Atılım Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi 1(2), 141-164

How Domestic Reform Movements Transformed Western Patriarchy from the 18th Century into the Early 20th Century

Suzanne M. Spencer-Wood

Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Oakland University

Abstract

Raising the status of women in Western patriarchy from the 18th century into the 20th century was perhaps the most important social transformation of the time. Women I call domestic reformers changed patriarchal ideology and practices with new gender ideologies that combined the supposedly separate female-domestic and male-public spheres in multiple ways. Women and their domestic sphere were associated with the higher morality of communitarian church values as men and their public sphere were separated from the church by conflicting capitalist practices that were sins. Domestic reformers valorized women's moral-domestic values and skills, transforming them into women's new public professions, organizations and institutions that were considered part of women's domestic sphere and thus acceptable in the patriarchal separate-spheres gender ideology. Women created a great diversity of reform movements that raised women's religious, social, and legal status in both the domestic and public spheres. Domestic reform movements are grouped into two categories. Public cooperative housekeeping socialized aspects of housework and mothering in women's public institutions and professions, from daycare to nursing, dietitians, and social work. In the municipal housekeeping movement women's expertise in housework led to government appointments in positions considered community housekeeping. Domestic reform was instrumental in gaining woman suffrage.

Keywords

Patriarchy, transformation, gender, 18th century, 19th century

Introduction

In this article research undertaken from the perspective of feminist agency theory reveals how reform women and their male allies raised the status of women within Western patriarchy from the 18th century into the early twentieth century. This major cultural transformation has been neglected by de-gendered histories and analyses of processes of culture change during this time period. An anthropological approach is taken here to focus on processes of culture change more than historical events. A cultural evolutionary perspective has led to the discovery of relationships across centuries that have often fallen in the cracks between publications covering predominantly one century or less.

In order to appreciate the transformation of the gender system, pre-existing patriarchal ideology and laws enforcing male domination and female subordination in the home are first briefly summarized. What I call structuralist-feminist theory is used to analyze patriarchal social structures, such as cultural gender ideology, the judicial system, and government. Given men's legal control of women, how did women modify patriarchy when they lacked any formal political or legal powers? The kinds of powers available to men and women are briefly analyzed with my heterarchical framework of multiple interacting powers. Women's "powers with" each other and male allies are exemplified by modifications of patriarchal laws in the 19th and early 20th centuries. The rest of the article analyzes how reform women, who I call domestic reformers, changed patriarchal culture by purposely conflating women's domestic sphere and men's public spheres in multiple ways that increased women's status and powers in both spheres. A major 18th-century shift in gender ideology is outlined that empowered women to move out of their domestic sphere of the home and create early public charitable organizations. Then, research from the perspective that I call feminist diversity theory, originating in the 1990s, reveals how reform women increased their status and powers by creating alternative gender ideologies that legitimated combining the public and domestic spheres to create new women's public professions, organizations, and institutions. Some of the European social reform ideologies and movements that inspired women's movements in America are outlined. The perspective of feminist diversity theory is used to analyze some of the multiple gender ideologies, identities, roles, relationships and power dynamics that existed due to the intersections of gender with other social dimensions, such as class, race, ethnicity, religion, age, and sexual orientation.

Legal Powers Enforcing Men's Dominance Over Women

The "separate spheres" gender ideology was initially created to legitimate men's public-sphere legal domination of women and their subordination in the domestic sphere of the home. The ideological discourse of "separate spheres" legitimated patriarchy by constructing gender as an innate, biologically-based, unchanging hierarchical dichotomy opposing dominant, public, active, rational, cultural, superior men versus subordinate, passive, irrational, natural, inferior, domestic women (Cott 1977, 161; Matthaei 1982, 29-32, 110-11; Robertson 1982, 26-8; Spencer-Wood 1992, 99; Verbrugge 1988, 117). Women were considered physically, biologically, mentally and morally inferior to men since at least ancient Greek civilization, later religiously sanctified by the biblical story of the moral failing of Eve that led God to cast Adam and Eve out of Eden (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, xiii-xiv, 96-9, 336-7; Donovan 2001, 19; Helsinger et al 1983, 76-7, 89-91,

105-6, 167-71). Men have been valorized as the makers of history through their public sphere activities, while women and their domestic sphere have been culturally devalued as irrelevant to the important affairs of the world, and therefore not worth researching (Spencer-Wood 1992, 99).

In 19th-century Europe and America the subjugation of women and the domestic sphere to men and their public sphere came to be enforced by men's new national law codes that transformed many domestic, intimate, and bodily affairs into public legal matters. In general, wives and their children had the legal status of chattel belonging to husbands, similar to slaves, although wives were often (but not always) treated better (Collins 2003, 53; Robertson 1982, 246). Husbands ruled their families and wives were legally incompetent minors with practically no civil rights, similar to children, the insane, and Negroes. Wives had no legal existence as persons, had no rights in their children, were prohibited from public legal actions, and were represented by their husbands, who owned their wives bodies, property, and earnings, and controlled what they did and where they lived. Wives were legally required to perform sex with their husbands on demand. A husband could legally confine his wife, beat her "with moderation" (except in France, Switzerland, and Massachusetts), and divorce her for adultery. Divorce for women was difficult to impossible, except in Germany 1794-1900. Wives who ran away could be hunted by police like runaway slaves and returned to their masters or imprisoned (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 28, 147-50; Helsinger et al 1983, 90-4; Kwolek-Folland 2002, 19-24; Millett 1970, 67-9; Robertson 1982, 150, 154-6, 163, 177, 237, 275-8, 350, 377, 455; Wollstonecraft 1975, 151-3).

Gendering Powers

How could women change patriarchy when they had no formal political or legal powers? Due to widespread gender segregation in their separate spheres, men and women had different sources and kinds of power at their disposal. While men had public legal powers over women and children, women only had the informal powers of a subordinate group. And yet, in the end, women's subordinate powers were arguably more powerful than men's powers of domination, because women influenced men to develop more egalitarian gender laws and ideology. How did this happen?

An understanding of women's and men's different kinds of powers can be gained through my model of power heterarchy, which draws on what I call feminist diversity diversity to theorize a variety of plural powers. My model of a heterarchy of many different powers was inspired by Marquart and Crumley's (1987) theorizing of the ranking of geographical places as a heterarchy of parallel or multiple rankings rather than the simple hierarchical ranking of places by size theorized in central place theory (Veneris 1984). I have translated the concept of heterarchical ranking of geographical places into a heterarchical conception of powers in general as multiple and diverse, including *both* traditionally analyzed hierarchically ranked forms of power *and* unranked or multiply-ranked nonhierarchical forms of power. This inclusive model of plural powers developed from my feminist inclusive *both/and* theoretical perspective that critiques and corrects the limits of oppositional models of power based on hierarchical *either/or* thinking (Spencer-Wood 1995, 129-30).

My model of a heterarchy of powers identifies, and provides parallel names for, four kinds of powers: *not only* previously theorized hierarchically ranked forms of power, or domination, that I call "powers over" others, *but also* resistant "powers under" of subordinate groups, *and* nonranked cooperative "powers with" others. "Powers over" others include physically, mentally or legally enforced or coerced domination based on interacting positions in a social structure, such as class, race, patriarchy, ethnicity, religion, age, etc. "Power under" others includes many forms of resistance, from feigning illness and foot dragging, to rebellion. "Powers with" others are not hierarchical or coercive, but rather affiliative, such as cooperation, accommodation, collaboration, inspiration, empowerment, persuasion, influence, and negotiation (Spencer-Wood 1999, 179). Women's and men's reform organizations involved using "powers with" each other and male legislators in order to create changes in cultural beliefs and laws.

While it is important to use traditional either/or thinking to distinguish these different kinds of powers, my feminist inclusive both/and theoretical perspective reveals that these different kinds of powers can all interact in complex ways (Spencer-Wood 1995, 129-30), since "powers with" others can be used by dominant as well as subordinate social groups. These three different kinds of powers can each also be "powers to" create change either alone or in combination with other kinds of power.

While the dominant group of men in Western societies made private and intimate matters public to enforce the subordination of women under patriarchy, women used "powers with" each other, and with allied men, including fathers who sought to improve the lives of their daughters, to slowly reform patriarchy. Starting in the 1400s proto-feminists argued that women were morally and mentally equal to men and deserved equal education (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 91-5). Not until the 19th century did equal public primary-school education become generally available to girls, followed by secondary and higher education stretching into the 20th century (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 30, 185-8, 250-2; Collins 2003, 60-1, 106; Robertson 1982, 338; Solomon 1985, 3, 15-17, 55-6; Verbrugge 1988, 118). Predominantly after 1850, men outlawed wifebeating as barbaric, and fathers protected their daughters from wastrel husbands by passing laws granting wives more control over their children, property, earnings, and divorce (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 150-1, 360, 379; Ginzberg 1990, 102; Kwolek-Folland 2002, 50-1, 95; Robertson 1982, 151, 159, 163, 167, 243, 246-7, 249, 278, 379, 456, 458). In general, women gained the vote in Protestant countries after World War I, and in Catholic countries after World War II, partly in recognition of the importance of women's war contributions and their ability to perform men's jobs (Robertson 1982, 278, 379). In the late-19th century American women first gained voting rights on municipal school and tax issues, followed by voting rights in four of the United States (Ginzberg 1990, 187, Hymowitz and Weissman 1978, 184-7).

Early Development of Domestic Reform Ideology and Charitable Organizations

Before women could use persuasive "powers with" men to change patriarchal laws, they needed an ideology legitimating their informal powers. During the 18th and 19th centuries women and allied men developed several alternative gender ideologies that legitimated women in increasing their powers *both* in the home *and* in men's public sphere. Women worked with male allies to fundamentally transform the meaning of the dominant separate-

spheres gender ideology by valorizing and raising the status of women's previously devalued domestic values and skills, and legitimating their use to influence men and their public governmental affairs. The reformers extended women's domestic values and roles into public roles, organizations and institutions that they claimed were still part of the domestic sphere. Domestic reformers accepted the identification of women as domestic but worked to transform domesticity from a subordinate inferior identity to a powerful superior identity.

Women's development of a powerful domestic identity began during the 18th century, when the status of women and their domestic sphere was raised through identification with culturally important religious values and powers. The first major ideological shift occurred as men increasingly adopted the values and practices of capitalism that were considered biblical sins, and were illegal in the Puritan theocratic colony of Massachusetts, such as usury, exploitation of others, making excessive profits, price gouging, and exporting goods needed in the colonies (Epstein 1981, 12-13, 24-5, 28, 48-50). Men were drawn out of churches by the conflict between Christian moral-communitarian values of social justice and capitalist competitive values and practices. As women came to dominate church membership they and their domestic sphere became identified with the Christian values of love, piety, humility, purity, morality, sacredness, cooperation, and fairness, spatially expressed in the segregation of women's domestic sphere from men's sinful capitalist public sphere. Women were considered "God's appointed agent of morality" (Hale 1854, xxxv). In the second half of the 18th century the justification of women's subjugation to men due to Eve's original sin, and the Calvinist belief in predestination for heaven of only a select few economically successful men, were largely replaced with the Protestant Evangelical doctrine that anyone could achieve heaven by performing good deeds, especially charitable works. Women's superior Christian values empowered them with a higher sanctified authority to perfect society by morally reforming or "civilizing" men and their sinful capitalist public sphere through charitable work providing some social justice (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 126, 179; Cott 1977, 86-7, 129, 131, 136, 140, 142; Epstein 1981, 45, 51, 62; Ginzberg 1990, 11-14; Robertson 1982, 13, 18-21, 30-2). The ideology of Enlightenment perfectionism combined with millennialism in women's attempts to morally reform society for Christ's second coming (Hill 1985, Porterfield 1980, 99-128, 155-88).

Having established women's superior morality as a source of women's superiority to men, ministers, priests, and other writers argued women had an obligation to morally reform irreligious men and their sinful capitalist society by participating in church-sponsored prayer groups, Sunday Schools, maternal associations for raising Christian children, missions promoting Protestant religions, religious charitable societies, service organizations, women's auxiliaries to raise funds for churches, and visitors to the poor and sick. In America William Alcott urged training women to become charitable nurses for all of society. Women's organizations grew phenomenally in the early 19th century, but were very predominantly sponsored by churches before 1835 (Alcott 1834, 303; Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 180; Cott 1977, 130-5, 137, 142; Ginzberg 1990, 14; Robertson 1982,

489-93). The identification of domesticity with morality empowered women to organize for two purposes: mutual support and social reform (Ginzberg 1990, 18). Women's church auxiliaries provided a training ground for women to organize a wide variety of religious charitable organizations and institutions for the relief of poor women and children, including orphanages, hospitals, asylums for the insane, homes for unemployed women, destitute widows, or wayward women; and industrial schools and houses of industry that employed poor women and children in spinning as early as 1798 in Philadelphia. Women also tried to make public institutions more home-like (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 180-1; Cott 1977, 134n; Ginzberg 1990, 38, 60; Hayden 1981, 152-3; Scott 1991, 13; Wertheimer 1977, 16-17). In Catholic countries orders of unpaid nuns cared for orphans, the sick, the poor, the old, and female convicts in prisons (Robertson 1982, 329).

Women organized to morally perfect society by raising Christian children and attempting to curtail men's licentious behaviors. Starting in the 1820s women took authority over childhood education from pastors and family patriarchs by organizing maternal associations (Ryan 1982, 56). Maternal societies were formed by women for mutual support in carrying out their mission in the Cult of Republican Motherhood to raise their children as Christians who would form a moral society. Mothers were valorized for the elaborated task of raising moral Christian children, and especially boys who would become the next citizens and leaders of a moral republic (Beecher 1841, 13; Cott 1977, 149-51; Robertson 1982, 15-17; Solomon 1985, 12). In domestic manuals mothers' moral influence on their sons was valorized for creating a new ideal of moral masculinity subjugated to loving maternal morality, replacing the earlier more aggressive masculinity (Ryan 1982, 58-9). In the 19th century many women demonstrated their higher morality by converting capitalist husbands and sons to churches espousing moral communitarian values (Epstein 1981, 51). The new single ideal for masculine as well as feminine moral domesticity had some effect by the 1860s, as up to 40% of men in their late twenties still lived with their parents in places such as Utica, New York, and Hamilton, Ontario (Ryan 1982, 60).

Women founded moral reform societies to eliminate the sexual double standard that blamed women as the temptress daughters of Eve for their own and men's fall from grace into licentiousness. The American Female Moral Reform Society argued that "fallen" women were the victims of licentious men, who deserved to be ostracized and treated with the disrespect accorded prostitutes (Ginzberg 1990, 19, 21-2). In New York and other urban newspapers Female Moral Reform Societies published lists of prominent men who visited brothels during the 1840s (Rosen 1982, 8). At a deeper level many women's organizations and popular domestic manuals from the 1830s through the 1890s sought to convert men to a single feminine standard of morality and sexual restraint espoused in the Cult of Domesticity (Ginzberg 1990, 12; Rosen 1982: 54-5; Ryan 1982: 50-8). "Respectability" was defined in terms of women's virtues in order to morally control husbands, sons, and the social order (Ginzberg 1990, 22; Ryan 1982, 19-20). Garrisonian Republicans valorized women's superior morality as the model for a new moral masculinity and joined women in spurning the corruption of politics for "moral suasion" (Ginzberg 1990, 67-8, 81, 85). In the 19th century Catholic as well as Protestant religious organizations in Europe

and America founded reformatories for prostitutes and "wayward" girls, who were sent to the institutions by their families or after arrest. The institutions sought to reform "fallen" women into proper moral-domestic women by requiring inmates to perform housework, especially laundry, to the profit of the institutions (Cott 1977, 151-3; De Cunzo 1995, Finnegan 2001, Ginzberg 1990, 13, 19-23; Hobson 1990, 117-124).

Athough not recognized as such by historians, women's charitable organizations and institutions were early aspects of domestic reform because they were viewed as natural extensions of women's superior domestic-moral values and sanctified roles such as mothering, nursing the sick, and creating a home (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 179-81; Ginzberg 1990, 16-17, 59-60; Verbrugge 1988, 122). Many domestic reform organizations, and especially charitable ones, were legitimated by middle-class women's alternative gender ideology of women's innately superior domesticity, piety, purity, morality, and submissiveness, called the Cult of True Womanhood or Domesticity (Welter 1966), which transformed women's domesticity from a devalued identity into a powerful identity that empowered women's public organizations. Women's organizations were also legitimated by the biblical injunction against idleness, the resulting denigration of idle elite women as "social butterflies" by reformers, feminists, and working women, and the valorization of women who were employed or undertook benevolent activities (Lockwood 1893, 385; Preston 1987, Wollstonecraft 1975, 118, 145-6). The gender segregation in society in general, as well as in voluntary associations, resulted in strong homosocial relationships being normative. Women viewed their friendships as morally superior to heterosexual relationships because women's friendships excluded the biblical sin of carnality (Cott 1977, 189).

Ideologically legitimated political/legal methods of women's reform organizations

By the 19th century domestic women's supposed innately superior piety and morality made them particularly suited for conducting charitable organizations (Ginzberg 1990, 1, 11-35, 39). The cultural norm of gender-segregated women's organizations developed out of the widespread gender segregation and resulting homosociality of Western patriarchies (Cott 1979, Ginzberg 1990, 39-40; Verbrugge 1988, 67). Since women's higher morality was supposedly due to their exclusion from the sordid affairs of politics and capitalism, they needed to reach across the gender boundary and enlist male allies who could change laws to grant women civil rights and the ability to take public actions (Ginzberg 1990, 14, 25, 59, 67; Robertson 1982, 30-2). Some male allies were fathers, or husbands of reform women or feminists. Some women's reform organizations invited male reformers to lead them or speak to them. In the later 19th century some women' organizations were revolutionary in being mixed-gendered, particularly social settlements.

In the 19th century many domestic reform organizations developed a number of methods to politically influence legislators. First, most women's organizations drew on the dominant ideological discourse of women's superior moral authority to either explicitly or implicitly argue that their reform programs and institutions deserved government support because they would contribute to morally reforming society by addressing inequalities of women and children resulting from men's sinful capitalism (Ginzberg 1990, 14).

Second, wealthy women's and men's donations and membership in reform organizations influenced legislators through financial clout and connections to a social network of wealthy women and men supporting legislators interested in social reform. Some women's societies organized fairs that raised as much as two million in 1860s dollars from supporters of social reform in cities such as New York and Philadelphia (Ginzberg 1990, 42-5, 65-6, 76-7, 167-8). Legislators recognized that every woman influenced at least one voter (Adams 1838, 65). Amelia Bloomer's paper *The Lily* (1849), urged women to "exert our powers of persuasion (…) Let us give the men over whom we have and influence no peace, until they consent to make our votes their own, and deposit them for us." A mother influenced her son to cast the final deciding vote in favor of women's suffrage.

Third, women's organizations petitioned legislators for social reforms, incorporation, and government funding. Legislative action on such petitions occurred more frequently when wealthy women were among the members, and when organizations operated institutions for poor or "fallen" women (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 183; Ginzberg 1990, 48-58, 74-82; Robertson 1982, 334; Scott 1991, 22, 2655). In the later 19th century some petitions by women's organizations gained women the right to vote in some municipal elections, resulting in elections of women to local school committees, and city boards of education as early as the 1870s (Ginzberg 1990, 188; Scott 1991, 115; Verbrugge 1988, 117). Fourth, some women convinced male governmental officials to fund women's organizations and appoint them to government positions that professionalized some of women's charitable work (Ginzberg 1990, 73-9, 189).

In the 19th century women successfully petitioned male legislators to incorporate their institutions, providing women's organizations with male public legal rights that women lacked. Incorporation made women's organizations equivalent to men's businesses, circumventing the civil death of wives in common law by providing them with male legal and civil powers that allowed them to own property and invest funds they raised (Scott 1991, 26). In 1803, in the first incorporation of a women's organization, the Boston Female Asylum's female managers, rejected legislators' suggestion that their funds be controlled by male trustees. This petition set a precedent that was accepted and continued into the 20th century as women gained civil rights (Ginzberg 1990, 48-53). Women's societies were financially as well as culturally significant in cities because they invested money in stable ventures such as bank stock and insurance companies. For instance, the Boston Female Asylum invested the substantial sum of $45,500 in the Massachusetts Hospital Life Insurance Company, providing the company significant income (BFA 1844, 30-1; Ginzberg 1990, 62).

Despite the rhetoric of the higher morality of women's volunteerism unsullied by the crass capitalist motivations (Robertson 1982, 19-20, 162), their organizations served as a safety net by employing middle-class benevolent women who fell into poverty through inability of a father or husband to support his family. Despite the public claim that benevolent women had only pure religious motivations because they were unpaid, most women's charitable organizations and institutions quietly hired middle-class women in genteel poverty, such as Louisa May Alcott's mother, as friendly visitors or urban missionaries

to the poor, as speakers, as matrons or teachers in their institutions, or as traveling agents who established new auxiliaries, thus increasing funds, subscriptions to journals and membership (Ginzberg 1990, 22, 48-58; Lebsock 1984, 197; Scott 1991, 2, 19, 26). During the 19th century women's organizations created an increasing diversity of charitable institutions for women and children, which were often racially and ethnically segregated in cities as different racial and ethnic groups established institutions run by and for women and children of their group (Scott 1991, Spencer-Wood 1994).

Strategies of Domestic Reform

Domestic reform is my term for the great diversity of middle-class and elite women's turn-of-the century social reform movements that raised women's status in both the domestic and public spheres by conflating and combining the supposedly separate spheres. These reformers were what Donovan (2001) calls cultural feminists, who valorized women's superior domestic values and skills and claimed women's moral superiority in their domestic sphere made them separate but equal with men's political superiority in their public sphere. While these reformers maintained the earlier belief in women's moral superiority, most combined this belief with men's public-sphere scientific worldview, transforming aspects of housework and mothering into scientific professions.

Domestic reformers used two different strategies for reforming society by combining women's superior domestic values and skills with men's public-sphere science. Some reformers continued to expand the previous strategy of extending women's domestic tasks and values into public organizations and institutions in order to morally reform society. Most additionally transformed some of women's domestic tasks into scientific public professions and institutions. Some reformers brought male-identified public-sphere scientific-industrial technology into the home to rationalize housework into a profession equivalent to men's professions (Hayden 1981). The rest of this article first addresses domestic reform of the home, followed by the domestic-public organizations, institutions and professions created by reform women.

Raising the Status of Housework by Bringing Public-Sphere Technology into Homes

Men ruled households and often even controlled their furnishings until the 1830s-50s, when the Cult of Domesticity associating the domestic sphere with women led most domestic advice manuals to shift from addressing the patriarch of the household to addressing his wife (Beecher and Stowe 1869; Robertson 1982, 133; Ryan 1982, 19-45, 97). Throughout the 19th century some reform women sought to raise the status of women by elaborating their domestic work into complex and often rationally organized sets of tasks (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 135-8; Ryan 1982:46, 56).

Feminist research on women's domestic manuals, which were not previously considered worth researching, reveals how both European and American women sought to raise the status of women's domestic work to a profession by applying male-identified science and rational systematic order to housework (Beecher and Stowe 1869; Fredericks 1923; Richards 1905; Robertson 1982, 134, 137, 140-1, 144-5). Women increased their power in the domestic sphere by elaborating mothering, Victorian meals, and cleaning into complex sets of tasks that they argued made housework equivalent to men's professions, and required more education for women. The most popular domestic manual in the second

half of the 19th century, by Beecher and Stowe (1869), was the first to advocate and provide drawings of ideal arrangements of furniture for more efficient sequencing of food preparation, cleanup, and other household tasks (Beecher and Stowe 1869, 32-6, 40).

As the dominant ideology shifted from the medieval view of children as little workers to the 19th-century view of childhood as a set of stages requiring training, mothering gained importance for raising the next generation of citizens of countries, and especially new republics in Europe and America (Beecher 1841, 13; Cott 1977, 149-51; Robertson 1982, 15-17). In America, starting in the early 19th-century, the Cult of Republican Motherhood religiously and culturally raised the status of mothering from an innate natural function to a politically important complex set of tasks that had to be learned, legitimating women's education. Women established mothers' clubs to support each other in learning scientific mothering (Scott 1991).

In *both* Europe *and* America in the 19th-century wives were viewed as the moral guardians of the family. The domestic sphere was considered a sacred refuge from men's competitive capitalist public sphere (Robertson 1982, 19-20, 406; Ryan 1982, 41). The superior morality of women and their domestic sphere was due to their separation from men's sinful public capitalist sphere. Beecher and Stowe (1869, 19-21, 23-4) espoused the Cult of Home Religion, which made an analogy that raised self-sacrificing domestic work and mothering to the high status of the profession of minister. Wives were considered the ministers of the home, innately pious moral guardians of the family who read the Bible each week to the family gathered around a round table with a vase of flowers symbolizing the moral influence of God's nature (Handlin 1979, 55-8). A bay window in a parlor became a conservatory where God's nature was brought into woman's domestic sphere to morally reform children through contact with nature (Beecher and Stowe 1869, 26, 97, 295-6). The Cult of Home Religion raised The Cult of Domesticity to a profession and gave sacred meaning to the Gothic house architecture of the 1860s.

Later domestic manuals focused on applying public-sphere scientific-industrial technology to rationalize housework through logical sequencing of tasks and mechanization. For instance, Ellen Swallow Richards, the first female graduate and professor at MIT, in 1905 wrote a domestic manual that brought the material culture of sanitary reform from the hospital into the home, such as glass shelves and tables (Richards 1905). Christine Frederick's 1915 domestic manual applied men's industrial principles of efficiency to housework by making Taylor-type time-motion studies of housework, in order to design logical procedural steps for maximum efficiency in task performance. Her domestic manual *Household Engineering* was immensely popular (Frederick 1923, 6-264). As Arwill-Nordbladh (2012) points out, Frederick's ideas were also very popular in Scandinavia, and particularly in the development of household laundries in Norway.

Transforming Housework and Mothering into Public Professions

In a related but larger and more diverse set of domestic reform movements women's private mothering and housekeeping tasks were transformed into public professions, organizations, and institutions. Domestic reformers redefined the scope of the domestic sphere as practically unlimited, with a belief that all aspects of social life had "domestic

meaning" (Leach 1980, 209). This belief led to the great diversity of women's domestic reform organizations and movements. Many reform ideologies and social movements spread from Western Europe to its colonies, while others originated in one of the colonies and then spread around the world (Coleman 1987, 5-7).

Women argued that their innately superior domestic skills and values made them best suited for public professions that were considered natural extensions of women's housework and mothering. Such arguments transformed a number of male professions into female professions, and then led to the creation of many new women's public professions and institutions. Employers continued the tradition of paying women between one quarter to two thirds of men's wages, providing an incentive to transform gender-segregated occupations from masculine to feminine (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 195, 248-9; Collins 2003, 99. 107). Reform women then argued that training was needed for these professions and they established and taught in classes and schools that justified women's higher education. Some professional schools developed into women's colleges, where women also were also hired as teachers.

The belief in women's superior domestic and child-rearing abilities legitimated women in establishing and running schools to train girls in housekeeping and piety, starting in 1684 in France, sponsored by the king (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 30). In America several women founded "finishing" schools to teach elite domestic and fine arts and piety to middle-class girls seeking to increase their attractiveness to future husbands. Women employed themselves in running and teaching in these schools (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 30; Robertson 1982, 413; Solomon 1985). Several boy's academies permitted girls to obtain more rigorous education (Solomon 1985, 15). In the 19th century several women in Europe and America founded schools that educated pupils in academic subjects as well as housekeeping and piety (Robertson 1982, 142-3). Many men's colleges and universities opened to women in the 19th century, but a few in Europe and America did not admit women until the 20th century (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 187-9; Solomon 1985, 17-21, 53-6).

Later in the 19th century domestic science became a subject taught in primary schools by female teachers with textbooks written by women (Bailey 1914). Domestic science, scientific cooking and scientific childcare were taught in industrial schools for girls and social settlements. Home economics developed as a discipline taught by women in secondary schools and colleges as they opened to girls and women from in second half of the 19th century into the 20th century. Around the turn of the century scientific cooking schools were established in Europe and America, and classes in cooking, home economics, childcare, hygiene and laundry, became part of the curriculum for girls in public schools and colleges (Anderson and Zinsser 1898, 185-7; Robertson 1982, 142-5). Classes in domestic science, scientific cooking and childcare were offered in women's social settlements in America. Women were the experts teaching domestic science, scientific cooking, scientific childcare, and home economics in secondary schools, industrial schools, social settlements, and women's colleges.

Reformers successfully argued that women should dominate primary school teaching because they were innately superior child rearers. Teaching was the only respectable profession for European and American women in the 18th and early 19th centuries (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 193-4; Solomon 1985, 16; Verbrugge 1988, 116). Starting in the early decades of the 19th-century in America, and later in Europe, primary schools opened to girls and teaching shifted from a male to a female profession on the argument that women were the naturally superior child-rearers (Robertson 1982, 413; Clinton 1984, 44; Rothman 1978, 56-60; Porterfield 1980, 119-21). In Europe primary and secondary education did not become available to girls until the last quarter of the century, and included courses in housework, hygiene, and mothering. Women became the predominant primary school teachers of both boys and girls because they accepted half to a quarter of men's pay as teachers. However, well into the 20th century women were required to resign from teaching when they married (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 193; Robertson 1982, 145; Collins 2003, 107, 110). State normal schools were established to train female teachers, providing another avenue of employment for women.

Reform women transformed nursing from male-dominated to a female-dominated profession on the argument that public nursing was a natural extension of women's expertise as family nurses . Public nursing was initially limited to men on battlefields. Many more military men died from illnesses than enemy fire. Nursing was transformed to a female-dominated profession by women who volunteered as nurses during the American Civil War, and by Englishwoman Florence Nightingale's female nursing corps during the Crimean War. Female nurses greatly reduced military men's deaths from operations and illnesses by improving the sanitation of military hospitals (Collins 2003, 199-203; Robertson 1982, 513). In Europe only men could obtain professional training as nurses, so Florence Nightingale had difficulty gaining admission to an early nursing school in Germany in 1852. In Germany Dr. Adolf Lette facilitated women's entry into nursing and midwifery. Schools to scientifically train female nurses developed in the last quarter of the 19th century, employing nurses as teachers. In Catholic countries new nursing and service orders were founded for wealthy young women who wanted to become unpaid nurses in hospitals or provide unpaid work in orphanages, refuges and overseas missions. Few women became doctors because they were seldom admitted to men's medical schools, were harassed as students, and were prohibited from hospital internships and employment in men's hospitals. In America women established separate medical schools and hospitals for women (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 167, 179-80, 188-9; Beard 1915, 47-8; Robertson 1982, 326, 334-5. 376, 394, 419-21, 444, 509-14; Vogel 1980, 19, 46, 57-8).

European and American middle-class reform women and their male allies also successfully argued that women's innate domestic skills made them best suited for several white-collar professions. Women were considered best suited to be store clerks selling dry goods to other women, while women's sewing ability gave them the superior dexterity needed for typing, typesetting, telegraphy, and telephone operation. Women replaced men as office clerks, secretaries, and sales clerks in the new department stores. Women's attention to detail earned them government positions as postal clerks, telegraph operators, and patent

office employees. They became librarians in the new city lending libraries (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 195; Baron 1987; Robertson 1982, 376). Around the turn of the century it was believed that women were superior at math because it was repetitive and boring work similar to housework. The occupations of bookkeeping and bank tellers were opened to women (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 196; Reinharz 1992, 78; Robertson 1982, 376).

Women's new public professions were legitimated with two new gender ideologies. The Cult of Real Womanhood argued that women needed to be educated, maintain health and physical fitness, marry carefully, and be trained in a profession in case they needed to support their family (Cogan 1989; Robertson 1982, 376). This ideology legitimated the development of women's physical education and gymnastics classes that were taught by women trained at schools in these new professions. Women founded the profession of physical therapy as an offshoot of physical eduction (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 202; MacDonald 1992, 105-6, 200-6; Robertson 1982, 339; Verbrugge 1988, 16-17, 139-92).

The Cult of Single Blessedness argued since 1780 that women should not marry men, but instead marry professions as a calling equivalent to nuns who are called by God renounce men to marry Christ. This ideology argued that the economic independence of professional women would redress women's economic dependence on men that made women subordinate. This ideology legitimated an increasing percentage of unmarried women in the United States and Western Europe during the 19th century (Chambers-Schiller 1984, 3-5, 21-3; Hajnal 1965:101-4).

Municipal Housekeeping

The diverse social movements that made aspects of women's housekeeping public can be classified into municipal housekeeping and public cooperative housekeeping. Scott (1991, 157) has noted that "standard histories of the age of reform have not included municipal housekeeping," although it was clearly important in opening new public professions and political activity to reform women. In municipal housekeeping women's domestic role as moral mother and housekeeper was extended from the private home into the public community, which was just considered as a larger household that also required women's superior domestic skills and morality to reform men's corrupt government (Robertson 1982, 375). By the early 20th century women in America and Europe could vote in some municipal elections, such as school boards, and were appointed to governmental positions such as factory inspectors, street inspectors, garbage inspectors, members of school committees, state boards of education, state boards of charities, municipal playground supervisors, prison matrons, juvenile parole officers, and heads of national welfare or women's and children's agencies (Addams 1910; Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 361-2; Beard 1915; Blair 1980, 93; Ginzberg 1990, 187-9; Hymowitz and Weissman 1978, 262; Melosi 1981, 35, 117-33; Robertson 1982, 144-5; Rothman 1978, 124-7, 153-6; Woloch 1984, 299).

Scott (1991, 106-8, 141-7, 179) has argued that reform women in the American municipal housekeeping movement invented the major political movement of progressivism with their programs for moral government and civic improvement, such as the inspectors above who were concerned with public health and workplace safety, parks and playgrounds, low-

cost housing, and safe and moral boarding houses for working women, such as YWCA. In 1912 Jane Addams, founder of the Hull House social settlement in Chicago, summarized work of reform women's organizations in her position paper that contributed major aspects of the American Progressive Party platform, including an eight-hour day and six-day work week, prohibition of child labor, support of unions, industrial health and safety laws, improvement of housing, regulation of women's employment, a federal system of accident, old-age and unemployment insurance, and women's suffrage (Hymowitz and Weissman 1978, 231-2, 311).

Public Cooperative Housekeeping

In the public cooperative housekeeping institutions women worked together communally to perform aspects of housework and mothering, socializing domestic tasks previously repeated in each household. The earliest cooperative housekeeping was conducted in medieval nunneries and monasteries, and since the 17th century by women in utopian communes in Europe and America. Communes were followers of charismatic, usually male, religious, leaders, who were inspired by passages in the Bible, Jesus' apostolic commune, new Christian sects, cosmologies, and philosophies (Holloway 1966). Women in communes cooperatively organized childcare, housework, gardening, and domestic production of agricultural and other specialty goods, some of which were sold to support communes. Utopian communal societies varied a great deal, but most offered women improved working conditions due to cooperation (Hayden 1976). Men cooperated in farming and in mills (Spencer-Wood 2006).

Cooperative cooking in communes was one source of inspiration for the development of urban community cooking cooperative businesses. In mid-19th century Europe and America bakeries, pie shops and cook shops sold hot food. In London families or their servants could bring food to be baked in a local baker's oven. Harriet Beecher Stowe (1868, 1) recounted her European experience of an ideal cooked-food service that delivered multi-course dinners. Around the turn of the century in England and America cooperative cooking became a female-run business in cooked-food delivery services, which transported food to middle-class members' homes. In America the most popular public cooperative housekeeping institutions were dining clubs, in which middle-class women organized their servants to cooperatively prepare dinners for member families, who ate in the club dining room. The increasing cost of servants no doubt gave impetus to the widespread development of dining clubs. Husbands increasingly supported their wives use of such cooperative cooking institutions to save them the exhaustion of preparing multi-course Victorian dinners (Hayden 1981, 207-27). Reformers also transformed women's home cooking expertise into the professions of nutritionists, hospital dietitions, writers of hospital dietary books, teachers of scientific cooking, and managers and workers in public kitchens that provided scientifically cooked food to the poor (Addams 1960, 102; Hayden 1981, 155-9, 162; Hunt 1912, 220-1, 226-7; Levenstein 1988, 51-2; Richards 1893, 356-60; 1901).

Cooperative mothering in socialist and often religious communes was one source of inspiration for creating new professions and institutions for urban community cooperative mothering that socialized childcare and early childhood education (Hayden 1981, 63). In Europe and America the earliest cooperative childcare was performed by women in

orphanages, which were run by nuns in Catholic countries (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 179-80). Such charitable institutions that cooperatively cared for poor children clearly fit women's moral mission to expand mothering from the home to the public sphere, and were encouraged by many Protestant ministers. In America women founded female orphanages in major cities, starting in 1800 in Boston (Ginzberg 1990, 38-9; Scott 1991, 17-20). Charitable childcare and early education was also conducted in day nurseries, infant schools, kindergartens, kitchen gardens, and Montessori nursery schools. Except for kitchen gardens, these institutions for daycare and early childhood education were founded in Europe and then spread to America. Day nurseries that provided physical care originated in Alsace in the late 18th century, followed by the infant school movement created in 1800 by Scottish industrialist Robert Owen to train workers' children to become docile workers in a period of worker unrest due to mechanization (Hayden 1981, 35; Prochner 2000, 14). In the United States and Canada middle-class reform women established day nurseries and infant schools to provide daycare to the latchkey children of working mothers, who otherwise were left to wander the streets during the day or were locked in their apartment (Beer 1942, 33-41, 48-51, 144-51; Hayden 1981, 97; Prochner 2000, 14-15, 20-1). Women were hired as matrons and childcare workers (who often had been teachers) in orphanages and later in refuges and day nurseries (Ginzberg 1990, 56).

The kindergarten was invented in Germany in 1838 by Friedrich Froebel (1782-1852), and was spread by his female students throughout Europe and to America, where reform women, in a typical strategy, used their "moral suasion" to get kindergartens adopted in public schools. The profession of kindergarten teaching grew as kindergartens were adopted as one of the most popular programs in schools and social settlements. Just before World War I American kindergartens adopted some methods of Italian Doctor Maria Montessori's schools for materially training children's perceptions and cognition (Bain 1964, 13; Bowen 1893, 179-81, 191-3; Deasey 1978, 81-6; Hayden 1981, 97; IKU 1897, Prochner 2000, 23, 29-39; Snyder 1972, 9-12, 19-21, 41, 61; Steinfels 1973, 58; Weber 1969, 41). Kindergarten teachers were also hired to supervise children's gardens, a movement that grew out of kindergartens, and the school farm movement (Bachert 1977, 33). American public school gardens were supervised predominantly by women teaching in vacation schools (Beard 1915, 23-4, 133-9), in contrast to Trelstad's (1997) inaccurate construction of a predominantly male lineage of leaders of the school garden movement. Kindergarten teachers were also hired to supervise the first American playgrounds at Boston missions in the 1880s. Reform women persuaded American public schools to adopt playgrounds and hire kindergarten teachers as supervisors. Cities across the country hired women as municipal playground supervisors. Women were leaders in the American playground movement (Rainwater 1922), in contrast to Cavallo's (1981) inaccurate construction of an exclusively male lineage of leaders of the movement, and his denial of the importance of women's early playgrounds.

Women successfully argued that their innate closeness to God's nature made them best suited to create urban green spaces that were intended to morally reform people influenced by the corruption in men's capitalist public sphere, and especially teens, by bringing them

in contact with God's nature. Playgrounds were intended and thought to reduce juvenile delinquency by removing children from the immoral temptations of public streets, particularly gambling and gangs (Almy 1908; Beard 1915, 131-2). The high popularity of playgrounds is indicated by the fact that older children would gain admittance to playgrounds for young children by bringing a young child and arguing to be admitted to the playground to "mind baby in the sand."

The Kitchen Garden movement was founded by Emily Huntington in New York City in 1875, to teach poor 4-5 year-old girls in industrial schools how to perform housework using miniature equipment. Huntington was soon teaching other reform women to become kitchen garden teachers, another new women's profession. Kitchen gardens spread to settlements and industrial schools in major US cities and then to Europe and Asia (Fridlington 1971, 239).

Many of women's new professions were practiced at social settlements, where predominantly college-educated women and/or men lived together cooperatively in poor neighborhoods while offering a wide variety of educational and recreational programs to create community among diverse groups of immigrants (Addams 1910; Blodgett 1971, 279). Although women predominated in most American settlements, the social settlement movement was started by college men who founded the first settlement, Toynbee Hall, in East London. Settlement workers researched their poor immigrant neighborhoods, founding the discipline of sociology and the new women's profession of social work (Addams 1910, 42-5, 74). Working-class childcare became public in charitable settlement programs, from well-baby clinics that developed into the new women's profession of public health nursing, to day nurseries, kindergartens, and kitchen gardens (Woods and Kennedy 1911). In settlements women also taught domestic science, scientific cooking, scientific childcare, nursing, gymnastics, dressmaking, machine sewing, and crafts (Woods and Kennedy 1911). At industrial schools and social settlements women and men were also hired to teach a wide variety of vocational classes as well as civics and academic classes, to assist immigrants in becoming economically independent citizens (Spencer-Wood 2002, 117). Settlements were fundamentally socialist and promoted the Arts and Crafts movement as a critique and remedy to the low wages of the working poor in industrial capitalism (Livermore 1886, 399).

Conclusion

Scott (1991, 2) has pointed out that historians have overlooked the major expansion of democracy created by the great diversity of women's organizations. Women in domestic reform organizations, and their male allies, succeeded in transforming Western patriarchy toward greater gender equality. This was accomplished by many interrelated strategies, including creating new gender ideologies that raised the status of women and the domestic sphere, persuading legislators to replace laws enforcing patriarchy with laws providing women with increasingly equal civil rights, and realizing new gender ideologies by creating a great diversity of new women's professions, many in charitable organizations such as social settlements. Reform women's new more egalitarian gender ideologies were drivers legitimating women in developing a great diversity of female-dominated public professions, charitable organizations, institutions. The status of women and their domestic

sphere was raised by combining the supposedly separate domestic and public spheres in ways that made it acceptable in the dominant gender ideology for women to have public roles by considering them extensions of women's supposedly innate domestic roles.

The opening of education and a large number of men's white collar professions to women, as well as several new women's public professions and training schools for those professions, was understood at the time to be a great widening of women's "respectable" employment options, which were previously limited to underpaid domestic service, taking in boarders, laundry or sewing; factory work (respectable in Europe, akin to prostitution in America), and sweated labor in piecework home production (less respectable) (Anderson and Zinsser 1988, 196, 248-51, 259, 271-4; Hymowitz and Weissman 1978, 122-5, 131, 200-02, 234-40; Collins 2003, 99, 107). In municipal housekeeping reform women considered "the world their household" (Hill 1985) and followed Willard's command to "make the whole world homelike" while undertaking "women's public work for the home" (Hayden 1981, 52-3). By socializing housework and mothering in women's public cooperative institutions, domestic reformers critiqued men's capitalistic values with more moral Christian values embodied in alternative communitarian institutions (Livermore 1886, 399). By founding many different charitable institutions to assist poor women and their families domestic reformers demonstrated that they were citizens contributing to public welfare, before woman suffrage. Many wealthy reform widows used their inheritances from their fathers' and/or husbands' capitalist fortunes to address some of the inequalities capitalism generated for working-class women and their families (Blodgett 1971; Keller 1971).

Many domestic reform movements started in Europe and spread to America, but some started in America or Australasia and spread to Europe (Coleman 1987). Domestic reform transformed Western patriarchy because it encompassed a vast diversity of social movements with programs that were adopted by international networks of several million women in conventions and councils, and the world's largest women's organization, the Women's Christian Temperance Union (Ginzberg 1990, 204; Gordon 1898, 140-4, 375; Gusfield 1955, 222-3; Gusfield 1986, 74; Okrent 2010, 18-19). The popularity of domestic reform led to many aspects being adopted and promoted in other large associations of women's reform organizations that included millions of women in America and Europe. Domestic reform was also adopted by millions of men and women in the mixed-gender international progressive movement (Blair 1980, 93, 101, 103-6; Hymowitz and Weissman 1978, 220, 231-2, 311; Wilson 1979, 95-101; Woloch 1984, 289-90).

Domestic reformers sought women's emancipation through economic independence in women's professions, but most realized by the early 20th century that suffrage was necessary for complete gender equality. Domestic reformers converted conservative women and men to the cause of women's suffrage with the municipal housekeeping argument that women's higher morality would reform men's corrupt government (Clinton 1984, 183-7; Rothman 1978, 127-32). The power of conservative women's large-scale domestic reform movements created a cultural tipping point when they came out for women's suffrage, creating a major cultural transformation that combined movements toward greater economic and political gender equality.

References

Adams, John Quincy. 1838. *Speech of John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts, upon the Right of the People, Men and Women, to Petition.* Washington D.C.: Gales and Seaton.

Addams, Jane. 1910. *Twenty Years at Hull-House* (1981 reprint). The New American Library, Inc., New York.

Alcott, William. 1834. *Female Attendance on the Sick. American Ladies' Magazine* 7 (July), 302-3.

Almy, Helen J. C. 1908. Handwritten Report to Cambridge Mothers' Club. Helen Jackson Cabot Almy Papers, 1899-1910. Folder 4. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute of Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Anderson, Bonnie S. and Judith P. Zinsser. 1988. *A History of Their Own: Women in Europe from Prehistory to the Present. Volume II.* New York: Harper and Row.

Arwill-Nordbladh, Elisabeth. 2012. Ethical Practice and Material Ethics: Domestic Technology and Swedish Modernity in the Early 20th Century, Exemplified From the Life of Hanna Rydh. In *Historical and Archaeological Perspectives on Gender Transformations: from Private to Public,* eds. Suzanne M. Spencer-Wood. Forthcoming from New York: Springer.

Bachert, Russell. 1977. School Gardens in American: 1890-1910. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University.

Bailey, Pearl L. 1914. *Domestic Science: Principles and Application. A Textbook for Public Schools.* St. Paul: Webb Publishing Co.

Bain, Winnifred D. 1964. *Leadership in Childhood Education, Images and Realities: A History of Wheelock College 1888. 89-1963/64.* Boston: Wheelock College Bureau of Publications.

Baron, Ava. 1987. *Masculinity and the Woman Question: The Transformation of Gender and Work in the Printing Industry*, 1850-1920. Paper presented at the Berkshire Conference on the History of Women, June 19-21, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA.

Beard, Mary. 1915. *Women's Work in Municipalities.* New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Beecher, Catherine E. 1977 [1841] *A Treatise on Domestic Economy for the Use of Young Ladies at Home and at School*. New York: Schocken Books.

Beecher, Catharine E. and Harriet B. Stowe. 1869. *The American Woman's Home, or Principles of Domestic Science.* New York: J. B. Ford & Co; reprint edition with Introduction by Joseph Van Why, Hartford: Stowe-Day Foundation, 1975.

Beer, Ethel S. 1942. *The Day Nursery.* War Edition. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

BFA: Boston Female Asylum. 1844. *Reminiscences.* Boston: Eastburn's Press.

Blair, Karen J. 1980. *The Clubwoman as Feminist: True Womanhood Redefined, 1868-1914.* New York: Homes and Meier.

Blackwell, Alice Stone. 1930. *Lucy Stone: Pioneer Woman Suffragist.* Norwood: Plimpton Press.

Blodgett, Geoffrey. 1971. Shaw, Pauline Agassiz. In *Notable American Women 1607-1950: A Biographical Dictionary. Volume III, P-Z,* eds. Edward T. James, Janet W. James and Paul S. Boyer, 278-80. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Bowen, H. C. 1893. *Froebel and Education by Self-Activity.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Brooks, Helen L. (Mrs. John Graham). 1908. Cambridge Playgrounds. *The Playground* (11), 3-8.

______. 1911 First Annual Report of the Playground Commission. Cambridge, Massachusetts 1910-1911. Folder 211. Boston: Chapple Publishing Co., Ltd. Helen Lawrence Brooks Papers. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute of Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Cavallo, Dominick. 1981. *Muscles and Morals: Organized Playgrounds and Urban Reform, 1880-1920.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Chambers-Schiller, Lee V. 1984. *Liberty a Better Husband. Single Women in America: The Generations of 1780-1840.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Clarke, Edward H. Dr. 1873. *Sex in Education; or, a fair chance for the girls.* Boston: J. R. Osgood and Company.

Clinton, Catherine. 1984. *The Other Civil War: American Women in the Nineteenth Century.* New York: Hill and Wang.

Coleman, Peter J. 1987. *Progressivism and the World of Reform: New Zealand and the Origins of the American Welfare State.* Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Collins, Gail. 2003. *America's Women: 400 Years of Dolls, Drudges, Helpmates, and Heroines.* New York: Harper Collins.

Coontz, Stephanie. 1991. *The Social Origins of Private Life: A History of American Families 1600-1900.* London: Verso.

Cott, Nancy F. 1977. *The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

______. 1979. Eighteenth-Century family and Social Life revealed in Massachusetts Divorce Records. In *A Heritage of Her Own: Toward a New Social History of American Women,* eds. Nancy F. Cott and Elizabeth H. Pleck, 107-36. New York: Touchstone, Simon and Schuster.

Deasey, Denison. 1978. *Education under Six.* New York: St. Martin's press.

Demos, John. 1970. *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DH: Denison House Records. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute of Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

DH. 1912. Denison House: The College Settlement in Boston. Annual Report for the Year Ending October 1, 1912.

DH. 1916. Denison House: The College Settlement in Boston. Annual Report for the Year Ending October 1, 1916.

Donovan, Josephine. 2001. *Feminist Theory: The Intellectual Traditions.* 3rd Ed. New York: Continuum.

EPH: Elizabeth Peabody House, Boston

EPH. 1915. *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Elizabeth Peabody House: Report for the Year 1914.* Thomas Todd Co. , Boston.

Ellis, John, M. D. 1884. *Deterioration of the Puritan Stock and Its Causes.* New York: John Ellis.

Epstein, Barbara L. 1981. *The Politics of Domesticity: Women, Evangelism and Temperance in Nineteenth Century America.* Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Finnegan, Frances. 2001. *Penance or Perish: Magdalen Asylums in Ireland.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frazer, Antonia. 1984. *The Weaker Vessel.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Fridlington, Robert J. 1971. Huntington, Emily. In *Notable American Women: A Biographical Dictionary. Vol. II G-O,* eds. Edward T. James, Janet W. James and Paul S. Boyer, 239-40. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Ginzberg, Lori D. 1990. *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the 19th-Century United States.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Gordon, Anna A. 1989. *The Beautiful Life of Frances E. Willard.* Chicago: Women's Temperance Publishing Association.

Gusfield, Joseph R. 1955. Social Structure and Moral Reform: A Study of the Women's Christian Temperance Union. *The American Journal of Sociology* 61(3):221-32.

______. 1986. *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement*. Champagne-Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Hajnal, John. 1965. European Marriage Patterns in Perspective. In *Population in History: essays in historical demography,* eds. David V. Glass and David E. C. Eversley, 101-8. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Hale, Sarah J. 1855. *Woman's Record; or, Sketches of All Distinguished Women, from the Creation to A. D. 1854,* 2nd ed. New York: Harper an Brothers.

Handlin, David P. 1979. *The American Home: Architecture and Society, 1815-1915.* Boston: Little Brown and Co.

Hayden, Dolores. 1976. *Seven American Utopias: The Architecture of Communitarian Socialism, 1790-1975.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

_____. 1981. *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Helsinger, Elizabeth K., Robin L. Sheets, and William Veeder. 1983. *The Woman Question: Society and Literature in Britain and America 1837-1883. Volume 2: Social Issues.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hill, Patricia R. 1985. *The World Their Household: The American Woman's Foreign Mission Movement and Cultural Transformation, 1870-1920.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hobson, Barbara M. 1987. *Uneasy Virtue: The Politics of Prostitution and the American Reform Tradition.* New York: Basic Books.

Holloway, Mark. 1966. *Heavens on Earth: Utopian Communities in America 1680-1880* (2nd edition). New York: Dover.

Hunt, Caroline L. 1912. *The Life of Ellen H. Richards.* Boston: Whitcomb and Barrows.

Hymowitz, Carol, and Michaele Weissman. 1978. *A History of Women in America: From Founding Mothers to Feminists – How Women Shaped the Life and Culture of America.* New York: Bantam Books.

IKU: International Kindergarten Union. 1897. Report of the Second Annual Meeeting of the IKU, St. Louis, April 20-22.

Keller, Phyllis. 1971. Hemenway, Mary Porter Tileston. In *Notable American Women 1607-1950: A Biographical Dictionary. Volume II, G-O,* eds. Edward T. James, Janet W. James and Paul S. Boyer, 278-80. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Kraditor, Aileen. 1968. *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920.* New York: Times Books.

Kwolek-Folland, Angel. 2002. *Incorporating Women: A History of Women & Business in the United States.* New York: Palgrave.

Lebsock, Suzanne. 1984. *The Free Women of Petersburg: Status and Culture in a Southern Town 1784-1860.* New York: University of California Press.

Levenstein, Harvey. 1988. *Revolution at the Table: The Transformation of the American Diet.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lily. 1849. Temperance and politics, Lily 1 (8), 69 (September 1).

Livermore, Mary A. 1886. Co-operative housekeeping. *The Chautauquan* (6), 395-42.

Lockwood, Belva A. 1893. Women in politics. *American Journal of Politics* (2), 385-7.

Macdonald, Anne L. 1992. *Feminine Ingenuity: Women and Invention in America.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Mann, Arthur. 1954. *Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age.* Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Marquardt, W. H. and C. L Crumley. 1987. Theoretical Issues in the Analysis of Spatial Patterning. In *Regional Dynamics: Burgundian Landscapes in Historical Perspective,* eds. Crumley, C. L. and Marquardt, W. H., 1-18. San Diego: Academic Press.

Matthaei, Julie A. 1982. *An Economic History of Women in America: Women's Work, the Sexual Division of Labor, and the Development of Capitalism.* New York: Schoken Books.

McManis, Douglas R. 1979. *Colonial New England: A Historical Geography.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Melosi, Martin V. 1981. *Garbage in the Cities: Refuse, Reform and the Environment 1880-1980.* College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

Mies, Maria, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, and Claudia von Werlhof. 1988. *Women: The Last Colony*. London: Zed Books.

Okrent, Daniel. 2010. *Last Call: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition.* New York: Scribner.

Peabody, Elizabeth P. and Mary Mann. 1877. *Guide to the Kindergarten and Intermediate Class; and Moral Culture of Infancy.* New York: E. Steiger.

Porterfield, Amanda. 1980. *Feminine Spirituality in America.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Preston, Jo Anne. 1987. Millgirl Narratives: Representations of Class and Gender in Nineteenth Century Lowell. *Life Stories/Recits de vie* (4), 21-30.

Prochner, Larry. 2000. *A History of Early Education and Child Care in Canada* 1820-1966. In *Early Childhood Care and Education in Canada,* eds. Larry Prochner and Nina Howe, 11-66. Toronto: UBC Press.

Rainwater, Clarence. 1922. *The Play Movement in the United States: A Study of Community Recreation.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Richards, Ellen S. 1893. Scientific Cooking – Studies in the New England Kitchen. *The Forum* XV, 355-61.

_______. 1901. *the Cost of Food: A Study in Dietaries.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

_______. 1905. *The Cost of Shelter.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

_______. 1907. *Sanitation in Daily Life.* Boston: Whitcomb & Barrows.

Robertson, Priscilla. 1982. *An Experience of Women: Pattern and Change in Nineteenth-Century Europe.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Rosen, Ruth. 1982. *The Lost Sisterhood: Prostitution in America 1900-1918.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ross, Elizabeth D. 1976. *The Kindergarten Crusade: The Establishment of Pre-School Education in the United States.* Athens: Ohio University Press.

Rothman, Shelia M. 1978. *Woman's Proper Place: A History of Changing Ideals and Practices, 1870 to the Present*. New York: Basic Books.

Russell, Frances E. 1892. A Brief Survey of the American Dress Reform Movements of the Past, with Views of Representative Women. *The Arena* VI (XXXIII), 325-9.

Ryan, Mary P. 1982. *The Empire of the Mother: American Writing about Domesticity 1830-1860.* New York: Haworth Press.

_____. 1990. *Women in Public: Between Banners and Ballots, 1825-1880.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Scott, Anne F. 1991. *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Smith, David S. 1979. Family Limitation, Sexual Control, and Domestic Feminism in Victorian America. In *A Heritage of Her Own,* eds. Nancy F. Cott and Elizabth H. Pleck, 222-45. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Snyder, Agnes. 1972. *Dauntless Women in Childhood Education 1856-1931.* Washington, D. C: Association for Childhood Education International.

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

Spencer-Wood, Suzanne M. 1991. Towards an Historical Archaeology of Materialistic Domestic Reform. In *The Archaeology of Inequality*, eds. Randall M. McGuire and Robert Paynter, 231-86. Oxford: Basil & Blackwell, Ltd.

_______. 1992. A Feminist Program for Non-sexist Archaeology. In *Quandaries and Quests: Visions of Archaeology's Future*, ed. LuAnn Wandsnider, 98-114. Carbondale: S. Illinois U. Press.

_______. 1995. Toward the Further Development of Feminist Historical Archaeology. 1993 *World Archaeological Bulletin*, 7:118-36.

_______. 1999. Gendering power. In *Manifesting Power: Gender and the Interpretation of Power in Archaeology*, ed. Tracy L. Sweely, 175-83. London: Routledge.

_______. 2002. Utopian Visions and Architectural Designs of Turn-of-the-century Social Settlements. In *Embodied Utopias: Gender, Social Change and the Modern Metropolis*, eds. Amy Bingaman, Lise Sanders and Rebecca Zorach, 116-32. London: Routledge.

_______. 2003. Gendering the Creation of Green Urban landscapes in America at the Turn of the Century. In *Shared Spaces and Divided Places. Material Dimensions of Gender Relations and the American Historical Landscape*, eds. D. L. Rotman and E. Savulis, 24-61. Knoxville: U. of Tennessee Press.

_______. 2006. A Feminist Theoretical Approach to the Historical Archaeology of Utopian Communities. *Historical Archaeology* 40(1): 152-85.

Stansell, Christine. 1986. *City of Women: Sex and Class in New York 1789-1860.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Steinfels, Margaret O'Brien. 1973. *Who's Minding the Children?* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Stowe, Harriet B. 1868. A model village. *The Revolution,* 1(April 2)

Thorp, Margaret F. 1949. Female Persuasion: Six Strong-Minded Women. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Trelstad, Brian. 1997. Little Machines in Their Gardens: A History of the School Gardens in America, 1891 to 1920. *Landscape Journal* 16 (2), 161-73.

Veneris, Yannis. 1984. Informational Revolution: Cybernetics and Urban Modelling. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne.

Verbrugge, Martha H. 1988. *Able-Bodied Womanhood: Personal Health and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century Boston.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Vogel, Morris J. 1980. *The Invention of the Modern Hospital: Boston 1870-1930.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wall, Diana diZerega. 1994. *The Archaeology of Gender: Separating the Spheres in Urban America.* New York: Plenum.

Weber, Evelyn. 1969. *The Kindergarten: Its Encounter with Educational Thought in America.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Welter, Barbara. 1966. The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860. *American Quarterly* (XVIII), 151-74.

Wertheimer, Barbara M. 1977. *We Were There: The Story of Working Women in America.* New York: Pantheon Books, Random House.

Wilson, Margaret G. 1979. *The American Woman in Transition: The Urban Influence, 1870-1920.* Westport: Greenwood Press, Inc.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. 1975. [1792] *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Baltimore: Penguin.

Woloch, Nancy. 1984. *Women and the American Experience.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Woods, Robert A. and Albert J. Kennedy, eds. 1911. *Handbook of Settlements.* New York: Charities Publications Committee.

Öz

Eviçi Reform Hareketleri 18. Yüzyıl ile Erken 20. Yüzyıl Arasında Batı Ataerkilliğini Nasıl Dönüştürdü?

Ataerkil batı kültüründe 18. Yüzyıldan 20. Yüzyıla kadar olan dönemde kadının statüsünün yükseltilmesi belki de dönemin en önemli toplumsal dönüşümüdür. Eviçi reformcular olarak adlandırdığım kadınlar, ataerkil ideoloji ve pratikleri, ayrı olduğu düşünülen ve kadına ait görülen eviçi alanıyla erkeğe ait olarak görülen kamusal alanı çeşitli yollarla birleştiren yeni cinsiyet ideolojileri ile değiştirmişlerdir. Kadınlar ve onların eviçi alanları kilise değerlerinin yüksek ahlakı ile ilişkilendirilirken, erkekler ve onların kamusal alanları kiliseden ayrılarak günah olan kapitalist pratiklerle ilişkilendirilmiştir. Eviçi reformcular kadınların eviçi-ahlaki değerlerini ve yeteneklerini yüceltmiş ve böylece onları kadınların yeni kamusal mesleklerine, örgütlerine ve kurumlarına dönüştürmüşlerdir. Bu yeni meslek, örgüt ve kurumlar kadınların eviçi alanlarının bir parçası sayılmış ve bu nedenle ayrı-alanlara dayananan ataerkil cinsiyet ideolojisince kabul görmüştür. Kadınlar, kadınların dini, toplumsal ve yasal statüsünü hem eviçi hem de kamusal alanlarda yükselten çok çeşitli reform hareketleri oluşturmuşlardır. Eviçi reform hareketleri iki kategori altında toplanır. Kamusal evidaresi işbirliği, evişlerinin ve anneliğin bazı yönlerini kadınların çocuk bakıcılığı, hastabakıcılık, diyetisyenlik ve sosyal görevlilik gibi kamusal kurumlarında ve mesleklerinde toplumsallaştırmıştır. Yerel evidaresi hareketinde, kadınların ev işlerindeki uzmanlığı toplumsal ev idaresi olarak görülen idari pozisyonlara atanmalarına yol açmıştır. Eviçi reformu kadınların oy hakkı kazanmasında önemli bir rol oynamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Ataerkil, dönüşüm, cinsiyet, 18. Yüzyıl, 19. yüzyıl

About the Author

Suzanne M. Spencer-Wood is a Professor in Anthropology at Oakland University and an Associate at the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University. She organized the first two symposia on gender research in historical archaeology at the Chacmool conference and the Society for Historical Archaeology conference in 1989, and subsequently published numerous book chapters, and articles in the following journals: Historical Archaeology, International Journal of Historical Archaeology, Northeast Historical Archaeology, and the Landscape Journal.

Yazar Hakkında

Suzanne M. Spencer-Wood Oakland Üniversitesi'nde antropoloji profesörüdür. Ayrıca Harvard Üniversitesi, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology'de çalışmalar yapmaktadır. Spencer-Wood, 1989 yılında Chacmool ve Society for Historical Archaeology konferanslarında tarihsel arkeolojide cinsiyet araştırmaları üzerine ilk iki sempozyumu organize etmiştir. Spencer-Wood'un pekçok kitap bölümü ve Historical Archaeology, International Journal of Historical Archaeology, Northeast Historical Archaeology, ve the Landscape Journal gibi dergilerde yayınlanmış makaleleri bulunmaktadır.