AHR Roundtable

Domesticating Colonizers: Domesticity, Indigenous Domestic Labor, and the Modern Settler Colonial Nation

VICTORIA HASKINS

In 1888, a short gag that had been syndicated in various U.S. newspapers made its appearance in *The Red Man*, the new school magazine of the United States Indian Industrial School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. Poking fun at the pretensions and provincialism of aspirational American women, the joke featured a stock figure in American wit of the time, Mrs. Anglomaniac, demanding that a hapless domestic employment agent furnish her with the latest style in maids. "I see by the *Court Journal* that Queen Victoria is using Indian servants," she told him haughtily, "and I want some nice, tidy squaws, right away."[1]

The purchase of this humor is an indication of the shared attitudes of the middle class in this period, including the preoccupation with the much-bemoaned "servant problem" of the late nineteenth century. But it also illustrates the awkward superimposition of imperial representations of native servants onto settler colonial relations. For many contemporary readers, the idea of an "Indian maid" must have seemed utterly laughable indeed. One does wonder what the young Native American women enrolled at Carlisle made of the joke—yet, as we shall see, it was not really directed at them. Rather, the barb was aimed at those women who would employ them under the school's experimental new "outing" program. The joke thus provides us with an entry point to explore how the placement of young Indigenous women and girls in white homes to work as servants—a strategy that was systematically pursued from the late nineteenth century through to the Second World War by official administrations both in the United States and across the Pacific in Australia—went beyond targeting Indigenous women alone for reformation in domesticity. What we see in the outing programs and their counterparts in Australia, the various domestic apprenticeship systems, is a broader interventionist project to refashion and restructure relations in the home between women. This project was integral to the formation of the self-consciously modern settler colonial nation.

As a concept referring to the set of prescriptive ideas and practices around familial and gender household relations associated with the rise of white middle-class bourgeois

[1] "Must Be English," *The Red Man* 8, no. 11 (October 1888): 6. See also *Tarborough (N.C.) Southerner*, August 30, 1888, 1; *Daily Review* (Wilmington, N.C.), September 18, 1888, 2.

society in the modern era, domesticity has been useful for understanding state programs of Indigenous domestic service placements in the U.S. and Australia. Reworking the early feminist critique of the "cult of domesticity" in the 1970s and 1980s, scholars of the gendered policies of Indigenous assimilation have argued that the kind of disciplinary domesticity imposed on Indigenous women by the state in both Australia and the U.S. was at best based upon misguided and outdated Victorian ideals of womanhood, and at worst a cynical ruse to disguise what was nothing more than a brutal lesson in subordination and dispossession.[2] Domesticity for Indigenous women meant simply, in the words of K. Tsianina Lomawaima, "training for subservience."[3] In this context, domesticity meant something else entirely for middle-class white women. Postcolonial scholarship pointing to the centrality of domesticity to colonial and imperial projects has emphasized the productive power of domesticity for such women. In utilizing "the sentimental fiction" of female authority in the home to assert their superior status over Indigenous women, it has been said that "they helped turn domesticity from a sign of gender subordination to a pillar of race and class privilege."[4]

The state serviced employers in the sense of arranging for Indigenous girls to work in their homes. Nevertheless, the interests of the employers and the state were not necessarily or even predictably aligned. My previous work on female employers of Indigenous girls placed in service by the state has highlighted the existence of real tensions between state officials and female employers, which could escalate into open conflict. Such clashes were often predicated on contested notions of what was the appropriate exercise of white women's "maternalist" authority in the home (as opposed to the power of the state), and were buttressed by an energetic white middle-class feminist reformist agenda.[5] Here, however, I want to question the notion of a hegemonic "civiliz-

[2] See Ann McGrath, "'Spinifex Fairies': Aboriginal Workers in the Northern Territory, 1911–1939," in Elizabeth Windschuttle, ed., *Women, Class and History: Feminist Perspectives on Australia, 1788–1978* (Melbourne, 1980), 237–267, here 245–246; Robert A. Trennert, "Victorian Morality and the Supervision of Indian Women Working in Phoenix, 1906–1930," *Journal of Social History* 22, no. 1 (1988): 113–128; Joanne Scott and Raymond Evans, "The Moulding of Menials: The Making of the Aboriginal Female Domestic Servant in Early Twentieth Century Queensland," *Hecate* 22, no. 1 (1996): 140–157; Lisa E. Emmerich, "'Save the Babies!' American Indian Women, Assimilation Policy, and Scientific Motherhood, 1912–1918," in Elizabeth Jameson and Susan Armitage, eds., *Writing the Range: Race, Class, and Culture in the Women's West* (Norman, Okla., 1997), 393–409; Francesca Bartlett, "Clean, White Girls: Assimilation and Women's Work," *Hecate* 25, no. 1 (1999): 10–38.

[3] K. Tsianina Lomawaima, "Domesticity in the Federal Indian Schools: The Power of Authority over Mind and Body," *American Ethnologist* 20, no. 2 (1993): 227–240, here 230.

[4] Jane E. Simonsen, *Making Home Work: Domesticity and Native American Assimilation in the American West, 1860–1919* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 2006), 59 (quoting an 1888 *Woman's Standard* article, "Is Woman a Unit or a Fraction?"), 6. See also Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context* (New York, 1995), 36; Laura Wexler, *Tender Violence: Domestic Visions in an Age of U.S. Imperialism* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 2000), 105. Note that Wexler uses the term "sentimental fiction" to refer not to female domestic authority but to the "myth" that reform was supposed to restore the vitality of dispossessed people.

[5] Victoria K. Haskins, *One Bright Spot* (Basingstoke, 2005); Haskins, "'& so we *are* 'Slave owners': Employers and the NSW Aborigines Protection Board Trust Funds," *Labour History*, no. 88 (May 2005): 147–164; Haskins, "Domestic Service and Frontier Feminism: The Call for a Woman Visitor to 'Half-Caste' Girls and Women in Domestic Service, Adelaide, 1925–1928," *Frontiers* 28, no. 1/2 (2007): 124–164; Haskins, "'The Privilege of Employing Natives': The Quan Sing Affair and Chinese-Aboriginal Employment in Western Australia, 1889–1934," *Aboriginal History* 35 (2011): 145–160. See also Margaret D. Jacobs, *White Mother to a Dark Race: Settler Colonialism, Maternalism, and the Removal of Indigenous Children in the American West and Australia, 1880–1940* (Lincoln, Nebr., 2009); Fiona Paisley, *Loving Protection? Australian Feminism and Aboriginal Women's Rights, 1919–1939* (Melbourne, 2000).

ing" domesticity that was more or less perfectly integrated and endorsed—indeed, dexterously wielded—by those white women who sought to employ Indigenous girls and young women. This is not to argue that the discourse of domesticity did not function to mask the exploitation and subjugation of Aboriginal and Native American girls and women by both the state and their female employers. That is well-established.[6] But closer consideration of domesticity as a technique of state discipline and governance directed at white employers as well as Indigenous workers—where the authorities insisted upon white women's particular performative displays of visible domesticity—advances our understanding of domesticity as a complex and contingent construction that was inherently bound up with the emergence of the modern settler colonial state. Domesticity came to be regarded both as a force for civilizing and as a sign of civilization in the modern settler colonial nation through the very process of state intervention in the domestic arena.

Perhaps the Indian girls at Carlisle who read that joke in their new school magazine saw themselves as precariously positioned outside the insult against Indian women, for of course they themselves were being exhorted to despise and reject the ways of their female relatives on the reservations. However, whether the pupils were or were not amused was probably of little concern to the magazine's editor, Carlisle's founder and superintendent, Captain Richard Henry Pratt. The magazine, a fundraising promotional vehicle that reflected Pratt's outlook and influence, was intended for circulation to the school's "patrons," those who took Carlisle pupils into their homes during the summer vacations.[7] No fewer than 143 of Carlisle's some 216 female pupils were recorded as having gone "on outing" to live with patrons in 1888, representing a dramatic increase over previous years, and indicating that there were a considerable number of new employers now.[8] Such readers, it appears, were well-advised to heed the underlying message. Carlisle's patrons were expected to understand that their recruits were not offered to them as fashionable ornaments of imperial conquest, nor as spoils of an unruly

[6] For such abuse, see Jackie Huggins, "'Firing On in the Mind': Aboriginal Women Domestic Servants in the Inter-War Years," *Hecate* 13, no. 2 (1987/1988): 5–23; Huggins, "Wedmedi—If Only You Knew" (1992), reprinted in Huggins, *Sister Girl: The Writings of Aboriginal Activist and Historian Jackie Huggins* (St. Lucia, Qld., 1998), 25–36; Jennifer Sabbioni, "'I Hate Working for White People,'" *Hecate* 19, no. 2 (1993): 7–29; Haskins, *One Bright Spot*; Margaret D. Jacobs, "Working on the Domestic Frontier: American Indian Domestic Servants in White Women's Households in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1920–1940," *Frontiers* 28, no. 1/2 (2007): 165–199; Jacobs, *White Mother to a Dark Race*, chap. 8.

[7] Jacqueline Fear-Segal, "The Man on the Bandstand at Carlisle Indian Industrial School: What He Reveals about the Children's Experiences," in Clifford E. Trafzer, Jean A. Keller, and Lorene Sisquoc, eds., *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences* (Lincoln, Nebr., 2006), 99–122.

[8] R. H. Pratt, Reports of Indian Schools: Carlisle, Pa., September 7, 1887, in *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior for the Year 1887*, 256–261, here 258 (table); Pratt, Report of School at Carlisle, Pa., August 17, 1888, in *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior for the Year 1888*, 276–278, here 276 (table). The number of girls placed on outing had steadily increased, in keeping with the increasing enrollments of girls, since the school opened in 1880, but began to rapidly climb from 1887, when the table shows that there were 97 girls on outing out of a total of 189 enrolled. Genevieve Bell offers different figures in her dissertation on Carlisle, based on the commissioner's annual reports (93 girls on outing in 1887 and 97 in 1888), but also traces a distinct rise in numbers of girls placed out after 1887; see Bell, "Telling Stories out of School: Remembering the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, 1879–1918" (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, June 1988), 409.

FIGURE 1: Flora Peters (standing) with Mrs. Phillip C. Pusey and her four children, 1911, London Grove village, Chester County, Pennsylvania. Courtesy of Cumberland County Historical Society, Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

frontier; rather, they were to be regarded as waifs to be inducted, with family love and care, into the ways of middle-class white domesticity.

By the late nineteenth century, potent ideas about colonial governance and domesticity refracted through domestic servitude were in transnational circulation. A pervasive discourse on British rule likened the successful administration of empire to the prudent running of a private household: managing native servants was an entrenched metaphor for the entire imperial project.[9] And in 1887, when Queen Victoria decided to import two Indian men to join the palace household in England—the reference for the joke about Mrs. Anglomaniac—she followed in what was by then a well-established tradition of displaying imperial power by bringing Indigenous people "home" to the metropole to be exotic servants.[10] Yet as the joke made clear, such status-defining displays appeared incongruous in settler societies.

Indigenous men, women, and children had long been used as household servants and slaves in American and Australian settler homes, even in the very midst of frontier violence. In distinct contrast to the imperial native servant, however, their presence in settler households was not romanticized, nor even particularly recognized as such.[11]

[9] Alison Blunt, "Imperial Geographies of Home: British Domesticity in India, 1886–1925," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, new series, 24, no. 4 (1999): 421–440, here 429–432.

[10] Rozina Visram, *Ayahs, Lascars and Princes: The Story of Indians in Britain, 1700–1947* (London, 1986), chap. 2; J. Jean Hecht, *Continental and Colonial Servants in Eighteenth Century England* (Northampton, Mass., 1954), 136.

[11] A number of historians have revealed the little-known history of Indigenous domestic servitude and slavery in America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, including Andrés Reséndez, *The Other Slavery: The Uncovered Story of Indian Enslavement in America* (Boston, 2016); and Stacey L. Smith, *Freedom's Frontier: California and the Struggle over Unfree Labor, Emancipation, and Reconstruction*

FIGURE 2: Ruby Jones (seated left), afternoon tea at the Benson residence, 1906, Wanaaring, New South Wales. At Work and Play 03597. Courtesy of Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney.

For the dispossessed and supplanted in a settler colonial society, no place, literally or figuratively, could be envisioned.[12] Instead, white women were both admired and pitied for the hardships they purportedly faced, required to help forge a new society without reliable domestic assistance. Domesticity was imperiled, not affirmed, by territorial expansion, as Amy Kaplan has shown: the figure of Queen Victoria as the "sovereign mother" countered by de Tocqueville's "lethargic and vulnerable" frontier mother, "at risk … from the very subjects she must domesticate and civilize"—that is, her children and the unsatisfactory immigrants she was obliged to rely upon for household servants.[13] It was only from the "closing of the frontier" at the end of the nineteenth century, and in tandem with campaigns for white female suffrage, that such fears subsided and Indigenous domestic labor could be acknowledged. "Pioneer" women would be celebrated and memorialized as successful maternal civilizers—"gentle tamers," to use

(Chapel Hill, N.C., 2013). See also Albert L. Hurtado, "'Hardly a Farm House—A Kitchen without Them': Indian and White Households on the California Borderland Frontier in 1860," *Western Historical Quarterly* 13, no. 3 (1982): 245–270. In Australia, there are studies of Aboriginal children in service, but not older workers, in the colonial period: Penelope Hetherington, *Settlers, Servants and Slaves: Aboriginal and European Children in Nineteenth-Century Western Australia* (Crawley, 2002); Shirleene Robinson, *Something Like Slavery? Queensland's Aboriginal Child Workers, 1842–1945* (Melbourne, 2008).

[12] For the disavowal of the Indigenous presence or "non-encounter" that is fundamental to settler colonial discourse and identity, see Lorenzo Veracini, "On Settlerness," *Borderlands e-Journal* 10, no. 1 (2011): 1–17, here 4–5, http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol10no1_2011/veracini_settlerness.htm.

[13] Amy Kaplan, "Manifest Domesticity," *American Literature* 70, no. 3 (1998): 581–606, here 586, 590–591, quotes from 589, 591.

Dee Brown's telling phrase.[14] From then on, Indigenous women who worked in settler homes might be accorded a certain limited visibility, particularly in Australia, where they were rapidly mythologized as passive and grateful subjects for domestication by their white mistress.[15]

In both countries, such maternalist mythology would provide the backdrop for the removal of Indigenous girls from their own mothers and families in the twentieth century.[16] But there was a decided tension and ambivalence around this strategy when it came to then placing the same girls in the care of white women in private homes, in the U.S. as part of the outing system, and in Australia in the apprenticeship schemes. Concerns that those who would choose to employ Indigenous girls would not be motivated by altruism, nor indeed anything other than the urge to exploit and abuse them, were expressed from the outset. "Mean people will get these children—mean, cringing and crawling people … who will not keep the children clean or in a proper condition," an Australian state parliamentarian had protested when a compulsory apprenticeship system was introduced in New South Wales. "We are going to hand over these children to merciless, grasping, cruel people, who are looking for cheap labour all the time."[17] Even the pious Quaker women of Pennsylvania had to be cautioned by Pratt that the girls supplied were supposed to be "treated as children of the family" and "not as mere servants."[18] When it came to extending outing to the newly established American settler communities of the West and Southwest, there were serious qualms. "Young Indians from the schools can not be safely located among such people; they had better go to the wildest reservations and take chances there," opined one high-ranking Indian Office official after a tour of inspection to Arizona and New Mexico.[19] In Australia, leading officials were similarly pessimistic. "People do not take these black children into the bosoms of their families for the sake of love, affection, or charity," warned Queensland Protector W. E. Roth, "but for what they can get out of them."[20]

Such negative characterizations of would-be employers were shot through with ideas about class, race, and respectability. It was evidently presumed that only the less desirable type of people would be willing to take Indigenous girls into their homes (and for the wrong reasons), while the more desirable employers would need to be cajoled and persuaded. Those charged with implementing the schemes often regarded the very

[14] Dee Brown, *The Gentle Tamers: Women of the Old Wild West* (Lincoln, Nebr., 1958).

[15] Joan M. Jensen and Darlis A. Miller, "The Gentle Tamers Revisited: New Approaches to the History of Women in the American West," *Pacific Historical Review* 49, no. 2 (1980): 173–213; Elizabeth Jameson, "Women as Workers, Women as Civilizers: True Womanhood in the American West," *Frontiers* 7, no. 3 (1984): 1–8; Victoria Haskins, "The White Woman's Burden: Encounters between White and Indigenous Women in Australian Domestic Service," *Maps, Dreams, History Revisited: Power and Pastmindedness in (Post)Colonial Australia*, Special Issue, *Journal of Australian Indigenous Issues* 18, no. 1 (2015): 38–53.

[16] Haskins, *One Bright Spot*, 51–52; Jacobs, *White Mother to a Dark Race*, chap. 3.

[17] Second reading in New South Wales Legislative Assembly, Aborigines Protection Amending Bill, January 27, 1915, *NSW Parliamentary Debates* [1905–1943], 1955.

[18] R. H. Pratt to Mrs. Geo. McCulloch, July 3, [188]3, box 10-7, Outgoing Letters, Series I: General Correspondence and Official Papers, 1867–1924, Richard Henry Pratt Papers, WA MSS S-1174, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. Mrs. McCulloch, of Juniata County, Pennsylvania, was inquiring after "a girl" for herself and another for a friend of hers.

[19] Daniel Dorchester, Report of Superintendent of Indian Schools, August 16, 1892, in *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior for the Year 1892*, 526–599, here 586, 588, quote from 588.

[20] *Annual Report of the Chief Protector of Aboriginals for 1904* (1905) [Queensland], 3.

purpose of the outing system as teaching white people generally that, as a U.S. school superintendent put it in 1905, "Injuns … may be as ladylike, as useful, and apt as anyone else."[21] For such an educative process to be effective, engaging a Native American or Aboriginal servant needed to be seen as a privilege reserved for those judged capable of offering the necessary, and carefully calibrated, affection and care—those capable of enacting, in short, a model of white middle-class domesticity.

"You were never sent to just anyone," recalled a former Aboriginal apprentice from New South Wales in eastern Australia, "you were sent to, well, wealthy people, wealthy and very religious."[22] In the earliest days of the systems, employers were largely recruited through personal social networks of local authorities, but the need for formalized recruitment practices and, importantly, systematic techniques of surveillance and monitoring of employers soon became evident. The Australian systems, usually backed by "protectionist" legal powers over all and any Aboriginal employment, enabled police to take on the responsibility for approving agreements, inspecting employers, and providing confidential reports to the authorities. Such heavy-handed intrusion might repel the refined kind of employer the authorities wanted to encourage, however, and more often the visible face of official surveillance was that of a genteel female official: a "Home Finder" in New South Wales, "Protectresses" in Queensland and Western Australia, and—after a campaign by women's groups—a female "Visitor" in South Australia.[23] In the U.S., outing placements were often managed by "outing matrons," female officials whose special role it was to liaise with would-be employers.[24] While their powers were more limited than those of their Australian counterparts, the matrons nonetheless made it difficult for employers they deemed unsuitable, not least by excluding them from their registers.

These officials in both countries actively courted those employers whom they wanted to hold up as the standard, identifying them according to an equation of domestic virtue with whiteness, seclusion, and a husband who worked at a well-paid job in an office of some kind. The first Queensland Protectress, for instance, happily reported that she had overcome the initial reluctance of "respectable" people to employ Aboriginal girls, and an early Nevada school matron wrote with gratification that she had found a number of places for girls in the San Francisco Bay Area—"a lovely place—no saloons only beautiful homes out there."[25] In their inspection reports and correspondences, a

[21] C. H. Asbury, Report of Carson School Superintendent in Charge of Walker River Reservation, August 4, 1905, in *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior for the Year 1905: Indian Affairs, Part I*, 254–256, here 255.

[22] Unidentified apprentice quoted in Carla Christine Hankins, "'The Missing Links': Cultural Genocide through the Abduction of Female Aboriginal Children from Their Families and Their Training for Domestic Service, 1883–1969" (B.A. Hons. thesis, University of New South Wales, 1982), sec. 4.6.2, unpaginated.

[23] For the South Australian campaign for a female "Visitor" to oversee Aboriginal domestic workers, see Haskins, "Domestic Service and Frontier Feminism."

[24] See Trennert, "Victorian Morality and the Supervision of Indian Women Working in Phoenix"; Victoria Haskins, *Matrons and Maids: Regulating Indian Domestic Service in Tucson, 1914–1934* (Tucson, Ariz., 2012); Jacobs, "Working on the Domestic Frontier."

[25] For the Queensland Protectress, see "Aboriginal Girls. Servants at 2s. 6d. per Week," clipping from *Truth* (newspaper), February 7, 1900, file: Item ID 717006, Batch Files 1900 re Nina and Mrs St Ledger, Home Secretary's Office, Series ID 4356: Health & Home Affairs/Education Department Batch Files, Queensland State Archives, Brisbane. For the Nevada matron, see [H. Sheahan] to Mr. Reed, n.d., ca. May 1912, file: Outing Girls in Sacramento Valley 1912 S. F. Bay Area, box 262, Carson Indian School Administrative Files 1909–1923, Record Group 75: General Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs

"good home for a girl" generally meant a well-maintained and comfortable home located in a middle-class suburb or rural township. The families in such approved homes typically consisted of a male breadwinner (a professional or a businessman) and his wife and children, with no other servants, boarders, or extended family living on the property. Crucially, non-white would-be employers were out of consideration altogether, an important signifier of their exclusion from the civilizing project.[26] But the appearance of the term "a good home" also indicated that the mistress had shown herself to be prepared to demonstrate a kindly and maternal interest in the worker. Emerging from the officials' inspection reports are a handful of elite and especially favored employers who were supplied with domestic workers (often in pairs) on a regular basis, on the understanding that the mistress was devoting her personal time and care not only to their "training" in household work, but also to their social and moral improvement. They included Margaret Adams, who lived in a seven-bedroom home on one of the most expensive streets on Sydney's north shore and regularly arranged for her apprentices to go to Girl Guide camps in the 1930s, and wealthy Quaker spinster Elizabeth Edge, who engaged, incredibly, a succession of more than sixty Carlisle girls between 1883 and 1918 to live and work in her "beautiful old home" in Downington, Pennsylvania, offering them "instruction and care for which any wealthy parent would be glad to pay $500 for his daughter," according to one inspector.[27] Such model employers were by no means the typical employer, but they served as powerful exemplars of the ideal and were held up as such.

A highly performative domesticity on the part of employers thus became integral to these schemes. Such demonstrations were of direct benefit to the employers, not only in material terms of securing the services of heavily regulated domestic labor, but in providing a marker of their social status. The state, meanwhile, had its own investment in maintaining an image of affective relations between mistresses and servants under a benevolent system. Visible maternalism translated into an obligation upon the female employers to be responsible for the young women's moral "protection," by strictly

[hereafter RG 75], U.S. National Archives and Records Administration [hereafter NARA], San Francisco, Calif.

[26] For discussion of one such exclusion, see Victoria Haskins, "'Plenty European ladies told me you should give me fair place same as everybody': Gender, Race and Aboriginal Domestic Service," in Francisca de Haan, Margaret Allen, June Purvis, and Krassimira Daskalova, eds., *Women's Activism: Global Perspectives from the 1890s to the Present* (London, 2012), 153–167.

[27] For Adams, see Mrs Adams, AWB Application to employ ward, December 15, 1941; M. Hypatia Adams to President, AP Board [*sic*], May 14, 1941; M. Hypatia Adams to AP Board [*sic*], April 28, 1941, all in file: A43/1634, NRS 905, Chief Secretary letters received [Files relating to Aboriginal Affairs, 1938–49], State Archives and Records Authority of New South Wales, Western Sydney Records Centre, Kingswood. For Edge and her "beautiful old home," see "The Outing: It's Work," *The Carlisle Arrow and Red Man* 14, no. 37 (June 7, 1918): 3–11, here 8–9 ("A Country Mother's Tribute to the Outing"). For the inspector's assessment of Edge, see "Report: The Outing System," enclosed with A. O. Wright to Commissioner, September 24, 1898, file: 43688-1898, box 1582, Letters Received 1881–1907, Office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D.C. I have found sixty-one names of outing girls placed with Edge in the Carlisle student files, which are being digitized and are available at the Carlisle Indian School Digital Resource Center, an online project maintained by the Waidner-Spahr Library, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., http://carlisleindian.dickinson.edu/student_records; the originals are held in the Carlisle Indian School Student Records, 1879–1918, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D.C. According to a later article by Oscar Lipps, published ten years after the school's closure, Edge had had altogether seventy-eight Indian girls in her home since Carlisle was founded, employing two girls a year for thirty-nine years. Lipps, "The Founding of the First Large Indian School and the Beginning of the Outing System," *Chemawa American*, March 28, 1928, 4.

monitoring their social activities and movements outside of the home. An employer's home, then, was intended not so much as a gateway for Indigenous women to the white world, but rather as a site of containment and surveillance.[28]

As the authorities arrogated the prerogative to assess and evaluate would-be and actual employers' performances of domesticity and their capacity to control Indigenous girls, the process not only created a mountain of paperwork, but formed a modernizing public state with surveillance of the private home located at its heart. It was in the most literal sense of domesticity and home life—housing—that white employers were seen to particularly require explicit direction and discipline. Outing matrons often struggled to make mistresses understand that outing workers were supposed to live with their employer's family, under the same roof. Phoenix outing matron Amanda Chingren ascribed the "problem of proper housing" to a lack of sophistication in the Southwest:

> In a young community the need of help in the household often came before there was a place to put the little maid. A cot in a shed or a garage, or in a tent in the yard affording about as much moral and physical protection as an umbrella, was offered as quarters with the suggestion that it was as good as she had at home, overlooking the fact that she was working for better conditions, and that at home she was not alone, but in her own family circle.[29]

Similarly, in 1909 the Queensland Protector of Aboriginals lamented that some employers thought "any sort of clothing or sleeping accommodation [was] good enough for a little black girl."[30] Regulations were implemented requiring employers to provide a room of at least 480 cubic feet located within their premises, and "sufficiently protected … to ensure the servant's being under proper care and supervision at night," with a "comfortable bed," bedding, and conveniences for washing.[31] Whether such regulations were followed is another matter altogether, but their existence signaled a clear message about the expectations of employers, that they were to demonstrate a level of familial care and middle-class comfort, to the satisfaction of the state. Four years later, the Queensland Protector reported that there was "no doubt the system helps to keep both mistress and girl up to the mark."[32] Indeed, Aboriginal girls, too, were aware that certain standards for their employment were supposed to be in place. A young woman complained to the South Australian Protector in 1928 that her mistress hit her and another Aboriginal girl working in the same household "nearly every day." "[T]hey all call us blacks in this house and we sleep on the floor." It should be noted, however, that her complaint was dismissed: the state's interest was in maintaining the appearance of its authority in the surveillance of employers, rather than in actually protecting Indigenous girls from abuse.[33]

[28] Victoria Haskins, "On the Doorstep: Aboriginal Domestic Service as a 'Contact Zone,'" *Australian Feminist Studies* 16, no. 34 (2001): 13–25.

[29] Amanda M. Chingren, "The Outing System at the Phoenix Indian School," *Chemawa American*, March 28, 1928, 7–8, here 7.

[30] *Annual Report of the Chief Protector of Aboriginals for 1909* (1910) [Queensland], 6.

[31] "Regulations under the Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Acts, 1897 to 1907," *Queensland Government Gazette*, June 6, 1912, 24.

[32] *Annual Report of the Chief Protector of Aboriginals for 1913* (1914) [Queensland], 5.

[33] Chief Protector [South Australia] to Chief Protector [Alice Springs], August 2, 1928, Letterbook Relating to the NT Protector of Aborigines, 1927–1939, GRG 52/8, State Archives of South Australia, Adelaide. See also Victoria Haskins, "From the Centre to the City: Modernity, Mobility and Mixed-Descent

The public monitoring of employer domesticity was manifested most explicitly in the contracts that employers were required to enter into, setting out their obligation to monitor their charges' moral welfare. In Queensland, the first Protectress had announced in 1900 that she predicted "no further trouble whatever with any of the new mistresses in future," as she intended to provide them with a copy of the rules so there would be no "misunderstanding."[34] In the U.S., the practice of having outing employers sign formal and quite extensive rules seems to have started at the Chemawa Indian School in Oregon, where in 1903 both patron and pupil were required to sign a one-page form that opened with the statement "Our object in placing pupils in families is to advance them in English and in customs of civilized life."[35] Similar rules were set down at Carlisle soon after, and such codes for patrons were eventually drawn up and circulated wherever outing operated.[36] The tone of the outing contracts could be quite stern. In 1911, patrons of the outing program at Stewart Indian School in Carson City, Nevada, were directed that "whenever it appears that such oversight is neglected pupils will be recalled or moved," warning that if the school believed that the rules had been signed only "for the purpose of getting a girl," no further outing placements would be made with that employer.[37] And in Los Angeles in 1927, the rules stated that outing girls were being "placed in families to learn the customs and ethics of our best American homes, and to be mother's helpers only," and stipulated as the very first rule that all patrons must read the rules carefully, "and if any hesitation appears on part of patron as regards compliance therewith it would be better that the Indian girl be placed elsewhere."[38]

These codifications suggest that the authorities believed that many employers did not understand the maternal expectations placed upon them, or, indeed, obstinately resisted them, and they can clearly be read as an assertion of the state's power over employers. In the U.S., we might regard such public declarations also as a strategic way of deflecting resistance by Indian parents, to reassure them, as Pratt had told one concerned Indian father back in 1895, that "in all cases the pupils are treated as members of the family and not as mere servants."[39] In Australia, Aboriginal parents had vir-

---

Aboriginal Domestic Workers from Central Australia," *Women's History Review* 18, no. 1 (2009): 155–175, here 168; Tony Austin, "'A Chance to Be Decent': Northern Territory 'Half-Caste' Girls in Service in South Australia 1916–1939," *Labour History*, no. 60 (May 1991): 51–65, here 55–56.

[34] F. Meston to Under Secretary, Home Secretary's Department, January 15, 1900, file: Item ID 717006, Batch Files 1900 re Nina and Mrs St Ledger, Queensland State Archives.

[35] "Rules to Govern Girls, Boys and Patrons" (Chemawa), enclosed with T. Potter to Commissioner, November 13, 1903, file: 80155-1903, box 2421, Letters Received 1881–1907, Office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D.C.

[36] "Outing Rules to Govern Carlisle Indian Students and Our Patrons," December 8, 1906, PI 2-8-1, Cumberland County Historical Society, Carlisle, Pa. These rules were reiterated in a book that was published by the school and "Printed by Indian Apprentices": *This Is Carlisle: Information Concerning the United States Indian Industrial School at Carlisle, Penna.—Containing a Brief Outline of What It Is, and What It Is Accomplishing, 1879–29th Year–1908* (Carlisle, Pa., 1908), 72–73.

[37] "To Outing Patrons of Carson Indian School," n.d., ca. 1911, file: Application for Outing Girls 1911–1919, box 262, Carson Indian School Administrative Files 1909–1923, RG 75, NARA, San Francisco.

[38] "Rules Governing Indian School Girls Who Are in Families and Attending Public Schools," n.d., ca. 1926–1927, file: 972 Field Matron Los Angeles CA, box 180, Subject Files 1904–1922, Colorado River Agency, RG 75, NARA, Los Angeles.

[39] R. H. Pratt to Dwight Sherman, May 28, 1895, box 10-28, Outgoing Letters, Series I, Pratt Papers, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library.

tually no power to refuse or protest against the apprenticeship of their daughters, and employers were usually prevented by law from employing Indigenous workers independently of the state. Here, rules for employers were more prosaic and cursory.[40] The attitudes of the Australian authorities are revealed perhaps most clearly by the comments made in hindsight about the schemes. "A good home with a kindly mistress is heaven to a coloured girl of the right type," former Western Australian Protector A. O. Neville wrote, "yet failures are often due to the attitude of employers and their families. It does not help matters much to have the children in a family refer to their mother's coloured help as a 'dirty black nigger' or a 'black bitch.'" By "failures," he meant the lack of success in reforming Indigenous girls into obedient and submissive servants.[41] In the view of the authorities, it was neither Indigenous resistance nor the maladministration of the system that was to blame for this outcome, but the inadequacies of the individual white woman who employed young Indigenous servants, particularly her refusal, or inability, to carry out the domesticating, civilizing role demanded of her.

As Lucy Delap observed of Victorian servant humor, "it can be the unfunny jokes … that are the most revealing" for the historian.[42] The particularly awkward appearance of the Mrs. Anglomaniac joke in an early Indian school newspaper becomes less unexpected when we understand that the civilizing power of domesticity through the new outing placement system was at that time a somewhat dubious proposition rather than a given. Clearly, the "tense and tender ties" forged in the intimate domains of the home were as much a source of anxiety to the Australian and U.S. authorities as they ever were to colonial administrators across multiple and diverse sites of colonization.[43] In the U.S. and Australia, state surveillance to see that domesticity should do the work it was supposed to do betrayed a deeper anxiety around white women's civilizing capacities and cross-cultural domestic relations in the modern settler colonial nation. Foolish Mrs. Anglomaniac functioned prescriptively for an apprehensive Captain Pratt, directing patrons in their appropriate posture as employers of outing girls as he expanded the program under the watchful eye of the Indian Affairs Office. Alluding to other, older modes of colonial domesticity (both the imperial and the frontier), the joke might be seen more broadly as a reorientation of the idea of domesticity-as-governance for a modern settler colonial nation, in which the performance of maternalism was central.

It appears, too, that many employers either did not understand or did not share the

[40] From 1925 in New South Wales, for example, conditions for employment of apprentices included the requirement that they be fed, clothed, and lodged by their employers "in a proper manner," and that "their moral training shall be duly cared for by their employer," with no explicit statement about the purpose of the placement. "Conditions of Employment of Aboriginal Apprentices Boys and Girls," enclosed in Minutes of the NSW Aborigines Protection Board, September 14, 1925, Minute Books [Aborigines Welfare Board], State Archives and Records Authority of New South Wales.

[41] A. O. Neville, *Australia's Coloured Minority: Its Place in the Community* (Sydney, 1947), 190. See also J. W. Bleakley, *The Aborigines of Australia: Their History, Their Habits, Their Assimilation* (Brisbane, 1961), 168–169.

[42] Lucy Delap, "Kitchen-Sink Laughter: Domestic Service Humor in Twentieth-Century Britain," *Journal of British Studies* 49, no. 3 (2010): 623–654, here 628. Delap refers to the work of Robert Darnton in making this point.

[43] Ann Laura Stoler, "Tense and Tender Ties: The Politics of Comparison in North American History and (Post) Colonial Studies," *Journal of American History* 88, no. 3 (2001): 829–865, here 831.

domestic ideals prescribed for them—although we must always be cautious in reading their experiences and perspectives through the state's own records of control. There was, of course, a fundamental contradiction, in that the state's purported monitoring and surveillance of employers did not translate in any way to genuine protection of the young women who were sent to them, to ensure that they were not abused and neglected by their mistresses. Rather, the disciplinary domesticity exercised by the state toward female employers can be regarded as a discursive device, ensuring a public assertion of the domesticity these employers were supposed to visibly perform in their homes.

To observe that the white middle-class female employers came under regimes of control is not to diminish or dismiss the inequalities of power and the very real oppressions that the Indigenous girls and young women they employed had to endure. Rather, it is to acknowledge that within the larger social order, all women were objects of a complex reform agenda and subjects of state surveillance. The modernizing industrial state of the early twentieth century looked to the home as the key arena for reshaping Indigenous people in an era of modern citizenship, while simultaneously and more broadly reforming interactions between Indigenous and settler communities. Clearly less than sanguine about the capacity of white women to demonstrably offer the kind of maternal, affectionate care that justified the removal of Indigenous girls to service in the first place, the authorities articulated prescriptive norms of a modern domesticity that centered upon displays of maternal care on the part of the white mistress. Such interventions inscribed power relations of tutelage between the state and white women in the employers' requisite performance of white womanhood as domesticity, even as domestic relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous women were ordered by the state. The state's position in relation to Indigenous women—to reform and control Indigenous women through imposed domesticity—was made explicit, but in the process the white woman, too, was to be refashioned, as the perfected, domesticating white citizen.

Victoria K. Haskins is Professor of History at the University of Newcastle, Australia, in New South Wales. She has published widely on domestic service, gender, and colonial histories, particularly in regard to Indigenous histories in Australia and the United States. Her books include *One Bright Spot* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005); *Matrons and Maids: Regulating Indian Domestic Service in Tucson, 1914–1934* (Arizona University Press, 2012); *Colonization and Domestic Service: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (Routledge, 2014), coedited with Claire Lowrie; and most recently *Colonialism and Male Domestic Service across the Asia Pacific*, co-authored with Julia Martínez, Claire Lowrie, and Frances Steel (Bloomsbury, 2018). She is series editor for the new Bloomsbury series Empire's Other Histories.