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Introduction

Founded in 1877, the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Boston is still in existence today. Although a pioneer in the fields of social reform, industrial education, women's organizations, and social science, it has long been neglected by historians. The first thirty-five years of the Union's history were particularly important in establishing a diversity of activities and a set of priorities. As an organization committed to mutual aid and benevolence, the WEIU, on the one hand, provided fellowship and an outlet for the energies of social-reform minded women, and, on the other hand, provided information and crucial services to the many young women who were newcomers to Boston, often alone, and in need of lodgings and employment. In particular, the Union deserves special attention for its concern with enabling women of all classes to support themselves. To this end, it sponsored some of the first women's handwork shops, employment agencies, and trade schools in the nation.

From 1877 to 1912, the Union emphasized the preparation of women for earning their own livings. Such concerns made for a close relationship between the WEIU and both the progressive education movement and the development of social science. In contact with these movements the WEIU was itself transformed from a volunteer reform organization and social club, with a naive social-economic perspective, to a highly-organized service agency directed and staffed by professional social scientists.
The changes in the Union's approach reflect — in addition to the changing needs of women — the popular trends in reform ideology. In particular, the Union's professionalization expressed and promoted a changing analysis of social problems, an effort to "rationalize relief" through "scientific philanthropy," and new roles for women in reform work and the labor market, all products of the Progressive era.

Surprisingly, recent scholars have written little on the WEIU despite its relevance to women's history, the history of education, and the history of philanthropy and social science.

Richard Hofstadter's discussion of the Progressive era offers a general context for the Union's work, particularly the forces which shaped the concerns and ideals of reformers, but adds little to an understanding of the relationship of women reformers to the larger movement. Feminist historians have begun to analyze the period as well. Unfortunately, scholars like Jill Conway, Estelle Freedman, and William Leach all concentrate on the failure of Progressive era feminists to formulate a sound strategy to win the suffrage struggle. They consequently underappreciate the gains women did make for themselves and for the field of social science by professionalizing their reform activities.

In the emerging literature on industrial education scholars have begun to address questions of educational reform, social control and the role of institutions like the WEIU. Marvin Lazerson examines
in depth several Boston organizations and individuals concerned with integrating education into an environment changed by urbanization and industrialization, although the WEIU is not among them. Lazerson argues that initial efforts to uplift the poor and regain some mythical social harmony of the past relied on new techniques to teach traditional moral values. When these failed, he says, educators accepted the new industrial order, and became preoccupied, instead, with fitting individuals for their perceived roles in the economy. My thesis asserts the validity of his interpretation to the development of the WEIU, but goes beyond it. For when the question of women as both reformers and clients emerges, we must consider the professional advance made by the educated class of women reformers even if we fault the progression of social control for favoring the status quo for advantaged men and disadvantaged workers.

The history of the WEIU left by members themselves presents a chronology of highlights from the Union's Annual Reports focusing mostly on the growth of the organization in terms of its real estate acquisitions. Since no significant secondary works exist, I relied most heavily on the Annual Reports of the WEIU to document its transformation. In addition, Annual and special reports of the Massachusetts State Board of Education, the United States Commissioner of Education, the National Education Association, and the state and national commissioners of labor and statistics together formed
a significant body of material relevant to the context in which the WEIU undertook its activities.

This thesis follows the development of the WEIU between its founding in 1877 and the appointment of its first paid and professionally education president in 1912. The Union had three presidents during this period, Dr. Harriet Clisby (1877-1880), Abbey Morton Diaz (1883-1891), and Mary Morton Kehew (1892-1912). The terms of Diaz and Kehew each correspond to the two major phases of the Union's early development, and therefore mark transitions within this paper. In each case, the president's own outlook significantly influenced the philosophy which shaped the Union's work, making it appropriate to examine it in some detail.

Chapter One briefly reviews the socio-economic development of Massachusetts in the late nineteenth century and the resulting reform ideology as expressed by prominent educators, philanthropists, and manufacturers. Their perspective formed the bases for the manual education movement and the expansion of woman's sphere into the public realm. Founders of the WEIU drew heavily upon their work in establishing the Union.

Chapter Two examines the Union's development during the presidencies of Clisby and Diaz. It emphasizes the persistence of traditional values in the organization, and the simultaneous expansion of the organization's membership and activities. The growing conflict between these two factors culminated in a change of direction in 1891 when Kehew took over the presidency and began to modernize the WEIU's operations.
Chapter Three outlines the differences between the socio-economic analyses of Diaz and Kehew, and the resulting differences in their presidencies. It examines the Union's adaptation to changes in the business world as a means of confronting the strain of its own growth, and demands for greater realism and relevance in the field of social reform and particularly industrial education.

In coming to terms with a growing demand for its services by women who could contribute little to its cause, the Union was forced to retreat from the ideal of mutual aid. As it provided more and better trade education programs, it replaced mutual aid with a growing patron-client relationship. As it hired workers to do tasks once performed by volunteers, it furthered this trend by becoming an employer with the responsibility of effective management of employees.

The first decade of Kehew's term, the 1890's, was a transition period during which Kehew rationalized and began to professionalize the Union in preparation for the Union's more significant accomplishments after the turn of the century. By the end of the decade, however, the nature of the Union was permanently transformed from any pretense of mutual aid to an overwhelmingly service-oriented organization. The latter half of Chapter Three demonstrates how the addition of experts and a new emphasis on social science research enabled the Union to build more effective educational structures by cooperating with businesses and educators.
In the end the WEIU never realized its goal of a "Union of all for the good of all." Nevertheless, these women of the Progressive era, who had seen themselves as merely expanding the boundaries of woman's sphere in order to defend woman's private prerogative, had helped to create significant new opportunities for women in public professions.
CHAPTER I:
SOCIAL REFORM AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION
IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

To understand the early activities of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Boston, it is necessary to understand the origins of the movements it promoted. While the Union performed an impressive array of functions, most significant was its interest in industrial education as a form of philanthropy and social improvement for women. When the Union was founded, formally-organized all-women's organizations were still rare. But if their all-female union was unusual, the women of the WEIU, however, made no radical departure from the common reform and philanthropic thought of their time. Philanthropy was essentially a way to ameliorate social problems like poverty, vice and crime, when few public mechanisms existed for this purpose other than punitive ones. All such efforts aimed at preserving social stability through benevolent means.

This chapter examines changes in society which, from the perspective of influential people, seemed responsible for current ills. It attempts to draw a line connecting the perceived causes of these ills to the proposed solution of industrial education, with special reference to the role of women as reformers and beneficiaries.
The Problem Of An Appropriate Workforce

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, one could not escape the sense that Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and, in fact, the entire country were riding atop a predestined yet uncertain wave of change. With a mixture of excitement and anxiety the nation confronted an awareness that it was rapidly surpassing mere recovery from the economic dislocations of the Civil War. New ways of manufacturing a product and running a business were rapidly replacing the old ways, but new problems were arriving hand-in-hand with progress.

Mechanization and rationalization of production was a gradual process in the United States. This trend had begun at least a century before with technological innovations in power and machinery. Yet it was not until the second half of the nineteenth century that the majority of American laborers worked significantly differently from their parents and grandparents.

The two most important consequences of mechanization were:
1) it brought workers together under one roof, thus concentrating more of the population into urban areas; and 2) it created a division of labor which had a profound impact on the social structure. What is more, the regularity imposed by machines and by the coordination of many workers, coupled with a heightened emphasis on efficiency, necessitated a new work ethic. Social reformers and manufacturers alike targeted the failure to adapt to the demands
of this new industrial work life as the source of many of the social ills which accompanied industrialization and urbanization. According to their analysis, there was no inherent conflict between industrial capitalism and a healthy, harmonious society, as long as those with foresight and moral conviction could safely guide the population through this critical stage of development. Yet by the 1870's a significant labor problem had arisen: as they saw it, Massachusetts lacked an appropriately skilled and socialized workforce.

With the greater division of labor came the end of the traditional handcraft system whereby a worker started as an apprentice, became a journeyman, and eventually arrived at the status of master craftsman. Under the factory system, an individual performed a single task over and over again. This task constituted only one step in the manufacturing process, and so the worker never achieved the ability and opportunity to produce an item from start to finish. Forever remaining a minor cog in the wheel, the average worker would not attain the prestige and financial rewards of master status. Unskilled workers could no longer look forward to greater skill and prosperity with age, and this change created a permanent class of low-income factory operatives. As a result, financial necessity forced more women and children to work for wages. What is more, now that workers had a lifelong stake in working conditions, and no future stake in the interests of manufacturers, they gradually became more class-conscious and ready to organize against their employers.6
In Massachusetts, where textiles were the principle industry, manufacturing represented the greatest source of the state's wealth. By the 1880's, factories would generate 91% of the total wealth of Massachusetts. Understandably, the problems of industry concerned everyone. Both the Crisis of 1848-49 and the Civil War had hurt the Massachusetts textile industry. Reduced wages during the Crisis coincided with an increased demand for women in the more attractive field of teaching. As a result, the Crisis intensified a trend already begun for the educated, native-born daughters of New England farmers, who had first filled the mills, to now leave them for higher wages in "higher employments." In their place came poor, less-educated Irish immigrants, and then French Canadians, both of whom manufacturers considered "inferior" workers.

The Civil War had an even more devastating effect on the Massachusetts textile industry. An "unstable supply of raw cotton and a curb on European immigration" caused a tremendous decline in production during the war. Many factories laid off large numbers of workers, or even shut down entirely. By the time they geared up to resume full production, many of their native workers had found better work. Southern and European competition threatened growth after the war. Manufacturers complained that the inefficiency of the new immigrant labor reduced their competitive edge and, therefore, profits for the Commonwealth, not to mention themselves. While manufacturers advocated a shift to higher quality goods produced by skilled labor, their attempts to improve profits by reducing
benefits and tightening shop discipline only made their factories more volatile and less attractive to the workers they wanted.

In the late 1860's, in order to solve their labor problems, Massachusetts manufacturers joined a growing coalition promoting manual education. Manual education meant different things to different people, but generally referred to exercises in handiwork with simple tools. Followers of Friedrich Froebel, an educational theorist, advocated an approach called object learning. Object learning promoted handiwork as the most effective way to introduce children to the basic principles of the physical world around them. Adherents to popular "faculty psychology" claimed that manual exercises developed that part of the brain responsible for manual activity. It thus improved reflexes and coordination of mind and body, and therefore promoted an almost spiritual harmony between one's mental and physical elements. Still others hoped to uplift the general level of culture and aesthetic taste among the populace by teaching design and execution of manual arts.

Yet it was not until the coalition of manufacturers and social reformers agreed that manual training would enhance the discipline, efficiency and therefore the employability of workers that the movement took off. The problem, as they saw it, stemmed from the disappearance of the apprentice system. Earlier generations had learned their trades under the close supervision of family members, or in a filial relationship to the master craftsman. Such an education
assured the cultural transmission of traditional values as well as skills. These values included attitudes toward work and one's role in society. Now that the family was separated from education by formal schooling, and work was separated from education, the continuity among these fundamental constituents of culture began to disintegrate. In particular, how were immigrants to learn proper attitudes and habits for the American industrial workplace? Manual exercises, they answered, would develop their attention to detail, neatness, and overall work discipline. Furthermore, offering manual training to all children through public schools would reduce the stigma that manual labor was for the poor, and once again make labor "honorable." If labor were honorable, many argued, fewer people would be tempted to make their living by crime and vice. Manual education, then, "seemed a primary means of reintegrating individuals and institutions, providing a link between the past and present, and thus securing the future."

Any attempt to grasp the nature of the manual education movement is likely to be confounded by the number of different interests aligned in its favor. In fact, the movement was highly eclectic. Often conflicting arguments for it stood side by side without anyone acknowledging, let alone trying to reconcile them. Most noticeably, some promoted manual training to advance industrial progress, while others saw it as a means of "reconstructing traditional handicrafts." The first embraced the new industrial values, such as promptness and conformity, the second rejected them; nonetheless, they both
sought social stability and prosperity through the direct influence of manual education.

It is not surprising, then, that philanthropists, both as socially concerned individuals, and, often, manufacturers themselves, sponsored many early manual education efforts. In Massachusetts, in particular, there had always been a very weak distinction between public and private education due to philanthropists who provided local school systems with aid in the form of money, materials, and facilities. Many manual education programs began as private, philanthropic experiments which the public school system could not afford to conduct. Once they proved viable, however, these pilot programs were turned over to public educators to administer and fund. Other efforts began, and sometimes remained, as joint initiatives between philanthropists and public authorities; but in either case the importance of philanthropic involvement in expanding the range of experiments available to Massachusetts educators should not be underestimated. Likewise, the influence of philanthropists on what programs were tried and emphasized should not be overlooked.

Education was a branch of philanthropic concern of particular interest to women. After all, they believed, nurturing the hearts and minds of the young fell within the natural province of woman's duties. Woman's influence on education through philanthropy was as logical an extension of her role as mother and a defender of morality as had been the feminization of the teaching profession
and initial entry of women into public reform efforts. In this light, the founding of an organization of women devoted to promoting industrial education through mutual aid and philanthropy seems almost inevitable.

The Women's Educational and Industrial Union began as a largely philanthropic organization, and as such, was one of those philanthropic concerns involved in Boston's manual education movement. It is therefore important to consider what leaders of the Union had to say about philanthropy and social reform to place their early activities in the proper context. Only then can one understand the significance of the Union's later developments and contributions to industrial education.

Philanthropy is the use of wealth and influence to perform works beneficial to the general welfare. "The object of all such effort," wrote Union president Diaz, "is so to change existing conditions, that evil in every shape shall give place to good." Since it was a Christian duty to perform good acts, it seemed obvious that the wealthy ought to apply the resources of their good fortune to social causes. The WEIU considered itself not only a vehicle for philanthropic work, but a promoter of the philanthropic ideal. When accused of benefiting the wealthy in contradiction to their stated aim to do good, the Union admitted, "... we acknowledge such to be our endeavor," and went on to explain:
in introducing any new order of things, the first step is to reach the parties having the most influence, and who are these but the well-to-do? They make the laws; they select the rulers and get them elected; they decide what is education and regulate the schools accordingly; they decide what is religion and have it preached; they fix the standards of respectability.\textsuperscript{14}

On the other hand, the Union did not assume that class denoted moral purity:

\textquoteleft\textquoteleft...need is sure to be recognized among the drunkenness and crime of our worst streets; but who own the distilleries and drinking saloons, and import and make the liquors which cause the drunkenness and crime? Who, indeed, but the well-to-do, living in our best streets, in a luxury paid for by the degradation of our worst streets?\textquoteright\textquoteright\textsuperscript{15}

Interestingly, these promoters of philanthropy did not see the undemocratic distribution of power in society as the root of social evil. In their analysis, the problem lay in the abuse of that power and, therefore, the solution lay in influencing the influential. As Diaz wrote, since "influence works down, and not up, it is plain that the high and influential badness is more harmful than the low and repulsive kind, and therefore the effective work for humanity lies in that direction."\textsuperscript{16} This is not such a surprising viewpoint when one recognizes the conflict for well-to-do reformers between the desire to do good and the desire not to undermine the legitimacy of their own position of power. In addition, a long accepted dictum of sex roles held that, while men had material power at their disposal, women had social influence to wield. This argument worked against women's achievement of economic equality with men not so much because it ruled out most forceful means of
achieving it, but because it belied the very relevance of the goal itself. Although contemporary economic conditions convinced the WEIU reformers of the value of economic self-sufficiency for women, they nonetheless understood their central function as female reformers to be the exertion of good influence, and not revolutionary threat.

As most philanthropic concerns, the WEIU certainly did not consider the wealthy to be the source of social problems. At worst they contributed to them by placing temptations such as alcohol and prostitution before the already degraded. Thus the first step in creating change was to spur the influential to action. But then what were these wealthy people to do? The answer depended on a view of causes and effects. The early leaders of the Union believed, as did many late nineteenth century reformers, that one's own character, as well as circumstances, caused one's poverty.

In her 1885 presidential address, Diaz declared:

> Sickness and Pauperism are the result of ignorance and sin in some quarter. . . . Pauperism, drunkenness, vice, crime -- do not exist of themselves. They are simply the inward conditions becoming apparent in conduct. These conditions are ignorance, selfishness, undeveloped faculties, false rating of values, lack of self-respect and self-restraint.  

This is not to say that environment had no influence on character.

On the contrary, social reformers worried deeply about the disintegration of "village values," the shift away from belief in family- and community-oriented values like hard work, thrift, and personal initiative in work. Most blamed the unstable influence on immigrants
and city living. Abbey Morton Diaz, however, represented an unusual variant of this concern. As both the second WEIU president, and a writer of popular articles and juvenile fiction, she warned that the poor quality of girls coming from the countryside threatened the social health of the city. She believed that social discontinuity originated in the villages. In this analysis, it was as a result of the breakdown of communal ties that young folk migrated from the country to the city to find work, and upon their arrival the once harmonious city suffered as well. "Inferior conditions there [in the countryside]," said Diaz, "mean weakness and vanity here." 18

In fact, it was precisely because these reformers and philanthropists acknowledged the significance of environmental conditions rather than innate character formation that they advanced educational answers to social problems. Like Social Darwinists, they saw the survival of the fittest threatened by the diseases of the unfit, but unlike the Social Darwinists they believed that "fitness" could be learned. If these reformers seem to have an inconsistent position on the classic nature/nurture controversy, it is because they wished to allow for environmental influences while refusing to forfeit their belief in free will. To resolve this conflict between the need to embody Christian charity and to maintain the Christian belief in free will, they attempted a notion of interaction between environment and choice. This compromise resulted in a notion of "worthy" and "unworthy" poor, the first being victims of circumstance, the second, their own sinfulness.
Perhaps the increasing weight these reformers placed on circumstance -- the growing liberality of their perspective -- came from witnessing the demise of numbers of once-comfortable Boston ladies. Because there was a "surplus" of women in Massachusetts in these years -- that is, more women than men -- the traditional means of supporting themselves through marriage was no longer an option for many women. Consequently, many single or widowed women faced conditions in the wage labor force or among the unemployed for which their upbringing had not prepared them. The Union's Employment Bureau complained:

The work of this Committee is accompanied by peculiar difficulties, from the fact that many of the women who apply to the Bureau for employment, are those who have lived in comfort, in some cases, affluent circumstances in their own homes, until overtaken by reverses of fortune which obliged them to seek means of support.

Lack of available jobs was not necessarily the biggest problem confronting these women. While the WEIU strove to broaden and diversify the scope of jobs open to women, it also struggled to make women more employable. On the one hand, there was little demand for women in "higher classes of employment;" on the other hand, once wealthy women found it difficult to "adjust down" to the more common forms of employment open to them. As for poor women, the reverse -- their inability or unwillingness to "adjust up" to standards of cleanliness, efficiency, and obedience -- was considered partially to blame for the shortage of acceptable domestic help even during periods of unemployment.

The task of preparing women for existing jobs, then, entailed not only skill training but attitudinal training. The first step was convincing women in need that work was, indeed, the answer
to their problems. The WEIU and other philanthropists and educators advocated work as both an ideological virtue and a practical solution to poverty: "The central idea to which we would hold fast," wrote the Union's Secretary in 1880, "is to help all classes and conditions of women: not only in giving money and time, but by making each and all workers for the general good." The Union often invited speakers to express views consistent with the organization's work. One particularly rich description of the Union's philosophy of work as a virtue, therefore, is found in its reporting on one such group of speakers:

At the following meeting, Miss Anna F. Dowse spoke on "ideal work," saying that we must dignify our work by doing it lovingly for its own sake; that God meant us to get our happiness out of our work. Dr. Stafford spoke on the importance of all classes of having some occupation, saying that the feeble-minded, the insane, and occupants of all institutions are made happy and benefited by work. Our teacher from the industrial school said that when a child learns to do a thing well, it ceases to be a drudgery.

On the practical side, the WEIU promoted self-sufficiency through work as the cornerstone of what reformers called "scientific philanthropy." As the term implies, scientific philanthropy was an attempt to "rationalize relief" by reducing overlap among the work of various aid societies, but also by increasing the effectiveness of the aid they gave: "The effective work is to change such conditions [of sickness and pauperism] by a kind of education that shall develop the highest and best, thus enabling the individual to stand upright of himself instead of being held in position by charities, reforms, or penalties," wrote Diaz in 1885. By teaching working-class
women the skills and attitudes necessary for success in the workplace, the Union believed it helped women more in the long run than if it gave "handouts" to relieve their poverty in the short run. Stating the matter bluntly, Diaz said, "... in thus helping women to help themselves we are exercising the most economical form of charity." 23

Not only did the material and psychological benefits of worker education go hand-in-hand, so did the benefits to the individual and to society. Sometimes this notion emerged in statements like the following:

"Rev. Julius H. Ward spoke at our next meeting on 'Industrial Education.' He deplored the scarcity of well-trained workers, and thought young girls would meet fewer temptations, if they were well skilled in some handicraft which would give them a feeling of independence and self-respect." 24

The comfortably situated reformer appears barely to mask his primary motive to produce "good" workers. Because much of the rhetoric of the industrial education movement is quite blatant in expressing its intention to produce efficient workers, some historians have viewed efforts at industrial education as a simple form of social control; or, in more sophisticated form, the exploitation of educational innovation in the transformation of the United States into a corporate state. 25 Such authors argue against the more traditional interpretation which emphasized the democratic aspects of industrial education in general and the increased relevance of public schools' offerings to the laboring classes in particular.
The truth of the matter is that reformers like WEIU members would have denied, instead, any contradiction between the two. As they saw it, education which promoted labor was practical, was virtuous, was good for the laborer and the manufacturer, in fact, all classes alike. The logical link between all these interests was their faith in the Christian and capitalist promise that hard work would be rewarded. Ideally the economic system would reward all with prosperity, but drunkards and indigents, as the unemployed, and "inferior" workers of all kinds, were a drag on the system. The trick was to incorporate them into the system by teaching them the rules, developing their skills, and finally, nurturing their sense of team spirit by pointing out the logical harmony between the concerns of business and labor.

**A Union of Women**

This chapter has already touched upon the popular concept of woman as moral agent, influencer, and teacher. These were all characteristics which nineteenth-century "woman's sphere" ideology attributed to women. According to this way of thinking, a woman had an equal but different function in society from man, defined by her dominant influence over domestic life. The home was a haven for morality, a counterbalance against the corrupting influence of political and commercial activities engaged in by men. This was so because, as one Union president explained, "... woman by her organization, comes into near relation to the Infinite, and is receptive, through her spirituality, of divine truth."
Original interpretations of woman's sphere, therefore, held that woman's sphere was limited to the private domain of the family, while man's sphere was the public world of business. Nineteenth-century social reformers justified the expansion of woman's sphere into public reform activities as a natural evolution of woman's role as nurturing mother and influential wife. The WEIU wasted no opportunity to exploit woman's sphere ideology in its campaigns to attract volunteers and support. "Pulpit, press and platform," boasted the Union's second president,

continually assert that the influence which most helps to determine character is woman's influence, as that more than any other impresses character while it is forming. Here, then, we have a chain, our logic. The country is ruled by individuals, character rules the individual, and character to a great degree determined by woman.  

Thus, to the women of the WEIU it appeared clear that as man's work life moved increasingly out of the home, and public authorities took over the function of education, woman's continued good influence on society required the extension of woman's sphere into the public realm.

The ideology of woman's sphere explains why members of the Union were interested in reform, and particularly education. But why create a union of women exclusive of men? Harriet Clisby, the Union's founder, thought collective endeavor was a virtue. Whether she based her opinion on theories of social evolution, or alluded solely to the communalism of early Christians is unclear. Nonetheless, she confidently maintained that, "Association is the great law of the universe. This law points to an ideal society on earth.
in which all true elements meet and find their place in the uses to which they subserve." It was time, Clisby felt, that women shared a greater part of collective responsibilities. To do so, they needed to act more publicly, but women traditionally had little experience with organizational activities. "In a complete association both men and women would be equally represented . . .," explained Clisby:

Our present apartness, not separateness is the indispensible earnest of our future indissoluble union . . . This is the day of measurement of strengths — not necessarily aggressive — but we as women have to test ourselves — see whether we are in earnest or not — whether or not we can work together in amity and peace. If we cannot, how dare we call upon man to work with us, since having failed ourselves we should doubtless prove hindrances to him.

Yet the Union was still more exclusive in its purpose than any of these explanations justifies. The WEIU was not just a union of women to promote virtuous acts by women. The constitution of the WEIU stated, "Its object is to increase fellowship among women with the purpose of promoting the best practical methods for securing their educational, industrial, and social advancement." The Women's Educational and Industrial Union was a mutual aid association as well as a benevolent association. Its motto, "The Union Of All For The Good of All," reflected its aim to look beyond class differences to find the strength of common cause among women. Union members shared more than the "innate" characteristics of womanhood.
They shared barriers to educational, industrial, and social* advancement as women in a male-dominated society.

The WEIU did not seek "luxuries." Barriers to education and employment hindered woman's ability to fulfill her duties to society.

On the subject of education, a Union leader wrote:

... the world is fast coming into the immaterial reign of mind ... For woman to bear well her part in this coming kingdom, the development of her powers of thinking ... will be essential whatever her vocation, and especially in the vocation of mother and homemaker.30

Employment, as well, was no longer a luxury for many women, but an economic necessity. As such, a job that kept a woman out of the almshouse or brothel -- moral imperatives aside -- was far from self-indulgent.

The Union brought women together to help overcome their limitations. As an organization of women trying to help each other as well as women outside the group, the distinction between mutual aid and benevolence was not always clear. The concept of mutual aid assumes a high degree of equality among members' abilities to help each other. Benevolence, on the other hand, creates a patron-client relationship. In aspiring to create a mutual aid society of all classes of women, the leaders of the Union often failed to distinguish --

---

*In this context, "social advancement" referred to acquisition or development of "culture," and not social status. This is not to deny that Clisby probably assumed some correlation between refinement and legitimate social status, however.
between the differing needs of poorer members. Part of the Union's transformation, then, entailed a retreat from the harsh and elite egalitarianism of its infancy, to a less "democratic," but more effective professionalism later on.
CHAPTER 2:
THE EMERGENCE OF THE UNION

In 1877, Dr. Harriet Clisby, a 46 year old Boston physician, invited seven women to join her in founding the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Boston. To her pleasant surprise, 42 women came to the first meeting and 13 more to the second. By the first Annual Meeting in the spring of 1878, the Union claimed 400 members.

For Dr. Clisby the Union embodied a dream: the possibility of creating an association of all women, who, by coming together, would uplift themselves and therefore the race. The Union's charter members were comfortable Boston matrons determined to ignore class differences in pursuit of an ideal solidarity based on womanhood alone. Yet as large numbers of women from other walks of life actually joined the Union, the ideal of mutual aid began to fade.

During its first years, the Union owed Clisby total credit for creating it, initially guaranteeing its rent, and providing inspiration and a guiding hand as its first president. By the time of the Union's incorporation in 1880, the organization was well enough established for Clisby to resign, rest assured, the WEIU would live on. A long list of the donors, pressure for more rooms to accommodate new activities, and an ever-expanding membership roll all fueled the fire of Union expansion.

Such rapid growth before the Union could possibly have proven itself demonstrates the need women felt for what the Union promised to provide: a forum for philanthropic and mutual aid activities
devoted to the expansion of opportunities for women, and the realiza-
tion of each woman's potential in education and industry. By
"industry," the Union meant work or labor, but in a sense exalted
by allusions to Old Testament praise for humble diligence. By
"education," it meant formal and informal, at all levels and in
all areas, scientific and cultural.

At the Union's sixth annual meeting the president innumerated
seventeen reasons why the WEIU ought to be permanently supported.
These reasons illustrate the richness and diversity of the Union's
early endeavors, and make it easy to understand the Union's appeal
to female members and male supporters:

First, Because the Industrial Department helps
women to help themselves. Over four hundred
women have sent in the products of their in-
dustry. Second, Because of its Employment
Department which obtains situations for many
who need them. There is personal interest
taken in the applicants, and advice, sympathy,
and needful information are gladly given.
Third, Because of its Lecture and Class Depart-
ment with various kinds of instruction given
free of charge or at a very low rate. Fourth,
Because through the Agency of Direction women
can obtain information in regard to local matters.
Fifth, Because of its Reading Room open day and
evening and free to all women. Sixth, Because
without charge it secures justice to women who
are defrauded of their rightful dues but who
are all too poor to pay for legal assistance.
Seventh, Because of its semi-weekly talks on
hygiene by competent women physicians, and
free to all women. Eighth, Because it furnishes
a band of sympathetic women whose duty and pleasure
it is to visit the sick. Ninth, Because of its
Wednesday evening social entertainments free to all.
Tenth, if afford [sic] a place where women may meet socially. Eleventh, Because of the high moral and spiritual tone of its Sunday afternoon meetings. Twelfth, Because it has no limitations of sect or creed. Thirteenth, Because of the chance it affords women to obtain recognition of their various talents, abilities, capabilities and acquirements, and turn them to practical advantage. Fourteenth, Because of the many women who need the privileges mentioned. Fifteenth, Because of the increasingly large number of women who avail themselves of these privileges. Sixteenth, Because what is done for the elevation of women is so much done for the elevation of the race. Seventeenth, Because it is a proven organization and the good it does will lead to the establishment of similar institutions in other places.

In 1880, Abbey Morton Diaz, a writer and separated mother of two, was a good choice as the WEIU's second president, for she was a woman of tremendous talent and conviction, ready to carry on in Clisby's footsteps. Diaz came from an old Plymouth family, descended from Mayflower stock, and actively involved in nineteenth-century social reforms. Her father, Ichabod Morton, was deeply involved in the anti-slavery and common school reform movements, and, as a friend of Horace Mann, contributed to the establishment of the Girl's High School in Plymouth and the North Bridgewater Normal School. He moved his family to Brook Farm around 1842 when Abbey was 21. As a young woman, Abbey taught in Brook Farm's infant school for about five years. A brief marriage to a Cuban left her with two sons whom she raised by herself, supplementing her income from writing through practical nursing and teaching.
singing and dancing in her father's kitchen. She was a suffragist, a Transcendentalist, a religious experimenter and, at least in her later years, an avid follower of Edward Bellamy. Her concern for the decay of village values was most evident, not only in her writing, but in her effort to organize other Unions around the country, particularly in small towns.32

With this energetic woman at the helm, the Union distinguished itself during the 1880's as one of the largest, most impressive reform organizations in Boston. Meeting real needs, making keen investments, enjoying strong leadership and the support of many influential Bostonians all contributed to its phenomenal growth. Its financial resources grew from a meager $100 after its first year, to $968 after its fourth year (1881), and $21,980 the year it celebrated its tenth anniversary (1887). Membership rose from 569 members in 1880 to 1700 in 1890.

Perhaps an even better index of involvement and activity within the Union is the number of people who entered the Union's building each day. Unfortunately, there is no figure for the close of the 1880's or the opening of the 1890's. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that the average reported in 1882 was 42 people entering the building per day. This figure skyrocketed to 1500 per day in 1896, an increase of over 3500 percent in 14 years and a remarkable figure in itself. Each of the Union's functions drew significant attention, but its employment registration, handwork exchange,
boarding house and other informational directories attracted the largest number of newcomers. The Employment Bureau registered 124 employers and 495 employees, and filled 61 positions in 1879. In 1891, by contrast, it registered 1,880 employers and 2,669 employees, and filled 717 positions.

The 1877 Constitution of the Union enumerated seven standing committees defining the organization's work: Finance, Social Affairs, Moral and Spiritual Development, Industries and Employment, Hygiene and Physical Culture, Education, and Protection. In the early years, the Protection Committee, which provided free legal services to those who could not afford them, probably did more for working women than any other committee. A sympathetic Boston lawyer volunteered his services to the Union. With his aid the Protection Committee helped poor women sue for wages, and write contracts for domestic service. Almost single-handedly, the Committee waged a successful campaign to end a rash of mail-order frauds which offered money for handwork, or profit-making craft kits for cash, but never delivered what was promised.

It was the Industries and Employment and the Education committees, however, which came to dominate the Union's efforts to prepare women for self-support. According to the Constitution, it was the duty of the Committee on Industries and Employment:

to devise and adopt such industrial methods as shall be a true help for women, whereby their individual talents may be unfolded to profitable issues, either in the domain of Art, Science, Literature, Trade,
Manufacture, Invention, Home Avocation, or whatever else offers to insure this end. 33

From the beginning, the Union devoted much of its attention to this committee, not only for its stated purpose, but because, unlike other committees, it paid for itself, generated a little income for other committees, and did most to advertise the Union to the public.

As for the Committee on Education, the Constitution stated:

They shall seek to obtain and disseminate true ideas affecting questions of human interest, forming Lecture Bureaus, providing courses of Lectures, Conversations, Single Lectures, and making such other provision as shall promote the educational interests of women. 34

It was several years, though, before the Committee on Education, later known as the Lecture and Class Committee, took up any practical, rather than purely cultural, subjects. In 1878-79 it presented a series of lectures "Upon Astronomy, 'Goethe,' 'Life in the South,' and 'Growth in Italian Art,'" and classes in English grammar, political economy, French, German, and Italian. 35 There is no list of participants, but it is fairly safe to assume that none enhanced her earning power by attending these offerings. Yet, in a little over a decade, this committee would become the primary structure for providing and promoting vocational training for women through the Union.

It is necessary to look at the activities of the Industrial and Employment Committee, therefore, to find the original "industrial" component of the Union's work. The two major achievements of this committee were establishing, first, a "Women's Exchange" and, second,
an "Employment Bureau." The latter was a prototype of today's employment agencies, but concentrated on matching women with situations only in the "higher employments" like teaching and nursing. Later the Bureau added some of the more available jobs open to uneducated women, namely in domestic service. This addition, however, was more to the benefit of desperate employers than to the unemployed.

The Women's Exchange began in 1879 as an agency to sell articles made by women. Originally it was a subcommittee of the Employment Bureau, but it had grown so much by 1880 that it was made a standing committee in its own right, called the Industrial Department. In that year the Exchange adopted the plan of the New York Women's Exchange, which claimed to be the first exchange for women's handwork in the country: it advertised itself and its products, and sold on ten percent consignment homemade bread, cake, preserves, jellies, "etc.," fancy articles, homemade underwear and infants' clothing. Already the Annual Report for that season noted small gifts of support from "Mr. Greenleaf, of the firm Hovey & Co., Mrs. A. M. Diaz [not yet president of the Union], Mr. Durant of the 'Transcript' and $50.00 from Mrs. J. W. James of Boylston Street." In her report, the Committee's Chairwoman declared, "... the Exchange shall become what it is intended, a place where those desiring to support themselves, can be sure to dispose of articles which they make, whether these articles are paintings, ornamental fancy work, useful under-ware [sic], or home-made bread and cake." During its first four-and-a-half months of business, the Exchange
received 1,295 articles from 247 consignors, producing gross sales of $616.06, an impressive achievement, to be sure.

But what class of women benefited from this opportunity to earn some money? Hardly a year went by when the Union failed to address this question in the Annual Report. The answer, they claimed, was all classes. The Union received articles, according to Diaz,

from the woman who comes in her satin and velvet;
from the woman who once rode in her own carriage but who seldom rides now even in a hired carriage;
from the woman who tickles your palate with her cake, preserves, and jellies; from the invalid who strives in the midst of her pain and suffering to make a few articles, that she may keep herself from dependence her few remaining days; from the young lady determined to have a college education, if it can be obtained by industry and energy.38

Although no one at the time noted the exclusion of working-class women from this description, the Union's critics continually questioned the philanthropic value of accepting consignments from wealthy women. The Union, therefore, never stopped defending its rationale for insisting that poor women compete equally with the wealthy for sales. To begin with, they believed this policy to be the only possible approach consistent with the democratic ideal of mutual aid. But they also argued that equal treatment promised to yield concrete rewards for all concerned: "The probably better work of the richer woman will help educate the poorer woman," they maintained. The better work would attract business, thus generating market criticism to spur each woman to her finest efforts. Each would benefit from her own progress, meanwhile ensuring premium
Moreover, for the well-to-do woman to sell her goods alongside the poor woman was a means of reducing class barriers, and making labor honorable. These benefits were far more valuable to the poor in the long run, claimed the Union, than increased profits in the short run.

While the Industrial Committee reported only a small increase in the number of consignors to its exchange, from 446 in 1883 to 525 in 1891, total annual sales rose during this period from $2,963 to $37,559. These data reflect the fact that the Union measured progress in this department in terms of higher standards of quality rather than a higher number of consignors. Limits on display space reinforced the Union's commitment to the educational and motivational value of competition. The object of the Exchange quickly transformed from providing a place where women could dispose of their wares to preparing women to sell on their own.

Throughout the 1880's, the Exchange continually raised the standard of quality on the items it would accept for sale. If a woman could not meet the standards of the committee, she was unlikely to succeed on her own, and might as well pursue some other avenue of employment. The Union's interest in presenting the most impressive image of itself and women's "industrial" abilities should not be overlooked either, for the Exchange was the best public exposure the Union had. As the Union raised its standards, critics raised more questions about the expediency of "democracy" in philanthropic
work. They failed to believe that equal treatment in the name
of mutual aid equally benefited poor and well-to-do women alike,
or that wealthy women ought to be helped at all. The Union, in
return, defended its stand ever more vehemently. In 1890, President
Diaz reiterated, in her strongest words to date, that besides the
fact that "opera tickets, books, and amusements are as necessary
to some as food and clothing to others, ... money-need should
not be made the only consideration ..."

"A community is entitled to the best its members
have to give ..." It has been asked why not
accept inferior work because those who offer it
need money? ... Paying for poor work is charity,
and the Industrial department is not a charity. It
educates in the direction of self-support. The lack
of such education on the part of applicants for
situations, together with their often unreasonable
demands and hopeless inefficiency does much to
cripple the work of our Employment Department.40

It would seem that the WEIU never clearly differentiated between
its mutual aid and philanthropic functions because of its stand
for "democracy" and against charity. In fact, however, the Union's
leaders genuinely believed that mutual aid was the most generous
form of philanthropy they could practice. It is only ironic that
by insisting on equality, the Exchange placed some women in the
position of judging other women's work, thus foreshadowing a patron-
client dynamic soon evident throughout the Union's operations.

Toward the end of the 1880's the Class and Lecture Department
began to shift its emphasis as well. The onset of an international
financial crises fueled the popularity of the manual education
movement and the demand for "practical" subjects. In 1888 the committee chairwoman wrote:

The question is frequently asked our committee, "how can I learn to earn a living?" and they take great pride in believing that it is satisfactorily answered by the yearly increasing demand for and success of the Union Industrial classes.\footnote{41}

As noted before, in its earliest years this committee had served a decidedly elite menu of speakers and courses. Now the Class and Lecture Department became the second place, after the Exchange, that the Union attempted to integrate its industrial and educational functions. The Union did not consider this move a reflection of any heightened sensitivity to class issues; after all it had always advertised its offerings "throughout the shops and places where women [were] employed." Instead the Union considered it a furtherance of its object "to obtain and disseminate true ideas affecting questions of human interest."\footnote{42} As more women needed to earn money, interest grew in any education through which a woman might learn a profitable skill or distinguish herself from the mass of other women seeking employment. "The tendency of the times," remarked the Union's secretary, is quite noticeable in the changing character of the general work of the Class Committee; the demand for classes in purely literary or aesthetic directions is comparatively small, but constantly grows for those dealing with industrial and practical subjects.\footnote{43}

From the Union's point of view, the committee was merely responding to the newest "question of human interest."
As the Union added more "industrial" classes like stenography and mechanical drawing, its leaders must have been pleased. Increased demand for practical subjects suggested that women themselves were realizing the expedition of preparing for self-support. By 1895 the Union could declare, optimistically, if not entirely realistically, "The day has gone by when women are ashamed of earning an honest dollar." Then too, practical offerings attracted a larger number of women to the Union, but more importantly, a different class of women. Many joined in order to take a single course, or earn immediate cash for their handwork, and then left.

At the onset of the 1890's, Union leaders lamented a decline in missionary zeal among the membership. They blamed a greater-than-fifty-percent annual turnover rate for a lack of experience which, they believed, diminished initiative. While the total number of members continued to climb, it seemed that most women now joined to gain the benefits of Union membership more than to further the Union's cause. Its philanthropic function was more alluring than its mutual aid function.

Middle class women probably represented the bulk of this growth; by the mid-1890's about half of the women attending WEIU classes came from the "suburbs." Even if they wanted to, few of these women were in a position to devote their lives to the Union as had many of its charter members. Consequently, larger numbers meant a reduced sense of individual responsibility, and smaller proportion of volunteers for sub-committees, thus increasing the burden on older members.
Displeased by this development, the old guard took measures to cope with the Union's growth in less active membership. In 1895, for example, they stopped requiring that consignors to the Exchange join the Union. Other measures seemed more aimed at maintaining old guard leadership than encouraging widespread participation. Voting policy, for instance, was changed to require a full year's membership before a woman could vote on Union matters. The goal of these changes was to make the amount of privilege received by members contingent on the amount of their contribution to the Union. The result was a growing distinction between those who received Union privileges as members, and those who received benefits as Union clients.

Despite such strategies, some of the old guard nonetheless felt that the Union's operations had become too big and complex for them to effectively manage as untrained volunteers. Longtime chairwoman of the Industrial Department, Mrs. G. D. North, and Union President Abbey Morton Diaz both resigned for this reason in 1891. Although Diaz was 70 years old at the time of her resignation, she retained active and influential involvement in the Union for many more years.
CHAPTER 3:
THE UNION'S TRANSFORMATION

The Decade of the 1890's

In January of 1892, Mary Morton Kehew became the third president of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Boston. Since joining the Union in 1886, Kehew had served on three committees and held two seats on the Board of Directors as Corresponding Secretary and Assistant Treasurer. Severe growing pains resulting from the increase in membership and demand for the Union's services immediately confronted her upon taking office. By plan or by accident, the measures which Kehew took in response to the Union's growth permanently transformed the Union during the decade of the 1890's. A more sophisticated socio-economic analysis than previous presidents had held motivated Kehew to answer the Union's problems in ways which were more responsive to the needs of different classes of women. By the end of the decade, adaptations to modern business practices and notions of "scientific" philanthropy had changed the Union's organizational structure, its relationship to its constituency, and overall perspective on social change.

Two characteristics of new membership made significant impact on the Union. First, the time and energy new members could contribute to the Union did not rise proportionately to the increase in services they demanded. Since the Union could no longer expect volunteers to supply all the labor it needed, it turned to hired workers, thus creating an employer/employee relationship within the WEIU
for the first time. Second, the new members looked to the Union more for instruction and guidance than for society. As a result, a hierarchical relationship based on patron and client roles soon crystalized. Both of these new relationships, in turn, caused the Union to embrace the emergent ideology of modern business efficiency.

The Union's first paid workers were custodians and kitchen staff. Union leaders probably felt a twinge of sadness, mixed with a sense of achievement, at the passage of the old ideal of volunteerism. Yet it is unlikely that they foresaw the full extent of the change they ushered in. These workers marked the beginning of the WEIU's road to professionalization, for being a direct employer placed a new responsibility on the Union. It now had to demonstrate effective management. Order and harmony within the Union depended on it, as did the solvency necessary to pay workers their wages.

The Exchange had been a practice ground for business operations for over a decade but now the Union as a whole was a business and had to conduct itself as one.

The growing demand for industrial education coincided with the advent of the women's club movement. The social activities of the WEIU had served the function of a women's club for twenty years before women's clubs came into full-bloom as a national movement in the 1890's. The Union had always maintained a wise policy of weeding out less expedient programs to make room for new experiments or the continued growth of priority endeavors. With the spread of the women's clubs, the Union saw an opportunity to cut back
its social and cultural activities, and devote more attention to industrial education. Lectures on labor relations, child culture for nursemoids, and domestic science now replaced talks on Shakespeare and romanticism. As the WEIU’s education function grew, it hired more lecturers and instructors from outside the Union. More formal teaching arrangements sharply differentiated the roles of teacher and student among the many women who passed through the Union’s doors.

One of the same trends which popularized the industrial education movement of the late nineteenth century, namely the systematization of production, also popularized the pursuit of efficiency in all aspects of business and domestic labor. Rationalization of its operations was the obvious answer to the Union's own growth problems, but it was also necessary, first, to maintain support of business-minded benefactors, and, second, to understand modern business practices well enough to teach them. In this respect, the 1890's was a time of transition between a Union which looked backward to traditional values and a Union which acknowledged the realities of the new industrial order. A decision in 1889 to devote more attention to sewing instruction now became central to the Union's effort to expand and rationalize its educational programs. Since this process of institution building illuminates the greater changes manifested in the Union's operations during this period, it is worth reviewing in some detail, but it is perhaps wiser to examine the context of these changes first.
Modern business practices developed as a function of the rationalization of production and the resulting growth of corporate structures. Their development confronted the WEIU in two ways, first as an opportunity, and second as a challenge. As an opportunity, they opened new avenues to female wage seekers. Growing bureaucracies and the explosion of the retail and advertising industries expanded the service sector of the job market by creating an increasing demand for clerical and sales workers. This demand, in turn, represented an opportunity to diversify women's jobs. An actual boom in clerical and sales jobs did not occur until the early twentieth century. Yet a trend in this direction was already making itself felt in the 1890's. With the deterioration of factory conditions, and the undesirability of domestic service, native women glutted the market for teachers. New employments, therefore, spelled better wages for this class of women, but required new training, as well. Here, then, was a challenge for the Union and all others interested in fostering opportunities for the economic independence of women.

In general, trade education, meaning complete preparation for a particular vocation, did not gain popularity in the industrial education movement until the early twentieth century. Even most of the Union's "practical" classes in the late nineteenth century were offered on an individual basis, as opposed to being part of a comprehensive sequence of courses progressing from beginning

* As early as 1869, in fact, Massachusetts manufacturers complained to the state legislature that clerking jobs were attracting too many of the better workers away from manual labor.45
to more advanced levels. The Union already sponsored two trade schools in the 1890's, but these were in the traditional areas of sewing and domestic service, and not the newer employments. These two programs are important, however, as they characterize well the Union's state of transition during this decade. As a step toward the future, they were experiments through which the Union developed its own skills and a model for others of how to build structures for vocational training. As a foot stuck in the past, neither program ultimately succeeded because each was motivated by the reformers' own impressions of society's needs, and not accurate consideration of job market conditions.

As already noted, the institutionalization of sewing instruction at the WEIU illustrates the initial ambiguities in the Union's modernizing effort. It also marks the Union's progression during the 1890's toward professionalization. Throughout the 1880's the Union had offered classes in various kinds of sewing, particularly dressmaking, millinery, plain sewing and buttonholes. In 1888, while English, penmanship, and botany classes were free to Union members, a sewing and buttonhole class was free to all women. Sewing, reformers believed, was the most thoroughly useful and healthy subject they could promote. Sewing and mending one's own clothes was thrifty, and thrift was a potent tonic against poverty. Sewing was, therefore, a particularly valuable skill for poor women; but as a means of self-support to fall back upon, it provided valuable financial security for all classes of women. By the late nineteenth
century, however, many girls grew up without learning how to sew at home, either because their mothers worked in factories or because they had servants who did the sewing. On a more abstract level, as a traditional skill which epitomized woman's worth, sewing offered stability to a society which seemed to be rapidly destabilizing due to lack of social continuity.

As part of a wider effort to promote sewing in Boston, therefore, the WEIU decided in 1889 to begin a system of progressive instruction in sewing. In its enthusiasm to offer some form of complete trade education, though, the Union advocated sewing as an actual vocation, and not just a valuable skill for hard times. In 1890 the Union began offering afternoon and evening classes in various levels of sewing. In the same year, it opened a Mending Bureau to provide its students with practice and a real opportunity to earn money by taking in work from the public. * Already in 1891 the Union reported that a number of women were now able to make a living by dressmaking and millinery, and, in fact, some were even teaching the skill in working girls' clubs. 46 An evening class began that year, but could not accommodate the number of women wishing to take advantage of it. In 1892, dressmaking classes came into vogue, replacing interest once given language and painting classes. The Union's Annual Report attributed this sudden popularity to the international economic crisis then descending upon the people of

*The Mending Bureau was also one of the Union's numerous efforts to alleviate the servant problem.
Boston, although, as the Crisis worsened, attendance dropped for all classes.

In 1895, after a six year buildup, the Union established a formal Training School in Dressmaking and Millinery. It hired a young graduate of Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, New York, one of the nation's first and foremost manual training schools for boys and girls, as head instructor and administrator of the program. Soon it managed to enlist the services of a prominent Boston embroidery artist as well. The following year, the Training School enrolled 342 pupils, started a special class to do custom work, and asked Pratt to send another teacher. Despite this heavy enrollment, few students followed the program from start to finish. Some dropped out to take free apprenticeships rather than pay for higher instruction. The Union, which had once argued for vocational education as a mere substitute for the more "natural" but dying apprenticeship system, now argued that apprenticeships were inferior to structured classes because they were not "scientific" enough. But the Union acknowledged that as it improved its methodology, its sewing and millinery school became less affordable to those who supposedly needed it most.

In 1901 the School held its first formal graduating exercises for three graduates of the full course. It then began to offer a Normal course for post graduates which involved teaching in the lower grades. The normal course crowned the Training School program, making it a complete educational structure.
Despite the school's failure ever to graduate a significant proportion of its students, several aspects of its development deserve emphasis. First, this was the Union's premier attempt to teach an industrial subject in a gradually advancing series of classes. This was a new way of teaching vocational skills, and still very much an experiment. As such, it forced the Union to rely heavily on innovation and the Pratt model, since New York was on the forefront of the sewing instruction movement. However, either the spectacle of Pratt's success in this area, or the comfort of tradition swayed the Union to an unwise decision in concentrating its resources on sewing instruction. For in doing so, the Union turned a deaf ear on the warning of its own Protection Committee which reported as early as 1890:

"... there is a very great number of unemployed in the city, which partly is due to the closing of many large shops, tailoring establishments, etc. Garments are sent to New York to be made there under contract as cheaper than when made in Boston."

In 1915 the Union would finally acknowledge its mistake in a report by its Research Department. Second, the Union attempted to integrate its educative and industrial functions by utilizing the Mending Bureau and other order work as shop experience for its students. This combination reflected a popular trend toward experiential learning among educators, but also the Union's increasing emphasis on practical education taught under more realistic conditions. Third, the Training School was only one example of ways in which the Union's work was becoming both too time-consuming and technically advanced for untrained volunteers to manage. In the 1890's, consequently,
the Union began hiring not only manual laborers, but experts as well. Finally, when the Union's demand for experts exceeded the ready supply, it began training its own.

The Union's Exchange is another example of how "village values" persisted amidst the WEIU's attempts to become more responsive to contemporary economic conditions. Throughout the 1890's the Union maintained its philosophy which tended to favor the handwork of middleclass and wealthier women, but it also made special efforts to somewhat equalize opportunity for particularly "worthy" individuals. At times the Union provided materials and instructions to give women with no capital an opportunity to get started. And although its general policy was to encourage consignors to become independent of the Union after a year or so, it allowed one invalid woman to remain a consignor year after year since she was incapable of running her own business.

In its expanding role as a training ground for would-be home producers, the Industrial Department relied not only on the educative value of competition, though, it took on an advising function as well. The Women's Exchange became the "Handcraft Shop," a name meant to imply "workshop" as much as "store." The Bureau advised women on how to produce a more saleable product -- sometimes suggesting a change in product altogether -- and trained them in modern business practices. It no longer allowed women to use the Union as an outlet for their goods without becoming familiar with how to make and keep business agreements, maintain account books, and calculate
costs and benefits. To this end, the Industrial Department sponsored workshops for its consignors on such subjects as design and color, and quantity buying of materials.

A question remains, however, whether this form of "industrial education" could, as the Union believed, lead the majority of women whom the Union encouraged to an independent livelihood as a consignor or shopkeeper. Moreover, were modern business practices enough to keep the small shop a viable economic unit, or was it already an obsolete ideal for most craftspeople in American society, an old fortress meant to safeguard the village value of entrepreneurship, but itself indefensible against the advance of big business? This is a question the Union was slow to address.

Both the increasingly pragmatic tone of the WEIU's work after 1890, and the tendency toward a service relationship instead of mutual aid reflected, along with economic changes, the new socio-economic analysis which Kehew brought to the Union.

While Diaz was a strong advocate of vocational education, her overall perspective on the nature of poverty was a rather simplistic one, though typical of the comfortable, native-born reformers of her generation. Diaz held a greater faith than Kehew in the justice and efficiency of capitalist economics; this faith manifested itself in the popular concept of "worthy" and "unworthy" poor. Like her predecessor, Harriet Clisby, Diaz was convinced that work alone was a cure for poverty, since the free enterprise system
assured that economic rewards were distributed on the basis of merit. Consequently, her notion of worthy and unworthy poor corresponded respectively with those who would and would not succeed by their own labor once given some direction, or, at most, a discreet boost over a temporary financial embarrassment. The first were not generally people born into poverty. Rather, the worthy poor were those of "good stock" who suddenly found themselves in financial need by no fault of their own, like those recently widowed or orphaned. The unworthy poor, by contrast, were those of irredeemably bad character who lacked the moral and motivational base to make them responsive to reform efforts. Diaz exposed the central thesis of her reform ideology when she exclaimed in 1885:

How are those lost to be saved? By making them think. "Smith's Wealth of Nations" says of the degraded classes: "Thought will show them where they are, and awaken desire to escape."

Diaz completely assumed the identity of moral and financial condition, and enlightenment and salvation, and from these inferred a connection between educability and worthiness as well. This was certainly a convenient notion, since those less likely or easily saved were, by definition, less worthy of efforts on their behalf. It follows, then, that the Union under Diaz spent little of its resources combatting the causes of entrenched poverty and economic inequality, but instead concentrated on helping the relatively fit become more fit for self-support.
Kehew was a prominent advocate of vocational education as well, but understood the causes of poverty to be more complex and systemic than notions of "worthy" and "unworthy" poor implied. Working women, Kehew argued, faced numerous disadvantages as a group because of their position in the economy, not merely because of individual misfortunes and character flaws. Helping women enter the workforce was not enough; conditions within the workplace and society at large needed reform. She did not view Diaz's village values as "wrong," rather as inadequate for solving current problems.

While Diaz believed that employers and employees shared an interest in efficient production and decent working conditions, Kehew had little faith that a natural harmony between the two awaited only the enlightenment of each as to its cooperative role. Kehew believed in the necessity of organizing labor. She herself was a labor activist and organizer, a founder of the Union for Industrial Progress, and first president of the National Women's Trade Union League. Although Kehew sometimes used the Union's resources (e.g. facilities) to advance labor unionism, the WEIU as a whole remained relatively neutral on the subject. Kehew did manage, however, to create an association of Union employees with an official voice in policy decisions concerning working conditions and terms of employment, and providing insurance against sickness and injury.
Another major difference between Diaz and Kehew was the degree to which they trusted capitalism to reward labor equitably. Diaz wrote of the Union in 1889, "...we are applying Christianity by equalizing opportunities (not possessions) and by ignoring class and sect boundaries..." By "ignoring" class boundaries rather than attempting to eradicate them, the Union failed to acknowledge their significance. Despite Diaz's claim, the WEIU did little to equalize opportunity during her presidency because it assumed that equality of opportunity was already an essential virtue engendered by free enterprise. Instead of trying to equalize opportunity, Diaz's Union tried to equalize its outcome by improving each woman's fitness to compete economically. By underestimating the complexity of economic stratification and the causes of poverty though, Diaz relied too heavily on class-blind "democracy" as a corrective. It was this error which led her to believe, for instance, that equal treatment of a poor woman's handwork would help her to become economically self-sufficient through motivation and practice alone.

Judging from her influence on the Union, Kehew had a different understanding of the causes of poverty and unemployment. Economic stratification was not just the product of individual failings to negotiate the system. Nor was it the fault of imperfect adherence to capitalist theory; but rather, it was the direct result of capitalist industrialization itself. It is unclear just how critical Kehew was of capitalism, but she was certainly in favor of government intervention to soften its negative effects. As Kehew saw it,
the education and organization of workers was crucial to improving their condition, but it was not enough. Under Kehew's influence, the Union turned to social welfare legislation, much of it protective, to mitigate the harshness of industrial reality upon the lives of working class women and children.

In so doing, the Union was, in effect, acknowledging for the first time that a class of disadvantaged workers existed in Boston, and not simply a collection of poor individuals. Yet, there was very little information about the exact nature of the working conditions, health, tenement life, and other aspects of these laborers' existence. The field of social science was in its infancy, so very little data was yet collected that was of use to the Union. If Kehew is remembered for being a "more realistic" reformer than most, it is largely because she appreciated the need for scientific research to inform her actions. One of the most important impacts Kehew had on the Union, and -- more significantly -- the field of social science itself, was to promote socio-economic research as a regular function of the Union's work.

Once the WEIU conceived of the poor as a class having special problems which required special solutions, the ideal of mutual aid lost much of its relevance to the Union's goals in reform. Instead, it became more effective as it became more willing to give special treatment to meet special needs and attacked causes of poverty outside the individual. During her first decade in office,
Kehew had changed the Union's way of thinking and its way of operating. She had organized the Union into an effective structure capable of coordinating its activities internally, as well as with outside entities. She developed in it a good foundation for further professionalization, which, among other things, made research and effective legislative work possible. Because of its professional aspirations and already impressive accomplishments, the WEIU commanded the respect and attention of philanthropists, educators, and businessmen, paving the way for the numerous successful collaborations which followed. Although the Union continued to suffer from growing pains, the 1890's constituted a transition period during which Kehew prepared the Union to accomplish the more vital contributions it made to social and economic reforms during the early twentieth century.

A Professional Union

By the time the WEIU entered the new century, the process of Union professionalization was well underway. As the Union's industrial education programs advanced, they required trade education specialists and full-time professional staff and administrators. The more manual laborers the Union hired, the more professional its managerial personnel needed to be. Even in departments which did not employ paid labor, professional business standards and a growing need for expertise called for paid managers and advisors.
Professionalization was the combined result of undertaking more practical work and aspiring to a higher level of organization. It was this process which made the 1890's significant in the WEIU's history. For as the nature of Union leadership changed, so too changed the nature of the Union's work. Specialists brought a new perspective to the Union which impelled developments in the twentieth century beyond those directly called for by the forces which had first stimulated the trend toward professionalization. In this respect, the Union became not only an example of, but a driving force in the development of social science research out of social reform during the Progressive era.

In 1905, the 25th anniversary of the WEIU's incorporation, Kehew discussed in some detail the Union's state of change from volunteer to paid workers. She began by commemorating the Union's volunteer origins. "At the outset," she explained:

> volunteer service offered the best realization of the Union's purpose. The work itself, not yet grown to unwieldy proportions, was well adapted to claim and hold the interests of committees . . . . These women, burning with belief in the Union adventure, accomplished what paid workers, untouched by their fire, could never have done in laying for the Union deep and lasting foundations. 50

She went on to describe the development that had taken place, primarily since she herself had taken office: "The magnitude of the change in conditions since those early years challenges attention," she wrote:

> The Union today presents the unique spectre[sic] of a business that employs one hundred and twenty paid workers and yields yearly receipts of more
than $168,000.00, conducted by one hundred different women, distributed among a Board of Government and sixteen standing committees. 51

After explaining how the Union's growth, together with the increased demand for trained workers, had necessitated the employment of technical experts as teachers and shop supervisors, she discussed the current transition to professionals at the executive level. Obviously making an effort to mediate tensions between the new, young professionals and the intensely devoted, but aging old guard, Kehew accentuated the positive aspects of the redefined role of volunteer workers:

This change offers to Union committees the opportunity to grow out of the executive duties that in the beginning absorbed their energy and thought, into responsibilities administrative and advisory. Hereafter, not to bear the burden of the actual details, but, freed from that, to conserve time and strength in order to vitalize the work of the departments and the paid workers, and give it far-sighted direction, is the possible service of these committees. 52

What Kehew said about the new "administrative and advisory" role of older volunteers, however, was not merely empty words to placate them. In fact, the Union for several years suffered from a shortage of women qualified for executive leadership, since, Kehew lamented, "... industrial possibilities are barely beginning to compel the attention of women trained in colleges and technical schools." Instead, she explained, "the current of their inclinations still sets in the direction of academic work with adherence to theory rather than to practical application." 53 Consequently, the Union found it difficult to locate women both trained and motivated to
meet its complex leadership needs, and so, she said, it would train its own. Like her predecessors, who always kept an eye on the past while accelerating the Union forward, Kehew declared that volunteers contributed to this training, "the force of tradition and precedent, emphasis of the Union purpose, [and] the collective judgement formed by the fusion of many and diverse elements."54

Nonetheless, this change in leadership appears to have caused significant distress in the Union, for two years later, Kehew again pleaded with all to maintain "forbearance, frankness, sympathy, and the broad outlook to grasp essentials," and expressed concern over the impact of the transition upon older members: "The perplexity of retaining, in an advisory capacity, the interest of committee members who have been used until recently to consider and to do executive detail is real and serious," she wrote.55 Yet by this time it was already obvious that the professionalization of the Union, just as its growth, was inevitable, and any adverse sentiment among older members was not going to halt this transformation. In those same two years the Union had doubled its number of paid workers to 230, and had recruited and trained leaders of "exceptional ability" to head half of its departments. Now paid workers outnumbered unpaid workers by about fifty percent.

As the Union grew and took an ever-increasing interest in trade education, it carried out more investigations into working conditions and topics relevant to home manufacturing. Finally,
in 1905, the Union established its Research Bureau to make social economic investigations a priority in the Union's work. That year the Union had underway, or planned to conduct, investigations ranging from the "working conditions of women and children under present factory legislation" to "The Cost of Homemade and Prepared Food."\(^{56}\)

The work of the Research Bureau made the WEIU a pioneer in the field of social science investigation. Since this new discipline had only recently developed out of the "scientific philanthropy" movement of the Progressive era, there was, as of yet, no formal methodology or graduate training at hand. In 1907 the Union hired Susan M. Kingsbury, a recent Ph. D. recipient from Columbia, to direct the Bureau. Kingsbury had already begun to make a name for herself as a social researcher, having conducted an investigation for the Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education in 1905-06 in relation to children in industries.\(^{57}\) While she continued her research through the Bureau, she simultaneously taught economics at the newly established Simmons College. In 1915 Kingsbury left Boston to direct the first graduate department of Social Economics and Social Research in the nation at Bryn Mawr. Through the Bryn Mawr program, Kingsbury developed the first graduate level curriculum in social science, but her work at the Union gave her the opportunity to first develop her teaching and field-study methods. Much of the work Kingsbury supervised at the Union was performed by graduate students from the area to whom the Union awarded research fellowships.
Consequently, the Union itself provided field training and publishing experience for the "new generation of college women" entering the field of social science before formal graduate programs existed.

The Research Bureau, therefore, brought the Union into cooperation with colleges. While investigating business conditions and job opportunities for women, the Union also gained important insights and connections in the business world, which helped to vitalize its trade education efforts. In addition, the information generated by the Bureau's research, published in a multitude of pamphlets and books, became the basis for increased legislative activities. Finally in 1908, the Union elevated the legal aspect of its work by creating a Standing Legislative Committee. Both the Research Bureau and the Legislative Committee made significant gains in their respective areas, and earned the Union a reputation for the professional quality of their work. Local and state authorities utilized the information generated by the Research Bureau to formulate policies and plan trade schools.

When there was a demand for trade schools for girls in certain cities in Massachusetts, the services of the Union's research students were enlisted to study the labor conditions in these centers. Upon these conditions depended the decision as to what kind of trade school was needed. 58

Numerous organizations, including labor unions, coalitioned with the Legislative committee to lobby for various causes.
While the Union became more political and committed to helping the working class, it also developed cooperative ties with businesses in Boston. Although Kehew broadened the Union's range of reform activities, she did not reduce its efforts to prepare women for the work world as it existed. On the contrary, she encouraged the development of more realistic trade school programs which proved more effective in training women in means of self-support. In the Dressmaking and Millinery School the Union finally made a distinction between classes for homemakers and classes for future wage earners, reducing the discrepancy between its own expectations and those of its pupils. In 1905 it added a class for grammar school graduates in "machine-made hat frames" which aimed to "fit young girls . . . to make hat frames with the help of newly patented wire-frame machine." There is no record of the outcome of this class, but it is clear that the Union had studied the matter before deciding to proceed with the project, as it is evident by this explanation in the Annual Report: "This is a new trade that promises light, cleanly work, unusually high pay and a long season to skilled workers." 59

For better and for worse, much of the Union's "business" activities, such as its trade schools, received the assistance of advisors from the business community. By 1905 the Union had professional business people to advise its Lunch Rooms, Food Sales Room, Handwork Department, Domestic Reform League, and Business Agency. The Union took these interactions with business very seriously. In all its
departments it constantly strove to live up to the standards of a well-run business, for the sake of efficiency and effectiveness, and to retain the respect of the local business community. In 1908 Kehew made clear the lofty expectations she held for the Union's relationship to the business world:

Another phase of the growing receipts in business departments should not be overlooked, i.e. the added weight which the larger volume of business gives the Union in its study and endeavor to cooperate with employees in allied trades. Every step toward the ranks of the major business enterprises puts it in possession of just so much more power to study business conditions and influence to command a hearing when it speaks.

With advice from business people, the Union organized two "Trade School Shops" in 1905 in cooperation with the Boston Trade School for Girls, and a third a few years later. These shops, Millinery, Children's Clothing, and Dressmaking, were designed to provide slower Trade School girls with experience under actual business conditions to supplement their class training and prepare them for self-support. Through a unique arrangement with the Boston School Committee, the girls were paid for their work. Meanwhile, through cooperation with Simmons College, these shops became laboratories for students of the College's normal courses for vocational school teachers.

Collaboration between the Union, businesses and schools multiplied almost geometrically during the first decade of the twentieth century as the Union opened more trade schools and made informal arrangement
for cooperatively training individual students. Before long, practically every department of the Union was affiliated in some way with a branch of business or education, if not both. Departments reorganized their filing systems to provide efficient sources of information for the Union’s own research students. The Union’s kitchens took on interns wishing to learn skills ranging from institutional kitchen management to catering. The Research Bureau used the kitchens for several studies simulating food production by both restaurants and home producers. The Lecture Committee displayed its prowess in industrial matters by holding a special series of three lectures on "Scientific Management" entitled "Definition of the Province of Industrial Engineering" by Mr. Charles Buxton Going, editor of "Engineering News;" "Scientific Management" by Mr. Frederick Winslow Taylor, ex-president of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers; and "Limitations in Organization" by Mr. Russell Robb of Stone and Webster.  

The epitome of the Union’s collaborative efforts, though, was its School of Salesmanship organized in 1905. The Union arranged with Boston’s Girl’s High School for thirty-five girls to be released from their regular school to attend classes at the Union in "the study of arithmetic, and practical business principles, growth and manufacture of fabrics, [and] theory of salesmanship." Besides taking field trips to shops and factories, the girls all worked a number of hours each week behind the counters of Boston department stores to supplement their in-class training.
Five department stores, Jordan Marsh, Wm. Filene's Sons, James A. Houston, Gilchrist, Shepard, and Norwell, convinced of the program's worth, provided these jobs and a guarantee of permanent employment at the completion of the course. When a $3 per week wage proved "too slow to attract mature enough girls," the stores agreed to pay a minimum of $6 the following term. A later study found that graduates of the program earned wages and commissions far higher than average saleswomen. Jordan Marsh and Filene's were pleased enough with the School's results that both contributed to the school's support.

In 1909 the Union reported:

So great has been the interest in this Salesmanship training outside Boston, that the Union has had a variety of demands from stores in other cities to supply teachers. As a result, a normal class was started September, 1909, in cooperation with Simmons College. The latter provides the theoretical training; the Union offers the practical knowledge and practice work in salesmanship, sewing and Children's Dressmaking, and millinery.

Also in its 1909 Report, the Union noted that its numerous affiliations with other educational agencies was "the most noticeable fact of the past year. . . ." The Union's growing connection with educational institutions and experiments in and about Boston now involves four colleges, a school committee, and two experiments in trade and vocational training. Among the Union's trustees were the presidents of Mount Holyoke and Wellesley, and the Deans of Radcliffe and Simmons. The Research Department supported four
fellowships that year, distributed among students at Columbia, Radcliffe, Simmons, and Wellesley.

The Union's affiliation with Simmons College was particularly conspicuous, probably because Kehew served as a trustee to the school for several years after it opened in 1902. The following tables from the Union's 1912 Report demonstrate the extent of the two institutions' involvements, and the Union's thrifty and creative use of its own various resources.

**Affiliations With Simmons College**

I. Simmons College Courses in Household Economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Shop</td>
<td>Institutional Management Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handwork Shop</td>
<td>Seminar Students in Economic Research for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch Rooms</td>
<td>New England Kitchen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Women's Educational and Industrial Union

Normal Courses for Vocational School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade School Shops</td>
<td>Economics of Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Clothing</td>
<td>Industrial Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millinery</td>
<td>Business Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressmaking</td>
<td>Needle Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class in Salesmanship</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Women's Educational and Industrial Union

Apprenticeship Training*

[* may include courses taken in Radcliffe and Wellesley Colleges, Boston University and Massachusetts Institute of Technology.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Student Workers In Appointment Bureau</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Shop</td>
<td>Secure practical training in departments, taking at the same time either related course in a college or field work, 1911-1912 students took courses in Simmons and Radcliffe colleges. 1912-1913 students are studying in Simmons College and Boston University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Thrift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarian Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1912 Mary Schenk Woolman, founder of the Manhattan Trade School for Girls, became the first paid and professionally educated president in the WEIU's history. Before her resignation, Kehew reflected on the growth of the Union to its current stature:

At the time of its organization the concerted impulse toward social and civil betterment that has been given since by Settlements, Clubs, and Committees and other organizations did not exist; ... Industrial and trade classes, investigations into industrial conditions, legal aid, protection, befriending, and many 'neighborly offices' that it renders are phases of its activity that partake of the character of the work [now] done by various organizations and settlements ... It is a non-resident settlement, a Women's Exchange, and a Woman's Club all embodied in one organization, all vitalized by the spirit of service ... The business departments have a three-fold purpose — Educational-Industry, Industrial-Education, interpreted in terms of Social-Economics.

What Kehew failed to note was that the professionalization of the Union had, by then, thoroughly displaced the old ideal of mutual aid, and dream of an association of all women. In its development,
the Union had mirrored the phases of the industrial education movement: it first advocated some general manual training for all people as a foundation for social stability. As it developed more complete and relevant trade education programs, the Union aimed its training at a more limited sector of society.

There is no question that the WEIU's professionalization places it within the definition of a social reform organization practicing social control. But it is difficult to see anything actually lost to this process, other than the hope for a harmonious, classless society, the means to which the Union never even approached realistically conceptualizing. In actuality, the Union's classes may have become less general in their appeal, but they had originally excluded the types of women they now helped. If they did not radically attack the existing class structure, they at least aided a significant number of individual women to increase their earning power.

As important as any benefits the Union made to the working class, though, it did much for college-educated women and the field of social science. The Research Bureau of the WEIU was more than a resource to graduate students lacking university programs. It devised methods of investigation which were copied throughout the country, and made significant contributions to a growing understanding of industrial conditions. Most importantly, though, the Women's Educational and Industrial Union was one of those organizations during the Progressive era which convinced the reform community
of the necessity for rational organization and "scientifically" accurate information. In so doing, the Union led the way for women, first in public reform activities, and finally — far beyond the boundaries of woman's traditional sphere — in the professional field of social science.
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