

Bridging Differences in Culture and Class: The Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers in Industry

Ellen Durrigan Santora
University of Alabama

For women, the years following World War I were indeed changing times. New challenges and opportunities came with successive waves of immigration, industrialization, urbanization, and democratization. For some women, the times throbbed with the pain of social and economic injustice; for others, it pulsed with the possibilities afforded by increased opportunities for higher education and the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment. Between 1900 and 1920, the percentage of women working outside the home had increased from 18.8 to 24 percent.¹ During the same period, college educated, middle and upper class women began to move into the public sphere proclaiming their mission as social workers and social reconstructionists.

In 1921, at the initiative of the President and Board of Trustees of Bryn Mawr College, the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers in Industry began its first session. The school offered young working women an education "in order that they may widen their influence in the industrial world, help in the coming social reconstruction and increase the happiness and usefulness of their own lives."² During the seventeen years of its residency at Bryn Mawr, the school represented, in every aspect of its program, a meeting of laboring and privileged classes.

Just as its cross-class coalition defined the administration of the school, so too did cultural diversity characterize the school's working class students. Women workers came from the Northeast, the Far West and the South, from the North Central States, the Mountain States, and the Appalachian region. They represented a cross section of both old and new immigrants -- Russians, Scandinavians, Italians, Lithuanians, Poles, Austrians, Rumanians, Czechs, Slovaks, and Eastern European Jews in addition to Scots, Irish, and English.³ African-American women were admitted for the first time in 1926.⁴ There were both union members and those who were not.⁵ Representing more than forty-eight different trades, some were employed as waitresses and laundresses, while others worked for railroads, munitions factories, garment makers, and the tobacco industry; half worked in the needle and textile trades.⁶ A few came with a high school education; others had not attended school past the eighth grade. A handful were married, most were single.⁷ In addition to diversity in hometowns, ethnicity, and work situations, students also represented a spectrum of political persuasions ranging from communism and leftist-oriented labor activism to conservative, family-oriented, Christian evangelism.⁸ As a result, for many the Summer School was a time for connecting their own experiences and perspectives with those of others.

As a middle class white teacher, my interest in the Summer School for Women Workers came from my own experience in teaching racially and ethnically diverse students and my special concern for the way in which traditional teaching seemed to exclude female students from full participation in both history-social science classes and society as a whole. When I first viewed *The Women of Summer*, a documentary about the school, as a female history teacher I was drawn to the cultural diversity within this community,

the sense of empowerment felt by its alumnae, and especially to its shared understandings and habits of critical inquiry.⁹ Could it provide historical clues to the preparation of culturally diverse students for increased participation in the political, social, and economic communities in which they lived and worked? Could it bear lessons that would increase female participation in a discipline too often dominated by male students? What constituted the seemingly instinctive ability of the school's director, Jane Worthington Smith, and her staff to promote cross-cultural communication as a method of democratic empowerment? What resources were used to bridge barriers of class, ethnicity, and political persuasion, and in so doing create a sense of empowerment, unity and cross-cultural solidarity?¹⁰

Background

The first two decades of the twentieth century were times of great change. The rapid industrialization and urbanization of American society created tensions over extremes of wealth and poverty, a gendered division and hierarchy of waged labor, race and ethnicity and a resulting exclusivity of rights and power both in and out of the workplace. As historical forces, these themes laid the foundations for the Summer School for Women Workers. During this period of great economic expansion, the number of gainfully employed American women doubled reaching approximately ten million by 1918.¹¹ By 1920, 17.2 percent of European American women were employed. Most worked to sustain themselves and their families.¹² Married African-American women were eight times more likely to work than married white women.¹³

By 1900, 75 percent of the nearly 1.25 million female factory workers were foreign born or the daughters of foreign born parents.¹⁴ In part because they were willing to work for lower wages than white workers, these immigrants and their off-spring encountered widespread prejudice extending beyond the workplace into most other areas of their lives. Employers capitalized on this, fragmenting workers' solidarity and decreasing the strength of their unions.¹⁵

Labor activism for women industrial workers lagged well behind that of men. As of 1900, only 2.2 percent of all union memberships were women.¹⁶ The American Federation of Labor locals, handicapped by their vision of a "family wage" and their conviction that a woman's place was in the home, were not amenable to accepting female memberships.¹⁷ In 1903, the Women's Trade Union League (WTUL) was established by middle and upper class, educated women to aid in the formation of unions that would be responsive to the needs of women, particularly immigrant women.¹⁸ With the support of the WTUL, between 1909 and 1915 women garment workers of the northeast and midwest burst forth with an unprecedented labor militancy ignited by the walkout of from 20,000 to 30,000 young shirtwaist makers, most of them Russian Jewish and Italian women protesting low wages and sweatshop conditions.¹⁹

Women's militancy and the need for protective legislation, highlighted by the 1911 Triangle Shirtwaist Factory Fire in New York City, gave birth to "industrial feminism," a hybrid-vision of political and social change forged in the workplace against unequal conditions of wage and work. Born of women's needs for "bread and roses," industrial feminists insisted on shorter hours, higher wages, safer working condition, medical care, decent and affordable housing, but also meaningful work, access to equal education and culture, and egalitarian relationships. Industrial feminism stood in contrast to the radical and social feminism that belonged to middle and upper class women. Driven by both class and gender consciousness, industrial feminism inextricably linked women's suffrage with working women's needs by seeking political power in order to influence legislation that would alter women's wage and working conditions.²⁰

This was also the time when workers' education took root in America. John Dewey and a loose network of educators, philosophers and intellectuals proclaimed that a new social order was needed, one that would change the way society thinks about issues of equality and justice, ethics and morality. In this new social order, institutions of learning would become models for democratic political and social action. The movement for social justice led by middle class, educated women became a practical extension of Dewey's social reconstructionism. Among its leaders was Jane Addams. Addams's Hull House and Dewey's experimental school at the University of Chicago, engaged in a constant exchange of ideas and personnel. Addams cited Dewey to support her belief that knowledge was useless unless it was related to social action.²¹ Addams encouraged the WTUL to begin a workers' school.²² The WTUL as a cross-class coalition of women labor organizers and educators later became instrumental in formulating plans for the Summer School and providing the backbone of its Joint Administrative Committee.²³ With its work also extending into the arenas of union organization and reform legislation, the WTUL provided the precedent for "sisterhood and solidarity" so important to the success of the Summer School's program.²⁴ The Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) also played a crucial role in the success of the Summer School by setting a tangible precedent for the Summer School's cross-class and interracial cooperation.²⁵

With the beginning of World War I, new opportunities for employment and empowerment in the workplace emerged for all women. By substituting for men in a vast array of employment situations, women were able to challenge the assumptions that had discriminated against them. Many African-American women who had fled the South's oppression during the Great Migration were able to find factory work and could look forward to decent wages and qualified participation in the mainstream of the labor force.²⁶

In spite of the ethnic and racial discrimination and the poor working conditions faced by many industrial workers, women began to feel greater control over the conditions of their waged labor. For some this meant leadership roles within unions and the organization of and participation in more than 6,000 wartime strikes; for others, it was simply a matter of expressing their dissatisfaction by quitting and taking new jobs.²⁷ Although at the end of the war, they were once again forced to the margins by employers and prevented from assuming leadership roles in male-led unions, through their wartime work force participation women ultimately gained fairer standards of employment.

As the first class enrolled at the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers, the spirit of wartime gains for women had already begun to wane. In 1919, a wave of unsuccessful strikes swept the country and the labor movement began its retreat. The "red scare" was driving socialist and communist-inspired leftists, many of whom were associated with labor organizations, underground, and, as a result, progressives were increasingly abandoning reform. Harding's normalcy had replaced Wilsonian idealism.²⁸ Against this picture of racial, ethnic and gender discrimination and labor upheaval, M. Carey Thomas, President of Bryn Mawr College, put forth her vision and Hilda (Jane) W. Smith, who later became Dean of the Summer School, and Rose Schneiderman, President of the Women's Trade Union League of New York, along with others, responded to the call for a summer school for women workers based on an alliance between middle class educated and working class women.

Three Women, Three Sets of Values

M. Carey Thomas, Hilda (Jane) Worthington Smith, and Rose Schneiderman were each vitally aware of her role in the development of the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers. Two of these women were upper/middle class, educated, social reformers and the third was a working class immigrant, industrial feminist, and labor reformer. They each, in her own way, made major contributions to the creation of a community of women that transcended differences in privilege, ideology, and capacity for caring and communicating. Their lives paralleled those of the academic and working class women whom they represented. Their collective story was one of cultural and class differences coalescing to achieve greater political and social empowerment for women.

Born as a privileged member of Baltimore society, M. Carey Thomas saw herself as a feminist who believed that the special qualities of women and their "age-long struggle" for human rights and civil liberties ideally suited them to the creation of a new social order founded on principles of equality and justice. As an intellectual and an academic leader, her personal mission was to cast Bryn Mawr as a leader in the movement for social reconstruction.²⁹ Thomas was an image maker and a legend builder with a visionary's rhetoric. In spite of her inclination to altruism, Thomas was characteristically an elitist who espoused both eugenics and social Darwinism.³⁰ She was, however, ill-prepared for the complexities of a school for industrial workers housed at one of the elite Seven Sister Colleges. As Hilda Worthington Smith reflected, "Miss Thomas didn't realize that a workers' school would plunge Bryn Mawr into the heart of the organized labor movement."³¹

Jane Smith, Thomas's personal choice as the school's second director, was an educator, social worker, poet, and most of all a gentle self-effacing administrator who accepted controversy and conflict, believing they were natural to life and that people had to learn how to live with them.³² Her success with the Summer School was a tribute to her dignity and the respect she held for the dignity and voices of others. Jane Smith endeared herself to all those with whom she worked. Susan Shepherd Sweezy, a former faculty member, characterized her in this way:

Jane was not a reformer. The word is irrelevant. It creates overtones of rigid doctrine, of an aggressive attitude, of an

"I know all the answers" character which is foreign to Jane's approach to life, education and human beings. She did not teach as an educator. She set the stage for real learning by the policies she encouraged, the presence she brought to the Summer School. She trusted people. She believed in the worker students. Most of all, she believed in the right of every human being to an education that was relevant to that person's life. . . .

. . . . The School's openness, breadth, flexibility, were primarily from Jane.³³

These qualities strengthened her as she confronted the cross-cultural complaints and demands of both students and faculty.³⁴

Rose Schneiderman, on the other hand, was an ideologue. One of seven representatives of women workers on the Summer School's Joint Administrative Committee, she was a labor organizer, educator, and industrial feminist. She firmly believed education was a vehicle for the political, social, and economic empowerment of women.³⁵ Born in a small Polish village to Orthodox Jewish parents, she immigrated to New York City's Lower East Side where, from the age of thirteen, she worked to support herself and her family. Her first contact with labor unions brought her into the turbulent world of early 20th century Jewish radicalism.³⁶ To Rose, the essence of trade unionism was "the service of fellowship, the feeling that the hurt of one is the concern of all and that the work of the individual benefits all."³⁷ In 1905, she joined the WTUL as its first worker-member and labor organizer.³⁸ Her goal was to capitalize on this cross-class alliance to empower working women to shape their own working conditions.³⁹

As key members of the Joint Administrative Committee, Hilda (Jane) Worthington Smith and Rose Schneiderman represented the cross-class coalition that grounded the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers and for 17 years, maintained it as a successful program in workers' education for women. Their commitment to subordinate differences in ethnicity, religion and class and to cooperatively engage in a worthwhile pursuit aimed at improving the self image and the leadership skills of poor and immigrant working class women exceeded that of other such cross-class alliances. During the early years of the Summer School program, as issues arose, their ethics of communication and caring transcended the many challenges posed by the school's cultural, socioeconomic, and educational diversity.

Students' Cultural and Political Differences

The Summer School flourished at a time when nativism and assimilationism defined political and educational efforts intended to cope with the demographic and industrial transformation of the nation. Class conflict emerged out of the ashes of unrestrained capitalism. It was, however, also a time when feminism began to look for a more popular identity -- a time when social feminism and industrial feminism confronted the intellectual and class boundaries of radical feminism. It was a time for coalitions of women to place a female agenda before the nation. Those connected with the Summer School hoped to do this by establishing a multicultural educational community of working class women endowed with a consciousness about their roles in a culturally pluralistic democracy.

To accomplish this, the Admissions Committee established enrollment quotas for regions, nationalities, union/non-union affiliation, trade of employment, and race. Outreach committees aggressively recruited "young women of character and ability who ha[d] shown a desire for a fuller education so that they [might] exercise an increasing influence on the social and industrial world."⁴⁰ Using these guidelines, each summer between 100 and 120 women were selected to attend the Summer School.

In the earliest years of the Summer School, approximately two-thirds of the students were American born, with about half of these being first generation. Students born in 25 different countries attended between 1921 and 1927.⁴¹ Beginning in the late 1920s, each summer the school also welcomed a small group of international students primarily from Britain, Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Sweden.⁴² However, in later years the composition of the student body changed. By 1938, only 16 percent were immigrants.⁴³ This reflected a national trend as the number entering the country responded to nativist pressures and restrictive immigration quotas enacted during the 1920s.

This portrait of the school's character begins the process of defining Jane Smith, the school's second director as a cultural democrat.⁴⁴ She delighted in the school's heterogeneity, seeing its diversity as one of its greatest assets. More than fifty years before Gordon Allport⁴⁵ put forth his contact theory, Smith proudly observed the effects working and studying together had on students' initial perceptions of cultural and racial differences. Smith wrote about the problems many of the students initially had in confronting the cultural diversity of the school.

Acute differences of opinion, expressed in all degrees of heated argument, often with angry outbursts of tears, were based on differences of race, previous education, geography, political theory, economic situation, religious background, home life and industrial and labor experience. It existed among workers in the same trade from different parts of the country, and among union workers belonging to opposite factions of the labor movement.⁴⁶

Carmen Lucia confessed to her own biases against others.

We were suspicious of each other because we had a mixture of people who spoke with a drawl, somebody with a Brooklynese accent and some of them who couldn't speak English at all and we thought what in the world kind of place did we come into? . . . maybe I was a little apprehensive and I was a little skeptical because I had suffered from intolerance⁴⁷

On several occasions, Smith told the story of two students, one a mountain girl from Tennessee and the other a Russian who discovered joy in each other's music only after a confrontation that pitted an American's patriotism against a Russian's nostalgia. By the end of the summer, friendly duets were played to the satisfaction of both singers and their audience.⁴⁸ Smith commented that "Controversy burned itself out toward the end of the term when a spirit of understanding glowed more brightly."⁴⁹ Occurring in a supportive and purposefully directed environment, relationships such as these served to erode stereotypes, promote respect for

individual differences, and give value to ethnic diversity.

Smith provided several examples of reconciliation, some of which were a result of her own involvement as a mediator of differing perspectives. Such was the case with Amy, a southern tobacco worker. Sobbing, Amy complained to Smith that the Russians said there was no God. " 'But ain't I prayed to God to let me come to school? And ain't I here? How can them Russians say there ain't no God?'" Smith told of comforting her by briefly explaining the history of the Jewish people and their persecution, their contributions to American life, their devotion to education and their belief in "human brotherhood in some more idealistic order of society." Once Smith was finished, Amy said, "'I reckon some of them furiners might be worth knowin' after all.'"⁵⁰ In this episode Smith modeled her empathy for different perspectives. She demonstrated the understanding and acceptance that knowledge could bring, and she showed how mutual understanding could emerge from an open discussion of conflicting ideas.

While Smith reported much success in mediating cultural differences among white students, the portrait of racial differences is somewhat more complex. First admitted during the summer of 1926, African American students who attended the Summer School willingly crossed boundaries of racial antagonism and opened gates for their own personal victories. Many reflected on the acceptance they experienced; others noted the enduring pains of prejudice. Marjorie Lynch Logan, an African-American hosiery looper who later attended Duke University and went on to become a teacher, said, "When everybody accepted you, you didn't feel any difference. They felt you could achieve and they drew you in. They even thought that I could write some poetry and I worked on a magazine here."⁵¹

As is evidenced in student writings from later years, prejudice persisted in spite of the successful admission and integration of Black women. Ersie Anderson, one of four African-Americans in the Class of 1938, wrote that many whites refused to associate with them.⁵² Mildred Olenio, who attended during the Summer of 1930, later wrote:

I befriended a colored girl and invited her to my sitting room which I shared with a girl from Winston-Salem, North Carolina. I was blissfully ignorant of racial prejudice at that time -- wouldn't even have known the meaning of the words. But my roommate being from the South took me aside and laid the law down, "Don't ever let her in here again! Not unless you want to be called 'nigger-lover!'" I remember that I didn't want to be called such a name but I couldn't understand why the color of her skin should stand in the way of our friendship.⁵³

Cross-cultural relationships between African-American and White students appear to have suffered from many of the same complexities that existed in the society as a whole.

Diversity was also a factor in the relationship between Bryn Mawr students who served as tutors and the school's working class students. One of Thomas's main reasons for proposing the Summer School was to open an avenue for Bryn Mawr's "winter students" to learn about social service through purposeful contacts with working class women. Initial contact between the two groups of young women prompted strange reactions. "Ignorant questions,

often asked in good faith, were sometimes misunderstood, and caused the two groups to be suspicious of each other." In most cases, as the summer progressed, tensions eased, and a mutual respect gradually emerged between the two groups of students. Smith reported the reactions of one undergraduate. "I never saw people eat up classes, as these girls do' . . . 'It makes me feel ashamed to think that I've had three years of college, and never stopped to think it was a privilege.'"⁵⁴ This gratified Smith who might have envisioned Bryn Mawr students following in her own footsteps, finding the same satisfaction she had found as a social worker, teacher, and activist.

To see our undergraduates become aware of their economic world through the eyes of our industrial workers, and begin to consider the part they might later play in social reconstruction seemed to me an education invaluable for any college student.⁵⁵

The Summer School students were also forced to confront ideological differences. Many students were actively involved in leftist movements and were schooled in the reality of a class struggle. When they entered the school, they came with their mission in tow, and as a result showed little patience or understanding of those unaware of the relationship between capitalism and class oppression. According to Smith, this could cause "emotional sparks to fly."⁵⁶ Antagonisms were at their worst between non-unionized southern students and unionized students from the northeast. The southern women were often horrified by the coarseness of union members' critique of societal conditions; whereas union members looked on the southerners with contempt for their naiveté.⁵⁷ One union activist remarked of her concern for "the status and backwardness among many students who came from all over the country who never heard about the class struggle."⁵⁸

The mixing of unionized and nonunionized workers awakened many students to the existence of ideological and social conflict. Through the lens of a unionist, Mary Kerewsky Friedman described her changing views of the nation's workers. She spoke of ultra conservatives and extreme radicals within the student body and of the awakening of "these working girls" to "the thought of capitalism and explantation [sic] of the working class."⁵⁹ Mildred Olenio wrote from the perspective of an unemployed Massachusetts woman.

I heard class discussion pointing out injustices in employment practices . . . when I was encouraged to participate in these discussions I would simply state that I had no complaints against anyone. This is misconstrued to mean that I approved of the injustices and I was jokingly referred to as the "Capitalist."⁶⁰

During the 1921 Summer School session, Smith recalled that students had been warned by union leaders that the school was financed and influenced by industrial capitalists. When students asked, after seeing Rockefeller Hall, if the famous industrialist owned the school, the Executive Committee, anticipating the problems this might cause, brought the students together. Smith described that meeting: "They didn't know where the money came from. They thought it was tainted money, and we had a meeting on

money And we decided it was more important where it went than where it came from."⁶¹ In what we know of this incident, Smith, with the primacy of the school's mission in mind, pragmatically and cleverly succeeded in redirecting students' attention to the benefits gained from the "tainted money" of capitalist barons.

Some of the students who entered the Summer School were avowed Communists. Jane Smith noted, "We always had eight or ten Communists in the school -- we wanted them, I mean they were very stimulating to the other students so we had small groups of communist members." These students often asserted their Marxism with great forcefulness. The effect of the school's openness softened the leftist tendencies of some and strengthened the commitment of others. One avowed communist woman said, "Well, when I go back to California, I'm going to spend all of my energy in the YWCA. They're doing the best job anywhere."⁶² Indeed the more conservative Industrial Clubs of the Y sharply contrasted with the revolutionary sentiments of communism. In contrast, another "radical" student was critical of the school as she commented about students' preparation for "social reconstruction."

What I do miss in Bryn Mawr is a real proletarian atmosphere which I expected to find here at Bryn Mawr, the institution for industrial girls where a workers' ideology is so essential. I find the prevailing bourgeois traditions and customs, which are contrary to all the teaching in the classes.⁶³

Generally, however, students described such confrontations in terms of their "struggle to listen and to weigh the views of others."⁶⁴ Ida Tarbell remarked in a *Colliers* article, "If there is one word that just sizzles on this campus, it is the word 'tolerance'."⁶⁵

Resolving Crucial Administrative Problems

During the winter of 1921, M. Carey Thomas, Hilda (Jane) Worthington Smith, and Ruth Schneiderman came together with academics, alumnae, representatives of women's organizations and women labor leaders in Thomas's home, the Deanery of Bryn Mawr, to plan a Summer School for Women Workers. Each came with a social consciousness that sought transformation, albeit in different ways: Thomas through the empowerment of educated women of privilege, Smith through voices gained as a result of community responsibility, and Schneiderman through the solidarity of working women as political activists.

The Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers was considered an "unconventional experiment."⁶⁶ Neva Deardorff discussed the nature of the experiment in her 1921 address at the National Conference on Workers' Education.

That [the use of the Summer School as a model] is what we regard as our great experiment Whether two groups of people -- the academic people with all their faults and their good intentions; the workers group with its point of view -- whether you can actually bring together 36 people and have them sit down and agree on the carrying out of a project of this kind. . . . we do ask you to watch what happens.⁶⁷

As a model, the experiment ultimately attained a reputation as a "flagship humanistic program for women workers."⁶⁸

Many of the decisions made during the early meetings of the Joint Administrative Committee provided a foundation for the school's unique approach to the education of working women. The national character of the school, student representation, the choice of subjects, the adoption of a tutoring plan, the age limits for students, the definition of "industrial worker," and the exclusion of clerical workers, teachers, and supervisors were all decided by this first committee. Some of the decisions were easy, others seriously strained the groups "ethic of communication." Jane Smith attributed the productive quality of these exchanges to the "deep underlying determination of the whole committee to work together for the accomplishment of their purpose."⁶⁹

In October 1921, motivated by a labor conference that brought students and staff together with labor union leaders and students' unrest about the relevance of the first summer's chaotic program, a resolution that one-half the members of the "controlling board" be elected by former students was brought before the Joint Administrative Committee. Jane Smith viewed this as an issue of trust; if the resolution was not passed, many of those students who were members of trade unions would continue to distrust the school's policies.⁷⁰

Not only was the decision itself crucial to the school's development, but the manner in which it was decided was bound to frame the handling of future issues posed from within the student body. Mary Anderson provided insight about the morning's debate when she wrote,

I remember resenting very much statements of Mrs. Bertrand Russell who was a cousin of Dr. Thomas. She argued with us about the 50-50 plan, saying, "What would the working woman know about academic education?" I said it was not academic education we were trying to give the girls, but rather information that would be useful in their everyday lives. We felt they knew what they needed and that they had certainly shown this in their studies at the school.⁷¹

Thomas eventually intervened to ask Anderson to select students to join them at lunch for a discussion of the matter. Smith reported on the conversation with an example of one student's convincing argument about how one of her instructors had lectured about the bonus system. "There was not a girl in that class who had not had some experience of a bonus system, who had not worked under one, or been on a committee to discuss it in her union. I don't think that was good teaching, for she never asked us what we knew about it."⁷² As a result of students' honest representations of their perspectives, the committee approved a 50-50 representation plan and later decided that students would have a complete say in deciding whom they would elect as their representatives.⁷³

This was one of the earliest and most significant decisions made by the committee. It enfranchised students giving them a permanent and direct voice in a democratically controlled institution, and it instilled in students a very real sense of responsibility for the success of the Summer School.⁷⁴ This controversy worked its way through a conflict resolution process that set a pattern for the committee's ethic of reflective communication -- a pattern that was

employed in deciding to institute the 48-hour work week for the school's African-American maids and to admit African American students. In a similar way during the unrest of the late 1920s and 30s, students decided it was necessary to forego endorsement of labor union activities in order to maintain a positive relationship between the Summer School and the college.

Running through these decisions was a common thread that respected the opinions and ability of students to decide issues that related directly to their participation in the Summer School. Through direct appeal to the voices of students, the Joint Administrative Committee was able to decide issues that could have irreconcilably divided them. Out of such decisions students developed a deeper interest in and sense of personal responsibility for the problems of industrial workers, something labor historians today refer to as a working class consciousness. Sharon Welch tells us that acts such as the students voluntarily collecting money for workers' relief are examples of the small expressions of solidarity and resistance that occur when conflict is worked out within an ethic of communication.⁷⁵

The Warp and Woof of Learning⁷⁶

At Bryn Mawr, workers' education was the product of teachers' personal and practical theorizing about the education of culturally diverse working women. Consequently, it was many things: Jane Smith's compassion and empathy as well as her belief in cultural pluralism and student empowerment; a flexible curriculum based on the sharing of women's experiences as workers; teachers who were creative, impassioned and responsive; and a pedagogy of self-expression, informality, open communication, democratic negotiation, and celebration. Its success could be seen in the nurturing of individual empowerment and the spawning of a female working class consciousness.

For its time, the school exemplified a multicultural, feminist and postmodernist pedagogy through its emphasis on building community through a critical examination of both shared and unique experiences. It was transformational to the extent that students learned through participation in democratic structures how to transcend individual differences in the development, support and implementation of common objectives. Students and teachers exercised the skills of citizenship in a cultural democracy by creating spaces for individual voices and negotiated understandings. Still with all its compassion, sensitivity, empathy and collectivity, the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers did little to promote an understanding of the workplace as a gendered experience where working women were not only exploited by employers but ignored by male co-workers who used labor unions to respond to their own special needs.

A Liberal Education - Preparing for the Hegemony of Gender and Class

M. Carey Thomas, as authoritarian in practice as she was democratic in rhetoric, initially modeled the school's curriculum after the humanities program espoused by Great Britain's Workers' Education Association.⁷⁷ However, as discussions proceeded, it became clear that the advice of those directly involved in the day-to-day business of workers' education was needed. At the invitation of President Thomas, Mary Anderson of the Women's Bureau, Rose Schneiderman of the New York WTUL, Agnes Nestor of the

Chicago WTUL, and others joined with Bryn Mawr alumnae and staff to become part of the Summer School's first Joint Administrative Committee.⁷⁸

The school's planning became largely a collaborative process. Each year instructors and students evaluated the curriculum, and the Joint Administrative Committee then would use the evaluations to revise it. Six subjects persisted from year to year: economics, English, history, literature, psychology, science, and music.⁷⁹ Each year renewed efforts sought to simplify and integrate course work in order to provide students with time for reflective thought while not forsaking valuable content.

Because students entered Summer School with a wide range of abilities and a variety of talents, flexibility was built into both courses and scheduling. The information gleaned from tests along with data gathered from student interviews and applications was used to track students in courses according to their ability and experience. Not every student took the same courses, nor did every student receive the same material in a particular course.⁸⁰

While economics was required of all students, the school's ability tracking created differential learning opportunities for students based on their test scores and the maturity of their knowledge about the worker's role in industry. Economics helped the more advanced learners, who may have been supplementing previous coursework, to analyze facts and view economic problems from a variety of perspectives. As one student put it,

I had never before had any patience with girls who did not belong to trade unions. In my economics classes I found they had as many reasons against as I had for belonging to a trade union. This gave me something to think about, whether we were using the right spirit and methods for organizing the unorganized.⁸¹

The non-trade unionists, on the other hand, were generally in the dark about even the most basic economic theory. For them, economics was an introduction and historic perspective of personally relevant issues.⁸² One student said in her course evaluation,

I saw no connection between my job and any one else's. I saw no relation to the industrial system in my little job. In fact I never even thought about it. . . . And gradually there seemed to dawn an understanding of the relation of myself and my job to society as a whole.⁸³

Thus such students moved their consciousness from the private into the public sphere, recognizing their own connection to the industrial capitalist economy, their fellow workers, and the various levels of government whose laws could affect their wages, hours, and conditions of work.

Coursework in both English and economics, which eventually were taught as an integrated unit, offered students a means of individual empowerment and group solidarity. Writing and speaking about their lives and interests gave students a voice for sharing personal and cultural differences as well as experiences that bonded them as a group of women workers. Usually a paper was assigned each week and one day was reserved for public speaking. Some instructors used a grammatical approach to instruction, other

pursued themes. Logical thought and clarity of expression were emphasized above the technical details of grammar and spelling.⁸⁴

The public speaking component included such student-selected topics as the evils of unemployment, housing problems in New York City, Defense Day, the purposes of the Bryn Mawr Summer School, and married women in industry. Student speeches evoked a storm of peer response as they were analyzed and criticized by the classes for logic, structure and expression. Those students who punctuated their speeches with prejudices and unsubstantiated generalizations faced negative criticism and ridicule by their classmates. At first, these students were angered, but according to Smith, as the weeks passed, anger gave way to good humored argument with students eventually recognizing that the primary goal was to improve their ability to use spoken and written English as a leadership tool.⁸⁵

Literature was used to help students improve their reading skills and to assist them in better understanding life. Its focus varied as students sampled from different genres and literary periods. In what may have been an early recognition of the value of reader's response theory, folk literature, poetry, and ballads were studied by making connections to students' individual lives.⁸⁶ Bertha Funk, a 1921 student wrote,

The literature class gave us a very special joy. As we studied the great international authors we could almost feel that they were living in our present age. Their struggles, sufferings, and victories seemed to have tremendous bearing on our present day civilization.⁸⁷

Sometimes literature was taught as an elective, at other times it was combined with English composition.

While economics, English, literature and public speaking tended to merge in both content and process, electives in history, science, psychology and music remained discreet disciplines. Although the study of society, its institutions, and current affairs was always emphasized, the content of history classes, occasionally taught as a series of guest lectures, varied from year to year. Science, a precedent-setting hallmark of the Bryn Mawr curriculum, trained students in a laboratory approach to the scientific method. Students explored special topics in astronomy, geology and biology for presentation to their classmates. From the perspective of the late 1990s, psychology, offered only to the most advanced students, was the most disappointing course of all. Special attention was paid to the development of the human species, mental hygiene, and the relationship between students' psychological test scores and the school's ability grouping. Music appreciation encouraged students to see music as a means of self-expression. The course sought to help students view the performing arts and music as a desirable way in which to use their leisure time.⁸⁸ This stood in stark contrast to upper-middle and upper class women's concerns that music and dance were responsible for ruining the lives of many young working girls.⁸⁹

The Summer School remained committed to the liberal arts/humanities concept of workers' education. Through it, the faculty sought pedagogical connections between traditional content, workers' experiences, and the development of a shared consciousness among students. Although the school slighted essential issues of power and hegemony as they related to gendered

oppression, course offerings served working women's need to recognize the oppression of industrial capitalism and provided them with opportunities to develop leadership skills as participants in a culturally diverse democracy.

The Faculty: Profiles of Caring and Communicating

The Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers was, by its very name and nature, a paradox -- a school for working women, many of whom had no more than an eighth grade education, located on a campus of an elite women's college and staffed by educated instructors from relatively affluent backgrounds. The nature of its faculty was one of the most sensitive issues occupying its administrators' agenda. It became apparent during the first summer that students' expectations were not being met by faculty members who had been hired for their academic credentials. Antagonisms were felt on both sides as demonstrated in a formal report from the fourth summer's faculty emphasizing its continuing displeasure with students' lack of academic ability.⁹⁰ The faculty recommended that "every effort be made to raise the caliber of the student group." They expressed concern that the school accept only those applicants who had "intelligence, an interest in education, and an interest in the problems of industry."⁹¹ On the other hand, students gave voice to feelings about the inevitability of the worker's condition, "We want our teachers to realize that we are workers and shall remain so." As a result, these working women were suspicious and challenged that which they believed to be unreasonable and unattainable. "We've been duped so many time."⁹² To add to the concern of Jane Smith and the Joint Administrative Committee, labor leaders highlighted the clash by withholding their endorsements from the school because of the lack of labor union representation within its faculty and Administrative Committee.⁹³

In 1923, motivated by students' continuing displeasure with certain faculty members and perhaps impelled by the retirement of M. Carey Thomas and her lessening control over the school and the Joint Administrative Committee, Jane Smith secured complete authority for staffing to herself. That summer, she began hiring faculty members who had demonstrated a sympathy for labor.⁹⁴ This brought about a change in the character of the faculty, one that staffed the school with instructors who demonstrated more warmth, understanding, concern about students, interest and sympathetic understanding of labor, compassion, ability to teach, and willingness to learn from students' shared experiences.⁹⁵

The educator who possessed the attributes Smith sought was essentially one who cared. While each worker educator must be judged holistically, the attributes themselves can be seen individually in fragments of student and faculty writing and oral histories. Susan Shepherd Sweezy's memoir characterized her own sympathetic personality.

But the students were the big education for me. Girls my age who had often less than an eighth grade education, many had emigrated from Europe, many had fled pogroms, all had worked hard when they could get jobs. . . . They are wonderful people, some full of flare and color, some repressed, rigid, many of them nursing strong grudges against the world.⁹⁶

Amy Hewes has given us still another snapshot of the warm and

sympathetic teacher to which Smith refers. She spelled out her own success in the following excerpt:

If he [the teacher] succeeds in seeing beyond the factors which may appear merely as the exasperating personalities of particular students to an unraveling of some social conflict he may properly say to himself that he has begun to practice the social art of teaching. . . .

In the end he may find fellowship with his students which is seldom achieved elsewhere.⁹⁷

Lillian Herstein, a member of the Chicago Federation of Women High School Teachers, spoke of her interest in students as individuals and her belief in their natural desire to learn.

I had what were called the "Language Handicapped," the immigrants. I taught . . . the way I have never been able to teach since. I had an interview with every girl. I'd get her talking and I'd say, "Now that's something you should write about" --their first days at Ellis Island or the first [industrial] accident that the girl witnessed. . . . At the end of the summer when we selected material [student essays and poems chosen for the school's magazine], most of the material came from "The Language Handicapped" because they wrote so well.⁹⁸

Because of Herstein's interest in her students she encouraged them to write about that which they knew best --their own experiences.

To Jane Smith, a sense of humor was essential. These students knew poverty, humility, and suffering. They needed time to think about lighter things, and the teachers with whom they studied needed to shoulder this as part of their responsibility. Amy Hewes was known to her students as one who could elicit a laugh. In her 1984 interview with Rita Heller, student Freddy Drake Paine painted Hewes with a colorful brush of creative humor.

She used to walk in as though she's going to run the show and you knew damn well she was just egging us on . . . she's carrying a bucket and she's got this hammer and sickle on her and she's going to be the water boy. When we shouted water, she'd say, "Capitalist, capitalist." It was a fun thing. It was a time to learn to relax.⁹⁹

Ponderous content portrayed by a caring jester interrupted students' worries about families that needed money, jobs that were lost, and fellow workers who had no opportunity for schooling.

Among the faculty, it seemed that Esther Peterson had the greatest knack for abandoning preconceived ideas about teaching as well as notions of Victorian propriety, as she encouraged student participation in cultural and recreational events. Through song, dance, and drama, she created conditions for students to share their individual and cultural perspectives with audiences of fellow students, faculty and staff. As a teacher she quickly recognized the cultural differences between her and her students. Contrary to her training as a physical education teacher at Columbia University, she saw students' eagerness for a program that would stimulate not only their bodies, but their minds. Esther Peterson developed a program that was "built, or rather grew, around the rich experiential

background of the students themselves." The girls wanted to dance. Peterson reported that "the function of the teacher would be confined largely to giving the technique whereby they [the students] might reconstruct and interpret their experiences through dancing." Students' ideas for dance interpretation covered such issues as loom tending under stretch-out conditions, strikes, job hunting, and the arms race. They developed self-confidence as they were confirmed in their ability to communicate ideas to others through the performing arts. Peterson's pedagogy confirmed Sharon Welch's theory that groups who have overcome barriers to communication through shared concerns can transcend differences.¹⁰⁰ In an article she wrote for the *Journal of Adult Education*, Peterson illuminated the meaning of this.

The treatment of individual and often divergent opinions on minor details only served to unite us further in our common purpose. The girls recognized their dependence on one another and on the technique and skills offered by the staff -- tools of expression that were quite useless without the viewpoints and ideas growing out of the lives of the girls. It was in this spirit that students began to feel the possibilities of the dance to be limitless.

One of the students was moved to write a poem explaining the experiences of her group.

We dare not look ahead
The darkness will discourage us.
We must not look back
The past was too frightful.
We may not close our eyes
The ground is too shaky.
So let's open our eyes wide
For we must live today
In the world we make.¹⁰¹

Her poem expressed the sense of responsibility and hope that came from having taken risks in transcending differences, a hope for a world which, as women workers in industry, they would have a share in reconstructing.

Louise Brown, a naturalist from the Dana Hall School and Wellesley College, was respected by faculty and students. Her teaching inspired a poem by Jane Smith, "The Workers Look at the Stars." Her course was truly a pioneer effort, a first for science in a workers' education program. Helen Schuldenfrei Selden remembered her this way. "She [Louise Brown] was definitely a genius, a teacher made in heaven. In two short months time she introduced us to astronomy, to history of life on earth, to behavior of matter, opening the heavens and earth to us."¹⁰² The ability to communicate as a teacher comes from an innate sense of caring that seeks out and focuses on the responses of students as a guidepost to instruction. Each of these faculty members possessed that unique ability, yet each was considered an expert in her field.

In discovering an experienced-based pedagogy, faculty members demonstrated their willingness to learn from students, to show students, in the words of Nel Noddings, that they were "infinitely more important than the subject matter."¹⁰³ Colston Warne addressed this as a reciprocal learning process.

What we found was that we got just as much education, if not more, than the students. . . . We didn't know the trade conditions as the students did and their perceptions were excellent. . . . It was an experience that changed the faculty and the students and exposed people to the contest of ideas.¹⁰⁴

Economics instructor Spencer Miller recognized that a "study class of thirty students and one teacher . . . are in fact thirty-one students, or, if you will, thirty-one teachers."¹⁰⁵

Faculty members' continued involvement in the affairs of the working class demonstrated their "sympathetic understanding of labor." For many, their position at the Summer School was a catalyst for activism; for others, it was an opportunity to further their commitments. For Esther Peterson, who had been seduced from her protected environment as a young woman of privilege, the love she had for her work at the school led her into years of public service of women and the working class. Amy Hewes became a force behind Massachusetts' first minimum wage law; Colston Warne, active in the Seabrook Farms Strike while at Bryn Mawr, founded the Consumer's Union; Broadus Mitchell ran as a Socialist candidate for governor of Maryland; Carolyn Ware served as a member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women; Susan Shepherd Sweezy continued her career as a member of the workers' education network, later serving the Works Progress Administration (WPA); and Lillian Herstein, a force in the Chicago Federation of Teachers, helped to organize the Farm Labor Party, ran for Congress in 1932, and served as a consultant to the War Production Board.¹⁰⁶ Given the near absence of union activists on the faculty, the absence of recruitment efforts to draw them in, and the contentious situation this created between organized labor, unionized students, and the school, this cross-class commitment to workers' education and working class issues serves as an ironic, but understandable footnote to the school's history. In a very real sense, the school, through its faculty, helped to sustain a commitment to women's issues and liberal reforms during the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover years as it shaped many of the outstanding labor, consumer, and women's public policy makers of the New Deal.

The question one asks is what motivated this privileged group of instructors to devote so much thought and effort designing a program that was successful with working women. In her autobiography, Jane Smith provided a hint: "I was aware that my acquaintance with hundreds of women in industry was effecting a change in me. With a growing appreciation of their urgent economic and educational problems, and the courage with which they faced them, I could no longer be apathetic."¹⁰⁷ She expressed the transformational powers of shared beliefs in the strength of communication, education, and democratic understanding. Such transformation, no doubt, worked its way through the faculty, as well, empowering them to take risks, to engage in real conversations, to develop an authentic curriculum that, in the words of labor and civil rights educator Myles Horton, respected working women's ability "to learn and to act and to shape their own lives."¹⁰⁸

In the school's eighteen summers, it employed approximately ninety instructors. Of these, two-thirds were female, a far greater percentage than on college and university faculties at that time. Faculty members' commitment to a "broadly based philanthropy in support of women"¹⁰⁹ was typical of middle and

upper-middle class women who found vocations and avocations in social work and volunteer service to the poor. Were they feminists? The answer is complex. To them, feminists were militant women of comfortable wealth, generally viewed as radicals by their non-feminist peers. When asked, forty years later, by Rita Heller, creator of the film, "The Women of Summer," if they considered themselves "social feminists," Caroline Ware, Susan Shepherd Sweezy, Constance Williams, and Alice Hanson Cook emphatically answered, "No." Cook admitted, however, that feminism was implicit in the school's existence, yet most faculty opposed the Equal Rights view of radical feminists. Cook said, "We at the School took it rather as a matter of course that women were disadvantaged and anything that could be done for them and with them was important to their development and to progress generally."¹¹⁰

However, the attitudes extant in faculty writing¹¹¹ and in testimonials¹¹² permit us to consider the faculty within a tradition of *cultural feminism*. The theory of cultural feminism attempts to identify and define the values of women's culture and to show how adopting these values might lead to a better world. Cultural feminists address the ways in which women are culturally different than men. They stress the womanly virtues and strengths of self-determination, self-reliance, critical thinking, intuition, collectivity, cooperation, loving relationships, desire for peace and harmony, and connectedness to the community. Their vision for social reform lies in the need for women to enter the public sphere and affect it with the sorely needed virtues of womanness.¹¹³ A number of contemporary variations provide cultural feminism with a "new moral vision."¹¹⁴ It is in this "new moral vision" that we can see Nel Noddings' pedagogy of caring, Carol Gilligan's metaphors of "voice" and "connections," Mary Field Belenky's et al. "connected knowing," "connected teaching," and Sharon Welch's "solidarity that transcends differences."¹¹⁵

The traits to which the cultural feminist's new moral vision refers can easily be seen in Jane Smith's conception of the ideal worker educator. In this, she recognized qualities of caring that have had a perennial place in the characterization of good teachers. From the standpoint of the teacher who cares, caring is the active desire to feel a student's reality and then to act as if that reality were hers. The teacher reaches out in an act of "inclusion" and receives the student. She accepts the student's feelings toward instructional matter; she "looks at it and listens to it" through the students' eyes and ears. Through the teacher's commitment to the student, the student is liberated and empowered. Because the nature of Noddings' ethic of caring includes dialogue, practice, and confirmation it becomes essential to Sharon Welch's ethic of communication.¹¹⁶ It is a possession of and responsiveness to students' realities that does more than just say, "I care." It alters the relationship between student and teacher while intrinsically changing both individuals.

For some faculty, however, their privileged status hid the true nature of poverty that existed among these working women. One instructor's perspective of the school's work appeared to be fed by a belief that "class" had inviolable boundaries making the work of the Summer School worthwhile in that it could "send them [students] away no less hopeful but with a clearer sense of perspective and a truer set of values." This was a response to what was seen as

Something exceedingly pathetic in the eagerness of many of the students. . . almost as if they had a conviction half

formed . . . that education was a process by which one gained a certain almost secret and mysterious power to accomplish one's will in the world.¹¹⁷

To such instructors, their work at the school meant only the relief of those less fortunate than themselves -- a moral endeavor unconditioned by the reality of an oppressive industrial capitalist system. For most, if not all, the ways in which gendering of the workplace contributed to this exploitation was part of a culture hidden by virtue of its very proximity.

It may well have been the very qualities of women exemplified by the faculty and prized by cultural feminists that hid the oppression of gendering and its effects on working women from view. These women valued their womanhood, and they saw in it a celebration of caring, collectivity, and heightened self-consciousness. What students did not truly understand was that those same qualities in workers in industry may have been an impediment to releasing themselves from conditions of exploitation. What they left with was individual self-confidence and a better understanding of how, as women, they could work together to make themselves and their views visible in the public sphere. This does not necessarily imply advancement in a male-centered world. Without an understanding of the processes of engendered labor and leadership, many were limited to pursuing reforms that were circumscribed by gendered social, political and economic conditions.

The faculty may not have created the feminist institution that M. Carey Thomas had envisioned, nor did it work to heighten awareness of oppression that was specific to women, but with its outstanding labor educators, it fortified the consciousness of a generation of working women, instilling in them a sense of responsibility for people in their workplaces and communities; it demonstrated the power of communication in forging alliances across boundaries of race, class, and ethnicity; and it helped working women discover that education is spiritually uplifting and offers the gift of an expanded sense of one's own human dignity.

A Pedagogy for Empowering a Community of Learners

The aim of instruction as outlined in the revised Statement of Purpose of the school was to help students to "train themselves in clear thinking; to stimulate an active and continued interest in the problems of our economic order, and to develop a desire for study as a means of understanding and enjoyment of life." Students were to gain "a truer insight into the problems of industry, and feel a more vital responsibility for their solution." Hilda (Jane) Smith emphasized that the school also tried to encourage students to discover more about themselves, to identify their own talents and resources, and to discover how best to use these for the benefit of society.¹¹⁸

To engage in this "experiment" in the education of culturally diverse women in industry, educators had to become risk-takers. Esther Peterson, Summer School physical education teacher said, "It was never a matter of method. I had studied how to get people motivated and all that crazy stuff. Because it was there, it was real. They wanted to learn. . . . It was a complete reversal of what I had been led to believe teaching was."¹¹⁹

Yet there were serious problems encountered in the teaching of women workers. Three major challenges confronted instructors at the outset. The first reality in educating working

women was that some students did not regard their instructors with the awe and respect teachers had come to expect in traditional college classes. In 1922, Lena Richman Zieph, a 26-year old, politically active immigrant and New York milliner, wrote critically about the school. Her viewpoint frames such challenges to the "unnatural experiment."¹²⁰

There was absolute freedom of discussion. The instructors were earnest and sympathetic to reality The tutorial system was a failure. Many of the tutors did not have the slightest conception of education and least of all worker's education. Many, though not all, were totally ignorant of the labor movement, of its aspirations and ideals The courses were not well arranged. There were courses on labor problems, but they were not sufficiently thorough. Some very important problems, such as collective bargaining, industrial unionism, direct action, etc., would probably not have been touched upon had it not been for a group of wide-awake girls who believed that a Summer School for Workers in Industry should throw some light, if possible, upon these vexed questions. It was thanks to their energy and to their knowledge that the Summer School was rescued from apathy. Instead of a Welfare Camp, it became an intellectual live wire. The campus and classrooms bristled with discussion, because these girls forced these really vital questions upon the attention of the instructors. [Emphasis in original] The instructors and even the tutors did receive a liberal education.¹²¹

Students like Lena sought recognition and confirmation of their own views and the work they had done toward reconstructing the workplace.

The second challenge was very much related to the first. Many students experienced bitterness and rejected American culture because it nourished the oppression they faced as female workers within an industrial capitalist system. For one Russian immigrant, "the English language became associated with the shrieking voice of my superiors in the factory, the contempt of my employer, the rough treatment of the police during strikes and the voice of 'injustice' when brought into court. Speaking English therefore became a tortuous process."¹²² Other students expressed their distrust of the school's capitalist patrons, men who made their fortunes off the backs of the working class.¹²³ For these students, there was a reality about American society that needed to be addressed before they could open their minds to new ways of thinking about society's problems.

The third challenge articulated by faculty members and students was seen in the frustration of teachers who had to address complex subjects with students, many of whom had no more than an eighth grade education. Reading, alone, posed a nearly insurmountable problem for those whose primary language was not English. One student told Smith, "I understand every word on this page, but I cannot understand the sentences." Each reading assignment, no matter how brief, meant long hours with a dictionary. Students reported frequent frustration with the technical vocabulary used by their instructors. Related to this were students' own doubts about their ability to learn.¹²⁴ One instructor remarked, "After years of teaching experience, I have had to abandon everything I thought about teaching and start all over again." A student's perspective was

voiced in this way: "There is no use that instructor using his high astronomical language on me."¹²⁵ Some instructors viewed these students as deprived, as having been denied educational opportunities. Others saw opportunities in students' intellectual and academic diversity, empowering opportunities to use individual experiences as a means for freeing students to learn about themselves, each other, their workplaces, and their communities.¹²⁶

The last challenge, students' conflicting perspectives, was initially viewed by a number of instructors as a barrier to communication between students as well as an interference in the orderly presentation of content. However, given space and an opportunity to voice their perspectives, these women became more self-confident and responsive to others. As they developed the ability to listen and respond to differences in more productive ways, their diverse perspectives became assets to be channeled in creating opportunities for authentic dialogue across cultures and political persuasions. Smith commented,

The clash of opinion is not only between girls from different trades or with different [labor union] affiliations. It exists also among girls of the same trade from different parts of the country, and among union workers who belong to opposing factions of the labor movement. It includes differences of racial tradition, political theory, economic situation, religious background, home life and industrial experience. Controversy rages as white heat throughout the summer, and only burns itself out as toward the end of the term a spirit of understanding glows more brightly. As one student put it, by the end of the summer tolerance "sizzles" on the campus.¹²⁷

In spite of the problems, the atmosphere in the school was open and friendly. There was a "genuine courtesy characteristic of almost every student" that more than compensated for "the lack of superficial convention." According to Smith, instructors were afforded respect as human beings, not as wardens of social and educational control.¹²⁸

In order to address these challenges, the Summer School's faculty as well as its students engaged in an informal yet continual critique of the instructional strategies employed in each of the classes. As a result of students' out-spoken criticisms of their instructor's didactic methods and a genuine sense of empathy and caring that permitted faculty members to address ways of providing the education its worker-students felt they most needed, two strands emerged and converged to create a pedagogy of empowerment. The first concentrated on the development of sociocultural competence through affirming identities, transcending differences, constructing a group consciousness, and confirming a sense of solidarity. The second strand nurtured civic competence through an engagement with the actual problems of decision-making within the school as the microcosm of a democratic society.

To facilitate student conversation as well as to interrupt conditions of status which normally empowered only the teacher, instruction and learning for working women at Bryn Mawr was informal. Desks were removed from classrooms and replaced with long tables around which the students gathered with their instructors. Classes were often held outdoors. Living together on campus, students became well acquainted with each other and with their

instructors and tutors. Discussions extended beyond normally scheduled classes as faculty and students mingled freely for meals, games, entertainment, parties, and talk. One student told Jane Smith, "I never knew a teacher could be so friendly. . . . They weren't like that in public school. They always made me feel I had no right to say what I thought. Here you can say anything you like, and the teachers will listen to you, and even talk with you about what you think." Jane Smith's very personal style also contributed to developing students' self-confidence and assurance that the faculty and staff were kind, caring, and trustworthy individuals. It didn't take long for students to realize that Bryn Mawr represented an island of support and hope amidst what may, at times, have seemed to be a sea of despair.¹²⁹ What many may not have realized, however, was that this was more a brief respite than a promise of opportunity.

During the 1930s, Jane's maternal instincts became more and more evident with the increasing gravity of the nation's economy. The climate of caring created at the Summer School provided a safe haven for students, alumnae, and members of their immediate families. Students attended the school who had been without work for months. For them, the school meant warm meals, a roof over their heads, and for one, a brief sojourn before she committed suicide. Many of the women were anxious about their families. They often smuggled food to relatives they kept in their rooms. Hungry and homeless guests became so frequent that the school's Council raised money, through contributions, to provide food. One former student returned; at the sight of her, Jane arranged for her visit to the school's doctor. When she was diagnosed with tuberculosis in its advanced stages, Jane arranged a special fund for her care in a sanitarium in her own city.¹³⁰ This was Jane's very natural inclination to translate caring into action.¹³¹

The Summer School endeavored to prepare women workers as thoughtful and active participants within a system of industrial capitalism embedded within a pluralistic democracy. The development of an instructional plan that would empower working women in both the community and the workplace caused instructors to question conventional methods. Learning through students' rich experiential backgrounds became essential to the success of the Summer School's program.¹³² With students generally unable to find common ground in ethnicity or culture, instructors who wanted to encourage a sense of solidarity among women workers soon came to realize the value of sharing workplace experiences. Each worker's personal relationship to her job became a major theme of the instructional program at Bryn Mawr. Based on a belief that those matters which affect workers' jobs, also affect workers, students, through a thorough examination of their own experiences, learned about the impact of industrialization on society.¹³³

Sociocultural consciousness and competence are grounded in the realization of an affirmed identity or one that has moral conviction and courage.¹³⁴ The need to focus on the continual process of identity formation is particularly acute in persons who inhabit bicultural worlds or persons who may be confronted with racial, ethnic, and gender biases.¹³⁵ By means of autobiographical writings¹³⁶ students at the Summer School focused on the sociocultural conditions that gave meaning to their lives. Working women developed a better sense of their own biculturality as well as their role as laborers in a system of industrial capitalism. As they explored and then shared their ethnic, cultural, and class-related backgrounds, they came to appreciate cultural diversity and the

enhanced understandings multiple perspectives could bring to common problems. Giving voice to their shared as well as their unique experiences through Summer School student publications such as the *Bryn Mawr Daisy* assisted the development of mutually supportive relationships and formed a foundation for the self-confidence and solidarity needed to engage in constructive civic participation.¹³⁷

Individual confidence in the ability of group members to transcend differences in the negotiation of socially responsible activity is a necessary condition to the development of a sense of community and thus a sense of solidarity.¹³⁸ Each year soon after the opening of the Summer program, the Trade Party was held to help worker-students from all trades to better understand each other. Students planned a dramatization of each of their industries. This often brought union and non-unionized students into confrontation with each other as they attempted to portray a single industrial system about which they had differing perspectives. In the words of Jane Smith,

Opinions meet and clash. Usually from this conflict emerges a feeling of responsibility in interpreting for the rest of the School the actual conditions of each trade. . . . As the evening goes on, it is evident to all that no one trade can work independently of many others; that all are bound together by the need of raw materials, labor, and capital; that students from every part of the country are meeting the same problems, and that in the great world of industry they as workers must play a responsible part. . . . Unconsciously the players, through their very familiarity with the conditions they are attempting to portray, bring out with creative force the comedy and tragedy of the daily drama of industry. May not such forms of spontaneous expression be the basis of a new and living drama of the people, drawn from the deep sources of daily living, with potential power to recreate new life for the workers themselves and for others?¹³⁹

With this description, Jane confirmed that differences encountered within this community of working women were transcended each year as students engaged in productions that addressed their individual and collective industrial experiences. These productions contributed to the development of a collective consciousness, and, as they did, they became a form of *praxis* that engaged students in the initial work of social transformation.¹⁴⁰

Dramas in which students depicted their unique and common experiences served a similar purpose. Under the direction of Jane Smith and/or Esther Peterson, each summer's students planned and carried out several dramatic events. These were often spontaneous and informal. Smith remembered some of these scenes: "an evening in Union Square; three old women in a flop house; a day in a union shop; . . . an east side market on Saturday night; a scene from Ellis Island; . . . company for supper; . . . an eviction."¹⁴¹ The scenes were portrayed by students who had lived them. Their value was two-fold: first, they contributed to the development of an individual and collective consciousness of students' shared identities as members of a culturally diverse community of working women, and second, the private became public and the personal became political as students bore witness to the struggle of women

immigrants, workers and city dwellers for respect and a decent standard of living.¹⁴²

Daily half-hour assembly periods also provided students with opportunities to share their culture, ethnicity and work experiences and to develop a sense of solidarity as women workers. At that time students and faculty addressed matters of interest to the whole school and everyone sang. Students led the group in singing songs they knew, songs that were carried from their homelands or their regions, songs that had significance within their workplace, and songs that swelled with oppression or burst forth in the promises of freedom. One student wrote a labor song which became the theme song for her class.

We shall be free
When we understand
The strength, the power, the glorious hour
That lie in our hands.
That hour will come
With our unity;
We'll make the machines that enslave us
Obey us.
We'll be free!¹⁴³

In the lantern ceremony which drew these women together at the conclusion of each summer session, students dramatized their lives at Bryn Mawr. The ceremony was a student written and directed program consisting of plays, skits, and songs about their summer experience.¹⁴⁴

Through its instructional techniques, the Summer School also encouraged the development of a second domain of competence among female students. With sociocultural competence as a foundation, students participated in a number of strategies designed to nurture skills of civic competence within a culturally diverse society. In so-doing, the Summer School incorporated Dewey's ideas of schools as models where students practiced the skills of democratic citizenship in a variety of ways.¹⁴⁵ Realizing that freedom of expression was an essential attribute of democratic societies, the school's "Plan of Instruction" called for a climate of academic freedom.

There will be absolute freedom of teaching and discussion. . . . The Summer School shall not be committed to any dogma or theory, but shall continue its teaching in a broad spirit of impartial inquiry, with absolute freedom of discussion and academic freedom of teaching.¹⁴⁶

It is within this climate that instructor's developed strategies for encouraging students to openly express their opinions. Instruction consisted of short lectures followed by intense and open discussion in which women, as knowledge producers,¹⁴⁷ related their personal insights and participated in hands-on inquiries. During these discussions, it was not unusual to see students empowered as facilitators while their instructors stayed in the background. Smith wrote that she was always impressed at the level of active participation in these discussions. "At intervals their frank challenges to the instructor or to other students would punctuate the discussion" as students measured economic theory against their own experiences. Occasionally instructors would have a stenographer

record discussions of the advanced classes and compile them into booklets which could be used in other classes.¹⁴⁸

The voice one has within a democratic society is often exercised through graphic media. Utilizing this concept, the faculty decided to create a social science workshop in which students would have opportunities to use graphic arts in the study of economics. Students used atlases to make relief maps and government reports to discover the production and profit levels of their own industries. They also employed the media of paint and clay to portray workers' experiences in visual form.¹⁴⁹ Student work was displayed during the last week of classes each summer.¹⁵⁰ One end-of-summer exhibit included:

a survey of city government in pictorial form, a map of the United States showing employment of Negroes in industry, another of textile centers, a model of a workers' theater, posters suitable for publicity in workers' education, a charcoal drawing of a steel mill, recently visited by the school, a chart showing the various countries supplying materials for a shoe, another illustrating plans of unemployment insurance in European countries.¹⁵¹

Accomplishments such as these and those that resulted from the laboratory approach used in science classes helped to integrate manual work like that done in factories with the academic work more characteristic of schools. Furthermore, such activities provided students with another media of self-expression and communication through which they could exercise competent leadership in the improvement of society.

In the 1930s, twenty students preoccupied with the threat of unemployment, learned how to measure its effect on their fellow-students. They began with a statistical study of earnings and employment in the previous year, then measured the effects of loss of earnings on living standards employing criteria they, themselves, had established.¹⁵² In statistical studies such as these, personal experiences contributed to the development of a collective consciousness, a process necessary for solidarity in political and social action.¹⁵³ This became part of a series of statistical research projects done during the years of the school's operation. In a *praxis*-oriented move, this series of statistical studies was published by the United States Department of Labor Women's Bureau, perhaps, in part, as a result of its director, Mary Anderson's, earlier work on the school's Joint Administrative Council. These studies measured economic trends among the Summer School women, relating them to the sociocultural problems encountered by women in industry as a whole.¹⁵⁴

The performing arts were viewed as another way in which students could portray a critical understanding of the uses of power within democratic societies. During the 1937 Summer School, as part of Esther Peterson's class, students used drama to give personal meaning to the economic and political significance of recent Supreme Court decisions. For four weeks, they sifted through newspapers, magazines, and books for material. Using charts and graphs dealing with specific phases of Supreme Court history, they organized a play.¹⁵⁵ Heller described the content of this or a similar play about the Court which she dated to the Summer of 1936. In this play, the Republican Supreme Court was portrayed as insensitive to the needs of workers.¹⁵⁶ Much of the research material was technical

and difficult, but as a group undertaking, students were able to learn about the relevance of the Court to events in their own lives and, at the same time, construct a shared perspective of one institution that formed the basis of American political power and its relationship to individual citizens.

Field trips and conferences formed another significant part of the experiential core of the educational program -- one that afforded students opportunities for personal investigation and reflection on the institutions of both industrial capitalism and representative democracy. Each summer, students gathered for an excursion to Valley Forge. Other trips were made to a coal mine, museum of art and natural history, and Philadelphia factories. Forums and conferences were often arranged at the school with speakers representing a variety of viewpoints related to industrial issues. Students witnessed insider's perspectives from leaders in the fields of legislative organization, labor organization, unemployment, the use of leisure, and the textile industry.¹⁵⁷

Driven by a belief that women would become a political force for social action and indirectly influenced by John Dewey's philosophy of education as expressed in *Democracy in Education*, the creation of a democratic environment was foremost in the minds of faculty and students. Smith wrote,

[T]he Directing Committee had realized that as adults these students would naturally take responsibility for governing themselves and regulating their own community life. . . . Nothing was taken for granted. Everything was put to a vote of the student body.¹⁵⁸

John Dewey believed that classes should be democratic communities of experiential inquiry. The best way to accomplish this was to immerse students in "modes of associated living" that were characteristic of democratic societies.¹⁵⁹ It appears from the evidence¹⁶⁰ that after 1923, a Deweyan pedagogy, albeit self-designed, was in practice at the Summer School. Communities were built through shared personal and work-related experiences, and democracy was at play in the school's focus on controversial issues, experiential learning, and student participation in democratic decision-making.

As part of their experiential curriculum, students, faculty and executives of the school formed the school's governing body, the Joint Administrative Committee. In addition to this, there was a School Council with proportional representation, seven student, four faculty and three executive members. The School Council acted as an executive committee during Summer School sessions, meeting once a week to consider matters of curriculum, instruction, and school policy, plan school programs, and act on subcommittee recommendations. According to Jane Smith, taking part in the school's government meant managing "heated argument, wounded sensibilities, uproar, fatigue, ill-advised decisions, confusion of mind and confusion of issues." It required good judgment and an understanding of the human dynamics unleashed when those with diverse beliefs and values assumed a real sense of responsibility for something of great importance. With a sense of agency, each issue had to be considered with all of its alternatives and consequences. According to Smith, nothing was hidden from students and faculty, and no decision of the School Council ever had to be appealed to the Joint Administrative Committee. "Many storms have shaken the

very existence of the school, but in every case the final decision of students and faculty has strengthened the organization, and given better understanding to all concerned of school purposes.¹⁶¹

It is significant, however, that this Council made important decisions always with the benefit of the Summer School in mind, even when those decisions acquiesced to the brokerage of industrial power, the same power that was used to oppress workers. A case in point occurred when the school, with the backing of the Council, decided to withhold endorsement of strikes because of the damage subsequent newspaper publicity could bring to its reputation¹⁶² and, by inference, to its patronage. Perhaps swayed by the faculty's middle class values, students believed that the power of education superseded the need to collectively confront wage oppression. These "women of summer" learned that rational choices made in an atmosphere of freedom and solidarity in one circumstance could indeed limit choices in others. But they also learned that, when the stakes were high enough, these limitations could be overcome through the solidarity and synergy created by collective problem solving. As in the case of strikes, their inability to participate as a group representing the school was replaced by voluntary student collections to support strikers' relief funds.¹⁶³ Thus women workers in industry learned the significance of ideological sacrifices alongside the skills of negotiation so vital to the maintenance of democratic citizenship.

Among the standing committees of the Council was the Cooperative Store. This was started to supply students with needed items and provide an opportunity for them to learn first-hand the principles of consumer cooperation within a free enterprise economy. The opening of the store each summer followed introductory classwork that included the principles of cooperative buying and the history of the cooperative movement as a form of labor resistance within a system of free enterprise. Students and staff bought shares at two dollars each. The shareholders elected a board who then hired one of the former students as the store's manager. Each student spent at least one day behind the sales counter. The store also engaged in the business of banking, taking deposits from students who could then draw out their money as needed. In this function, students who naturally exercised greater responsibility with their money found themselves giving advice to the less thrifty. At the end of each Summer School session, stockholders chose between getting back their original investment plus a share of the store's profits or contributing the share and the profits toward the purchase of something for the school. Under the spell of the school's community concept, frequently students decided to use the approximately \$250. the store earned annually to purchase equipment for the school.¹⁶⁴ Through their efforts to maintain the store, students gained experience in the management of a consumer cooperative, a growing enterprise of organized labor and working class women.¹⁶⁵

Students also exercised democratic decision-making through the publication of student writings in the school's magazine. This magazine appeared under a number of names selected each year by that session's students: the *Bryn Mawr Daisy*, *Shop and School*, *Bryn Mawr Light*, *Bryn Mawr Echo*, and the *Bryn Mawr Lantern*. The magazine, usually published two or three times throughout the summer, gathered together the best articles, essays, stories and poems written by students. The Board of Editors was appointed by the English Department from among the students and

the English faculty with the Editor-in-Chief always being a student. The Board was entirely responsible for the selection of student work, agency that was often drawn into question by students whose work was rejected. In addition, the production of the students' magazine potentially improved their understanding of the uses of media in shaping public opinion within a democratic society.¹⁶⁶

Each summer as a final step in the affairs of the worker-students' community, the Council compiled recommendations of the students and the faculty for the following year. At the final school meeting, a report was made on these recommendations and each main issue was brought to a vote of the school. Those items voted for consideration were then passed on to the Joint Administrative Committee for action or tabled until the following Summer School. The school's last official act was to elect its own representatives to the Joint Administrative Committee.¹⁶⁷ Thus as students engaged in responsible decision-making that had long-term implications for school policy and programs, they developed a sense of personal pride in their achievements and a sense of personal responsibility for the school, its faculty and staff, alumnae, their classmates, as well as future students. Their sociocultural and civic competence gave rise to a sense of solidarity or a way of acting within the collective best interests of the group. Solidarity, by its nature, endowed its membership with the ability and desire to listen to the voices of others, to grant them respect for their difference and to realize that the lives of different others are interconnected with each having as her own charge the responsibility for all.¹⁶⁸

The "Unnatural Experiment" Draws to a Close

The summer of 1934 proved to be a watershed in the relationship of the Summer School to Bryn Mawr College. Four factors contributed to the floodtide of problems facing the school. In 1933, Jane Smith, who had so often mediated difficulties that arose between the Summer School and the College, left to take a position in Washington's New Deal Emergency Education Program.¹⁶⁹ The Communist Party had gained strength as a result of severe economic conditions, and its influence was particularly visible within the labor movement. Concern about the influence of communism increased the vigilance of the press in affairs related to the Summer School and particularly in affairs relevant to the school's growing reputation for radicalism.¹⁷⁰

Students' individual participation in nearby strikes was increasing as was their interest in a more leftist-oriented approach to economics.¹⁷¹ In July 1934, Colston Warne and at least two other faculty members became involved in the communist-inspired Seabrook Farms strike. The specter of the "red menace" hanging amidst the tragedies of the Great Depression created fear of class warfare among Bryn Mawr's wealthy patrons, and, in the eyes of the College, the Summer School became a symbol of that warfare. Fueled by the press, Bryn Mawr's Board broke with the college's long-term policy of non-interference with the Summer School and blocked its use of the campus for the summer of 1935.¹⁷²

Smith's intervention at the peak of the crisis marked a break in her genius for pacification and reconciliation. Returning from her job in Washington markedly upset with the College Board for personal, professional and political reasons, she placed its members in the category of "red baiters, . . . the DAR, Chambers of Commerce and other groups which are waging a fight against liberal

opinions, and the labor movement"¹⁷³ Smith was aware that the negative response to the strike incident had been manipulated by individuals within the college structure who found the presence of the Summer School demeaning to the college, as she was also aware that the college found its million dollar fundraising campaign incompatible with the continued presence of the school on its campus.¹⁷⁴ A stormy meeting followed at which M. Carey Thomas was among those insisting on the complete severance of the Summer School from the college.¹⁷⁵

Although the Summer School was allowed to return to the college for its 1936, 1937 and 1938 sessions, its former relationship with the College Board was never fully restored. Academic freedom had been shackled by the college's capitalist guardians. This, coupled with decreasing enrollments, financial difficulties, and the appearance of New Deal workers' education programs, caused the school's termination with the class of the Summer of 1938.¹⁷⁶ In the end, even the strength the school derived from its loyal alumnae and associates waned in the face of class conflict exacerbated by the severe economic conditions of the Depression and the political pressures of the "red Scare."¹⁷⁷

The Summer School and Its Implications for Multicultural Education

In choosing to engage in this research, I wanted to understand more about the Summer School's teaching strategies and how they were perceived by faculty and students. In so doing, I sought greater understanding of what the women portrayed in Heller's film, *The Women of Summer*, had experienced and the educational forces that facilitated or impeded their formation of a civic community of culturally and politically diverse women. I questioned the impressions conveyed by Heller's film and the fact that forty to sixty years later these women reflected so positively on the vitality of the program and the significance it had on their lives. In my effort to bring new understanding to the Summer School's learning experiences and personalities, I have applied feminist and postmodernist standards. As a result, a number of conclusions have emerged which may have serious implications for the instruction of culturally diverse students, and particularly those who are female, in the public school classrooms of today.

The educational program as it was originally conceived at Bryn Mawr, a broad humanistic program aiming to prepare students as participants in a nationwide social and industrial feminist or social reconstructionist reform movement, was initially resisted by students. Students who arrived at the Summer School with anxieties about their learning ability were overwhelmed with the demands of the program. When confronted by instructors who preached the need for social reconstruction and the promises that students would be offered the tools with which to affect a long-range redistribution of individual wealth and create a more just and equitable society, students charged the program with irrelevance. For some, their personal goals were bound up with a class consciousness that cried "foul." For others, the "overload" was coupled with anxiety about their ability to keep pace with the demands of the instructor.

Like the "banking model" of education described by Paulo Freire in his work with the impoverished and illiterate of Brazil, these early teacher-imposed goals seemed irrelevant to the "existential experience of the students," and for many, they elicited

feelings of oppression. The original Bryn Mawr model of teaching recognized students as unknowing objects upon whom the knowledgeable confer their gifts. Students, in short, were viewed as ignorant, and it is this representation against which they rebelled as much as it was the frustration over an unreasonable workload.¹⁷⁸

By the end of the second summer, motivated by student complaints and the expressed concern of the working women on the Joint Administration Committee that too much theory was causing confusion in the minds of students, the school, under the leadership of Jane Smith, turned to a curriculum that would utilize students' experiences as a way of developing skills in critical thinking and social action. Students more readily accepted this as they saw in it the opportunity to focus on their immediate needs and short range goals, goals that were intricately connected to their consciousness of themselves as working women. The upshot of this was that the school abandoned the feminist, social reconstructionist goals of M. Carey Thomas and began a plan that would help students develop sociocultural and civic competencies through participation in a more democratic form of education that centered instruction on student experiences.

Student complaints about didactic teaching strategies caused Jane Smith to redefine the qualities of a worker educator. Previously the school had looked for experts in the academic disciplines. Jane began seeking instructors who would be more responsive to students' perceived needs. Freire again provides an interpretation when he says that educators must recognize that students and teachers are both "simultaneously students and teachers," and in so doing, he gives us a yardstick for measuring the school's success in reaching its worker-students. Students cannot be treated as marginal to the education process, as a "pathology" with which teachers must deal; instead, they must be placed at the center of each educational endeavor as resources from whom others can learn.¹⁷⁹

Summer School instructors re-thought their instructional strategies. Those who were able to free themselves from the constraints of a teacher-centered pedagogy to listen to students, began to teach reflectively and to effectively use student feedback to modify their instructional programs. Those teachers who engaged in dialogue with students and exercised an ethic of caring and reflective communication incurred the greatest success. They worked together with their worker-students in an environment of transformative pedagogy. They discovered that students who were more vocal preferred progressive teaching strategies that engaged them in controversial issues and promoted interaction in which they shared personal experiences, reconstructing them in a way that shed new light on their roles in the school, the community and the workplace. As the educational program evolved, new concepts of teaching and learning emerged well ahead of their popularity some 40 to 60 years later.

Integrated instruction in which economics and English were taught as a single unit by teams of teachers provided increased opportunities for students to identify common problems and to design strategies involving the media of communication -- writing and the performing and visual arts -- for raising the consciousness of their fellow students, faculty and administrators. Through these activities students not only experienced success, but they felt they had learned how to do something that would be useful in their own lives. They had engaged in the process of combining tacit theorizing

about significant and shared problems with practice that contributed to their own emancipation as students and learners. Students' goals were immediate, and such activities gave them feelings of accomplishment and satisfaction that they were learning the skills required for democratic living.

The multicultural character of the Summer School, in many ways, contributed to students' frustrations. Many lacked the ability to communicate comfortably in English. Some felt as if they were being pulled in a variety of directions. Many felt reasons to reject the ways and the beliefs of others. Most sought self-acceptance and acceptance of one's self by others. This was an era in American history when the dominant culture assumed others wanted to be more like themselves, to be assimilated into society, not to be recognized for their difference. Yet, there was an overt effort on the part of the faculty to design innovative instructional strategies that would help students highlight, celebrate, and transcend their differences as they engaged in productive communication across barriers of ethnicity, class, race, religion, regionality, trade union attachments, and political persuasions. Through dialogue with students, the faculty was able to engage students in ways that honored individual difference.

Through autobiographical writing about the personal significance of telling episodes in their lives, students explored their values, beliefs, and the ways in which their experiential responses had been influenced by others. By giving voice to their autobiographical experiences in skits, drama, dance, poetry, and conversation, others began to see the value of diversity, the value of multiple and shared perspectives. The mutually transformative power of this facilitated the development of a sense of community where students had the ability to transcend difference, to feel self-assured in expressing their opinions while, at the same time exercising responsibility for the accomplishment of common goals. By penetrating their silences, the school enabled students to develop a sense of their own sociocultural competence and consequently empowered them to act democratically and transformatively, with a true sense of *praxis*.¹⁵⁰

The exercise of self-government further gave voice to student concerns, empowering them within a system of representative decision-making modeled after John Dewey's vision of schools as microcosms of democratic living.¹⁵¹ Under Jane Smith's guidance, many major decisions were referred to the student body as a committee of the whole. Students confronted issues in contentious, argumentative ways, yet when considering issues that would have a very real impact on the future of the school, they were able to transcend those differences in order to achieve common goals. Through this they developed a sense of civic competency and efficacy.

In spite of all this, given the eight-week duration of the school, no resolution ever came to the students' ability to decide, independent of the influence of the faculty's middle class values. In issues related to the school, they seemed unable to transcend the differences in power created by a hierarchy of class. Teachers' values became students' values whenever it came to issues related directly to the school's continued stability. Class-based issues such as participation in strikes and demonstrations were decisively superseded by their value for loyalty, stability, pacification, and education.

Likewise, middle class cultural feminist perspectives and

values which placed great significance on responsiveness to conditions of social oppression may have obscured the need for action against the gender exploitation experienced by women of all classes. This was particularly noticeable in the fact that the school neglected to distinguish between issues of gender and class as they are encountered within an industrial capitalist workplace dominated and defined by males.

Success within an educational setting, however, is a complex thing. It is the product of people and their social, cultural, economic, and political contexts. The Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers was highly successful in creating a community of women that respected and welcomed difference. Students were empowered to determine many of the programs and policies of the school. However their gratitude for the educational opportunities afforded by the Summer School, their loyalty to those who had helped to provide it, and perhaps their growing identification with middle class womanly values hampered their ability to respond to conditions of gendered oppression implicit in their industrial labor. Issues of both class and gender were submerged within this cross-class alliance of females. Cultural feminism gave middle class women a sense of pride, but robbed their working class sisters of voices and freedom in the workplace. Failing to see these issues of context, both middle class teachers and their working class students lost the battle for the school's independence and were forced finally to succumb to the domination of the college -- a fact that perhaps had been foreshadowed when Jane Smith first sought public funding for workers' education. Without their freedom and disempowered, the school and its students moved to Jane Smith's estate where it continued in a very different form until 1952.

Endnotes

- ¹ Bureau of the Census, *Fourteenth Census of the United States Population Vol. IV Occupation*, "Table 2" (1920), 340; Schneider and Schneider 1993, p. 49.
- ² For the "Original Statement of Purpose Issued by the Joint Administrative Committee, 1921" from which this is taken, see Hilda Worthington Smith, *Women Workers at the Bryn Mawr Summer School* (New York City: Affiliated Summer Schools for Women Workers in Industry and American Association for Adult Education, 1929), 7.
- ³ Smith 1929, 121-128.
- ⁴ Rita Heller, "The Women of Summer: The Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers: 1921-1938," (Ph. D. diss., Rutgers University, The State University of New Jersey, 1986), 21; Lucille Ann Maddalena, "The Goals of the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers as Established during its First Five Years." (Ph. D. diss., Rutgers University, The State University of New Jersey, 1978), 142.
- ⁵ Smith 1929, 226; Ida M. Tarbell, "None But Working Girls Need Apply," *Colliers*, 28 October 1922, 11-12.
- ⁶ Heller 1978, p. 133; Smith 1929, 280-281.
- ⁷ Heller 1986, 101, 133.
- ⁸ Tarbell 1922, 11-12.
- ⁹ Rita Heller and Susan Baumann, *The Women of Summer*, 55 min. (New York: Filmmakers Library, 1986).

- ¹⁰ My discussion of a communicative ethics and solidarity is based almost entirely on that described by Sharon Welch, "An Ethic of Solidarity and Difference," *Postmodernism, Feminism and Cultural Politics. Redrawing Educational Boundaries*, ed. Henry Giroux. (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1991), 83-99.
- ¹¹ Bureau of the Census, *Fourteenth Census of the United States Population Vol. IV Occupation*, "Table 2" (1920), 340; Schneider and Schneider 1993, p. 49.
- ¹² Lynn Weiner, *From Working Girl to Working Mother: The Female Labor Force in the United States, 1820-1980* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 1985), Table 5, 28 cited in Teresa L. Amoti and Julie A. Matthaei, *Race, Gender, and Work: A Multicultural Economic History of Women in the United States* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1991), 126. This tells us little however about the percent of African-American women who wanted jobs but remained unemployed.
- ¹³ U. S. Bureau of Census, "Statistics of Women at Work," (1907) cited in Weiner 1985, 84.
- ¹⁴ Nancy Woloch, *Women and the American Experience* (New York: Knopf, 1984), 235.
- ¹⁵ Susan Estabrook Kennedy, *If All We Did Was To Weep at Home: A History of White Working Class Women in America* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1970), 113.
- ¹⁶ Alice Kessler-Harris, *Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 86.
- ¹⁷ James J. Kenneally, *Women and American Trade Unions* (Montreal: Eden Press Women's Publications, 1981), 47-48.
- ¹⁸ Amoti and Matthaei 1991, 123; Mary Anderson *Woman at Work* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1951), 32-36.
- ¹⁹ Nancy Schrom Dye, *As Equals and as Sisters: Feminism, the Labor Movement, and the Women's Trade Union League of New York* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1980), 88-109; Annelise Orleck, *Common Sense and a Little Fire: Women and Working Class Politics in the United States, 1900-1965* Gender and American Culture, eds. Linda K. Kerber, and Nell Irvin Painter (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 62-63.
- ²⁰ "Industrial feminism" was first coined by Mildred Moore in 1915 in her writing about the WTUL. See Mildred Moore, "A History of the Women's Trade Union League of Chicago" (M. A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1915) cited in Diane Kirby, "The Wage-Earning Woman in the State: The National Women's Trade Union League and Protective Labor Legislation, 1903-1923," *Labor History* 28, no. 1 (Winter 1987): 54-74 and Orleck 1995, 6, 63-80.
- ²¹ Christopher Lasch, *The New Radicalism in America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965) 158-159 cited in Maddalena 1978, 35.
- ²² Rose Schneiderman and Lucy Goldwaite, *All for One* (New York: Paul S. Eriksson, Inc., 1967), 140.
- ²³ Smith 1929, 37, 271-279.
- ²⁴ Joyce L. Kornbluh and Mary Frederickson, eds. *Sisterhood and Solidarity: Workers' Education for Women, 1914-1984* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press 1984), xv-xvii.
- ²⁵ Mary Frederickson, "Citizens for Democracy: The Industrial Programs of the YWCA," *Sisterhood and Solidarity: Workers Education for Women, 1914-1984*, ed. Joyce Kornbluh and Mary Frederickson (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984), 75-106.
- ²⁶ Paula Giddings, *When and Where I Enter: The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in American* (New York: Bantam, 1984), 143.
- ²⁷ Schneider and Schneider 1993, 224-228.
- ²⁸ David Kennedy, *Overthere: The First World War and American Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 88-92, 287-91.
- ²⁹ Smith 1929, 257; Horowitz 1994.
- ³⁰ Horowitz 1994, 230-232, 333, 341-343, 381, 422-423.
- ³¹ Interview with Hilda Worthington Smith, Washington D. C. March 1976 cited in Heller 1986, 16.
- ³² Interview with Esther Peterson, Washington, D.C., January, 1977, cited in Heller 1986, 77-78.
- ³³ Self Interview, Susan Shepherd Sweezy, Pasadena, CA, June, 1983 cited in Heller 1986, 64-65.
- ³⁴ Smith 1929, 8-22; Smith 1978, 111-156.
- ³⁵ Orleck 1995, 36; Rose Schneiderman and Lucy Goldwaite, *All for One* (New York: Paul S. Eriksson, Inc., 1967), 11-42.
- ³⁶ Dye 1980, 50.
- ³⁷ Schneiderman and Goldwaite 1967, 67-68.
- ³⁸ Dye 1980, 50.
- ³⁹ Orleck 1995, 43-45.
- ⁴⁰ "Preliminary and Tentative Announcement: Summer School for Women Workers in Industry" cited in Maddalena 1978, 136.
- ⁴¹ Smith 1929, 282.
- ⁴² Smith 1929, 222-223.
- ⁴³ Schneider 1941, 82.
- ⁴⁴ In referring to Smith as a "cultural democrat," I have appropriated and personalized the contemporary heuristic "cultural democracy," first used by Ramirez and Castañeda to refer to a condition which honors the right of every individual to maintain their primary culture while participating as an equal and valued member of the dominant culture. Critical theorists such as Darder and Sleeter maintain that within a cultural democracy bicultural groups such as African-Americans and Mexican-Americans use their voices to create conditions for their own emancipation and empowerment. Antonio Darder, *Culture and Power in the Classroom* (Westport, CN: Bergin and Garvey, 1991); M. Ramirez and A. Castañeda, *Cultural Democracy, Bicognitive Development and Education* (New York: Academic Press, 1974); Christine E. Sleeter and Carl A. Grant, *Making Choices for Multicultural Education: Five Approaches to Race, Class, and Gender* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1994).
- ⁴⁵ Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge, MA: Addison Wesley, 1978).
- ⁴⁶ Smith 1978, 124.

- ⁴⁷ Interview with Carmen Lucia, Bryn Mawr, June 1982 quoted in Heller 1986, 269.
- ⁴⁸ Smith 1978, 125.
- ⁴⁹ Smith 1978, 124.
- ⁵⁰ quoted in Smith 1978, 125.
- ⁵¹ Filmed interview with Marjorie Lynch Logan, Bryn Mawr, PA, June 1984, cited in Heller 1986, 113.
- ⁵² excerpt from questionnaire collected by Rita Heller between 1977 and 1981 cited in Heller 1986, 118.
- ⁵³ *ibid.*
- ⁵⁴ quoted in Smith 1978, 127.
- ⁵⁵ Smith 1978, 127.
- ⁵⁶ Smith 1978, 124.
- ⁵⁷ Tarbell 1922, 11-12.
- ⁵⁸ excerpt from questionnaire collected by Rita Heller between 1977 and 1981 cited and quoted in Heller 1986, 117.
- ⁵⁹ *ibid.*
- ⁶⁰ excerpt from questionnaire as collected by Rita Heller between 1977 and 1981 quoted in Heller 1986, 118.
- ⁶¹ Hilda Worthington Smith, interview, Washington, D.C., 30 May 1969, quoted in Maddalena 1978, 99.
- ⁶² Interview with Hilda [Jane] Worthington Smith, 9 March 1977, in Washington, D.C. cited in Maddalena 1978, 158.
- ⁶³ Tarbell 1922, 11-12.
- ⁶⁴ Tarbell 1922, 11-12.
- ⁶⁵ Tarbell 1922, 11-12.
- ⁶⁶ Kornbluh 1987, 9-12, 9-106.
- ⁶⁷ Neva Deardorff, "Bryn Mawr Summer School," *Workers Education in the United States -- Report of Proceedings Second National Conference on Workers Education in the United States*, ed. Spencer Miller (New York: Workers' Education Bureau of America, 1922), 79.
- ⁶⁸ quoted in Heller 1986, 2; Kornbluh 1987, 17.
- ⁶⁹ Smith 1929, 38.
- ⁷⁰ Smith 1929, 39-40.
- ⁷¹ Anderson 1951, 225.
- ⁷² Smith 1929, 40-41.
- ⁷³ Smith 1929, 30-32.
- ⁷⁴ Smith 1929, 40-41.
- ⁷⁵ Welch 1991, 83-99.
- ⁷⁶ This subtitle is borrowed directly from the title of a chapter about curriculum in Smith 1929, 124.
- ⁷⁷ Heller 1986, 9-11.
- ⁷⁸ Hewes 1956, 213.
- ⁷⁹ Smith 1929, 35-39; Hewes 1956, 213.
- ⁸⁰ Smith 1929, 66-77.
- ⁸¹ quoted in Smith 1929, 128-129.
- ⁸² Broadus Mitchell, "The Working Women's Classes at Bryn Mawr College," *Educational Review* 68 (October 1924): 127-128.
- ⁸³ quoted in Smith 1929, 127.
- ⁸⁴ Smith 1929, 137-141.
- ⁸⁵ Smith 1929, 83-85, 137-141.
- ⁸⁶ See L. M. Rosenblatt, *Literature as Exploration* 4th ed. (New York: The Modern Language Association, 1933); A. C. Purves, T. Rogers, and A. O. Soter. *How Porcupines Make Love III: Readers, Texts, Cultures in the Response-based Literature Classroom*. (White Plains, NY: Longman, 1995).
- ⁸⁷ Funk 1921, 248.
- ⁸⁸ Straightforward descriptions of elective courses were taken entirely from Smith 1929, 71-77, 85-90, 130-135. Footnotes are used to identify the sources of all other information.
- ⁸⁹ See, e.g., Peggy Pascoe, *Relations of Rescue: The Search for Female Moral Authority in the American West, 1874-1939* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990) and Christine Stansell, *City of Women: Sex and Class in New York, 1789-1860* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1986).
- ⁹⁰ Maddalena 1978, 118-126.
- ⁹¹ "Faculty committee report, 1924 Summer School," Hilda Worthington Smith Collection, Wisconsin State Historical Society Library Archives cited in Maddalena 1978, 125-126.
- ⁹² Louise Brownell Saunders, "Four Weeks' Experience in the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Labor," *Bryn Mawr Bulletin* 1 (November 1921) cited in Maddalena 1978, 124-125.
- ⁹³ Maddalena 1978, 81-96.
- ⁹⁴ The impact of Thomas's retirement is suggested by Heller, Maddalena, and Orleck. Heller 1986, 152-153; Maddalena 1978, 126-127, 133-134; Orleck 1995.
- ⁹⁵ Gratten states that "sardonic bystanders" referred to these as Miss Smith's "'integrated paragons.'" C. Hartley Gratten, *In Quest of Knowledge: A Historical Perspective on Adult Education* (New York: Association Press, 1955), 253.
- ⁹⁶ Susan Shepherd Sweezy, questionnaire response, July 1980, collected by Rita Heller cited in Heller 1986, 127.
- ⁹⁷ Hewes 1921, 373.
- ⁹⁸ Interview with Lillian Herstein by Betty Balanoff, 7 May 1971, "Twentieth Century Trade Union Woman: Vehicle for Social Change Oral History Project, Program on Women and Work, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan - Wayne State University, 1978 cited in Heller 1986, 168. Explanations of text are not in the original and have been added by this author.
- ⁹⁹ Freddy Drake Paine, filmed interview, Bryn Mawr, PA June 1984 cited in Heller 1986, 161.
- ¹⁰⁰ Welch 1991, 83-99.
- ¹⁰¹ Esther Peterson, "The Medium of Movement," *Journal of Adult Education* 7 (April 1935), 182-185.
- ¹⁰² Interview of Carolyn Ware, Washington, DC, May 1983, cited on 152; Interview with Broadus Mitchell, New York, NY, January 1982 cited on 162; Questionnaire from Helen Schuldenfrei Selden collected by Rita Heller as cited on 170. Heller 1986, 151-189.
- ¹⁰³ Nel Noddings, *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984), 177.
- ¹⁰⁴ Heller 1986, 174.
- ¹⁰⁵ Arthur Gleason and Spencer Miller Jr., *Workers' Education* (New York: The Workers Education Bureau, 1927). 25.
- ¹⁰⁶ Heller 1986, 151-189.
- ¹⁰⁷ Smith 1978, 117.
- ¹⁰⁸ Myles Horton and Paulo Freire, *We Make the Road by Walking: Conversations on Education and Social Change*

- (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), 177.
- ¹⁰⁹ Historian Susan Ware defined "social feminism" as a "broadly based philanthropy in support of women." Susan Ware, *Beyond Suffrage: Women in the New Deal* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), 16.
- ¹¹⁰ Heller 1986, 166-167, 176-179, 188-189. Telephone interview with Alice Hanson Cook by Rita Heller cited in Heller 1986, 177.
- ¹¹¹ For example, Eleanor G. Coit, "Workers Education and the Community," *American Teacher* 17 (December 1932): 67; Eleanor G. Coit, "Progressive Education at Work" in *Workers' Education in the United States*, ed. Theodore Brameld (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941); Broadus Mitchell 1924; Peterson 1935, 182-185; Hewes 1956, 211-220; Spencer Miller Jr. "Adult Education and the Industrial Worker," *Journal of Adult Education* 1 (October 1929) 382-387; Spencer Miller Jr. and Mollie Ray Carroll, *American Workers Education: Its Meaning, Methods and Policies* (New York: Workers Education Bureau, 1934).
- ¹¹² For example, Funk 1921; Rita Heller, "Blue Collars and Bluestockings: The Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers: 1921-1938," in *Sisterhood and Solidarity*, ed. Joyce L. Kornbluh and Mary Frederickson (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984); Heller 1986; Maddalena 1978; Smith 1929; Smith 1978.
- ¹¹³ Pascoe has set a precedent for the application of cultural feminism and the "new moral vision" to female social reformers. See Pascoe 1990. For a detailed explanation of cultural feminism refer to Donovan. Josephine Donovan, *Feminist Theory: The Intellectual Traditions of American Feminism* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1985), 171-186.
- ¹¹⁴ A "new moral vision" is the title to a chapter in Donovan's book about contemporary additions to and adaptations of what cultural feminists would have called women's values Donovan, 1985, 171.
- ¹¹⁵ M. F. Belenky, et al., *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind* (New York: Basic Books, 1986); Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* 2nd. ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993); Noddings 1984, 83-99; Welsh, 1991, 83-99.
- ¹¹⁶ Noddings 1984, 1-29, 171-182.
- ¹¹⁷ quoted in Smith 1929, 95.
- ¹¹⁸ This statement of purpose is taken from the Constitution as amended in 1923. It represents a change in emphasis from that of influencing social reconstruction to reflective inquiry into the economic problems of society and the development of a sustained interest in learning. (Hilda Worthington Smith 1929, 7-8).
- ¹¹⁹ Esther Peterson, filmed interview, cited in Heller 1986, 25.
- ¹²⁰ Mary Beard, wife of Charles Beard, referred to the Summer School as "unnatural" because of its expectations of such a cross-class alliance. I take this phrase from her reference. Mary Beard, "Report of Fact Finding Committee, 1935" in Van Kleeck Papers cited in Heller, 1986, 82.
- ¹²¹ Lena Richman Zieph, "The Bryn Mawr Summer School: A Worker's Viewpoint," *The Lantern* 2 (January 1922), 30-31 *The Lantern* was a magazine of student writings published cooperatively by students and faculty. Cited in Heller 1986, 201-202.
- ¹²² quoted in Smith 1929, 16.
- ¹²³ Smith 1929, 22-23.
- ¹²⁴ Smith 1929, 117-119; Smith 1978, 136-137.
- ¹²⁵ quoted in Smith 1929, 108.
- ¹²⁶ My conclusions here are based on the reactions of instructors during the initial years of the Summer School. These reactions are reported in Smith 1929; Smith 1978; Hewes 1956, 216.
- ¹²⁷ Tarbell had also used the term "sizzles" in reference to tolerance. One might question if it is perhaps Tarbell's use of it that Smith remembers instead of its use by a student. quoted in Smith 1929, 15; also used in Tarbell 1922, 11-12.
- ¹²⁸ quoted in Smith 1929, 93.
- ¹²⁹ quoted on 134, Smith 1978, 127-134.
- ¹³⁰ Smith 1978, 149-150.
- ¹³¹ Gilligan 1993; Noddings 1984.
- ¹³² Mitchell 1924, 126-127; Smith 1929, 15, 22-33; Smith 1978, 128-155; Hewes 1956, 216).
- ¹³³ Miller 1929, 384.
- ¹³⁴ Geneva Gay, *At the Essence of Learning: Multicultural Education* (West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi, 1994).
- ¹³⁵ Darder 1991, 47-71.
- ¹³⁶ Hewes 1956, 216; Maddalena 1978, 107.
- ¹³⁷ See Welch 1991, 83-99, for an interpretation of the connection between shared experiences and perspectives and conditions of solidarity.
- ¹³⁸ Welch 1991, 83-99.
- ¹³⁹ Smith 1929, 166-167.
- ¹⁴⁰ This interpretation is based on the writings of Welch 1991, 83-99.
- ¹⁴¹ Smith 1978, 138.
- ¹⁴² The struggle for "bread and roses" is portrayed in (auto)biographical resources that focus on the lives of working women immigrants. Respect and a decent standard of living were the chief concerns of these women. See, for example, Schneiderman and Goldwaite 1967; Smith 1978; Dye 1980; Kessler-Harris 1982; Orleck 1995.
- ¹⁴³ Song quoted on 139, Smith 1978, 137-140.
- ¹⁴⁴ Smith 1929, 171.
- ¹⁴⁵ Dewey 1916.
- ¹⁴⁶ "Plan of Instruction" (In the files of Wisconsin State Historical Society Library Archives, Hilda Worthington Smith Collection). See Heller 1986, 62.
- ¹⁴⁷ In the postmodern critique of education, the concept of students as knowledge producers is contrasted with that of students as passive recipients of knowing or what Freire calls "the banking model" of teaching. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, rev. ed. (New York: Continuum 1970); Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren, "Language, Schooling, and Subjectivity: Beyond a Pedagogy of Reproduction and Resistance," in *Contemporary Issues in U. S. Education*

- eds. K. Borman, P. Swami 1991, and L. Wagstaff (Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing, 1991), 79; Joe Kincheloe, *Toward a Critical Politics of Teacher Thinking: Mapping the Postmodern*, Critical Studies in Education and Culture Series, eds. Henry Giroux and Paulo Freire (Westport, CN: Bergin and Garvey, 1993), 192-193, 208-209.
- ¹⁴⁸ Smith 1978, 127.
- ¹⁴⁹ Smith 1978, 129.
- ¹⁵⁰ Coit 1941, 167; Smith 1978, 128-129.
- ¹⁵¹ Smith 1978, 129.
- ¹⁵² Hewes 1956, 216-217.
- ¹⁵³ Dewey 1916, 184-188, 217; Welch 1991.
- ¹⁵⁴ Smith 1929, 271-272; Smith 1978, 128.
- ¹⁵⁵ Alice Hanson, "Action and Study: Some Representative Examples of Workers' Education Programs," *Fifth Yearbook of the John Dewey Society: Workers Education in the United States* ed. Theodore Brameld (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941), 145-146.
- ¹⁵⁶ "Dramatics" 1936 Coit Papers, Box 16 cited in Heller 1986, 221.
- ¹⁵⁷ Smith 1929, 159-164.
- ¹⁵⁸ Smith 1929, 26.
- ¹⁵⁹ Dewey 1916, 86-88; Robert Westbrook, *John Dewey and American Democracy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), 172.
- ¹⁶⁰ Smith 1929, 61-62.
- ¹⁶¹ Smith 1929, 148-150. Quotations from pages 149 and 150 respectively.
- ¹⁶² Smith 1929, 151.
- ¹⁶³ Smith 1929, 152.
- ¹⁶⁴ Smith 1929, 155-157.
- ¹⁶⁵ For more on cooperatives, see Dana Frank, *Purchasing Power: Consumer Organizing, Gender, and the Seattle Labor Movement* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- ¹⁶⁶ Smith 1929, 157-158.
- ¹⁶⁷ Smith 1929, 158.
- ¹⁶⁸ Kincheloe 1993, 67.
- ¹⁶⁹ Grattan 1955, 251; Joyce L. Kornbluh, "A New Deal for Workers' Education: The Workers' Service Program under the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and the Works Progress Administration, 1933-1942," (Ph. D. diss., Rutgers University, The State University of New Jersey, 1986), 64.
- ¹⁷⁰ Smith 1978, 142-144; Heller 1986, 242.
- ¹⁷¹ Smith 1978, 124.
- ¹⁷² "Editorial," *New Republic* 33 (June 12, 1935): 115; Heller 1986.
- ¹⁷³ Hilda Worthington Smith to President Marion E. Park, March 28, 1935, President's Official Correspondence File quoted in Heller 1986, 256.
- ¹⁷⁴ "Editorial," *New Republic* 33 (June 12, 1935): 115.
- ¹⁷⁵ Heller 1986, 252-260.
- ¹⁷⁶ Heller 1986, 260-262.
- ¹⁷⁷ By way of epilogue, the Summer School later re-opened as the Hudson Shore Labor School, taking up its new residence on Jane Smith's family estate. It stayed there until 1952 when it became a part of the Rutgers University Labor Education program. Smith 1978; Grattan 1955; Heller 1986.
- ¹⁷⁸ Freire, 1970, 52-67; 179 Freire, 1970, 52-67.
- ¹⁸⁰ My thinking about autobiographical experiencing is based on Gay, Kincheloe, Slattery, and Pinar. Gay 1994; Freire 1970; Kincheloe, 1993; William F. Pinar, *Autobiography, Politics and Sexuality: Essays in Curriculum Theory 1972-1992* (New York: Peter Lang) 1994.; Patrick Slattery, *Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era* (New York: Garland), 1995.
- ¹⁸¹ Dewey 1916.