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Abstract

(En)Gendering Whiteness: A Historical Analysis of White Womanhood, Colonial Anxieties, and “Tender Violence” in US Schools
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Designated Emphasis in Women, Gender, and Sexuality

University of California, Berkeley
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Within educational research, the over-disciplining of Black and Brown students is most often presented as a problem located within pathologized or misunderstood communities. That is, theories and proposed solutions tend toward those that ask how we can make students of color more suited to US educational standards rather than questioning the racist roots of those standards. This dissertation takes as a provocation this “discipline gap,” in exploring a thus far unconsidered stance and asking how white women (the majority of US teachers) have historically understood their roles in the disciplining of nonwhite student bodies, and how and why their role has been constructed over time and space in service to the white colonial State. Toward this end, I take a genealogical approach in making sense of a contemporary phenomenon by asking, “How and why has the persona of the benevolent white female teacher been put into discourse during the foundational period in public schools’ history, and how has it been reproduced over time, specifically in relation to students of color?” With this perspective, my project helps to fill a much-overlooked void in the contemporary conversation on raced and gendered student-teacher interactions in schools.

This project employs two main methodologies: (1) close readings informed by literary theory, and (2) Foucauldian discourse analysis, which I use in constructing a genealogy of heroic white womanhood (what I am calling “benevolent whiteness”). Using these methods I analyze the archival writings
of and about white missionary women in the 19th century to explain how the collective acceptance of and participation in the discursive construction of heroic white womanhood has been the normative underpinnings of US educational and disciplinary practice for nearly two hundred years. Toward this end, this project serves to refocus whiteness within current debates on the over-disciplining of students of color toward a historical and structural analysis with a goal of understanding, refusing, and reimagining the roles of white female teachers.
Dedication

This work is inspired by and dedicated to Black, Brown, and Native peoples who persist, survive, and refuse in the face of relentless settler colonialism, anti-blackness, and white supremacy. Me ka mahalo nui.
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“American Progress,” painted by John Gast in 1872, is a visual representation of “Manifest Destiny,” one of the most important beliefs held by Americans in the mid-19th century. I open this dissertation with this image as a means of grounding visually and conceptually the overall focus of my research. The image, like its symbolized discourse, was circulated widely, particularly in pamphlets distributed by mining companies and west coast “boomtowns,” as a reminder that it was every white man’s destiny to expand through possession (and Native dispossession) the US frontier. Together, the myriad representations in this image symbolize the US collective self-concept at the time.
The most important piece of this image is what the woman is carrying west: the schoolbook. This is an often-overlooked detail in this image, often misread as representing the Bible. Interestingly, the schoolbook and the schoolhouse in the 19th century were largely conflated with the Bible and Protestant teachings and ideals, so perhaps that is not too much of a misreading after all. Holding the schoolbook is the Goddess Columbia, a blond white woman, who was the female symbolic counterpart to Uncle Sam (later replaced by the Statue of Liberty). Dressed in a Roman toga to represent classical republicanism and crowned with the star of empire, she is “bringing light” to the darkness. We see this literally, as the light follows her across the canvas from east to west; we also see that she is symbolically carrying enlightenment by way of the schoolbook, the telegraph, the railroad, and so on. Along with her, she brings settlers who, by definition, require land to settle; land that can only be acquired by driving the indigenous tribes and the buffalo westward and into extinction. According to widely held belief at the time, indigenous peoples had two possible futures: (1) extinction, or (2) assimilation, which meant, and is represented in this image, learning to move from a nomadic hunting people to an agrarian society that, conveniently, requires significantly less land for Native farmers and more land for the government to give to white settlers.

Again, important to this image, to my dissertation, and to my overall research trajectory, all of this settler colonial violence is taking place through the maternalistic, seemingly benign and benevolent, work of a woman with a schoolbook. We can also read the painting as a text, against the grain and through the gaps: notably absent from the image, perhaps too far off in either direction, are the colonial outposts (Hawai‘i, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines) that also fell victim to this “tender violence,” as well as the 388,000 African slaves upon whose backs this progress was built.

“American Progress” is a visual representation of everything the United States stood for in the 19th century (and perhaps what it continues to symbolize today). This image, along with many other similar political images of the time, is significant in our contemporary understanding of the mindset behind settler colonialism as manifest destiny, mandated by God, for the betterment of all citizens and savages. Likewise, much of its visual representation could be read as equally representative and significant for our own contemporary understandings of benevolence, progress, Indigeneity, settler colonialism, and whiteness. Gast’s image told an intentional and precise (though invented) truth about the “American Dream” and
the role of the goddess-like white woman in achieving that dream, a truth that was reiterated and upheld with each reproduction of this and similar images. Similarly, contemporary reiterations and cultural representations do the same work of discursively constructing truths, ideals, and personas that persist and become commonsensical in a Gramscian sense – meaning un-interrogated and uncritically absorbed by the masses. This dissertation does the work of interrogating one such “truth” constructed discursively over the past two centuries, that of Columbia herself: the white, middle class woman wielding the power of the schoolbook.
Chapter 1
(En)Gendering Whiteness: An Introduction

We do not have to romanticize our past in order to be aware of how it seeds our present. We do not have to suffer the waste of an amnesia that robs us of the lessons of the past rather than permit us to read them with pride as well as deep understanding. We know what it is to be lied to, and we know how important it is not lie to ourselves. We are powerful because we have survived, and that is what it is all about—survival and growth.¹

There is nothing inherently heroic about teaching. Schools and communities are not waiting for Superman², Michelle Pfeiffer³, or Hillary Swank⁴ to magically show up one day and begin the process of salvation. Despite the prevailing narrative, teaching, and particularly teaching poor children of color, is not in itself a heroic act. This is not to say that teaching is easy, nor is it meant to dispute the belief that most teachers arrive at their careers with benevolent intentions. It is likely safe to argue that in fact most present-day teachers have entered into the profession out of a genuine desire to “do good”; many teacher education students arrive at our training programs with a well-defined, predetermined understanding of what “good” education looks like, regardless of where and to whom the good is being done. Still, to view the predominantly white women who come from other (safer, whiter) places to teach “underserved” kids of color as an act of heroism is not only categorically false, it also does irreparable damage to students, their families, and their

² “Waiting for Superman” is a 2010 documentary about the “failing public school system” and the need for more superhero reformers (privatizers) to fix what is broken. The title comes from a quote in the film from Geoffrey Canada where he recalls, “one of the saddest days of my life was when my mother told me ‘Superman’ did not exist...she thought I was crying because it’s like Santa Claus is not real. I was crying because no one was coming with enough power to save us.”
³ *Dangerous Minds*, (1995) based on the biography, “My Posse Don’t Do Homework.” White teacher and ex-marine, Louanne Johnson, gets a job teaching “inner city kids” despite having no teaching experience. She is celebrated for her “unconventional methods” and for “saving” her students when no one else (their families included) would or could.
⁴ *Freedom Writers* (2007), set in the early 90s, the film focuses on first-year teacher Erin Gruwell at Woodrow Wilson High School, which, two years earlier, implemented a voluntary integration program. Gruwell works several part time jobs to pay for resources her students need (composition notebooks for journals) but the administration will not provide; assigning daily journal writing without restrictions is heralded as what opens the kids up to her as an outsider, and what saves them from their abject poverty and crime-riddled neighborhoods.
communities. Yet one of the most persistent and dangerous tropes about teaching is that it is an act of individual heroism. We are inundated with memoirs, movies, and viral videos celebrating the individual (white) teacher for magically reaching/teaching children of color in a way that, presumably, no other teacher could have. These narratives are national best sellers, such as Freedom Writers by Erin Gruwell, devoured by early career teachers as a kind of instructional manual, often chosen as required reading in the very preparation programs that should be working to actively dispel the reductive fairy tale of their simplistically heroic futures that lie ahead. As a society, we are relieved to read and watch these narratives, as they reinforce a belief in the inherent pathology of poor Black and Brown communities, and the heavy but necessary “white [wo]man’s burden” as the superior yet benevolently heroic “race.”

This dissertation, as the result of intentional cycles of inquiry in which theory informs practice which then informs research, with the cycle repeating itself ad infinitum, refutes the myth of the heroic white (usually female) teacher. This project, as well as my overarching research trajectory, is inspired by my decade-plus of teaching in “underserved” public schools in four different cities. In each school, regardless of geographic location or parental income level, our patterns of suspensions matched well-published data: across the United States, Black students are suspended at a disproportionate rate and for the same behaviors for which their white peers are not. Throughout my tenure in public schools, this “discipline gap” was consistently the focal point of faculty meetings, usually with a focus on resolving problems located within a pathologized Black community. What was not often discussed, and what is rarely addressed in the educational research, is the impact of teachers’ race and gender on the racially biased suspension rate—there is little to no desire or requirement for looking inward at ourselves, as educators, while supposedly trying to make

---

5 Following Dumas (2016), "In my work, I have decided to capitalize Black when referencing Black people, organizations, and cultural products. Here, Black is understood as a self determined name of a racialized social group that shares a specific set of histories, cultural processes, and imagined and performed kinships. White is not capitalized in my work because it is nothing but a social construct, and does not describe a group with a sense of common experiences or kinship outside of acts of colonization and terror. Thus, white is employed almost solely as a negation of others—it is, as David Roediger (1994) insisted, nothing but false and oppressive.”

6 The “discipline gap” refers to the disproportionate percentage of suspended students of color, particularly Black and Indigenous students, compared to their representative size within a school population and compared to the lack of exclusionary discipline for their white peers who commit the same behaviors. Throughout this dissertation, I use the terms “discipline gap” and “over-disciplining” in relation to the same phenomenon.
sense of what is clearly the result of relationships and interactions involving more than just the suspended students. Importantly, this dissertation brings to light and re-centers the data\(^7\) that show that over eighty percent of United States teachers are white women, a group that has been historically positioned in vulnerable relationship to an inherently violent Black masculinity. As such, my research explores the ways in which the historical legacy of the imagined relations between white femininity and Black masculinity critically shapes the current “discipline gap.” As a nonwhite female teacher who at times passes for white, and more importantly (like most people of color in the United States) as someone who has been indoctrinated over decades of schooling in a white supremacist school system, I have both personal and practical impetus for making sense of the ways in which gendered whiteness holds and reproduces power in schools, and specifically how this obscured legacy manifests in the over-disciplining of students of color. My work is motivated by the urgent need to pay attention to how whiteness works and how we “work” whiteness, specifically within our racialized and gendered interactions in public schools.

As an interdisciplinary scholar, I approached this issue first from an ethnographic perspective (during a year-long study at an urban middle school in northern California), and in this current project I investigate its roots from a different perspective: a historical analysis of heroic white womanhood at the heart of educational discourse since the mid-19\(^{th}\) century. Toward that end, this dissertation takes as its focus not a direct analysis of school discipline, but instead an historical understanding and analysis of the roles teachers play in constructing and upholding white supremacy (resulting in the over-disciplining of students of color as one of many consequences).

My dissertation thus asks: “How and why was the persona of the benevolent white female teacher put into discourse during the foundational period in US public schools’ history, and how has it been reproduced over time, specifically in relation to students of color?” I answer the question by critically engaging with women’s confessional literature of the 19\(^{th}\) century, specifically the diaries and letters of white, female, missionary teachers in two distinct yet interrelated locales and time periods: the Hawaiian Kingdom at the start of the “missionary period” (roughly 1820-1880), and the organization of reservation and boarding schools in Dakota Territory (roughly

the 1870s-1890s). In this work, I conduct close readings and discourse analysis of the texts left behind by the women who effectively constructed our contemporary understanding of heroic, motherly, white womanhood and its role in schooling. By focusing on white women’s voices, highlighting their extraordinary power and agency as participants in colonial school systems, the dissertation interprets the historical events in question and analyzes the “operability of power” (Foucault, 1978) of what has been said, by whom, and demonstrates how that has constructed our contemporary imagination of the roles of white female teachers.

While the dissertation maintains a specific focus on 19th-century US white womanhood, the larger goal and future implications of this project rely upon an understanding of whiteness and white womanhood as persistently and virulently mutable depending upon the needs of white supremacy. It would be foolish and problematic to presume that nothing about schools or womanhood has changed in the past two centuries; however, the archival data demonstrate that not much has changed about whiteness as the foundational ideology of the United States (aside from, perhaps, who has been allowed into the fold over time). The mutability of white womanhood over time is perhaps its most dangerous feature, precisely because of its obfuscation by its historic construction as an always vulnerable, always pious and loving identity.

In the midst of conducting this research on the dangers and responsibilities of white womanhood in schools, the importance of this work has become more evident than ever. Two significant sociopolitical moments occurred during the writing of this dissertation, each further clarifying the need and urgency for this type of a specifically gendered interrogation of whiteness. The first moment is the response to the founding of the #BlackLivesMatter Movement (Garza, 2014) began with the acquittal of George Zimmerman, a neighborhood watch captain, in the 2012 murder of unarmed 17-year-old child Trayvon Martin in Sanford, Florida. The movement has grown in response to the highly publicized extraordinary rate at which unarmed people of color are murdered with impunity by police officers and white civilians.

---

---
that the #BLM movement seeks to bring to light and to an end. What it fails to acknowledge is that “yes, all cops” (including nonwhite police officers) are in fact complicit to some degree by the very nature of their participation in an inherently violent “Repressive State Apparatus” (Althusser, 1971). The movement for “blue lives” strategically attempts to erase countless acts of state sanctioned violence by painting “blue lives” as innocent, at risk, and heroic. Further, it discursively positions law enforcement officers in one of two innocent camps: those who have committed violent acts “in the line of duty” and as unwilling victims who “had to” protect themselves as a last resort (a claim contradicted by all evidence brought to light thus far), and those who are the exceptions - the good guys - misunderstood and tainted by an overactive liberal media that has cast an imagined shadow of violence over the profession. More problematically, although quite in line with the operability of whiteness, “blue lives” arguments remove whiteness from culpability - in fact, from existence - when the majority of the officers who have shot and/or killed unarmed people of color are white.

In reflecting on this relationship between “good” police officers and the always already violent embodiment of the state, it becomes clear that those resisting an interrogation into white supremacy in schools often employ a similar discourse of “not all teachers”: not all teachers “see” race (or if they do, they have been taught that to claim colorblindness is no longer politically correct); not all teachers are racist, have the power to suspend students, over-discipline students of color, reinforce whiteness and white supremacy, and so on. Similarly to the analysis of “all cops,” I maintain that it is accurate to argue that “yes, all teachers” (including nonwhite teachers) are likewise implicated in the reinforcement and reproduction of white supremacy (to varying degrees) by the very nature of our participation in the inherently racist structure that is the public school system. In the same manner that responsibility lies with police officers who maintain a code of silence when it comes to their violent colleagues, culpability can be found in even the most well-intentioned “progressive” teachers who do not daily disavow the structural racism of the schools, the state, the curriculum, and so on, as well as those teachers who persistently witness but do not call out the patterns of exclusionary discipline enforced on students of color. All teachers who are not actively working to dismantle the power structure of white supremacy in schools are responsible for its perpetuation - despite the fact that very few of us have the tools or guidance necessary to see the system for what it is or to know what to do about it. This dissertation provides the
historical and genealogical background necessary for contemporary teachers to locate themselves within this power structure, a crucial first step in order to ultimately rework (or dismantle) a system that is disproportionately, and intentionally, casting out students of color for behaviors otherwise deemed benign, even playful and amusing, when enacted by their white peers.

The second recent moment highlighting the importance of this dissertation’s gendered interrogation of whiteness was the 2016 election of Donald Trump to the United States presidency, and the data that showed 53% of white women ushered him in—a known misogynist and sexual predator—to the White House. Comparing this data to the 94% of Black women and 68% of Latina women who voted for Hillary Clinton, it is clear that gender is not the universal unifier that first wave feminism thought it might be: when white women are (collectively) faced with a choice, they side with whiteness by way of patriarchy. This is a fact that has held true since the inception of the women’s rights movement in the mid-19th century, during which the fight for white women’s suffrage was also a fight rooted in anti-blackness and against the political power of a growing number of nonwhite immigrants.

The 2016 election data has by now been widely shared and critiqued, particularly regarding Trump’s white female supporters whose votes surprised the world (perhaps with exception to people of color who have long since known that race always trumps both class and gender). In great part due to social media and the intellectual and physical labor of women of color, white women’s role in putting Trump in office has been made repeatedly visible through even the most well-known media outlets. As a result, in this moment white women have nowhere to hide from their complicity in electing what is clearly becoming a neo-fascist, white supremacist regime. What I might argue is perhaps the one positive to come out of the recent presidential election is this public insistence (work largely carried out by women of color) on taking white women to task for their vote for

9 http://www.cnn.com/election/results/exit-polls
10 Exit poll data does not allow for a spectrum of gender identities, thus the cis-normative data presented here represents those who were identified as women by those collecting data.
11 For example WCTU leader, Frances Willard, among many other white women “heroes” of the suffrage movement, unabashedly pitted white women against Black men and women when it came to the fight for women’s suffrage, arguing that the illiterate “plantation negroes” should not have access to the ballot before the more deserving, more intellectually capable, white women.
12 Here I refer specifically to the labor evidenced in the many photos of Black women holding signs reading “53% of White Women Voted for Trump” at the national and regional “Women’s Marches” against Trump.
race over gender (and, arguably, over humanity). We are, therefore, at an important potential turning point in the conversation on the persistence of the power of white womanhood in the United States, and thus on the concomitant responsibility of white women to refuse their role in upholding and sustaining patriarchal white supremacy, and to disavow the benefits they receive for their participation.

Thus far, as a group, white women in the United States have benefitted from a hidden psychological wage of whiteness (Du Bois, 1935; Roediger, 1991) that complicates their understanding of, and ability to interrogate, their participation in and complicity with capitalist patriarchal oppression by the state at large, and more specifically within school discipline as a form of anti-blackness. That is, white women are rewarded by the privileges of whiteness for their participation in a system that, for the most part, works against their best interests and ultimately against their freedom. This dissertation is an attempt at making visible the historical roots and ideological permanence of scholastic and disciplinary white supremacy as enforced by women in exchange for these “wages of whiteness.”

Overview of the Study

This study is a genealogy of “benevolent whiteness”: the self-imposed selfless service and heroic identity of white womanhood in relation to people of color through systematic schooling as the feminized arm of white supremacy. A Foucauldian-inspired genealogical method asks not what a thing-in-itself was like in history, but how we came to thinking of certain behaviors and actions as constituting the thing. In other words, it starts with the present understanding of “the thing” (for Foucault, it was madness; for me, it is the trope of the benevolent white mother-savior-teacher). Thus, a genealogical analysis seeks to uncover how we came to define and understand teachers as heroes. Here, I employ the term “genealogy” as described by Foucault in a 1983 interview with Paul Rabinow and Herbert Dreyfus as having three possible domains. I specifically focus on the second possible domain, “a historical ontology of ourselves in relation to a field of power through which we constitute ourselves as subjects acting on others,” (Foucault and Rabinow, 1984, p. 351). From that understanding we can ask, what are the contemporary implications of benevolent whiteness, particularly given that the majority of public school teachers are white women? And, further, how does the hero discourse interfere with teacher accountability and their ability to see and locate structural racism as it presents itself in teachers’ behaviors and school rules, policies, and so
on? How has the disciplining (in a literal and Foucauldian sense) of kids of color become heroic, and for whom? What purpose does this heroism serve on a larger scale?

Methods

In order to construct a genealogy of benevolent whiteness, this project employs two main methodologies: (1) literary methods, including close textual analysis, and (2) discourse analysis (informed by both Foucault and the field of historical anthropology) which I use in tracing the discursive construction of heroic white womanhood. Following Foucault, I ask how and why a specifically gendered benevolent whiteness has been “put into discourse,” and what effects that has had over time in constructing normative ideas and beliefs about the relationship between white female teachers and male students of color. While this dissertation does not claim to be a work of historical anthropology, per se, it takes its methodological inspiration from that field’s understanding of the relationship between the past and present. Historical anthropology employs discourse analysis as one of many methods based on the contention that the study of any contemporary social issue through historical research provides the “critical contextual link of the past to the present” (Given, 2008, p. 395). Park (2008) states, “Using a historical research design is of particular relevance to research about contemporary social and cultural issues, as it enhances an understanding of the present. Any contemporary issue is bound intrinsically with the social and historical milieu of the past” (p. 395). Further, Axel (2002) explains, “Rather than the study of a people in a particular place and at a certain time, what is at stake in historical anthropology is explaining the production of a people, and the production of space and time” (p. 3).

It is precisely this connection between past and present, and the possibility for a discursive “production of a people” (in this case, not an ethnic group, but a persona defined by group discourse and behavior) that I hope to make visible to the field of educational research in its collective attempts to understand the contemporary issue of the raced/gendered “discipline gap.” Toward this end, I applied these methodologies to an archive of primary and secondary sources written by or about the 19th-century missionary women who did the work of solidifying the US as a white, middle class, Protestant empire through the loving, maternalistic work of teaching. Doing so, I sought out patterns of key terms and ideas that spanned the century and the globe in order to trace the discursive constructions through which teachers were produced as particular kinds of subjects throughout the 19th century, particularly how
they were framed as heroic, loving, and inherently benevolent (thus free of complicity in the white supremacist project).

Choosing to focus my historical archive on white women’s journals and letters is a strategic move, although on the surface it may seem commonplace. Rather than using these women’s writings to give voice yet again to whiteness, I conduct close readings of their journals and letters and use their own words to tell the story of benevolent white womanhood with a re-centered focus on whiteness, following Leonardo (2009), to re-center whiteness as a means of shining light on its normative nature. Combining the techniques of literary close reading and discourse analysis, I use what has been said and claimed in the name of benevolent whiteness to make visible in contemporary times a more accurately complex history of white female teachers in relation to students of color. Through this methodology, my work speaks directly and primarily to contemporary white female teachers, as well as to people of color who have been indoctrinated into the compulsory whiteness of education. Given the history of schools and schooling in the United States at both the elementary and secondary levels as well as in universities and teacher preparation programs, all of us are implicated in belonging to one of these two groups.

The archives under analysis in this dissertation span several decades within the 19th century with a precise focus on the missionary roots of what would become our contemporary US educational system. I analyzed several hundred physical and digitally archived documents including newspapers, letters, diaries, pamphlets, and public records located in the Hawaiian Mission Houses Historic Site and Archives under the auspices of the Hawaiian Mission Children’s Society (HMCS) in Honolulu, Hawai‘i, and in the Eastman-Goodale-Dayton Family Papers, located in the Sophia Smith Collection at Smith College in Northampton, Massachusetts. Additionally, I conducted close textual analysis of published materials written by and about the two main women under examination in this dissertation’s main chapters: Lucy Goodale Thurston and Elaine Goodale Eastman. Each focal woman was chosen to represent an era and locale within the larger missionary and colonial expansion of the US; both were ultimately chosen after I first cast a much larger net and analyzed historical documents written by and about up to a dozen other missionary women in each era. The final decision to focus on Thurston and Eastman was based on the substantial amount of writings left behind by each woman. Although the

---

13 As far as I have been able to uncover to date, there is no direct relationship between the women despite their shared maiden names. However, given both women’s New England Protestant roots, I imagine there is a familial relationship of some degree.
extensive collections of other women’s writings found in each archive shared common themes, I made the choice to spend the bulk of each chapter focusing on one woman in particular in order to provide depth over breadth while seeking to trace the logics of heroic, loving white womanhood as the feminized arm of colonial violence.

Theoretical Frameworks

Black Feminism and Third World feminist critique inform my epistemological framing of power as a site of multidimensionality existing across space and depth (Sandoval, 2000) and comprised of mutually constructed systems of oppression (Collins, 1999). I apply these lenses to my analysis of women’s confessional literature of the 19th century, along with a thorough historical, social, and political understanding of the workings of the State at the time these women were writing and teaching. Although this dissertation aims to uncover the prior-to unacknowledged power and agency of women within educational reform movements of the 19th century, Black Feminist Critique offers a framework of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991) with which to understand the potential for white women’s positioning as both oppressed (by patriarchy) and oppressor (within white supremacy). In other words, it is imperative to acknowledge that the women’s “power and agency” to which I refer throughout this project is limited by its situation within the much larger structure of patriarchal power. Thus, a nuanced analysis of white women’s power in the 19th century necessitates an understanding of their complicity in white supremacy as a requirement of escaping some (yet not all) of the limitations of New England Protestant patriarchy.

One might rightfully argue that the United States in the 21st century is not that of the 19th century, the former being a system of mature capitalism whilst the latter was an era of colonial capitalist expansion; yet both apparently different experiences/moments serve the same ends: white supremacy. This dissertation argues that benevolent whiteness, as the feminized arm of empire, and white supremacy are bolstered though the discourse of loving maternalism and the corporeal and ideological disciplining of Black and Brown bodies. Through this analysis, I explain how the collective acceptance of and participation in the discursive construction of heroic white womanhood has been invisibly and normatively influential, in various temporal and geographical locations, in the discursive underpinnings of United States educational and disciplinary practice for nearly two hundred years. Toward this end, I hope to productively unsettle and refocus current discussions on the over-disciplining of Black boys toward a historical and
structural analysis of the roles played by white female teachers, and their potential for refusing and reimagining their collective mis/recognition as benevolent heroes. By asking and attempting to answer the question, “How and why has the persona of the white female teacher developed over time and in varying geographic locales, specifically in relation to students of color?” this dissertation provides the critical link between past and present, re-centers and refocuses on whiteness as an ideology and racial discourse (Leonardo, 2002) rather than as a static identity category, and provides an avenue through which to open up dialogue in which teachers and researchers can consider the multiple and overlapping ways in which the over-disciplining of male students of color, a task largely performed by white females\textsuperscript{14} in an institution haunted by the specter of an imagined benevolent whiteness, can be understood as expressions of contemporary “colonial anxieties” (Stoler, 2009) and as a consequence of our settler colonial past and present.

\textbf{19th Century as Temporal Frame}

This study is temporally situated in the midst of the United States’ greatest period of colonial capitalist expansion, which necessarily coincided with the organization and systematization of public schooling as an ideological state apparatus. Beginning with the first group of missionaries to the Kingdom of Hawai‘i in 1820, I trace the circuitry of benevolent whiteness and settler colonialism as they travel both discursively and literally, following the descendants of the first Hawai‘i missionaries back to North America as teachers and “reformers” of education for Indigenous tribes and newly-freed Black citizens of the postwar south.

The 19th century’s systemization of schooling tends to be remembered with a symbolically significant false nostalgia as the era during which education was freely provided for all, with the benevolent intent of creating equality and opportunity as its sole purpose. This is the false memory of a leveled playing field meant to peacefully welcome all peoples to climb into the great melting pot of “America.” Framing this study within this time period, with a focus on how white women in particular imagined themselves as heroes within and outside of the violence of settler colonialism,\textsuperscript{15} is important for several reasons:

\textsuperscript{14} White women have continued to make up the majority of the United States teaching force, beginning in the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} Century. According the U.S. Department of Education, approximately 84% of elementary school teachers in the United States are women, and 85% are white.

\textsuperscript{15} Defined by Cavanagh and Veracini (2010): “Settler colonialism is a global and transnational phenomenon, and as much a thing of the past as a thing of the present. There is no such thing as neo-settler colonialism or post-
primarily, it serves to dispel the falsehood that there ever existed a time during which schools were disentangled from white supremacy. Secondly, situating each chapter within the social and political happenings of the 19th century allows for a more complex, nuanced understanding of the otherwise seemingly benign and in fact benevolent acts carried out by “educational reformers” over the past two centuries. This orientation engenders a critical understand of the insidious nature of white supremacy as it is embedded in ostensibly innocuous structures (schools, missionary organizations, the women’s rights movement, and reform movements in general) and as it works to further United States imperial expansion. Finally, understanding the gendering of whiteness and white supremacy through a historical lens makes visible the ways in which women accepted “wages of whiteness” in exchange for attaining individual power and freedom in exchange for their nurturing and upholding of white supremacy.

Women’s Confessional Literature as Iterative Violence

Focusing on women’s confessional literature (diaries, memoirs, letters) as an archive sheds light on the discursive power of gendered whiteness during its 19th-century invention. It is important to illuminate and interrogate this self-constructed discourse of white women’s selflessness and self-proclaimed heroism for several reasons: primarily, it demonstrates the precise moment in time during which white womanhood became conflated with innocent heroism (although historically it has been always been symbolic of innocence); secondly, paying attention to white missionary women’s voices makes visible the intersection of the putting into discourse the imagined benevolent teacher/savior role of white women with the larger, presumably masculine project of United States global empire and white supremacy; thirdly, because it demonstrates a certain type of white woman drawn to teaching, and the discourse around teaching as a calling, from the beginning of formalized schooling and continuing to the present. Further, it is highly important and relevant that we read missionary women’s words

settler colonialism because settler colonialism is a resilient formation that rarely ends... And settler colonialism is not colonialism: settlers want Indigenous people to vanish (but can make use of their labour before they are made to disappear).” Patrick Wolfe (2006) is perhaps the most cited scholar of settler colonialism, famous for stating that settler colonialism “is both as complex social formation and as continuity through time ... a structure rather than an event.” For an analysis of settler colonialism as a gendered process, see Arvin, Tuck, and Morril (2013) “Decolonizing feminism: Challenging connections between settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy.” I explore and explain settler colonialism in great depth in the literature review appearing later this chapter.
through a critical lens, as they (the women and their writing) were far more influential in the United States settler colonial project and in the furthering of a discursive “benevolent whiteness” than published history has previously acknowledged.

Missionary women (and men) were required to keep extensive written records in the form of letters (to family, funders, and church) and private journals. Many additionally hand copied their letters home into a bound journal prior to mailing. These writings were widely read by contemporaries during the 19th century, and many were later published into what now serves as the main written record of this period in United States educational and colonial expansion. As such, it is important to (re-)read these writings through a more critical lens and thus to adjust the dominant discourse on our collective conception of the roles of white women in the United States settler colonial project and in schooling children of color throughout history to the present.

Review of the Literature

My dissertation forges a connection between three bodies of literature. First, it is a response to the extant literature on gender, race, and discipline in United States schools, which I find lacking in a specifically gendered analysis of whiteness and its influence on the disproportionate incidents of exclusionary discipline for Black students. Secondly, I look specifically at Critical Whiteness Studies as an academic field, as well as its precursor Black Feminist Thought, to lay the groundwork of what has already been said about whiteness in general and white womanhood specifically. Finally, my study aims to make a contribution to the growing field of research on the relationship between anti-blackness and settler colonialism, which I will argue is at the structural heart of the “discipline gap” in US public schools. The following is a brief overview of each body of literature, including their main contributions to my work, and the areas into which my work will intervene.

Literature on Gender, Race, and Discipline in United States Schools

The literature in this area overwhelmingly supports the claim that Black boys are disciplined more frequently and more

---

16 Here I follow Freire’s (2003) conception of conscientização, roughly translated to “conscientization” or “acquiring a critical consciousness.” Such an acquisition works toward liberation, and requires both oppressors’ and oppresseds’ awareness of and taking action against dominant social myths and societal, political, and economical oppression.
severely than their peers (Gottfredson 2001; Joseph 1996; Lipsey and Derzon 1998; Monroe, 2005; Skiba et al. 2000, 2002) beginning as early as preschool (US Department of Education, 2014). Specifically, Black boys are up to three times more likely to receive office referrals, suspensions, and expulsions compared with their enrollment rates (Mendez, Knoff, & Ferron, 2002; Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2002), and often such punishments are the result of behaviors that go without reprimand when exhibited by white boys (hooks, 2004; Ferguson, 2000; Kunjufu, 2005). More recently, researchers have turned a focus on discipline trends for Black girls, and when adjusted for population size, the results are even more telling in terms of racialized discrepancies in who is and is not disciplined for benign, typical adolescent behaviors (Blake, Butler, Lewis, & Daresnebour, 2011; Crenshaw, Ocen, & Nanda, 2015).

As a body of literature, research on gender, race, and school discipline is extensive but perhaps a bit colorblind. There is a palpable paucity of research that looks at the invisible antagonists in disciplinary interactions: the white female teachers. Instead, the overall focus of the research is aimed toward understanding and “fixing” the problems that cause Black boys to behave “inappropriately.” Among the most-cited causes for the “discipline gap” are the lack of Black male role models and the relatedly vilified single Black mothers, environment (i.e. negative neighborhood characteristics), poverty (Anderson 1998; Ogbu, 1989, 1998, 2004; Sampson and Lauritsen 1997; Warr 2002; Wu et al. 1982), low academic achievement, and generalized higher rates of misconduct among Black boys (Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010; Hindelang et al. 1979; Murray and Herrnstein, 2010/1994; Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985).

Although much of the research points toward demographic factors as predictive characteristics, Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera (2010) point out that these factors often occur simultaneously, thus making them impossible to separate and identify as predictors of misbehavior, although it remains true that the confluence of these factors does increase a child’s likelihood to be excessively disciplined. The authors make clear, however, that these factors are not predictive of misbehavior so much as predictive of potential for racial disparities in students’ disciplinary interactions.

A lesser explored theory to explain the over-disciplining of Black boys points to class (poverty) without regard to race, or the structural inseparability of race and class in the US. This is a common belief espoused by many teachers and laypersons alike; however, it is less directly pointed toward in
educational research\textsuperscript{17} because the data simply do not support the claim. After controlling for socio-economic statues (SES), and similarly when controlled for grade point average (GPA), race remains a predictor of excessive exclusionary discipline (Skiba et al., 2000; Wehlage & Rutter, 1986).

Although much of the extant literature focuses on causal factors located within students and communities (academic failure, poverty, chronic misbehavior), a growing number of scholars have looked to the roles of school personnel (teachers, security officers, and administrators) and their perception of certain students as outside of the “norm” of proper student behavior and thus unable to be “controlled.” (Fenning & Rose, 2007; Ferguson, 2000; Noguera, 1995). This would help explain the extreme numbers of students who are suspended for nonviolent infractions (for example, “willful defiance”). Fenning and Rose (2007) posit that excessive exclusionary disciplining of Black boys is the result of perceived threats and unfounded fears of losing control, rather than actual physical or verbal threats toward teachers or classmates. In the dissertation I will argue that such teachers’ fears of “ uncontrollable” students of color is a remnant of centuries’ old discourse on dangerous, dark savages and their threat to (specifically female) whiteness, and the over disciplining of Black boys for nonviolent infractions can be directly traced through this lineage.

Further analysis of teachers’ roles in students’ failures (although generally focused on academic failures) include theories of cultural differences (Delpit, 1995; Frisby, 1993; Hanna, 1988; Howard, 2006). This line of inquiry removes the weight of responsibility from students and families and asks teachers to consider how their behaviors impact students’ learning. Although this body of literature places the onus for change on school personnel rather than on students and families, the underlying discourse reveals that all poor and/or Black families fail to speak the language of whiteness/ schooling, and thus must be spoken to “at their level” so they understand how they are expected to behave. Delpit’s seminal work, Other People’s Children, for example, overgeneralizes blackness in its attempts to teach white teachers how to relate to nonwhite students, arguing that there is a white way to “request” a certain task be attempted, and a Black way of directly telling a child to perform a task immediately and without question. Yet, although cultural variances in speaking and disciplining certainly exist, they alone cannot “explain away” the over-representation of Black boys in the suspension data, nor can

\textsuperscript{17} I say “less directly” because there is a great deal of literature that focuses on class as a key factor in academic failure, which is then cited as a causal factor for misbehavior and eventual exclusionary discipline.
such cultural variances be applied generally to an entire population.

Continuing the investigation into teachers’ roles and perceptions in working with students of color, Ferguson (2000) focuses on negative student-teacher interactions and the resulting removal of “trouble makers” from spaces of “polite” academic learning. Again, this line of research focuses on cultural incompatibility; however, unlike Delpit’s work, Ferguson looks at teachers’ misunderstandings of Black behavior combined with a reliance on stereotypes of dangerous and endangered blackness, and the resulting overreaction to nonviolent behavior. Ferguson further explores how Black masculinity is constructed through repeated interpellations into “badness,” and through students’ agency in “choosing” to be removed from the classroom. Ferguson argues that the Troublemakers (and often the Schoolboys) are expressing a deliberate rejection of the school’s enactment of “symbolic violence” as it attempts to “enforce a cultural hegemony” and instill a “politics of politeness” as a means to control and construct the black body, and recreate a social hierarchy to “define and label African American students and condemn them to the bottom rung of the social order” (51). Whereas Ferguson’s work focuses on the experiences, motivations, and social construction of Black boys, I see my work as taking up the other side of the relationship: the experiences, motivations, and social construction of white female teachers.

Collectively, this body of literature falls short of rigorously interrogating the schools’ and teachers’ investment in whiteness (Lipsitz, 1995/2006). If middle class whiteness and the perpetuation of white supremacy is, ideologically, what is at stake in US public schools (Leonardo, 2009), whether for Black Schoolboys, white youth, or adults of any race, it seems as though there is room, and in fact a demand, for a further investigation into the “possessive investment of whiteness” as the next step in understanding and rectifying the over-disciplining of Black boys in schools. Yet most literature dealing specifically with the discipline gap renders whiteness invisible, or at most an indicator of cultural incompatibility.

18 “Troublemakers” and “Schoolboys” are Ferguson’s invented identity categories into which she divides Black boys who either rebel against (Troublemakers) or conform to (Schoolboys) their school’s behavioral expectations.

19 There is extensive literature that uses whiteness as a lens through which to analyze school policy, academic achievement standards, and so on. Leonardo (2009), for example, conducts a thorough analysis of whiteness in educational theory, policy, and practice. However, I am speaking here about the literature that directly addresses the disproportionate incidents of exclusionary discipline for Black boys.
This dissertation seeks to fill this gap of “invisible whiteness” in the extant literature. Both the theoretical and historical literature I will use offers a lens through which to rethink the literature on race, gender, and discipline. Specifically, the dissertation will illustrate (1) a dialectical relationship between black and “Native” males as threatening and white femininity as always at risk, (2) the discursive invention of the “benevolent savior” in United States imperial expansion, and (3) the permanence of such discursive constructions in the collective U.S. psyche and its glaring absence in the analysis of contemporary school disciplinary concerns. This being so, it is imperative that a project such as mine includes a bringing together of the literature on race, gender, and discipline in schools with an ontological understanding of the evolving permanence of gendered racialization throughout the existence of the United States. Thus, what I am bringing to the conversation is a specifically gendered understanding of whiteness vis-a-vis anti-blackness and settler colonialism in education.

Critical Whiteness Studies

Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS) argues for a re-centering of whiteness that reveals and problematizes its hegemonic normativity and thus destabilizes white supremacy as the dominant ideology and system of power in the United States. Further, CWS calls into question white people’s investments in whiteness (Lipsitz, 1995/2006), as well as the economic (Roediger, 2005), material (Oliver and Shapiro 1997), and juridical (Haney-Lopez, 2006) benefits of and contributions to white supremacy. More recently, Matias (2014) invokes a CWS framework to interrogate white people’s emotional investments in whiteness, as well as their active refusal to acknowledge or reject the (material, emotional, etc.) riches afforded by whiteness.

CWS is commonly understood as growing from white feminist roots (Frankenberg, 1993; McIntosh, 1989), although it is deeply indebted to the work of Black intellectuals spanning nearly a century (Baldwin, 1963; Du Bois, 1904/1989; Fanon, 1967; hooks, 1992; Morrison, 1992/2015). Despite its roots in feminist scholarship, contemporary CWS lacks an intentional analysis of white womanhood in particular and gender/ing in general. My work thus asks the question, what would it mean to return a feminist lens to CWS? In other words, how might turning our attention specifically toward white women, their relationships, rhetoric, and the power they wield while disguised as always already at risk, contribute to a more nuanced and intersectional approach to the study of whiteness?
White reconstruction

There are two main schools of thought in the burgeoning field of whiteness studies: white reconstruction and white abolition, each signifying exactly what their monikers suggest. White reconstructionists, put simply, believe in the potentiality for (re)constructing a new, positive whiteness - ironic, since aesthetic and ideological whiteness in modern capitalist society is nothing but positive, as is supported by Ian Haney-Lopez in his book White by Law (1996). Haney-Lopez (who, to be clear, is not of the reconstructionist camp) questions the academic search for positivity in whiteness, arguing that such an approach has been shown to “uncritically advocate race-consciousness as a step toward the elaboration of a positive White racial identity, and thus disregard the extent to which a positive White identity already exists, and further, the extent to which such a positive identity may require inferior minority identities as tropes of hierarchical difference,” (1996, p. 21).

Proponents of white reconstruction, however, disagree with Haney-Lopez, primarily due to their collective understanding of whiteness as both an identity and a performance. Following the theoretical example of Judith Butler, reconstructionists argue that performative iterations of whiteness by definition cannot “be” the same thing twice. As such, all white people inhabit whiteness differently, and if one hundred white people in a room each perform whiteness differently, there cannot likely be one agreed upon whiteness, oppressive or otherwise. The problem here lies in an evidentiary void: since its invention whiteness has yet to be performed in a manner entirely free from power and domination, and thus the argument for a performance of non-oppressive whiteness (or a non-oppressive white identity) remains a historical fallacy.

As it stands, proponents of white reconstruction have offered us a whiteness that cannot be structurally identified - an “understanding” of whiteness that is by their own definition fundamentally incomprehensible. Through their rhetorical sleight of hand we end up with a whiteness that remains invisible and innocent by proxy. Without an agreed-upon and static understanding of whiteness, it remains conceptually slippery, hard to pin down, and thus difficult to deconstruct or reconstruct at all. This leaves reconstruction as an option in theory only.

The more distressing problem with working toward reconstructing whiteness is the inherent failure to address the structural and hierarchical nature of whiteness and white

20 “Performativity must be understood not as a singular or deliberate ‘act,’ but, rather, as the reiterative and citational practice by which discourse produces the effects that it names” (Butler, 1993).
supremacy – in fact there is hesitancy within the movement to discuss supremacy at all, instead favoring to focus on its kinder, gentler cousin, “privilege.” Discourse around white privilege would have us believe that whites are unwilling and unwitting recipients of gifts (material and otherwise) placed in their invisible backpacks of privilege at a cost to no one (McIntosh, 1989). Semantically, the word “privilege” invokes images of advantages, benefits, or rights “enjoyed” exclusively by particular people or groups, earned either through hard work or dumb luck. Privileges are “extras” – a child, for example, earns (is rewarded) the privilege (special benefit) of going out to play on the playground (while others remain indoors) after turning in her math test early. A privilege is therefore deserved, to some degree. Yet through this term those who build discursive walls of protection around their comfortable supremacy do not recognize the failure of their own terminology on at least two grounds: Definitively, “privileges” are earned or deserved special rights – a fact that theorists of white privilege feign to disbelieve. Secondly, privileges in general are not meant to be subtractive – that is, they give without taking away, coming perhaps from somewhere but not from someone. The idea of white privilege, when explained as unearned advantages given by someone (but whom?) and hidden within an invisible backpack, is an ontological impossibility. Whiteness is not at all something hidden inside an invisible backpack out of the view of the unknowing carrier; if anything, whiteness is – to invoke a cultural reference mainstream America should understand – a magical cloak of invisibility. Whiteness and white privilege are neither hidden nor invisible, but rather whiteness is what hides and what is hidden under.

Peggy McIntosh’s now famous 1989 “White Privilege” article has become required reading for many teacher credential programs and school staff development trainings, arguably because it seems to have been written specifically for white female audiences. In this piece, McIntosh lists forty-six privileges “given” to whites, unbeknownst to them, from the most basic (“flesh” colored bandages) to the taken-for-granted impossibility of ever being essentialized or blamed as poorly “representing their race.” McIntosh, like Frankenberg, comes from a Women’s Studies feminist tradition, and as such has described her “revelation” regarding white privilege as the result of trying to name all of the privileges men have but are similarly unaware of. She describes white privilege as, “an
invisible knapsack of unearned assets that I can count on
cashing in each day, but about which I was ‘meant’ to remain
oblivious” (emphasis mine).

Criticism of McIntosh’s article (largely by scholars of
color) argues that although the backpack is certainly existent
and full of advantages, it is not in fact invisible to people of
color, nor to whites. McIntosh, on the other hand, argues that
whiteness is “elusive and fugitive,” and that she forgets her
own white privileges if they aren’t written down. While I side
with scholars of color who simply do not buy into the
invisibility, I would argue that what McIntosh and other white
scholars are hinting toward is white privilege that is
normalized, although visible to those whose eyes are open to
others’ experiences.

Although the term “white privilege” is now used with
relative regularity, both within academia and the teaching
profession, I (along with Leonardo, 2002) prefer to name the
forty-six “unearned advantages” as the results of white
supremacy, thus naming the system in addition to its effects.
McIntosh, too, rethinks her use of the word “privilege” by the
second half of the article, preferring to use “unearned
entitlement” or “unearned advantage,” although her followers
conveniently forget this turn. This signals the sticking point
so often experienced in conversations about race with white
teachers: acknowledging unknown privileges is about as far as
they are comfortably willing to go; acknowledging that those
advantages are “unearned” is asking them to step a bit too far
outside of their realities.

Within the field of critical pedagogy, Henry Giroux (1997)
asks what it means, politically and pedagogically, to
rearticulate whiteness in oppositional terms in order to bring
white students into the struggles of anti-racist groups of
color. To better understand the possibility for resistance
within whiteness, Giroux looks at the discourse on whiteness in
both right-wing organizations and critical race scholarship.
This piece is largely summative and more historical than
theoretical, first outlining the process through which “right-
wing whites had convinced themselves of their loss of privilege”
(p. 377) in the 80s and 90s, resulting in a “new racism”
designed to mobilize whites’ fears while also relieving them of
responsibility. In this realm, whiteness has been revived and
rearticulated to give a sense of collective and individual
identity to those who feel slighted by the system, in somewhat
the same way whiteness was initially invented in the United
States in order to shore up the numbers of whites. Whiteness is
now seen by many of its members as not simply an identity
category, but a besieged racial identity.
In the academic realm, Giroux speaks to the inspiration by scholars of color (Du Bois, Ellison, and Baldwin) in the analysis of whiteness as a social construction. Roediger and Ignatiev add a historical component to the study of whiteness, while Frankenberg, Dyer, and hooks represent cultural studies. Yet, as Giroux rightly points out, there has been “a curious absence in the work on whiteness” (p. 384) when it comes to instruction on how to enable white students to move beyond guilt and resentment toward rewriting whiteness within a discourse of resistance and possibility. Toward this end, Giroux advocates for a “pedagogy of whiteness” and thus, a whiteness that is recuperable through proper instruction and reconstruction.

Through their adherence to a somewhat reworked colorblind mentality, reconstructionists further the myth of white people’s ignorance of their own privilege and their roles in the oppression of people of color; in doing so reconstructionists further the trope of an innocent whiteness. White reconstruction gives too little agency to whites – they in fact have no agency – and therefore no responsibility for their superordinate position at the expense of people of color. White reconstruction as it stands is a half-hearted attempt at change, while ignoring white agency and thus avoiding its inherent white guilt. Because reconstructionists fail to acknowledge the complexity of the underlying structures of supremacy, attempting to rehabilitate whiteness by cloaking it in false innocence, as a field reconstruction will continue to function as a rhetorical hamster wheel.

White abolition

White abolitionists have taken a much more forceful stance than their reconstructionist peers, and have called for an all-out war on whiteness. Unlike reconstructionists who see whiteness as an inherited identity, abolitionists see whiteness as an ideology – in fact as The ideology. As such, abolitionists argue that whiteness is “nothing but false and oppressive” (Roediger, 1994, p.13; italics in original) – there are no redeemable or reconstructible qualities to whiteness, and thus no need to waste time attempting a resurrection of something that has no life left to give. The proposed solution to ideological whiteness is abolition: the complete obliteration of all whiteness and white people as a concept. To clarify, white abolitionists seek not to be rid of all light-skinned people, but to abolish whiteness as an idea and an ideology, and end the identification with whiteness (the ability to call one a “white person”) – much in the same way abolitionists of an earlier era sought to abolish slavery and the existence of slaves without the implication of seeking to be rid of all who look like slaves.
(i.e. those of African descent). This is a rhetorical move that is often confusing and off-putting to white-identified people, to say the least.

To further elucidate the aims of abolition, and in response to a reader’s letter accusing Noel Ignatiev’s abolitionist online journal Race Traitor of being no better than the Klan, the editors responded with the following:

When we say we want to abolish the white race, we do not mean we want to exterminate people with fair skin. We mean that we want to do away with the social meaning of skin color, thereby abolishing the white race as a social category. Consider this parallel: To be against royalty does not mean wanting to kill the king. It means wanting to do away with crowns, thrones, titles, and the privileges attached to them. In our view, whiteness has a lot in common with royalty: they are both social formations that carry unearned advantages (Ignatiev, 2005).

Acknowledging the inability to shed the visible markers of whiteness, Ignatiev offers the suggestion that whites might work toward abolition by repeatedly performing a non-whiteness or a refusal of whiteness in their everyday actions. He explains that, if whiteness depends on the unspoken membership in a secret club to which all its members have pledged solidarity, and whose members can be identified by certain visual markers, abolitionist whites must constantly problematize and reject their assumed membership in an effort that (ideally) would eventually make it impossible for anyone to be white. He gives the examples of such rejection on both personal and collective levels ranging from individuals asking, “What makes you think I’m white?” in the presence of racist conversation, to collectively (following the work of Black Feminism) questioning and opposing all forms of institutionalized oppression in schools, labor, and the legal system. “What if,” Ignatiev asks, “there were enough people around who looked white but were really enemies of official society so that the cops couldn’t tell whom to beat and whom to let off?” (Ignatiev, 1997).

For Ignatiev, the abolition of whiteness requires, quite simply, the iterative performance of nonwhiteness, and the resulting chaos that ensues. As “there is no hope in whiteness, the strategy is to locate it, insist that whites misidentify with it, and thereby commit race treason.” (Leonardo, Class Lecture, 2010). This is easier said than done, as whites can make their best efforts to disavow their whiteness, but at the end of the day they still carry their magical invisibility
cloaks wherever they go. Ignatiev presents an interesting proposal, and one that is more productive that what has been offered by reconstructionists; however, one is left to wonder if this suggestion is perhaps a bit too naïve. To mix theoretical metaphors, Ignatiev is asking whites to remove their backpacks of privilege, to renounce publicly their privileges, and to simply walk away. To understand whiteness in this way is to misunderstand the ways in which whiteness is inscribed upon the white body, as a visual and aesthetic marker of centuries of privilege and supremacy. One cannot shed the visible markers of whiteness any easier than those of blackness. Despite Ignatiev’s apt clarification that his aim is to abolish the symbolic rather than the phenotypic whiteness, he fails to see that the latter is also inextricably the former.

Similarly, in his 1993 article, Abolish the White Race - By Any Means Necessary, Ignatiev makes claims that white abolition will only happen if enough people agree to disown and destroy their own whiteness, yet he also makes it clear that his goal is “not to make converts, but to reach out to those who are dissatisfied with the terms of membership in the white club” (racetraitor.org, 1993). This complicates the question of how abolitionism as a strategic movement can draw more members into its fold without any recruitment efforts, how it can somehow subliminally convince whites that they too have suffered from their own whiteness, which is as he states absolutely necessary before whiteness and white supremacy will be eradicated. It would seem that Ignatiev is arguing that whatever number of supporters he already has is enough – that abolition requires very few, or there are more than enough white-looking people who are dissatisfied with the privileges they have acquired by their membership in the club of whiteness.

The obvious failure of white abolition is the one small question of exactly who in their right/white mind is going to want to give up their whiteness? And, if they do in fact give it up, what will keep them to their commitment to abolish their own whiteness? A commitment as such seems as secure as a promise to hold one’s breath – it requires an unceasing lifelong commitment, is easy to forget about, a quick reversal of performance occurs if one changes one’s mind, and most importantly, every inherent autonomic survival instinct will work against all good faith efforts to keep such a promise.

Nevertheless, although abolitionists lack a method for their potential madness, by correctly identifying whiteness as an ideological force rather than an enacted identity, abolitionists take whiteness theory to a new, necessary level, away from the innocent politeness of white privilege and its hopes for a “good” whiteness that is in reality nowhere to be found. As
such, dispelling the illusory innocence of whiteness brings us closer to disrupting its ideological tyranny, but still leaves us the question of what to do with whiteness and how to do it. This question is particularly important within the field of education, specifically within teacher education, as the majority of United States teachers continue to be middle class white women (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2016).

Whereas white reconstructionists study whiteness in order to locate it and “fix” it, abolitionists study whiteness in order to dismantle it completely. A third hybrid theory of whiteness situated in schools, and focusing on something between abolition and recuperated whiteness, is offered by Leonardo (2002) and Gillborn (2005), defining whiteness as “a racial discourse, whereas the category of ‘white people’ represents a socially constructed identity, usually based on skin color,” and supports the argument for a “neo-abolitionist” position related to whiteness in education. This is the strain of CWS in which I situate my analysis of white womanhood in schools. Following Christine Sleeter’s (2004) research on how white teachers construct race, I look specifically at how white teachers understand, construct, and uphold whiteness (as opposed to white identity).

To return a feminist lens to CWS is to re-incorporate an intersectional understanding of gendered racialization, specifically gendered whiteness, and the precise role played by a more subdued, loving, mothering white supremacy. My work seeks to return to the feminist roots of CWS, bringing to light what is often allowed to fade into whiteness as benign or without agency: the role of white womanhood. Making the historic and contemporary roles of white womanhood visible within the fields of education history and CWS allows a disruption in the normative narrative of heroic white women entering into schools and spaces of color, replacing/displacing teachers of color who are already there, saving the perpetually un-savable, and doing so out of the goodness of their hearts.

**Literature on Settler Colonialism and Anti-blackness**

Although theorizations of settler colonialism and theorization of anti-blackness (the central concern within Afro-pessimism) have existed as distinct categories and frameworks in a range of disciplinary fields such as history, sociology, and ethnic studies, only recently have examinations into the “mutually reinforcing” relationship (Smith, 2014) between settler colonialism and anti-blackness been conducted by scholars in these fields. This “mutually enforcing” understanding of anti-blackness and settler colonialism is at
the core of my dissertation, and is likewise noticeably absent from the great majority of literature in the field of educational research. In this section of the literature review, I will briefly demonstrate the ways in which anti-blackness and settler colonialism are understood and employed as both separate and interrelated frameworks, and I will offer suggestions for viewing contemporary educational research concerns through an understanding of the interrelated structures of settler colonialism and anti-blackness as necessary logics of white supremacy.

To begin with, I follow the theorization of anti-blackness as set forth by Michael Dumas (2016), which builds upon the work of afro-pessimist scholars Frank Wilderson (2010), Jared Sexton (2008, 2010), Orlando Patterson (1982), and Louis Gordon (1997) among others. Dumas argues that there is no clear historical break between the conceptualization and understanding of “the Black” within slavery and a reimagined Black citizen recognized as fully human within the white imagination. That is, the Black remains sub- or non-human in the white imagination (and thus in the collective US imaginary), regardless of the claims made by multiculturalists and neoliberals who point toward legal emancipation, the Civil Rights Movement, and the election of Barack Obama as signifiers of a new, post-racial world in which blackness is recognized as synonymous with humanity. A theorization of anti-blackness, therefore, is necessary in order to simply recognize Black humanity within a racial state that is predicated on the refusal thereof (Dumas, 2016; Wilderson, 2010). Further, theorization of anti-blackness extends the sphere of accountability beyond only white people within white supremacy and encompasses the complicity of people of color as both used by and taking advantage of a system in which the Black is positioned as the dichotomous other to white humanity (Dumas, 2016; Sexton, 2010). This theorization is helpful in articulating my theorization of benevolent whiteness as a technology of power wielded by white people and people of color (to lesser but not insignificant degrees) alike.

To move toward understanding the mutually reinforcing relationship between anti-blackness and settler colonialism, I first define “settler colonialism” following Patrick Wolfe’s oft-cited claim that it is inherently eliminatory and permanent: “invasion is a structure, not an event” (1999, p. 163). Understanding settler colonialism as a structure allows us to analyze its contemporary existence in state apparatuses such as schools, without allowing us to pretend that settler colonialism was “something that happened” in the distant past. In this dissertation I understand the structural nature of settler colonialism as permanently embedded in the psyche of United
States citizens, and permanently embedded in educational and disciplinary practice.

Tuck and Yang (2012) further elaborate on settler colonialism as both internal and external. They state: “Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain” (p. 5). This, they argue, most accurately describes the form of colonialism employed by the United States. Historically, United States settler colonialism required the use of chattel slavery, allowing for free labor for white gain, without loss of newly acquired (stolen Indigenous) land, while the violence of keeping and killing chattel slaves discursively transformed the enslaved (and “slaveable”) into the threat of violence (p. 6). In my dissertation, I expand on Tuck and Yang’s notion of the transferability of violence – the victims of state violence becoming framed as inherently violent themselves – and I propose that contemporary school discipline trends further the construction of dangerous Black masculinity with the continued underlying impetus being the upholding of settler colonialism and white supremacy.

A handful of scholars of United States and world history (Jacobs, 2009; Wexler, 2000), as well as scholars of the history of education (Adams, 1995 & 2012; Coloma, 2011) have explored women’s roles in settler colonialism. Jacobs uses settler colonialism as an interpretive frame in understanding the removal of Indigenous children in the United States and Australia as “the solution” for creating white nation-states. Her work offers a particularly gendered analysis of whiteness, focusing on the roles of white women as the kinder, gentler agents of colonial violence and dispossession. Focusing on the “Great White Mother” metaphor, Jacobs explores white women’s paradoxical roles in building the white nation-state, as she finds most white women who publicly crusaded for Indigenous women’s rights also wholeheartedly advocated for the removal of Indigenous children from their “unfit” Indigenous mothers. Jacobs’ work demonstrates one way in which women as colonial agents act in ways that appear to advance humanitarian efforts, while in reality their actions serve to structurally and discursively reinforce settler colonialism.

Coloma (2009 & 2012) explores white women’s roles as agents of empire and education in the 1900s US and Philippines. As with Jacobs, Coloma’s research finds that white women were recruited and trained by the state to discipline other (nonwhite) women. In early 20th century Philippines, white women served as “imperial feminists” (p. 3), discursively constructing ideal morality for the colonized via their “disciplinary gazes”
and their roles as teachers and thus as creators of docile bodies (p. 16). This is an important shift in understanding colonialism, supplanting the common assertion\(^{22}\) that white men were saving white and Brown women from Brown men, with the idea that white women were attempting to save both white men and Brown women from themselves and each other (p. 5). In this role, Coloma sees white women as both “bearers” of morality and “barriers” to immorality; however when their “disciplining gaze” of gender did not work on the white man, the “gaze of race” was turned solely on Brown women. In this manner, white women attempted to pass on Victorian codes of morality to not only the Brown women by example, but to their children by way of both their mothers and their white teachers’ curricular offerings in colonial schools. Following this framework of the white woman’s disciplinary gaze of race, I ask how this method of creating docile bodies and reinforcing white supremacy occurs in contemporary schools, bypassing the colonial direct instruction of black and Brown mothers, and instead using the mothering role of teachers directly in the classroom to further what might still be construed as Victorian “racialized heteronormative traditions and feminine respectability” (p. 3).

Andrea Smith (2012) argues that current ways in which both Ethnic Studies and Native Studies address white supremacy and settler colonialism as separate concerns prevent both fields from developing a thorough analysis of people of color in the United States, and put both at risk of being locked into “politics of recognition rather than politics of liberation” (p. 88). In her analysis, Smith finds that scholars of race ignore settler colonialism, while Native scholars lack attention to race and white supremacy. As such, the former has an incomplete analysis of white supremacy while the latter is prevented from developing a decolonial framework (p. 66). Smith offers a rearticulated “understanding of white supremacy by not assuming that it is enacted in a single fashion; rather, white supremacy is constituted by separate and distinct, but still interrelated, logics,” which she defines as (1) slaveability/anti-Black racism, which anchors capitalism; (2) genocide, which anchors colonialism; and (3) orientalism,\(^{23}\) which anchors and keeps us in a perpetual state of war (p. 67-70). Each logic makes the remaining two possible, and through this understanding Smith


\(^{23}\) Smith uses “orientalism” more broadly than Said’s (1994) reference to what has historically been known as “the Orient” or Asia; Smith’s logic of orientalism expands to include recent immigrants as always-foreign, marked as simultaneously inferior and threatening to the wellbeing of empire.
makes clear how people of color are implicated in the work of settler colonialism. Further, using the term “logics” rather than categories, accounts for the way in which people of color can participate in more than one logic at a time and in different spaces (p. 70).

Smith’s framework is key in my analysis of contemporary educational issues. Following her critique of racial theorists (she cites Omi & Winant and Derrick Bell) as understanding the state as inherently racial but lacking an analysis of settler colonialism, I suggest the same lack of analysis on the part of educational scholars prevents the imagining of changing an educational system that is structurally flawed. Smith finds race scholars’ pessimism regarding potential for change as the result of being unable to imagine “other forms of governance that are not founded on the racial state”24 (p. 69). Likewise, a lack of analysis of settler colonialism as a structure undergirding schools and schooling not only prevents educational scholars from imagining a new structure, but more importantly it keeps invisible the connections between the school and the racial state, thus keeping the scholarly focus on constructions of black masculinity rather than the perpetuation of white supremacy. It is my goal in this dissertation to bridge this gap.

Much of the scholarship covered in this review examines colonial encounters through a lens of gender, race, and sexuality, which importantly allows us to view the role of white womanhood to be one of agency in service to white supremacy and the colonial project. Other work asks us to imagine the interrelatedness of settler colonialism and anti-blackness as they relate to white supremacy. Where the research falls short, and where I see my work contributing to the field, is within the specifically gendered analysis of the reinforcing relationship between colonialism and anti-blackness as it manifests itself in schools contemporarily— that is, making the connection between how our past is linked to our present. Anyon states, “An urban school may present as a collection of harried teachers and unmotivated students, until it is studied as an institutional repository of the effects of discriminatory macroeconomic, political, and racial policies and social processes” (2009, p. 4). In this dissertation, I employ a gendered historical analysis of white women’s teaching in order to make visible the ways in which public schools were set up as institutional

24 Here, Smith relies on Omi & Winant’s (1994) theorization of the “U.S. racial state” in which “every state institution is a racial institution,” and all state policies are either “explicitly or implicitly racial,” (p. 84).
repositories of the effects of the contemporary processes Anyon cites, along with the effects of historical and contemporary settler colonialism and anti-blackness in service to white supremacy.

**Structure of the Dissertation**

I begin with the acknowledgment that white womanhood and its related power remain somewhat mysterious, and intentionally so. Without a proper interrogation of race, popular history has taught us that women were a monolithic oppressed class, powerless and endangered without the protection and guidance of a white man, be it father or husband. Women are represented as without agency, both in the diaries of white women suffragettes and in contemporary historical texts. Despite the complexity, fluidity, and invisibility of white womanhood and its agency, both can historically be traced. In this dissertation, I trace this agency through the roles of female teachers in US colonial and compulsory schools. I will begin with an examination of the changing ideals of womanhood in the mid-19th century, ideals which were deeply married to the needs of white patriarchy (and thus the term “womanhood” here is inherently raced as white). I then move on to the concomitant gendering of the teaching profession as a feminine domain, allowing it the duplicitous nature of being seen as an important and inherently nurturing, loving task, as well as a relatively powerless social role (thus exempt from critique).

In Chapter 2, I build on Foucault (1977/1995), Brodhead (1991), and Jacobs (2005) to set forth a theory of “benevolent whiteness,” birthed by the Victorian “Cult of True Womanhood” (Welter, 1966) and incubated in the newly feminized profession of teaching. I develop and extend extant theories to demonstrate the importance of making visible the permanence of a trope of heroic maternal labor that relies on “benevolent whiteness” in education. To do so, I offer a brief historical explanation for the conflation of mothering and teaching as women’s godly work, which I propose as a discursively constructed concept that persists to the present day, and which is an important and unrecognized foundation that undergirds race- and gender-based inequities in school discipline trends. I also suggest

---

25 Regarding the cis-normative binary of male and female, woman and man: despite both contemporary understanding of gender as fluid and existing on a spectrum with limitless possible identities, as well as the centuries-old Native and Kanaka acknowledgement of multiple genders, for the purposes of this dissertation most reference to sex and gender remains dichotomous in order to highlight the ways in which the idea(l) of “womanhood” was constructed in the 19th-century United States.
connections between benevolent whiteness as an answer to a holy calling, and its specific and intentional role in furthering of the U.S. white nation-state.

Chapter 3 is the first main historical chapter. Framed within the social and political contexts of the early 19th century (beginning in 1820), this chapter tells the story of the feminine arm of empire as flexed by ABCFM missionary women, with a focus on the life and works of missionary Lucy Goodale Thurston. In considering the role of white womanhood in general, and that of Lucy Thurston specifically, this chapter asks how we can begin to see the discursive construction of a benevolent whiteness—a cult of true womanhood—that characterizes itself as wholly benevolent, innocent, and salvation-oriented, and what remnants of this are evident in contemporary narratives about schooling and saving students of color. Lucy’s story gives us insight into the impetus behind white women teaching Brown children (and adults, who were perceived as children) in the 19th century, and in a more general way into the minds of women regardless of era who are “called” into teaching with hopes of saving Black and Brown children from themselves and their families. Further, the work of Lucy and her contemporaries as evidenced by their own diaries and subsequent histories and biographies makes clear the conflation of evangelicalism with teaching: schools function(ed) as a tool with which to spread Christianity to “heathen” populations while simultaneously furthering United States white middle class values of capitalism and imperial domination in the name of enlightenment. These qualities born alongside organized schooling are deeply embedded in the role of the female teacher, amalgamated to a point where they cannot be individuated or decoupled from the white female teacher’s identity without explicit work and intention.

Chapter 4 turns toward the role of white womanhood and benevolent whiteness as constructed in Native American boarding schools. This chapter is again framed within the social and political contexts of the time (the mid-19th century), and traces the circuit of benevolent whiteness as it travels back to its roots, often by way of missionary descendants who took what they learned in Hawai‘i and applied it unilaterally toward the education of Indigenous peoples (and freed Blacks) on the continent. As in the previous chapter, I ask readers to consider how we can view 19th-century women’s diaries and journals—

26 I use the term “Native American” and “American Indian” here and whenever else I am directly quoting or referring to a 19th-century term, such as Native American boarding schools. “Indigenous Peoples” will be used when I am speaking in my own voice, especially when referring to Indigenous Peoples collectively/globally. When tribal affiliation is known, I use self-identified tribal names unless directly quoting an author or archival source.
“truths” — through a lens that clarifies the history of teaching and schools as sites of settler colonialism and its related violence and power dynamics. What does it mean when “good intentions” end up with malevolent results, and more importantly, why do we (and who are “we”?) expect that good intentions excuse negative outcomes? How can we uncouple “good intentions” from the colonial violence so often the result of benevolent whiteness? Who determines what intentions are good in the first place? After all, colonialism was good in the eyes of the colonizer state, as were missions in the minds of missionaries, regardless of their genocidal effects on native populations and colonized nations.

Finally, in Chapter 5, I consider the implications for this study, particularly in relation to training a new generation of teachers that continues to be predominantly white and female. In this era that, until recently was lauded as “post-racial,” benevolent whiteness continues to function, although arguably in a mutated form, in contemporary women’s writings as well as through “alternative” teaching programs like Teach For America. White womanhood continues to operate through hidden wages of whiteness, hidden under its cloak of invisible normativity, innocence, and perpetual victimhood under patriarchy. The collective national discourse on teaching and teachers in poor Black and Brown schools remains focused on inherent benevolence and heroism, a chorus perpetually singing the praises of those who dare to do this “thankless” and seemingly impossibly work for the betterment of the nation. Benevolent whiteness in our schools persists, with little interrogation into the possibility of having good intentions that result in malevolent outcomes. This chapter concludes the dissertation by asking us to consider how and why benevolent whiteness persists, particularly in our schools. How has it changed over time to meet the needs of the white supremacy, and how much of it is simply residual conditioning, remnants of a 19th-century trope that continues to function to the detriment of students of color? Regardless of whether teachers’ uptake of benevolent whiteness is conscious or subconscious (or anywhere in between), the important question moving forward is, how can benevolent whiteness be located and dislocated in contemporary classrooms and teacher preparation programs?

Through its genealogical undertaking, the dissertation provides an in-depth analysis of the multidimensional nature of white womanhood as it explores the foundational tropes of (1)

---

27 After the first election of President Barack Obama (2008), much public discourse reductively lauded the landmark occasion as an entry into a new “post-racial” era; in 2017, we would be hard pressed to argue that the post-racial misnomer extends to the present neo-fascist Trump administration.
white women as perpetually endangered by black masculinity and the social and material consequences “at risk,” and (2) white women as symbolic of whiteness writ large, the Goddess Columbia representing the white racial state, again at risk by a threatening blackness (particularly post-emancipation) and at risk (of losing valuable land) by Native Peoples who must either be saved or made extinct. I argue that, whether by accident or by design, schools became the primary site of white women’s power in the mid-19th century and have continued to function as such to the present day. Married to this power has always been the denial of its existence, primarily on the part of white female teachers. Through this dissertation, I will bring to light the depth of the relationship between both lines of discourse: (1) the “Great White Mother” and (2) the white woman as always already at risk, and I will show that these codependent discourses have worked (and continue to work) to obfuscate the significant roles played by white women in perpetuating settler colonialism and white supremacy. Additionally, I acknowledge that there is indeed a danger is choosing to focus on something as seemingly specific yet generic as “white womanhood.” Yet, with a close analysis of history we can see that the ideology of white womanhood, like whiteness itself, does exist and was invented for a very specific purpose, which I will argue is always mutating yet still functioning in the present day.

---

28 For a explanation of the 19th-century use of the Goddess Columbia imagery as representative of the US racial state, see the Preface to this dissertation (p. iii).
Chapter 2
The Cult of White Womanhood: Theorizing Benevolent Whiteness

The empire of the woman is an empire of softness . . . her commands are caresses, her menaces are tears.\(^{29}\)

By the mid-19th century, white womanhood gained a new authoritative foothold in the United States. Already held in the highest regard, mid-century white women (minus the “fallen” – poor, prostitutes, recent immigrants) were considered inherently holy and pious, enshrined as the mothers of the nation and thus the obvious protectors of the family’s and the nation’s moral compasses. Defined by what is now termed the “Cult of True Womanhood” (as described by historian Barbara Welter, 1966), white women saw themselves as “a new and holy army, a national ‘army of women’” meant to solidify white statehood through healing the fissure between the postwar north and south (Blum, 2005, p. 179).

Although women’s “proper” domain was once confined to the spaces of home and family, changes in the 19th-century economy began to open a new door for white women: that of the schoolhouse. The schoolhouse, at this moment, becomes newly imagined as feminized – as an extension of the space of the domestic, a site of moral as well as material education. Prior to this shift, young white men made up the majority of the nation’s teachers, a workforce seen as a temporary holding ground for those preparing for other professions (Apple, 1985; Strober & Lanford, 1986; Clifford, 1989; Rury, 1989; Sedlak & Schlossman, 1986). Two major changes contributed to a mass exodus of men from the primary school classrooms: (1) a change in available work, from home-based skilled labor to work outside of the home in factories and other newly expanding professions, and (2) as the public schooling movement grew compulsory and more bureaucratic, men moved into the higher paying and more powerful and respectable positions of management and administration (Apple, 1985; Strober & Lanford, 1986). By the mid-19th century, young, single white women staffed classrooms across the country in unprecedented numbers, constituting the majority of the nation’s teachers (Clifford, 1989; Rury, 1989; Sedlak & Schlossman, 1986), a majority they would hold for the next hundred and sixty-plus years. Women’s roles as mothering disciplinarians in both home and school were created simultaneously and were conflated to include a primary focus on teaching morality and discipline through women’s “inherent

talents” at mothering, loving, and instilling in students a desire to obey and thus maintain their surrogate mothers’ affections.

At the same time, during the mid-19th century, the United States was in the midst of its greatest period of colonial expansion, with the ideological arm of the empire belonging to missionary teachers. In the latter half of the 19th century, the number of missionaries from the Presbyterian Church alone rose from fewer than one hundred to more than ten thousand across the globe (Blum, 2005, p. 214-15). In this context, white women’s roles expanded from serving as vanguards of morality for their own and the nation’s white children, to include all children of color and their parents within the United States and its occupied territories (Adams, 1995) as well as those white children whose birth and status put them outside of the middle class moral sphere of their teachers.

It is this culturally specific, temporally located invention of sacred (white) mother as guardian and vanguard of whiteness that I seek to explore in this dissertation, arguing that as the imperial schoolhouse model has not changed significantly over time, neither has its related imagination of the proper student subject nor the role of the surrogate mother/teacher. I argue that, while perhaps unintentional in the main, the racist and colonialist ideological and practical roots that undergird the myth of the teacher as “maternal” moral stand-in, structurally upholds and requires myths of dangerous and untutored “other” that threatens a mythic, fragile, maternal whiteness.

In this chapter, I will expand on the idea of the “Great White Mother” (Jacobs, 2005) to introduce my theory of “benevolent whiteness” as a gendered historical and cultural production via the relationship between “middle classness,” anti-blackness, and settler colonialism. I also explore the chronology of and impetus for the “white woman’s burden”: the need to save an always un-savable people, and the deeper implications of this trope and its role in serving whiteness. It is my hope that, once we examine the genealogy of benevolent whiteness, we are finally able to see the structural and ideological realities that ensure the racialized discipline gap in contemporary United States schools as a necessary function of upholding and reproducing white supremacy.

In theorizing benevolent whiteness, I first introduce Foucault’s concept of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1977/1995) – specifically his theorization of a “gentler” way of controlling society via normalizing judgment of internal monitoring in place of public and physical punishment. In other words, I apply this conceptual framework of “gentler” internal monitoring to the
affective control so associated with the “maternal white savior” model of educator I outline above. I also rely on the ways in which Brodhead (1991) uses Foucault’s work to theorize “disciplinary intimacy” within the creation of the first public (common) school movement, and I connect this notion of disciplinary intimacy with the feminization of teaching and disciplining. Finally, I will return to my initial proposal and will end the chapter from a historical perspective with an explanation of the dialectical relationship between white womanhood and settler colonialism to lay the foundation for an understanding of benevolent whiteness as a tool of settler colonialism and white supremacy, and potentially as a site for/ space within which we might re-imagine the role of white female teachers in United States public schools.

Throughout this chapter, I contemplate several theoretical and practical questions, including: What does it mean, and how is it useful, to conceptualize white women as agents and schools as sites of settler colonialism? How does an ideological and historical understanding of gendered whiteness allow for a more nuanced understanding of contemporary teacher identities and raced/gendered relationships in schools? How viable is a theory of gendered benevolent whiteness given the fluidity and performative nature of both whiteness and gender? Ultimately, the chapter serves as the model of analysis for later chapters and to clarify the overall focus and argument of the dissertation: the over-disciplining of Black and Indigenous youth is a consequence of benevolent whiteness (gendered settler colonialism and white supremacy).

Disciplinary Intimacy and the Feminization of Teaching

When the rod gets laid aside in nineteenth-century domesticity, it is because it is no longer needed in the disciplinary arsenal, having been replaced by psychological weapons with new orders of coercive power (Brodhead, p. 87).

According to Foucault in Discipline and Punish, the “historical period” of punishment serves as the transition period between the sovereign torture state and the modern disciplinary state. Foucault discusses, crucially, the figure of the delinquent (“controlled legality,” 1977, p. 279), distinguished from the offender. The figure of the delinquent is one who is hopelessly recidivist due to his own moral failings. Paradoxically, the prison (and the school system) produce the “delinquent,” requiring the delinquent in order to survive and retain purpose. The delinquent is the degenerate other of normalcy, and thus, enemy of the people. The delinquent exists to make the prison necessary. This idea of the requisite
delinquent is both resulting from, and required for, benevolent whiteness.

Brodhead (1991) builds on Foucault’s theories and proposes a theory of “disciplinary intimacy” made commonsensical\(^{30}\) through the combination of 19\(^{th}\)-century parenting manuals and popular fiction, and as a means of distancing the “respectable” progressives of the North from corporal punishment as slavery’s “ultimate referent” (p. 68). In antebellum decades, northerners’ expressions of outrage against whipping (in any site of punishment) is a veritable Foucauldian “cry from the heart” that “began stigmatizing physical punishment in early modernity as an outrage to ‘humanity.’” In response, northern educational reformers advocated for “less visible but more persuasive, less ‘cruel’ but more deeply controlling” technologies of social regulation (p. 69). As such, disciplinary intimacy, or “discipline through love” is heralded as both creating and created by the nation’s nascent middle class.

Following Foucault, Brodhead cites a change in disciplining practice from visible, external acts (here, the whipping of the slave) as symbolic of the public impression upon the body with the marks of the transgressor’s sins and the corrective power of authority, toward the “less visible but more persuasive, less ‘cruel’ but more deeply controlling” technologies of social regulation (p. 69). Foucault explains how disciplinary power transitions from the power of the sovereign, a power that exists in the body of the king but is not confined therein, to a power that is less visible, and in fact invisible — as in the panopticon. Here, power becomes a technology: something that is not held, but simply functions. Disciplinary power functions through the idea of the surveiller: the unseen but all seeing observer at the center of the panopticon who can be anyone or no one. Foucault’s idea is based on Bentham’s panopticon, a design intended for his ideal prison, which was never actualized, though whose design has been applied to many contemporary structures, including schools. In Bentham’s panoptic design, “power should be visible and unverifiable” (Foucault, 1977, p. 201), resulting in an inmate population that acts as its own guard, functioning under the assumption that they could, at any time, be under surveillance. Foucault’s theorization suggests that panopticism results in self-monitoring and self-regulation, amplifying power through internalization of rules and normalization of subjects (p. 206).

Conversely, Brodhead describes a changing disciplinary power in the 19th century as “against both these formulations”:

\(^{30}\) “Commonsensical” in a Gramscian sense: un-interrogated and uncritically absorbed by the masses.
disciplinary power as love (disciplinary intimacy) resides in the female authority figure, and it also becomes “dissolved into their very personal pretense” (Brodhead, 1991, p. 71) resulting in the personification of authority/power rather than an understanding of authority as a transpersonal right. Therefore, authority figures (in this case, female teachers) represent power symbolically while they also hold power literally and functionally. This is important to keep in mind, as teachers often attempt to absolve themselves of agency in the formal punishing of students, citing what they see as a problematic lack of power in their roles and blaming suspensions and other punishments on school administrators with whom the proverbial buck officially stops. Brodhead’s theorization of female authoritative power suggests that teachers’ discursive self-positioning as disempowered subjects of a larger system is not only harmful, but is categorically untrue.

The birth of disciplinary intimacy resulted not only from the North’s rejection of slavery and its referents, but also from an important transition in gendered family dynamics which can be seen as both a necessity for, and result of, the developing middle class: mothers as authority figures. The new middle class distanced itself from the poor and the past via the emphasis of the new role of the father who worked outside of the home, and mothers whose sole responsibility was to safeguard the morals of her children, and thus the nation, through her modeling and teaching of proper behavior. In support of this effort, an overabundance of books and pamphlets were published to advise women on using their inherent feminine powers (manipulative feelings of love) to embed a “deep burial of morality” (Brodhead, 1991, p. 146) into their children “aiming toward inward colonialism” (p. 147). Books on child rearing31 instructed mothers in the humanization of authority as a replacement for the harsher (masculine) scolding and physical punishment of the father. Following this method, as a successful disciplinarian, a mother would punish with a look rather than a lash, having enveloped her charges with an intense emotional bond of love, guilt, and obligation.

The role of mother as authority through love coincided with the compulsory public school movement, with a conflation of teaching and mothering “traced to a mixture of 19th-century prescriptions for middle-class mothers and theorizing by Froebel

31 See, for example, Bushnell’s Christian Nurture (1916), Beecher’s A Treatise on Domestic Economy, for the use of Young Ladies at Home and at School (1841), Cobb’s The Evil Tendencies of Corporal Punishment: As a Means of Moral Discipline in Families and Schools, Examined and Discussed (1847), and Sigourney’s Letters to Mothers (1839).
and other reformers about what is natural mothering and how it can be realized in the classroom” (Acker, 1996, p. 121). The middle class home, in fact, necessitated a nationwide public school system as a site for the extension of middle class values enforced via disciplinary intimacy. Mann, in his prolific writings, represented the common school as “disciplinary intimacy’s second home” (p. 148), and school teachers as surrogate mothers to ill-bred children (p. 149). This historical nexus continues to shape dangerously masked notions that position students of color as delinquents to be saved, yet always already lost by white teacher-saviors.

**Feminization of Teaching**

As I have illustrated generally, the “feminization of teaching” began in the mid-1800s and was all but completed by the turn of the century. This shift — both in labor force and in the perception of the work itself — occurred across geographic locations. While I have outlined the larger cultural changes that informed this shift, its particular nature was also affected by a variety of contributing factors. The teaching profession first, for example, became female dominated in places where schooling was organized and formalized, beginning with New England, the Mid-Atlantic, the Midwest, and large urban areas. In rural and pre-formalized areas, teaching remained, for a longer time, a path toward motherhood and marriage for women, and a stepping-stone toward a more lucrative occupation for men who had fewer options than their urban counterparts (Rury, 1989; Strober & Lanford, 1986). The shift in teachers’ backgrounds from rural white men toward middle class white women across the country was finally due to both changes in the economy, and changes in the educational system itself (in fact, in the systemizing of education).

Scholars generally agree upon four main causes for the shift toward teaching as “women’s work” (notwithstanding the larger umbrella cause of the cult of true womanhood): (1) cost — women could be hired for pennies on the dollar compared to equally (or less) qualified men; (2) women were seen as inherently better with younger children, and naturally inclined to impart morality and caring to their young charges; (3) the formalization of teaching and schooling was designed for female teachers, specifically with the length of the school year. The school year’s length led to an increase in demand for female teachers and a decrease in supply for male teachers, as the lengthened school year precluded men from engaging in full time agricultural work while using teaching as a source of “off season” extra income; (4) women were seen as easily controlled
and bureaucratized, and thus a more desirable work force controlled by men in central administrative positions (Apple, 1985; Grumet, 1988; Strober & Lanford, 1986; Montgomery, 2009; Rury, 1989). Taking into account both the larger ideological shift that “sanctioned” teaching as “proper” work and these more specific causes, what we know for sure is that women moved into teaching when and where there were few educated men willing to teach and, therefore, by the latter half of the 19th century the profession was overwhelmingly female.

The Great White Mother as the Educative Arm of Empire

As I intimated earlier, this female army of teachers was not simply charged with educating United States’ children, but with extending its reach abroad. 19th-century constructions of gender dictated that white women’s inherent obligations were to spend their lives caring for (instilling moral values in) their families, or teaching school (instilling moral values in other people’s children) — each task a different arm of the same beast meant to protect the white republic. Margaret Jacobs (2005 & 2008) explores this too-often ignored significance of gender in the colonial project via her theorization of the “Great White Mother” trope. The “Great White Mother” recalls the Cult of True Womanhood and refers to white women as active agents of the state, as moral arbiters at home and abroad, in the “post-frontier phase of internal colonialism.” Like disciplinary intimacy I discussed above, this tool of the state is one that operates through less visibly violent although no less dangerous mechanisms than masculine colonial power.

Unlike the more recognizably violent phases of colonialism, the murder and displacement of Indigenous peoples for the purpose of furthering US manifest destiny, internal (maternal) colonialism consists of women’s work focused on the management of Indigenous women’s bodies and homes (including their children). The missionary woman’s task was and still is to attempt to sever children’s ties between family and culture so as to educate them and indoctrinate them into a narrowly defined, white, middle class, Protestant ideal. Jacobs problematizes the self-appointed savior role of 19th-century white women by exploring their paradoxical stance as supposed advocates for Native women’s rights while simultaneously advocating for the state sanctioned removal of Native children from their “unfit” homes. Jacobs’ work makes clear that white women were not merely victims of a white supremacist patriarchy, but that they indeed were active agents of the colonial process who took advantage of their prescribed roles as “sacred nurturers” to promote their agenda within the workings of a
patriarchal state. That is, elevating white womanhood, and thus potentially reacting to and railing against women’s marginalized status, required (and continues to require) the pathologizing of nonwhite womanhood. White missionary women worked the system to their advantage and advancement as key participants in the systematic dehumanization of nonwhite peoples, gaining advantage and power from their active enforcement of a system that empowered and ennobled them (Jacobs, 2005, p. 456).

The failure to name and interrogate white women as more than just “innocent bystanders to colonial conquest” leaves a chasm in the history of the United States and unduly reiterates the belief in the frontier experience as central to the contemporary American character, including democracy and materialism; it names the cause as the effect without holding accountable nor making visible the true basis of American character as white supremacist, patriarchal, and colonialist. Ignoring white women’s agency within the “army of whiteness” (Leonardo, 2013) represses the ways in which white women discursively positioned themselves as heroically doing “God’s work” through love and salvation, all the while publicly touting their beloved status amongst nonwhite mothers who happily handed over their children (Brodhead, 1991; Coloma, 2002; Jacobs, 2005). The erasure of this history means that its repercussions remain invisible— not only in our educational system but in similar formulations in NGOs, “voluntourism,” and countless “white savior” female narratives.

This persona as beloved mother-substitute, devoid of guilt or colonial agency, is what I argue is alive and well in contemporary schools and formalized teacher training programs, yet we ignore its deep historical roots as well as its current existence. What was once described as maternalistic duty to rescue and civilize “ill-bred” children, first via the formation of women’s organizations and foreign missionary societies, and soon after as teachers at home and abroad, has imbedded itself ideologically in the imagining of teachers throughout history, heard contemporarily in refrains such as “teaching is my calling,” or “I teach because I love my kids,” and so on. While teaching is no longer referred to as “doing the Lord’s work,” it is nonetheless revered, especially amongst white and middle class teachers, as a selfless, heroic calling from a higher power. It is imperative to highlight the connections between historical and contemporary motivations behind this specific type of altruistic women’s work, while also making visible the hidden work of white womanhood, then and now, in building and maintaining the white nation-state. To do this, I will propose a theory of “benevolent whiteness” that is deeply rooted in US
colonialist educational history, and which persists to the present day.

**Theorizing Benevolent Whiteness**

In this chapter, I have used existing theory to demonstrate the importance of making visible the permanence of a trope of heroic maternal labor that relies on what I am calling “benevolent whiteness” in education. I have offered a brief historical explanation for the conflation of mothering and teaching as women’s godly work, which I have proposed as a discursively constructed concept that persists to the present day, and which is an important and unrecognized foundation that undergirds race- and gender-based inequities in school discipline trends. I have also suggested connections between benevolent whiteness as an answer to a holy calling, and its specific and intentional role in furthering the U.S. white nation-state.

My theorization of benevolent whiteness comes from the desire to re-center whiteness, and a specifically gendered whiteness, to make it visible and thus to destabilize white supremacy as the dominant ideology and system of power in the US, to name it as a constant during the development of organized schooling throughout the 19th century; to be able to view benevolent whiteness ideologically, historically, and structurally in hopes that we can trace its persistence through schooling and interrogate its presence, rather than spend time paying attention to questions of individual teachers’ commitments to anti-racism, equity, multiculturalism, and so forth. That is to say, the desire here is to take the focus off of individual teachers as potentially “racists” or “not racist” (which is where in my experience the conversations often head), and to locate ourselves as educators as participants within a complex web that long predates us, and to therefore begin talking about that web, what it is doing, who it is harming, how we are sustaining it regardless of our intentions, and most importantly, how we can begin to dismantle it for the benefit of our students and families.

In theorizing benevolent whiteness in education, I must first define whiteness: following Leonardo, I recognize and stress the importance of separating white people, a socially constructed identity generally assigned to those with white skin, from whiteness, a racial discourse and “structural valuation of skin color, which invests it with meaning regarding overall organization of society” (2009, p. 92). This differentiation is crucial to my theorization of benevolent whiteness because it allows for the fluid nature of race and
gender, thus leaving room for the reification/reproduction/ performance of benevolent whiteness by those who might not necessarily self-identify as white. While benevolent whiteness as a feminized arm of settler colonial violence has been carried out by white women historically, its legacy has impacted the field of education, and specifically the field of teacher education, in a way that makes indelible its mark on the profession. In other words, the way most of us have experienced schooling as students in the United States has been infused with the values of 19th-century white middle class Protestant morality, and colonialist white supremacist suppression and oppression of Black and Indigenous populations. Thus, we must analyze the ways in which we teach pre-service teachers, the ways in which we envision the roles of teachers, and the ways in which visual and behavioral markers of the “proper” student subjects are deeply steeped in arcane traditions, in order to interrogate properly the racialized discipline gap and other inequities facing students of color in United States schools.

My theorization of benevolent whiteness is based in analysis of archival and ethnographic data that has been distilled down to several key characteristics. Primarily, my definition of benevolent whiteness is that it is gendered feminine and operates through formalized schooling, carried out by teachers from outside of the students’ home community, and in most cases the students are of color and the teachers are white women. Historically, and at its start, missionary women carried out the work of benevolent whiteness. Contemporarily, this work is continued through programs such as Teach For America and its legacy, well documented in best-selling books and critically acclaimed movies such as Dangerous Minds, or Freedom Writers’ Diaries. White (usually) female teachers enter into a chaotic urban school and are able to do the job that no one else (read: no Black or Brown teacher) was able to do.

This point leads to the second characteristic of benevolent whiteness: it literally and figuratively displaces teachers (and parents) of color within school communities, replacing them with heroic white teachers who “know better” how to reach/teach children of color. In the literal sense, this displacement has occurred in Black communities beginning with the Reconstruction South during which northern white missionary women sought to “bring light to the darkness” by educating the “freedmen”; the most contemporary example of this literal displacement is post-Katrina New Orleans, where all 7,000-plus of the city’s

---

32 Hurricane Katrina was the costliest, and one of the top five deadliest hurricanes, in United States history. Katrina lasted from August 23, 2005 – August 31, 2005 and resulted in 1,837 fatalities, including that of the Louisiana public school system.
teachers were fired, reducing the once predominantly Black teaching force (72% in 2004) to just 49%, and converting nearly all public schools into charters now flooded by transient Teach For America teachers. Contemporarily, benevolent whiteness figuratively displaces teachers of color through the appropriation of techniques stolen from communities of color, for which communities of color are often penalized, including hip hop pedagogy, physical movement strategies, handshakes, spoken word and musical performances, and so on.

Figuratively speaking, benevolent whiteness seeks to displace parents of color through ideological whitewashing of the ideal, proper woman and mother. For example, in Hawai‘i white women were tasked with “educating” and converting the royal women; white women were used to access female ali‘i (royalty) who distrusted male missionaries. Their charge was to convince the ali‘i to accept Christianity and its gender roles, and by proxy to accept a Protestant work ethic, capitalist understandings of land ownership. The method for this transition, also used in countless prior colonial outposts, is to replace the Native mother (figuratively) by transforming her into a pseudo-white, middle class, Protestant mother (or as close to this as possible).

In Indian education, the displacement of parents has occurred both literally (in boarding schools) and figuratively. Retelling the story of a child re-named “our own Florence,” Elaine Goodale Eastman33 analyzed the girl’s father as simply not knowing better because he refused to send his daughter to the government day school. Rather than respecting a father’s wishes (which would have required her viewing him as a real parent in the first place), Eastman fondly retold the story of how she lured Scarlett Ball to her school with “baskets of inviting food” and then enrolled the child in school on her own. Within two years of schooling, Scarlett was appropriately assimilated by Eastman’s standards – in this case because she began pushing her father toward Christianity. Despite his refusal to convert, and based in no more than a lukewarm sentiment that his “seed had grown” from schooling, Eastman joyously announced that the “one time skeptic father is ever-grateful” for her intervention into his family, bypassing his parental authority, and converting a child she lured away though trickery.

The third identifying characteristic of benevolent whiteness is its roots in a multidirectional salvation: the need to simultaneously save peoples whose salvation would always remain incomplete, as well as saving the self. Historically, it

33 See Chapter 4 for an in-depth look at Eastman and her role in Indigenous education.
should be remembered that the impetus for Protestant missions was first to demonstrate selfless service to God, thus leading to one’s own salvation, with a secondary goal of bringing as many other dark souls toward the light, thus saving them as well. This salvation proved to be a difficult, if not impossible, project as, I argue, it was never imagined to be an attainable goal.

Contemporarily, this heroic fantasy is expressed as a desire to save /serve “underprivileged” (also marked as poor, urban, diverse, etc.) students, whilst lacking a political economic analysis of why those communities are underprivileged in the first place (i.e. a more nuanced understanding of white communities as “over-privileged” due to the theft of political and economic privileges from communities of color). Regardless of decade or geographic location, missionary women’s writings all echoed a similar commitment to the idea that their salvation depended on their saving others. Many journals opened with early reflections on heeding the proverbial call and, after careful deliberation and weighing the horrific risks, ultimately always choosing the “Lord’s will.”

Elaine Eastman notes throughout her memoirs that she found her path to salvation through saving others (e.g., teaching). She reiteratively marks herself a savior, wondering rhetorically, for example upon finding an abandoned government schoolhouse on Sioux land, “who would open the inhospitable doors of the waiting schoolhouse and ring the silent bells [if not her]?” echoing the nearly identical sentiment made by missionary Lucy Thurston34 on her way to “save” the Kanaka Maoli of Hawai‘i. Positioning herself on the side of assimilation in lieu of extinction regarding the “Indian problem,” without wondering or caring why the schoolhouse sat abandoned and unwanted in the first place, Eastman balanced her proclaimed love for the Sioux people and culture with a firm stance that their culture was inferior and necessarily dying out. Hurrying that process along, Eastman was, by her rationale, saving Sioux lives and their nation, ironically, by attempting to erase it.

The final characteristic of benevolent whiteness is its operation through a language of “love,” which I argue is an act of settler colonial violence when invoked by missionary teachers toward colonized and otherwise oppressed peoples. In Eastman’s memoirs, for example, she speaks repeatedly of her love (a generally maternalistic and patronizing love) for the Dakota Sioux, often cited as a source or evidence of knowledge – that is “knowing” them and what is best for them (when conversing with Congress, for example). “We who loved them moved among

34 See Chapter 3.
them as freely and with as much confidence as ever,” she claims, in response to the idea that the United States should fear another Indigenous uprising. She continues, now contradicting any claim of genuine love, that “only a handful of hopeless and desperate men” would consider rising up against the United States now that the “Sioux had been thoroughly ‘conquered’ in the 1870s” (Eastman, 1978, p. 145-146). Again, she cites her love in a similarly contradicting statement: “We who really knew and loved the Sioux were convinced that, with patience and redress of their grievances, the sane and loyal majority might safely be counted upon to bring a fanatical few to their senses” (Eastman, 1978, p. 155).

Not surprisingly, much of the writing left behind by 19th-century missionary teachers regardless of geographic location echoes Eastman’s refrains; their diaries and letters are replete with references to love as the impetus behind what are, in reality, violent acts of settler colonialism (separation from family, erasure of indigenous culture and language, indoctrination into middle class, Protestant, capitalist values, etc.). The language of love in contemporary educational discourse persists as a common trope. Teaching continues to be revered as a “calling” despite its contemporary decoupling from religion, and it is not uncommon to hear teaching credential candidates and veteran teachers alike explaining their career choice in loving terms (over practicality, material benefits, or being intellectually or academically well-suited for it): they do it “out of love.”

In understanding “love language as colonial violence” in its most reductive sense, I am referring to the ways in which teachers participate in settler colonialism through the discourse of “doing this for your own good,” disciplining because they “love their students” and because they “want and know what is best” based on a narrow and antiquated idea of what success looks like in a capitalist society. One of the dangers in this comes from the power of love language to obfuscate complicity in colonial violence. This obfuscation is as present in contemporary faculty meetings as it is in the archives under analysis in this dissertation. When love language is invoked in this manner, it isn’t a genuine love, but rather a manipulative countermeasure meant to deflect from self-reflection or interrogation of participation in oppressive behaviors or outcomes. It’s the logical fallacy “If I am this (loving) I cannot also be that (oppressive).

Contemporary educators must, then, have our eyes opened to the ways in which we daily reproduce a system in which we are needed as heroes in the first place. Benevolent whiteness
depends on the “willful defiance”\textsuperscript{35} of white women who insist that they are not racist, are not a part of racist policy implementation, that they are one of the “good ones,” and therefore that they are incapable of conterminously being in any way at fault whilst they are doing the good work of saving “less fortunate” children from their communities and themselves. Until we uncover and articulate the pre-history of the feminized white savior as educator, we are doomed to repeat the failures of the past in the prison pipelines of the present, and that teacher who dismisses what she sees as inevitable and beyond her reach will be a tool of a system that shores up white supremacy.

\textsuperscript{35} I use this term here intentionally, and somewhat ironically, calling attention to the catch-all educational code category for which roughly half of all Black students are suspended.
Chapter 3
Woman on a Mission: Lucy Goodale Thurston

Jan. 29, 1820. — I must not, I will not repine. Even now, though tears bedew my cheeks, I wish not for an alteration in my present situation or future prospects. When I look forward to that land of darkness, whither I am bound, and reflect on the degradation and misery of its inhabitants, ... all my petty sufferings dwindle to a point, and I exclaim, what have I to say of trials, I, who can press to my bosom the word of God, and feel interested in those precious promises which it contains.

Lucy Goodale, age twenty-three, wrote these words aboard the brig Thaddeus during the first American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions’ (ABFCM’s) trip to the Kingdom of Hawai‘i. After weighing the potential hardships and considerable dangers she would likely face living amongst heathens, she decided she would “risk everything” in order to “be given to the noble enterprise of carrying light to the poor benighted countrymen of Obookiah”36 (Thurston, 1934). This theme of great personal suffering and martyrdom necessary for the sake of heathen salvation and enlightenment runs throughout missionary women’s diaries and letters, and is a common refrain among their contemporary peers and lay countrypersons alike. Missionary Fidelia Coan described adult Hawaiians as “poor children who are as sheep without a shepherd,” declaring herself just the shepherd they needed to overcome their godless ways (Coan, 1838).37 Contemplating a marriage proposal (and immediate mission to Hawai‘i) from the formerly unknown Garrett Judd, Laura Fish proclaimed, “I feel that I am placed in the most trying circumstances. If it is the Lord’s will, I am ready to go.” Nine days later she declared, “‘The die is cast.’ I have in the strength of the Lord, consented Rebecca-like – ‘I WILL GO,’ yes, I will leave friends, native land, everything for Jesus” (Judd Family, 1903, p. 26-28).38 Likening themselves to the biblical Rebecca, chaste and pious, God’s chosen instruments, women from across New England sought teaching positions at home and around the globe in the name of “doing the Lord’s work.”

36 Obookiah is the Anglicized name for Kanaka sailor and student ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia, famous in New England as an example of “how the heathen could be regenerated” (Zwiep, 1991, p.14). Reverend Edwin Dwight’s Memoirs of Obookiah (1818) sold over 50,000 copies throughout New England and was the inspiration for many applications to the ABFCM’s Hawai‘i missions.
37 Fidelia Coan to M. Robinson, 1/26/1838; cited in Grimshaw, 1989, p.105.
It is important to illuminate and interrogate this discourse of women’s selfless and self-proclaimed heroism for several reasons. Primarily, it demonstrates the precise moment in time during which white womanhood became conflated with innocent heroism (although historically it has always been symbolic of innocence). Secondly, paying attention to white missionary women’s voices makes visible the intersection of the putting into discourse the imagined benevolent teacher/savior role of white women with the larger, presumably masculine project of United States global empire and white supremacy; thirdly, because it demonstrates a certain type of white woman drawn to teaching, and the discourse around teaching as a calling, from the beginning of formalized schooling and continuing to the present. Further, it is highly important and relevant that we read missionary women’s words through a lens of gendered whiteness, as they (the women and their writing) were far more influential in the colonization of Hawai‘i and the furthering of a discursive “benevolent whiteness” than published history has previously acknowledged.

Mission women (and men) were required to keep extensive written records in the form letters (to family, funders, and church) and private journals. Many of them additionally hand copied their letters home into a bound journal prior to mailing. These writings were widely read by contemporaries during the 19th century, and many were later published into what now serves as the main written record of this period in United States and Hawaiian history. As such, it is important to re-read these works with a focus on white supremacy, and particularly a gendered analysis of white supremacy. Through such a lens, we can adjust the dominant discourse on the history of United States-Hawai‘i relations, as well as our collective conception of the roles of white women in the United States imperial project, and in schooling children of color throughout history to the present.

To understand further the agency held by missionary women without reducing them to oppressed and innocent participants in capitalist patriarchy, we must shed light on the impetus behind these women’s missionary zeal, as well as the historical and social context of New England, the United States, and the Kingdom of Hawai‘i. Lucy’s inspiration, like most missionary

---

39 Throughout this dissertation, I use the term “white supremacy” not to describe hate groups or blatant Klan-like organizations we have come to associate with the term. Instead, I follow trailblazing scholar of whiteness studies and critical race theory in understanding “white supremacy” as a systematic racial ordering that benefits those deemed white at the cost of oppressing people of color (Bonilla-Silva 2003; Feagin 2006; Leonardo, 2009; Smith 2005; Takaki 1993; Yancey 2008).
women of her time, was not born of the ABCFM’s new missionary programs; rather, many of these women were already trained as teachers and were in the process of heading west to help conquer the “new frontier” through the only avenue open to single women: the newly-gendered feminine\(^4\) profession of teaching. Juliette Montague and Louisa Clark had plans to travel west to teach, while Sybil Bingham and Lucia Ruggles were already employed as teachers in New England. All four women’s letters and diaries, along with those of missionaries Mercy Partridge Whitney, Clarissa Lyman, Laura Fish Judd, and Lucy Goodale Thurston spoke of their duty toward “selfless sacrifice” through teaching and spreading the gospel long before they were made aware of the ABCFM proposed Hawai‘i mission (Grimshaw, 1989; Zwiep, 1991). For Lucy and others, the news of a missionary excursion to Hawai‘i simply came at the right time, and seemed to offer a guaranteed way into gaining independence, agency, and heroism unlike what had previously been available hitherto for women in the United States. Feminized heroism in God’s name was a path upon which they were already headed, and which would otherwise likely have ended up with them teaching “savages” in any number of continental locations: the expanding occupied Indian territory, and/or children of frontiersmen, or children in their home territory of New England. The seeds of salvation were already deeply planted within the hearts and minds of these young, educated white women; the ABCFM simply provided the women a soil in which their dreams and godly obligations could grow.

Background: Social and Political Context - New England

This first of many uninvited missions from New England to the Kingdom of Hawai‘i was inspired in great part by the antebellum reform movements sweeping the nation: abolitionism, temperance, women’s rights, and evangelicalism. Reform movements of the early 19th century found their genesis in three main phenomena: (1) economic change: the growing economy and its resulting production of the middle class to which most reformers belonged, (2) spiritual change: the “Second Great Awakening,” (3) and cultural change: the women’s rights movement, which grew out of abolitionism.

The rapidly growing economy of antebellum America produced a new middle class while raising the standard of living for the already wealthy upper classes concentrated in primarily urban areas. For the rest of the country, the increase in industrial

\(^4\) See Chapter 2 for extensive analysis of the feminization of teaching.
economies created low paying, low security, and often-dangerous employment for immigrants and the poor, including women and children. Those few who became wealthy through industrialization believed in and promoted the bootstrap mentality of hard work and self-discipline as key to success in the new economy. From their perspectives, the poor could easily share in the economic reward with a little more hard work and a lot less drinking. Combining this mindset with their Christian faith, many middle and upper class men and women (though predominantly women) were quick to join the temperance and other reform movements of the early 19th century.

The “Second Great Awakening” was a swell of Protestant evangelical revivalism flooding the United States in the first quarter of the 19th century. This new religious revival brought thousands of converts into the church, all fueled with the belief that their main duties to God and man included the eradication of sin, and a dedication to Biblical perfectionism for themselves and anyone they might convert. Conversion and specifically spreading the light amongst dark nations was a core tenet of 19th-century evangelical Protestantism, with one’s sole purpose in life being the forced conversion and salvation of all the world’s peoples. In the 19th century, conversions were largely contained within New England via regional traveling preachers and large religious gatherings or “camps” during which the devout could affirm their fervor whilst also bringing in potential converts. Of the thousands of new converts, far more were women than men. This led to a “feminization of religion” (Zwiep, 1991, p. 10-11) previously unseen, which occurred coincidentally alongside the feminization of the teaching profession.

This is an important point to which I will return throughout this chapter, and throughout the dissertation: two main facets of middle class white womanhood were forged at the same time, during the period of the US’s greatest imperial expansion across the continent and the globe. These facets were then applied to define an ideal student/citizen subject, and used as a standard by which to judge morality writ large regardless of location, socioeconomic status, or desire to be included in this new and impossible ideal. Further, the concomitant feminization of religion and teaching led to a conflation of evangelical values and the ideals of missionary salvation with the 19th-century middle class belief in teaching as women’s work (Welter, 1966; Zwiep, 1991). It is this moment of putting into discourse the mother/savior/teacher trope and its immortal melding into the teaching profession that I intend to make visible, and to question as a valid mentality with which
to teach diverse populations in the 21st century (or at any time, for that matter).

A third and coinciding movement working alongside the religious fervor of the Second Great Awakening was the nascent women’s rights movement. The movement was inspired somewhat unintentionally by the trope of “True Womanhood,” a moniker given retroactively by contemporary historians, taken from the title of Barbara Welter’s 1966 essay, “The Cult of True Womanhood.” Welter describes the four pillars of True Womanhood as piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity, all of which were crucial to not only a woman’s identity, but to the upholding of the nation and the (white) race. Through this trope, white women represented a moral standard that held constant, and held the family and nation together, despite all other changes or challenges, all while remaining confined to the home as her microcosmic world. Woman, with a capital W, was defined and defended by the primary political and social influences of the 19th century: women’s magazines, pamphlets, illustrated gift annuals, and religious literature (Welter, 1966), and as in contemporary times, the majority of women could not meet these impossible standards. This led to (1) the reiteration of a belief that white middle class women were the only “true women,” and were thus the rulers by which to measure the rest of the world, and (2) a population of white middle class women who spent their lives struggling to adhere to a perfection that would remain beyond their reach (Welter, 1966, p.8). The latter, along with the former, gave rise to a group of newly empowered, sanctioned by God, white women who would soon reject True Womanhood and its conflicting understanding of women’s roles, leading to the creation of an organized movement for women’s rights, and the eventual destruction of the True Womanhood ideal.

True Womanhood held that woman was by nature the weaker sex, yet they were also inherently morally pure and as close to perfect as any human might aspire. This characterization led to understanding women as the ideal candidates to influence morally their children, their husbands, the nation, and later their maternalistic charges in colonial outposts on the continent and abroad. Yet women’s domain remained confined to the home, whilst men’s domain was quite literally anywhere (and everywhere) in the world. Women were charged with doing the heavy moral lifting of the nation from within their domestic spheres, specifically

---

41 The Women’s Rights Movement became an organized movement of the latter half of the 19th century, roughly forty years after the Thaddeus set sail for Hawai‘i. Its genesis, however, was rooted as well as grown out of the same economic and cultural changes that inspired women’s participation in foreign missions and in expanding their worlds both literally and politically.
by raising the next generation of white, Christian, male capitalist Americans. Aching to be free of their restrictions as “hostages in the home” (Welter, 1966, p. 8), middle class white women would soon use parts of the True Womanhood ideal to their advantage, as evidence supporting their claims for greater political and societal influence within 19th-century reform movements, while simultaneously rebelling against the idea that women were the weaker sex. After all, if women were morally perfect by God’s own design, they certainly owed it to themselves and the world to participate more freely and powerfully in all aspects of society. Building on the one exception to the rule of “hostage in the home,” that church work did not sully a woman’s perfect nature, white women were able to discursively create a world within which their work was always already the work of God, inspired and sanctioned by His word and His implied reasoning behind creating one morally perfect sex.42

Middle class white women, many of whom participated in some way in abolitionism, began building what has become known as “The” Women’s Rights Movement. I put “The” capitalized and in quotes to signal the movement’s disingenuous name as well as its lack of inclusion of most of the United States female population, specifically poor women and women of color.43

Ironically, a key leader of the movement, Angelina Grimké, is often quoted as saying, “The investigation of the rights of slaves has led me to a better understanding of my own,” (Grimké, 1836) as if there were a reciprocal relationship between the needs of middle class white women (those who were doing the speaking) and enslaved or freed Black women, poor women, or other “fallen” women (those who were without voice or recognition as “true women” at all). Along with Grimké, in 1848 a group of largely abolitionist, largely white middle class women held a convention in Seneca Falls which resulted in the “Declaration of Sentiments,” modeled after the Declaration of Independence but with all men / patriarchy in the place of King George’s role as oppressor. The Declaration served as a manifesto of the new Women’s Rights movement, and serves as perhaps the first example of white womanhood positioning itself as uniquely oppressed without acknowledgment of its role within oppression, and of middle class white women taking a myopic view

42 I am working under the 19th-century belief that God is a “He” and that there are two distinct sexes. I want to acknowledge my rejection of both ideas, while also realizing that though this dissertation is meant to interrogate / challenge past notions of gender and patriarchy, there is insufficient room to address it in this regard.

of what is best and right for all women, based solely on their experiences of the world and their desire to break free of what they liken to the chains of chattel slavery.

Prior to the organized movement for women’s rights, white women made smaller, strategic moves toward agency and breaking free of the “hostage in the homes” requirements of True Womanhood, but by all accounts they remained comfortably within its confines as servants of God and their husbands prior to and during missionary service. This was the archetype for 19th-century missionary wives: a desire to serve God and man at all costs, reputations for absolute moral purity, a belief that women’s inherent roles in life were to spread light and the gospel across the globe (Grimshaw, 1989; Zwiep, 1991), and just the right (controllable) amount of an inkling for adventure and freedom from the confines of 19th-century womanhood.

Background / social & political context – Hawai‘i

Most mainstream histories of 19th-century Hawai‘i, informed by the writings of the first missionaries to the kingdom, tell the story of a feudal people recently freed from an oppressive kapu (taboo) system and thus “literally a ‘people without a religion’ – a condition unique in history” (Thurston, 1934). This is problematic for many reasons, not least of all because it is based solely on the words of haole missionaries and their descendants, thus reflecting a gross misunderstanding of pre-contact Hawai‘i governance, beliefs, traditions, and history. First off, the idea that Kanaka women and maka‘āinana were oppressed is based on a western understanding of both gender roles and spirituality, compounded by the idea that Calvinist missionaries saw their own religion as one that held women in the highest esteem, and one which would in fact save “savage” women from their men and their cultures. Ironically, women in the United States were in many ways afforded far less freedom and agency than Kanaka women and women in general in pre-Christian Hawai‘i.

44 See, for example, Daws’ Shoal of Time (1982/1968), Kuykendall’s The Hawaiian Kingdom (1938), and Fuchs’ Hawaii pono (1992/1961).
45 For a detailed analysis of western scholars’ invention of feudalism in Hawai‘i, see the first section in Part III of Haunani Kay-Trask’s From a Native daughter: Colonialism and sovereignty in Hawai‘i.
46 Haole literally translates to “foreigner.” Early foreigners, usually white Europeans and United States citizens, as well as Asian immigrants were initially referred to as haole. Contemporarily, white people are considered haole whether or not they are “foreigners” (newcomers) to the islands whereas Asians, whether recent immigrants or decedents of planation workers, are referred to by their ethnic group (Japanese, Chinese, and so on).
47 Commoners: primarily laborers, fishermen, farmers, etc.
Secondly, the over-simplification involved in describing Hawaiian governance and land use as “feudal” reflects a Euro-American understanding of their own medieval ancestors’ feudalism more so than it actually describes what existed in Hawai‘i pre-contact and through the mid-19th century. Hawai‘i’s governance was never akin to what has historically been defined as feudalism: a social system in which the land is owned by the Crown, and all who resided upon the land were bound to the land and the Crown either in exchange for protection or as military protectors of the Crown. Under Kamehameha’s reign, and as far back as Kanaka oral history recites, maka‘ainana “neither owed military service to ali‘i nor were they bound to the land.” Maka‘ainana were free to live anywhere in the islands, without obligation, and could move from one moku to another at any time without repercussion. Kanaka believed that the more people an ali‘i had living under his protection, the greater his power and status among his peers. Thus, the obligation to provide for the people fell on ali‘i rather than an obligation toward ali‘i held by maka‘ainana. To fail to provide for the people in one’s moku reflected poorly upon ali‘i, signifying a loss of mana and status (Trask, 1993, p. 4-6). This is diametrically opposed to the relationship between medieval feudal peasants and their lords, and was by no means a system from which kanaka needed or wanted “freedom” as defined by the Protestant Church and United States white supremacy.

Haole interpretation of kanaka culture, society, and governance, as well as the events leading up to the end to the traditional kapu system was and remains filtered through the lens of white United States missionaries. The moment in history is generally reduced to a simple interaction between two allegedly power-hungry women and the newly crowned young (20-year-old) King Liholiho. It was indeed the late Kamehameha III’s favorite wife Ka‘ahumanu, who upon the monarch’s death, decreed that the old customs and taboos be broken via her influence over Liholiho. Upon his deathbed, Kamehameha made Ka‘ahumanu kuhina nui, thus anointing her with the highest power of any woman in the kingdom, as equal (or some would argue as superior) to

48 District or land division
49 Spiritual or divine power
50 The religious system of rules and prohibitions, particularly defining relationships between the ali‘i and maka‘ainana and haole. “Kapu” when used as an adjective or noun means “scared” or “forbidden.”
51 The Kuhina Nui was a unique position in Kanaka government, roughly translated as “co-regent,” and had no equivalent in western governments of the day. “The Kuhina Nui held equal authority to the king in all matters of government, including the distribution of land, negotiating treaties and other agreements, and dispensing justice.”
Kamehameha’s son, the new King Liholiho. As haole history tells it, along with Liholiho’s mother (High Chiefess Kina‘u, a daughter of Kamehameha I), Ka‘ahumanu convinced Liholiho to aid her in abolishing the kapu system, particularly the kapu that applied to herself and other women, beginning with the kapu around men and women eating in each others’ company. The abolition of the kapu system would presumably result in personal and political gain for both women, thus making this seemingly manipulative first act of the new monarchy one based on selfishness and greed. Many haole scholars (Grimshaw, 1989; Zwiep, 1991) thus read the abolishing of kapu as an act primarily about the two women wanting power on par with men, despite the fact that both women already held more power than anyone, male or female, in the islands (see Kauanui, 2008; Linnekin, 1990). Both Grimshaw and Zwiep celebrate the end to the kapu system as a win for women’s rights, again misreading the complexity of the Kanaka situation through a lens colored by white feminist thought and missionary writings of history.

Hawaiian writing from the 19th century, intentionally forgotten articles and diaries written alongside missionaries’ journals, tells a much more nuanced story. Additionally, contemporary authors informed by more than just the one-sided history of Calvinist missionaries provide us with a different perspective to consider.\(^{52}\) Merry (2000) and Trask (1993), for example, demonstrate that the food kapu, ‘ai kapu, was once a source of mana, protecting the people. Rules prohibiting men and women from mixed eating, and preventing women from eating certain foods that were either phallic in nature and/or associated with masculine power, were based in a centuries-old belief in protecting the mana of the male ali‘i, rather than as an overly simplified misogynistic rule meant to keep women subservient. Ka‘ahumanu’s decision to invite Liholiho to publicly dine with her was based on an extension of this belief in the ali‘i’s mana being directly tied to the health and safety of the people. Kamehameha III was seen as pono, following and enforcing all kapu, and full of more mana than perhaps any ali‘i before him, all of which were royal qualities meant to ensure the livelihood of the maka‘āinana and the nation. Yet toward the end of Kamehameha’s rule, the Kanaka were no longer protected in the ways they had been prior to haole contact. Upward of 150,000 Kanaka had died of violence, simple illnesses, and more complex and devastating diseases, none of which had the same deadly effects on haole living in the islands. The kapu system was no

---

longer doing its job. Ka‘ahumanu and her ali‘i nui might have thus decided to break the ‘ai kapu because they surmised that free eating was a source of the haole’s resistance to death from simple disease, and because although haole had ignored the ‘ai kapu for decades in Hawai‘i, they had never been struck down by the gods (Merry, 2000, p. 61; Silva, 2004, p.29). Thus the idea of mixed eating was considered as not only something for which Kanaka would not be punished as was previously believed, but more hopefully that the end to the ‘ai kapu would be the key to protecting Kanaka from further decimation and thus ensuring the continued existence of the Kanaka Maoli for generations to come.⁵³

Despite haole interpretation of the women’s roles in ending the ‘ai kapu as purely manipulative, Liholiho complied with his mother’s request that he sit and eat with her in the presence of men and women, although he did so cautiously and afraid of the repercussions promised by kahuna and common lore. Soon after the shared meal, according to missionary journals and contemporary haole authors, Ka‘ahumanu convinced Liholiho to destroy all heiau and religious symbols in Hawai‘i as an act of acknowledging that the kapu system and its power no longer existed. Again, the more complex history as told by Kanaka scholars (Silva, 2004; Trask, 1993), and which is based on Hawaiian language newspapers and the writing of 19th-century Kanaka historians, argues that the heiau were destroyed by the kahuna out of obligation, as their spiritual duty, because the heiau were symbols of a kapu system that was no longer pono⁵⁴, and which perhaps was thus contributing to mass death unlike any they had ever known. Whereas haole scholars describe a simple yet calculated decision made by two power hungry women, carried out by a scared young king, resulting in chaos and the destruction of all things traditionally Hawaiian, a more balanced reading of Kanaka history suggests the kuhina nui acted with the intention of preserving the health and lives of the Kanaka people and sustaining the kingdom through what seemed like the most logical means at the time.

Despite the destruction of the kapu and religious powers of the past, Hawai‘i was not the empty vessel waiting to be filled with Christian light that the missionaries made it out to be. Basic beliefs, traditions, and practices remained in place, as did the traditional division of land and labor. What missionary writers and contemporary historians fail to acknowledge is the

⁵³ For an in depth explanation of the kapu, see the translated writing of 19th-century Kanaka historian John Papa ʻĪʻī, Fragments of Hawaiian History (1959), David Malo’s Hawaiian Antiquities (1951), and Samuel Manaiakalani Kamakau’s Ruling chiefs of Hawaii (1961).
⁵⁴ Righteous, moral, respectable, correct.
dire health of the overall population, now decimated by haole diseases, which was much more influential in the ali‘i and maka‘āinana eventually accepting and promoting Christianity as a promise of eternal life for their people, not necessarily for themselves as individuals (Trask, 1993). Combining the anecdotal evidence that haole broke the ‘ai kapu and were immune to disease and death with the missionaries’ promise of eternal live in Christianity, Ka‘ahumanu and other ali‘i eventually became open to the idea that conversion to Christianity might be the best way to save the Kanaka Maoli (Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992; Merry, 2000; Trask, 1993).

**Woman on a mission: Lucy Goodale Thurston**

The swell of 19th-century Christian conversion in New England meant no shortage of saviors in search of someone(s) to save. Committed to accessing their own salvation, devout Congregationalists were determined to fulfill their desires and obligations to spread their gospel across the globe. In 1819, they found their inspiration in the diary of a young Kanaka Christian convert named ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia (in English, referred to as Henry or Heneri Obookiah).

‘Ōpūkaha‘ia was born in 1792 in the Ka‘ū moku of Hawai‘i Island, just three years before Kamehameha the Great won the Battle of Nu‘uanu Pali and conquered all the major islands of Hawai‘i.55 ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia’s father served in the army of his moku’s ali‘i nui who, like other local chiefs, hoped to reclaim their lands from Kamehameha who was still fighting on O‘ahu. In retribution, Kamehameha’s soldiers returned to Hawai‘i Island and slaughtered all who fought against him, along with their wives, children, and any family members who could be found. ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia was around ten years old when his parents were killed in front of him, and though he attempted to escape with his infant brother on his back, the baby was quickly killed and ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia was captured and given to the family of the soldier who killed his parents. Soon after, he was ransomed as apprentice to his Kahuna nui56 uncle. ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia, however, had other ideas, and planned to leave the islands as soon as he was able. This chance came when he signed onto Yankee ship leaving Hilo for Alaska, China, and eventually landing in New York in 1809. ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia would never again see his homeland.

Shortly after he succumbed to “typhus fever” at the age of 26, ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia’s memoirs were edited and published by Edwin W.

---

55 By 1810, Kaua‘i and Ni‘ihau were also united within the newly established Kingdom of Hawai‘i.
56 High priest; also “Kahuna po‘o.”
Dwight, a graduate of Yale, and coincidentally also the person named in the memoirs as "discovering" Ōpūkahaʻia “weeping on the steps” of Yale, embarrassed and lamenting his lack of education. According to the memoirs, his homeland, the “Sandwich Islands,” were desperate for spiritual guidance and the parental oversight only Christian missionaries could provide. Along with Opukahaʻia’s words, common knowledge, pithy as it was, painted Hawai‘i as an exotic land populated by ignorant heathens and drunken, lascivious sailors. As the story has been retold (by haole missionaries and their decedents), Ōpūkahaʻia fought typhus just long enough to implore his Christian brethren to travel to Hawai‘i to spread Christianity and literacy in hopes of saving his people from eternal damnation. His diary, Memoirs of Henry Obookiah,⁵⁷ was widely read, with over 50,000 copies in publication. One might argue it was second only to the Bible in importance and influence amongst New England’s middle class evangelicals. Within a year of its publication the ABCFM formed the “Sandwich Islands Mission,” and applications poured in from across the east coast.

Seven men were chosen for the first mission to Hawai‘i; however, their sense of moral duty and adventure was not enough to prepare them for the journey. It was the deeply held belief, based on prior missions to Tahiti, that single men in heathen land would be unable to resist the advances of the naked and sexually promiscuous natives of Hawai‘i. As fortune would have it, one of the many saintly roles meant for white women in the 19th century included the salvation of white men and Brown women from each other and from themselves (Coloma, 2009, 2012; Jacobs, 2009). Thus, it was required that all missionaries be protected from temptation by way of marriage prior to their departure. Like many unmarried missionary-minded young men, in mid-September a thirty-two-year-old scythe maker and Yale and Andover graduate, Asa Thurston, spread the word to family and church that he was seeking a pious, selflessly benevolent bride to join him in the “Sandwich Islands.” Word soon spread to a cousin of an already adventure-minded, and highly educated⁵⁸ Lucy Goodale, and in quick time Lucy’s father arranged a meeting between the young pair. Within a few days Asa proposed to Lucy,

---

⁵⁷ This is not the same text as the book published later in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i (the Hawaiian language) in 1867 in New York: "Ka Moolelo o Heneri Opukahaia (The History of Henry Obookiah). The published book is based on the same English story, but is edited for errors, and includes further information gathered by Rev. S. W. Papaula in Kealakekua.

⁵⁸ Lucy received significantly more schooling than most girls. With the support of her father, she attended and graduated from Bradford Academy, one of New England’s first coeducational academies, and she later became a schoolteacher.
and less than two weeks later they were married. By October 23rd, a short eleven days post-marriage, the Thurstons began their 157-day journey to salvation.

In the fall of 1819, the first group of Calvinist missionaries left Boston to set sail for Hawai‘i aboard the tiny vessel Thaddeus. The group consisted of the Thurstons and six other married couples: the Bingham, the Holmans (a doctor and his wife), the Whitney and the Ruggles (teachers and their wives), the Loomises (a printer and wife), and the Chamberlains (a farmer, his wife and their five children). In addition to the Protestant missionaries, the company included four Kānaka Maoli who had been educated and converted to Christianity in Massachusetts, and who were returning home to spread the gospel amongst their people.

Throughout their difficult journey, the missionary women kept detailed diaries of their travels, as well as expressions of their hopes and fears for their new life ahead. The general theme of most journals was one of intense physical and spiritual hardship—the immeasurable personal cost of leaving the only home they had ever known (referred to often as “their native land”) to travel to distant heathen lands, the arduous journey and near-constant seasickness, and the future threat of living under the kapu system and its death penalty for seemingly endless offenses. Offsetting the chorus of hardship and uncertainty was a repeated refrain on the value of and gratitude for a chance at selfless sacrifice.

Upon the Thaddeus’ arrival off the coast of Hawai‘i Island, Kanaka men and women swam and paddled out to greet the crew and their missionary passengers. Appalled by the near-nudity of “the Natives,” Lucy Thurston returned to her cabin in tears to confide in her husband and journal: “After sailing 18,000 miles, I met, for the first time, those children of nature alone” (Thurston, 1934, p.30). She, along with her female shipmates, expressed deep disgust and revulsion toward the Native population within minutes of their first visual encounter—prior to ever setting foot on Hawaiian soil. Following similar rhetorical production of Africans in the United States, this first crew of missionaries began the rhetorical production of

---

59 There is something to be said here regarding haole referring to North America as their own “native land,” particularly as it relates to the speed with which they soon after referred to Hawai‘i in the same regard, and referred to themselves as kama‘aina (children of the land). Cf. Wood, Displacing Natives: The Rhetorical Production of Hawai‘i.

60 Kanaka system of laws and prohibitions, including rules prohibiting women from eating phallic shaped foods (bananas) or those associated with masculine energy, rules against men and women eating in each other’s company, and rules prohibiting looking at or casting shadows upon certain ali‘i or sacred spaces.
Kanaka as simultaneously sub-human and childlike, a trope they would continue to further throughout their decades in the islands, despite living side-by-side with Kanaka and raising their children alongside them. Wood (1999) names the discursive construction of Kanaka as “dirty, depraved beasts” and “filthy, naked, wicked heathen,” a “rhetoric of revulsion” (p. 38-39), often tempered by a simultaneous rhetoric of infantilizing the Native population. In much the same manner that European and US whites used this technique to argue for paternal power over African slaves, Christian missionaries represented the Native population in this precise manner that in turn would position themselves as necessary heroes (both to their funders and contemporaries at home, and eventually in recorded history).

Thurston further confided in her journal:

As I was looking out of a cabin window, to see a canoe of chattering natives with
animated countenances, they approached and gave me a
banana. In return I gave them a biscuit. “Wahine maikai,”
(good woman) was the reply. I then threw out several
pieces, and from my scanty vocabulary said “Wahine,”
(woman.) They with great avidity snatched them up and again
repeated, “Wahine maikai.” (Thurston, 1934, p. 30; italics in original)

Thus began her decades-long discursive construction of Kanaka as simple, animal like (snatching treats tossed their way like
dogs), and blindly faithful toward and adoring of herself and
the other missionaries. Lucy’s diaries are rife with examples of
Kanaka falling over themselves with adoration and love for the
missionary mother-hero, especially upon each of Lucy’s returns
to Hawai’i Island from trips to neighboring islands or the
United States (Thurston, 1934).

Kanaka, who ventured out to meet and marvel at the white
women on the Thaddeus, brought gifts of food along with news

61 For a thorough analysis of white American women’s attempts at separating
Native from non-native children, see Zwiep, (1990) “Sending the Children
Home: A Dilemma for Early Missionaries.”

62 I want to say this is ironic, given that the ABCFM movement grew out of the
United States abolition movement; however, history has shown that even those
who fought for the end of slavery remained discursively self-positioned as
paternal/maternal caretakers over Black people for centuries, and arguably
into the present day.

63 Although haole men from Europe and the United States had long been a
presence in the islands, white women were a rare sight prior to 1820 as most
explorers were male and the addition of women to missionary trips was a new
ABCFM requirement meant to keep its white men from falling prey to insatiable
Polynesian women.
that the long-reigning King Kamehameha was recently deceased, and with his passing, the centuries-old kapu system had been dismantled. The missionaries immediately took this as a sign of their God’s divine intervention, creating opportunity and need for the word of the gospel and a new Christian savior (found in both themselves and their God). Lucy Thurston rejoiced to find “a people without a religion” (Thurston, 1934, p. C), while her shipmates confessed to their journals and in letters home an equal joy: “the idol gods are burned!”; “Surely this is the Lord’s doings and it is marvelous in our eyes”; “It seems as if the Lord had verily gone before us and that the Isles are even now waiting for his law”; “the Lord hath comforted his people, and ministered unto us an open and abundant entrance among the heathen” (Grimshaw, 1983; Missionary Herald, 1821:111; Thurston, 1934; Zwiep, 1991). They had arrived just in time.

Throughout her life, the remainder of which was spent in Hawai‘i, Lucy continued to keep detailed diaries and handwritten copies of letters she sent to family and funders in New England. Her story weaves in themes commonly found in the confessional writing of her contemporaries: unbearable hardship made worthwhile by the promise of eternal salvation, a motherly love for the childlike Natives (“Think of children, cut off from the benefits of sanctuary, of schools, of associates: of children thus exiled, I am the mother … they say ‘you are our father, our mother: tell us what to do.’”) who returned that love tenfold, and the ongoing difficulty of raising white children in a heathen land no matter how Christian it has supposedly become.

Soon after their arrival in Hawai‘i, the Thurston were given probationary permission to set up on the dry, arid Kona side of Hawai‘i Island in a small, one-room hut. They lived there for a brief seven months, after which they were allowed to move their mission home and church to Honolulu, where they lived for the next three years. During this time, Lucy gave birth to two children, Persis and Lucy (who later died as a child in New England). In Honolulu the Thurston were able to more readily attempt their mission to convert the Kanaka population through first converting the ali‘i. They met regularly with ali‘i Liholiho (now Kamehameha II) and Kamāmalu, more so because of the ali‘i’s fascination with the haole missionaries than due to any power or influence they may have thought they held. The Thurston worked tirelessly to convert the King and his wives, though they showed little interest in following either Protestant doctrine or New England customs. According to Lucy’s diaries and letters home, their failure at converting the ali‘i was not due to the Thurston’s lack of effort or the Kanaka’s disinterest in eternal salvation; instead, she cites alcoholism and innate laziness as the reasons for the failed conversion.
This diagnosis quickly became “truth” in Hawai‘i and New England, falling in line with white supremacist ideas regarding all other Native and non-European populations with whom they had come into contact (Filipino, African, Native Americans, and so on).

Liholiho and Kamāmalu died soon after their failed conversion, contracting measles during a trip to London. The resulting change in Kanaka governance was mourned by the Thurston, who incorrectly saw themselves as trusted friends to the deceased ali‘i, yet it was also celebrated as a new opportunity to once again attempt conversion of the maka‘āinana by first converting their ali‘i. By this time (1824) the Thurston had returned to their home in Kona. Lucy’s diaries tell a story of tireless work running the home and raising children in order to leave her husband free to do the work of preaching and converting Kanaka. Still fueled by her own desires to grow God’s flock, Lucy and the other mission wives spent their days meeting familial obligations, and their evenings doing the work they imagined they were traveling across the world to do: proselytizing to and converting Native women: “I am the house-keeper, the mother, and the domestic teacher. What time I can redeem from family cares, I give to our native females,” (Thurston, 1934, p. 103). In addition to teaching her “grateful” and “eager pupils” the glory of eternal salvation, Lucy made it her main priority to teach Kanaka women how to be proper women and mothers according to New England Protestant values: “we tried to give them a standard of what was right,” she wrote, “and began by endeavoring to form a healthy moral atmosphere in two rooms, eighteen feet square, where natives were allowed to tread” (Thurston, 1934, p.90). She established regular women’s meetings within which to do this work, hoping to bring light to the heathens by acting upon the women and mothers who would, it was hoped, share their new Protestant beliefs and influence with their as of yet unsaved children and husbands. She prided herself on having taught thousands of Kanaka wahine “scriptures and civilized comportment” in the course of just a few years.

During these early years in Hawai‘i, Lucy’s diaries tell of her unbearable loneliness, feeling overworked as a domestic servant (yet constructing her work as God’s will), and deep conflict over her children’s future welfare living in heathen land. “We are willing to come and live among you, that you may be taught the good way,” she writes, “but it would break our hearts to see our children rise up and be like the children of Hawaii” (Thurston, 1934, p.129). Contemporary white feminist authors retell Lucy’s story with an equal sense of pity and feminist pride, applauding her tireless determination to be an equal part of the missionary work without analyzing the violence
implicit in the mission (Grimshaw, 1989; Zwiep, 1989). They empathize with her decision in 1840 to send her children back across the ocean to be raised among proper (white) people, even while knowing this meant she would likely never see her children again. While they include some analysis of the racist hypocrisy of the missionaries’ refusal to raise their children among the Natives, the underlying sentiment expressed by modern-day white female scholars remains the same as that of Lucy’s contemporaries: it was a difficult (yet understandable) decision made by a loving, overworked, and wholly benevolent mother. Lucy’s own words tell a similarly whitewashed story of Native mothers applauding her decisions to segregate their children. She wrote:

The heathen could see that it was such evidence of parental faithfulness and love, as was not known among them ... I have often seen them shed tears, while contrasting our children with their own degenerate offspring” (Thurston, 1934, p. 128).

Despite Lucy Goodale Thurston’s immediate and lifelong disgust toward and pity for “the dark minds of these untutored natives,” she remained in the islands until her 1876 death at the age of eighty-one. As one of the first and longest remaining missionaries in Hawai‘i, Lucy has become somewhat legendary, as much so as any woman in the missionary project could have been given what little attention has been historically paid to the “fairer sex.” Attempts at writing missionary women back into history (Grimshaw, 1983; Thigpen, 2014; Zwiep, 1989) have lauded Thurston as an unsung hero, celebrating the “feminist implications” of her desire to join the mission in the first place, as well as her lifelong commitment to suffering through great personal sacrifice in the name of heathen salvation. Yet by painting Thurston as a hero for feminism writ large, white feminist scholars once again mark feminism as a solely white terrain, and white womanhood as universal. What is more, they further the long-held trope of the white woman as oppressed by patriarchy, yet not oppressive to the Native populations they lovingly and benevolently colonize and conquer. In so doing,

64 Letter from L. Thurston to A. Parker, January 31, 1822; ABCFM-Hawaii Papers
65 Strange, yet unsurprising, as her grandson Lorrin A. Thurston (1857–1931) ended up as a leader of the 1893 overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, and her great-great grandson, Thurston Twigg-Smith (recently dead as of July 2016), spent his twilight years fighting against the Hawaiian Sovereignty Movement. Lucy Goodale Thurston literally gave birth to the end of the Hawaiian Kingdom.
contemporary scholars perpetuate missionary love language as colonial violence.

**Conclusion**

While most women missionaries shared a similar view of themselves as godly servants and innocent saviors, in this chapter I narrowed my focus on the words of Lucy Goodale Thurston for several reasons: (1) unlike most missionaries, she remained in Hawai‘i all of her life, and kept detailed written accounts of her life, which were/are published and widely read, meaning her story has been the “truth” as understood by most historians and laypeople alike; (2) she is often lauded as a hero missionary, a hero to feminism, and written about contemporarily (Zwiep, Grimshaw) in an effort to “give her a voice” where she has been silenced by history. Ironically, by giving Thurston a voice (which she arguably already had, if not compared to male missionaries but compared to most white and Native women of her time) the authors summarily silence the voices of the Kanaka Maoli, further amplifying the voices of whiteness and white womanhood in the story of schooling and what it means to be a teacher specifically amongst nonwhite peoples; and (3) being among the first missionaries, and the longest living in the islands, her journals provide the most complete picture of missionary women’s lives in Hawai‘i, but more importantly the most complete record of the discursive construction of benevolent whiteness. It was Thurston’s dying wish (granted by her descendants and the ABCFM) that her words be spread across the continent, and her story of the Hawaiian Islands be known for generations to come. This chapter sought to reinterpret Lucy’s story, to conduct a close reading of the putting into discourse a heroic white womanhood somehow separate from white supremacy and free of accountability, and to question her story’s validity and its silencing of Native voices both then and now.

In considering the role of white womanhood in general, and that of Lucy Thurston specifically, how can we begin to see the discursive construction of a benevolent whiteness – a cult of true womanhood – that characterizes itself as wholly benevolent, innocent, and salvation-oriented, and what remnants of this are evident in contemporary narratives about schooling and saving students of color? Lucy’s story gives us insight into the impetus behind white women teaching Brown children (and adults, who were perceived as children) in the 19th century, and in a more general way into the minds of women regardless of era who are “called” into teaching with hopes of saving Black and Brown children from themselves and their families. Further, the work
of Lucy and her contemporaries as evidenced by their own diaries and subsequent histories and biographies makes clear the conflation of evangelicalism with teaching: schools function(ed) as a tool with which to spread Christianity to “heathen” populations while simultaneously furthering United States white middle class values of capitalism and imperial domination in the name of enlightenment. These qualities born alongside organized schooling are deeply embedded in the role of the female teacher, amalgamated to a point where they cannot be individuated or decoupled from the white female teacher’s identity without explicit work and intention.

In the next chapter, I turn toward the role of white womanhood and benevolent whiteness as constructed in Native American boarding schools. I will trace the circuit of benevolent whiteness as it travels back to its roots, often by way of missionary descendants who take what they have learned in Hawai‘i and apply it unilaterally toward the education of Indigenous peoples (and freed Black people) on the continent. As in the current chapter, in those that follow I will ask readers to consider how we can view 19th-century women’s diaries and journals – their “truths” – through a lens that clarifies the history of teaching and schools as sites of settler colonialism and its related violence and power dynamics. What does it mean when “good intentions” end up with malevolent results, and more importantly, why do we (and who are “we”?) expect that good intentions excuse negative outcomes? How can we uncouple “good intentions” from the colonial violence that is so often the result of benevolent whiteness? Who determines what intentions are good in the first place? After all, colonialism was good in the eyes of the colonizer state, as were missions in the minds of missionaries, regardless of their genocidal effects on Native populations and colonized nations.

---

66 I will the term “Native American” and “American Indian” here and whenever else I am directly quoting or referring to a 19th-century term, such as Native American boarding schools. “Indigenous Peoples” will be used when I am speaking in my own voice, especially when referring to Indigenous Peoples collectively/globally. When tribal affiliation is known, I use self-identified tribal names unless directly quoting an author or archival source.
Chapter 4
Sister to the Sioux: Elaine Goodale Eastman

If there is an idol that the American people have, it is the school ... It is a remedy for barbarism we think, so we give them the dose. Uncle Sam is like a man setting a charge of powder.

The school is the slow match. He lights it and goes off whistling, sure that in time it will blow up the old life, and of its shattered pieces he will make good citizens.

- Annie Beecher Scoville, missionary to the Sioux, 1901.

During the early decades of the 19th century, white women inspired by the Second Great Awakening\(^6^7\) found the Protestant foreign missionary cause an avenue through which to access agency and adventure in an otherwise male-dominated culture. A half century later, US patriarchy continued to keep women out of political, business, and most professional pursuits; however white women of the 1880s like Elaine Goodale had the Indian Reform Movement, a campaign to assimilate Indians in response to the “Indian Problem.”\(^6^8\) While the self-appointed “reformers” included men and women, predominantly “white, eastern, urban, Protestant, well-educated and well-off” (Bannan, 1978, p. 787) white women took up the on-the-ground work of reforming “savages” toward “civilization” in the now feminized profession of teaching. During this period immediately following the Reconstruction Era, teaching was completely feminized and structured around Horace Mann’s “common schools” movement,\(^6^9\)

---

\(^6^7\) The “Second Great Awakening” was a swell of Protestant evangelical revivalism flooding the United States in the first quarter of the 19th century. This new religious revival brought thousands of converts into the church, all fueled with the belief that their main duties to God and man included the eradication of sin, and a dedication to Biblical perfectionism for themselves and anyone they might convert. Conversion and specifically spreading the light amongst dark nations was a core tenet of 19th-century evangelical Protestantism, with one’s sole purpose in life being the forced conversion and salvation of all the world’s peoples. In the 19\(^{th}\) century, conversions were largely contained within New England via regional traveling preachers and large religious gatherings or “camps” during which the devout could affirm their fervor whilst also bringing in potential converts. Of the thousands of new converts, far more were women than men. This led to a “feminization of religion” (Zwiep, 1991, p. 10-11) previously unseen, which occurred coincidently alongside the feminization of the teaching profession. See Chapter 2 for more detailed discussion.

\(^6^8\) The “Indian problem” refers to Indigenous tribes “owning” land desired by white settlers; the problem or question was, in short, whether nor not this problem would be rectified by Indigenous genocide or assimilation.

\(^6^9\) The “common schools movement” was a reform movement led by Horace Mann, then-Secretary of Education in Massachusetts. The movement quickly spread throughout the United States with the goal of providing a basic tax-payer-funded education for all (white) students. See pages 83-85 for fuller
while the demand for teachers was at the highest of any time in the country’s history. By the 1880s, the teaching profession was between two-thirds and three quarters occupied by women depending on location, and schooling was (as in colonial outposts) the method through which white missionaries and the United States government would attempt to “Americanize” and disenfranchise Indigenous peoples. Empowered and funded by the 1819 Indian Civilization Act and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, individuals and religious groups made it their mission to teach and live (in reservations and boarding schools) among the Indians with the goal of complete Indian assimilation into whiteness. Elaine Goodale Eastman was perhaps the most powerful woman involved in this project.

**Background: Social and Political Context**

In order to understand the context within which a woman garnered freedom and power in an otherwise anti-woman society, it is necessary to first look at the events of the earlier 19th century. Although the United States government had complex and ongoing relationships with Indigenous tribes from the moment a formal US State actually existed, I am beginning this historical chronology in the early 19th century for several reasons, most importantly because this is the time in our country’s history during which “Americanization” through schooling became formally organized as a means through which to assimilate or colonize nonwhite peoples across the globe. Additionally, the second and third decades of the 19th century mark respectively the Missionary Period in Hawai‘i and the beginning of the common schools movement, as well as the commonly accepted beginning of formalized Indian education in the United States. Therefore bounding this chapter within roughly the same time frame as the previous two serves to provide an overall picture of the intentional organization of schooling as a tool of Americanization and white supremacy.

On March 3, 1819, congress passed the Indian Civilization Fund Act “for the purpose of providing against the further decline and final extinction of the Indian tribes, adjoining the frontier settlements of the United States, and for introducing among them the habits and arts of civilization ... to employ capable persons of good moral character [to teach Indian adults and children].” The act approved an annual sum of ten thousand dollars for any religious groups or individuals who chose to teach and live among the Indians, resulting in the creation of treatment of the common schools movement in relation to the feminization of teaching.

70 U.S. Statutes at Large, 3:516-17
missionary schools on and off Indian reservations. Despite the seemingly benevolent claim of preventing further decline and extinction of Indian tribes, the true purpose of the Act was effectively the opposite: to exterminate Indian culture and identity through systematic assimilation into 19th-century American white culture. Fueled by capitalist desire and the sense of moral necessity resulting from the Second Great Awakening, white middle class Americans felt a moral and patriotic duty to assimilate Indians into Christianity, permanent agricultural\textsuperscript{71} (as opposed to nomadic hunting) lifestyles involving ownership of private property, an “Americanized” understanding of citizenship and democracy, and the Protestant work ethic and gender and familial roles.

Missionary and Superintendent of Indian Trade/Affairs (1816-1830), Thomas McKenney, was a strong believer in the potential for social control and civilization by way of organized schooling, greatly inspired by the work of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM). His main aim in (successfully) urging missionaries to petition congress to pass the Act was to fund missionary-led schools to test his hypothesis that schooling could turn savages into civilized Christian Americans within just one generation (Keller, 2000; Spring, 2016).

In January of 1824, the Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun, a staunch supporter of slavery and southern separatism, unilaterally created the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)\textsuperscript{72} in the War Department.\textsuperscript{73} Although the wording used in the Department’s founding stated it was meant to oversee the federal government trade and treaty relations, the primary purpose of the Bureau was to administer the McKenney’s Indian Civilization Fund,\textsuperscript{74} dividing it among Christian missionary groups with the primary purpose of establishing (or strengthening and aligning already operating) schools with approved plans for educating Native children in gender-specific agricultural and domestic skills. Calhoun named McKenney head of the BIA and within three months twenty-one Indian schools were operating with federal funding,

\textsuperscript{71} It is also important to point out that most tribes had well-established agricultural traditions that were not acknowledged by reformers, likely because (1) agricultural work was largely women’s work, and (2) Indigenous agricultural methods did not depend on European tools and strategies.

\textsuperscript{72} Sometimes referred to as the Office of Indian Affairs, a term preferred by department head Thomas McKenney.


\textsuperscript{74} U.S. Statutes at Large, 3:516-17.
more than fulfilling McKenney’s vision. McKenney’s belief in the civilizing potential of schools for Native Americans was short-lived, however, and after a tour of “Indian Country” in late 1827 he formally urged Congress to pass an Indian Removal bill.

The 1829 discovery of gold in Cherokee territory, along with the ever-increasing demands and illegal attempts by white settlers to acquire Indian land, led to heightened governmental impatience with the failed plan for Indian erasure by way of assimilation. On May 28, 1830, President Andrew Jackson signed The Indian Removal Act authorizing the president to grant tribes land west of the Mississippi (recently acquired through the Louisiana Purchase) in return for their fertile and resource rich lands east of the Mississippi. Although Jackson was the first to sign into law Indian removal, the stage was set for nearly three decades prior, beginning with Thomas Jefferson’s Indian policy aiming to free up Native land for white settlers and to facilitate trade as a means to keep tribes allied with the United States rather than European colonizers (England and Spain) in North America (Keller, 2000, p. 42). During the 1830s, the Native population east of the Mississippi dwindled to near uncountable lows: some tribes went willingly, in exchange for money, land, and what they viewed as the potential lesser evil; many resisted, resulting in a series of battles and wars between Native tribes and the United States government.

In 1831 the Choctaw were the first tribe to be completely removed from their land under threat of invasion by the U.S. Army, followed by the Creek tribe in 1832, with thousands of each tribe dying during the journey on the “Trail of Tears.” The Cherokee were a more divided tribe, with some members willing to accept payment for their land, while others demanded to stay and fight. In 1835, a small group of self-appointed Cherokee representatives agreed to sell their land, and despite the refusal of such a treaty by nearly 16,000 members of the tribe, the government considered the sale a done deal. Over the next three years, only a small fraction of the Cherokee Nation had moved west (approximately 2,000), fueling the government’s ire. During the fall and winter of 1838 and 1839, on President Van Buren’s orders, the U.S. Army forcibly removed the Cherokee from their land (and their gold) relocating them by foot over 1,200 miles to present-day Oklahoma, despite the fact that the Supreme Court (Worcester v. Georgia, 1832) expressly prohibited the president’s authority to do so.
Common Schools and Americanization (1837 ~ 1880)

As with missionary education in Hawai'i, the educational "reform" movement in the continental United States was merely a standardization of whiteness as American identity for those who could be easily absorbed into it (western European immigrants), and a means through which to get Native peoples as close to whiteness (or away from Indigenous legitimacy) as possible in order to effectively eradicate them. In short, education was the clichéd "melting pot" praised in contemporary false nostalgia, but with a far more malevolent purpose than we have been led to believe.

Nineteenth century education reformers in Massachusetts, led by the "father of common schools," Horace Mann, led a movement toward establishing "common schools" supported by tax dollars and which anyone could attend—provided they were white and male. Responding to the expansion in white male suffrage (via the removal of the property requirement for voting), industrialization, urbanization, and an increase in immigration, educational reformers argued that common schools could do the work unfit mothers (generally either poor white or nonwhite mothers) could not: creating good citizens and thereby uniting society, and decreasing crime and poverty (Katznelson & Weir, 1988). By the end of the 19th century, free public elementary education was available for most white children in New England regardless of gender. For white, or white-adjacent students, common schools served as sites for Americanization through basic literacy and numeracy skills and the building of a white Protestant identity, preparing this class of citizens for its proper place on the societal and economic ladder (Tyack, 2003). Meanwhile, wealthy families continued to employ private tutors or send their children to private preparatory schools with classical academic curriculum. As discussed in Chapter 2, the common schools movement coincided with the feminization of teaching, and by the 1880s schools and teaching were ideologically and structurally defined to reflect the values of both movements.

Meant to teach a "common" body of knowledge that would give everyone the same opportunities, Horace Mann’s model schools soon spread to other states and the idea of universal American schooling was born. He argued that creating a public that possessed a rudimentary level of literacy and a shared set of

75 Subgroups included the Women’s National Indian Association, the Indian Rights Association, and the National Indian Defence Association (Bannon, 1978, p. 788).
76 Some girls were allowed to attend schools, but their education differed and focused primarily on home economics and raising "good boys" who would grow up to be good republican citizens.
core beliefs could best ensure American sociopolitical stability. He claimed, “A republican form of government, without intelligence in the people, must be, on a vast scale, what a mad-house, without superintendent or keepers, would be on a small one” (Mann, 1848).

Despite Mann’s call for all children learning together in “common” schools, he never took a stand against school segregation in his own city. As with other policies rhetorically aimed at “all” Americans, school policy for “all” children in the Progressive Era was commonly understood and interpreted to mean all white Americans (and by necessity, all near-white immigrants). Americanization, then, was synonymous with “white-ification” – a welcoming into the fold of whiteness to those who had previously not been considered “pure” enough to assimilate into the white race. This did not go as far as to include Asians, Native Americans, and certainly not Blacks, but those who might add to the numbers of whites in a country increasingly less white were welcome with the caveat that they forsake all else aside from their new American identity: “a self-conscious effort was made to define the Anglo-American or American identity and to defend it as the product of a melting pot assimilationism, and not simply as the maintenance of one group’s dominance, while deliberately controlling who was to be eligible to assimilate. This identity was used politically in the Americanization Movement” (King, 2000, p. 86).

From the outset, the role of schools was discursively to construct a white American identity, “provide a common language and narrative of the history of the United States” (King, 2002, p. 89). What is clear is that common schools were meant not necessarily to create a literate and educated populace for the sake of an elevated humanity, although that is the romanticized false-memory often employed when invoking Mann’s legacy; rather, the goal of schools was a massive indoctrination in ideological whiteness and Americanization during a time of great upheaval—massive immigration, a world war, and a growing population of urban poor. As in the ideological colonization of the Hawaiian Kingdom, continental American statesmen knew that education was the fastest, most far-reaching method of hegemonic domination and thus the most efficient manner of Americanizing the waves of recent European immigrants pouring into the United States. Proponents and directors of common schools proudly proselytized that “the public schools are the biggest Americanizing agency in the United States – they have been ever since we have had public schools ...” (King, 2000, p.88).
Because the common school movement began during slavery—roughly twenty-five years before the start of the Civil War—there was initially no need to consider the organized and federally funded education of enslaved Black children. Unlike the assimilationist education of the near and newly white, as well as the use of education as a tool used in colonizing island nations, the education of Black children (and adults) was seen as a direct threat to white citizenship in most of New England, where educated Blacks were seen as economic competition. *Regardless of legal, economic, or political restrictions, free and enslaved Black people did everything in their power to become educated, either formally or in secret. Prior to 1831, there were few preventing Black education. Free Black people had organized schools and reading groups for adults and children, while many slave owners allowed or provided for education to their slaves. All of this changed after Nat Turner’s Rebellion in 1831, during which an estimated sixty white people were killed (whose deaths were avenged with the murders of over 200 hundred Black people). Terrified white citizens blamed the rebellion on Turner being “too educated,” turning him into the living embodiment of their fears of an educated Black public. After the rebellion, southern states made Black education and congregation (without a licensed white presence) illegal, and it remained so until the South lost the Civil War in 1865 (Anderson, 1988, p. 148).*

Post Civil War, expanding Black literacy was a crucial focus of Black activists and white abolitionists alike. Although key leaders in the black educational movement (largely Du Bois versus Washington) disagreed on the focus and goals of Black education, there was unanimous agreement among Black and white educators and “reformers” that education was vital to the success of the new free Black citizenry. *Despite the reductive*

---

77 In some places, Baltimore for example, educated slaves were a boon to their white owners, whereas in New England educated free Blacks were seen as direct economic competition to white men. For an excellent exploration of the complexity of Black education in the prewar United States, see Moss, Schooling citizens: The struggle for African American education in antebellum America, and Jones, Soldiers of light and love: Northern teachers and Georgia Blacks, 1865-1873.

78 Washington was more concerned with economic development; Du Bois was concerned with education of all, especially the “talented 10th” who might uplift the race. Washington’s schools focused on self-sufficiency: students built their own schools, focused on growing food, etc. Du Bois wanted Black students held to same the academic standards as whites; taking classical courses such as Latin, Greek, etc.

79 This is not meant to further the factually reductive dichotomy of Du Bois versus Washington in the struggle for Black resistance against white supremacy during this era; however, for the purposes of this project there is
story most of us are taught throughout our own schooling experiences, postwar freedom for enslaved Blacks did not simply translate to an invitation to public schools, segregated or otherwise. To a great degree, geographic and economic location decided the type of schooling available to Black children (and adults) throughout the United States. In the south, many postwar schools had been formerly operating as clandestine schools led by members of the Black community. Black men and women opened new schools in record number, funded in small part by the federal government and benevolent societies including the American Missionary Association (AMA), the National Freedmen’s Relief Association, and the Freedmen’s Bureau, but predominantly sustained by the community itself. The AMA had already established a new missionary outpost, this time at home, providing schooling for salvation in the antebellum south. The primary teachers in AMA common schools, as was the trend across the United States, were white middle class women from northern states. Once the war ended, the AMA focused on rapidly expanding its educational empire in the south, increasing its teaching corps from 250 to 538 teachers, extending their influence to nearly 70,000 students within a two-year period. During reconstruction alone, over three thousand Black schools were established in the south, with a focus on literacy and teacher preparation (Butchart, 1980; Richardson, 2009).

In addition to establishing common schools, the AMA and the Freedman’s Bureau provided funding for normal schools (teacher training schools) and colleges in the south, following the standard missionary goals of spreading the gospel tenfold by creating teachers from within colonized societies. Included among the new AMA schools was one of the most well known: Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute established in 1868 in Hampton, Virginia. Hampton was founded by Samuel Chapman Armstrong, a Union Army colonel and commander of US Colored Troops (USCT) during the Civil War, and the son of AMA missionaries in Hawai‘i. Armstrong’s experience commanding the 8th USCT is cited as his first moment of interest in Black welfare.\(^8^0\) His experience growing up as a member of a missionary family, bearing lifelong witness to the AMA methods of schooling and Christianizing Kanaka Maoli, informed his beliefs in the purposes and possibilities of schooling for Black and (later)

---

Native peoples, stating: “It meant something to the Hampton School, and perhaps to the ex-slaves of America, that, from 1820 to 1860, the distinctly missionary period, there was worked out in the Hawaiian Islands, the problem of the emancipation, enfranchisement and Christian civilization of a dark-skinned Polynesian people in many respects like the Negro race” (Hampton, 1893, p.1).

Following his missionary parents’ methods, Armstrong designed Hampton to educate Black children by schooling “the head, the hand, and the heart,” training students who would return to their communities to spread AMA ideologies and Christian capitalist beliefs and behavior among their people. To be clear, Armstrong was not the unwavering advocate for Black people’s freedom that he is generally made out to be; rather, his goals were to change the Black person to fit the already established order of the south, not to change the realities of an unfair south to benefit Black citizens. His letters demonstrate a feeling only slightly higher than contempt when it came to Black people as citizens and humans, calling them “worse than the Kanakas, and ... hardly worth fighting for.” He further clarified his position on “the Negro” in a letter to Archibald Hopkins dated 8 December 1862, writing, “I am sort of an abolitionist, but I have not learned to love the Negro. I believe in universal freedom; I believe the whole world cannot buy a single soul ... more on account of their souls than their bodies.” Armstrong made it clear, as did most of his abolitionist reform peers, that their fight against slavery was aligned with the Protestant belief in the inability for anyone but God to own a human soul; thus, the institution of slavery was putting the United States and its white citizenry at odds with God Himself.

For both the reformers and the government, the movement for postwar Black education soon inspired extending the cause to include Indian education in an attempt to further “civilize” nonwhite peoples on the continent just as missionaries were attempting the same abroad. The bulk of the effort toward civilizing Indian children took place in government funded boarding schools. In 1878, Civil War Captain Richard Henry Pratt brought seventeen of his Indian prisoners of war to Armstrong’s Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute and began what would grow into their “Indian Department.” The following year, The Bureau of Indian Affairs developed the first off-reservation day and boarding schools, including Pratt’s now famous Carlisle Indian industrial School in Pennsylvania. Pratt modeled Carlisle after Hampton and aimed to achieve total assimilation of Indians.

---

81 S.C. Armstrong to Richard Baxter Armstrong, dated 12 Dec 1862.
into American whiteness by way of separation from family and culture, indoctrination into the “Protestant work ethic,” training in manual labor and agriculture, and complete disavowal of Native customs and culture through his mandate to “kill the Indian in him, and save the man.” Carlisle quickly became the model for twenty-six similar Indian boarding schools with the same goal: assimilation through education. Many of the students enrolled in these boarding schools were taken from their homes without parental permission and often by force to a “miserable state of cultural dislocation” (Wu, 2009).

At Hampton, following the national trend, white women taught Black and Native students. The exception to this rule was the teaching of ethics and citizenship, which was either taught by Armstrong himself or by other white men (Anderson, 2009). This is not surprising for the time, given the belief that women could be positively influential only at the primary level, with secondary education and school administration remaining male-dominated fields. Women were seen as inherently motherly, kind, and nurturing, all qualities desired in teaching younger children to obey out of obligation and desire for maternal approval (See Chapter 2 for an expanded discussion of this). Young, single, middle class women known for their piety and a desire of selfless service at any cost were eagerly recruited to teach at both residential and on-reservation schools in the hopes that they could create decent, hard-working citizens out of children and parents alike. Leaving home to teach Indigenous students afforded young women more agency and influence than otherwise possible in the 19th century, fulfilling their sense of moral duty as well as their deep yearning for adventure and freedom. One of the most well-known, and most powerful of these missionary mother surrogates was Elaine Goodale Eastman, a young Hampton teacher who in a matter of a few short years ascended to one of the highest offices in public education.

Sister to the Sioux: Elaine Goodale Eastman

Elaine Goodale was born in 1863 during the middle of, yet geographically far removed from, the United States Civil War. She was the first of four children born to a literary-minded but puritanical family in the Berkshire Hills of Massachusetts; her father a teacher and would-be farmer but “Yankee to the
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backbone,” and her mother a pretentious, “city-bred girl,” were both descendants of well-known colonial families. Three years later, a younger sister and “constant companion” Dora was born. The two sisters were prolific and published child poets, selling more than ten thousand copies of their first book of poetry. Despite their literary fame, however, the Goodale sisters and their siblings were homeschooled and intentionally isolated from their peers and most of the outside world. They were taught classical curricula of Greek, Latin, art, botany, and literature (with an uncompromising restriction against reading fiction of any kind). Following the evangelical leaning of the time, the Goodale matriarch, Dora Reed Goodale, taught her children to honor duty and service above all else—a refrain that her eldest daughter would cite throughout her life as self-appointed “sister to the Sioux” and hero to Indians in general.

When Elaine was fifteen, Samuel Chapman Armstrong, founder of the Hampton Institute, visited the Goodale home during one of his many trips to raise funds for the cause of educating and assimilating freedmen. Elaine was instantly as enamored by Armstrong as he was impressed with her intellect and desire to serve selflessly (though at the time she had no real idea how that service would happen). Armstrong remained in touch with the Goodale family, returning for visits often in the coming years. In her diary Elaine notes, “From that hour of that first auspicious meeting under the lilacs, the famous champion of the red and black races was no stranger in our home” (1978, p. 91). Four years later, Elaine accepted Armstrong’s offer of a position teaching in Hampton’s nascent Indian Education department. She was nineteen years old, untrained, and inexperienced with Indians, education, and most of the outside world.

By the middle of her second year teaching at Hampton, Elaine found herself “burning with an intense desire to see the much discussed and little-known ‘Indian country’ with [her] own eyes,” and she soon after set off on a tour of Dakota Sioux Territory (Eastman & Graber, 1978, p. 2). Her memoirs detail her preparation for, and arrival at, the home territory of many of her Hampton students, whom she claimed to want to better understand via this trip. It is important to note here that Elaine’s memoirs were compiled herself, and based on much of her published and unpublished writings over the course of several decades living among the Sioux. I note this to demonstrate that, even with hindsight, decades of personal relationships with the Sioux, and marriage to a Sioux man, her characterization of the Sioux and her fight for their assimilation through education falls far short of anything one might characterize as “sisterly.” Reflecting back in her old age, Eastman remarked on
the surprise afforded by hindsight that someone of her age and (lack of) experience would be allowed to open and run a school in Indian Territory as “a mere girl of twenty-two who proposed to create a little center of ‘sweetness and light’ ... in a squalid camp of savages” at White River Camp (p. 30) where she found the Natives surprisingly humanlike, “their friendly ways and dark, smiling faces” making a “pleasant impression” (p. 25).

At the “heart of the forlorn little community” Eastman found a schoolhouse and mission residence, both unoccupied remnants of a government plan to litter “Indian Territory” with schoolhouses and teachers to help assimilate and Americanize them. Without any analysis of why the structures remained unoccupied, nor mention of what made the community forlorn in the first place (did its inhabitants find it forlorn? Is this merely Eastman’s assessment of a culture unlike her own sheltered upbringing? Was there, perhaps, any fault on the part of the United States government and missionaries like herself that might have led to the forlorn nature of White River Camp?), Eastman knew at once that she had found her calling in life, heeding her mother’s call for duty and service above self. She marked herself a hero, wondering rhetorically, “who would open the inhospitable doors of the waiting schoolhouse and ring the silent bells [if not her]?” (p. 26), echoing the nearly identical sentiment made by Lucy Thurston on her way to save the Kanaka Maoli of Hawai‘i (see Chapter 3).

Adjacent to the abandoned schoolhouse “rose a stately new tent, handsomely decorated and protected by a neat fence of woven willows — the ‘Ghost Lodge,’\textsuperscript{83} sacred to the spirits of the honored idea” (p. 25). It was clear in the 1800s as it is today that the schoolhouse stands as a symbol of American assimilation, progress, and desire for entrance into a recognized humanity. Standing between the symbols of two “opposing and irreconcilable” cultures, one needed, sacred, and clearly in regular use, the other abandoned before completion, Eastman deduced that her duty, and the Sioux’s need, was clear: she must take on the “selfless duty” of reclaiming, opening, and running the day school to save the Indian people in the manner she knew was right. “She had made up her mind to begin at the beginning, in the heart of a newly transplanted, leaderless, bewildered little community” (p. 29). Eastman was immediately and simultaneously a self-described expert on Indians (for white America) and what was best for Indians and the country at large: assimilation into white, Protestant, capitalist morality and existences.

\textsuperscript{83} The “ghost lodge” was an English misnomer for the ceremonial Sioux sweat lodge.
Here and throughout Eastman’s memoirs – most of which, we should recall, were published as articles and widely read during her early life among the Sioux\(^8\) – she differentiates between Indian and white, savage versus human, referring to “wild men” and “their even more primitive allies” (Eastman & Graber, 1978, p. 27) versus those Indians who showed human potential through their participation in her assimilationist project. She argued, “mixed-bloods and men of better mental caliber or a smattering of education perceived clearly that the old life was at an end … These were the ones who should have been heard” (p. 88). While Sioux men were marked as subhuman and ignorant, Sioux women were described as “childlike,” “lovable,” “intensely feminine,” “innocent,” “devoted” (p. 34) as well as superstitious and simpleminded (p. 70). To clarify Eastman’s self-appointed benevolence, she was in reality an advocate for and “sister to the Sioux” who accepted their fate as an endangered people with no recourse but to attempt melting into whiteness. She was therefore not much of an advocate for Indians at all, but instead an advocate for whiteness, white supremacy, and a Protestant capitalist notion of proper American citizenry.

Eastman accepted the very doctrine that she attempted to distance herself from: that “a handful of primitives whose own way of life had been made impossible by our countrymen’s advance could survive and prosper only through adaptation to the modern [white] world” (p. 22). She found no fault with this belief, nor with the genocidal impact her “countrymen’s advance” made on the Indigenous tribes of North America. She in fact added her proud recollection of realizing “education was the master-key and that education must be universal” in assimilating the Indians to a white Protestant way of life. At times in her memoirs, Eastman hinted toward a slight sense of sorrow or perhaps pity toward the displaced tribes she had come to “know and love,” but nothing outweighed her firm belief in the superiority of the “white race” and the unavoidable doom awaiting those tribes who refused to relocate and assimilate to make way for her nation’s geographical and economic progress (Eastman & Graber, 1978). Despite the generally understood nineteenth century ideal of women being disempowered and required to stay in the home and at the command of patriarchy, Eastman at no point in her memoirs indicated any sense that she was aware of such a standard. Rather, she retold the story of her youth and her subsequent

\(^8\) She writes during her first visit to Indian Country, “my letters from the field, hurriedly written in longhand with no opportunity to polish, were already appearing in New York and Boston papers … they described in detail the semi barbaric spectacle of Indian camp and council, new to most readers, not forgetting to stress the effects of mission training with its promise for the future” (Eastman & Graber, 1978, p. 28).
decades among the Sioux with unwavering confidence in her early knowledge of her destiny to be out among the Indian tribes, speaking for them, and teaching them the proper ways of white womanhood and humanity in general (ironic, since the “proper womanhood” taught to Native women was nothing like the womanhood Eastman embodied).

Despite her self-assigned role as expert and savior to Indians, Eastman’s publications and memoirs demonstrate her committed alignment with racist white supremacist ideologies of her day. Although it is true that she spent much of her adult life working on behalf of the Sioux and Indian education in general, Eastman spent little to no time actually letting the Sioux speak for themselves, and her advocacy was firmly rooted in a maternalistic belief in assimilating a lesser population of beings into a more enlightened/whitened identity and way of being. She wrote about the state of Indian/white relations just before the massacre at Wounded Knee:

We who really knew and loved the Sioux were convinced that, with patience and redress of their grievances, the sane and loyal majority might safely be counted upon to bring a fanatical few to their senses. It cannot be too clearly understood that the clash was between two cultures—not two races. The cause of the pretend Messiah was already lost and time was on our side. (Eastman & Graber, 1978, p. 155)

Regardless of her own devout belief in a Christian religion dependent upon the idea of a messianic savior returning to the Earth, Eastman repeatedly mocked the Sioux belief in the Ghost Dance and the coming of a Native messiah and return of the buffalo that would signal a return of the land to north American tribes. Whereas many white men in the United States military and Indian Department were greatly concerned about a coming Indian uprising, Eastman recollected the time with the same youthful confidence that saturates all of her writing that only “a handful of hopeless and desperate men” would even consider rising up against the State, noting further that “we who loved85 them moved among them as freely and with as much confidence as ever” (Eastman & Graber, 1978, p. 145-46). Here again, Eastman referred to those whom she decided had not yet reached their potential for humanity via assimilation into a white Protestant capitalist ideal. Those Indians who Eastman granted human status were those who were, in her eyes, civilized. On tour of

85 See Chapter 2 for an in depth exploration of the use of love language as a feminized form of colonial violence.
reservation schools, Eastman found herself surprised to come across civilized people, defined as those who had adopted white Protestant ethics and lifestyles, living in homes “quite equal to those of the average [white] settler.” Women who were “good housekeepers and neatly dressed” with children who were “clean and attractive,” all of whom spoke English and were in support of Eastman’s desires to open additional day schools on their land.

Supporting Eastman’s identity as a part of the Sioux family, she filled her contemporary publications and her memoir with evidence of her selfless sacrifice and heroism, along with the common colonialist refrain of maternalistic all-knowing expertise on an otherwise un-evolved people. Not satisfied teaching solely Native children, Eastman insisted on teaching the adults in White River Camp as well, furthering the nineteenth century belief that white women knew better than other women how to be proper women, and that they certainly knew better than nonwhite men and women when it came to parenting and properly raising decent children. Native ways were discursively reduced to silly superstition and ignorance, while Eastman set about teaching men how to parent or, more often, intervening in parent-child relationships to parent by proxy the children who she deemed uncared for.

Retelling the story of a child named Scarlett Ball (“our own Florence”), Eastman analyzed the girl’s father as simply not knowing better because he refused to send his daughter to the government day school. Rather than respecting a father’s wishes (which would have required her viewing him as a real parent in the first place), Eastman fondly retold the story of how she lured Scarlett Ball to her school with “baskets of inviting food” and then enrolled the child in school on her own (Eastman & Graber, 1978, p. 42). Within two years of schooling, Scarlett was appropriately assimilated by Eastman’s standards—in this case because she began pushing her father toward Christianity. Despite his refusal to convert, and based in no more than a lukewarm sentiment that his “seed had grown” from schooling, Eastman joyously announced that the “one time skeptic father is ever-grateful” for her intervention into his family, bypassing his parental authority, and converting a child she lured away though trickery.

Eastman’s memoirs are riddled with misunderstood retellings of Native parents refusing assimilation through their children’s forced education, translated as eager parents handing off their children to someone who clearly knew better. In response to Chief Medicine Bull’s statement that he has sent a son and daughter to Hampton “so that they may some day come back and be my eyes,” Eastman misreads his attempt at perhaps using the
master’s tools to dismantle the master’s house, using white schooling as a weapon against itself in the war for ideological colonization. Instead, she heard his words as not simply an unwavering acceptance of her assimilationist methods, but also as a calling / sign from above, writing, “here was a clear call to the heart of the ardent young girl — a call which she then and there silently promised herself to answer” (Eastman & Graber, 1978, p. 26).

During a great blizzard of 1888, Eastman revealed herself and the few other white women as the sole heroes to a tribe otherwise incapable of surviving winter during which two hundred Dakotans — mostly children — died. “Heroic teachers held their flock all night,” she wrote, “perhaps burning desks and benches to keep from freezing ... until toward nightfall the parents appeared, amused and grateful” (Eastman & Graber, 1978, p. 47). Here, and throughout her memoirs, Eastman recalls with paternalistic amusement how the very lives and existence of Dakota Sioux depended on the heroics of white womanhood while childlike and incompetent Native elders either sit by without acting, or (and) express immeasurable gratitude for the white women’s good (better) sense.

After her brief time teaching at White River Camp, Eastman became a paid speaker and expert on Indian education, often appearing in front of U.S. congressional committees where she found herself to be not only an expert but a hero to the Indians, positioning herself against the U.S. Congress who, she noted, had the most “self-congratulatory ignorance” on the “Indian question” (Eastman & Graber, 1978, p. 21). One of her many examples of advocating on behalf of her beloved Native “family” and for the further financial and political support of reservation day schools included the following memory:

I retorted with a story of heavily marked features that ‘lighten and quicken from day to day,’ of ‘rows of dusky faces fairly alive with every variety of expression,’ of ‘odd, bright questions and answers that make knowledge which before seemed hackneyed, even to one’s self, a fresh mental acquisition. (Eastman & Graber, 1978, p. 20)

In language akin to one who had surprised herself by teaching a trained animal a new trick, Eastman propped herself up as the sole voice for Indian education and rights, all the while doubly silencing Native voices during her youth and again while re-crafting her memoirs in her old age. All the while, Eastman admitted throughout her writings that she was functioning on pure instinct, pluck, and pioneering spirit in lieu of any formal training or much experience.
Yet despite her unimpressive resume, not once in her memoirs did Eastman consider that she might not know best, nor that she might in fact have been further damaging the Sioux through her insistence on erasing the very culture that she claimed to love and adopt as her own. She recalled her short journey toward obtaining an official government post overseeing Indian Education: “When I went east again the autumn of 1889 [with less than three years experience teaching in Dakota Sioux Territory], I had no money and no job, but I had ideas to spare and plenty of self-confidence. Believing that I knew the Sioux and their needs, I had made definite plans for my next campaign” (Eastman & Graber, 1978, p. 114). Those plans included working for the United States government’s Indian Office as a public speaker on Indian education, for which she was (and remains) widely recognized as an expert only because no one (white) knew nor attempted to know Indian life on the reservations (or anywhere else, outside of stereotypical characterizations).

At this time, General Morgan, the not-yet-confirmed appointee to the Indian Commission, publicly named Eastman as supervisor of the entire day school system in the Dakotas, which was quickly expanded to “Supervisor of Education in the two Dakotas,” a position created specifically for Eastman, which put her in charge of all day schools and “several large boarding schools” and catapulted her into a position of power previously unheard of for a woman (p. 116). In her new position as supervisor, Eastman was a strong vocal proponent for day schools over boarding schools, but not for the reasons for which she is often applauded (in short, keeping families together); rather, Eastman saw day schools for their powerful potential as tools for white supremacy and assimilation. She argued that day schools could assimilate Indian tribes more efficiently and effectively because they were more cost effective (less than half the cost of boarding schools), there would be less parental opposition to enrolling children, and most importantly, the day schools would have a greater assimilationist impact on adults and families than boarding schools that kept students away from home, often for life. Eastman’s tenure as supervisor for the Dakotas required her to travel among the five Dakota reservations to supervise and evaluate more than sixty government and missionary schools, allowing her a degree of freedom and adventure that few women were allowed in the 19th century.

Conclusion

Following her mentor and “strongest influence in [her] life” Samuel Chapman Armstrong’s beliefs in Indian education and
assimilation (Indians are “grown up children” and “we are a thousand years ahead of them”), Eastman became one of the most valued and powerful voices influencing Indian education and federal policy in the nineteenth century (Talbot, 1904, p. 277) and perhaps beyond. Her memoirs, based on her collection of letters and articles published during her earlier life, paint the picture of a benevolent hero and surrogate mother and sister to the Indigenous peoples of the Dakotas. For contemporary readers and for her contemporaries, Eastman’s voice served as one of few authorities on the birth and gestation of government and missionary Indian schools. Her racist distrust toward “uncivilized” Natives is lovingly couched in language of maternalistic best practices, not unlike much of the rhetoric used in educational reform discourse of the present day; through this rhetorical turn, Eastman is lauded as a hero to Indigenous peoples as well as for a nascent white feminism.

Although she was well-published and often sought out as the singular expert on Indian education, Eastman expressed deep regret that her literary career never took off as she had hoped it would. Aside from her childhood books of poetry, her most well known writings were her husband’s books on growing up as an Indian – for which Elaine Eastman has been posthumously given primary credit by those who re-inscribe her as heroic, benevolent, and superior to the Indigenous peoples she selflessly served. This discursive reiteration of near sainthood is especially common in works written by contemporary women (Alexander, 1988, 1992; Eick, 2008; Ellinghaus, 1999) as well as by her most recent biographer (Sargent, 2005). To a much broader audience, the national Public Broadcasting Station (pbs.org) includes Eastman in its online history of unquestionably heroic teachers, a site which opens with the Spalding Gray quote: “Good teachers to me are like poets and saints.”

While I cannot argue that countless (dare I say, even most?) teachers, past and present, have entered the profession with honorable intentions, perhaps even landing somewhere on a spectrum between poetic in skills and saintly in patience, the reiterative discursive construction of women who teach as infallibly maternal and wholly benevolent is as dangerous as it is false. The trope of teacher as savior by definition puts white women teachers in a position of binary opposition with the violent military (masculine) power that has always marched alongside the feminine missionary colonial school teacher, when in reality, each role operated as two arms of the same beast. To forgo a more nuanced, complex understanding of the power and violence tied to maternalistic colonialism and benevolent
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86 [http://www.pbs.org/onlyateacher/about.html](http://www.pbs.org/onlyateacher/about.html)
whiteness is to perpetuate a misunderstanding of the history of schools and schooling and teachers’ roles therein; in addition, such binary positioning reinforces contemporary historical amnesia and an inability to understand our roles as teachers in oppressed communities as one that has always been fraught with violence, cultural and literal genocide, the furthering of white supremacy, and a narrow definition of a precise and perfect student-subject modeled after arcane Protestant ideals. Until we are willing to engage in a thorough genealogical understanding of the power and purpose of teaching, we will remain unable to reimagine schools and teaching in a manner that is decolonial and emancipatory for those we have claimed to serve for the past two centuries.

Toward that end, and in the following concluding chapter, I consider the questions raised throughout this historical look at benevolent whiteness and its role in furthering the power of the white nation state by way of a feminized educational system, including the following:

What does white women’s confessional literature of the 19th century demonstrate about, and what can we learn from, the ways in which white women’s benevolence served them in their unorthodox performance of womanhood, their power over oppressed and colonized peoples, and their agency and influence within institutions during an era when women had little power or voice outside of the heteronormative Protestant home? What are the benefits white women get from their “good deeds” and “selfless service” whilst working for a violently patriarchal system that simultaneously works against them?
Chapter 5
A Woman’s Work is Never Done: Benevolent Whiteness in “Post-Racial” America

Our mission is to enlist, develop, and mobilize as many as possible of our nation’s most promising future leaders to grow and strengthen the movement for educational equity and excellence.87

This 2017 Teach For America (TFA) mission statement echoes 19th-century missionary ambitions with haunting similarity. Not unlike the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), contemporary “alternative preparation” programs such as TFA aim to send their recruits to spread light to dark places across North America and the Pacific. Steeped in the language of love, selfless service, and heroics (“You have bold ambitions to make a difference. You are ready to be part of something big. Greatness is waiting on you.”88), modern missionaries commit to teaching in areas the organization has designated as “high priority,” generally low income urban centers and rural outposts populated with children of color. The rhetoric of expert benevolent whiteness is alive and well in TFA recruitment materials, as well as in the countless blogs and memoirs written by its founder and alumni.89 Counter-narratives written by alumni of color are slowly becoming more plentiful and readily available to the general public, unlike the one-sided amplification of benevolent whiteness during the 19th-century. Yet in this era once proclaimed as “post-racial America”90 the basic tenets of benevolent whiteness persist in common discourse on what it means to be an all knowing, purely benevolent, outsider teacher in communities that are deemed “in need” of enlightenment. The dominant narrative of benevolence drowns out the voices of TFA critics; in fact an entire public relations department at TFA is dedicated to spinning counter narratives as the voices of a few lone, maligned defectors representing a

87 https://www.teachforamerica.org/about-us/our-mission
88 https://www.teachforamerica.org
89 Cf. Kopp, W. One day, all children: The unlikely triumph of Teach For America and what I learned along the way, and A chance to make history: What works and what doesn't in providing an excellent education for all; Sockel, H. The kids don't stand a chance: Growing up in Teach for America; Foote, D. Relentless Pursuit; Copperman, M. Teacher: Two years in the Mississippi Delta; Ness, M. Lessons to learn: Voices from the frontlines of Teach for America.
90 After the first election of President Barack Obama (2008), much public discourse reductively lauded the landmark occasion as an entry into a new “post-racial” era; in 2017, we would be hard pressed to argue that the post-racial misnomer extends to the present neo-fascist Trump administration.
miniscule percentage of TFA alumni, or as defenders of the old guard who are resisting the “relentless pursuit” of positive change that TFA represents.

As was the case with the 19th-century American Missionary Association (AMA), government funding and public and private donors pour money into the TFA coffers during a time in which the nation’s most struggling public schools (predominantly of color) are being financially drained through loss of state and federal funding and fines related to “failing” at high stakes assessments. The money follows the message of benevolent, all-knowing salvation, particularly rewarding the reiteration of an unwavering belief in an American bootstrap mentality and a false nostalgia for a time when schools gave everyone a “fair shot” at the American Dream. In this regard, the message of benevolent whiteness and the functions of federal government and private funds harkens back to the Reconstruction Era South during which already established Black schools were left unfunded while money flooded into AMA schools. Similarly, TFA-led privatization efforts and alumni-led charter schools strategically displace Black teachers and already established public schools (the most drastic example of this occurring in post-Hurricane Katrina New Orleans, which is now completed devoid of public schools). The narrative of benevolent white middle class salvation, led by a living replica of Columbia herself, seeks to fulfill its manifest destiny to “One Day” create a future in which “all children in this nation will have the opportunity to attain an excellent education,” as long as “excellence” remains narrowly defined through a lens of middle class whiteness. Despite the passing of time and the changing of social and political values and ideals, the persistence of white supremacy couched in heroism remains the same. As white supremacy is the foundation upon which stands the metaphoric United States home, white womanhood is merely the paint, the stucco, the brick or wood siding; while it looks different in different eras, it remains a protective layer to an otherwise rotten structure.

In the previous chapters, I have highlighted the ways in which benevolent whiteness remained beholden to the white racial state: schools earned funding and white women earned agency and power in exchange for their service in the “army of whiteness” (Leonardo, 2013). In this chapter, I ask the reader to consider the ways in which white womanhood continues to participate in this white racial economy, collecting the “wages of whiteness” (Du Bois, 1904/1989) that afford white women positions of power within a larger patriarchal structure. Acknowledging that we no longer operate entirely under the Victorian “Cult of True
Womanhood,” and thus the construction of womanhood has necessarily changed as decades have passed, a thorough historical understanding of its influence in the discursive construction of benevolent whiteness allows us a lens through which to examine the role of white womanhood contemporarily.

In this chapter, I want to revisit the questions I posed at the beginning of this dissertation: What does it mean, and how is it useful, to conceptualize white women as agents and schools as sites of settler colonialism? How does an ideological and historical understanding of gendered whiteness allow for a more nuanced understanding of contemporary teacher identities and raced/gendered relationships in schools? How viable is a theory of gendered benevolent whiteness given the fluidity and performative nature of both whiteness and gender? How can we understand the over-disciplining of Black and Indigenous youth as the consequence of benevolent whiteness (gendered settler colonialism and white supremacy)? These questions, as my research reveals, can indeed help us to construct a genealogy of benevolent whiteness: a backward mapping of the settler colonial origins behind the contemporary trope of the heroic white woman who will save our schools. From such a standpoint, teachers and teacher educators can begin to (re)construct both our complicity and emancipatory potential within schools and the larger United States settler colonial project.

**Conceptualizing white women as agents of settler colonialism:** How does an ideological and historical understanding of gendered whiteness allow for a more nuanced understanding of contemporary teacher identities and raced/gendered relationships in schools?

Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS), Zeus Leonardo (2013) reminds us, posits that it is whiteness that needs changing, and therefore there will always be a limit to the possibilities of educational research and policy that insists we focus on “fixing” pathologized communities of color. Nevertheless, that is where the majority of educational research focuses its efforts: toward understanding what makes Black and Brown youth prone to behaviors that result in their necessary removal from schools. What is it, we ask, about blackness that resists the mold of proper student subjectivity? And how can we better help Black and Brown students to “fit in”? Meanwhile, the literature on white womanhood lacks a focus on schooling, particularly a focus on the relationship between schooling and “disciplining,” in both the traditional and the Foucauldian senses of the word.

---

91 See Chapter 3 for an explanation of the “Cult of True Womanhood” and its role in missionary service and the feminization of teaching.
and the ever-expanding work on whiteness in education (Allen, 2001, Gillborn, 2006, Leonardo 2009, Matias, 2014) remains suspiciously gender neutral. Thus, to push CWS toward a return to its early feminist roots allows us to understand the ways in which an explicitly feminized whiteness has been employed within sites understood as women’s “places” (schools and home, specifically).

Understanding the role of benevolent whiteness in furthering the settler colonial state requires an acceptance of whiteness as something other than normative and invisible to begin with. Turning Du Bois’ (1904/1989) question to Black people, “How does it feel to be a problem?” on its head, CWS “asks Whites the same question without the implicit irony: ‘How does it feel to be the problem?’” (Leonardo, 2013, p. 84). Toward this end, it is first necessary to understand the United States as a settler colonial state, and the history of schools as sites of settler colonialism and white supremacy. Additionally, we must make visible and interrogate the roles white women have played in the perpetuation of settler colonialism, particularly during the founding decades of systematized schooling. As I have demonstrated, the conflation of 19th-century white middle class mothering with the feminization of teaching has resulted in the discursive construction of teaching as inherently benevolent, and by that rationale as exempt from critique within the larger settler colonial project. It is thus necessary that contemporary educators and researchers locate teachers, the majority of whom are white women, as always already imbued with extraordinary power and agency within (and thus culpability for the ramifications of) U.S. settler colonial schools, past and present. Further, this conceptualization of white womanhood allows for — in fact requires — contemporary teachers to locate themselves within a larger project, as deeply entangled in the erratic web of white supremacy, and thus to consider ongoing educational problems such as the “discipline gap” through this lens, rather than allowing them a “pass” for being well intentioned and “not racist.”

**How viable is a theory of gendered benevolent whiteness given the fluidity and performative nature of both whiteness and gender?**

It is now well established that gender is as fluid as it is performative (Butler, 1988), despite the “colonial imposition of gender binaries” (Lugones, 2010) on colonized peoples. Because this dissertation understands whiteness as ideological, I propose that whiteness, to a certain degree, can be as fluid and
performative as gender. Through this claim, I am signaling the ways in which whiteness is used and reinforced by people of color, particularly within a school system that is rooted in inescapable and compulsory whiteness. Therefore, to define benevolent whiteness as gendered female\textsuperscript{92} does not imply that its invocation is restricted to cis-gendered women who are genotypically or phenotypically marked as “white people.” The theorization of benevolent whiteness allows teachers and scholars a lens through which to view educational inequities and institutional racism as the result of a structure upon which we have all agreed (to varying degrees) to build our schools.

**How can we understand the contemporary over-disciplining of Black and Indigenous youth as a consequence of benevolent whiteness (gendered settler colonialism and white supremacy)?**

Returning to Wolfe (2006), settler colonialism requires a “logic of elimination” – the elimination of Indigenous peoples – in order to provide white settlers with access to valuable land. Relatedly, genocidal settler colonialism employs an “organizing grammar of race” that racializes Indigenous peoples and Black people in opposing but related ways, carefully controlling who is brought into or perpetually distanced from whiteness. To achieve these ends, the United States legally codified Indigenous erasure and Black perpetuity and fungibility in both the “one-drop rule” (also known as the “rule of hypodescent”) and in blood quantum regulations that limit Indigenous identity and access to land, both of which result in the creation of more “property” (humans and land) for white settlers. Through the theorization of settler colonialism, we see that anti-blackness and Indigenous genocide are always already interrelated.

Benevolent whiteness, as the feminized arm of settler colonialism and white supremacy, commits the “tender violence” that complements the more overt, masculinized violence of military occupation and war. In educational settings, this is largely carried out through the disciplining – literally and in the Foucauldian sense – of inherently delinquent (Foucault, 1977) student subjects. As demonstrated in previous chapters, 19th-century white women were charged with disciplining nonwhite students (and parents) through middle class Victorian codes of morality and propriety, a task carried out through informal and formalized schooling. Much of what is understood contemporarily as “proper” student behavior and the role of teachers in urban schools remains influenced by this historical construction. Through this logic, I argue that the current “over disciplining”

\textsuperscript{92} See Chapter 2.
of students of color is in fact a continuation of “just disciplining” students of color – that is, there is no “over” in terms of what is intended by and necessary for white supremacy, although statistically speaking there is a dangerous over-representation of students of color punished by exclusionary discipline.

**Implications: What Comes Next?**

The goal of this dissertation and its implications for the field of educational research and teacher preparation is to construct a genealogical understanding of the contemporary discourse and collective cultural understanding of white women teaching students of color as inherently heroic. The aim, thus, is to locate the historical roots of this trope in order to dispel its possibility of ever having been, or ever having the potential to be, a realistic possibility for white teachers in settler colonial schools. In no uncertain terms, this dissertation implicates white teachers in the perpetuation of white supremacy. Specifically, it locates an extraordinary amount of power and complicity in benevolent whiteness, defined in prior chapters as a gendered female (feminine) enactment of white supremacy carried out through the seemingly benevolent work of loving, mothering teacher-saviors. I would be remiss to make such a claim without also acknowledging that white teachers can be extraordinary teachers in communities of color, as there are far too many who fit that bill within my social and professional circles alone. However, as CWS (and lived experience as people of color) reminds us, whiteness remains marked as normative within educational settings just as it does in the larger US social and cultural context. Therefore, even the purest intentions when based upon white middle class experience and knowledge tend to have reverberatingly harmful effects on students of color. Given that the teaching force in the United States has been predominantly white and female for the past hundred and fifty years, the primary goal in improving educational outcomes for students of color should be to recruit and retain teachers of color in equal proportion to student populations. At the same time, and because current numbers demonstrate an increase in white women enrolled in teacher preparation programs, our secondary goal must be a collective working away from whiteness, rooted in the theoretical understanding of whiteness as “nothing but oppressive and false” (Roediger, 1994), along with a re-education on the history of teachers and schooling in the settler colonial United States. This requires an entirely new practice in teacher education,
diverging and divesting from the current trend toward “multiculturalism.”

Sleeter’s (2004) study of multicultural education and white teachers’ construction of race argued that attempting to “solve racism by educating whites” doesn’t result in anti-racist education or in a change in teachers’ understandings of race and racism. This claim is based on a series of studies ranging from the late 1970s to the early 1990s, including a two-year study by Haberman and Post (1992) in which it was found that “teacher education reinforced, rather than reconstructed, how the white students viewed children of color.” (Sleeter, 2004, p. 158). Neither behavioral patterns nor self-reported perspectives on race, racism, and people of color were found to change in response to “multicultural” education. Nevertheless, I would argue that (1) the goal of teacher education is not necessarily to “solve racism,” and (2) perhaps the ways in which the researchers went about “educating whites” might be a causal factor in the studies’ failures. That is, the studies in question, and multiculturalism in general, aims to effect change within a predominantly white profession through educating white people about other peoples, cultures, and histories. Problematically, this still locates the basis of structural and reproductive racism in schools as somehow related to white people not knowing enough about “others,” rather than, as I am advocating, white people not knowing enough about whiteness. As such, multicultural education remains ineffective, lacking the necessary complexity and nuance as well as the historical grounding that might otherwise provide white teachers with an understanding of themselves. This is particularly relevant as Sleeter (2004) along with Haberman and Post (1992) have demonstrated that white teachers’ perceptions about people of color are based in understandings reinforced over multiple generations; white teachers’ beliefs about people of color are part of the fabric of their culture, inherited unnoticed, and thus resistant to change.

While Sleeter’s extensive work provides a necessary starting off point for white teachers, this dissertation is intended to push the discussion amongst white teachers and teacher educators both deeper and inward. The work to be done is not about white teachers knowing more about communities of color, our cultures, our ways of being and producing knowledge, and so on. Quite to the contrary, the work ahead of us requires white teachers paying more attention to whiteness, its history, its malignancy, its permanence within the ways in which we understand teachers, students, and the purposes of schooling.
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