogg. Unlike chapters 2 and 3, I will analyze an institution. The Cherokee Female Seminary offered rhetorical training with the auspicious understanding that its collegians would work publicly, whether in activism for Cherokee causes or not. The women students were given a sense of autonomy and freedom to do with their education what they felt best for their lives, regardless of whether their administration actively hoped for their public activism. This, in a sense, differs from Susan Kates' definition of activist education that I have utilized throughout this dissertation. In her research, Kates studied different colleges that encouraged certain members of labor unions to enroll in rhetorical training programs, then, after graduation, those collegians would return to their labor unions and publicly campaign for civic causes on behalf of their union. Kates referred to this as activist education, whereas collegians who enrolled in rhetorical training programs without the motivation of labor union work were mainstream education. Activist education and mainstream education are two key terms that I have connected to both Joslyn Gage and Kellogg's rhetorical training, and these same terms will be further applied in this chapter as well. Because this chapter examines the

space and curriculum of an institution, Kates' terms will be applied categorically to how the institution did or did not utilize rhetorical training and public participation. For this chapter, I will begin with a history of the Cherokee, their move to Indian Territory, and their decisions in establishing their public and collegiate systems. Next, I will analyze the campus, curriculum, and space of the Cherokee Female Seminary, noting that many of the educational decisions revert back to one of the Seven Sisters Colleges—Mount Holyoke. Following this discussion, I will present two women from the Seminary who have (as far as I am aware) never been placed side by side: Ellen Whitmore Goodale and Rachel Caroline (“Callie”) Eaton, the first principal of the Seminary and a graduate from the Seminary. From Goodales's diary and Eaton's essay, I will analyze their thoughts about the Seminary and how this education has affected them. Then, I will look at several essays from *The Cherokee Rose Buds*. It is both sad and amazing that only two copies of the newspaper survive to this day. And, as far as I am aware, only one essay from one edition has been mentioned in passing by another historian. Before my conclusion, I will revert to applying Kates' ideas of activist education and mainstream education to the Seminary. It is important to understand why the Seminary is unique, and this is why I will illustrate this complexity in a slight comparison to a twentieth-century institution, Brookwood Labor College. At the end of my chapter, I will argue for why the Seminary was so effective as a place for rhetorical training that moved collegiate women into the public if they wished. However, before we examine the Seminary, we must first understand the complex history of the Cherokee's move to Tahlequah from Georgia.

When Indigenous tribes were forcibly removed from their native lands and required by the military to relocate to what was then Indian Territory, now Oklahoma, they suffered unspeakable pain and loss. This suffering was then often translated into the rhetorical work of

female students at the Seminary. Through the Seminary's newspaper, the *Cherokee Rose Buds*, the women students told the stories that were most meaningful to them, controversial or not. All of this will be unpacked in chapter 4, but first, let us return to the beginnings of Cherokee history and why their move to Tahlequah stirred a fine example of *rhetorical usefulness*.

Cherokee history is shaped by political, military, and gendered constraints that have molded the future Seminary in a historico-cultural context. Historians have documented the geographical movements and patterns of Indigenous tribes, noting the complexity within the Cherokee story. Originally, the Cherokee were settled and thriving in Georgia, trading with many Europeans and also encouraging a matrilineal political structure. Historians have noted that "At the end of the 1820s, the tribe boasted 22,400 head of cattle, 40,000 swine, gristmills, sawmills, blacksmith shops, ferries, public roads, and a turnpike" (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 11). The Cherokee were well-established, cultivating a farming lifestyle. Even as more Europeans moved into the East Coast colonies, the majority of the Cherokee did stay within the confines of their set villages. Some full-blood Cherokee moved into more isolated areas, because they did not wish to learn English or Christianity, and retained their Black slaves (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 11). A natural break was evident within the Cherokee tribe: those who were willing to work with white settlers and the federal government, and those who were not. Because of the growing dissension, the Cherokee National Executive Council was formed in 1809; its first order of business was to immediately stop all forced removals from their ancestral lands (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 11). In an attempt to unite the Upper and Lower Georgian villages, the Cherokee named New Echota their capital city, and though the attempt was a valiant step to form a republican government, all efforts to stop removal failed (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 11).

While the Cherokee Council worked to hold on to their native lands, research has revealed that education was a vital component of their society. After early contact from Christian missionaries in the 18th century, the Cherokee promoted and spread missionary schools throughout their lands. Many Indigenous communities up and down the East Coast also integrated missionary schools into their way of life. At these schools, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist missionaries worked to collectively educate Indigenous groups (Cobb 26). By 1810, Congress had implemented a plan of assimilation through education, and a Civilization Fund was enacted whereby \$10,000 was annually spent on each tribe to actively educate the tribes in American ways (Cobb 26). Indigenous scholar Amanda Cobb points out that “Civilization meant acculturation, which entailed more than learning to read and write; acculturation included learning the appropriate ideologies, cultural conventions, traditions, and social skills. Policymakers wanted the Indians ‘civilized.’ Evangelical Protestant missionary groups wanted the Indians ‘Christianized’” (Cobb 26). With a foundation of American indoctrination for Indigenous education, missionary schools were not teaching rigorous academic skills. The mindset behind missionary schools would not be repeated when the Cherokee created their new schools in Oklahoma.

At this point in American history, several key points of state legislation must be noted, along with a momentous discovery. Gold was mined and recovered in Dahlonega in 1828—unfortunately for the Cherokee, Dahlonega is centrally located within their lands (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 13). Because gold was so precious to settlers, the Georgia legislature enacted a series of state laws essentially removing all control or authority from the Cherokee of their land and granting full access to whoever wished to mine there. Not only did the Georgia legislature grant full and unmitigated access to their ancestral lands, but they also barred any

Cherokee from mining for gold (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 13). The Cherokee were left to witness their lands being trashed, polluted, and damaged without the ability to protest. Their recourse for action was limited. They had been manipulated by the federal government, and they left for Indian Territory. Though it might have appeared their move was voluntary, this removal was federally encouraged and regulated.

In 1835, a significant group of Cherokee led by Major Ridge signed the Treaty of New Echota and began the treacherous and infamous march to what is now Oklahoma. There were still Cherokees who remained, choosing to live in North Carolina in isolation (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 13-14). Historians have cataloged the numbers and estimate that “From September 1838 through March 1839, approximately twelve thousand Cherokees began the long journey west over the ‘Trail of Tears’ (also known as ‘The Trail Where They Cried’)” (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 13-14). However, these statistics do not do justice to the tales and stories that created what the Cherokee endured during their departure and removal from what they called home.

The Cherokee had always been a tribe of resilience, but their journey across the country would be a test unlike anything they had thus far encountered. The journey that carried the Cherokee from their home is often referred to as the Trail of Tears due to the magnitude of death and trauma the many tribesmen encountered. In fact, “The journey of over eight hundred miles, 4,000 Cherokees — more than one-fifth of their Nation — died of cholera, dysentery, fever, exposure, improper care of mothers giving birth, and, especially in the aged, loss of the will to survive” (Fleischmann 3). This history reveals that the military that forced the removal was not only unwavering in their inability to sympathize with the suffering, but also in their inability to distinguish the types of suffering along the journey. Through this journey, the Cherokee would come to know the bald face of how indifferent the federal government was to suffering.

And it is this suffering that creates the stories of their past. The stories that need sharing need to be passed down and, most importantly, need to be recorded accurately in history. When the Cherokee relate:

The Cherokees, in their last acts before eviction from their old homes, were often strange as they were pathetic. One woman picked up a pan of corn and fed her children, then, weeping, she put on her bonnet, collected her children and led them away, never to return. Another woman, having washed and dried her dishes, insisted upon putting them carefully in her cupboard before she would leave. An ancient grandfather had his family kneel in prayer, as the soldiers, embarrassed and awkwardly respectful, stood waiting; then the old man locked all the doors, as marauders crashed in at the rear. Mothers gave birth along the roadsides, as hundreds of Cherokees, soldiers, militiamen, white civilians clustered about, stood watching, curious, embarrassed, some trying to hide their shame with ribald humor that drew no laughs. The great processions would move on, platoons of prisoners under heavy guard, hundreds of trudging feet raising clouds of dust, and, gradually, slowly, getting smaller in the distance, they would pass from view round a bend in the road, now hidden by trees, or disappear over the top of a hill, a light reddish haze upon the crest showing that another contingent of Cherokees had seen the last of their native soil” (Fleishmann 52-53).

These stories reflect a desperate attempt to maintain a sense of ownership in the home. Both of the women in this passage knew they were being evicted from what was rightfully theirs without just cause, knew strangers were soon to confiscate their property, and still maintained a level of dignity in structure and order. In this passage, the Cherokee way of life is one of honor and pride,

even in the face of inevitability. The Cherokee's long and slow trudge to Oklahoma would then amount to more federal policies that would structurally shift what order they had previously known.

Upon arriving in Indian Territory, the Cherokee encountered a new way of life. They were to be civilized or at least that was the policy sent from Washington, D.C. Civilized was defined by speaking English and no longer speaking in their Cherokee language, practicing Christianity, and sending all Indigenous adolescents to boarding schools where they would come to understand what it meant to be an American. In other words, the Cherokee faced assimilation. Many of these new policies the Cherokee conceded to, some they did not (Perdue 115). “The Cherokees accepted many of the technological innovations offered by government agents, and Cherokee homesteads began to resemble those that dotted the rural land-scape of the United States” (Perdue 115). One cultural expectation many Cherokee women were averse to accepting was their ceding to a patriarchal structure (Perdue 115). Being considered civilized did not mean rendering Cherokee women useless in tribal affairs; typical Cherokee gender roles did not always follow normed social behaviors in the 19th century (Perdue 115). This pushback against what was expected by typical American gender and what Cherokee women wanted in life would soon be reflected in the curriculum demands at the Cherokee Female Seminary.

However, if twelve thousand began the journey, sadly, only eight thousand arrived in Eastern Oklahoma (Miheuah *Cultivating* 14-15). But life in Eastern Oklahoma slowly proved profitable to the Cherokee, where they once again established a farming community. And though they agriculturally supported themselves, it seems the move west instilled a different approach, a different perspective on how they should establish a governing structure. After years of Christian missionary influence, the Cherokee had a patrilineal and patriarchal power structure imposed on

them through federal influence. By 1841, thousands were farming and establishing their livelihood to the point where the Cherokee set up Tahlequah as their capital (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 14-15). Even with all of these cultural and historical changes, one thing remained the same for the Cherokee: a profound respect for formal education.

Now in Tahlequah, the Cherokee faced many discussions as to how they would enact an educational system that would train their young boys and girls for future careers in a white society while also instilling within them wisdom from their Indigenous past. This clash between living in a white world while still maintaining respect for Indigenous culture was a common and relevant conversation many in Indian Territory were having. If formal education, through primary schools and eventually higher institutions, was the way to survive, then the Cherokee needed a system that could manage their dilemma. Cherokee Female Seminary scholar, Emily Legg, has written extensively on the educational questions and conversations that led the Executive Council to establish multiple places for formal education and to promote a gender inclusive environment at the collegiate level. Prior to the notorious Trail of Tears move, the Cherokee respected women's autonomy and respected their liberation; now it seemed the Cherokee would suspend this mindset and push a curriculum that aligned with patriarchal notions of women's roles. A white education where young men received higher academic training and young women received domestic training was what many Cherokee believed could align them with a Christian mentality. Legg argues that the Cherokee were marginalized by the federal government, by the state government of Georgia, and male leaders attempted to marginalize Cherokee women through education ("Stories" 140-141). This layering of oppression caused many Cherokee women to feel torn between the past and what was expected by their Elder tribe members, and what they viewed as a new opportunity. There were

mixed-blood and full-blood Cherokee children who, advised by their families, adhered to a white education that taught “the cult of true womanhood” and that a Cherokee woman’s place was in the home (Welter 152, Mihesuah “Let Us Strive” 104). But, fortunately, not all Cherokee, mixed-blood, or full-blood were willing to submit, willing to cling to a mindset that, arguably, harmed Cherokee women. Many Cherokee did not want a “white education” that bred subservience and silence; instead, the Cherokee Female Seminary was established to represent what I will categorically define as the embodiment of *rhetorical usefulness* (Mihesuah “Let Us Strive” 105). Ultimately, the Cherokee Council made the decision not to teach domesticity at the Seminary; instead, instructors would educate their female students in a mainstream rhetorical training program that would teach argument and awareness for civic causes.

The early nineteenth century, specifically between 1825 and 1835, witnessed the Cherokee National Council taking immediate steps to separate their education system from the mission and boarding schools that plagued many Indigenous tribes. The Cherokee schooling system was not associated with the federally-controlled schools that were cropping up nationwide, utilizing the institutionalized Christianity that removed many parts of Indigenous heritage. The National Council established laws that required, among other things, that permission must be granted before any school, primary or secondary, may be constructed; the National Council also allowed non-Cherokee teachers, male and female, to live on Cherokee lands and teach Cherokee students both a secular and an Indigenous curriculum (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 18). The Cherokee understood the relationship between the federal government and their tribe and how education played a part: it needed a foundation that no one would question. Cherokee historian Devon A. Mihesuah has pinpointed two acts of the National Council that represent major decisions:

Two articles of the Cherokee Constitution of 1827 expressed their commitment to religion and to education. One stated that ‘no person who denies the beginning of God or future state of reward and punishment shall hold office in the civil department in this Nation’ and the other held that ‘religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government, the preservation of liberty and happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged in this Nation’ (*Cultivating* 18).

The fact that the Cherokee were so committed to “knowledge,” “schools,” and “education” leaves little room to deny their approach to the post-removal world (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 18). Later in 1835, the Cherokee added a resolution to the above articles by verifying that all schools must always have “Cherokee national interests and [meet] [its] community needs” (Legg “Stories” 146). This duality reflects the Cherokee’s understanding of working with a system and not against it. And by 1841, eleven public schools for both boys and girls were founded in eight districts, with the Rev. Stephen Foreman, a full-blood Cherokee, serving as superintendent of the Cherokee Nation (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 19). The system was working and progressing, and within two years, over five hundred mixed, full-blood, and non-Cherokee students were attending eleven schools with two Cherokee and nine white teachers (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 19).

This progression, this revival, was evident in the Cherokee culture. In fact, as time and experience passed for the Cherokee in Tahlequah, many more unconventional tribal members pushed for “an educational system in order to ‘uplift’ the entire tribe, including poor fullbloods and some mixed-bloods, whom they considered to be ‘unenlightened’ and ‘uninformed’” (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 21). They pushed back against the stereotypical *savage Indian* or the stereotypical *silent squaw* and viewed themselves as able to reconstruct an Americanized and

newer Cherokee that was both educated and Indigenous. This newness took shape for “the entire[ty] [of the] tribe,” not just the young boys who were to lead; young Cherokee girls were allowed to attend a Cherokee higher institute (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 21).

Before the Cherokee Female Seminary, that is at the center of this chapter was established, there was another Cherokee Female Seminary. Though sadly, this Seminary did not last, due to fiscal restraints, at its bedrock is the term so unique, so essential to understanding how to cultivate true 19th-century women. In 1843, a Baptist-based Cherokee Female Seminary was erected “for the ‘improvement, subsequent usefulness, and ultimate happiness of the young ladies of the Cherokee Nation’” (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 21-22). The Cherokee were enabling their progressive, young, educationally aspiring women to be “subsequent[ly] [useful]” at their own discretion (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 21-22). They were not harnessed to a notion of some patriarchal institution, nor were they grounded in some gendered or racial expectation that limited their writing ability and space. The Cherokee opened a space for them and said, Have at it. Do what you will, but do something...*useful*. At this first Seminary, Sarah Hale Hibbard, the first principal, taught what we have witnessed at Clinton Liberal Institute, the University of Wisconsin, and Stanford University: “a ‘regular curriculum,’ plus civil ecclesiastical history, Latin, natural science, and social and intellectual philosophy” (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 21-22). It’s all right there: the beginnings of the urge and drive to argue. When colleges enrolled young collegiate women in classes like “social and intellectual philosophy,” they were giving their collegiate women the opportunity to argue, even if they were still being socially reminded to stay in their domestic lane (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 21-22). And though I will devote the next sections of chapter 4 to research on the 1851 Cherokee Female Seminary, this research reveals that the

Cherokee were a forward-moving tribe that understood the value in teaching women to understand, appreciate, and ultimately utilize a rhetorical education.

The Cherokee have a complicated history, both locally and nationally. Fortunately, that complicated history has been researched by many scholars. This chapter has benefited from the scholarly efforts of several authors. Emily Legg, in her comprehensive work, *Stories of Our Living Ephemera: Storytelling Methodologies in the Archives of the Cherokee National Seminaries, 1846-1907*, not only gives us the story of the Cherokee's arrival in Tahlequah but then delves into the birth and survival of the Seminary. This work does the Seminary justice in its compilation of both students, instructors, and its relationship to the community. Along with Legg, I also leaned heavily on Devon A. Mihesuah's work, *Cultivating the Rosebuds : The Education of Women at the Cherokee Female Seminary, 1851-1909*, and her essay "'Let Us Strive Earnestly to Value Education Aright': Cherokee Female Seminarians as Leaders of a Changing Culture," in the book *Nineteenth-Century Women Learn to Write*. Both of these sources were meaningful to developing a contextual understanding of the Cherokee Female Seminary. However, I doubt nothing would have been as beneficial as locating the only two remaining editions of the *Cherokee Rose Buds*, the 1854 and 1855 editions. The writers in these two editions need to be memorialized and deserve visibility. This is why I am thankful that both the Western History Collections at the University of Oklahoma and the Library of Congress double-checked that the 1854 and 1855 editions are all that remain of these revolutionary essays. We cannot fail in our efforts to allow these early female Cherokee students to fall into the margins. Their writing demands further exploration, research, and analysis.

Campus, Curriculum, and Space

The Cherokee planned for both a male and female seminary at Park Hill, just outside of Tahlequah, and though the only remains from the female seminary are three pillars that still stand after a devastating fire, the land is now the site for the Cherokee Heritage Center (Legg “Stories” 144). These sites were incredible in their approach to education. The Cherokee welcomed both Cherokee and non-Cherokee instructors and students, which mirrors their plan to implement an educational system that could serve multiple communities. This approach, known as *duyuk’ta* (balance), enabled the Cherokee students to both learn a white curriculum and resist assimilation; it enabled space for Cherokee instructors and students to understand how Indigeneity could simultaneously fit into a 19th-century society (Legg “Stories” 137-138). By acknowledging that the Cherokee students sitting in unfamiliar classrooms were experiencing thoughts and feelings that were displacing, the National Council incorporated a system that granted access to language, culture, and heritage. The approach of *duyuk’ta* was a rhetorical and educational method that worked for the seminary students, but this method was a balanced method; it balanced an Indigenous way of life with a white way of education. This combination needs research and attention because the National Council that implemented this approach devoted time and space to making sure this plan would work. And it did. This is where Cherokee young women would meet the rhetorical curriculum of Mount Holyoke.

Prior to the Cherokee Female Seminary opening, David Vann, who was treasurer for the tribe, and William Potter Ross, son of the current chief, John Ross, set out in 1850 on an educational expedition to find both collegiate instructors and collegiate curriculum that they could emulate—their journey eventually led them to Mount Holyoke (Legg “Stories” 147). Research has revealed that the Seven Sisters Colleges, where wealthy white women were offered a collegiate education, were not just teaching domesticity and republican motherhood. Beginning

in 1837, with Mount Holyoke being the first to open, these colleges framed seriousness and a rigorous rhetorical education as their foundation. The Seven Sisters were not just a place to allow young women to bide their time before marriage and motherhood; these schools eventually offered teacher training, nursing training, and other advanced coursework. This advanced coursework was the frame that Vann and Ross sought out for the Seminary in Tahlequah. In addition to Vann and Ross, they also asked Thomas Van Horn to accompany them and ascertain whether Mount Holyoke's curriculum would translate to Tahlequah (Legg "Stories" 147). The three men spent time observing classes, reading through catalogs, and discussing with administrators what works and what doesn't for educationally aspiring women. This conversation is, of course, wrapped up in the understanding that a private school designed for wealthy white women is not the same as a seminary designed for Cherokee young women whose families just completed the torturous Trail of Tears. Knowing the delicacies of how to provide for *duyak'ta*, Vann, Ross, and Horn asked two Mount Holyoke graduates to return with them to Tahlequah to implement this curriculum: Ellen Whitmore Goodale and Sarah Worcester (Legg "Stories" 147). Slowly, the Seminary was coming together.

In 1851, the Cherokee Female Seminary opened its doors, though the entire campus would not be ready until 1857. And unfortunately, the original structure was destroyed in the 1887 fire. The Cherokee quickly rebuilt a newer structure to accommodate the growing student population (Mihesuah "Let Us Strive" 103). Indeed, the Seminary was growing, practically exploding with more students and more teachers (many traveling from Massachusetts), all to continue the rich tradition of high standards of not only curriculum, but the tribe paid their instructors, through no federal money, incredibly high (Legg "Stories" 146). The growing student population was put through their paces, and the tribe required all incoming students to

prove satisfactory in “English language proficiency in spelling, reading, arithmetic, grammar, and geography” (Legg “Stories” 147). As long as incoming students could prove proficiency in these requirements, the Seminary would accommodate anyone.

This approach in education created both a welcoming and a conflicting dynamic. Mihesuah notes that “Students ranged from 1/128 degree Cherokee blood to full-blood; some knew nothing about Cherokee culture, while others enrolled in the seminary to learn about white society” (“Let Us Strive” 104). It was a place for tolerance and empathy. Full-blood Cherokee women were sitting next to white women and learning about the problematic history of how America came to be, and, arguably, who gets to tell this story. The dimensions between students and their curriculum were delicate. The female students at the Seminary utilized the Seminary’s newspaper, *Cherokee Rose Buds*, to write about these dimensions. Cherokee women were being instructed in a white rhetorical education on land granted to them by a white federal government, and by white and Cherokee instructors. All of this converged for Cherokee women as they made themselves *rhetorically useful* for their classmates and the entirety of the tribe. Everything was dependent on the success of the Mount Holyoke curriculum embedded with Cherokee culture working for the Seminary.

Ellen Whitmore Goodale and Sarah Worcester were joined by Mary Chapin to administer this Mount Holyoke curriculum that coupled Cherokee culture within it (Legg “Stories” 147). The three women worked diligently with the National Council to incorporate a “student-centered approach,” which was started by Mary Lyon, the 1837 founder of Mount Holyoke (Legg “Stories” 148). The curriculum was an in-depth preparation for a future public career, but interestingly, the Seminary also embedded within this curriculum domestic women’s duties and expectations, but not in the way that Welter would advise. Rather, Cherokee women were

assigned daily domestic chores that would reduce tuition costs and fees (Legg “Stories”148). I’m going to devote some time and space to analyzing this administrative move because of its relation to *rhetorical usefulness*.

Nineteenth-century normal schools, seminaries, and institutions had traditionally taught domesticity to their white female students to promote the ideology of true womanhood. This was an inherited belief that white women were the gatekeepers of the home. But Goodale, Worcester, Chapin, and the National Council wanted to push back against this inheritance by instilling within the young Cherokee women an appreciation not for domestic containment but, I argue, instead, academic freedom. The administration assigned daily work to lower school costs, but this, ironically, raised academic fervor. Cherokee women were not taught to complete domestic chores because that was their inherited role in life; instead, they were taught that by completing these tasks, they could be more *rhetorically useful* and enable more young women to enroll at the Seminary. The daily chores were just a means to get to the real work, the academic work. The administration never instilled within their students that these chores were what the students could expect in life. The chores did not represent some preordained role or duty to fulfill. The chores did, however, fulfill an aspect of *rhetorical usefulness*. The Cherokee Female Seminary was *rhetorically useful* by demonstrating to women that they can learn more than just domesticity. Domesticity can be a part of a woman’s life, but it does not have to dominate it. This was most evident when the Seminary released its 1867 catalog and triumphantly stated, “All the members of the school aid to some extent in the domestic work of the family...but a literary institution is not the place to gain it” (Legg “Stories” 148). This research reveals, and I argue, that the Cherokee Female Seminary believed that a woman’s domestic life and her literary life should be separate. The home and the college were separate spheres, but both still created a true woman.

Research reveals that a highly rigorous curriculum was essential to teaching both men and women students at both Seminary's. Both the Cherokee women and men were essentially taught from the same catalog:

First-year students studied geometry, Greek history, intellectual theology, and a course based on Paley's *Natural Theology*—the same work Mary Lyon used to impress the importance of Christianity upon her Mount Holyoke pupils. The second-year class studied algebra, physiology, Latin, and Watts's *Improvement of the Mind*. Third- and fourth-year students studied geography, Latin, and advanced arithmetic. (Mihsuah *Cultivating* 30-31)

Like students at the Clinton Liberal Institute, the University of Wisconsin, and Stanford University, these collegiate women were being gifted with the tools of argument. The Cherokee Female Seminary continued to instruct its young women in a classical curriculum. Domestic courses were never a part of the Seminary's education. The Cherokee Female Seminary knew it had a civic responsibility to its women students, which is why:

Until 1856—when the seminary closed because of financial difficulties and the impending Civil War—students studied geometry, algebra, physiology, geography, Latin, English grammar, and Greek and American history. When the seminary reopened in 1872, the curriculum broadened and diversified. In addition to the former courses, students devoted their efforts to a more intensive study of French, German, chemistry, zoology, botany, trigonometry, analytical geometry, calculus, and business writing... Juniors and seniors studied the works of Virgil, Livy, Homer, Goethe, Molière, George Eliot, and Shakespeare. Literary clubs, such as the Minervian, Germane, Sodales, Netrophian, Philomathian, Utopian,

and Hypathian societies, gave students an opportunity to develop their ‘literary, musical, and dramatic talents’ and to learn the important qualities ‘necessary to a pleasing appearance before the public’. (Mihesuah “Let Us Strive” 106)

The authors and texts are the same as those of the Clinton Liberal Institute, the University of Wisconsin, and Stanford University. Students were called to work “before the public” (Mihesuah “Let Us Strive” 106). Here is another aspect of the Seminary’s *rhetorical usefulness*: they always believed that, after having received a mainstream rhetorical education, their students were worthy of public work. Cherokee Female Seminary students are representative of true women and *rhetorically useful* because not only were they trained in an academic collegiate setting, but they were also expected to make use of their education by doing something outside of domesticity.

Instructors and Students

By sending a search committee to several private women’s colleges that taught rhetorical education as their mainstay, the National Council was motivated by the idea of their women students at the Cherokee Female Seminary leading a beneficial public life post-graduation. The National Council brought in Mount Holyoke instructors and students to raise the bar of what an academic Cherokee woman could accomplish. The relationships that formed between instructors and students at the Cherokee Female Seminary were dynamic. Sarah Worcester and Ellen Whitmore Goodale returned to the Seminary as instructors along with Oswald Woodford and Thomas Van Horne in 1850 under the expectation to instruct all of the young women in everything they had learned at Mount Holyoke, setting high expectations for their young students (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 28). Worcester and Goodale were the beginning of the rigorous education at the Seminary.

After arriving from Marlborough, Massachusetts, Goodale demonstrated such keen teaching skills and an amicable rapport with her students, she was appointed first principal, though she only served from 1851-1852, with Worcester as her assistant (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 31). Almost immediately, the National Council took notice of how easily Goodale and Worcester “immersed themselves in their work,” which was an indication of not only how eager the two teachers were to teach but also how eager the students were to learn (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 32). The young women were thriving under the guidance of Goodale and Worcester. And though Goodale did resign after only one year of instructing, due to her getting married to Warren Goodale on June 17, 1852, her comments in a letter to another Mount Holyoke graduate, Mary Chapin, deserve notice (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 32). Goodale wrote that her time at the Seminary was ““the pleasantest field in which I have ever been called to labor...I have found warm friends here whose unremitting kindness I can never repay”” (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 32). Her comments do not allude to any academic work, but they do allude to the positive relationships formed between a white teacher and her Indigenous students. She found “warm[th]” and “kindness” in every moment she was at the Seminary (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 32).

After Goodale retired, another astute representation of successful collegiate women took the helm as principal of the Seminary. Beginning in 1875, Ann Florence Wilson, a graduate of New York’s Oswego Normal School, traveled from New England, like Goodale and Worcester, to lead the Seminary (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 52). Wilson was remarkable in her leadership at the Seminary. Wilson encouraged her Seminary students to invest in their rhetorical education so they might move beyond homemaking (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 52). The Cherokee National Council was methodical in selecting Wilson as principal at the Seminary. Not only did Wilson graduate from Cane Hill Female Seminary in Arkansas and La Grange Female College near

Jackson, Tennessee, but she also had a strong background in “curriculum development, student psychology, textbook selection, and teaching techniques” (Miheuah *Cultivating* 52-53). So under the tutelage of Goodale, Worcester, and Wilson, the female collegiate students of the Cherokee Female Seminary grew in their rhetorical prowess. All three instructors had powerful backgrounds in rhetoric that they then imparted to their students. And as Goodale related in her *The Journal of Ellen Whitmore*, originally published in 1852, and resurrected for archival work by the Western History Collection of the University of Oklahoma in 1953, this invaluable document teaches us much about the usefulness of complex relationships between teachers and their students.

The Journal of Ellen Whitmore, carefully maintained and guarded by the Western History Collection at the University of Oklahoma, is beyond delicate; its construction paper-like binding is sensitive to touch. Because Goodale published the journal in 1852 after she was married, for my analysis and consistent citation documentation, I will cite Goodale, as in Ellen Rebecca Whitmore Goodale, as the author of the journal³. Goodale’s journey from Massachusetts to Indian Territory was not just an educational journey, as reflected in her opening remarks, she writes philosophically about how this quest is more than just a job. Goodale begins with, “The future is hidden from me—whether happiness or sorrow is in store for me in that school I cannot tell. If I can only see plainly that I am in the path of duty it is all that I could ask” (19). The fact that she refers to this journey as a “path of duty” implies several things (Goodale 19). Goodale not only believes that this is a long movement, not short-lived, but a movement in feminist education. Goodale also believes that she has a sense of responsibility to other women to instruct in what she has been instructed in—a passing of the torch. Goodale uniquely understood her

³ Although, the title of the journal is *The Diary of Ellen Whitmore*, Goodale published after she was married.

place and its delicacy in setting up the beginnings of what these young women would understand.

The Cherokee tribe had just been established in Tahlequah, after a traumatic move from Georgia over the Trail of Tears. The young women who were entering the classrooms at the Cherokee Female Seminary needed instructors who were ready, willing, and able to work with them. This is why when Goodale writes, “I do not know yet how soon the school will open, for the building is not quite completed and probably will not be for some weeks, I shall have to rest and become acquainted with the people” her remarks demonstrate a sincerity to know and understand not only her students but the Cherokee community as well (19). To “become acquainted with the people” would be useful for Goodale and make her teaching useful for her students (Goodale 19). She was bringing in a private, wealthy, white education to Indian Territory. She needed to convey empathy for her students who were learning something new in a historical time that was hostile to Indigenous women and not exactly encouraging to Indigenous women wanting an education other than domesticity. But Goodale, based on this research, demonstrates an earnestness for her task, and the task at hand was rhetorical training.

And the rhetorical training at the Cherokee Female Seminary, based on Goodale’s journal, began with a fervent challenge to their women students. Goodale writes:

You are already acquainted with the character of this institution. It will contain about fifty scholars this year, as the second class of twenty-five are admitted this term. The branches attended to this year will be; Latin, Algebra, Arithmetic, Grammar, Geography, Botany and Vocal Music. (23)

Though we do not see “the works of Virgil, Livy, Homer, Goethe, Molière, George Eliot, and Shakespeare” that would be staples in later catalogs, what is noteworthy here is the lack of

domestic courses (Mihesuah “Let Us Strive” 106). Needlework and housewifery are not in the courses taught by Goodale.

The students demonstrated their rhetorical training through the Seminary’s newspaper, *Cherokee Rose Buds*, through articles like student Qua-Tsy’s “Female Influence” (Legg “To Keep” 205). The *Cherokee Rose Buds*, analyzed in detail in the next section, created writing space for students to broaden and expand on what Indigenous women students were or were not encouraged to write and discuss. Legg argues:

Education, for the Cherokee, wasn’t a means to assimilate but a tool of self-determination for the continuance of the Cherokee Nation. Cherokee women could write of ideals like piety and beauty in the *Cherokee Rose Buds*, but these ideals, when constellated with Qua-Tsy’s story on female influence and the importance of Selu as Corn Mother, are characters of powerful women who can influence the Nation. (“To Keep” 207).

So there was a complex cross-section of usefulness working here. The students were pushing back against white ideologies while also memorializing their rich heritage. The *Cherokee Rose Buds* was also the means for students Na-Li and Fanny to write explicitly, or name, what life for Cherokee women is like in Tahlequah, in their article “Two Scenes in Cherokee Land” (Legg “To Keep” 214). It is significant the rhetorical freedom the collegiate women were given in writing and publishing in *The Cherokee Rose Buds*, because many of the graduates continued their rhetorical work in public spheres. Former student Nannie Catherine Daniel (Fite), writing in a post-graduation essay, hoped that the “‘volume of usefulness be increased and enriched as it flows down the remote future’” (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 71). Now, having explored the thoughts

of Goodale, I will move to a graduate of the Seminary, Rachel Caroline (“Callie”) Eaton, who recounts her rhetorical experiences and how much it meant to her post-graduation public life.

Rachel Caroline Eaton was one of the Cherokee Female Seminary graduates between 1851 and 1909, one of 212 women. She was the first Cherokee woman to earn her doctoral degree; she is the embodiment of what the Seminary called for when administrators proclaimed a rhetorical education was ““necessary to a pleasing appearance before the public”” for their young women (King 100, Mihesuah “Let Us Strive” 106). After graduating from the Seminary, the idea of public work weighed heavily on Eaton, and she knew she needed to contribute to her community, giving back to those who could benefit from her education. She became both an educator and a historian, and the first female superintendent in Oklahoma (King 102). Her service to her community, though greatly needed, was not without criticism. Eaton viewed the relationship between white education and Cherokee education differently from others. “In her work, she valued oral tradition and her Cherokee identity, which many other academics underappreciated and even ostracized her for. Despite various challenges, she formed a hybrid methodology that celebrated and focused on Cherokee national history” (King 102). This bridge that she hoped to conquer, helping her students understand the connections between the spheres they live and work in: Cherokee students living in a white world, was often fraught with conflict. Not many agreed with her teaching methods: the local school boards often pushed back against her determination to advocate for Cherokee children speaking Cherokee in white classrooms.

Regardless of the setbacks she faced as an educated Cherokee woman attempting to instill the knowledge that adapting Cherokee traditions to a white culture could prove useful, Eaton became a symbol for what her nation referred to as ““loyal countrywomen”” (King 102). Loyalty to the tribal community was integral to the National Council, regardless of any federal

overreach, and Eaton maintained her firm belief in Cherokee sovereignty. In her study of Eaton, Farina King writes about the tribulations Eaton overcame in fighting white oppression while pushing for Cherokee independence, in the essay “‘Loyal Countrywoman’ Rachel Caroline Eaton, Alumna of the Cherokee National Female Seminary.” King argues:

While scholars have asserted that the Cherokee National Female Seminary enabled them to obtain a white settler education and imbued them with European American customs and mannerisms, the seminary also ingrained in its graduates at least one significant aspect of an intergenerational Cherokee tradition—Cherokee peoplehood as separate from US nationalism. (King 102)

Eaton worked to be useful for her students, embedding within them the ability to understand the place and space the Cherokee have had in the story of the making of America. The Cherokee were a people, regardless of whether the federal government formally recognized their “peoplehood” (King 102). Eaton’s scholarly work would continue as she moved in multiple academic and Indigenous spheres.

By 1910, Eaton recognized a need to begin more public rhetorical work through storytelling; she was already a “teacher” but now needed to become an “author” (King 106). In teaching and storytelling, Eaton’s usefulness is revealed in her exploration “The Legend of the Battle of Claremore Mound Oklahoma,” which centered on Eaton’s hometown of Claremore and the infamous battle between the Cherokee and the Osage in 1817 (King 106). This essay became a pivotal moment when she decided to embark on her educational journey, graduating from Drury College in Springfield, Missouri, with her Bachelor of Science in 1895 (King 107). After her bachelor’s, Eaton received her Master’s in 1911 and then, at the University of Chicago in 1919, earned her doctorate of philosophy (King 107). Her early experiences at the Seminary had

instilled in her an appreciation for rhetorical training, and she then moved into public work. The *Waxahachie Daily Light* reported that Eaton was ““a woman of broad scholarship, rich experience, and splendid personality”” (King 107). Her rhetorical training culminated in 1916 with her election as “dean of women and chair of History Department at Trinity University in Waxahachie, Texas” (King 107). Similar to Joslyn Gage and Kellogg, Eaton also applied her early rhetorical training to public work.

This public work, for Eaton, was demonstrated in several ways. Eaton's participation in the Federated Club, the Eastern Star, and the Tulsa Indian Women's Club reflects her public participation in public service (King 109). However, as a strong advocate for Cherokee voice and making space for these voices available, Eaton ““had the privilege of seeing and hearing all of the principal chiefs of the nation since the Civil War”” (King 111). She worked to create a methodology that allowed the Cherokee principal chiefs to make storytelling a way for them to publish their shared histories. This methodology “hybridized approaches, intermingling forms of ‘fireside’ stories in the oral tradition and the practice of reading place, as someone who had grown up in the region, with her academic training, which prioritized written sources and archival documents” (King 111). Eaton ultimately contributed much to the history of the Cherokee people, and many of these public contributions can be credited to her collegiate training, which began at the Cherokee Female Seminary.

Devon A. Mihesuah's research on the Cherokee Female Seminary and its rich history is illuminating. Eight graduates from the 1855-56 class taught in the Cherokee public schools (Mihesuah Appendix B). After the Seminary was rebuilt, the alumni from the classes of 1872-1909 had twenty-six graduates who taught in Cherokee public schools (Mihesuah Appendix C). There were a total of eighty-four graduates from the Seminary who returned to the

Seminary to teach and pass on the torch to future students (Mihesuah Appendix D). Seventeen nongraduates of the Seminary would spend time teaching there (Mihesuah Appendix E).

Graduation numbers are interesting as well⁴. These numbers indicate that retention was consistent at the Seminary. The graduating numbers may not have always been in the double digits, but that does not demonstrate the success that was happening at the Seminary.

Coincidentally, the 1910 graduating class was the final collegians for the Seminary, but the campus and space were already starting to shift. In 1909, Northeastern State Normal School would open on the Seminary's grounds. Nevertheless, rhetorical training was meaningful for all students throughout the institution's history. This was encouraged through the writing in the *Cherokee Rose Buds*, where again, usefulness is a readily apparent concept in student voices.

Cherokee Rose Buds

The *Cherokee Rose Buds* are a prime example of usefulness in many ways. Its original premise was to be a vehicle for a national exchange of ideas between other women's colleges, both private and public. And under the direction of original editors Elizabeth Duncan and Lucinda M. Ross, on August 1, 1855, instructed the newspaper to be bilingual in printing both Cherokee and English stories (Legg "To Keep" 200, 205). We see the newspaper expanding ideas both locally and nationally, and it is also opening up space for language diversity. It is also significant that we can see the effectiveness in real-time of how the rhetorical classroom lessons translated to writing and publishing essays in a newspaper. Legg argues that by opening an avenue for rhetorical freedom, it was an example of:

⁴ February 1855: 11, February 1856: 12, January 1879: 2, July 1880: 7, June 1881: 4, June 1883: 3, June 1884: 1, June 1885: 3, May 1886: 1, June 1888: 3, June 1890: 3, June 1892: 3, June 1893: 3, June 1894: 4, June 1895: 6, June 1896: 1, June 1897: 7, June 1898: 5, June 1899: 11, May 1900: 8, May 1901: 7, May 1902: 11, June 1903: 16, June 1904: 12, June 1905: 14, May 1906: 17, May 1907: 7, May 1908: 9, May 1909: 10, May 1910: 4 (Mihesuah Appendix G).

rhetorical sovereignty, which is ‘the inherent right and ability of a *people* to determine their own communicative needs and desires in this pursuit, to decide for themselves the goals, modes, styles, and languages of public discourse.’ These newspapers and student writings are public yet maintain sovereignty by what they do not give to that distant white audience. (Legg “To Keep” 205)

Interestingly, I argue, this approach is both an example of identifying and omitting as an act of rhetorical sovereignty. The *Cherokee Rose Buds* named the two distinct languages they would be publishing in, still exerting control over when the female editors want to write in their native language and maintain power. This same power is also reflected in what they willingly choose to omit in publishing in English. Their editorials may be side by side in both Cherokee and English, but the storytelling is substantially different. By identifying and omitting through language diversity, the *Cherokee Rose Buds* conveyed power to their women students.

Legg goes on to argue, “When these writings are constellated within Cherokee stories and rhetorical practices, they are recast as a negotiating balance between what it meant to be Cherokee during this time and to write for a public audience that included non-Cherokees” (Legg “To Keep” 213). The first principal of the Cherokee Female Seminary, Ellen Whitmore Goodale, was a Mount Holyoke graduate, naturally inheriting an elitist white education. And though the National Council maintained a firm and watchful eye over the curriculum and training the young Cherokee students were receiving, it still does not dismiss the idea that these young Cherokee women were being taught a white curriculum, by a white instructor, in a territory that they were forced onto after white removal. The newspaper became for many of the young women a beacon or outlet for expressing this conflict in cultural terms. As Indigenous scholar Mark Rifkin argues:

‘Native peoples occupy a double bind within dominant settler reckonings of time. Either they are consigned to the past, or they are inserted into a present defined on non-native terms. From this perspective, Native people(s) do not so much exist within the flow of time as erupt from it as an anomaly, one usually understood as emanating from a bygone era.’ (qtd. in Legg “To Keep” 213-214)

This “double bind” is reflected in the essays published in the *Cherokee Rose Buds*, with articles like “The Algebra Sum Soliloquy” from Na-Li or Qua-Tsy writing “Female Influence” or Kitty writing the article “Se-Quah-Yah” (Legg “To Keep” 213-214). The young women wanted to expand their rhetorical terrain while still respecting their Cherokee traditions. The young women wanted to capture the proof of their rhetorical education while still conveying their stories in the Cherokee language. The “double bind” embeds within these women a need to be useful to their community, which ironically, more than one of the young women uses this exact verbiage to call on their need to be influential, beneficial, and true women for the Cherokee people (Legg “To Keep” 213-214).

I will analyze several different articles from the only two surviving editions that both the Western History Collections from the University of Oklahoma and the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. could locate of the newspaper⁵. From the August 2, 1854 edition, several articles of civic awareness were published⁶. These titles further represent a clash between

⁵ The 1854 edition is titled *Cherokee Rose Buds*. The 1855 edition is titled *A Wreath of Cherokee Rose Buds*. For my analysis I will refer to the newspaper as the *Cherokee Rose Buds*.

⁶ Corrinne “Original Poetry”, Ka-Ya-Kun-Stah “An Osage Wedding”, Na-Li “The Algebra Sum Soliloquy”, Wah-Lie “Childhood”, Eattie “The Power of Kindness”, Quale-U-Quah “A Small River or Creek”, Letilla “The Gardening Season—A Great Time Among All Matrons”, Fanny “Revenge is Sweet”, Alice “The Rose”, Belle “The Wind”, Observer “Celebration of the 4th of July”, Kate “Music”, Cherokee “Dissipation”, Lusette “Kate M——’s Composition”, Inez “A Peep into the Future”, Dora “Queer Matty”, Ada May “Thoughts in Study Hour”, Cha Wah-You-Kah “A Rainy Night”, Bessie “Tardiness” Marie Stewart “Beauty”, and Flora Green “A Dream.” From the August 1, 1855 edition the following articles were published: Alice “Beauty”, Ida “The Curious Garden”, Kate “A Walk”, Ga-Yu-Ga “Stars”, “Exchanges”, “Our

tradition and modernity. The young women were challenging themselves to write about religion and beauty standards; the young women wanted to openly express their thoughts on how the Seminary fit into larger conversations about white education for Indigenous students. And the *Cherokee Rose Buds* is a vital example of how young collegiate women navigate often uncertain spaces where their rhetorical abilities are tested. Still, they can demonstrate their training with precision and clarity.

In the August 2, 1854, edition of the *Cherokee Rose Buds*, readers catch a glimpse of the inner lives of the students at the Seminary and, most importantly, a glimpse of how these young women viewed themselves postgraduation. In Na-Li's "An Address to the Females of the Cherokee Nation," the author writes specifically to a group of apprehensive young women who are ambivalent about a white education, and thus, Na-Li's essay is an argument for enrolling at the Seminary. She begins with her background and how troubling her life had been up until several missionaries took her under their care and instruction, writing almost apologetically, "I should not have said so much about myself, but I feel that a great many of the full Cherokee can have the benefit of the Seminary as well as I" (Na-Li 3). Na-Li argues the tension between the white missionaries and many of the Cherokee, the stings of history from white betrayal, removal, and persecution are now calling the young Cherokee students to trust and receive a white education. The Seminary, for many, is not a place of safety, but for Na-Li, the physical space and rhetorical space became a way to grapple with her Indigenous past. When Na-Li eloquently states, "My dark complexion does not prevent me from acquiring knowledge and of being useful hereafter" (3). She understands that the Seminary is a space where, through her rhetorical

Anniversary", Haide "Spring", Lelea "Critics and Criticism", Ionia "Noble Names", Icy "The Two Companions", Ada "The First Sabbath", Lily Lee "Literary Day Among the Birds", Ma-Li "The Seed", "Nature", H. Mann "Free Schools", Grace "Intemperance", Leonora "The Mourse's Will."

education, she can fight back against those who simply see her “dark complexion” as a reason to discount her (Na-Li 3). Note her realization that she wants to make herself “useful,” so by publishing the essay “An Address to the Females of the Cherokee Nation,” she is extending and widening spaces and ideas for other young women (Na-Li 3).

Discussing the space of the Cherokee Female Seminary is another topic that Edith reflects on in her essay “View from our Seminary.” Though her rather short essay, only four paragraphs, details the picturesque woods and prairies of the lands surrounding the Seminary, her final paragraph hints at a subject that might be bordering on controversial. Edith ends her essay with the statement, “One of the most handsome and beautifully situated of these dwellings is the residence of our Chief and his white bride, who left her native land and friends a few years since to come and dwell with him in his wild prairie home among his own tribe, the Cherokee” (3). Could Edith be making the argument that a life lived on Cherokee land, or even Indian Territory, “in [the] wild prairie” and away from “friends” is far more meaningful and valuable than a life lived in white luxury (3)? I argue, she is. I also argue that her boldness and ability to end the essay with such a statement were a result of being taught inductive rhetorical arguments, where authors place the climactic and pinnacle statement at the conclusion. Edith knew exactly what she was doing by making the statement that the Chief’s “white bride” had found more contentment here, on the reservation, and amongst the Seminarians than she could have ever found elsewhere. Though this statement is assumptive, it also speaks to the freedom and space the young women writers were given in publishing in the *Cherokee Rose Buds*.

In the next essay by Wah-Leah, the author conveys the often relatable stigma of a monotonous school day. Yes, the first two essays I analyzed were intriguing, but in Wah-Leah’s “A Journal of a Day at School,” it’s the basic routine of school that the author writes about.

Wah-Leah narrates her morning and afternoon: “It was a pleasant morning in the month of June. Every thing seemed happy, but I felt very dull and stupid as I sat in my room listening to the distant sound of bells and every now and then the merry laugh of the school girls” (3). This feeling of listlessness continues through her passage, but at least Wah-Leah recognizes what these feelings of restlessness can cause, and she quickly reverses herself. She ends her passage with “The next day, I am happy to inform you all that I succeeded. I have not passed another day in this manner and sincerely hope I never shall” (Wah-Leah 3). Two things stand out to me here: the fact that Wah-Leah is so intuned to her need to be successful, beneficial not only for herself but for her community as well. And the fact that she addresses the reader in the newspaper, almost reporting to them, like a check-in, by doing this, she intentionally breaks the fourth wall. This level of storytelling and rhetorical style is characteristic of someone who is not only attempting to be useful but also someone who has been trained rhetorically.

One of the most interesting pieces from the 1854 edition is “A Dialogue Between Susan and Ellen,” with no credited authors. The two women in the conversation, Susan and Ellen, engage in what quickly becomes an argument for young women taking their higher education seriously. Susan asks Ellen, “Good morning, cousin E. Do you intend going to the Seminary to improve your mind and prepare for usefulness?” (5) However, Ellen responds less academically with, “I don’t know about all that. I intend going, but I shall want to engage in the fun I understand they have there sometimes, for I like to pass much of my time away in high glee, and not be pouring over these ‘old books’ all the time” (5). However, Susan reverses Ellen’s position on “‘old books’” with:

I have been here some time, and I think I now know what is about the truth, that the directors would have you do nothing but for your own good; and what you do

not wholly approve now, you will a few years hence. Come to the Seminary, then, and be faithful in your studies, upright in your deportment, obedient to rule, and you will find no difficulty. And at the close of the four years, you will leave with honors to yourself and friends, prepared to exert a good influence, and to be useful to those around you. (5)

These closing remarks are remarkable! For one, Susan conveys that there is a found “truth” in higher education that there is something only available to be found when we seek out higher things in life (5). Also, Susan’s insistence that the Seminary’s young collegians be something “useful” to “[them]selves and friends” speaks to a civic awareness (5). The young women of the Cherokee Female Seminary were not being called to be “useful” for their prerogative but to then pass the torch for others in their communities (5). They were being asked to make spaces wider, to make issues more visible, and to live a life of *rhetorical usefulness*.

This same level of duty is revealed in the August 4, 1855, edition, where a balance between traditional tales of Cherokee heroes and arguments for feminine leadership is published. In Kitty’s essay “Se-Quah-Yah,” she not only examines the famed Cherokee’s character but also what the young women of the Seminary can learn from his life. Kitty begins with his circumstances: “Se-Quah-Yah, or George Guess, is one whose name will ever be remembered by the Cherokee. Not because he was a great warrior, or one of their most distinguished chiefs, but because he invented the Cherokee Alphabet, and that without education” (1). Kitty’s observation of Sequoyah’s life is meant to argue for the young woman that, yes, education will take them far in life, but often it is through one’s ingenuity and resilience that they will help them succeed. Kitty then applies the concept of usefulness for Sequoyah with “On being asked what induced him to make these letters, he replied, that he had heard that men found out and did things, and so

he thought he would do something too, and see if they could not have *books* as well as the whites” (1). Kitty is revealing to the readers of the newspaper that when someone recognizes a need in a community and then makes themselves useful for others, the community will reap the rewards for generations to come.

Community is a fervent topic in Fanny’s “Two Scenes in Cherokee Land,” as she writes about a before and after white intervention through religion and education. Fanny narrates a contented Cherokee family; their homelife and activities reflect a harmony with the earth. Fanny ends the first scene with this memorable paragraph, “They pass their wild life, without any intellectual pleasure or enjoyments, only varied from the same monotonous round by some great gathering or public festival” (1). This scene is then juxtaposed with scene two, which quickly expresses what has happened to Cherokee life post-white invasion. Fanny writes in scene two, “White cottages peep forth from the same spot, perhaps, where some warrior’s rude wigwam once stood. What a contrast to the scene of olden time! What has produced this change? The Missionaries came and brought with them the Bible... Thus, under the influence of the religion of the Missionaries, the wild Indian was changed and became a new man” (1-2). Fanny, I argue, is not necessarily arguing here that the introduction of “Missionaries” was a bad thing, but it did, no doubt, “[change]” the Cherokee, irrevocably (1-2). Fanny has the astute observational skills to tell a story in two diverse scenes, the consequences of Indian removal and the Missionary entrance. Her rhetorical skills in pushing the idea that the Missionaries “changed” the Cherokee, maybe for good or maybe for bad, but they forever “changed” the Cherokee, reflect her rhetorical training (Fanny 1-2).

In Isabelle’s essay “A Day’s Experience,” storytelling is another unique rhetorical skill that the author uses to demonstrate the daily struggles many collegiate women face. Isabelle, like

Wah-Leah, faces the dilemma of sometimes not feeling motivated in academics. Isabelle narrates, “I arose one beautiful morning with a determination to spend *one* day of my life as I ought” (2). This reflects that many young collegians know their academic responsibilities and still sometimes fall behind in what is required of them. This is a natural and human observation, and I argue that both Isabelle and Wah-Leah are trying to engage with many of the young women who feel that they are not meeting their expectations or the Seminary’s expectations. Isabelle narrates the rigors of her day, where she often feels exasperation for not having enough time in the day to accomplish everything. This is why she ends the essay with “We should, therefore, be very watchful every day and hour, lest we be led by our own evil propensities into wrong and forbidden paths” (Isabelle 2). By moving from a first-person narrative to now saying “We,” Isabelle is explaining that this is a common tendency and “our own evil propensities” can have drastic consequences (Isabelle 2). Empathy is the prevailing theme in this piece, knowing the academic rigor that can feel suffocating. This writing reflects the writer’s beliefs that the *Cherokee Rose Buds* should be a space, both rhetorical and literary, for women to work through issues of their collegiate education.

Rhetorical space for challenging conventions is evident in Qua-Tay’s essay “Female Influence.” In this landmark essay, Qua-Tay both questions and pushes against the feminine archetypes that are projected onto Cherokee women. Qua-Tay argues, “How often have we heard it reiterated that the destiny of the world depends on women and woman is the appropriate agent of morality—the inspirer of those feelings and dispositions which form the mental nature of man” (5) Qua-Tay is defining gender roles here and conveying that women have a more powerful, more influential place than any other. Woman is the backbone of society, for both “moral[s]” and the “mental nature” of society (Qua-Tay 5). The author wrote this essay knowing

that after removal to Indian Territory, the Cherokee shifted from a matrilineal structure to a patriarchal structure. Qua-Tay is directly confronting the ways the Cherokee structure has shifted and how the influence of women can help reshape this structure again. This is reflected when Qua-Tay states, “If this influence has been so universal in past ages, is it not equally powerful in our day... The elevation of the Cherokee people also depends upon the females; and, perhaps, particularly upon those who are just springing into active life, and who enjoy the privileges of this Institution” (5). The author argues that the Cherokee should not only revert to a matrilineal structure, but based on the collegiate knowledge of the graduates from the Seminary, their influence would greatly help the entire tribe. This essay is a past and present discussion of what the Cherokee used to be and what they are now, and as Qua-Tay posits, the Cherokee need a more sustainable female influence. These essays from the *Cherokee Rose Buds* demonstrate not only rhetorical understanding of logical arguments but also a desire to inspire both past, current, and future Seminarians to be useful for the Cherokee people.

In addition to enabling the women students to write on issues of their choice, the *Cherokee Rose Buds* was also a vehicle for writing on civic issues. In both the 1854 and 1855 issues, there are examples of women students addressing social issues they found relevant. For example, in 1854, a writer with the byline of Cherokee wrote the essay “Dissipation.” In the essay, the author not only argues what continually plagues many reservations but also attempts to motivate her fellow Seminarians to take a stand and help their fellow tribesmen to fight this debilitating condition. The author writes, “It is something very common to see dissipated persons in our little villages by half dozens or more every week, especially on the Sabbath, that day appointed for sacred rest. Dissipation or intemperance is one of the greatest evils in our Nation” (Cherokee 5). Without any hint of hyperbole, the author points out that laziness and indifference

are “evils” to their way of life, and this mindset has rooted itself within the core of their villages (Cherokee 5). The author continues, “Just look around and see how many happy families have been deprived of their happiness and peace by this one habit. Ought we not all try to lend our aid in putting down this great evil!” (Cherokee 5). This remark takes on two objectives: the author is taking a stake in a civic cause, and then attempting to motivate her fellow students to also take up this same cause. The author recognizes that as collegiate students, who were not taught sewing and needlework but instead, rhetoric and American history, have an advantage over their fellow tribesmen. The author also ends her remark with an exclamation mark, not a question mark, revealing that she knows it is their duty to lend a hand when called upon to do so.

This same idea continues when the author, Cherokee, in her essay “Dissipation,” writes that it is honorable to help those who can’t help themselves. The author shifts her audience directly to her fellow Seminarians, “If we are young, we have an influence (our teachers say,) so let us one and all give our utmost influence for this noble cause” (Cherokee 5-6). This rhetorical shift is effective because it creates a reminder that it was their original instructors who first taught them that their education would lead them to a “noble cause” (Cherokee 5-6). The author then reflects, “How I love the very word ‘Temperance.’ How often it restores comfort to many nearly ruined families. How many hearts would beat with pleasure to hear of our little Nation becoming one in heart and hand in this cause of Temperance” (Cherokee 5-6). This demonstrates an understanding that the author understands that hard work will reward itself, but the author also understands that her blessing of a collegiate education has not been bestowed on everyone, which is why she must extend her outreach to her fellow tribesmen.

Similar to Cherokee’s “Dissipation” essay, in 1855, H. Mann wrote the essay “Free Schools” as a reminder of the rewards for the social need of community outreach, service, and

activism. H. Mann argues for the benefits of free education for all. The author begins their essay with:

The establishment of Free Schools was one of those grand mental and moral experiments whose effects could not be developed and made manifest in a single generation. But now, according to the manner in which human life is computed, we are the sixth generation from its founders; and have we not reason to be grateful, both to God and man, for its unnumbered blessings! The sincerity of our gratitude must be tested by our efforts to perpetuate and to improve what they established. The gratitude of the lips only is an unholy offering. (7)

H. Mann commends the social rewards of public education, knowing she herself was a recipient of a free collegiate education. Interestingly, the author comments that public education was both a “mental and moral experiment” (H. Mann 7). The author is pointing out the many issues involved when public education was discussed, and the author also uses the metaphor that “lips” service is not enough to be thankful for what an education can do for reservations (H. Mann 7). The author ends this essay by noting that because the United States is a democracy and not another form of government, a public education free to all can elevate many in society. The author writes:

In later times, and since the achievement of American Independence, the universal and ever-repeated argument in favor of Free Schools has been, that the general intelligence which they are capable of diffusing, and which can be imparted by no other human instrumentality, is indispensable to the continuance of republicanism. A sincere monarchist, or a defender of arbitrary power, or a believer in the divine right of kings, would oppose Free Schools, for the identical

reasons we offer on their behalf. The fact that Free Schools are the basis of republican institutions, would be proof to his mind, that they should be exterminated. (H. Mann 7)

By comparing our system of government to other forms, H. Mann is reminding their audience that not every country or community has the opportunity that public education can offer. This civic essay argues that “Free Schools...is indispensable to the continuance of republicanism” (H. Mann 7). H. Mann’s essay on public education is another example that the women students at the Seminary were influenced to write on civic issues and activist causes, all in an effort to be useful.

Activist and Mainstream Rhetorical Instruction at the Cherokee Female Seminary and at Brookwood Labor College

It is remarkable that the essays available in the 1854 and 1855 editions of *The Cherokee Rose Buds* haven’t been more thoroughly examined. Considering the only remains of its foundation are three pillars that mark the original foundation of the administrative building, the fact remains that we have little of what is left of the writing of the young collegiate women. However, the Seminary was not alone in its quest to establish a space for rhetorical training for men and women in the 19th and 20th centuries. In her work *Activist Rhetorics and American Higher Education, 1885-1937*, Susan Kates defines a unique concept that I have utilized throughout my research: activist education. She dedicates a chapter to the rhetorical work at Brookwood Labor College in Katonah, New York, and explains how the college applied these terms to the work there. This institute shared the same approach and practices that the Seminary conveyed: teaching rhetorical education as a means to argue for social justice. The instructors and students at the College also share a highly situated historical context that molded their ways

of understanding rhetoric and then arguing publicly for social justice. However, as I will explain, the Seminary does differ categorically from Brookwood in activist education.

If, as Kates defines it, activist versus mainstream rhetoric instruction was based on recruiting both men and women collegiate students for the purpose of post-collegiate public work, then both the Seminary and the College are similar in that fashion. We have research that the administration at the Seminary wanted their female collegians to perform publicly. And, if, as Kates defines it, activist versus mainstream rhetoric instruction was based on the unique curriculum that was applied in the classroom, where lessons were incorporated that drew “attention to racism, sexism, and economic exploitation from the perspective of those who experienced it most often,” then this is where the Seminary differs from the College, categorically (Kates 10). Because the Seminary did not actively engage with activist rhetorical instruction, it was, based on my research, mainstream rhetorical instruction. The lessons in the classroom were not designed to actively generate discussion on social injustices, but that does not mean that the women students did not, on their own volition, then engage with discussions of social injustices through their newspaper, because they did. So what does this reveal? It reveals that when students are taught to engage with critical thinking and critical writing, when they are given the tools to address social injustices, they have the ability and autonomy to do so, if they wish. The Seminary and the College are complex places from both the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries that deserve more attention. Both institutes need unpacking a little more as to how their rhetorical instruction effectively engaged with collegiate students.

Brookwood Labor College, which was established from 1921 to 1937, became a beacon for labor and worker unions in the early twentieth century (Kates 76). During this time, the United States was in the midst of the Progressive Movement, where men and women fought

valiantly in public protest for workers' rights and social justice. Brookwood actively introduced a curriculum that cultivated rhetorical training in workers' rights. Kates explains, "Students were asked to think about language and the ways it functions in a wide variety of contexts so that they might enlist their rhetorical skills in the service of the labor movement" (76). Faculty members clearly understood the need and demand for collegiately trained advocates for labor causes, so the curriculum took on a specific relationship to future public work. Kates continues, "Brookwood educators offered assignments to students that asked them to consider the many abuses endured by workers in America's mines, mills, and factories because they wanted to enhance the class consciousness of their students" (78). These details are significant in correlation to the Cherokee Female Seminary. We do not have written evidence that Goodale and Worcester actively encouraged their students to write about their situational experiences, but we do have the product of their writing, where the collegians actively wrote on racism and sexism. In fact, when I examined the catalogs and syllabi from the Seminary, the curriculum is not reflective of a "consciousness of their students," because the curriculum reflected Mount Holyoke's initial design (Kates 78). Both the Seminary and Brookwood actively acknowledged that women collegians should be active public participants in American life, but the curriculum differed significantly.

This acknowledgment can be seen in Brookwood's ideological vision statement from the school director, A. J. Muste, who wrote, "In determining courses, teaching methods, and all matters of educational policy, Brookwood asks one question: What can a resident school do to enable American workers to work more effectively in the American labor movement?" (Kates 80-81) Is this ideological statement not similar to the National Council's statement that called on the Seminary students "to develop their 'literary, musical, and dramatic talents' and to learn the

important qualities ‘necessary to a pleasing appearance before the public’” (Miheuah “Let Us Strive” 106)? In both statements, there is an approach from administrators that their graduates will hold or work towards some type of public service in the future. Both statements extend a collegiate woman’s space into public spheres. Helen Norton, a labor journalism instructor at Brookwood, remarked that “They’re [the students] coming, in the first place, for knowledge...Then they’re coming to learn how to use facts after they have them” (qtd. in Kates 81). In this instance, we see the keen awareness of faculty that their students were actively participating in their rhetorical education, that the students wanted “to use” this “knowledge” for their betterment and community’s beneficence (Kates 81). Both Brookwood and the Seminary are examples that when administrators foster training for their students to move beyond the roles expected of them and to actively participate in civic awareness, the collegiate space becomes more than just a space for academic learning. It becomes a space for civic engagement, as well.

We see this in the writing from both the Seminary and Brookwood. The Seminary cultivated *The Cherokee Rose Buds* as a way for their female students to argue and push for social justice issues. Brookwood had the publication *The Brookwood Review*, and though it was not a publication written exclusively by its students, it was a newspaper that detailed the students' work/life experiences at their job sites, often very raw and very honest (Kates 82). This research presents the idea that maybe when collegiate students are given further writing opportunities, in a collegiate newspaper, for example, then they are further encouraged to move their classroom lessons to the public sphere. Both Brookwood and the Seminary were successful examples that when colleges implement either activist or mainstream training, they cultivate a unique rhetorical belief within their students: that arguments are skills free for anyone to learn and utilize.

Now, Brookwood Labor College a perfect example to compare to the Cherokee Female Seminary? No, certainly not. But it does open relevant conversations about how the curriculum does or does not shape a student's decisions to move to public performance. The Seminary and the College are from two different centuries. The Seminary and the College have two entirely different contexts. But what we can do is look at the similarities and differences of purpose and curriculum. If Kates' concept of activist and mainstream rhetorical instruction is shaped by classroom lessons that openly engage with social injustice with the end goal of moving publicly, then my research with the Seminary can add onto that concept when an educational site does not openly engage with classroom lessons on social injustice, but the students still do, ultimately, move into public performance. There is a layer of freedom and autonomy that the Cherokee administrators and faculty embedded with the Seminary that enabled their students to choose whether to be active feminists or not. Based on my research, I speculate that the women students at the Cherokee Female Seminary didn't have to be told to write and speak on social justice issues; they wanted to. These women students were given the tools, the weapons, to address issues they found pertinent in their communities and addressed them on their terms. And this unique decision is just one of many that still need further inquiry as to how the Cherokee Female Seminary was so effective for rhetorical training in the 19th century.

Conclusion

There is much to be learned from the space, curriculum, relationships, and writing from the Cherokee Female Seminary. I purposely placed this example in my fourth chapter to illustrate that when writing and space are coupled, then a unique learning experience can occur. The learning that happened at the Seminary is what made the writing possible, but, as Legg argues, the trauma the Cherokee experienced molded the writing. As Legg points out, "The Cherokee

people saw their current way of life, including their cultural practices, society, and political functions, as being overwhelmingly threatened, and as a means to promote their causes, they wrote stories of idealized pasts in almost a lovingly eulogistic form” (“To Keep” 212) We see this happening in the *Cherokee Rose Buds*. When the young women wrote about their former warrior chief Sequoyah or when the young women wrote about the former feminine influence they shared in the Cherokee structure, they were both “promot[ing]” and “eulogi[zing]” (Legg “To Keep” 212). The newspaper became their vehicle to express how the old can connect with the new.

For many of the Cherokee, this connection was pluralistic: many of the collegiate women took on roles that shifted between traditional and modern. Legg adds to her argument that the Seminars “Process is not a binary choice between becoming white or living an Indigenous existence and identity; it’s an active relationship between shifting and evolving identities to reach political goals and maintain cultural survivance” (“To Keep” 208). I argue it’s not just “an active relationship between shifting and evolving identities” for the young collegiate women themselves, but is also, most importantly viewing the Mount Holyoke instructors as not representative of a white oppressive federal government but as facilitating instruction for usefulness (Legg “To Keep” 208). There has to be an equitable relationship between instructor and student that can also “evolve identities,” possibly as a result of preconceived notions (Legg “To Keep” 212). Students such as Callie Eaton and instructors like Ellen Whitmore Goodale worked, ultimately, to “maintain cultural survivance” (Legg “To Keep” 208). And though we have the relatively short journal of Goodale and we also have the catalogs and curriculum lists of the Seminary, we don’t know how the instruction was carried out in the classroom.

This becomes an interesting point. What was Goodale saying in the classroom to enable Na-Li to argue, “My dark complexion does not prevent me from acquiring knowledge and of being useful hereafter” (3)? How was space defined to create the confidence for EDITH to remark, “One of the most handsome and beautifully situated of these dwellings is the residence of our Chief and his white bride, who left her native land and friends a few years since to come and dwell with him in his wild prairie home among his own tribe, the Cherokee” (3)? I argue that it begins when a college teaches women rhetoric. In his many studies of the Cherokee Female Seminary, Mihesuah comments that:

There is not enough evidence to reconstruct what the students were taught regarding their gender role and ‘Indianness,’ but the editorials and stories in the *Rose Buds* reveal that the race-conscious and ethnocentric students were attempting to define their roles as women and as Cherokees. The females who have been the focus of studies of domesticity and Protestant evangelism have usually been white, but like them, the Cherokee students of the Female Seminary were advocates of the ‘true woman’ ideal. (*Cultivating* 37)

But, I argue that for the Cherokee Female Seminarians, this “‘true woman’ ideal” was not on par, coupled with, or disseminated from Welter’s “cult of true womanhood” (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 37, 52). These are two strikingly different definitions that frame strikingly different idealizations of women. The Cherokee idealization, arguably, aligns with my concept of *rhetorical usefulness*: a woman who argued on civic issues, ventured into spaces that might not have accepted her, and most importantly, applied her rhetorical education both in writing and speaking roles, all while fighting for sovereignty. The Cherokee Female Seminary was a place where women were instructed not to accept domesticity as an inevitability.

The Cherokee Female Seminary enabled the young women to push back against ingrained idealizations that had plagued women of color based on the idea of a true woman. Mihesuah points out, “The early seminarians were indeed defensive about their hair and skin coloring, which provided a popular theme of the Cherokee seminary’s paper. There were numerous anecdotes and stories in which appearance was a prominent factor, particularly blue eyes” (“Let Us Strive” 109). In both the 1854 and 1855 editions of the *Cherokee Rose Buds*, there are multiple essays on beauty, expectations, and responsibilities. The young women, after taking classes in Watts’s *Improvement of the Mind*, were, I speculate, willing to push back against what constitutes beauty in 19th-century women (Mihesuah *Cultivating* 30-31). This willingness is revolutionary. Some of these women weren’t even considered citizens by the country. While all of the students, full-blood, mixed-blood, or white, were trained in rhetorical skills, how they utilized those skills is interesting.

This willingness to not accept cultural tropes or stereotypes continues into the alumnae activities, where again women promote positive usefulness amongst their community. Mihesuah reminds us:

The Cherokee Female Seminary alumnae led the way for those Cherokees who were desirous of ‘advancing’ Cherokee culture (although many Cherokees saw nothing wrong with the ‘old’ culture). The women did not want to ‘de-Indianize’ their tribe, for despite their belief in the superiority of white culture, they were staunch advocates of keeping their Cherokee Nation distinct from—and superior to—all other Indian and non-Indian nations. Rather, they promoted a new Indianness among educated Cherokees who were good Christians and patriotic citizens of the Cherokee Nation and of the United States, people who could

manage their own affairs according to the ways of white, not traditional Cherokee, society” (Mihesuah “Let Us Strive” 115).

It is this “new Indianness” that, I argue, led the way for usefulness at the Cherokee Female Seminary (Mihesuah “Let Us Strive” 115). The Seminary opened in 1851. Its buildings, curriculum, instructors, and community all gathered to support the young collegiate women in their higher training, a training for newness. But newness does not necessarily mean dismissal of history. The instructors had a fine line of negotiating Cherokee history with a private collegiate curriculum. The Seminary’s curriculum did originate at Mount Holyoke, but we don’t know how that translated in the classrooms at Tahlequah. What we do know is how this curriculum translated into the writing of the *Cherokee Rose Buds*.

This newspaper, I argue, is a primary example of *rhetorical usefulness*. Not only does it facilitate young women to present essays on “‘advancing’ Cherokee culture,” but it also allows young women to advance themselves (Mihesuah “Let Us Strive” 115). The most poignant example of this is “A Dialogue Between Susan and Ellen,” where Susan rhetorically pushes Ellen not to accept complacency. She admonishes her classmate, “And at the close of the four years, you will leave with honors to yourself and friends, prepared to exert a good influence, and to be useful to those around you” (5). Could Susan and Ellen be actual students of the 1854 class at the Seminary? I think it would be better if they were metaphorical representations of everyday conversations among the Seminarians. Ellen is at a crossroads, willing to fall back into what is expected of not only her race but also her age and gender. Susan, on the other hand, is the embodiment of ambition and living a purposeful life. Susan reminds her friend that there are greater purposes for a woman who is given the gift of higher education: usefulness. Because for women in the 19th century, collegiate education was a gift; it was not a given. Many Indigenous

women were expected to stay in the home and accept their lot in life: homemaking. Collegiate women wrote speeches and essays in an effort to enlarge a movement for women in higher education. They argued that a woman's place is wherever she can be useful.

Chapter 5:

The Complexity of Women Finding and Being Useful

The Need for Collegiate Women

Women of diverse backgrounds enrolled and graduated from both private and public colleges in the 19th century. A collegiate education was a means for many ambitious women to escape the confines of domesticity. Though there were many women who did remain in elite parlors, this was not the story of collegiate women or the working poor. Women worked in factories, where they helped support their families. Women moved into administrative positions, where they voiced their opinions on civic issues. Many women ready to make their mark in society and did so. Though a college degree was not the goal of every woman, there is ample evidence that the introduction of educationally ambitious women entering collegiate classrooms dramatically affected both college and public spheres. College administrators understood the need for recruiting women to their campuses, and educationally aspiring women were ready to train in classical courses as their way into activism.

For quite some time, the college campus was a male-dominated landscape, both in faculty positions and in the student body. However, this dissertation shows that college administrators actively recruited women to do more than just be domestic harbingers of “piety, purity, and subservience” (Welter 152). These administrators wanted the academic woman on their campus for a variety of reasons. For the collegiate woman, university campuses were the place where they learned more about social issues and, more importantly, learned how to make a public impact. The fact that college administrators encouraged all women to leave the social safety of domesticity and pursue a collegiate education lent respectability to this educational movement.

Many colleges offered both classical courses alongside women's courses; women were offered the ability to choose. And in this choice, many women sought the sphere of a mainstream rhetorical instruction; they no longer wished for a life of just housewifery (Kates 8-9).

The academic sphere and domestic sphere collided for many women. Could a collegiately trained woman also be a mother to her children and helpmate to her husband? Today, there is no doubt in the obvious answer. But in the 19th century, colleges instinctively offered women "rigorous courses" to push their academic bounds while also including "'ornamental' subjects" that would serve a domestic purpose (McMahon 25). Many collegiate women were given the opportunity to have "similar academic training" to their male classmates and were not held back by any Victorian era assumptions (McMahon 25). Collegiate women were not limited to just needlework and elocution courses, nor were their textbooks and class discussions reduced due to their sex. This research pushes back against Nan Johnson's scholarship on collegiate women being taught a highly limited academic course load and being narrowed to parlor rhetorics based on gendered ideologies (*Gender* 19-26).

Both catalogs and syllabi reflect the fact that women were expected to academically compete; they were expected to withstand the curriculum pressures of institutions. In fact, collegiate documents reveal this with the correspondence of Matthew Vassar in his founding of Vassar College in 1861. He wanted, "'to build a college in the proper sense of the word, an institution which should be to women what Yale and Harvard are to young men, receiving them after suitable preparation at the academies and seminaries, and furnishing them with the means for a true liberal education'" (Geiger 189). Academic competence was a goal many women met when they enrolled in higher institutions. Frederick Rudolph's extensive research on early

collegiate training helps us understand how women navigated collegiate spaces and what their education meant to their future public work.

The ramifications of instructing collegiate women in what had typically been considered dominant academic behaviors, such as teaching women the art of argument, were fairly controversial in higher education. Rudolf makes the point that if collegiate women were to leave the confines of the parlor for the freedom of academia, then justification for enabling women to learn challenging ideas was needed (317). Rudolf posits that an educationally aspiring woman needed to justify her enrollment in a classical education course, whereas 19th-century educational scholar Roger L. Geiger challenges this. Geiger points to Mary Sharp College in Winchester, Tennessee, where President Z. C. Graves, in 1853, remarked that his institution was founded on ““a higher grade than any previously in existence—in fact, a College where ladies may have the privilege of a classical education”” (Geiger 186). President Graves recognized that offering challenging courses for academically-minded women was in the best interests of his college, and this was a way to separate and elevate his college from other institutions that only offered domestic courses. The implication was that not only were the women who trained in classical courses considered “privileged,” but that also institutions that did not train women in classical courses were mediocre in their academic standards (Geiger 186). President Graves was arguing that encouraging his collegiate women students to rhetorically challenge themselves resulted in an elite institution. Such a collegiate education would be useful both for administrators and students.

Arguments for women to enroll in colleges to find fulfillment and usefulness are not only found in university documents. From the 19th-century newspaper *The Pioneer*, an anonymously named author simply titled “D” argued that women needed to urgently remove themselves from

parlors because, “Though thus suitably placed, how are they [women] previously to fulfill the arduous duties which then devolve upon them?” (D 169) This question builds on whether women were prepared or competent to handle civic conversations if they were confined, uninformed and ignorant in the parlor. *The Pioneer* is essentially comparing the education at a university to the education in a parlor, and arguing that a woman is rendered useless when she is confined to the parlor. This is also seen in *The Pioneer*’s statement that “The women of to-day, are to be the wives, the helpmates, the companions of the men of to-day; — and more, to be the mothers, the nurses, and the first instructors of those who will be the men of to-morrow” (D 169). Though this list of tasks 19th century women were expected to fulfill lends toward a domestic terrain, women could only be “the first instructors,” if they were instructed in a curriculum that taught them rhetoric, logical thinking, and an awareness of how their instruction could further influence “the men of to-morrow” (D 169). These women became the backbone of rational thinking and civic awareness for their politically engaged husbands, based on the instruction they had received.

College catalogs reveal that women were taught to argue through the giants of rhetorical influence, including Hugh Blair and Richard Whately. Johnson argues:

Although early scholars recognized the expanding curricular concerns of nineteenth-century rhetoric, an expansion that ensured the status of oratory and belles lettres as the most favored arts, they argued that the study of oratory underwent a rebirth in the late nineteenth century through the popularity of forensic debate and the development of speech communication as a discrete academic specialization. (*Nineteenth-Century* 9)

This research reveals that collegiate instructors, knowing their students wanted to argue and wanted to argue publicly, shifted their curriculum to meet these historical demands. And

knowing that women students were also receiving this instruction on “forensic debate and the development of speech communication” again pushes back against the claim that wealthy white women, Johnson’s primary contextual frame, “had no use for training in the more culturally powerful forms of rhetorical performance” (*Nineteenth-Century* 9; *Gender* 21). By instructing collegiate women in oratory, a move to public performance was a natural progression, even if many in society did not view a woman’s entrance to public work as inevitable.

Further exploration of these 19th century textbooks reveals compelling insights about how and what collegiate women were taught about rhetoric. In Blairs’ *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, chapters include a wide variety of both thematic lessons and syntactic lessons⁷. In his sixth lecture on “The Rise and Progress of Language,” Blair argues, “Language is become a vehicle by which the most delicate and refined emotions of one mind can be transmitted” (53). This claim connects to Blair’s ideas that language should be elevated, pristine, and exact. His elitist notions of how language works taught women students that precise and eloquent communication was divine. Blair argues “It is much more natural to think that God taught our first parents only such language as suited their present occasions; leaving them, as he did in other things, to enlarge and improve it as their future necessities should require” (54). This lecture illustrates that women students were taught elevated language, rather than plain or simple language was not only acceptable but demonstrated the moralistic character of the speaker. The

⁷ The first eighteen chapter titled include “Taste,” “Criticism—Genius—Pleasures of taste—Sublimity in objects,” “The sublime in writing,” “Beauty and other pleasures of taste,” “Rise and progress of language,” “Rise and progress of language and of writing,” “Structure of language,” “Structure of language-English tongue,” “Style—Perspicuity and procision,” “Structure of sentences,” “Structure of sentences,” “Structure of sentences—Harmony,” “Origin and nature of figurative language,” “Metaphor,” “Hyperbole—Personification—Apostrophe,” “Comparison, Antithesis, Interrogation, Exclamation, and other figures of Speech,” “Figurative Language—General Characters of Style—Diffuse, Concise—Feeble, Nervous—Dry, Plain, Neat, Elegant, Flowery,” and “General Characters of Style—Simple, Affected, Vehement—Directions for forming a proper style.”

more refined a speaker was, the more moralistic they were. Based on the evidence that the multiple catalogues from various colleges that I have pulled, the majority of them were utilizing Blairs' textbook and lectures in some form.

In addition to Blairs' textbook, Whately was another rhetorical scholar repeatedly found in 19th century college classrooms. His textbook *Logic* appears on the college syllabi and the chapters illustrate both similarities and differences to Blair⁸. Whately's textbook does breakdown arguments into a more keen understanding but also does not have an exploration of figurative language and rhetorical devices. In his chapter "Of Arguments," Whately begins with "The third operation of the mind, *viz Reasoning* (or discourse) expressed in words, is *Argument*, and an *Argument* stated *at full length*, and in its *regular form* is called a *Syllogism*; the third part of *Logic* therefore treats of the *Syllogism*" (37). Whately does not discuss the mechanics of an argument, instead his concentration is on the structure. He does mention the value of language but not how Blair treats it. Whately explains that "Logic is wholly concerned in the use of language, it follows that a Syllogism (which is an Argument stated in a regular logical form,) must be 'an Argument so expressed, that the conclusiveness of it is manifest from *the mere force of the expression*'" (37). This evidence reflects that women students were taught that whatever language they used, eloquent or plain, needed to result in a concise and exact affirmation of their audience's mind. Though both Blair and Whately honed in on different approaches to rhetorical training, an analysis of their textbooks reveals that women students were taught that language and how they structured their language was vital to moving in public places.

Interestingly, many in society were flabbergasted and astonished when women began arguing in public or writing for the public. It's as if many in society didn't believe that after

⁸ Chapter titles include "Of the Operations of the Mind of of Terms," "Of Propositions," "Of Arguments," "Of Modal Syllogisms, and of All Arguments Besides Regular and Pure Categorical Syllogisms," "Of Fallacies," and "Essay on the Province of Reasoning."

encouraging women to do more than entertain in a parlor, to do more than learn embroidery and the fine art of housekeeping, that after attaining a rhetorical education, women would put that education to use. This speaks to collegiate women's tenacity and bravery. Nineteenth-century historian Laura Morgan Green argues this same point about the veracity of collegiate women and their prospects post-graduation. The educationally aspiring women who sought something more than parlor rhetoric understood that "participation in the [higher education] movement...required a degree of strong-mindedness in the face of opposition" (Green 7). Collegiate women were not countering the "dominion of 'respectability'" that had thus far governed their lives; they were rather bending respectability "to include university study" (Green 7). Extension is synonymous with widening and broadening. So, as collegiate women extended the spheres they were respected in, women such as Joslyn Gage expanded the issues she discussed in public spheres. I point to these similar moments of *rhetorical usefulness* to illustrate that there wasn't one remarkable moment in my research to convey how influential these examples are. The fluidity within my research reflects that these examples were continuous and ever-evolving. They were situational and exceptional. To be *rhetorically useful* demonstrates a layered approach to collegiate training that then enabled a woman to be civically engaged. Gage's textbooks, professors, class discussions, and even university choice all contribute to how rhetoric was taught, which was then reflected in how she made herself useful post-graduation. So the components of *rhetorical usefulness* reflect a deeply embedded respect for collegiate training.

There is another significant aspect of the need for women to attain a collegiate education that I have yet to discuss: 19th-century women wanted to be taken seriously. I believe that mounting discontent and bitterness were bubbling just below the surface for many articulate women, and being confined to a parlor and told to perform solely in a private space was

infantilizing for many women. I believe the roots behind many women being educationally aspiring were their inherent subservience that Welter argues governed their lives (152). I believe many women of various backgrounds enrolled in colleges because they were tired of being treated like the children they were also raising. Tired of not being considered able or competent to understand civic issues, women were motivated. “In the late nineteenth century, what few women undergraduates there were, were serious, some with very strong, if vague, aspirations to do something important with their education” (Solomon 84).

It’s as if there was a stirring, a building up, a resounding tiredness of women not being seen as equals. Not in the sense that women were on the same footing politically, because they weren’t; women couldn’t vote. Women were hungry for acknowledgement. If the parlor fashioned women to a gendered ideal, then the classroom released them. But understandably, many would still not take a woman seriously, even with a college degree. There was a concrete gender bias in society that proclaimed that even if a woman received her degree, “a woman’s usefulness was not equated with professionalism” (Solomon 83). I argue that women took advantage of higher education opportunities to no longer allow their sex to be weaponized against them. They wanted to be seen as professional, serious, competent, beneficial, and most importantly, useful for something other than the parlor. Of course, there were women who did remain happily content in parlors, and there were many working women who labored tirelessly in indescribable working conditions. But then there were collegiate women who need a rewritten history.

I have offered the evidence that college administrators were encouraging all women to enroll in public universities. And I have the evidence of college syllabi and catalogues that illustrate that collegiate women were sitting in the same classrooms as their fellow male students

and acquiring the same mainstream rhetorical instruction. And I have presented the public work of two prominent women activists and a collegiate institution that worked to promote feminist and activist causes in the world. This research also suggests that collegiate women mined their rhetorical education for whatever usefulness they felt was needed at the time. All of this research combines to show that the story of collegiate women should revise our understanding of women's roles in the 19th century.

A Case Study for Usefulness:

Lucy Craft Laney and the Haines Normal and Industrial Institute

The pull to establish places of rhetorical training and civic awareness for men and women of color in the 19th century is slowly becoming more visible to 21st-century historians. In Augusta, Georgia, the rhetorical efforts of Lucy Craft Laney at the Haines Normal and Industrial Institute resemble the rhetorical achievements of students at the Cherokee Female Seminary. Laney led a program of academic appreciation, and she established a place where women and men could profit from the lessons learned in a rhetorically centered classroom.

The daughter of Reverend David and Mrs. Louisa Campbell, Lucy Craft Laney, born on October 13, 1854, and passed away on October 23, 1933, was raised in a home in Macon, Georgia, of strict morals and an appreciation for education, even though both her parents and Laney were born in enslavement (Marshall 85-86). Beginning as a skilled carpenter and working day and night, Laney's father eventually purchased his freedom and Louisa's and soon traded his carpentry tools for the appeal of the pulpit and became the local pastor (Marshall 85-86). Laney's mother was taken in as a domestic servant in a local, wealthy white family, the Campbells, where she would often bring her daughter with her. Though not many white families would have taken the time to facilitate Laney's education, while Louisa cleaned the Campbells' large library, Laney

took a keen interest in books, and Mrs. Campbell noticed (Williams-Way 47). Mrs. Campbell not only encouraged her to select as many books as she was interested in, but also supported Laney in borrowing and taking books home to further her education (Williams-Way 47). Because of these opportunities, Laney was far ahead of her brothers, sisters, and friends her age in her learning. In fact, “By the time she was twelve, Laney had grown into a . . . young woman who could translate difficult Latin passages fluently. It soon became obvious that Laney would greatly benefit from formal training” (Williams-Way 47). Formal training was not a guarantee for many young Black students in Georgia. So when Laney was offered this challenge, she and her family understood both the risks and advantages of formal training.

It was during the turmoil of Reconstruction when the American Missionary Association (AMA) slowly worked its way across the war-torn South that Black primary and high schools began to be established, including Lewis High School in Macon, Georgia. Though the AMA was one of the largest organizations to help establish Freedmen’s schools, it was not alone in its educational efforts. Laney entered as one of its first students (Williams-Way 48). The AMA worked with the Freedmen’s Bureau in the postbellum South to establish schools. In 1873, founded by the AMA, Atlanta University was founded to educate Black students; at the age of fifteen, Laney enrolled in its first class (Williams-Way 48). Laney graduated in 1876, having completed the normal course (Williams-Way 48). It was certainly foreseeable that education would forever be a part of her life, for “After graduation, she taught in the public schools of Georgia for the next ten years, successively in Augusta, Macon, Milledgeville, and Savannah” (Williams-Way 48). By moving across the state of Georgia and motivating other young Black men and women to advocate for their formal education, Laney was making herself *rhetorically useful*.

After graduating in 1876, Laney identified the need for primary and secondary schools for Black men and women, especially for those who had been dissuaded from enrolling in the past. Through the upbringing of her parents, Laney knew that success was possible for those in poverty-stricken and educationally deprived areas. All of her family recognized within her a deep-seated devotion to charity. “She became convinced, according to her niece Louise Laney, that she could be an impetus for change. She resolved that throughout her life she would: ‘Do all the good that she could and make no fuss about it’” (Williams-Way 50). Her philanthropy was guided by her formal training at Atlanta University, and in 1883, she founded what would become in 1886 the Haines Normal and Industrial Institute (Marshall 18). Laney retained the role and title as head principal, one of only three at the time in Georgia, which caused many in white society to label her as manly, not feminine, not even a woman anymore; one critic labeling her “unnatural” (Marshall 18). This did not deter her in the least. Such labels and stigmas were anathema to her cause, to her *rhetorical usefulness*.

And though Laney’s Institute, which I will analyze thoroughly for its rhetorical training, was a bedrock for young Black women to grow in their education, both vocational and academic, the role that Laney fulfilled testifies to a deeper conversation about Black women leaders in the postbellum South. Needless to say, Augusta, Georgia, had to overcome many of the stereotypes and biases that past-Confederacy and current Jim Crow ideologies embedded. Still, Laney fought against the assumptions about Black women in educational spheres. This is in part because of the firm foundation her parents set for her and in part because of the rhetorical training she received at Atlanta University. Beginning in 1883, she held the role of principal because she could argue with the best and:

Thus, despite contempt, racism, ambiguities, and contradictions in Augusta's white community, and blacks' mistaken belief that the white community supported their education efforts, Lucy Craft Laney and Augusta black intellectuals punctuated post Civil War Augusta, Georgia, with their radical education philosophy, vision, and success in building educational and social institutions for blacks. (Marshall 18-19).

Her Institute may have been considered radical for its shape and scope, but it survived. It was one of only three places in Georgia for rhetorical training of Black men and women. The Institute survived when many primary and secondary schools closed due to insufficient funds. The Institute survived when Laney stepped away, briefly, as principal to travel the South asking for funding while championing the cause of Black education. While traveling in 1899, Laney gave her most memorable speech, "The Burden of the Educated Colored Woman." In the speech, she reflects on the plight of Black women to attain a collegiate education, then argues why it is so difficult for many Black women to find useful employment post-graduation. The speech characterizes the need for educational opportunities and is also an example of her effective public work.

Though Laney is one of many Black women who worked fervently in the South to better the lives of many, she is still relatively unknown in suffrage and women's history. Authors who have written on her include Grace Carolyn Branch-Haislip, Mary Magdalene Marshall, and Gloria Taylor Williams-Way. Though her speech "The Burden of the Educated Colored Woman" may be her only writing to survive, it is her dedication to the Haines Normal and Industrial Institute that places her solidly in rhetorical history. The Institute is no longer open; beginning in

1949, it was changed to the Lucy Craft Laney High School, which is an appropriate honor for a woman so devoted to the education of all.

In a post-Civil War recovery, education became one of the prevailing ways to help rebuild the South. However, Black schools and Black education became reframed by different elements from white schools and white education. After 1880, Black education for primary and secondary schools was primarily funded through philanthropists and not the federal government (Branch-Haislip 36). Missionaries and benevolent societies took it upon themselves to work in local Black, rural communities to spread liberal education, along with Latin, Greek, and vocational training, which became a staple for racial uplift (Branch-Haislip 36). Primary and secondary schools in Black communities spread slowly; records reveal that by 1876, Augusta listed “Lucy Laney, Anna White, and Georgia Swift” as the lone three Black women principals (Marshall 69). This isolation of being one of only three Black women principals may have led Laney to feel vulnerable, but nevertheless, she led her school and students to believe in the power of rhetoric and the power of self-actualization. She opened and spent her entire life at the Institute.

The Institute, first established in the basement of Christ Presbyterian Church, opened its doors to all students, regardless of age, race, socio-economic status, gender, or any circumstances that could impede a student's desire for formal training, on January 6, 1886 (Branch-Haislip 42-43). Laney recognized that the Institute needed to benefit both young men and women, but she still prepared for a day school for young Black women (Branch-Haislip 43). Eventually, the Institute moved to one small wooden building and a larger brick building. In the brick building, both academic and domestic duties were taught, with recitation exercises and music lessons supplemented as electives (“Haines Normal and Industrial Institute”). The top floors of the brick

building housed Laney's office and served as a dormitory for about sixty young women who needed to stay on campus; smaller cottages housed the young men who also lived on campus ("Haines Normal and Industrial Institute"). Driven by her training at Atlanta University, Laney established a normal department and a college preparatory department ("Haines Normal and Industrial Institute"). The normal department listed sewing, needlework, and laundressing as several of the skills acquired in the department, while students who wished to prepare for teacher training and further collegiate work enrolled in the college preparatory department.

Though the normal department at the Institute demonstrated considerable advancements in training for young men and women, I will focus my analysis on the college preparatory department, where Laney implemented her rhetorical training from Atlanta University. Edmund Asa Ware, the founder and first president of Atlanta University, structured a mainstream curriculum at the university with "courses in Greek, Latin, history, geometry, algebra, natural philosophy, and forensics;" this classical structure was replicated at the Institute by Laney (Marshall 109). The Institute continued with both the normal department and the college preparatory department for several decades.

The Institute thrived and grew; in fact, the *Haines Journal* records that by 1931, the Institute had attained Junior College status (Marshall 111). Though she was nearing the end of her life, with this new status, Laney emphasized that a rigorous curriculum that was in accord with the same elite schools as hers would reside at the Institute. The 1931 Haines Normal and Industrial Institute Catalog reveals that for:

Freshmen - . . . English, mathematics, Bible, biology and physics three times a week; and, sociology, French, Latin or Greek was taken twice a week.

Sophomores - . . . English, math, history, political science, philosophy and logic; French or Latin three times a week, and Bible once a week. (Marshall 111).

Here, again, we see similar courses to those of Clinton Liberal College, the University of Wisconsin, and Stanford University. The Institute, same as at Atlanta University and the same as at other elite universities, “political science, philosophy and logic” had to be staples for her young and enquiring minds (Marshall 111). This liberal training conveyed to young Black men and women that their education was just as useful as that of other historically white universities. Laney developed:

Core instruction at all levels included courses in English (Rhetoric, American literature, composition and grammar), Public Speaking, Classics, Language (Latin, Greek and French), History and Geography (ancient, United States and Negro history). (Marshall 111)

So not only was Laney prioritizing *rhetorical usefulness* in creating a physical space for rhetorical training, she was also representing *rhetorical usefulness* in being a Black woman principal in a typically male-dominated profession where her femininity was routinely attacked. She instilled within her students a desire to be *rhetorically useful* to their future communities by designing a curriculum that placed “English (Rhetoric, American literature, composition and grammar), Public Speaking, Classics” at its core (Marshall 111). These unique layers of *rhetorical usefulness* all converge at Laney’s Institute and demonstrate that rhetorical education and rigor are intrinsically connected. Though only small, piecemeal spaces of the original campus remain, the Haines Normal and Industrial Institute remains as a vital example of Laney’s achievement.

Usefulness and Ingenuity

As I have noted elsewhere, Lindal Buchanan has argued that 19th-century private and public rhetoric was categorized by feminine and masculine features (78). These categories were constructed by the location, the style the rhetor used, and the message the rhetor argued (Buchanan 78-79). As previously discussed, gendered ideologies shaped the idea that the parlor was a feminine space and anything public was a masculine space, just as the training of and ability to argue were considered masculine behavior. The topics the rhetor discussed, whether it was abolition or immigration, were considered masculine, while topics addressing homelife and religion were considered feminine. But Buchanan's conclusions are problematic because they do not take into account the fact that young women were receiving rhetorical education at public and private colleges and encouraged to use their training. Buchanan's research posits that many educated women willingly chose not to participate publicly out of fear of breaking social conventions (80). She argues that many rhetorically trained women chose to use their rhetorical training to address the domestic sphere (Buchanan 83). But my research shows that colleges and universities quickly abolished the women's curriculum, collapsing the distinction between the men's and women's learning. The collegiate women who worked publicly were applying what were considered "masculine" styles, on "masculine" messages, in "masculine" spaces, because they were trained to do so (Buchanan 80).

When women enrolled in a classical course, the collegiate instructor followed their syllabi and gave them the robust education of "Adam's Latin Grammar, Gould's edition; Jacob's Latin Reader; Caesar; Virgil; Sallust; Cicero's Orations; Livy Folsom's edition; Horace, Anthon's edition; Tacitus; Cicero de Oratore; Goodich's Greek Grammar; Jacob's Greek Reader; Graeca Majora; Leevizae's French Grammar; and Voltaire" ("Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Clinton Liberal Institute (1837)"). Now Buchanan does concede that:

Therefore, somewhat ironically, the masculine delivery style, initially perceived as a marginal and controversial manner of rhetorical presentation for women, moved center stage because of its affinity to men's oratorical practices while the feminine style was relegated to the margins, where it gradually became unrecognizable as delivery at all. Although women's indirect methods of rhetorical performance neither look like conventional delivery nor correspond to its masculinist assumptions, the feminine style allowed antebellum women to subvert dominant gender norms and interject their views into the public milieu, arguably the key feature or outcome of delivery. (104-105)

Colleges trained women to argue directly. Because of their training, women subverted archaic notions of true womanhood, realizing that their femininity was not tethered to their rhetorical prowess, and moved into the public sphere.

Part of their rhetorical training was Whately's lessons on rhetorical occasion. As summarized by Johnson:

[Rhetoricians like Whately] were committed to the assumption that the writer's ability to improve in the composition beyond the simple level of correct writing depends on the degree to which a critical sensibility is acquired. By developing critical abilities through the study of taste, the appreciation of the 'masters of literature,' and frequent exercise in critical analysis, the writer learns to identify flaws and also to develop rhetorical force in all species of composition.

Nineteenth-century theorists considered this interrelationship between the critical and the constructive aspects of rhetoric as the only dynamic that allows writers to move beyond competence to true eloquence...the complete 'circuit of rhetorical

training' needed to help the student 'discover his own rhetoric.'

(*Nineteenth-Century* 216)

It was through these lessons that collegiate women were taught to master argument in order to invent their own style. Johnson further argues that "writers learn[ed] a variety of methods for implementing these strategies and come to appreciate even more how techniques of form and style contribute to rhetorical force" (*Nineteenth-Century* 217). Now, acquiring "rhetorical force" does not necessarily negate it as a masculine behavior, especially since Johnson is defining it as mastering the "form[s] and style" taught in the classroom (Johnson *Nineteenth-Century* 217). Yet collegiate woman could use force, could apply force, could be forceful, and still not be considered masculine, because they were simply acquiring and conveying the skills their instructor taught them. This "discover[y]" in "rhetorical force" is what enabled Joslyn Gage to challenge the Catholic Church and create scrapbooks on the cowardice of the Confederacy; it enabled Kellogg and Laney to break down the physical and metaphorical walls of spaces that had constricted women; and it enabled the Cherokee female collegians to argue against stereotypes of their Indigeneity. The women I have researched in this dissertation all took their collegiate rhetorical training into the public sphere.

The Extensions of Usefulness: The LWV, Club Work, and Literary Societies

Moving from private spaces to public places was not easy, even for collegiate women. It was one thing to practice your oratorical skills in a collegiate classroom, surrounded by your classmates and instructor. It was an entirely different thing to stand on a corner or in front of a crowd of hundreds, alone behind a podium, and defend your opinions to an opposition. In 1872, the administrators at the Cherokee Female Seminary addressed this issue when they explained to their young women students that they were "to learn the important qualities 'necessary to a

pleasing appearance before the public” (Miheuah “Let Us Strive” 106). This advice to always have a “pleasing appearance before the public” resounds on two levels (Miheuah “Let Us Strive” 106). To be “pleasing” a collegiate woman had to be mindful of her physical appearance as well as her rhetorical acumen (Miheuah “Let Us Strive” 106). The Seminary’s signal here was that to be useful, women had to take care to present themselves well.

In my research, the proclamation from the Seminary’s administrators is one of the rare instances where an administrator proclaims in a written record that their women students were to move next to a public arena after graduation. In her essay “The ‘Promiscuous Audience’ Controversy and the Emergence of the Early Woman’s Rights Movement,” Susan Zaeske discusses the conundrum of women speaking in public. Zaeske begins by quoting Karlyn Campbell: “‘In nineteenth-century America, femininity and rhetorical action were seen as mutually exclusive. No ‘true woman’ could be a public persuader.’ Women who did give speeches ‘entered the public sphere and thereby lost their claim to purity and piety’” (Zaeska 234). Zaeska adds onto Campbell’s argument about women who were public persuaders and argues that women who entered public arenas had both their “morality and sexuality” questioned (235). I contend with both Zaeska and Campbell’s arguments here for the most basic reason that if their definition of a “true woman” was based on Welter’s concept, then they are leaving out two of the four components: subservience and domesticity (Zaeska 234, Welter 152). Could Zaeska and Campbell be privately acknowledging that more young women were leaving the confines of domesticity and moving into the collegiate sphere, thus, after rhetorical training, no longer adhering to subservience? As I said, my argument is that collegiate women redefined true womanhood by leaving the parlors, gaining rhetorical education, and then openly subverting their inherent inferiority by willingly discussing meaningful issues in public spheres. The

qualifier for their definition is that when women entered the public sphere, something happened to them. I contend that something greater happened before they entered the public sphere: activism. For nearly one hundred years, collegiate and activist women worked for civic causes to be more visible.

The League of Women Voters (LWV), women's clubs, and literacy societies all enabled women to prove their *rhetorical usefulness* effectively. The LWV was formed in direct correlation to the passage of the 19th Amendment. It began with Tennessee passing suffrage for women in August of 1920. The federal government granted full suffrage to all regardless of sex, but NAWSA president Carrie Chapman Catt quickly acknowledged an underlying problem with this new liberation (Sharer 91-92). Up until 1920, with all American women not being able to vote, there was a natural exclusion happening in politics. Women were not educated on polling places, on registering to vote, on what issues would come up in primary elections or general elections, or on how to register to vote. The lack of education surrounding citizenship today would be abhorrent, but before 1920, women did not need this level of education. So in 1919, recognizing this general lack of education for many women, Catt proposed a new group, a group designed to teach women citizenship and preparation for when enfranchisement was possible (Sharer 92).

Women became teachers to other women. Race, age, socio-economic status, or education did not matter; the LWV was a group designed to fight the "entrenched men who refused to view women as colleagues and coworkers" (Sharer 93). Sharer explains by describing one of the LWV's biggest motivations. She argues:

Because party elites held tightly to their privileges, women needed to create a space from which they could critique the existing political order and voice their

arguments about political issues. What Royster points out about nineteenth-century African American women writers holds true for women trying to enter political parties in the 1920s: “As people of low status or of no status or privilege, given the habitual hierarchies of power,... they are deemed unimportant and made invisible or non-entities.” In order to make women visible, audible, and legible in the discursive structures of electoral and legislative politics, the LWV needed to carve out rhetorical territory where they could establish authority as speakers and writers on political matters. The organization effected this rhetorical authority by constructing itself as a ‘nonpartisan’ organization. (Sharer 94)

Collegiate women knew how to argue. They knew how to “discover” new ways to meet in rhetorical occasions; they knew how to apply “rhetorical force” when it was appropriate (Johnson *Nineteenth-Century* 216-217). Now they were being asked not to apply their skills for educating other women, regardless of party. Catt and the other charter members of the LWV had a plan for their ““nonpartisan”” approach (Sharer 94).

Having been trained to argue effectively, collegiate women may have found it difficult to take a step back and not immediately challenge or defend certain issues. After all, they had been working for suffrage since 1848 at Seneca Falls; many of these women were ready and chomping at the bit to get to work. But the LWV leadership acknowledged the need to stay neutral:

[T]he LWV’s advocacy of women’s participation in parties resulted not from a desire merely to have women’s involvement in politics mimic the behavior of men. Rather, the LWV hoped that women might spearhead extensive change within parties by making them more receptive to progressive legislative programs. (Sharer 96)

So by not instantly taking a side on political issues and allowing full conversations to evolve without the LWV backing particular issues, like a lobbyist would today, more ground was covered in opening awareness for social issues. The LWV widened the scope and terrain of cultural issues being discussed simply by holding back. By pushing a platform of nonpartisan affiliation, the LWV revealed that sometimes some of our most effective rhetorical strategies are not grounded in dominance but instead in collegiality and reciprocity (Sharer 94). A true woman was consistently able to widen her work through the literacy efforts she participated in. The research I have presented throughout this dissertation has revealed that collegiate women were well-read individuals who could manage a robust course syllabus. They were instructed to engage in heavy reading loads, participate in mixed-sex class discussions, and were also encouraged to write, edit, and publish extracurricular documents such as newspapers. The literacy efforts of collegiate women, as David Gold and Catherine L. Hobbs have also explored, demonstrate an effort to test the waters of what they could swim in without getting in over their heads. In *Educating the New Southern Woman: Speech, Writing, and Race at the Public Women's Colleges, 1884-1945*, Gold and Hobbs describe the outlier efforts collegiate women took to break away from traditional standards. They begin with the classroom that introduced collegiate women to a variety of literature. The curriculum supported new ideas: "Teachers immersed in and engaged with the philosophical struggles of their day and attempting to reconcile and synthesize *multiple* theories, aims, and ends" (Gold and Hobbs 39). This evidence illustrates the instructor's perspective that they were incorporating newness into their lessons. They recognized the rhetorical situation of where the country was moving, where colleges were moving, and thus redesigned their curriculum to meet these new challenges.

Rhetorical curriculum and literacy found its base in the college composition classroom where both sexes, of various backgrounds, could flesh out their writing. At the time, many instructors did recognize the need to stick to a conventional course catalog that taught the basic anthology that had been taught to previous generations. While, as Gold and Hobbs point out from above, other instructors wanted to allow the composition classroom to introduce new ways of thinking and writing. These instructors believed in still studying and making use of Cicero and Caesar's essays, but also acknowledged that collegiate women needed to know how to apply the structures of these ancient men to real-life scenarios. This is why the literacy efforts in "The college Composition course must not only train the student in clear expression, but must at the same time teach him to think for himself....English Composition should do more than cultivate facile expression in the student; it should do its part toward enabling him to take his place in the world of men and women who are producing ideas'" (Gold and Hobbs 45). This mindset and philosophy are what ground collegiate women in being useful. This is where they are encouraged to not just write and speak on suffrage, but to take their ideas on immigration and veterans affairs into the world. The tools collegiate women learned in the classroom, they then applied to literary societies and public work.

Rhetorical classroom influence was so strong in encouraging collegiate women to enter public spheres that many universities became synonymous with their program's ability to extend them into public life. Gold and Hobbs point out:

As with Texas, spoken English and expression were also emphasized at the westernmost of the public women's colleges, Oklahoma College for Women in Chickasha. The first president, Hosea Baker Abernathy, was a rhetoric scholar from Columbus, Mississippi (the home of Mississippi State College for Women);

he appointed a professor of German and oratory named Olive Leaman McClintic, a speaker, performer, and educator, who began a degree program in expression. She must have been popular, for the young women soon named their literary society after her. Soon the young women were out in the community giving both speeches and interpretative readings publicly at events such as Confederate memorials. (70)

This research reflects the influence that strong rhetorical programs can have in encouraging collegiate women to not only set up literary societies and continue their rhetorical efforts but to do so publicly. Note that their “speeches and interpretative readings publicly at events such as Confederate memorials” would probably not have been seen as a feminine style (Gold and Hobbs 70, Buchanan 78). Respectable collegiate women willing to address the ethical implications of Confederate memorials in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, publicly, strongly dispel the idea that women were prevented from speaking in public. This literary work was born from a collective desire to not be confined by domesticity any longer.

The number of collegiate women forming literary societies to grow their rhetorical acumen increased with each college semester and with each year. Gold and Hobbs point out:

As with other colleges, Oklahoma College for Women also had its literary societies such as *Literatae*, begun in 1917, the Leaman Literary Society, 1911, and others including *Othana* and *Utopian* clubs. The Ruth Bryan Owens Club was often in charge of daily assemblies. Speaking also took place in oratorical contests sponsored by different groups, as well as at programs like the 1921 Old South commemoration. Most special programs featured young women reading poetry or

literature or less frequently giving speeches. Forensics were strong at Oklahoma until into the forties. (82)

This research conveys the fearlessness that abounds when collegiate women are given the proper tools to be effective, and they then discover what works for them. The collaboration that happened amongst collegiate women is powerful: they were useful to and for each other. And organizations such as the LWV, clubs, and literary societies reflect the sense that many collegiate women were grappling with social issues. They organized in groups to promote causes and form powerful relationships. The LWV, clubs, and literary societies are ingrained in women's history as examples that women can connect their collegiate training to public work.

It Began at Oberlin with an Acknowledgment

During the writing of Chapter 5, I have returned again and again to many of the primary documents written during the 19th century, both encouraging collegiate activities and instructing women that their place is in the home. In the *Lady's Token*, a woman is advised, "A wife should occupy herself 'only with domestic affairs—wait till your husband confides to you those of a high importance—and do not give your advice until he asks for it'" (Welter 161). *A Young Lady's Guide to the Harmonious Development of a Christian Character* encouraged young women to "'become as little children' and 'avoid a controversial spirit'" (Welter 161). Mrs. Sanford observed in a domestic column, "'St Paul knew what was best for women when he advised them to be domestic'" (Welter 162). The rhetorical efforts made by women to confine women are limitless and intriguing.

These magazines and journals are using family and Bible references; they are attempting to persuade women that their lives will be so much easier if they stick to what they know: domesticity. How amazingly low were the expectations of Victorian women! To be compared to

children and willingly accept it speaks volumes to the complacency of a certain class of women. It also speaks volumes when administrators such as Daniel Chandler, in the mid-1830s, spoke before the Pi Kappa Societies of the University of Georgia, “calling it a ‘disgrace’ that of the nation’s sixty-one colleges, ‘not one is dedicated to the cause of female education’” (Farham 19). This was an urgent call to take women’s education seriously.

This research does make me wonder if President Fairchild from Oberlin College was reading magazines like the *Lady’s Token* or *A Young Lady’s Guide to the Harmonious Development of a Christian Character*, even just breezing through them. Did his wife have a copy of them at home, and at a leisurely moment in his day, he found himself sifting through the pages of domesticity advice columns and wondering, What is wrong with these women? I would like to think there was an epiphany moment for President Fairchild. Whether out loud or to himself, he declared, our country needs serious women. I’d like to think that that same epiphany moment happened across the country to many women of different ages, races, and socio-economic statuses, where they declared, “Enough is enough and I want to be taken seriously.”

Oberlin College was the antithesis of the parlor. This was where administrators believed and advocated that “The chief emphasis of female education at Oberlin was to prepare young women to be *useful*—not to graduate a ‘company of Butterflies, to glitter a while, and then to vanish, but to send out a set of pious well educated and genteel (not fashionable) young Ladies to be useful in any circumstances’” (Hogeland 167). I argue that this research is a figurative denunciation of the parlor and everything that it stands for. If the parlor represents “a ‘company of Butterflies, to glitter a while, and then to vanish’” then collegiate education for women was represented by “prepare[d],” “pious well educated and gentell,” and most especially “useful”

(Hogeland 167). These binaries reflect that both men and women encouraged women to break the confines of domesticity and shape a new, true woman.

Another statement I find most fascinating is the first part of President Fairchild's original reasoning and justification for opening up enrollment for women. There was nothing to indicate prior to Oberlin opening enrollment that women would be successful or that women would be welcomed with open arms from their male classmates, faculty, or community; Oberlin was the first. But he declared "that women (or at least, maidens) had both the physical and mental capacity successfully to pursue an academic program" (Hogeland 164). There is an unwavering belief here that resonates when someone pushes back against inherent nonsense. For far too long, women had been stereotyped into an image of not being capable of a higher education, not wanting a higher education. I do feel that many women, regrettably, went along with this stereotype, not knowing any better, believing that their education in gender roles had done them well. But at some point, educationally aspiring women, under the encouragement of highly respectable men, like President Fairchild, changed their minds.

In his reflections on Oberlin's beginnings and its decisions, President Fairchild criticizes the ambivalence of the founders as to the entrance of women. He writes, "The founders certainly held no new or special views of the rights or the sphere of women: they only sought for her such an education as should fit her for the highest usefulness in her own appropriate work" (Fredlund 419). If usefulness for the founders meant women staying in their "appropriate" spheres and roles, then President Fairchild widened those expectations of what is appropriate for women students to study and do (Fredlund 419). This research also reveals that spaces and curriculum are historically inclined to change, because the parlor and the women's course were simply not enough for everyone.

My definition of *rhetorical usefulness* is lifted from the primary documents of administrators and women students themselves; this call for education was coming up again and again. This repetition in my term reveals a general nausea for not only patriarchal institutions deliberately holding women back, but unfortunately, women deliberately holding themselves back as well. Consider the column in the 1854 *Cherokee Rose Buds* edition where Susan and Ellen have a fairly insightful conversation. It begins as any other classmate discussion would, but where their conversation shifts and pertains to my research is when Ellen remarks on her apparent lack of motivation to study or do much of anything. Susan instantly rebukes her, reminding her that “at the close of the four years, you will leave with honors to yourself and friends, prepared to exert a good influence, and to be useful to those around you” (“A Dialogue Between Susan and Ellen” 5). This is the epitome of *rhetorical usefulness*, where a collegiate woman finds “honors” in using her words in order to be “useful” (“A Dialogue Between Susan and Ellen” 5).

The educationally aspiring women who were bold and left their homes to speak and write for causes in public spheres were poignant examples of honor. Their careers dispel the notion that addressing social problems in a public forum was impossible because of their sex. These women contributed to United States history in remarkably important ways, though their histories are still often lost in the archives. It is honorable to see a need in society and use one’s rhetorical education to fight for a solution. And that is what the women and institutions that educated them, which I have explored in this dissertation, did. They wanted to be useful and fought for that principle. For in locating usefulness, educated women found a newer and truer womanhood.

Works Cited Page

- Ackley, Kristina. "Laura Cornelius Kellogg, Lolomi, and Modern Oneida Placemaking." *American Indian Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 3, 2013, pp. 117–38.
- "A Dialogue Between Susan and Ellen." *Cherokee Rose Buds*. Vol. 1. No. 2. Female Seminary, Cherokee Nation, Wednesday, August 2, 1854.
- Allen, William Francis. *Higher Education in Wisconsin*. District of Columbia: Govt. print. Off., 1889.
- Archibald, Joann, and Q'um Q'um Xiim. *Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body, and Spirit*. UBCPress, Vancouver, 2008.
- Barker, Joanne. *Sovereignty Matters : Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles for Self-Determination*. Edited by Joanne Barker. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.
- Blair, Hugh. *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres by Hugh Blair*. 8th American, from the last Edinburgh ed.. New-York: L. & F. Lockwood, 1819.
- Boland, Sue. "The Power of Women: Matilda Joslyn Gage and the New York Women's Vote of 1880." *New York History*, vol. 100, no. 1, 2019, pp. 28–50.
- Bonnin, Gertrude Simmons. "To Help Indians Help Themselves." *Recasting the Vote: How Women of Color Transformed the Suffrage Movement*. Edited by Cathleen D. Cahill. The University of North Carolina Press, 2020. Pp. 243-261.
- Brammer, Leila R. *Excluded From Suffrage History: Matilda Joslyn Gage, Nineteenth-Century American Feminist*. Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, London, 2000.
- Branch-Haislip, Grace Carolyn. "Haines Normal and Industrial Institute and Penn Normal and

Industrial School: A Prospective on Black and White Educational Involvement.”

ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, 1982.

Buchanan, Lindal. *Regendering Delivery: The Fifth Canon and Antebellum Women Rhetors*.

Southern Illinois University Press, 2005.

Buhle, Mari Jo and Paul Buhle, Eds. *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage*. University of Illinois Press, 1978.

Butterfield, Consul Willshire. *History of the University of Wisconsin from Its First Organization To 1879: With Biographical Sketches of Its Chancellors, Presidents, and Professors / By C.W. Butterfield*. Wisconsin: University Press Company, 1879.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. *Man Cannot Speak for Her: A Critical Study of Early Feminist Rhetoric*. Volume I. New York, Praeger: 1989.

“Catalogue of the Faculty and Students of Wisconsin University.” University of Wisconsin Archives, July 27th, 1853.

“Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Clinton Liberal Institute.” Clinton, Oneida County, New York, August 30, 1837.

“Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Clinton Liberal Institute.” Clinton, Oneida County, New York. Utica, C.C.P. Grosh, Printer, 1840.

“Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Clinton Liberal Institute.” Clinton, Oneida County, New York. Utica, D.C. Grove, Printer, 1850-1851.

“Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Wisconsin.” Atwood & Rublee, Book and Job Printers, June 25, 1862.

“Catalogue of the University of Wisconsin.” Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, No. 46. General Series, No. 7. March, 1901. Part 1. The University of Wisconsin, 1901.

- Cherokee. "Dissipation." *Cherokee Rose Buds*. Vol. 1. No. 2. Female Seminary, Cherokee Nation, Wednesday, August 2, 1854.
- Clarke, Edward H. *Sex in Education; or, A Fair Chance for the Girls*. New York (State): Arno Press, 1972 [c1873], 1873.
- Cobb, Amanda J. *Listening to Our Grandmothers' Stories: The Bloomfield Academy for Chickasaw Females, 1852-1949*. University of Nebraska Press, 1992.
- Conway, Kathryn M. "Woman Suffrage and the History of Rhetoric at the Seven Sisters Colleges, 1865-1919." *Reclaiming Rhetoric: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*. Edited By Andrea A. Lunsford. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995. Pp. 203-226.
- Corbett, Edward P. J. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Corey, Mary E. *The Political Life and Times of Matilda Joslyn Gage: Activist, Historian, Publisher, Writer*. Paramount Market Publishing, Inc., 2019.
- Crocco, Margaret Smith, et al. *Pedagogies of Resistance: Women Educator Activists, 1880-1960*. Foreword by Nel Noddings. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1999.
- Curti, Merle Eugene, and Vernon Carstensen. *The University of Wisconsin: a history, 1848-1925*. Volume 1. The University of Wisconsin Press, 1949.
- D. *The Pioneer*, 28 September 1833, pp. 31-2. *Women and Radicalism in the Nineteenth Century*. Vol. 1: Specific Controversies. Edited with an Introduction by Mike Sanders. London and New York, Routledge, 2001. Pp. 169-170.
- DuBois, Ellen. *Feminism and Suffrage: The Emergence of an Independent Women's Movement in America, 1848-1869*. Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Edith. "View From Our Seminary." *Cherokee Rose Buds*. Vol. 1. No. 2. Female Seminary,

- Cherokee Nation, Wednesday, August 2, 1854.
- Eschbach, Elizabeth Seymour. *The Higher Education of Women in England and America, 1865-1920*. New York: Garland, 1993.
- Fairchild, James Harris. *Oberlin: The Colony and the College, 1833-1883*. Oberlin, O.: E.J. Goodrich, 1883.
- Fanny. "Two Scenes in Cherokee Land." *A Wreath of Cherokee Rose Buds*. Vol. II. No. 1. Female Seminary, Cherokee Nation, Wednesday, August 1, 1855.
- Finneman, Teri. "A Countermovement on the Verge of Defeat: Antisuffragist Arguments in 1917 Press Coverage." *Front Pages, Front Lines: Media and the Fight for Women's Suffrage*, edited by Linda Steiner et al., University of Illinois Press, 2020, pp. 134–52.
- Fleischmann, Glen. *The Cherokee Removal, 1838; an Entire Indian Nation Is Forced out of Its Homeland*. New York: Watts, 1971.
- Fletcher, Robert Samuel. *A History of Oberlin College: From its Foundation Through the Civil War* Volume I & II. Oberlin College, 1943.
- Fredlund, Katherine. "A Feminist and Antiracist History of Composition and Rhetoric at Oberlin College (1846-1851). *College Composition and Communication*. Edited by Malea Powell. February 2021, Volume 72, No. 3. National Council of the Teachers of English, 2021. Pp.413-439.
- Gage, Matilda Joslyn. "Matilda Joslyn Gage on the Right of Habeas Corpus." *The National Citizen & The Ballot Box*, November 1876, Vol. 1, No. 8, p. 1.
- Gage, Matilda Joslyn. "Prospectus: The National Citizen and Ballot Box." *The National Citizen & The Ballot Box*, May 1878, p. 1.
- Gage, Matilda Joslyn. "The Dangers of the Hour." *Man Cannot Speak for Her: Key Texts Of The*

- Early Feminists*. Volume II. Compiled by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell. Praeger, 1989. Pp. 339-370.
- Gage, Matilda Joslyn. *Woman, Church, and State*. 1893. Arno Press, 1972.
- “Gage, Matilda Joslyn (1826-1898).” *Civil War Era and Reconstruction (1861-1877)* 2013: 326–328.
- Geiger, Roger L. “The ‘Superior Instruction of Women,’ 1836-1890.” *The American College in The Nineteenth Century*. Edited by Roger Geiger. Vanderbilt University Press, 2000. Pp. 183-195.
- Gold, David, and Catherine L. Hobbs. *Educating The New Southern Woman: Speech, Writing, and Race at the Public Women’s Colleges, 1884-1945*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2014.
- Goodale, Ellen Rebecca Whitmore. *The Journal of Ellen Whitmore / Edited by Lola Garrett Bowers and Kathleen Garrett*. 1852. Tahlequah, Okla: Northeastern State College, 1953.
- Green, Laura Morgan. *Educating Women: Cultural Conflict and Victorian Literature*. Ohio University Press, 2001.
- “Haines Normal and Industrial Institute.” *Afro-American Encyclopaedia or, the Thoughts, Doings and Sayings of the Race*, Edited by James T. Haley. (Nashville, TN: Haley & Florida, 1896). Pp. 110-111.
- Hauptman, Laurence M. “Designing Woman: Minnie Kellogg, Iroquois Leader.” *Indian Lives: Essays on Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Native American Leaders*, Edited by L. G. Moses and Raymond Wilson. University of New Mexico, 1985. Pp. 133-155.
- H. Mann. “Free Schools.” *A Wreath of Cherokee Rose Buds*. Vol. II. No. 1. Female

Seminary, Cherokee Nation, Wednesday, August 1, 1855.

Hogeland, Ronald "Coeducation of the Sexes at Oberlin College: In Mid-Nineteenth Century America." *Journal of Social History*. Winter, 1972-1973, Vol. 6. No. 2 (Winter, 1972-1973). Oxford University Press. Pp. 160-176.

Howard-Pitney, David. "The Enduring Black Jeremiad: The American Jeremiad and Black Protest Rhetoric, from Frederick Douglass to W. E. B. Du Bois, 1841-1919." *American Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 3, 1986, pp. 481-92.

Isabelle. "A Day's Experience." *A Wreath of Cherokee Rose Buds*. Vol. II. No. 1. Female Seminary, Cherokee Nation, Wednesday, August 1, 1855.

Johnson, Nan. *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life, 1866-1910*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2002.

—. *Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric in North America*. Southern Illinois University Press, 1991.

—. "Reigning in the Court of Silence: Women and Rhetorical Space in Postbellum America." *Walking and Talking Feminist Rhetorics: Landmark Essays and Controversies*. Edited by Lindal Buchanan & Kathleen J. Ryan. Parlor Press, 2010. Pp. 274-290.

Kates, Susan. *Activist Rhetorics and American Higher Education, 1885-1937*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2001.

Kelley, Mary. *Learning to Stand and Speak: Women, Education, and Public Life in America's Republic*. University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Kellogg, Laura Cornelius. *Our Democracy and the American Indian: A Comprehensive Presentation of the Indian Situation as It Is Today*. Burton Publishing Company, 1920.

Kellogg, Laura Cornelius. "Statement, US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs: Statement of Mrs. Laura Cornelius Kellogg, (1916)." *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy and*

- The American Indian and Other Works*. Edited by Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu. Forward by Loretta V. Metoxen. Syracuse University Press, 2015. Pp. 197-201.
- Kellogg, Laura Cornelius. "Testimony during Hearings on H.R. 1917: Statement of Laura C. Kellogg, (1913)." *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy and the American Indian And Other Works*. Edited by Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu. Forward by Loretta V. Metoxen. Syracuse University Press, 2015. Pp. 173-196.
- King, Farina. "'Loyal Countrywoman' Rachel Caroline Eaton, Alumna of the Cherokee National Female Seminary." *This Land is Herland: Gendered Activism in Oklahoma From the 1870s to the 2010s*. Edited by Sarah Eppler Janda and Patricia Loughlin. Foreward by Renee M. Laegreid. The University of Oklahoma Press, 2021. Pp. 99-120.
- King, Lisa, and Resa Crane Bizzaro. "Sovereignty, Rhetorical Sovereignty, and Representation: Keywords for Teaching Indigenous Texts." *Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story: Teaching American Indian Rhetorics*, edited by Lisa King et al., University Press of Colorado, 2015, pp. 17-34.
- Kitty, "Se-Quah-Yah." *A Wreath of Cherokee Rose Buds*. Vol. II. No. 1. Female Seminary, Cherokee Nation, Wednesday, August 1, 1855.
- Kellogg, Laura Cornelius. *Laura Cornelius Kellogg: Our Democracy and the American Indian and Other Works*. Edited by Kristina Ackley and Cristina Stanciu. Forward by Loretta V. Metoxen. Syracuse University Press, 2015.
- Kellogg, Laura Cornelius. "Laura Kellogg, Daughter of a Long Line of Indian Chiefs, Laughs at the Old Idea of the Downtrodden Squaw." *Washington Herald*, February 16, 1915, 8.
- Laney, Lucy Craft. "The Burden of the Educated Colored Woman." Hampton Negro Conference, Number III, July 1899, Hampton, Virginia.

- Legg, Emily. "Stories Emerging from Dusty Boxes: Finding Duyuk'ta at the Cherokee National Seminaries." *Stories of Our Living Ephemera: Storytelling Methodologies in the Archives Of the Cherokee National Seminaries, 1846-1907*. The University Press of Colorado, Utah State University Press, 2023. Pp. 133-168.
- . "To Keep Alive Tradition": Survivance and Writing at the Cherokee National Seminaries." *Stories of Our Living Ephemera: Storytelling Methodologies in the Archives Of the Cherokee National Seminaries, 1846-1907*. The University Press of Colorado, Utah State University Press, 2023. Pp. 196-219.
- Loria, Laura, and Amelie Von Zumbusch. *The 19th Amendment*. 1st ed. Chicago, IL: Britannica Educational Publishing, 2016.
- Lyons, Scott Richard. "Rhetorical Sovereignty: American Indian Writing as Self -Determination." ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, 2000.
- . "Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing?" *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 51, no. 3, 2000, pp. 447–68.
- Manshel, Hannah. "Bad Faith and the American Indian: Laura Cornelius Kellogg and the Problem of Democratic Inclusion." *American Literary History*, Volume 35, Issue 1, Spring 2023, Pages 113–125.
- Marshall, Mary Magdalene. "'Tell Them, We're Rising!': Black Intellectuals and Lucy Craft Laney in Post-Civil War Augusta, Georgia." ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, 1998.
- McMahon, Lucia. *Mere Equals: The Paradox of Educated Women in the Early American Republic*. Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Mecklenburg-Faenger, Amy. "Trifles, Abominations, and Literary Gossip: Gendered Rhetoric and Nineteenth-Century Scrapbooks." *Genders* 55.55 (2012): 1–46.

- Mihesuah, Devon A. *Cultivating the Rosebuds : The Education of Women at the Cherokee Female Seminary, 1851-1909* / Devon A. Mihesuah. Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- . “Let Us Strive Earnestly to Value Education Aright”: Cherokee Female Seminarians as Leaders of a Changing Culture.” *Nineteenth-Century Women Learn to Write*. Edited with An Introduction by Catherine Hobbs. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995. Pp. 103-119.
- Mirrielees, Edith Ronald. *Stanford: The Story of a University*. New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1959.
- “More Women’s Rights Conventions.” National Historical Park Service, New York. U.S. Department of the Interior, 2025.
- <https://www.nps.gov/wori/learn/historyculture/more-womens-rights-conventions.htm>.
- Na-Li. “An Address to the Females of the Cherokee Female Seminary.” *Cherokee Rose Buds*. Vol. 1. No. 2. Female Seminary, Cherokee Nation, Wednesday, August 2, 1854.
- Paquet, Laura Byrne. "Matilda Joslyn Gage, the Suffragette Ahead of Her Time Who Defied the U.S. Government." *CE Noticias Financieras*, Jul 04, 2023.
- Perdue, Theda. *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change, 1700-1835*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Qua-Tay. “Female Influence.” *A Wreath of Cherokee Rose Buds*. Vol. II. No. 1. Female Seminary, Cherokee Nation, Wednesday, August 1, 1855.
- Rudolf, Frederick. *The American College and University: A History*. Introductory Essay and Supplemental Bibliography by John R. Thelin. The University of Georgia Press, 1962.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Journal of Church and State*, vol. 25, no. 2, 1983, pp. 358–59.

JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23916232>.

Ryan, Mary P. "Gender and Public Access: Women's Politics in Nineteenth-Century America."

Feminism, the Public and the Private. Edited by Joan B. Landes. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Sharer, Wendy B. *Vote & Voice: Women's Organizations and Political Literacy, 1915-1930*.

Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.

Sohan, Vanessa Kraemer. "'But a Quilt Is More': Recontextualizing the Discourse(s) of the Gee's Bend Quilts." *College English*, vol. 77, no. 4, 2015, pp. 294–316.

Solomon, Barbara Miller. *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1985.

Smith, Christi M. *Reparation and Reconciliation: The Rise and Fall of Integrated Higher Education*. The University of North Carolina Press, 2016.

Smith, S. R. "Clinton Liberal Institute.: Clinton Liberal Institute." *Evangelical Magazine and Gospel Advocate (1830-1848)*, vol. 12, no. 36, 03 Sept., 1841, pp. 284.

Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, and Frederick Douglass. "Declaration of Sentiments' (1848)."

Treacherous Texts: An Anthology of U.S. Suffrage Literature, 1846-1946, edited by Mary Chapman and Angela Mills, Rutgers University Press, 2011, pp. 20–23.

Steineker, Rowan Faye. "Lilah Lindsey: Mvskoke Creek Educator and Civic Reformer." *This*

Land Is Herland: Gendered Activism in Oklahoma From the 1870s to the 2010s. Edited By Sarah Eppler Janda and Patricia Loughlin. Foreword by Renee M. Laegreid. The University of Oklahoma Press, 2021. Pp. 11-31.

"The Leland Stanford Junior University Sixth Annual Register." Stanford University, California, April 1897.

“The Leland Stanford Junior University Twelfth Annual Register.” Stanford University, California, April 1903.

“The Leland Stanford Junior University Announcement of Courses 1912-1913.” Stanford University, California, June 1912.

The ‘War Scrap Book’ of Matilda Joslyn Gage: Witness to Rebellion. Edited by Peter Svenson. Foreword by Sally Roesch Wagner. Lehigh University Press, 2019.

The Young Lady’s Book: A Manual of Elegant Recreations, Exercises, and Pursuits. England: Vizetelly, Branston, and Co., 1829, 1829.

Transforming Women’s Education: The History of Women’s Studies in the University of Wisconsin System. A Collective Project of the Wisconsin System Women’s Studies Consortium. The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, 1999.

Wagner, Sally R. "The Root of Oppression is the Loss of Memory: The Iroquois and the Early Feminist Vision: [1]." *Akwesasne Notes (1975-1989)*, 28 Feb., 1989, pp. 11.

Wah-Leah. “A Journal of a Day at School.” *Cherokee Rose Buds*. Vol. 1. No. 2. Female Seminary, Cherokee Nation, Wednesday, August 2, 1854.

Welter, Barbara et al. “The Cult of True Womanhood, 1820-1860.” *Journal of women’s history* 14.1 (2002): 150–173.

Whately, Richard. *Logic / by Richard Whately*. England: Charles Griffin, 1872, 1872.

Williams, Fannie Barrier. “The Club Movement among Colored Women of America (1900).” *The New Negro: Readings on Race, Representation, and African American Culture, 1892-1938*, edited by Henry Louis Gates and Gene Andrew Jarrett, Princeton University Press, 2007, pp. 54–59.

Williams-Way, Gloria Taylor. "Lucy Craft Laney, the Mother of the Children of the People: Educator, Reformer, Social Activist." ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, 1998.

Zaeske, Susan. "The 'Promiscuous Audience' Controversy and the Emergence of the Early Women's Rights Movement." *Walking and Talking Feminist Rhetorics: Landmark Essays and Controversies*. Edited by Lindal Buchanan & Kathleen J. Ryan. Parlor Press, 2010. Pp 234-253.