

WALTHER, MEREDITH E., Ph.D. Learning to Ask: Philanthropic Struggles and Rewards of Women Forging the Path toward Transformation 1865 – 1920. (2011) Directed by Dr. Leila Villaverde. 215 pp.

The purpose of this dissertation is to understand why representations of women's educational philanthropy are often invisible in historical context. The political and economic power structures that existed between 1865 through 1920 are examined to understand how women created social change through educational philanthropy. The concept of philanthropy is (re)defined to be more inclusive of monetary giving, as well as volunteerism. My research focuses on three women and a society: Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, who established schools that later became Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, Palmer Memorial Institute and Warren Wilson College, all located in North Carolina.

Using the framework of postmodern feminist theory infused with black feminist theory, the methodology of this work is rooted in historiography. Examining primary sources enabled new interpretations of the life experiences of the women mentioned above and their philanthropic work. The research resulted in understanding that the influence of family, learning of the need for their philanthropic work, a vision for social change and struggles with the issue of power were the main influences on those women's educational philanthropy. Women have historically been dismissed and generally excluded from this field. Our work today as fundraisers, philanthropists and researchers must be to eradicate such exclusion.

LEARNING TO ASK: PHILANTHROPIC STRUGGLES AND REWARDS
OF WOMEN FORGING THE PATH TOWARD
TRANSFORMATION 1865 – 1920

by

Meredith E. Walther

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2011

Approved by

Committee Chair

To my grandmothers Elizabeth DeBard Thorn and Jewell Eaton Walther
who taught me the value of education, each in her own way.

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of
The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____

Committee Members _____

Date of Acceptance by Committee

Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I owe a huge debt of gratitude to Dr. Leila Villaverde, who has been an outstanding advisor. Her insight and attention to thoughtful detail pushed me to consider my work in ways that brought growth and depth to my research. Her organization, professionalism and moral support have been much appreciated.

Thank you also to my committee, without whom I would have not grown and pushed myself further to know my subject matter in more depth. Dr. Camille Wilson Cooper grounded my interest in black feminist theory and encouraged my writing by providing additional, thoughtful suggestions for my research. Dr. Glenn Hudak sparked my interest in postmodernism throughout the course work. His enthusiasm for the subject matter encouraged me to challenge myself through development of the theory. Dr. Dale Schunk encouraged me to think beyond the three women and a society in my study to thoroughly understand the circumstances and societal structures that influenced the philanthropy of these women. Having been the past Dean of the School of Education, he also had the opportunity to visit donors with me and understands the power of philanthropy. Dr. Patti Stewart contributed her expertise in fundraising and encouraged my studies while patiently allowing me to continue my full time job as Director of Development at the University. I am forever grateful for her understanding and flexibility.

Thank you to Dr. Barbara Parramore, who kindly and thoughtfully reviewed my dissertation before I handed it over to my advisor for first review. Thank you to Jim

Kehoe and Dennis Huston who nicely reviewed and edited my final dissertation. And thank you to the archivists and librarians who helped me uncover the untold stories of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church. Without their expertise and solid knowledge of their archives I would not have been able to write this dissertation.

My colleagues at UNCG must also be acknowledged. I am forever grateful that I have worked at a place that has given me the flexibility and support needed to finish this degree. It has not been easy balancing a full time job with a Ph.D. program but I have done it with their help. Thank you especially to the directors of development who I am proud to call my colleagues as well as good friends.

To my parents, Robert and Eleanor Walther, who have always supported me in whatever direction my life has taken, thank you for your love, guidance and wisdom. My paternal grandmother, Jewell Walther, has been an inspiration and a rock in my life. Her faith in my journey means more than she will ever know. And my maternal grandmother, Betty Thorn, was a true believer in education and always told me that life may take away all worldly possessions but one can never lose what one put in her mind. She is responsible for my college and graduate education and I know she has been with me on this journey smiling from above. My sister Julie, her husband Dennis, and their beautiful girls, Samantha and Taylor, have given me a fabulous retreat in Chicago when I needed a break from my academic work and I thank them.

There are so many friends, and you know who you are, that have listened to me go on and on about the research and writing, my work, and the life balance I have tried to maintain. Thank you for listening to me throughout this process. Your love and belief in me kept me going.

And finally, I am grateful to the women who have forged the path before me allowing space for other women to follow in the world of educational philanthropy. Thank you Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown, members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church and all those other untold women who gave their time, talent and treasures for social change. Thank you for your giving, asking and leading. Your achievements have inspired me to be a better fundraiser, researcher, philanthropist and person.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Definition of Philanthropy	2
Background	5
Statement of the Problem	11
Significance of the Problem	14
Research Question	17
Overview of the Literature	19
Personal Assumptions as a Researcher and as a Fundraiser	24
II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	28
Why Look to History?	28
Postmodern Feminism as a Theoretical Framework	35
Women, Education and Philanthropy	48
III. METHODOLOGY	52
Research Questions and Purpose of the Study	52
Research Design and Methodology	53
Explanation of the Research Methodology	60
Data Collection and Analysis Procedures	62
IV. HISTORICAL FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	71
Historical Framework	75
Women's role in the 19th century	76
Women, economy and politics	78
Women, education and North Carolina	81
Education, philanthropy and women	92
Sharing the Stories	99
Mary D. Biddle and Johnson C. Smith University	99
Emily Prudden and Pfeiffer University	103
Charlotte Hawkins Brown and Palmer Memorial Institute	118

Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church and Warren Wilson College	134
Discussion and Analysis	149
Support of family and friends	149
Learning the need.....	154
Vision for a better future.....	161
Power and philanthropy	170
 V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 176
Impact and Importance of Historical Study of Women	177
Impact on Women and Educational Philanthropy	180
Recommendations for Fundraisers	187
Include women in the conversation	187
Giving circles	190
Connect family.....	191
Point of entry.....	191
Vision.....	193
Recommendations for Philanthropists	194
Embrace the term philanthropist.....	196
Younger donors.....	197
Avoid building parallel systems.....	198
Strategic giving.....	198
Philanthropy is power	199
Recommendations for Future Research	202
More research on women, philanthropy and education	202
Making research accessible.....	203
Minority philanthropists.....	204
Faculty education	204
 REFERENCES	 206

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION



One must return to the past in order to move forward – Akan saying

As a Peace Corps Volunteer in Ghana, I learned about the rich history of the country, including many varying tribal histories. The Akan people are well known for their Adinkra symbols. These symbols tell stories that are constant reminders of their connection to their ancestors. It is also true with the lives of the women in this study. Their lives reveal symbols of the time in which they lived through their language and actions. The symbol of Sankofa reminds us that we too must look back to move ahead. It is depicted through an image of a bird looking back toward her egg. So often we forget to reflect on the experiences of our forefathers and mothers to expand our understanding of the changes that have taken place, as well as offering us the strength and courage to press forward for continued social change. Villaverde, Kincheloe and Helyar (2006) also understand this concept. They write, “In this context *sankofa* becomes a key historiographical concept that it provides compelling multilogical perceptions of how the

present came to be and the possibilities of the future portends” (p. 328). Reflecting on my experiences, both personal and professional, I realize that looking to history to better understand the philanthropic actions of women and education enhances my work as an educational fundraiser; looking back to move ahead. I have narrowed the parameters of my study to include four schools located in North Carolina. They are Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, Warren Wilson College and Palmer Memorial Institute, all of which continue to operate with the exception of Palmer Memorial Institute. These educational institutes were started by women, Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, who understood the importance of education at a critical moment of history. Through their philanthropic actions, they were able to make significant social changes in the education of Freedmen, mountain boys, and black and white children in North Carolina.

Definition of Philanthropy

To better frame this study, a working definition of philanthropy is required. There have been varying definitions over time. As language tends to shift meaning through time, it is natural to expect the definition of a powerful word such as philanthropy to do the same. The origins of the word are found in the Greek language; philoanthropia – love of mankind or kindness to humans. This early concept set no limits on what sort of kindness may be offered and it certainly was not tied to a certain amount of money. Kathleen McCarthy (2003) writes of philanthropy in colonial America explaining:

Rather than the privilege of a few, it [philanthropy] was the practice and prerogative of many. Black social activists, white abolitionists and educational patrons, even female labor reformers adopted the term, defining themselves as ‘philanthropists and lovers of equal rights’ in their campaigns. (p. 3)

The term shifted toward a more exclusive meaning in the 1800s and early 1900s when the United States shifted from an agricultural focus to a manufacturing country. Wealthy businessmen took on the role of donating large amounts of money to support libraries, museums and colleges. Many today would still consider philanthropy a term for the rich, mostly white males, who give large sums of money to support their passion. However, Paton and Moody (2008) define philanthropy as “voluntary action for the public good” (p. 6). There are many words to describe philanthropy: charity, benevolence, altruism, generosity, the list could go on but the point is philanthropy has been practiced in one form or another since the beginning of history.

Payton and Moody (2008) explain:

American philanthropy, as we define it, encompasses two million organizations, tens of millions of donors and volunteers, millions of full time jobs, and trillions of dollars in expenditures and trillions in assets. (p. 16)

So, if language has evolved as American philanthropy has, why challenge the definition?

Because philanthropy is powerful. It changes lives and influences policy. The women involved in this study, Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, are examples of individuals who have made a difference because of their commitment to

education and social justice through their philanthropic work. The current definition of philanthropy excludes the work of these women because some of their gifts were not monetary they were gifts of service. Because the definition of philanthropy excludes this work, the names of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions are not found in popular history books as great educational philanthropists. Names that come to mind when we are asked to think of historical philanthropists may be Andrew Carnegie or John Rockefeller. Current philanthropists such as Oprah Winfrey, Bill Gates or Warren Buffet are often in the news. However, there are other women doing this work such as Betty Irene Moore, who in 2003 led her family foundation to make a gift of \$100 million to the school of nursing at the University of California, Davis and Marjora Carter, who has dedicated her life to developing sustainable environmental solutions starting in her own community with the South Bronx Greenway. With the exception of Oprah Winfrey, the other women mentioned are not well known, but they are philanthropists.

It is important to widen our current definition of philanthropy for the millions of women and people of color who want to engage in social change but don't identify as philanthropists, who don't see role models in the media who look like them, and who are giving back to their communities without recognition. The stories of the unseen philanthropists must be told. For this study, the working definition of philanthropy includes the gift of time and/or money with neither having a value greater than the other. It also includes a moral aspect as Payton and Moody (2008) assert:

...we present philanthropy as voluntary action that advances a vision for public good, as moral action that intervenes in the lives of others as to make the world better through human effort. (p. 35)

Background

The influence of women's philanthropy has been felt for years; however, their voice and experiences have been hidden. Women were active participants in the history of American philanthropy. Women like Isabella Graham, who began the Society for the Relief of Poor Widows and Small Children in 1797, or Catharine Beecher, sister of Harriet Beecher Stowe, who began Hartford Seminary for girls in 1823, "conceptualized teaching as a philanthropic activity: proffering the gift of education rewarded both the giver and recipient" (Huehls, 2005, p. 40). By the 1980's historical research and writing about women's history had emerged from the feminist movement. Cowman and Jackson (2003) state there were calls to change history by creating:

'Herstory' rather than 'History' in an attempt 'to convey the idea that for too long history has been a male preserve, telling stories of men for men.' Feminist historians also realized that the project of history was not as simple as one of telling stories, of reconstructing narrative for a particular audience in order to enlighten, or possibly entertain. (p. 35)

Cowman and Jackson continue, "History's tales were not innocent narratives but held a wider political purpose, the potential to create or reinforce dominant paradigms, national identities and cultural norms" (p. 35). As we have seen with the history of philanthropy, the names associated with great wealth and giving are generally those of men. How many people recognize that Lady Anne Moulson was among the first to make a significant gift of scholarship to students of Harvard? Her gift made an education at Harvard possible

and was significant enough to have the woman's college of Harvard later bear her maiden name, Radcliff. These histories (or herstories) need to be told and retold to gain a better understanding of the power structures that have influenced women's identity around philanthropy both in the past and today. hooks (2000) reminds us, "Sexism as a system of domination is institutionalized, but it has never determined in an absolute way the fate of all women in this society" (p. 5). Women of color, of different class, or sexual orientation may experience sexism in varying degrees. As we move forward with the research, it is important this concept remain visible. As a researcher, it is imperative to fill the gaps and omissions by adding to the body of research addressing women's philanthropy. As a fundraiser, this research is essential for two main reasons: 1) to educate development staff on engaging women in the conversation about philanthropy and 2) to encourage women donors to take a participatory, if not lead role, as a philanthropist. Exploring how Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions established four unique educational institutes in North Carolina through their philanthropic actions is a central contribution to women's history and the history of North Carolina. As an historical researcher, it is essential to (re)write this story so that future generations may know of the work their foremothers did to open spaces for women with regard to race, class and gender and to participate publicly in both philanthropy and education.

To understand how philanthropic roles have shifted within society, McCarthy (2003) explains:

When Jefferson wrote the declaration [of independence], voluntary associations were almost exclusively the providence of white male elite. Two decades later, African American mutual aid societies were evolving into the nucleus of the black church, and the first women's charities were seeing charters in Philadelphia and New York. (p. 13)

Over time these organizations would gain strength and numbers and make significant changes in societal structure, creating cracks in the patriarchal society which allowed women and people of color to step forward. McCarthy continues, "The advent of women's organizations in the 1790s added a feminine twist, providing tangible evidence for female virtue, valor, self-sacrifice and public service..." (p. 202) and for black Americans, "philanthropy had a twofold aim: helping others while helping themselves to combat racial stereotypes in terms that they themselves defined" (p. 202). Early in the nation's history we begin to see a shift from solely white male dominated voluntary organization to witness the beginnings of organized philanthropy by women and people of color. Because large monetary gifts were not common at this time and women generally did not have control over their finances, they did not have the ability to make large monetary contributions. Instead they, as members of black mutual aid societies did, relied on smaller gifts and volunteer hours contributed by members to support their causes. The Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church had great success with this method, so much so that they were able to demand from the Church full control over the funds they raised and autonomy to run their Board solely by volunteers, thus further elevating their visibility in public society.

Participation in the public sphere through associations or education slowly eroded the power a husband or father may have held over women in the home. McCarthy (2003)

asserts, “Husbands who legally owned their wives’ earnings lost that privilege when the funds were generated through associational activities that enabled their wives to collectively control, invest, and even loan funds themselves” (p. 57). Additionally, white women such as Emma Willard, Mary Lyons and Catharine Beecher, respectively sought to provide young women with a liberal education by establishing schools for upper and middle class white girls in Troy, New York, South Hadley, Massachusetts and Hartford, Connecticut. Huehls (2005) cites that Catharine Beecher after a brief engagement to Alexander Fischer ended because of his death at sea, “...made a conscious and irrevocable decision to remain a single and financially independent woman, making the school and its success her primary objective” (p. 43). Two of the women in this study followed this example; Emily Prudden never married and Charlotte Hawkins Brown had two brief marriages both, of which failed. Through the work of philanthropy, as defined in this paper, women were able to slowly claim a position in the economy by either earning their own funds as a teacher or gaining status and mobility through charity associations.

The stories of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the women of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church offer a unique perspective on philanthropy and education in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Their philanthropic work laid the foundation for Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, Warren Wilson College, and Palmer Memorial Institute. Of the fifty plus public and private colleges and universities in the State of North Carolina (North Carolina Independent Colleges and Universities, 2010), only three find their origins in the

philanthropic work of women: Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, and Warren Wilson College. The fourth institute I have included in the research is Palmer Memorial Institute. At one time Palmer attained the brief status of junior college but was unable to maintain finances and closed its doors in 1971. Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, Warren Wilson College and Palmer Memorial Institute were selected because of their distinctive connection to women's educational philanthropy in North Carolina. Although these schools each began serving different populations across the State, and have very different missions today, the underlying commonality is the way in which they were founded, through the philanthropic actions of women. These women, with varying backgrounds, demonstrate an awareness of their positionality through race, class and gender that enabled them to be philanthropic. Johnson C. Smith University began with the vision of The Reverend S. C. Alexander and The Reverend W. L. Miller, both white men, who thought there needed to be a college for Freedmen in the South. They presented this need to the Catawba Presbytery and opened the school in the old Charlotte Presbyterian Church in 1867 (Johnson C. Smith University, 2010). Mrs. Mary Biddle, a white woman from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, made an initial donation of \$1,400 to the school to fund the modest beginnings. Pfeiffer University was originally established as Oberlin School and Home by Emily Prudden. She founded the school for white children in 1885 with the purchase of farmland in the foothills of North Carolina. Over her lifetime, Miss Prudden, a white woman, would create fifteen schools throughout the area for both black and white children, turning them over to other organizations for operation once the school was firmly established. Palmer Memorial Institute was founded

in 1902 by Charlotte Hawkins Brown, a young black woman. The school was originally named the Bethany Institute by the American Missionary Association, whose mission was, “to bring the Gospel, freedom, and education to all, but particularly blacks” (Wadelington and Knapp, 1999, p. 5). The American Missionary Association closed Bethany Institute one year after Brown began teaching at the school. Brown immediately began fundraising to support the school and reopened it as Palmer Memorial Institute. Finally, Warren Wilson College, located in the mountains near Asheville, was started as the Asheville Farm School for mountain boys by the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, a white women’s society headquartered in New York. The school opened in 1894 with funds from the women’s fundraising efforts.

Because of the philanthropic dedication of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions, four very different schools with four very different beginnings continue today, with the exception of Palmer Memorial Institute. Their initial dedication has enabled the schools to grow into the colleges and universities they are today. It is essential that the stories of these women and their work to break barriers across gender, race and class be shared to set an example for future women philanthropists.

During the time frame of this study, there were other women working to establish schools and increase educational access for women, minority populations and poor communities. They were white women such as Emma Willard, Mary Lyon and Catharine Beecher, mentioned earlier, who established schools for white girls and black women like Lucy Craft Laney, Mary McLeod Bethune and Nannie Burroughs who opened education

for black children. Additionally, across the nation, woman's boards and auxiliary groups were formed to disseminate the work of various religious organizations through education. These individuals and groups are discussed further in Chapter IV.

Statement of the Problem

The problem presented can be viewed as multi-tiered questions. The overarching question stems from the fact that representations of women's philanthropic actions in historical context are often invisible. Why are they invisible? What societal structures were in place, and perhaps continue to be in place, that dissuades women from making large public philanthropic gestures? Or perhaps what keeps these gestures hidden? Before these question can be addressed, we must consider what philanthropy means to women. How is the word defined and who defines it? Within the political and economic power structures that existed in the past, how did women move within and around to create change? Leavy (2007) notes, "...postmodernism looks at the knowledge-building process as one of creation versus the traditional science model of 'discovery' " (p. 91). Adding the layer of feminist theory to postmodernism opens spaces for the creation of new knowledge and additionally allows for political and social change. By exploring philanthropy through a knowledge-building theoretical framework, such as postmodern feminism, we are able to better recognize how women have learned to give and how they make the decision to give with the understanding that there is no one story, no exact truth. The story depends on who is narrating. Exploring philanthropic history through the lived experiences of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and members of the Presbyterian Woman's Board of Home Missions opens the dialogue for women's

giving and its invisibility. This research addresses why women's philanthropy is not much more visible today than it was over one hundred years ago.

I chose to use historiography as a methodology in this study because it allowed me to examine and (re)examine historical documentation to reinterpret situations in the past. It enabled consideration of the historical cultural context, in which the lives and experiences of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions were produced, to be viewed through the lens of postmodern feminist and black feminist theory. This makes it possible for the researcher to shift the center of focus from a male-dominated philanthropic world to one in which women and people of color were participating. As we know, and Raddeker (2007) reminds us, "What is taught as history (or told or written or performed as history) is *always* the reflection of particular interests, view and concerns" (p. 61). It is my hope, that through this historiographical study, the reader will better understand how the work of women in education and philanthropy furthered political and transformational changes in society.

By exploring the lives and experiences of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions, as they brought education to North Carolina through the establishment of their schools, we can reframe philanthropy to an ethical compass or moral biography as Schervish and Whitaker (2010) claim. A moral biography is a personal reflection of how one chooses to live their life. It contains critical moments, which Denzin (1989) would call "turning points" and have a significant impact on one's life. I suggest that the women in this study developed their own moral biography through their philanthropy as they moved through their lives. Like

the women of this study, Americans continue to be among the most philanthropic people of the world. According to the Giving USA Foundation 2008 report, approximately two-thirds of American households gave to charity. Education received 14.1 percent of all estimated giving (p. 10). According to Webber-Thrush (2008) "...when women are the philanthropic deciders of the household, they give nearly twice as much to education" (p. 34). It makes sense therefore that we celebrate and honor the philanthropic work of women in education rather than hide it. By examining women's philanthropy through a postmodern feminist lens, we can deconstruct why they made their contribution and shift the political balance enabling women's participation to become more visible.

Part of the problem as Luce Irigaray (1991) discusses is, "In our social order, women are 'products' used and exchanged by men" (p. 131). This is demonstrated particularly well through the experiences of the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church. Within the Presbyterian Church in the late 1800s women were not allowed to participate in business meetings, church leadership or be ordained as a pastor. Women carved a space through fundraising and volunteering which benefited the mission of the Church. When the male leaders saw the amount of money the women could raise for the Church, at no extra cost to the Church, the leadership encouraged the philanthropic work of the women. However, when these women were seen as becoming too powerful, demanding control over the funds they were raising, the Church leadership became alarmed and resisted giving the women further authority in an attempt at continued subordination. Irigaray (1991) continues, "So women have remained an 'infrastructure' unrecognized as such by our society and our culture"

(p. 131). Rather than seen as leaders in philanthropy, women have been relegated to the margins. She further observes, “Women’s social inferiority is reinforced and complicated by the fact that woman does not have access to language, except through recourse to ‘masculine’ systems of representation which disappropriate her from her relation to herself and to other women” (p. 131). The use of language by women and for women is a vital tool in deconstructing the social structures around women’s giving. The language the women used to describe those they served at their schools is indicative of how they were treated by their oppressor. Irigaray concludes that perhaps it is this social inferiority that allows women to critique political economy because women still remain external from the social constructs, on the fringe rather than the center. At the time when Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church began their schools, it was the norm that women were operating in the framework of masculine language. Women operated on the fringe of political society but through philanthropy they were able to create a new framework that was more inclusive. As the definition of philanthropy took on a more masculine tone focusing more on large monetary gifts and leaving out works of volunteerism and smaller gifts, women were again pushed to the margins. Thus the problem of invisibility of women’s philanthropy remains at the center of this study.

Significance of the Problem

The significance of the problem with women’s invisibility throughout American philanthropic history is that the exclusion of women philanthropists in the history books and the silencing of their actions have not ended. Women from all races, classes and

religions continue to be active philanthropists, but do not receive public recognition for the work they do, much of it in education. hooks (2000) notes:

It is essential for continued feminist struggle that black women recognize the special vantage point our marginality gives us and makes use of this perspective to criticize the dominant racist, classist, sexist hegemony as well as to envision and create counter-hegemony. (p. 16)

It is critical for this research that not only black women, but women of all colors push for further change that is inclusive of difference as it relates to philanthropic giving, especially coming out of the South.

After the Civil War, with North Carolina still reeling from the loss of men, resources and finances, the state of education sank further. However, missionaries from the North, many of them women seeking independence from traditional family life, traveled south to start schools for both black and white children. Unfortunately, we often find records of the work women did diminished or destroyed (Huehles, 2005, Wadelington, 1999). Research in the area of women's educational philanthropy is lacking. Hélène Bowen Raddeker (2007) notes:

Academic history often serves the interests of those in power, whether it be at the level of state/nation/society or in the academy itself where history will often reflect dominant ideologies or intellectual paradigms. Sometimes it will contest them, too, but not always without attendant risks (academic positions, tenure, promotions, research funding and so on). (p. 61)

Research into philanthropy and the study of women has been of little concern to mainstream historians and academics. Only recently when fundraisers have been forced

to look for alternative sources for donations have they seriously considered women as prospects. The same is true with academic research in the area of philanthropy and education. Noah Drezner (2010) noted in his guest editorial in the *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, "...members of the higher education scholarly community have claimed that the study of philanthropy and fundraising in higher education is not central to the understanding of post-secondary education" (p. 194). If the study of philanthropy is shunned in the scholarly community, the study of women and philanthropy is even further marginalized. Historically, it seems, there has not been a need to consider women and philanthropy when gifts to academia have generally been credited to men. However, upon further examination, it was often the woman of the family who gave her time as a volunteer and later influenced her husband to support with finances. The financial dependency on men changed when women began forming women's societies, fundraising for their church communities and gaining economic freedoms through employment as teachers or missionaries. This new freedom enabled women to then decide if they wanted to marry rather than it being a requirement for survival. It is all the more critical then that we open previously sealed areas of philanthropic ideals. The path Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions forged was transformative. Through their work in educational philanthropy they were able transform political, ideological and economic structures around gender, race and class, but their work has hardly been acknowledged; thus the significance of the problem remains invisibility.

Research Question

This research is as much about social change as it is about philanthropy. It is important to understand that those in power are the ones who write the history, asserting what is important to retain and what can be forgotten. It is my responsibility as a researcher to resituate this power so that the stories and experiences of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions who have previously been silenced are now heard. In doing so I intend to address the following questions: *historically, why are stories around women's philanthropy invisible?, how do women define philanthropy? And what does it mean to be philanthropic?, how have women learned to be philanthropic?, and how has the societal definition of philanthropy shifted in time and what are the benefits and concerns of this shift to women's agency?*

Chapter II addresses the conceptual framework for the research specifically examining the importance of looking to history to address questions of today. The chapter introduces the intersection of philanthropy, education and women through a historical overview while also introducing historiography as a research tool. Historiography enables the social construction of philanthropy to be reexamined demonstrating that women were making philanthropic contributions throughout U. S. American history. Additionally, Chapter II establishes my theoretical framework of postmodern feminist theory with a subtenant focus on black feminist theory. I offer my interpretation of these individual theories and address how they cohesively merge to support my research. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the historical absence of women's giving to education in

both formal and informal context. Women continue to be excluded, or at least marginalized, from philanthropy today. The intention of Chapter II is to introduce this notion along with the conceptual framework shaping the research.

Chapter III addresses the methodology by first offering how I arrived at the topic of women, education and philanthropy through the experiences of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church. I then reinstate the research questions to remind the reader of the topic. The research design and methodology are discussed in depth, explaining my understanding of historiography and how it is used in this study. I use Denzin's (1989) interpretive biography as a point of entry because he offers nine assumptions a researcher must be concerned with when exploring biography. These nine assumptions align nicely with the thinking of postmodern feminist theory and offer firm thought for consideration. I then layer Raddeker's (2008) guidelines for historical research as a firm channel for my study. Her guidelines enable me, as a postmodern feminist historian, to explain how social structures influence the lives of the women in my study. The concluding section of Chapter III describes the data collection and analysis procedures in which I discuss visiting the colleges, exploring archives and reading primary sources to discover untold stories of the women in this study.

In Chapter IV the historical findings and analysis are presented. This chapter offers an opportunity to learn about the philanthropic giving of women in North Carolina which laid the foundation for Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, Warren Wilson College and Palmer Memorial Institute. There is a brief review of the economic,

political, educational and philanthropic climate of the United States and the State of North Carolina from 1865–1920, the years in which the study is grounded. This historical overview specifically addresses how women participated in these arenas. The overview permits a better perspective on the lives of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church as they navigated their way through daily life seeking social justice through educational philanthropy. The chapter highlights each of the three women and the society sharing their philanthropic experiences through primary and secondary sources. Once each story has been told, the analysis unfolds revealing four commonalities with all women in the study: 1) the influence of family and friends on the women’s giving, 2) learning about the need and learning to ask others for support, 3) visioning a better future for the next generation, and 4) understanding and working with, in and around issues of power. These four areas are discussed within the theoretical framework drawing Chapter IV to a close.

The dissertation concludes with Chapter V, which offers a summary of the research questions and their answers along with implications of the research, recommendations for fundraisers and for philanthropists, as well as ideas for future study.

Overview of the Literature

Research in the area of philanthropy has only become a scholarly pursuit in recent years with the exception of Jesse Brundage Sears’ dissertation written in 1919 and published in 1922. Sears’ work, republished in 1990, adds an important piece of literature on philanthropy and higher education to American history. His dissertation titled,

Philanthropy in the History of American Higher Education, was published by the U.S. Bureau of Education. In addition to contributing an important piece of scholarly research to fundraisers working within higher education, his dissertation was the first piece of American research to mention women donors, however few. After his brief nod to several women philanthropists there had been little research on the topic until the last twenty years.

Most of the information on philanthropy and women has been written for fundraisers seeking new ways to engage donors. Payton and Moody (2008) observe, “Scholars have only recently been studying it [philanthropy] systematically.... Our knowledge of philanthropy is tacit, experiential, tentative” (p. 11). The idea of working with women specifically has become a hot topic in recent years as fundraisers seek new ways to increase the dollars raised for their institution. Articles and books have been published to explain how women are different from men in their giving patterns and how non-profits can encourage women donors to give to their institution. Martha A. Taylor and Sondra Shaw-Hardy are two well known forces behind this movement. In 2005 they edited *The Transformative Power of Women’s Philanthropy*. This book, sponsored by The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, begins stating that:

The discussions ...vary from practical to theoretical. The authors speak from their own personal experiences or present research to underscore how women have brought about change in the ways women are approached to give but also projects and programs to which they give. (Taylor and Shaw-Hardy, 2005. p. 5)

This book is an excellent resource for people working within the development world trying to understand how to work with women donors. It is the final book in a fifteen year series on fundraising. Interestingly, the first book in the series began with women's philanthropy and the series closes with the same topic. However engaging and important this work is, it is also limited in that it is aimed at those working in the field of fundraising rather than the academic community.

The second book of value is *Women and Philanthropy in Education* edited by Andrea Walton (2005), who at the time was Assistant Professor of Education at Indiana University within the Higher Education and Foundations of Education program. She is also a member of the Philanthropic Studies faculty at the same institution. The book concept began in 2000 when Walton had the opportunity to work for three years on bringing together scholars from various institutions to examine the history of philanthropy, education and women. The results are impressive because the book is not focused specifically for development professionals, although it is helpful; it is a scholarly look at the intersection of women's philanthropy and education. She writes:

Exploring the significance and variety of women's philanthropic action in education is important because both philanthropy and education were among the earliest spaces where women, though still acting within culturally prescribed roles, found opportunities to participate in the public sphere. (Walton, 2005, p. 5)

This publication is the book that influenced my interest in women, education and philanthropy as a research topic for my dissertation. Because Walton and other contributors widen the definition of philanthropy to include the amount of time women

gave as well and monetary gifts, they expanded the stories of philanthropy to be more inclusive. It is my intention to follow the work Walton has laid out and make an additional contribution to the stories of women, philanthropy and education in a thoughtful, scholarly manner. My hope is that by offering another interpretation of the historical experiences of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions, my research enables a better understanding to why the work of women's philanthropy has been invisible and how we can encourage more visibility among future philanthropists.

These two books are by no means the only materials on the topic of women and giving. However, as I have searched for articles, much of what I find are pieces written for trade journals such as *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* or *Currents*, published by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education. In researching books, several have been written on philanthropy and the morality of philanthropy in scholarly terms and I have used them to establish a framework around the research questions, but not directly in the analysis because they did not pertain to women's philanthropy, but to the idea in general. Instead I held close to the work of postmodern feminist theorists, especially Luce Irigaray to inform the analysis. Payton and Moody (2008) have recently published *Understanding Philanthropy* written for scholars and students with an interest in this area. However, as with other materials, it does not specifically address women's giving nor is the focus on educational philanthropy. Again, there are few authors and researchers who have specifically addressed women's philanthropy; add education to the mix and the pool of resources becomes even smaller.

With respect to researching Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions, more has been written about some than others. Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the Woman's Board of Home Missions both have extensive archived materials. Emily Prudden has less primary and secondary materials about her life and Mary Biddle has hardly a mention of her name in history. The challenge has been to give voice to each woman or society reflecting their moral biography in terms of their philanthropic experiences. Because I, as the historian and researcher, selected what I felt were critical moments in their lives that led them to their philanthropy, I acknowledge my own positionality in these selections and hope they honor the women's lived experiences. Very little information was available regarding Mary Biddle so her silence speaks for her place in society in the late 1800s. The material for Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the Woman's Board of Home Missions, each of whom began their work between forty and fifty years after Biddle, were plenty. I spent many days sifting through materials in archives in an attempt to find just the right pieces to tell their story succinctly. Each could have had a book written on their philanthropic experiences alone. Finally, Emily Prudden had less material than Brown and the Woman's Board, but a bit more than Biddle. Pfeiffer University has done a nice job maintaining her legacy in the University archives. These women were at the forefront of progressive education initiatives and contributed extensively to the role of women in education and philanthropy.

Personal Assumptions as a Researcher and as a Fundraiser

I came to this topic, a study of women and giving in education, because of my work as a director of development at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG). This university was founded with the sole purpose of the education of women. UNCG began in 1891 as The State Normal and Industrial School with three areas of study: business, home economics and teaching. The school became The State Normal and Industrial College in 1897 and was known as such until 1919 when the name changed to the North Carolina College for Women. From 1932–1963 it was known as The Woman’s College of the University of North Carolina. The last change was made in 1963 when the University admitted men and the name became The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 2010). I work mainly with women donors for two reasons; because many graduated before 1963, they are alums of The Woman’s College, and because I work primarily with the School of Education which continues to graduate a predominantly female student body. As any fundraiser understands, this position offers the great privilege of building relationships with extraordinary individuals, and in my case women who have devoted their lives to public service, teaching and/or family life. I have had the opportunity to know many fascinating women over the years and have heard numerous inspirational stories. Because of these stories, I became interested in better understanding why these women give to their university. Most of the women I work with do not identify themselves as philanthropists, although all of them are; they consider philanthropy, like most of modern society, to be the work of someone like Bill Gates or Warren Buffett. They do not see themselves as

change agents. In addition, women who graduated from college in the 1950s and earlier, are of a generation that had been socialized to believe the money was earned by their husbands and therefore they cannot take credit for the giving (Kaminski, 2002).

Perceptions about philanthropy change depending on age and experience with giving. My reflections on my work with donors are limited to my direct experience and may be viewed differently by others who do the same work. I acknowledge this personal bias.

My positionality is located through both the professional lens of my work as a fundraiser and my educational lens as a doctoral student. My personal background also plays a strong role in how I address my research. I was raised in a white middle class family and received a good public education, including my undergraduate experience. My sister and I were taught to look out for others, with the message ingrained in us that there will always be people who have more than us and there will always be people who have less. My parents led through example by taking us to soup kitchens to volunteer, exposing us to different cultures through travel, and enrolling us in different extracurricular programs with children who did not necessarily look like us. They were also careful to teach us that there were at least two sides to every story and encouraged us to think critically before acting or speaking. Virginia Olesen (2005) writes, "...postmodern feminists regard 'truth' as a destructive illusion. They see the world as a series of stories or texts that sustain the integration of power and oppression..." (p. 246). This may be why postmodern feminism resonates with me as a complement to my personal background, as well as my academic interests.

I consider myself an emerging postmodern feminist because I believe there is no single truth, only multiple realities. In addition, language does have an impact on society and it is constantly in motion. I also recognize that by deconstructing societal structures through critical review we must then rebuild the construct in a more inclusive and productive way allowing for social change. I am too much of an optimist to be solely postmodernist, taking things apart with no hope for what's next. Adding the feminist theory enables me to hope for a better future. Weedon (1997) writes:

Feminist poststructuralists argue that in patriarchal societies, knowledge and power work systematically to marginalize women, defining us as 'other' to the patriarchal order of meaning. (pp. 171-172)

It is my intention to address the idea of philanthropy in higher education within this patriarchal system, thereby bringing to light positions that may not have been considered and perhaps offer new insights on women's giving. In doing so I understand that I am developing a dialogue with the women I have researched. I am responsible for shaping this dialogue because I selected their words to respond to my research questions. The way in which language was used in the late 1800s and early 1900s is different from how it is used today. I have tried to take this into consideration as I analyzed the research. As I read the letters and documents written by Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church I could not help but to consider how the role of women has changed over time. I could hear the frustration of the members of the Woman's Board had with the male leaders of the Church and the determination they had to make changes. I also heard Charlotte Hawkins

Brown's disappointment with the slow progress of racial issues in the South. These voices merged with my personal experiences and assumptions to lay the ground work for my research. My analysis of the lives of these women as related to educational philanthropy is entangled with my lived experience. As a white woman working in the field of fundraising I may have approached my research with assumptions about women's giving that may not have been present when they were living. I therefore acknowledge that my views have been imposed on their experiences to tell a new story, hopefully one that has meaning for other women in the field of philanthropy.

Payton and Moody (2008) write:

We hope the study of philanthropy is interesting enough that it will someday permeate the intellectual life of the university, helping us to think more effectively about justice and welfare and truth. (p. 13)

It is my hope that my research offers the scholarly community new knowledge regarding women's history and educational philanthropy, to the fundraising community, a deeper understanding of how to work with women donors, and to women philanthropists, the encouragement to claim the title philanthropist for contributions made to the betterment of society through voluntary or monetary action.

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Why Look to History?

In establishing a conceptual framework, I must address why it is necessary to look to history for answers to modern day questions. The African proverb of the Sankofa states simply one must look back to move forward. If we critically examine the actions and deeds of our predecessors, then perhaps we can learn from their experiences, mistakes and successes. However, it is not always this simple. The stories of history can be told through many different voices with just as much variation in purpose; after all, as Kaestle (1992) observes, “historical truths are social truths” (p. 364). History is often emotional. Joel Spring (2005) asserts that we tend to romanticize history to identify with lessons from the past. He states:

One’s knowledge, images, and emotions regarding the past have an impact on our future. Individuals often make decisions based on what they believe to be the historical purposes and goals of an institution. (p. 2)

Therefore it is important to take into account the multiple voices throughout history before making decisions that will affect the future. There is no right or wrong position but many differing opinions about the past. Often, historically, the strongest political voice is the one that is heard and maintained. The stories of U.S. American history shared in public schools are told to impose the dominant view and maintain the dominant culture. It

takes critical thinking to explore alternatives and varying possibilities. In the case of education in the United States, much of our history has been told through the eyes of the Protestant Anglo-American patriarchal culture to ensure dominance. It should be no surprise that in a culture founded on Christian patriarchy that the stories of women and their philanthropy are diminished or buried rather than celebrated and shared.

It wasn't until the early to mid-twentieth century that the definition of philanthropy became more exclusive; available to those who made large monetary gifts as individuals or through a foundation that we begin to see the sole emergence of white men as "philanthropists." Walton (2005) offers:

Since women were not among the few who accumulated vast wealth in the postbellum decades and steered the course of foundation work, women's earlier and continued contributions were eclipsed as histories focused on the crucial but narrow understanding of philanthropy. (p. 9)

Prior to this shift individuals did not have access to large monetary amounts of wealth as were gained with the expansion of the U.S. post Civil War. Women were active before, during and after the definition of philanthropy shifted. They continued their work with the poor, sick and under-educated; however, because this work was often volunteer or received low wages, it was regulated as unimportant and left to bury while history celebrated the wealth and financial generosity of men.

Women seeking to gain financial independence from men often saw education as a means. By becoming teachers, women gained access to the public sphere while earning a small salary and serving society. Catharine Beecher, founder of the Hartford Seminary for girls, believed as Huehles (2005) notes, "If women were educated to improve both

themselves and others, they would bring about overall improvements to society” (p. 44). Education, as Catharine saw it, was a form of philanthropy. Education, however, was and remains very political. Walton (2005) sees three tenets that link philanthropy and education in U.S. history; 1) the reliance on local and voluntary services, 2) the use of public education as a place for social reform and 3) the funding of education by individuals and foundations. She asserts:

The confluence of these three tendencies, reflecting broader currents in U.S. social, cultural, and political history, rendered education a widely contested arena in which social opportunities for individuals and groups were shaped and philanthropy – emanating from a host of values, including self-interest – played a salient and complex role. (p. 22)

Because of this connection between philanthropy and education it is important to look closer at the role women played in education and philanthropy.

It makes sense that we must turn to history to examine the intersection of women, education and philanthropy. Each of the three subjects deserves careful individual examination. Much research has been done over the years directly pertaining to the history of education. The scholarly study of women’s history now has a presence in academic research. Philanthropy as an academic area is slowly beginning to emerge. However, the combination of all three, education, philanthropy and women, in academic research is rarely found. This study requires both reflection and the ability to look forward with careful consideration of gender, race, religion and class. While doing this we must reconsider as well as deconstruct the historical context and the power structures

to enable us to emerge with new, fresh ideas about the past and move toward a socially just future.

To understand the history of philanthropy we need to understand that every gift is connected to power. With each gift there is potential to create good or induce harm. Although postmodern feminist theory is my theoretical framework for this dissertation, it is important to acknowledge Western philosophers and theologians that have given great thought to the concept of giving over time. Great deliberation and care were at the forefront of giving in ancient times. Hands (1968) wrote that Aristotle said, “Giving and returning is that which binds men together in their living” (p. 32). In ancient Greek society as well as in the Roman Republic, gifts were given and returned as part of the fabric of society. They benefited both political and personal relations. There was a fine line in generosity between giving too much and giving too little. Aristotle, translated by Ostwald (1962), wrote:

A generous man...will give – give in the correct manner – because that is noble. He will give to the right people, the right amount, at the right time, and do everything else that is implied in the correct giving. Moreover, it will give him pleasure to do so, or (at least) no pain; for to act in conformity with virtue is pleasant or painless, but certainly not painful. If he gives to the wrong people or for the wrong motive, and not because it is noble to give, he will not be called generous but something else. (p. 84)

The ancient Greeks thought it important to be reflective about giving to be certain it's the right cause, the right timing and the right motivation. If not, the gift could be interpreted as something other than the donor's intention. Smith (2006) found that Seneca had similar thoughts on generosity writing:

A benefit [of giving] was not a business deal; gifts were made to be given purely for the sake of giving. He consequently distinguished the bestowing of gifts from financial transactions. (p. 19-20)

In fact, Seneca encouraged the donor to give swiftly but thoughtfully. Both Seneca and Aristotle spoke of the anonymous gift as the best way of making a gift so the receiver does not feel the need to reciprocate and the donor is relieved of self-serving motivations to give. Although this was rarely done in ancient Greece and continues to be as uncommon today, Smith (2006) notes Aristotle's general insights on the idea of the anonymous gift by writing, "He maintained that the only morally acceptable and truly generous gift was the one given without expectation of return" (p. 21). Jacques Derrida (1992) often regarded as the father of the postmodern movement, discusses the gift as something that is annulled each time it is reciprocated. In other words someone has to give with no expectation of getting anything back; no thank you, no reciprocal gift, nothing, in order for the offering to be truly a gift.

The ideas of Aristotle, Seneca and Derrida offer a perfect historical point of departure in understanding power relationships surrounding giving. Smith (2006) explains that the power of gifts reaches beyond the individuals directly involved in the exchange; they have a ripple effect that can reach future generations. Gifts also can mend political, social and geographic feuds over time. There are many tales of gifts healing rifts and creating bonds among people. Smith (2006) mentions the Maori belief that giving a gift is to give a part of oneself and therefore creates a connection to the soul between the giver and receiver (p. 15). Throughout Christian mythology we see examples of generosity. The Bible tells of Jesus praising a poor widow who gave two copper coins

while the rich also brought their gifts, but without as much sacrifice or consideration (Luke 21:1-4 Revised Standard Version). There are many stories like these throughout history that try to explain giving. It is simply something we do. What is behind the gift varies as much as who we are. However, unless the gift is truly anonymous, there is a reason behind the offering; perhaps it is to improve society, invoking the will of God, enhancing business, or it just feels right. Whatever the reason, there is a power dynamic found behind the gift. The issue of power surfaces in the philanthropic experiences of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions. The point is the gift is political. If we reflect, deconstruct and (re)construct situations from history, we create new spaces for growth and understanding.

Exploring history through the tool of historiography opens spaces for critical examination. It is an especially helpful tool when looking at the intersection of women, education and philanthropy through the study of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church. Iggers (1997) writes:

...traditional historiography had focused on the agency of individuals and on elements of intentionality that defined reduction to abstract generalizations, the new forms of social science-oriented history emphasized social structures and processes of social change. (p. 3)

It is the new definition of historiography that I am using as a methodology in this dissertation. The use of historiography opens the doors of history to enable an honest and open dialogue which attempts to understand the social structures established within

society that allowed or disallowed actions. It makes history that was once sealed shut accessible to modern society and available for new interpretation or, as Iggers explains, it allows for, “a democratization of history, an inclusion of broader segments of the population and an extension of the historical perspective from politics to society” (p. 5).

Villaverde, Kincheloe and Helyer (2006) write:

Historiography exposes the frames and parameters of historical writing in order to further one’s understanding of the circumstances of the past. Historiography offers a method of intervention in the comprehension of and living in socio-cultural political events. It is the careful study of historical writing and the ways in which historians interpret the past through various lenses and methodologies. (p. 311)

By reexamining both primary sources and historical writings about the primary sources one may come to new conclusions about historical situations allowing for new interpretations and understanding of the social context and structures. In order to better understand Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions we must return to reexamine the social and political structures surrounding their actions. Scott (1999) observes:

The story is no longer about the things that have happened to women and men and how they have reacted to them; instead it is about how the subjective and collective meanings of women and men as categories of identity have been constructed. (p. 6)

In deconstructing past situations we must take a broader look at the situations to ensure we are not just telling the story of women who did interesting or great deeds, but demonstrating what pieces were in place to allow or disallow such movement in the

wider societal and political structure. The women's voices and stories are not the primary ones told in textbooks, but there is much value in exploring their work so that we may better understand their impact on the philanthropic actions of women today. Villaverde, Kincheloe and Helyer (2006) write, "We often run the risk of supplanting present values and beliefs on past events without careful recognition of the trappings of simulated time travel" (p. 312). By using historiography as a research tool, we can avoid these traps by considering the time and language used in historical documents. Of course, I am a product of the 20th century so it is impossible to analyze the sources without my biases, but they are recognized and shared.

We must look back to history so that we can better see the multiplicity of stories now available to us which have remained suppressed by society. In particular, this study will inform new ways of thinking about the intersection of women, philanthropy and education. All three areas are disciplines of their own but together they tell a more interesting story around giving, power and social change. This is best told through historiography which enables the researcher to search archived materials and reconstruct historical frameworks so that we can reframe our future.

Postmodern Feminism as a Theoretical Framework

Postmodern feminist theory allows for just such knowledge production to flow. This is the theoretical framework I have chosen to work with in this dissertation with an emphasis in black feminist theory. To better understand why I have chosen this theoretical paradigm as a base, I first must explain my understanding of postmodernism, feminism and black feminism because there are many varying ideas of these theories. I

offer a general overview of my understanding and the theorists I choose to use in my research. Then I bring the differing but cohesive paradigms together to create the lens for my research.

Postmodernism came out of a resistance to the Western canon, with thinkers such as Derrida, Lyotard and Foucault offering the idea that there are multiple truths (Powell, 1998). Derrida focused much of his work on the use of language while Lyotard, coming from a science background, introduced the idea of the metanarrative and cautioned against them. Foucault focused on the idea of the self and the connection to social institutions and power. These ideas released claims to knowledge that had previously been tied to singular and essential truths. By deconstructing the views of society, Derrida and others demonstrated cracks in the walls that led to wider openings for new ideas to be considered. Nicholson (1994) writes:

Postmodernism undermined the theoretical arrogance of these...political perspectives by showing that the foundations upon which each rested were themselves without ultimate justification and, like any other worldview, could be judged only within the context of historically specific values.
(p. 75)

Postmodernism opens possibilities to see historical situations through a new or different lens. It embraces fragmentation, discontinuity, conflict and multiplicity. Ebert (1991) explains:

“Rewriting” is a (post)modern strategy for what I call “activating” the “other” suppressed and concealed by dominant modes of knowing: it articulates the unsaid, the suppressed, not only of texts and signifying practices but also of the theories and frames of the intelligibilities shaping them. Voicing this silent “other” displaces the dominant logic – dislodging

its hegemony and demystifying its “naturalness” – and unleashes an alternative potential. (p. 888)

The point of postmodernism is to lift the veil so that we can see what was invisible while challenging the dominant discourse. Not a lot of research is available for Mary Biddle and Emily Prudden; more has been written on the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church and Charlotte Hawkins Brown. However, all have remained relatively unknown in the philanthropic world. By reexamining their work through the postmodern lens, I am able to find unwritten stories that allow me to give voice to their experiences with philanthropy and education. Postmodernism also allows me to politicize their work demonstrating their ability to push for social change.

The problem with postmodern thought is that after the deconstruction it is left for the reader to consider future implications. Many feminists believe that postmodernism endangers the work they have done historically to give voice to women because postmodernists dismiss binaries as a construction of society (Gardner, 2006). There is also the claim that Derrida and Foucault never truly included the question of gender in their work, thus making postmodernism more difficult for feminists to embrace (Gardner, 2006). What postmodernism does is expand a worldview. As Kirsteva (1980) writes, “Let us say that postmodernism is that literature which writes itself with the more or less conscious intention of expanding the signifiable and thus human realm” (p. 137). Although postmodernism has its limitations, it is a good tool for deconstructing and rewriting historical accounts to recreate history with specific attention to gender analysis.

The history of feminist theory has worked to move women out of the margins and into the mainstream of conversation. It has done a very good job of that through several “waves” of activity and many different forms of theory. Overall feminist theory seeks to uncover gender biases, inform and reconstruct knowledge. Gardner (2006) writes:

The fundamental distinction between feminist philosophy and mainstream philosophy is that feminist philosophy does not claim to search for knowledge for its own sake, but rather for the sake of a political goal: resistance to, and elimination of, the subordination of women. (p. xxiii)

This is my attraction to feminist philosophies; it is a means to social justice, there is a political purpose behind the work. Howie (2008) notes:

The recognition of otherness... whilst not the supreme goal of feminism, may well be the condition of historical narrative and woman-to-woman sociality, which is itself the condition for political intervention. (p. 110)

My research examines the historical situations of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church and their work in the foothills of North Carolina to explore through historical narrative their “otherness” to better understand the motivation of these women and their philanthropic efforts. Their culture and identity are crucial pieces to the understanding of their actions.

Ebert (1991) explains:

Feminism rewrites not only our knowledge of but also our construction of society by inscribing gender in social relations – that is, by articulating the gender differences patriarchy requires but naturalizes “as the way things are,” and conceals in the illusion of universality. (p. 888)

Through my research I intend to uncover the social situatedness of the women and their schools to better expose the system of patriarchy that was (and continues to be) imbedded in society. Scott (1999) writes:

The realization of the radical potential of women's history comes in the writing of histories that focus on women's experiences *and* analyze the ways in which politics constructs gender and gender constructs politics. (p. 27)

She continues to say that by doing this we don't simply tell the untold stories of women in history but we are sharing the impact their actions made on society despite the silence.

Black feminist theory understands that it is not only black women who are oppressed but other groups as well and vies for support and change within oppressed populations. Freedman (2002) cites Barbara Smith, member of the Combahee River Collective and active black lesbian feminist by noting:

In Smith's view, the struggle to free *all* women had to include 'women of color, working-class women, poor women, disabled women, Jewish women, lesbians, old women – as well as white, economically privileged, heterosexual women. Anything less than this vision of total freedom is not feminism, but merely female self-aggrandizement.' (pp. 91-92)

Whereas prior to the third wave that most feminist theory focuses solely on gender, black feminist theorists acknowledge, gender, race, class and religion may all be layered forms of oppression. Black women, because of gender and race, may experience a different type of oppression from white women. hooks (2000) acknowledges, "Sexism, racism, and classism divide women from one another" (p. 63). She goes on to mention all the splintered factions of feminism understanding women may have their special interest

groups but she notes, “Every woman can stand in political opposition to sexist, racist, heterosexist, and classist oppression” (p. 64). None of the women in this study recognize this more than Charlotte Hawkins Brown, a black woman from the South, educated in the North, who began teacher training college after high school in 1900. This was a time when most women, black or white, did not have the opportunity for higher education; Brown was exceptional and understood the many layers of oppression but pushed beyond.

The work of bell hooks and Patricia Hill Collins inform this research by adding to the discussion the multiplicity of oppression. Collins believes that by theorizing the experiences of every day black women, a unique perspective of society and community is formed (Collins, 2009). Brooks and Hesse-Biber (2007) note, “By asking the questions ‘which women?’ and ‘whose experience?’ feminists of color have broadened the scope of feminist research” (p. 19). By adding black feminist theory with postmodern feminist theory I have created a more inclusive theoretical framework that allows for deconstruction of societal structures as well as a wider reconstruction of women, education and philanthropy.

The women I am writing about, Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions pushed through established barriers with the goal of educating Freedmen, black and white children and mountain men of North Carolina in times when this was certainly not the norm. To explore the implication of their actions on society, postmodernism, feminism and black feminism are necessary and useful theories to deconstruct societal norms as well as

reconstruct political actions to introduce social change. The theories understand that no one story for any situation, group, agency or individual can be used as a metanarrative. Rather, they each allow us to see through the construct of patriarchy to imagine and create different realities. Postmodernism and feminism are not particularly easy schools of thought because there are many interpretations of both. However, Ebert (1991) writes, "...I believe that postmodern feminist theory is necessary for social change and that, rather than abandon it as too abstract, we need to reunderstand it in more social and political terms" (p. 886). Gardner (2006) adds, "The strength of postmodern feminist philosophy is that it deconstructs the discourse of Western intellectual thought; it does not replace this thought with another..." (p. 177). Rather, it allows space for thoughtful consideration on the part of the reader. Spaces are opened for discourses that were previously hidden, forgotten or all together closed.

I understand that there are many paths one could take when viewing philanthropy, particularly the philanthropy of women concerned with education. At the very basic level I needed to consider the benefits of a qualitative verses quantitative study. Because quantitative research calls for a hypothesis, researchers tend to know the results they are looking for as they begin the research and an objective stance is expected, I knew that my research would not fall into this methodology. It is not that did was unaware of what I intended to research; I had established my research questions early on in the process, but I found qualitative research more flexible. I strongly believe researchers cannot come to their work without a positionality, thus the concept of objectivity is mute.

I selected my theoretical framework knowing my research would be on women, education and philanthropy. I found myself attracted to feminist epistemologies. In reading further about the many varieties within feminist thought such as Liberal Feminism, Radical Feminism or Standpoint Theory, to name a few, I eliminated concepts such as Liberal Feminism because they, “do not believe that there needs to be new political, economic or social categories to end gender oppression” (McHugh, 2007, p. 72). Radical Feminism believes that by ending gender oppression all other forms of oppression would end thus requiring a focus only on gender and not on the multiple layers of identity that make up a woman. And although I do agree with many points within the Standpoint epistemology, I ultimately rejected it as a theoretical base because, according to McHugh (2007) researchers in this area tend to, “...hold that the view of the oppressed groups is more critical than the view of those within dominant culture” (p. 138). I believe that we must build a culture in which all voices are represented in a dialogue of social change otherwise we will continue to have the oppressed and the oppressor.

The decision to take one path rather than another eventually comes down to intuition. For me the intersections of postmodernism and feminism together with black feminist theory have an interesting connection. Often postmodernism and feminism have approached issues from opposite sides; postmodernists from the philosophical side, deconstructing the foundation, while feminists have approached social criticism as the primary focus (Fraser and Nicholson, 1990). Black feminist theory adds the additional layer of race to the conversation. Where these ideas intersect there is much to be learned.

McHugh (2007) explains postmodern feminism as, "...a positive positioning that can help to understand how women's different experiences, resulting from race, class, ethnicity, ability, sexuality and age, lead to different social positioning, different knowledge claims and different ways of being." Using deconstruction as a means to break through barriers creates space to apply a political agenda to the research which enables social change.

Ebert (1991) further breaks down postmodern feminism into two very different styles. First she describes "ludic postmodernism" which seeks to change relations between language and the world. It disrupts the flow and changes "cultural policy." Language becomes essential to poststructuralist thinking. Gannon and Davies (2007) write, "Poststructuralist theory turns to discourse as the primary site for analysis and brings a deep skepticism to realist approaches where the task of social science is to discover and describe real worlds" (pp. 80-81). Language is used to be disassembled in order to deconstruct the dominant culture. Kourany, Sterba, and Tong (1999) note:

Once it is stamped with the official seal of patriarchal approval, a thought is no longer permitted to move or change. Thus for Cixous, feminine writing is not merely a new style of writing; it is the very possibility of change, the space that can serve as a springboard for subversive thought, the precursory movement of a transformation of social and cultural standards. (p. 435)

Cixous and Irigaray both call for a new form of society in which the feminine is fully embraced. They do not advocate for the parallel structures which have been created and are very clear in the work of the Woman's Board of Home Missions. Irigaray (1999) asserts:

It clearly cannot be a matter of substituting feminine power for masculine power. Because this reversal would still be caught up in the economy of the same, in the same economy – in which, of course, what I am trying to designate as “feminine” would not emerge. (p. 446)

Ebert believes the ludic postmodernists focus on the language and details of deconstructing the textuality of language. She also describes another form of postmodernism as “resistance postmodernists.” Resistance postmodernism, Ebert (1991) writes, “...insists on a materialist political practice that works for equal access for all to social resources and for an end to the exploitative exercise of power” (p. 887). This point is critical to my work in that I wish to explore the stories of women who have been active and successful in the world of philanthropy with the hopes that their stories will empower women to embrace the word “philanthropist” and to inform fundraisers how to better interact with women donors so that women have a seat at the table for future negotiation and discussion around educational philanthropy. I do not seek to empower one gender over another, but rather infuse the idea of all people, regardless of gender, race or class working together for social justice and a space in the history books.

I acknowledge that the founders of the postmodern movement, Derrida, Lyotard, Foucault are all white, Western males who have not specifically written on the subject of gender. To this Cixous (1986) eloquently explains:

Men and women are caught up in a web of age-old cultural determination that are almost unanalyzable in their complexity. One can no more speak of “woman” than of “man” without being trapped within an ideological theatre where the proliferation of representations, images, reflections, myths, identifications transform, deform, constantly change everyone’s imaginary and invalidate in advance any conceptualization. (p. 83)

With this comment Cixous is essentially noting that any claim binaries may create on what is feminine or masculine should be dismissed because we cross over, interweave and are entangled despite what society may attempt to place as structure. Elam (1944) notes, “Gender is culturally determined, yet ‘culture’ is made up of an ensemble of gender determinations. It is hard to know whether to blame culture for gender stereotypes or gender for cultural stereotypes” (p. 43). Elam’s comment solidifies Cixous’ thoughts in that gender is interlaced, complex and has multiple layers. Society is not black and white but shades of gray; thus to state women are this or that would be doing a disservice to women overall. Gender identity is complex and deconstructing it certainly holds challenges.

My research is informed by the work of Fraser, hooks, Irigaray, Nicholson, and Scott because of their varied and extensive work in postmodern feminist, black feminist and identity theories. Additionally, I used the work of Raddeker to establish the framework for the historical and cultural analysis. I found that the work of these theorists holds significant value to my analysis. The reason that I found myself swayed to their work is because they acknowledge both postmodernism and feminism as important structures that can and do work well together. Fraser and Nicholson (1990) explain:

Both have offered deep and far reaching criticisms of the institution of philosophy. Both have elaborated critical perspectives on the relations of philosophy to the larger culture. And...both have sought to develop new paradigms of social criticism which do not rely on traditional philosophical underpinnings. (p. 19)

In addition, Fraser and Nicholson acknowledge postmodern feminism leaves room for no single solution for issues pertaining to women. They recognize the complex multilayered identities women carry with them. Furthermore, Nicholson also understands and writes about the concept of identity – both gender and race – noting how they are each social constructs that shift and change over time (Nicholson, 2008). Nicholson’s contribution on race and gender adds to the discussion of Charlotte Hawkins Brown, a young African American woman educated in the north who returned to her birth State of North Carolina to teach. Brown encountered many layers of resistance based on her many layers of experience. I also relied on bell hooks for culturally relevant work pertaining to Brown. However, hooks’ work as a black feminist overlaps into issues the other white women in my study encountered despite race. Finally, Irigaray, the most difficult of the theorists and the one most closely aligned with the work of Derrida, resonated because she has such passion for women finding a space of their own, through language, through gender identity and thoughtful analysis. Irigaray (1994) recognizes:

Living requires knowing how to stop, reflect, and even contemplate, so that we can be capable of situating ourselves individually and collectively. It is an essential condition for arriving at a fair decision concerning social and cultural measures. (p. 34)

In other words, women must take time to consider where we are as individuals and as a group to ready ourselves for the next step forward. It is just as the Sankofa calls for – looking back to move ahead. Within this research I am seeking to interject their ideas on the concept of women’s educational philanthropy and to understand the ideas such as those questioned by Gannon and Davies (2007):

How are such categories [i.e. male/female] constructed? ... How are social identities, the iterations of sex/gender, performed and sedimented in the particularities of people's lives? ... How are the unstable borders of these sites policed by individuals and institutions through oppositional and moralistic discourses and regimes of truth? (p. 75)

These questions align precisely with my research questions: Why are women's philanthropic stories invisible, how do women learn to become philanthropic and can we shift the concept of philanthropy to be more inclusive? To address these questions, a postmodern feminist framework allows deconstruction as well as reconstruction to the existing historical structure while looking at the political actions that enabled movement and success for these women and future generations.

Postmodern feminist theory often is associated with much academic intellectual discussion and is accused of not offering enough action. However, I would disagree because this theoretical framework requires constant movement, work with multiple discourses, and a constant attention to reflection and self awareness. It also depends on the definition of social action. Gannon and Davies (2007) write, "...worthwhile social action is underpinned by grand narratives (such as the relentless oppression of women by patriarchy) that imply large-scale social action as the ideal goal for feminists" (p. 91). The actions Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions were not recorded in the history books as "large-scale social actions." They were in fact very small gestures in the grand scheme of education and philanthropy but in reexamining the actions of these women in a historical context, we now see that their work to establish schools through their philanthropic gifts was pivotal to educating several marginalized populations (Freedmen, mountain men, and poor black and white

children in the foothills of North Carolina). Dill, McLaughlin and Nieves (2007) understand that social action can mean many things and one of the powerful components to postmodern feminist theory is the ability to work alongside many other disciplines.

They write:

It is intellectually transformative not only because it centers on the experience of people of color and located its analysis within systems of ideological, political, and economic power as they are shaped by historical patterns of race, class, gender, sexuality, nation, ethnicity, and age, but also because it provides a platform for uniting different kinds of praxis in the pursuit of social justice: analysis, theorizing, education, advocacy, and policy development. (p. 629)

For this reason postmodern feminist theory is applicable across many academic settings.

It can and should be adapted to a wide range of disciplines.

My decision to analyze the philanthropic work of women was certainly guided by my role as a fundraiser, but it was also influenced by who I am as a person. As a researcher, the opportunity to contribute to a field that has just recently begun to embrace scholarly research is an exciting endeavor. Postmodern feminist theory enables me to contest the official story, opening spaces for new untold stories to emerge and paths for knowledge construction.

Women, Education and Philanthropy

As early as the late 1800s, there was a concern among women about the narrowing definition of philanthropy. Andrea Walton (2005) begins her book *Women and Philanthropy in Education* with the following quote from Helen Hiscock Backus, an 1873 Vassar graduate:

I believe it rests largely with us to redeem the word philanthropy from the strait [sic] and narrow meaning thrust upon it in popular understanding, if not in lexicography. It has come to signify with most of us the giving of money, or of time or effort so considerable as to be the marketable equivalent of money, to relieve sickness, pain, poverty, religious blindness. It should mean far more, - the intelligent exercise of moral and mental power applied directly or indirectly through any and every instrumentality towards the physical, intellectual, spiritual elevation of the race, in the man or in the mass. (p. 1)

Backus' paper, *The Need and the Opportunity for College-Trained Women in Philanthropic Work*, was presented to the New York Association of Collegiate alumnae in March 1887. This early demonstration of the intersection between philanthropy, education and women exemplifies how women have been involved in shaping history. Women have supported the growth of public education by giving of their time as teachers, volunteers, and fundraisers as well as giving both large and small monetary gifts (subscriptions) to fund the growth of schools and colleges. They have created social change through their gifts and actions. Walton (2005) writes:

Despite the long list of women's philanthropic engagements, until recent decades women have been virtually absent from dominant accounts of U.S. philanthropy and remain excluded from, or at best marginalized in, the literature on educational philanthropy. (p. 2)

There is now a small body of scholarly work that has been developed in this area that explores white Protestant women's philanthropy, women's leadership within the black church, the role of Catholic nuns who address poverty and the welfare of others, as well as documentation of women supporting the arts, cultural institutions and education (Walton, 2005). All of these works build on the premise that the voices of women were

not being heard; women were making changes in the public sphere and it was not being documented. As Scott (1999) notes, women's history is not the writing of women in history but the writing of a new history.

The contribution my research makes to this body of work is twofold. First, reexamining the historical context through a postmodern feminist lens, the stories of women's educational philanthropy in North Carolina in the late 1800s and early 1900s offers a new history. It allows important inspection of materials, writings and actions of women that have not been previously examined to surface. North Carolina currently has thirty-six independent colleges or universities and fifteen public universities and one School of the Arts totaling fifty-two institutes of higher education, three of which were started through the philanthropic work of women (North Carolina Independent College and Universities, 2010, The University of North Carolina, 2010). It is important to acknowledge the beginnings of these colleges and universities. Secondly, by deconstructing the experiences of the women who began Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, Warren Wilson College and Palmer Memorial Institute, we are able to glean fragments and pieces of knowledge that demonstrate how social change arrived because of the actions of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions. We are able to offer this learning to women philanthropists, fundraisers and researchers today who are working in the sphere of women's educational philanthropy to better dialogue with women philanthropists about their experiences and continue the path of social change through education.

This work is important because, as Walton notes, “both philanthropy and education were among the earliest spaces where women, though still acting within culturally prescribed roles, found opportunities to participate in the public sphere” (p. 5). She also points out that historians have overlooked women’s giving to education in both formal and informal context. In doing so we have missed the cultural complexities and significant movements made possible because of the actions of women philanthropists. The point of this research is to widen our perception and vision for educational philanthropy. By broadening the definition as we did in Chapter I and rewriting history as in Chapter IV, we are opening spaces, creating a more fluid and authentic history of giving in North Carolina. Walton (2005) writes:

In all though they encountered gender-related barriers in nearly every sphere of life, including education and philanthropy, women were able, through channels of educational philanthropy, to promote new ideas, to advance their individual and collective goals, and to shape education in the U.S. (p. 5)

It is imperative that this field receive scholarly attention through theoretical analysis.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research design for this study. Using the framework of postmodern feminist theory infused with black feminist theory to ground the study, the methodology of the work is rooted in historiography. This chapter reiterates the research question, describes the research design and explains how the methodology was used. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the data collection and analysis procedures.

Research Questions and Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study emerged from my interest in fundraising and working with women donors in higher education. In my professional work as a fundraiser for higher education, I have encountered many women alumni, all of whom share interesting stories about how they came to give. However, I found that these women had not reflected on their experience around giving, asking themselves how they learned to give or why they give. Because they have not reflected on their own story, it is not a wonder that other stories of women's philanthropic experiences have not been passed down through writing or oral history. To better understand why women's philanthropy has been invisible, I turned to history to explore women's educational philanthropy. The study narrowed when I looked at North Carolina, where I currently reside, and learned that of the fifty-two four-year colleges or universities in the State (North Carolina Independent

College and Universities, 2010) only the foundation of three, Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University and Warren Wilson College, could be traced back directly to the philanthropic actions of women. When I mentioned the founders, Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden and the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church to others, I found people did not know these names nor that the schools were started by women's philanthropy. I added Charlotte Hawkins Brown and Palmer Memorial Institute to the study because although Palmer closed in 1971, it had achieved the status of a junior college briefly and the work of Brown coincides with the time frame of Biddle, Prudden and the Woman's Board of Home Missions. The point of this study, then, became to understand why the stories of these women were not well known and to understand how they came to learn about philanthropy and add it to their moral biography. I knew then that I needed to address my research through historiography because it would allow me explore history searching for spaces that were eliminated or silences and bring these stories to the present. All the while I conducted my research I kept the proposed questions in mind; why have stories about women's philanthropy been invisible throughout history?, what is the definition of philanthropy?, how have women learned to be philanthropic?, and how has the definition of philanthropy shifted over time?

Research Design and Methodology

To begin to understand what historiography is and how it has been used as a methodology in this study, let us first look to an explanation of interpretive biography because interpretive biography offers a starting point to enter the lives of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of

Home Missions. The entry comes through “turning-points” of individual lives which had an impact on their philanthropy which in turn impacted society causing social change. Denzin (1989) describes interpretive biography as, “the studied use and collection of personal-life documents, stories, accounts, and narratives which describe turning-point moments in individual lives” (p. 13). It is this “turning point” or “moral biography” as Schervish and Whitaker (2010) describe; a narrative of life intersections particularly pertaining to personal capacity and moral bearing, that are particularly interesting when studying philanthropy. The “turning-point” moments Denzin notes, and the “moral biography” Schervish and Whitaker discuss, are collected from documents preserved from and about the lives of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions in reference to their work with Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, Palmer Memorial Institute and Warren Wilson College respectively. Understand that the “turning-point” moments Denzin refers to and the “moral biography” Schervish and Whitaker note are moments in time selected by me, the researcher, with a different cultural context and research lens in place than these women had 100 years ago.

When using interpretive biography, Denzin (1989) notes that the researcher needs to be concerned with nine “take-for-granted assumptions” when developing a biography.

These assumptions are:

- (1) the existence of others,
- (2) the influence and importance of gender and class,
- (3) family beginnings,
- (4) starting points,
- (5) known and knowing authors and observers,
- (6) objective life markers,
- (7) real persons with real lives,
- (8) turning-point experiences,
- (9) truthful statements distinguished from fiction. (p. 17)

I offer Denzin's "take-for-granted" assumptions because they, in addition to the "turning-points", are a good introduction to historiography because the points Denzin notes are directly applied to my research. It is important to consider gender and class when analyzing the primary documents along with noting family relations. The selection of starting points is not as important to postmodern feminist theorists but the researcher does need to select a starting point and understand why. In my case I began the research with the first gift from Mary Biddle to Johnson C. Smith University in 1867. Additionally, knowing the authors through reading their letters, meeting transcripts and other documentation helps to create a better understanding of the women in the study. I used "objective life markers" to indicate how and when the women in this study began to understand and put into action their philanthropy. These markers are selected by me as the researcher and may only have importance because I emphasize them but they are important to the study. When conducting historiographic research it is also important to remember the people in the study were real with lived experiences that are culturally relevant to the time in which they lived. Having an appreciation of this enables me to better apply their experiences to the work of modern philanthropic women. The "turning points" are used to describe critical points in the lives of the women which directed them toward philanthropy.

However, there are several holes in Denzin's assumptions. He regretfully leaves out race in Number 2 as a consideration. I have included it in my study because in addition to gender and class, race plays an important role in educational philanthropy, especially in the South. Truths come in many forms and through many lenses.

Interpretations of “truthful statements” as noted in Number 9, may not represent the original meaning of the subject but still is potentially relevant to the research. It is therefore important to also understand the positionality of the author when reading historical research. Finally, I read Number 5, “known and knowing authors and observers,” as noting the importance of the researcher’s positionality and claim on experience. This is not a critique but an explanation as to how I interpreted one of Denzin’s assumptions. It’s also a good example of how different individuals may interpret particular research.

Postmodern feminist researchers are not especially concerned with beginning and end points, rather seeing experiences as fluid and fragmented. In fact, through this framework, it is the researcher who selects the starting and ending points, inserting her historical context into the research. I acknowledge that this is the case with my work. I selected critical moments from the lives of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions to share based on what I found interesting and essential as a researcher to open a discourse on women, education and philanthropy in North Carolina. As I reviewed the primary and secondary documents, common themes began to emerge allowing me to categorize the experiences of the women as they relate to the research questions on philanthropy. The main categories that emerged were the influence of family, learning of the need, vision for social change and struggles with the issue of power. As the themes became more apparent I focused my analysis on these areas. The research is grounded in the time period 1865–1920; a time in which there was much political action among women. It was apparent from the lack of archival

information on Mary Biddle in 1867 to the copious amount of materials on Charlotte Hawkins Brown in the 1900s that recording women's experiences became more important as time moved forward.

To build upon Denzin's ideas on interpretive biography, I turned next to Helene Bowen Raddeker, postmodern feminist historian, to explain historiography. Raddeker (2007) recommends six guidelines for historical research in the postmodern feminist vein:

1. a 'self reflexive' practice by the historian (a practice that includes both self criticism and frank admission of one's own position);
 2. an emphasis on leaving arguments open, or on the provisional nature of any argument or interpretation (an emphasis that accompanies a suspicion of closures of knowledge seen in traditional discourses);
 3. a focus more upon ruptures, breaks or discontinuities than on continuities in developments or processes in the past (a focus that seeks to avoid teleological and essentialist representations of the past);
 4. a recognition of 'difference' – differences of culture, race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, etc. – in order to avoid earlier tendencies to universalize cultures and homogenize people (a recognition that must nevertheless accompany an awareness that often differences are not natural but rather naturalized in social processes of differentiation);
 5. a rejection of humanistic views of identity, whether it be national, group or individual identity (modern humanist and individualist conceptions of identity being essentialized and static rather than discursively constituted in an ongoing process); and
 6. the view that historiography, the discourse of history itself, is at least a necessary focus of the historian, if not necessarily the only proper one.
- (p. 33)

The concepts Raddeker purports dictated the direction of my research. She offers a methodological framework for my research in an area that tends to approach history quite differently from mainstream historians. It is my job as a researcher to locate the primary sources and situate them within the context of the day. It is here that postmodern feminist

theory and black feminist theory merge with the methodology to highlight the fluidity of the situatedness. The theory and the methodology both allow for reflexivity, difference, and an understanding that arguments may remain open because there is no one correct answer, especially when examining historical context. hooks (1984) brings to our attention that there are many tenets to feminist theory, the main being that all women are oppressed. She writes:

This assertion implies that women share a common lot, that factors like race, religion, sexual preference, etc. do not create a diversity of experience that determines the extent to which sexism will be an oppressive force in the individual lives of women. (p. 5)

Women experience sexism in varying forms and layers based on the issues hooks mentions. Therefore it is helpful when using historiography, to use not only postmodernism to deconstruct, and feminism to rebuild or change society but to include black feminist theory to understand the depth of the oppression which may take many shapes and forms. Raddeker (2007) continues, “The virtue of studying history is that we are more likely to be able to recognize the historicity of such terms, the ways in which their meanings shift according to time and cultural/political context” (p. 101). The story of education in North Carolina and how it was told in 1867 is different from how the same story is told today because of the context, changes in society, ideas and language. As Kaestle (1992) observes, “historical truths are social truths” (p. 364) created by those in power. My research reveals new truths in history and opens new spaces for dialogue and action.

Throughout my work I have tried to closely follow Raddeker's guidelines to enhance my research and, as a new researcher, to be sure my focus stayed on target. I did so by remaining self reflexive in the process. I continually pulled back from my work as I was writing to try to see it in the larger context, understanding how my work as a fundraiser influenced my work as a researcher. Raddeker suggests an emphasis on leaving arguments open. While I present the material through my lens of postmodern feminist and black feminist theory, I acknowledge that there may be other interpretations of the women's actions. My context was focused on the philanthropic actions of the women which has not been examined this way before so I am open to dialogue on this topic. Raddeker suggests in Number 3 that the researcher focus on the ruptures and breaks in the story. As I researched each school and the lives of the women who founded them, I quickly found such breaks, particularly in the life of Mary Biddle. I found no personal letters, diaries, or other material written directly by Biddle but instead was forced to rely on historical records from the county in which she lived to document her life and family. The fact that there were no words directly from Biddle spoke louder than if she had written a biography. Another important guideline of Raddeker's is to recognize the difference and avoid universalizing cultures. One may be tempted to assume that because my research is based on the lives of three women and a woman's society that the stories of all the women are similar. In fact, the stories are all quite different. I present the research in four themes for the ease of the reader but the experiences of the women and how they come to their philanthropic work are all different. It is important to appreciate these differences as well as the similarities when reading my work. Finally, I have

attempted to demonstrate, as Raddeker purports, that the identity of these women was fluid; as they progressed in their philanthropic journey they each became more mature in their vision and goal. Understanding identity is a continual flux of development is important to this research and to practitioners of fundraising.

Explanation of the Research Methodology

Using interpretive biography as a starting point, and leaning more heavily on historiography as a methodology, strengthens the link between postmodern feminist and black feminist theory. hooks (1984) draws to our attention

Much of feminist theory emerges from privileged women who live at the center, and whose perspectives on reality rarely include knowledge and awareness of the lives of women and men who live on the margin. (p. xvii)

This is demonstrated clearly in this study through the work of Emily Prudden and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions. Historiography allows me to examine the lives of the women in the study through a new lens, opening spaces previously not noticed or submerged in history. My research involves deconstructing the sources to explore what is not present as much as what is actually found in the documents. It also involves comparing and contrasting experiences and moving the reader throughout a period of time while observing the historical, political and cultural framework that allowed change to happen. This methodology gives the researcher and historian license to further dissect history, unearthing what has been left untold. Examining primary sources, such as personal letters, county historical books, church speeches, informal biographies written by some of the women and meeting notes, around

the philanthropic activity of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church has enabled new interpretations of the life experiences of these women around their philanthropic work. However, it is not as easy as just reviewing documentation and reporting the findings. Raddeker (2007) questions:

Where they [historical figures] are clearly modernist, do we, for example, take as given the singular, centered and fixed identities that they claimed derived from the 'truth' of their experience? Or do we suspend the classic biographical concern with subjects' truthfulness by enquiring into the positionalities they performed, asking in what context and to what ends subjects spoke to the truth of their experience and formation of their identities? (p. 16)

I attempted to address questions like these throughout the study to ensure a subjective reflection on the lives of these women. To infuse my thinking with the actions of these women is to create a new way of engaging history and opening dialogue. This methodology, which seeks to explain how life has been negotiated by social structures, establishes a strong framework for my research. By looking back to historical moments and sources, I have created opportunities for others to better understand how women remained invisible in the philanthropic world and how they learned to become philanthropic.

Because I have not used interviews, ethnography, narrative or other interactive research methodologies, this study required the analysis of content material found in primary and secondary documents. According to Leavy (2007), "The goal of this kind of research is not to create conjecture about what should be there, but rather to deconstruct

the text to see what is revealed, what emerges, what juxtapositions develop” (p. 228). Deconstructing text not only considers what is present but what is not said, what is missing and what has been silenced. Language plays a critical role in postmodern feminist theory as Ebert (1991) notes, “Language acquires its meaning not from its formal system...but from its place in the social struggle over meaning” (p. 887). I, too, looked for clues as to the “social struggle” of these women in their world experiences with philanthropy and education. Historiography as a methodology allows for exploration into language, cultural spaces and agency creating an interesting approach to (re)discovering history.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

Denzin and Lincoln (2008) explain:

...postmodernists have contributed to the understanding that there is no clear window into the inner life of an individual. Any gaze is always filtered through lenses of language, gender, social class, race and ethnicity. There are no objective observations, only observations socially situated in the world of – and between – the observer and the observed. (p. 29)

It is all the more critical, then, to address the analysis with a clear understanding that there are multiple truths. The analysis I present in this study is based on my positionality, my research lens and the guidelines established by Raddeker (2008). I made every attempt to explore the experiences of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church with an open mind knowing that my imprint will make a mark on what is known about their lives.

In my research I visited the campuses of Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, Warren Wilson College and the historic site of Palmer Memorial Institute, now the Charlotte Hawkins Brown State Historic Site. Johnson C. Smith University and Pfeiffer University both had archival materials available to review. The Charlotte Hawkins Brown State Historic Site offered a tour of what was once Palmer Memorial Institute and had a small museum with materials from Brown's life work. Warren Wilson did not have any archival materials pertaining to the founding of their school. To obtain this research I traveled to the Presbyterian Historical Society in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to search their archives. The Society had an extensive collection on the Woman's Board of Home Missions. I narrowed my search to work pertaining to Western North Carolina focusing particularly on the Asheville Farm School, later Warren Wilson. I also narrowed the time frame to the work the Woman's Board of Home Missions took on just before they founded Asheville Farm School, around 1880, until the early 1900s. It was necessary to limit the scope because of the tremendous amount of materials available in the archives. The same is true for Charlotte Hawkins Brown. I narrowed my focus to materials from just before she began her school in 1902 through the early 1900s. Sources for the research around Brown came mainly from the Schlesinger Library at Harvard University. Brown's original papers are no longer available to the public but the entire collection is on microfiche so I was able to use inter-library loan to acquire this material.

The primary sources I used in this study contained personal letters from Charlotte Hawkins Brown and members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions to and from friends, colleagues, donors and community members, fundraising pamphlets from the

Woman's Board of Home Missions, and original autobiographical material from Charlotte Hawkins Brown and Emily Prudden, often just a page or two typed out but not completed. When working with materials pertaining to Mary Biddle I used books such as the Montgomery's 1886 *History of Berks County in Pennsylvania* and Jordan's 1911 *Colonial and Revolutionary Families of Pennsylvania* as a primary source because there was no other documentation on her. Secondary sources came from mainly books written about the schools or women in the study. Specifically, Inez Parker's 1975 publication of *The Biddle-Johnson C. Smith Story* was helpful with general information about Mary Biddle. Both Bernard Russell and Phoebe Pollitt were helpful with information on Emily Prudden; Russell with his historical account of Pfeiffer University and Pollitt with her dissertation titled *Emily Prudden and Her Schools*. Kathleen McCarthy's *American Creed: Philanthropy and the Rise of Civil Society 1700 – 1865* and J. M. Richardson's *Christian Reconstruction: The American Missionary Association and Southern Blacks* were both useful in learning more about women's benevolent societies as well as the history of American philanthropy. As a secondary source for my research on Charlotte Hawkins Brown, Charles Wadelington's *Charlotte Hawkins Brown and Palmer Memorial Institute: What One Young African American Woman Could Do* was invaluable due to the complete story Wadelington told of the Palmer Memorial Institute from the inception to closing of the school in 1971. For an historical overview of women in North Carolina I turned to *North Carolina Women: Making History* by Margaret Smith and Emily Wilson which offered both individual portraits of North Carolina women as well as placement of these women in historical context.

To address a variety of social issues between 1865 and 1920, the timeframe in which the women in my study established their schools, I included issues such as the economic, political and educational and philanthropic climate of the time. I integrate the actions (or inactions) of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church through an historical overview to allow the reader to better understand where each woman was situated in the historical framework. While doing so, I tried to keep my voice present so the reader does not forget that this is a story created by an author, researcher and fundraiser. Raddeker discusses ethnographic historian Greg Dening's work by noting:

...the author [Dening], is present in the text, reflecting upon the story he is telling. Typically, in them a descriptive narrative is interspersed with interpretation and also reflexive sections where he discusses his research experiences, inspirations, findings and methods. (p. 90)

Raddeker explains that this sort of historical writing makes some traditionalists uncomfortable. However, it is my belief that this style of writing actually allows the reader to remember what they are reading is an historical interpretation by the author. This approach creates more transparency to the research than other historical methods and allows for open endings and alternative possibilities. In her book *Composing a Life* Mary C. Bates shares the stories of five women's lives. Although all were living when she wrote the book, the framework she established deals with some of the complex issues I work with in my study. Bates (1989) writes:

These lives are in flux, lives still indeterminate and subject for further discontinuities. This very quality protects me from the temptation to

interpret them as pilgrimages to some fixed goal, for there is no way to know which fragments of the past will prove to be relevant in the future. Composing a life involves a continual reimagining of the future and reinterpretation of the past to give meaning to the present... (pp. 29-30)

There are always alternative interpretations. The stories I share are biographical but they are more complex than simple stories about getting from point A to point B. The research has opened historical dialogue in a new and unique way to explore the subjective history of very influential and philanthropic women.

The lives of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the work of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church overlapped in some instances. These women were aware of the work of those who came before them, as well as what their peers were doing in this arena. The members of the Woman's Board knew of the work the American Missionary Association (AMA) had done in the South before the Woman's Board ever formed as an organization. The AMA was the reason Charlotte Hawkins Brown left the Teachers College in Boston without her teaching certificate in hand. Charlotte Hawkins Brown demonstrated her knowledge of what others were doing in her letters. She communicated often with other women who had started schools to seek their ideas and share challenges. She wrote to Mary McLeod Bethune who opened Daytona Educational and Industrial Institute for girls in Daytona, Florida as well as women in the North such as Mary Lyons, who began Mount Holyoke years before Brown moved back to North Carolina.

To find such information, I located primary sources from the archives at Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, Schlesinger Library at Harvard University, the

Presbyterian Historical Society in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and The University of North Carolina at Greensboro as well as the Charlotte Hawkins Brown State Historic Site in Sedalia, North Carolina. Secondary sources included a dissertation on Emily Prudden and her schools, biographies about Charlotte Hawkins Brown, women of North Carolina, and books written about Pfeiffer University and Johnson C. Smith University. As mentioned earlier, to collect the primary sources I traveled to all four of the schools and fully explored their archives and walked the campuses. Some had better records than others but all the archivists were extremely helpful offering further suggestions to better understand the lives of the women I was researching. The Charlotte Hawkins Brown State Historic Site in Sedalia, North Carolina has an excellent museum and knowledgeable archivist and The University of North Carolina at Greensboro library helped with interlibrary loans to complete the data collection. Sifting through letters, personal notes, old books and formal minutes offered amazing insight into the lives and everyday experiences of these women. Attempting to decipher the handwritten notes was a challenge. Some had been copied and transferred into more legible documents but much had to be sifted through requiring many arduous hours. However, taking the time to review the materials certainly had its rewards. I finished the data collection feeling as if I knew these women quite well and felt sad that I could not locate more on Mary Biddle. Her life was the most difficult to review and had little documentation leaving large spaces of silence to analyze. She is the earliest of the women and perhaps demonstrates how small the public sphere was for women's giving at the time. Her story is explored more in the following chapter. Overall, there is sufficient data to feel confident in sharing the

stories of how these women came to make the philanthropic choices and to ensure their stories are no longer invisible.

Atkinson and Delamont (2008) reminded me that I needed to:

analyze narratives and lived materials so as to treat them as instances of social action, that is, as speech acts or even with common properties, recurrent structures, cultural conventions, and recognizable genres.
(p. 290)

Once the primary sources had been reviewed, I needed to step back and look at the materials as a whole body, not just as individuals, to see the larger structures surrounding them. I compared the philanthropic work of these women against not only each other but the larger public sphere. I explored only one school per woman or society despite the fact that Emily Prudden and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church were intimately involved in establishing many schools. The schools I focused on, Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, Warren Wilson College, and Palmer Memorial Institute, were all founded in North Carolina and remain functioning colleges or universities today with the exception of Palmer Memorial Institute which closed in 1971. It is important to understand that although these primary sources hold the center piece of this study, they are by no means the beginning or the end of these women's stories. Just as I have my own positionality that is in constant flux, influenced by new experiences, moods and days of the week, so did these women. Raddeker (2007) writes:

Put simply, positionality refers to how we may be positioned by the world as black and/or other objects (women, queer, etc.), that is, objectified as

such discriminatory representations... but we lay claim to a radical subjectivity when we also position ourselves, as we resist, as we take up and act upon political subject positions. These do not, however, remain fixed or unchanging, but rather are shifting, perhaps politically strategic and temporary. They are also multiple... (p. 183)

Just as we are positioned in the world, so were Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman's Board. Although postmodernism rejected any sort of structure or patterning in research discerning that lives are fluid and in constant flux, I have chosen to create a semblance of order to help the reader move through the findings of this research. This also, as Atkinson and Delamont (2008) explain, "give[s] us principled ways of understanding the data of different sorts as reflections of the codes of order" (p. 295). I divided the data into four consistent themes which ran throughout all the experiences of the women: all the women had family support (either financially and/or emotionally), all began schools because someone shared the need with them, all the women had a vision of a better society and felt compelled to act, and the issue of power was evident throughout their philanthropy. Through these main themes I wove the effects of race, class and gender while exploring my initial research questions. I also addressed language and how it plays a role in these constructs as Luce Irigaray (1994) reminds us, "Of course, we must remember that language is not neutral and that its rules weigh heavily on the constitution of a female identity and on women's relationships with one another" (p. 27). Within the analysis I have attempted to include language consideration as I deconstruct the lives of the women in the study. Again, Atkinson and Delamont (2008) remind me that the goal of my research "is to *analyze social action, social order, and social organization* as well as to analyze the forms of content of *culture*" (p. 304).

My challenge has been to remind myself, as a researcher, that there are many aspects to these women's lives, some of which we will never uncover. The task of analyzing the content in an interesting and fluid way that opened possibilities not yet explored as well as encourage future research in this area has been complex and rewarding. This study is a piece of a much larger picture that is now open for further exploration. There are not truths with a capital "T" presented, only possibilities of truths. The journeys of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church remain fluid even though they have been analyzed with some structure imposed. They remain tied to history through their documents; but they have also been released through my research to empower future women as philanthropists and fundraisers.

Gaining a stronger understanding of what philanthropy meant to Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions and what it meant to take on the role of the fundraiser and philanthropist, roles traditionally held by white men during this period, is fundamental to fundraisers and women philanthropists today. It adds to the depth of research in the fundraising field as well as opens doors to revisit how we may think about educational fundraising. Using historiography as the methodological approach for this research has allowed for a (re)writing of history through a different lens. Raddeker (2008) reminds us, "...history is not material reality; it is not *the past* but representations of it, however many 'facts' (*references* to real events etc.) it may contain" (p. 23).

CHAPTER IV

HISTORICAL FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This is a study about women, women who gave of themselves, both their time and money, through their philanthropic actions to educate the people of North Carolina. Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church did not ask to be recorded in the history books, did not intentionally seek power, recognition or fame. What they did was to follow their instincts and passion that lead them to support education. All came to support very different schools throughout North Carolina and all arrived at their giving from different perspectives. I have the privilege of sharing their stories through a historiographic study written with a postmodern feminist lens. With this privilege however, comes tremendous responsibility in honoring the memory of these women and their work. Wagner-Martin (1994) writes:

It is important for both women writers of fiction and women biographers who attempt to tell women's lives truthfully to recognize that they must tell the stories they want to tell with integrity, regardless of criticism about structure or genre. They must understand the way their culture views women and the patterns in their lives, women's roles and women's narratives. And biographers of women have a further responsibility: to understand both their subjects' cultures and their own and to provide their readers with a bridge back into history, so that they understand why certain behaviors then were approved or disapproved. (p. 29)

This study provides a bridge to history from which we may learn about women's educational philanthropic work in North Carolina. Many of the experiences Biddle, Prudden, Brown and members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions had with philanthropy is still applicable to women today who have volunteered in or made a financial gift to an organization. They have gone before us creating a space where we may have direct and indirect influence in someone's life through our philanthropy. They demonstrate the significance one gift can make in the lives of many. By exploring the lives of these women through a new lens this research also informs the practice of fundraisers working with women donors. In the current economic climate when fundraising has become an essential operation at all universities, it is important to understand how women from varying cultural backgrounds learn to give. Through this information we can build better fundraising practices and partner with women philanthropists for the benefit of our organizations.

Chapter IV offers an historic overview of the years 1865–1920 in which this study is grounded. Briefly reviewed is the economic, political, educational and philanthropic climate of the United States and the State of North Carolina as it pertains to women. This overview allows the reader a better understanding of the structures surrounding Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church that shaped their giving.

This chapter shares the stories of three women and one society of women who began schools in North Carolina through their philanthropy, either giving of their time or their money and sometimes both. Three of the schools founded by these women, Johnson

C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University and Warren Wilson College, became colleges or universities, Palmer Memorial Institute no longer remains open. Mary Biddle gave nearly \$2,000 (roughly equivalent to \$30,300 today) to begin what is now Johnson C. Smith University, Emily Prudden began Pfeiffer University as the Oberlin School and Home for rural white girls, Charlotte Hawkins Brown became a teacher at Bethany Institute which she transformed into the Palmer Memorial Institute, serving as the president for fifty years, and The Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church founded Asheville Farm School for boys which later became Warren Wilson College. The stories of these women and how they discovered their path to philanthropy are shared in this chapter.

An analysis of my research surrounding the philanthropic work of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of Woman's Board of Home Missions coupled with the transformational changes made possible by these women closes the chapter. The stories of the women and their schools are told sequentially so the reader may learn about each individual or society first. The analysis follows once each woman or society has been presented. I addressed my research questions by inserting theoretical support within the analysis and discussion. There are endless details that could have been dissected and deconstructed to better know these women and understand their experiences. However, I have narrowed the focus to four main commonalities which I identified throughout the work of each individual and society: 1) the support of family and friends, 2) learning about the need for schools in North Carolina, as none of the women were living in the State when they made the decision to give, 3) all had a vision of a better tomorrow for the

people they served through their philanthropy, and 4) issues of power apparent in each journey. With regard to writing about the lives of women Bates (1989) observes:

The real challenge comes from the realization of multiple alternatives and the invention of new models. Aspirations cease to be a one-way street - from child to adult, from female inferiority to male privilege, from exclusion to full membership – and instead becomes open in all directions, claiming possibility of inclusion and setting an individual course among the many ways of being human. (p. 62)

What Bates describes here is true not only in my struggle to tell the stories, but to do so in each of the lives of the women about whom I write. I struggle because although I am telling an historic tale through the lives of women who have passed on, I am also creating something new, recognizing difference, ruptures and breaks within the stories. I am exploring the lives of these women through a different lens than they had available to them when they lived their lives, recognizing my own positionality. At the same time, my research indicates each woman or society pushed forth to create something new. While doing so they opened new doors for those behind them demonstrating the multiple ways to create space and invent new approaches to women's philanthropy. They claimed inclusion at a time when society excluded them. Through the gifts of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions education became available to Freedmen, white mountain men, and both black and white children in North Carolina. A critical shift was made in a State with a high illiterate population toward one that offered literacy and skill building tools. At the same time a shift was being made in the power of women's philanthropy.

Historical Framework

A brief focus on Johnson C. Smith University establishes a link to the historical framework. In 1902, roughly 30 years after the establishment of the university, formerly Henry J. Biddle Memorial Institute, The Rev. Willis L. Miller wrote an article in *The Presbyterian* titled “The Founding of Biddle University: The Site Donated by a Slave Holder and the Money for Building by a Philadelphian.” He begins the article by firmly stating, “I secured a charter from a Democratic Legislature by a two-thirds vote for a college to train teachers and preachers for the colored race...” (p. 20). He continues describing the beginnings of Johnson C. Smith University with such statements as, “I first went to Pittsburg...and addressed both the Old and New School Assemblies on the urgent need and great importance of founding such a college (for freedmen)”, “I could organize colored Presbyterian churches of the best material...”, and “In fact I was the organizer of the whole work in North and South Carolina...” (p. 20). The Rev. Miller continues for three full pages describing his work in such stellar terms one may think of him as the tireless lone soldier pushing forth in the name of Christianity. Despite the difficulties of his work, it seems he primarily organized churches for freed slaves in the South during reconstruction. This led to his proposition to build a school for black men in North Carolina. He describes his travels from North to South gaining approval for such a venture in detail. Then he explains how he located the land for the school describing a grove he found overlooking Charlotte and thinking it the perfect place for the school. The Rev. Miller (1902) approached Col. Myers, the land owner and inquired explaining:

...he [Col. Myers] went on to say that he was in sympathy with the efforts to Christianize and educate the colored race and that for a college site he would donate the grove and so many acres of land for a campus. (p. 21)

Mrs. Mary Biddle, who made the first substantial monetary gift and for whose husband the school was originally named the Henry J. Biddle Memorial Institute, was never mentioned in the article. Mary Biddle's gift of an initial \$1,000 was made in 1867. Col. Myers gift of land was not made until one year later.

I begin with this story because it clearly outlines the political context of the time. We must consider why there is no mention of Mrs. Biddle throughout this article when the university held her husband's name and, in fact, the title of the article states the university's name and notes a gift from Philadelphia. This article neatly delivers the notion of contest, conflict and power in three tidy pages. It opens the question why has the philanthropic work of women remained invisible? Surely Mrs. Biddle's gift, quite large at the time, did not go unnoticed. The school was after all, later named in her husband's honor. It was political. Women still operated very much in the private sphere in which their work or contributions to the public sphere were few and not readily acknowledged by those in power.

Women's role in the 19th century. Mainstream historians claim that in the 1800s the influence women had in the public sphere was limited. It was believed in the early 19th century that there were natural differences between men and women. Marilley (1996) explains it was commonly believed, "females possess natural talent for child-raising and men possess natural talents for protecting women and children" (p. 3). She continues to describe the societal context noting that even if women had natural rights (such as voting)

they were thought to lack the ability to make critical judgments. This notion of natural talents for men and women separated the sexes and reinforced the existing patriarchal power structure. Nicolson (2008) describes this time in a lengthy paragraph but one well worth citing:

They [scientists] were very much about social exclusion, particularly about excluding women as a group from non-domestic spaces and about excluding black men and women from political and civic spaces occupied by whites. But this meant that nature had to do the heavy work in elaborating the identities of women and black people. The categories of female and black had to be descriptively rich, and since these categories were understood as categories of nature, this meant that they had to be descriptively rich in naturalistic terms. The categories of white and male, since not required to do as much exclusionary work, could be thinner in natural content and more easily brushed aside in favor of other identities, such as being American or a wage earner, in providing more elaborate content to the identities of white males. (p. 10)

The point being that history is not simple. It has been simplified in the history books leaving out important work of women and minorities (Other). When we categorize or naturalize history we are missing the multiplicity of the story. We eliminate Other by eliminating their voice in history. We need to remember, as Scott (1999) points out, that the concept of women is a construct in itself. Society shaped this definition and thus created an ideal identity for women. This broad definition of the ideal woman generally meant a white woman with financial means provided for by her husband. This ideal woman was especially praised in the South. Waal and Korner compiled journals written by Southern women of Missouri in the 19th century. Waal and Korner (1997) found that within these journals, “Motherhood was a high and sacred calling for the antebellum South; it was the finest ‘calling’ for a woman in a patriarchal society that limited

women's opinions for self fulfillment" (p. 59). While motherhood was a critical role for women, advocates for women's education used this to argue that women needed to be able to teach their sons, future citizens, how to be literate in the world. The "republican motherhood" as it was called in the United States, enabled women to begin to earn an education; even single women could learn in order to teach the next generation (Freedman, 2002). The primary care givers of the children of the new American Republic were women. It was argued that these women needed to be educated in the in virtue so they could pass the lessons on to their children thus opening the door to education for women through the "republican motherhood." Again, we see the socially constructed assignments for women limiting their access to the public sphere. Luce Irigaray (1993) acknowledges this situation noting, "The difficulties women have in gaining recognition for their social and political rights are rooted in this insufficiently thought out relation between biology and culture" (p. 46).

Women, economy and politics. Although women participated in political movements such as abolitionist and feminist activities in the early 19th century, it was the Civil War that actually opened economic spaces for women. As men went to fight, the women were left to manage the expenses, farms, shops and daily life. By the time the war ended in 1865 women had gained some political ground. With improvement and expansion of transportation women gained access to news from across the country as well as the ability to more easily travel and share their message. Kerber and De Hart-Mathews (1987) point out that "Single women rarely traveled in the colonial period; long trips meant nights in unfamiliar taverns and lodging houses where accommodations were

uncertain and safety could not be assured” (p. 94). However, after the Civil War women like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony could get their message out through regular travel for lectures across the country. Additionally, improvements in printing technologies and distribution of newspapers and pamphlets meant that information could have a wider reach. As we learn in this study, pamphlets were often used as a way to share information and seek funding for projects. Women could now have information about such issues as women’s rights or abolition through newspapers delivered directly to her home. Over time, women also gained greater control over finances and property enabling some to avoid marriage and family obligations all together. Emily Prudden was one such woman who never married and Charlotte Hawkins Brown married twice with neither relation lasting longer than one year. As women were gaining access to more information they also gained control over their subjectivity.

In 1815 there were only eighteen States in the United States, by 1860 there were thirty-three. The growth of this country in the 19th century was tremendous. Between 1869 and 1899 the Gross National Product (GNP) nearly tripled and the United States surpassed Great Britain as the leading manufacturing nation in the world (Giddings, 1984). The workforce was changing from an agricultural base to one with more focus on industrial manufacturing. The North expanded its factory towns while the steamboat and railroad expansion connected the country enabling faster and cheaper transport of goods (Rudolph, 1962). Thus the small spheres of the traditional towns were broadening, facilitating conversations and movements across the country.

In addition, availability in the urban areas of bakeries, ready-made clothing and canned foods began to alter the traditional labor in the home. Evans (1989) comments, "...improved household technologies such as indoor plumbing, cooking stoves and iceboxes reduced the amount of physical labor required for food preparation and the care of clothing" (p. 138). Of course these conveniences were available to those who could afford such luxuries, usually upper and middle class white families. Kerber and De Hart-Mathews (1987) note, "In free households female work – including taking in borders, washing their clothes, and cooking for them – might account for as much income as working-class husbands gained from their own employment" (p. 95). This work was central to the American labor history but often overlooked. Black women, post Civil War, were forced to work but simultaneously had limited access to work. White women were beginning to enter the work force through education and charity work. Black women in urban areas were forced to take on domestic work regulating them out of the public sphere as their white sisters were gaining entry; while rural black women were forced back into the fields out of necessity and poverty. On top of the insecure post Civil War economy in the South, both black women and men had to fear success. Cott (2000) reminds us, "In the early years of Reconstruction, the terror of the Ku Klux Klan threatened the already precarious lives of free African American women and men throughout the South" (p. 302). She reports on a situation in which a black couple was severely beaten because they had been able to purchase a small plot of land. There are many more stories such as this and worse that disenfranchised black women from gains of their white sisters. As we analyze the situations and stories of the women in this study

we must keep in mind that cultural symbols shift; what appeared to be an opening may also be reframed to continue oppression.

Women, education and North Carolina. Education since the 19th century has served many purposes. Originally public education was established, according to Spring (2006), “to educate future citizens, reduce crime and provide equal opportunity” (p. 11). The U.S. college system, such that it was in the 1800s, aligned itself with German universities. Many students, mostly white males, traveled abroad to study German education and thought after the Civil War. They returned with ideas about a more scientific foundation for colleges, moving away from liberal arts education. In doing so there became an increased need to categorize and label groupings of individuals; particularly affected by this movement were women and minorities. Doctors and lawyers were produced by the elite colleges in the northeast. Schools of higher education were established mainly to teach how to preach and educate. In the late 1880s education shifted to produce trained labor, teach home life skills and family care. Sorber (2010) explains, “...evidence of the changing labor market supports the contention of an expanding class of vocational opportunities in a new middle class of technically skilled labor and management” (p. 17). He continues his analysis of colleges and universities between 1850 and 1900 noting:

...there was a sharp decrease in the percentage of ministers (22% of all graduates in 1850 and only 5.9% by 1900), and a leveling and decrease of lawyers and doctors (25.4% and 9.3% of all graduates respectively in 1850 and down to 15.5% and 6.6% by 1900). Second the occupations that received an increasing percentage of all graduates between 1850 and 1900 were education, business, and engineering pursuits... Thus there was a great shift in the occupational destination of graduates. (p. 17)

This suggests a shift in economic status of the country with the rise of new technologies and corporate markets.

The women in this study, Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, are a small sample of the women working in educational philanthropy across the United States at this time.

Goldberg (2000) notes from the period of 1800–1848, just before the time frame of this study:

...was particularly unsettled [for women]. As new rules were created, and old ones renegotiated and reinforced, the varying degrees of woman's power and powerlessness in relation to those closest to her were revealed, reflecting her status in society at large. (p. 179)

The idea of the republican mother was reinforced at this time encouraging education in the areas of domestic skills and in passing cultural values to the next generation. Emma Hart Willard is one of the early pioneers for female education. After teaching at a finishing school for girls and beginning her own school in her home for extra income, Willard began to conceptualize a school that would be on par with schools for boys complete with challenging academic material from geometry to literature. To gain the support of the community she planned the school as a seminary and took extreme measures to involve the male leadership of the country in her quest. She was granted permission to move forward with her school and opened Troy Female Seminary in 1821.

The Emma Willard School's web site (2011) explains:

For a few years the Troy Female Seminary was the sole beacon of rational education for women in the United States, but its success soon spawned

many children, some by example, others by the labors of its graduates. In the south the schools were often called ‘colleges,’ a name Mrs. Willard shunned for fear that men would consider it a presumption of equality with men's colleges. Mary Lyon, who founded Mt. Holyoke in 1837, was active in New England, experimenting with ideas about teaching. Boston Public Latin School for Boys, founded in 1635, gained a sister school in 1826. So popular was this institution that it was closed two years later by officials who feared its effects on women's role in society. Oberlin opened its doors a few years later (1833) to what must have seemed to many a scandalous mixture of male and female, white and black students. (Emma Willard School, 2011)

Willard passed away in 1870 but the school remained active and was renamed Emma Willard School in 1895. The school continues to flourish today as a private college preparatory school for girls.

Another early pioneer in educational philanthropy was Catharine Beecher, sister of Harriet Beecher Stowe, American abolitionist and author. Catharine Beecher began Hartford Female Seminary in 1823 as, “a laboratory for Catharine’s beliefs about education, religion, and the role of women in society” notes Huehles (2005, p. 40). Beecher believed that all three of these concepts played in important role in philanthropy. She felt that education and the transmission of cultural values from one generation to the next were the greatest sources of happiness. She also believed in the ideals of the republican mother. Beecher (1931) wrote of a woman’s responsibility in 1835 as, “the physical, intellectual, and moral education of children. It is the care of health, and the formation of the character, of the future citizens of this great country” (p. 172). Beecher’s school closed in 1831 but the few years it was open made an impact on her students. Huehles (2005) notes that four graduates went on to start a school in Alabama and

Beecher's younger sister Harriet went on to take her place in history as an outspoken abolitionist.

Mary Lyon, another notable educational philanthropist established Mount Holyoke. Lyon grew up in a modest home and she had great appreciation for the middle class student, understanding what education could do for a woman. Like Beecher, Lyon's position as a teacher gave her economic freedom other women of this period lacked. She, too, considered her work as an educator and fundraiser as philanthropy, giving back to community. Bringing Lyon's passion for educating young women into the forefront with her school, she certainly was making a statement about the importance of educating girls, not just wealthy girls, and breaking established societal barriers which had served only men. Lyon educated middle class girls so that they, too, could have more possibilities in the future. Feminist praxis is about understanding the "interlocking of inequalities of race, class, and gender" (Hesse-Biber, 2007, p. 12) as well as the concept that these are socially constructed ideas. Lyon began by unlocking educational inequalities for both gender and class.

As the nation progressed, the need for more colleges and universities also grew. Mary Lyon saw this need and began Mount Holyoke Seminary and College for women through a fundraising initiative. Many small colleges began with tiny gifts collected by subscription or one time donations. Such is the case with Mount Holyoke. The school was founded in 1839 with 1,800 subscriptions totaling \$27,000 (Sears, p. 35). Considering subscriptions (and gifts) ranged anywhere from 6 cents to \$1,000, it was no

small feat to raise nearly \$30,000. Lyon realized the power behind fundraising and the value of each individual contribution.

Lyon led the movement to create an institution for women that would, “put within the reach of students of moderate means such opportunities that none can find better ... a permanent institution consecrated to the work of training young women to the greatest usefulness” (Sears, 1990, p. 45). From a postmodern feminist perspective Lyon was deconstructing the educational system and rebuilding it with the inclusion of women. She was creating a social change. Through the writing of Sears’ dissertation in 1919 (republished in 1990), opened the door for Lyon, as a female philanthropist, and others to have a space in history alongside prominent philanthropic names known in the field of higher education giving. Sears writes:

As is well known, the new idea [of educating women] met with opposition but, as usual, it was finally proved that philanthropy can be depended upon to meet any important social need as soon as that need differentiates itself from mere vague unrest. (p. 45)

In this case the social need was to educate women and Sears makes the point that philanthropy can be a tool used for social justice, recreating societal constructs.

Willard, Beecher and Lyon were pioneers in opening education to white women in the early part of the 1800s. Women of color had less opportunity for education because many schools did not accept black students. Oberlin College was one of the first to actively recruit both black men and women students. Sigerman (2001) notes, “From 1835 to 1865, at least 140 black women attended Oberlin. Most of these students took one or two classes in basic skills, such as reading and writing” (p. 264). While jobs for black

graduates were limited, women of color had even fewer options. As educated African Americans finished their schooling many saw the need for education among minority students. Among them were women like Lucy Craft Laney, Mary McLeod Bethune and Nannie Burroughs who were instrumental in moving education for black children forward.

Lucy Craft Laney was born into slavery but her father was able to save enough to buy her mother's freedom and help his children achieve a better future. According to the Lucy Craft Laney Museum of Black History (2008):

In 1869 at the age of 15, Lucy entered the first class of Atlanta University. In 1873, she graduated with three other students and went on to start a teaching career that would change the lives of an entire community of people and influence the nation. (Lucy Craft Laney Museum of Black History, 2008)

In 1883 Laney started a school for black boys and girls in Atlanta in the basement of a Presbyterian Church. Her school grew from 6 students to 234 within a two year period requiring her to find additional funding and space. Unsure of how to secure funds for the growing school Laney traveled to the Presbyterian Church Convention in Minnesota to share her need. Mrs. Francine E. H. Haines, President of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, later involved with the establishment of the Asheville Farm School, had heard her speak at the convention. According the Lucy Craft Laney Museum of Black History's website:

Mrs. Haines was so impressed with Ms. Laney and her mission that she was able to secure funding for the expansion of the school in the amount of \$10,000.00. Ms. Laney was so touched by the kindness of this stranger

that she named the new school the Haines Normal and Industrial Institute. In 1886, the Haines Normal School was chartered by the state of Georgia and moved into its new location at 800 Gwinnett (Laney-Walker Blvd.) Street. (The Lucy Craft Laney Museum of Black History, 2008)

This action further demonstrates the concept of philanthropy as defined in this research by highlighting the financial gift Mrs. Haines was able to secure, as well as the gift of time and talent that Ms. Laney was giving to her school. The work of Laney was inspirational to Charlotte Hawkins Brown as she began the Palmer Memorial Institute in North Carolina. Brown heard Laney speak when Brown was just a girl and continued to keep contact with Laney through the years.

Brown also had contemporary friends doing similar work to her own. Mary McLeod Bethune and Brown were close friends and discussed issues of education, race and fundraising through their letters. Bethune, born in 1875 in Mayesville, South Carolina was one of 17 children born to former slaves. She grew up picking cotton. The Women in History website notes Bethune's many accomplishments noting Bethune:

Founded the Daytona Normal and Industrial Institute for Negro Girls (now Bethune-Cookman College) in 1904, and served as president from 1904-1942 and from 1946-47. Was a leader in the black women's club movement and served as president of the National Association of Colored Women. Was a delegate and advisor to national conferences on education, child welfare, and home ownership. Was Director of Negro Affairs in the the National Youth Administration from 1936 to 1944. Served as consultant to the U.S. Secretary of War for selection of the first female officer candidates. Appointed consultant on interracial affairs and understanding at the charter conference of the U.N. Founder of the National Council of Negro Women. Vice-president of the NAACP. Was awarded the Haitian Medal of Honor and Merit, that country's highest award. In Liberia she received the honor of Commander of the Order of the Star of Africa. (Women in History, 2011)

Bethune's educational philosophy focused on the "head-heart-hand" which translated into traditional, religion, and industrial education. She also ran a farm on the school's property for income and food for the students. Brown and Bethune complimented each other and learned from one another's experiences. Bethune noted in a letter to Brown:

...I think of you and Nannie Burroughs and Lucy Laney and myself as being in the most sacrificing class in our group of women... I have unselfishly given my best, and I thank God that I have lived long enough to see the fruits from it. (personal correspondence, 1927)

Nannie Helen Burroughs (1879-1961), born in Orange, Virginia to ex-slaves, is another notable educator in the black community. She moved to Washington D.C. with her mother in 1893. After graduating at the top of her class in 1893 from the Colored High School on M Street she was unable to find a job in the public schools or federal government because of her race. She became a secretary for the First Baptist Christian Banner in Philadelphia and later for the National Baptist Convention's Foreign Mission Board. She helped to found the women's auxiliary in the National Baptist Convention and played a vital role in African American Woman's Clubs. She was the secretary of the Baptist auxiliary for nearly 25 years and the president until her death in 1961, recruiting more than 1.5 million black women to the auxiliary (Synnott, 2000). According to American National Biography Online:

Burroughs also convinced the Woman's Convention to found the National Training School for Women and Girls, Incorporated (NTS), which opened on 19 October 1909, in Lincoln Heights, Washington, D.C. Serving as school president until her death, Burroughs raised money, primarily among black women, to pay off the \$6,000 purchase price. By 1960 its physical plant had expanded from one to nine

buildings and from six to thirteen acres; NTS also received some support from the white Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society. The school's title did not include the word 'Baptist,' since it admitted young women and girls of all religious denominations. (Synnott , 2000)

The school is still in existence today as a private Christian school bearing Burroughs' name. The school originally taught domestic science, vocational education and a bit of liberal arts. Burroughs used the three B's in her school; Bible, bath and broom. Together Brown, Bethune and Burroughs were known as the "three B's" of education. All were admirers of Lucy Craft Laney, founder of Haines Normal and Industrial School in Augusta, Georgia.

In addition to individual women starting schools there were also organizations that rallied behind education during this time period. Woman's boards of many different religious affiliations began fundraising for schools in low income areas and after the Civil War the government established the Freedmen's Bureau to build schools for black children. There were other organizations like the American Missionary Association that proselytized Christianity while building schools both nationally and internationally. This was a time of great expansion of the American education system. The Woman's Executive Committee of Home Missions (1882) note in a report of their goals for 1882 and 1883 that, "Our aim is first to put every School already established [in Utah and Idaho], now thirty or more in number, on a firm and permanent basis" (n. p.). They continue to lay out other educational projects in New Mexico, South Colorado, Arizona, Nevada, Texas, Nebraska and Tennessee demonstrating the large push education was receiving across the country. In another document from 1893, there is discussion of

overlap between the work the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions is doing and that of the Congregationalist, again signifying the trend of educating the nation.

Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions were certainly aware of other women and societies beginning and growing schools across the United States, as evidenced in the archival materials. Their work was perhaps not unique but it was significant to the education of North Carolinians.

North Carolina has a history of embracing education, if only on paper. After the Revolutionary War, North Carolina created its own constitution which, according to Rudolph (1962) was adopted in 1776 with:

...an injunction to the effect that, 'all useful learning shall be duly encouraged and promoted in one or more universities.' Not only North Carolina, but Georgia, Tennessee and Vermont also founded state-chartered, state-supported institutions before 1800. (p. 36)

Despite the promising look of education during the early development of the State, North Carolina, along with much of the South, lost ground after the Civil War. Parramore (1978) explains:

The 1868 Constitution, providing free public schools for all children from six to twenty-one, had been ignored or violated. Only about one in six children was enrolled in school in the last years of the nineteenth century. And these were in racially segregated institutions. The public has been poorly led by its political and educational officers. It showed no interest in education. People had little concern about the state's backwardness. During the 1870s, North Carolina's illiteracy rate actually increased. (p. 361)

As the rest of the country moved forward with education reform and embraced higher education, the South struggled because of the devastations of war. Rudolph (1962) writes:

Only in the desolate Southland was there an absence of movement. Laid waste by war, impoverished, robbed by death and poverty of the college-going generation, the southern colleges, like the South itself, could but hold on... (p. 244)

Most of the colleges and universities in North Carolina closed before the Civil War had ended. With the young men off fighting in the war and the economy in such a dismal state there was little money to support the colleges or public education.

By 1850 North Carolina had more than 2,600 schools (Parramore, 1978, Pollitt, 1993). In North Carolina, public schools were free, however, for those who could pay the private schools were generally of better quality. Parramore (1978) writes:

For these (the private schools), students paid tuition. 'Old field schools' were started by a teacher or parent. They operated during the winter months in small communities. They had been the typical schools up until the 1840s. On a little higher were private academies, chartered by the state. These had boards of trustees and usually enjoyed some regular support in their communities. Every sizeable town had one or two of these. Some were first rate schools. They were mostly for white boys, but a few were for girls and some were coeducational. (pp. 225-226)

The education of women in the State lagged far behind Northern States. Most upper middle class white parents were interested in seeing that their daughters were educated in the ways of household management, music, arts and other areas that were suitable to a young lady of the time. Salem Female Academy was firmly established in Winston Salem by the Moravians. There was also a female seminary in Warrenton and Greensboro

Female College, now Greensboro College. Few other opportunities existed for a girl who desired more than a finishing school (Parramore, 1978).

Despite the grim outlook for Southern schools, education was gaining popularity. Missionaries traveled south after the Civil War to establish Christian based schools for rural white and black children and the U.S. Federal Government started the Freedman's Bureau which funded some education for black children during Reconstruction. Giddings (1984) also reminds us that, "A number of Black women founded their own schools, filling the vacuum left by the Freedman's Bureau" when Reconstruction came to an end (p. 76). Women like Lucy Craft Laney, Sophie Bell Wright, in addition to the women of this study, are among women who began schools for the education of black and white children in the South. Cott (2000) quotes an agent of the North Carolina Freedman's Bureau as saying, "The colored people are far more zealous in the cause of education than whites... They will starve themselves, and go without clothes, in order to send their children to school" (p. 301). The women in this study are not unique in that they began a school through their giving, there were others who also forged this path. What makes this study special is that most of the schools survived over the years and have morphed into colleges or universities; and of the fifty plus colleges and universities in the State of North Carolina (North Carolina Independent Colleges and Universities, 2010) only three trace their foundation to the philanthropic actions of women.

Education, philanthropy and women. As the demand for trained labor grew so did the interest in education as a national issue. Spring (2005) reports that men who earned great fortunes from the expansion of the United States such as Ezra Cornell, Johns

Hopkins and Leland Stanford were now endowing colleges. Through their financial commitments they dictated, to some extent, the curriculum. For example, Spring (2005) observes that the founding of Cornell University was to “serve the industrial classes and be a model research institute” (p. 308). However, the stories of women’s involvement in educational philanthropy are not told. Even Joel Spring, who pushes for alternative views of educational history, does not mention the philanthropic influence of women on the education system in the United States. We know now that historically many women gave substantial gifts to universities and schools, but few were publicly acknowledged. Women chose not to put their own names on buildings, opting instead for the space to bear her spouse’s name. As stated in an earlier chapter, stories of women such as Lady Molson (Anne Radcliff) who gave one of the first gifts of scholarship to Harvard remain lost in history. As does Mary Lyon who established Mount Holyoke College but remains fairly unknown in the philanthropy world. Mary Biddle is another prime example. Her husband, Col. Henry J. Biddle was killed fighting the Civil War. After making several substantial gifts to a school for Freedmen she was asked to name the college. Rather than using her name, however, she chose (or the school trustees choose – this matter is unclear) to use only her husband’s name, Henry J. Biddle Memorial Institute, later changed to Biddle University. In the 1921 the name of Biddle University was changed to Johnson C. Smith University. Mr. Smith, at his death, left his fortune to his wife with the request that she, “invest the money that he left her in some worthwhile causes” (p. 19) explains Parker (1975). Mrs. Smith learned about the needs of the university through Rev. Henry Lawrence McCrorey, the first black president of Biddle University and an

alumnus. Through her relationship with President McCrorey, Mrs. Smith contributed over \$700,000 between 1921 and her death in 1929 for buildings and equipment.

According to Parker (1975):

In deepest appreciation for Mrs. Smith's concern and substantial support, the Board of Trustees and the Division of Missions for Colored People voted to change the name of the institution from Biddle University to Johnson C. Smith University (p. 19 -20)

recognizing her husband rather than actual donor.

It is interesting that both Biddle and Smith supposedly named the college in honor of their late husbands. This tradition often carries through today with naming opportunities. In my work with women donors, I have come across several who would rather put their family name or no name at all on an endowed gift. Yet, as fundraisers, we know that seeing someone's name, especially that of a woman, on a building, classroom or scholarship inspires other to do the same. When women do not see the names of other women on buildings, professorships or scholarships we do not see ourselves as philanthropists. This demonstrates that women in the 1800s and today continue to live in the shadow of men with respect to public recognition of giving. Women's assumed economic inferiority may be reinforced by not seeing visible examples of their philanthropy while society continues to perpetuate the situation. It may be that we live within a system that has determined it is not appropriate for women to demonstrate wealth through philanthropy. It is not because women do not have the capacity; rather the giver and/or receiver may lack the desire to change expectations.

As we look back historically, we recognize the philanthropic actions of women were present. Sadly, the legacy of their work was placed on the back shelves of history, dominated instead by the contributions of white men. Walton (2005) explains:

Works by Jane Addams, Eleanor Flexner, Mary Beard and other female authors that captured the important aspects of the relationship between women's history and philanthropic action in education were generally discounted as 'amateur' writings or minimized by scholars of education as contributions to the highly feminized field of social work (p. 11).

If we look back to the founding of the United States we will find the presence of women's philanthropy from the start. McCarthy (2003) shares the story of Isabella Graham, a Scottish born immigrant who, after finding herself destitute in Scotland. "eked [sic] out a marginal existence ... by opening a girls' school near Edinburgh with the aid of a local patron" (p. 30). When she immigrated to New York she started another school which later became affiliated with Cedar Street Scottish Presbyterian Church. Her daughter met and married a wealthy merchant placing Isabella in more comfort. However, she never forgot her humble beginnings and in 1797 began one of the nation's first female-controlled charities, the Society for the Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children (McCarthy, 2003). Although she had no right to vote her actions demonstrated the space of women in the public sphere was available. Through charity work, women began securing positions of power beyond the private sphere.

The development of benevolence societies and non-profit organizations in the late 1700s and early 1800s also gave women a place to explore their financial authority and political identity. Religion gave them moral ground to pursue their activities. McCarthy

(2003) explains, “Protestantism – especially evangelical Protestantism – was the single most important factor in the growth and elaboration of American philanthropy...” (p. 49). Through the Second Great Awakening both men and women increased their attendance at church and contributions to the church community through both volunteer work and financial gifts. Churches needed income to support the needs of their congregation. Through fundraising Protestant women were able to further expand their knowledge of market relations and financial independence. But it wasn’t just Protestant women, Jewish, Catholic and black women’s groups developed as well. As women’s groups were formed women asked for gifts through small subscriptions. McCarthy (2003) again explains:

Participation in market transactions, however modest, chipped away at patriarchal rule. Husbands who legally owned their wives’ earnings lost that privilege when the funds generated through associational activities that enabled their wives to collectively control, invest, and even loan funds themselves. More over benevolent women assumed identifiable independent public personae in their communities and churches. This in turn signified a subtle shift in domestic power relationships. (p. 57)

In the rural South, however, this was not always the case. Southern women were more inclined to be part of mixed sex organizations leaving much of the financial responsibilities with the men. McCarthy suggests that literacy may have played a role early perpetuating this structure. Smith and Wilson (1999) note that towns, as opposed to rural locations in North Carolina in the 1860s:

...offered both white and free black women employment options and many white women their first opportunity to step outside their homes, claim a place in public life through church and benevolent work, and develop organizational skills that served them when war came. (p. 75)

However, in the South the power structure remained with the white male being the dominant force leaving both black and white women behind as their counterparts in the North formed more independent and diverse organizations.

At the same time elite and middle class white women were beginning to realize their potential in the public sphere, the role of the black church was expanding to support social advocacy and community mobilization. Although the majority of the black population was held under slavery until 1865, there were small pockets of freedmen in the North and South. The country's first African American independent organizations were of the belief that, as McCarthy (2003) explains, "...virtuous behavior would defuse racial prejudice and undermine negative stereotypes, a notion that infused many... associational efforts" (p. 99), in line with the thoughts of W.E. B. Du Bois. The Free African Society, which promoted "charity, self-help, and individual probity among its members", was established as a small mutual aid society in 1787. This organization then became the foundation of St. Thomas's Episcopal Church and Bethel Methodist Episcopal Church in Philadelphia; the first independent black congregations in the country. Through these churches, as with their white female counterparts, small sums were raised to create a pool that could support members of the congregation in need. The black intellectuals of the time, recognized the power behind the giving and believed that economic cooperation among black people must begin with the church. Later, leaders such as W.E.B. Du Bois also followed this thinking.

In summary, women played an active role in education and philanthropy throughout American history. Unfortunately, the stories of their work are little known. As

we enter the histories of Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, Warren Wilson College and Palmer Memorial Institute through the philanthropic actions of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church we must remember their stories are a fraction of what still needs to be explored. By unearthing their stories we learn a little more about the educational philanthropy of women in North Carolina. Smith and Wilson (1999) write:

As we begin to move through the centuries, two important themes emerge: first, women's importance in the economic underlying of North Carolina's agrarian history and urban development, and second, women's significance in shaping values, at first in the privacy of their homes, then increasingly in the public sphere. Religion was central in most lives, and women became the mainstay of congregations. (p. xviii)

Sharing the value of religion later became a main argument in women's access to education through the movement of the Republican Mothers. It also influences the philanthropic actions of women. However, many stories of women's giving remain buried in history; they have been silenced in a patriarchal world where their actions were absorbed but not celebrated. As Scott (1999) asserts:

The objects of study are then epistemological phenomena, which include economics, industrialization, relations of production, factories, families, classes, genders, collective action, and political ideas, as well as one's own interpretive categories. (p. 5)

The list could go on but the point is these stories add dimension to our history claiming space for women of all colors and allowing us to view history through another lens.

Author Howard Zinn (1999) wryly notes, “It is possible, reading standard histories, to forget half the population of the country” (p. 101). This study illuminates four experiences from the other half of the population. I have offered a brief overview of the historical structures affecting women’s agency in the United States. We now move the lens closer to learn about the lives of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church.

Sharing the Stories

Our stories begin during Reconstruction when every effort was made to improve education in the South among blacks and whites. Many missionaries traveled south to assist in the development and reconstruction. Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions all learned of the need in North Carolina. Each made an effort to impact the lives of others through education. Within this section we meet three women and learn about their families, what influenced their giving, their vision for the future and issues of power they may have struggled with, as well as learn about the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions. The individual stories will be followed by an overview of the schools established and where the schools are today. A discussion of the research findings and analysis will conclude the chapter.

Mary D. Biddle and Johnson C. Smith University. The first significant donor to Johnson C. Smith University, as reported earlier, was Mrs. Mary D. Biddle, a white woman from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Unfortunately, I could find no original

documents written by Biddle, in fact, I could find very little about her in any archives. The small amount we do know about her is that she made her gift because she read an appeal published in her church bulletin asking for funds to support a school for Freedmen in North Carolina. Morton Montgomery (1886) wrote the *History of Berks County in Pennsylvania* which mentioned Mrs. Biddle's father, William M. Baird. Montgomery describes Baird:

...of a tall and commanding presence, possessed of fine and well-cultured mind, a Christian without bigotry, charitable without ostentation, a wise counselor, a gentile companion, a good citizen and patriot and a true friend. (p. 569)

The fact that absolutely nothing about the women in the family is listed in this historical account of Berks County reveals the place of women within the cultural construct of the time. It is also of interest that the author mentions "a Christian without bigotry" in the description of Biddle's father. The language used to describe William Baird is very paternalistic and privileged. Written at a time when women and minority citizens were not included in the history books offers a glimpse of how society was structured at this time. Yet the fact that Baird was mentioned as "without bigotry" may have had some bearing on his daughter's philanthropy.

In Jordan's *Colonial and Revolutionary Families of Pennsylvania: Genealogical and Personal Memoirs* we find reference to Henry Jonathan Biddle, Mary Biddle's husband. The brief entry mentions his parents, that he was a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, and a cadet at West Point Military Academy. He served under General

McCall as Captain and Assistant Adjutant General of the Pennsylvania Reserves fighting in the Civil War on the side of the Union. Jordan (1911) documents:

He was mortally wounded and taken prisoner at the battle of Charles City, or New Market Cross Roads, June 20, 1862, and carried by the confederates to Richmond, Virginia, where he died July 30, 1862. (p. 183)

The description of Henry Biddle ends with a brief note about his marriage to Mary Deborah Biddle, daughter of William Baird and that they had five children. Again, much can be surmised by what is not said as well as where the information about wife and children are placed, at the end of the report. From the description of Mary Biddle's father we may presume that her family is somewhat philanthropic. We may also assume that the family has some wealth if they are listed in the county registrar and given such a lengthy description. The fact that Mary had five children and was still able to make a substantial gift to Johnson C. Smith University also indicates financial means. Through her gift to help educate Freedmen, Mary Biddle demonstrates her family's strong support of the Union as well as their belief in offering blacks access to society through education.

Through a church bulletin, Mary Biddle learned of The Reverend Miller who wanted to build a school for Freedmen. Parker (1975) explains Biddle contacted Reverend Logan, Secretary of the Assembly's Committee, to pledge \$1,000 toward the work of educating Freedmen. She later gave another \$400 and the name of the school was changed to Henry J. Biddle Memorial Institute in 1867. Mary Biddle made a final gift of \$500 to the school before the end of the year totaling \$1,900, a significant contribution for this time. During this period many Northerners, both black and white, were figuring

out how to support Reconstruction in the South through philanthropy. Many whites gave to organizations such as the American Missionary Association or church related mission groups to support religious education to the newly freed black people of the South.

Biddle's gift was not out of the ordinary for white Union supporters. What made her gift different was the size and that a gift of that size came directly from a woman.

Subsequently, her generosity encouraged others to give. For example, Governor-Senator Zebulon B. Vance approved the amendment to change the name of the school to Biddle Memorial Institute and made a fifty dollar gift to the school.

Current research suggests women today seek a connection to the organization they support through more than a thank you note; they want to be involved with meaningful decision making. I have not discovered any documentation that would suggest women of the 1800s thought otherwise and it seems Mary Biddle was no exception. Her interest in Biddle Memorial Institute (now Johnson C. Smith University) extended one year. There are no records indicating why the funding stopped but if we recall the earlier article written by the Reverend Miller, we may infer that perhaps Mary Biddle was not asked to be involved with the school as perhaps she may have liked. We can only speculate that this lack of connection may have led to the end of her financial support.

Mary Biddle took a chance when she gave her gift of nearly \$2,000 to an unknown pastor who wanted to start a school for Freedmen. Was it the fact that her husband gave his life so that others may be free? Or was her vision based on faith? Perhaps her family values influenced her giving. Without primary sources from Biddle

we will never know but we can speculate that she had a vision for a united country, one free of slavery. And because of this vision Mary Biddle was moved to make it a reality through her philanthropy.

Mary Biddle's gift to the new school resulted in the name of the school becoming Henry J. Biddle Memorial Institute until 1923. At this time Mrs. Johnson C. Smith's substantial gifts to build a theological dormitory, a science hall, teacher's cottage and create a large endowment led the Board of Trustees to change the name of the Institute to Johnson C. Smith University. To this day the university remains an active Historically Black College or University (HBCU) in the community of Charlotte, North Carolina. The university began admitting women in 1932 and currently has 1,415 full time students (Johnson C. Smith University, 2009). Interestingly, Johnson C. Smith University was the only school of the four in this study that actually started as an institute of higher education.

Emily Prudden and Pfeiffer University. Emily Prudden, founder of Oberlin School and Home, now Pfeiffer University, grew up in a white New England Christian family. Her father was a deacon at the first Congregational Church of Milford. The church and public service were important values in Prudden's childhood years. Born, June 13, 1832 on a farm in New Haven, Connecticut, Prudden was only eight years old when her father died and left her mother to care for their five children. Emily's mother never remarried but retained and managed the family farm on her own, an anomaly at the time. This may be where Emily Prudden learned some of her management skills later applied so well in her schools. Religion and faith played a significant role in Prudden's

life. She and her family continued attending church as she grew up and she committed herself to spreading the “joy and meaning she found in Christianity” (Pollitt, 1994, p. 26).

Prudden attended high school in New Haven, boarding at one of her family’s rental properties in town demonstrating that her family had some wealth to run a farm as well as maintain rental properties. Prudden also describes her memories as a child (1910), “coming in the sleigh with my father” to church on a wintery day (p. 28). Again, a family with a sleigh, and one who educated their daughter past primary school had some financial means. After high school she returned to the family farm to help her mother. Prudden (1914) writes of herself, “Hampered by deafness from the age of seventeen, I could not enter the ways of larger endeavor” (p. 737). The reason for the hearing loss is unclear. According to Pollitt (1994) when Prudden was only twenty four her elder sister died leaving two young children. Prudden’s brother-in-law entrusted the children to Emily. She spent much of her early adult years caring for her niece and nephew and aging mother.

In 1878 Prudden moved her church membership to the Congregational Church in Berea, Kentucky. She was forty-six and her niece was in her early twenties. Pollitt (1994) speculates that the two women moved to teach however, no teaching records were found for either woman at neither Berea College nor the Congregational Church. Prudden’s niece married the same year and died in 1880. Her nephew was on his own, so at the age of forty-eight Prudden, having never married and with no family responsibility, moved to Minneapolis to be near her sister Cornelia. By this time she was “almost totally deaf and

suffered from arthritis so severe that she had to use two canes in order to walk” (Pollitt, 1994, p. 28).

Emily Prudden found her way south through an invitation from Mrs. Samuel Loomis, an old school friend. Mrs. Loomis and her husband were working at Brainerd Institute in Chester, South Carolina. Interestingly, the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church ran the school as they did many similar schools across the country and throughout the South. Brainerd was the only school in the area for black children. Prudden served as house mother to the girls in the boarding school. She writes of her experience (1914), “I gladly accepted the call of an old schoolmate to help as housemother for forty girls... I went, paying my own way, neither then nor since receiving one dollar for service done” (p. 737). This experience of being asked to help, to serve, engaged Prudden in an unexpected way. She learned of the need through a trusted friend. Successful fundraisers still encourage friends to share the need with friends understanding that the opinion of a close associate has a much stronger pull than a request from a person representing an organization. Thus, Prudden moved forward into her new career as educator and philanthropist.

The experience of being a house mother at Brainerd introduced Prudden to her philanthropic work of establishing fifteen schools at the foothills of the North Carolina mountains. As the house mother for the girls’ dormitory, she had most of the day free while the children were in classes. While the girls were out and despite her disabilities, Prudden (1914) would, “visit the poor cabins, both colored and white, in the city and far out in the country. I would walk many miles and talk with people by the way... My

theme was always salvation” (p. 737). As she explored the community of Chester, South Carolina she soon realized that she could build a school to support the education of the poor who are unable to afford schooling or lived too far from a school. This begins her vision of education for the rural and poor children of the foothills in North Carolina. The point here is that Prudden was asked to give of herself, to begin her philanthropy, by a trusted friend. It is in the asking that one is then motivated to act.

Throughout her life she continued her Christian faith by writing it into the curriculum at all of the fifteen schools she founded. In 1910 she wrote a paper for her home church, the Church of Christ, Congregational in Orange, Connecticut, for their centennial anniversary. Prudden (1910) writes, “Words cannot tell the debt we owe, we owe *ourselves*, to the holy teachings of this Church of God” (p. 37). When we owe something there is an immediate power shift. We must pay back for our debts. Prudden notes we owe ourselves for the teachings of God. Written well into her career as a philanthropist, serving others through building schools in the South, she is well aware of service to her God. She employs others to consider their debt and act with thoughtful deed. The work of missionaries to educate and teach the word of God in the late 19th century was often left to the hands of women. Prudden grew up understanding service and what it means to the church. She spent her life paying her debt through her philanthropic work, understanding philanthropy is not stagnant. It is active and intentional.

Emily Prudden, although her roots are from a white, well educated family with financial means, sought to educate all children regardless of color. She believed

education led to a better quality of life. Bates (1989) wrote about the exposure to other cultures as a means to create a new innovative whole. As discussed earlier, Prudden was exposed to the culture of poor Southerners in her experience at Brainerd Institute. When not performing her duties as housemother she spent her days with people in the rural South. In her autobiographical sketch Prudden (1914) explains:

I would find three or four white girls, sisters so fair, blue eyes, rosy cheeks and gentle manners, but without any advantage, no school, no church, no society, more to be pitied than the colored, who are social and full of gladness. (p.737)

From experiences like these Prudden grew to know her vision of providing education for poor rural children in the foothills of North Carolina. She thought to herself (1914), “You could build a home in some lovely place where every influence is pure and uplifting, and take fifteen girls and train them as your own, and send them out to useful lives” (p. 737). There are many implications to the language Prudden uses to describe her vision.

Emily Prudden makes clear that she did not take one dollar for her service to any of the schools she established. She does not share publicly the fact that she used her personal finances to purchase the land and start the schools. Her philanthropic interests may have begun with feelings of pity and actions of charity but they transformed into alliances with those she sought to educate. Prudden’s descriptions of the situations she encountered are full of judgment statements: “without any advantage”, “pitied” or “forlorn.” Communications in the 1800s were not as they are today. Unless someone actually left their small local sphere they most likely would not have any understanding of situations of others in their own country. Today we have access to images from around

the world, but there is still a difference actually experiencing someone's poverty by meeting people where they are rather than viewing it on television or the internet. Perhaps actually walking with the people of North Carolina affected Prudden at a deeper level – forcing her to address her moral biography. It demonstrates her lived experience among the people of North Carolina was vastly different from her upbringing. She came with class values that were different from the people she served. Prudden (1914) describes, “In the deep valleys were the homes of poor, unlearned, but interesting people, shut out from all that makes life rich and lovely, no school, no church, no social life” (p. 738). By stating that the mountain people she encountered were poor but interesting, she seems to entertain the concept of partnership. Later in her writings she describes herself talking with the people and asking their needs before moving forward to establish her schools. Additionally, Prudden did not only establish schools for white children but also for black children. She subscribed to Booker T. Washington's philosophy of separate but equal and she encouraged black teachers to run the schools for black children. From all indications the curriculum at both black and white schools was the same as well as the materials provided for education. Overall, Prudden established seven schools for black children and eight for white children between 1884 when she opened her first school and her death in 1910. She understood the relationship between power and education. As her first school began to grow to a student body of sixty, Prudden (1914) commented, “I would look over the fine crowd in the dining-room and say to myself, ‘See the plants grow’ ” (p. 738). Prudden worked hard to equalize the societal structure of the South by making education accessible to black and white children with the same materials,

curriculum and qualified teachers while priding herself on her service, never taking payment for her work.

In one demonstration of alliance with the black community, Prudden sought to establish Lincoln Academy, near All Healing, North Carolina. While building her first schools for white children she continued to think of the needs of the black children. Prudden (1914) explains, “I thought of the colored people around All Healing, poor, wicked, and uncared-for, and I felt I had not done for the least of Christ’s brethren” (p. 739). She returned to All Healing to purchase land for her new school. Prudden writes in her autobiography (1914):

The white people protested at my doing this: ‘Miss Prudden, you can make nothing out of these lying, good for-nothing Negros.’... I trembled for the safety of that new Home, and I gave it to the Lord with an absolute trust that He would guard and bless it; and now for twenty five years it has been a blessing to a wide section. (p. 739)

Her work continued and although Lincoln Academy is no longer open today, it remained open until 1955. Prudden describes in her autobiographical sketch (1914) the first Christmas at Lincoln Academy. She recalls:

Tears streamed down the faces of the men as they listened. Never before had a helping hand been extended to them. A white-headed granny near the stage shouted, ‘Glory, hallelujah, the heavens are open above me; this is the happiest day of my life; glory, hallelujah!’ (p. 739)

Prudden’s obituary in the Hickory Record (n. d.) reads, “What a model for girls and young women who wish to make their lives tell for great deeds and noble careers” (n. p.). Prudden set an example through her philanthropy, as to what is possible for women, both

black and white. In a society where men still maintained financial control, Prudden demonstrated the capability of women to make sound financial decisions resulting in socially just outcomes. Prudden explains in her biography, "... in six years three large schools had been built, established and passed from my care" (p. 739). She continues as she describes her fifth school in Saluda, North Carolina:

Monday morning early I could not keep back the tears as... we opened that morning and graded a school of fifty pupils... This was the only school of the fifteen that was not entirely built from my own rather slender purse. (pp. 739-740)

Prudden had worked in partnership with the American Missionary Association to build the school in Saluda, all other schools she selected the site and supported the development on her own or with community support. Prudden understood the idea of partnership as she matured in her philanthropy. She writes (1914):

I promised to furnish all materials if the citizens would do the work. This they did so quickly that the unfinished building was in use that very fall, and by 1893 the second floor was used for boarding pupils and teachers. (p. 741)

She established fifteen schools, transforming spaces so others could move forward. She used her power as a white, educated woman with financial backing, to change a community through her philanthropy, opening spaces for black and white poor children to earn a quality education. As a woman at the turn of the century, she recognized her responsibility to give back to others. She truly demonstrated Sankofa, reaching back to move forward.

Pfeiffer University began through an advertisement in the *Lenoir Topic* in 1897 when a farmer announced the sale of his property. Prudden responded to the ad and purchased the farm on Lick Mountain. She called the school The Oberlin Home and School named for The Rev. John Frederick Oberlin, who was a pastor whom she respected working in the mountains of France. She originally had two teachers who lived with her and taught the children. Prudden purchased the land for a school and establish the basic furnishings and curriculum. She would launch the school and run it for three to four years. Once the school was established she would find a partner organization to continue the school. She partnered with the American Missionary Association (AMA), Women's Boards affiliated with various denominations, or other organizations that could support the work. In 1903 she offered Oberlin Home and School to the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Russell (2004) explains:

Her conditions were that the Society, 'contribute to the support \$200 annually, and if it grows so as to require another teacher, an additional \$100, and allow \$100 as student aid for ten girls.' (p. 15)

The school was then renamed Ebenezer Mitchell Home and School in honor of Mrs. Mary A. Mitchell's late stepson. Again another situation in which the gift was made by a woman but the naming honors a man. Mrs. Mitchell gave the school \$1,000 for their work which enabled the school to complete the second story of the school house. The school suffered some setbacks when a teacher, trying to raise funds for the school, wrote a public piece to the Cincinnati papers describing the ignorance of the South. It was not well received; the teacher was removed and the school closed for a semester. In 1908 a

fire destroyed the school but no one was injured. The Society attempted to raise funds to rebuild but was unsuccessful. They moved the school to Mesenheimer in Stanly County, North Carolina in 1910 (Russell, 2004). In 1935 the school was renamed Pfeiffer Junior College to honor philanthropists Henry and Annie Pfeiffer from New York City. In 1954 the junior college became a full senior college and in 1996 added graduate programs, changing the name to Pfeiffer University. Prudden's passion for education continues today on the campus of Pfeiffer University. A statue of Emily Prudden sits on the front lawn of the university reminding students of what one woman's philanthropy can do. Pfeiffer University is the only school of the fifteen Prudden established to become a four year college and then university. It continues to produce students with the motto, "The nature to serve. The knowledge to lead."

After starting her schools and running them for two or three years, Prudden turned all of them over to various organizations or people to maintain. In 1887 All Healing Springs, her first school, was handed over to Judge Edwin Jones of Minnesota, who had also been a financial supporter of the school. Because of Judge Jones' support Prudden changed the name to Jones Seminary. The aim of the school was to provide Christian education to young white women and to train them to be teachers. In 1890 Judge Jones died but the school remained in operation with the support of his heirs and under the direction of The Rev. Hampton. Upon The Reverend's death in 1899 the Jones heirs offered the school to the Associated Reformed Presbyterian Church who accepted the offer. The school was closed for one year for reorganization. The school reopened in 1900 without the elementary school component. The full focus was then a secondary and

normal school. In 1914 college courses were added and the name of the school was changed to Linwood College. The college had a good reputation in the field of education until 1921 when it closed its doors due to financial difficulties (Pollitt, 1994).

While establishing All Healing Springs School, Prudden visited Blowing Rock, North Carolina and purchased 13 acres of land calling it Skyland. In the summer of 1885 she built the “Home” which doubled as teaching and living space for students and teachers. The school accepted both white boys and girls with the girls living on the second floor with the teachers and the boys housed in the attic. In 1888 Prudden deeded the school to the American Mission Association (AMA) to continue the growth. The AMA ran the school until 1912 when public schools became the norm and Skyland was no longer needed (Pollitt, 1994). Prudden returned to close the school. She writes in her autobiography (1914):

In 1911 I returned to Blowing Rock, and at the request of the American Missionary Association took charge of Skyland Institute for two prosperous years. This school in 1912 reached its twenty-fifth year, and I reached my eightieth birthday June 13th at that date resting from all school work. (p. 743)

Pollitt (1994) explains that, at All Healing Springs School, Prudden taught white children in the day and then traveled to teach black children and adults in the evening. By the time she established her first two schools for white children she knew she wanted to establish schools for black children too. Prudden bought land in Gaston County for the Lincoln Academy for black girls in 1888 and after a small building was constructed the school opened the same year. Prudden deeded the school to the American Missionary

Association in 1890 and the school grew and prospered. When the AMA took over boys were also admitted. At times the school could not accept all the students who applied. “Preference was given to students from areas with no education alternatives” (Pollitt, 1994, p. 72). Many black Western North Carolinians received their high school diploma or teaching certificate from Lincoln Academy. Pollitt (1994) notes:

From the 1930’s to the 1950’s, Lincoln also served as one of the few southern interracial meeting sites for groups such as the YMCA/YWCA and the United Christian Youth Movement, a national interdenominational, interracial organization for college students. (p. 73)

Lincoln closed in 1955 when the American Mission Association stopped supporting boarding schools and a new public high school for black students was built nearby. The building is no longer standing (Pollitt, 1994).

Saluda Seminary was opened by Prudden in 1891 at the encouragement of the American Missionary Association. The school quickly had over 150 students and suffered from overcrowding. The community pulled together in 1908 to donate land to the Association and assisted in building another dormitory. However, the student population continued to grow. In 1920 the American Missionary Association turned the school over to Polk County to become a public school. Pollitt (1994) explains the eventually new buildings replaced the original structure but the school served its original purpose.

Prudden mentions briefly in her autobiography (1914) Trout, which she renamed Altamont. Pollitt (1994) notes the school was called Owl Den School but there are no

existing records to discover what happened to the school after Prudden's brief year in Altamont.

Around 1890 Prudden received an invitation from The Reverend Robert Payne Pell to assist in starting a school in Elk Park, North Carolina. She agreed and according to Pollitt (1994) over 300 students were soon attending the school. In 1900 the school became part of the public school system of Mitchell County (now Avery County). Prudden also set out to start a school for black children in Elk Park which was met with great resistance. She mentioned briefly in her autobiography of the difficult situation but in no detail. Pollitt (1994) sites the writing of one of the missionary teachers noting that the race relations were so bad in the area that Prudden had difficulty finding teachers. The Krimmer Mennonite Conference decided to expand their missionary work to the mountain area of North Carolina and sent a married couple to help Prudden establish the school. The school was named the Salem School and Orphanage which opened an orphanage for black children shortly after the Mennonite couple arrived at the school. The school and orphanage closed in 1912 due to difficult race relations and the remote location (Pollitt, 1994).

The Mountain View Academy was established in 1892 with a joint venture between Prudden and the community members; she supplied the materials and they supplied the labor. By 1904 the school became part of the public school system of Caldwell County (Pollitt, 1994, Prudden, 1914).

Douglas Academy and Clarkson Home, also known as the Lawndale Schools were the concept of two brothers, James and Jim Wells, former slaves, who wanted

education for their children. Cleveland County denied public education to black children in 1900. James Wells sent his daughters to Lincoln Academy and learned of the work of Emily Prudden. He contacted her with his idea of building a school for black children in Lawndale. Wells supplied the land, materials and labor and Prudden supplied the teachers and the school equipment (Pollitt, 1994). In 1901 Douglas academy opened as a girls school employing James Wells' daughters as the first teachers. Clarkson Home opened for boys a year later. The American Missionary Association supported the schools until funding ran short then it deeded the schools to the Methodist Episcopal Church. Pollitt (1994) reports that Cleveland County began public education of black student in 1920 and Douglas Academy became part of the county school system.

Golden Valley Institute opened in Golden, North Carolina in 1903 to white boys and girls of all ages. Pollitt (1994) explains the school had many owners, "In 1904, with an enrollment of 91 students, Prudden deeded the school to the AMA. Suffering from lack of funds the AMA deeded it back to Prudden in 1906" (p. 94). The Reverend Richard Forrest then purchased the school from Prudden in 1907 as a school and seminary. The school grew but in 1911 Forrest moved the seminary portion of the school to Georgia leaving the primary school in Golden. The school then fell to the leadership of the Fairview Baptist Church. The school managed to stay open through the Great Depression but was in such disrepair the State ordered no more students to be admitted. Pollitt (1994) writes that the Board of Education of Burke County offered the owners 154 acres and a new building to move the school so they did. The name of the school was changed to the Southernmountain Institute. Pollitt (1994) claims the school was deeded to

the Burke County public school system after World War II and remains open as a home for abused and neglected children. However, at the time of my research I could not locate records for the Southernmountain Institute.

The Lovejoy Academy was built in 1905 at the request of black families in the Mill Springs area of Polk County. Families approached Prudden and asked for help establishing a school if they gave the land, building supplies and materials. She agreed and Lovejoy Academy began. The school was turned over to the Christian Missionary Alliance (CMA) in 1905. Lovejoy was destroyed by a fire which, according to Pollitt (1994), some believed to be racially motivated. After the fire the Polk County School Board built a new school for black children.

Finally, the Mt. Herman Academy was the last of Prudden's schools. Pollitt (1994) explains:

In the early 1900s, the situation for African-American children in the town of Brevard, in Transylvania County, North Carolina, was similar to that in most western North Carolina counties. While local white children could attend tax-supported public schools, no provisions were made for the education of black children. (p. 99)

Wilke Carpenter, an alumnus of Lincoln Academy and former teacher at both Douglas and Lovejoy academies, and her husband Dr. Johnstone began Mt. Herman Academy with the help of Prudden. The school never had a sponsor such as the American Missionary Association but relied solely on contributions from the black community of Brevard. The school provided education for students in the day and a community

gathering space in the evening. In 1941 the school burned down. Pollitt (1994) explained that after the fire:

For seven years, black children around Brevard attended school in various churches in their community... It was not until the 1960's that black high school students could attain public school education in Transylvania County. (p. 102)

Prudden's philanthropic service to education made learning available to children and adults in Western North Carolina at a time when access to education was limited. The motto of Pfeiffer University, "*the nature to serve – the knowledge to lead*", represents the work of Emily Prudden well.

Charlotte Hawkins Brown and Palmer Memorial Institute. Dr. Charlotte Hawkins Brown, born in Henderson, North Carolina on June 11, 1883, was a descendent of slaves. Brown's maternal grandparents were Rebecca and Mingo Hawkins. It is believed that Rebecca was a descendent of John Hawkins, the English navigator and seemed to be a favored slave in the Hawkins family. Not much is known of Brown's grandfather except it is thought he was a field hand and a skilled carpenter. After emancipation he owned a forty acre farm in Vance County, North Carolina where he lived with Rebecca and their children. According to Wadelington and Knapp (1999):

That a man just five years out of slavery owned a farm was notable considering the growing number of black and white North Carolinians who were forced into tenant farming, sharecropping, and peonage. (p. 14)

Charlotte's mother, Carolyn (Carrie) Hawkins, was born free in 1865 and highly influenced by southern white upper-class values. Jane Hawkins, Rebecca's white half-

sister, reared Carrie in her home surrounded by fine art and music. Jane sent Carrie to primary school at Shaw University in Raleigh for several years. Brown (n. d.) recalls her mother's story of Jane telling her, "Caroline, if there be anything like a colored lady, I want you to be one" (p.3). This is the first memory Charlotte has around race.

Undoubtedly Jane was disappointed when Carrie, at seventeen, became pregnant with Charlotte and as a result was sent to live with Rebecca in Henderson, North Carolina. Not much is known about Charlotte's biological father except it is believed that he was a former slave from an adjacent plantation.

Like many Southern black families after the Civil War, Carrie migrated North bringing young Charlotte to Boston in hopes of a better future for her daughter. Brown (1927) recalls her mother as:

A thrifty woman... She made home and home life beautiful for me and my one brother, Mingo. I had a wonderful stepfather who shared with mother in providing the comforts of life. (p. 14)

She continues to explain the furnishings that were in the home such as a piano, "flowers around the front door" and other material items giving the impression that Brown was not raised in a poor family. Despite the hardship her mother may have faced leaving North Carolina, she was able to provide Charlotte with a comfortable, stable family life.

Brown attended Union Baptist Church of Cambridge with her mother. This was the foundation for Brown's lifelong commitment to service and philanthropy. Her faith served her throughout her career and she refers to it often in her letters and notes. It is in church where her leadership skills first emerged. Brown tells the story that as a young girl

she noticed there was no special attention given to the youngest children in the congregation so she took it upon herself to organize a kindergarten class. She also recalls she was selected to speak during a special occasion at her church. She did such a good job, Brown (1927) wrote:

I can see myself bowing again and again as my ears had made me the proud possessor of the comments heard on the platform, - 'She's going to be a mighty speaker some day'[sic], and 'I expect to hear from that girl in the future.' (p. 12)

Faith and family played a large role in Brown's life offering her, at a young age, substantial examples to follow.

Charlotte Hawkins Brown learned philanthropy at a young age through the support of her family and church. Within her church she had the opportunity to hear from great speakers such as Booker T. Washington, Lucy Craft Laney and Mary L. Baldwin and learned of their important work in the South. Brown perhaps first heard of the educational work being done in the South through a lecture Booker T. Washington gave at Ebenezer Baptist Church in Boston entitled, "The Negro in the South." Wadelington and Knapp (1999) comment:

Brown remembered Washington's appeal to northern blacks that Sunday: 'You, who have had the opportunity for education in Massachusetts, should help your own people in the South. Massachusetts does not need you.' (p. 28)

This made an impression on young Miss Hawkins; one that led her to her life of service in the South.

In addition to her church and family Brown also had external influences which made an impact on her moral biography. The reason she became a teacher and the reason she moved to Sedalia, North Carolina were because of two seemingly random encounters that pushed her life in new directions. In her biography Brown (1927) explains she had taken a babysitting position to earn money for her graduation gown. One afternoon she was pushing the baby carriage down the road while also reading Virgil when a nicely dressed white woman stopped her and inquired about her reading. She explained it was a text book for her senior class at the English High School. A few days later Brown learned through her school principal that Mrs. Alice Freeman Palmer, second female president of Wesley College, had inquired about her. At the time this interaction Brown (1927) recalls, "The name 'Alice Freeman Palmer' did not mean very much to me. It would not have meant much to any girl of my years" (p. 17). After high school Brown (1927) had fully planned on attending college as she explains:

My hopes and ambitions were centered on going to Radcliffe College, but these hopes had been shattered, not because my mother had not saved up the means to send me through college or to provide me with the necessary things that would have been in keeping with a thrifty household, but having had only three or four years of schooling herself, though with a keen business judgment and a culture absorbed from her association in her early childhood with one of the finest white families in the south, she could not possibly sense the necessity for going four years beyond high school, for suffice it to say there were very few in any group in the year 1900 who were going through college. (p. 17)

Brown continued to pester her mother about further education and was able to persuade her mother to agree to allow her to attend Normal School to become a well prepared teacher. It was then that she discovered Alice Freeman Palmer was a Salem Normal

School graduate and contacted her at once to introduce herself. Palmer remembered the young student reading Virgil while babysitting. Brown (1927) remembers:

... without inquiring about my financial position (Alice Freeman Palmer) voluntarily became responsible for whatever expenses I might have in the state normal school of my choice. (p. 18)

Brown naturally selected Salem Normal School and Palmer became Brown's mentor and benefactor. Being the recipient of Palmer's generosity reinforced in Brown the concept of philanthropy. She learned the importance of asking for assistance when needed and she recognized the power philanthropy held.

The second person of professional influence in Brown's life is a woman Brown met on the train between Boston and Salem. Brown recounts the chance meeting in a letter to Mrs. Galen Stone, a benefactor to Brown's future school, Palmer Memorial Institute. Brown writes:

Another instance, equally as leading... a kind faced elderly woman was attracted to me and chose to change her seat that she might enter into conversation with me. I was one colored girl in a large group of young white girls, thereby more conspicuous. Through our conversation she discovered my aim to return some day to the land of my birth, for I was born in the south, altho [sic] I grew up from childhood in New England. She told me of the work that the American Missionary Association was doing in North Carolina and their great need for well prepared teachers... She made me realize that all of this would be such an asset to the mission service I could render my people in some school. Altho [sic] the salary offered was very small, my mother decided among other offers that North Carolina her home state was the place for me. (personal communication, March 10, 1921)

The American Missionary Association representative shared the need for missionary teachers and asked Brown to serve. Brown learned of the need not from a church bulletin, as Mary Biddle had or a trusted friend as with Emily Prudden but from a complete stranger. The story of need must have been compelling because Brown took the position after completing only one of the two years required of the teacher training course at Salem Normal School. She completed the second year through correspondence while in North Carolina.

The American Missionary Association was formed in 1846 by the Union Missionary Society, the Committee for West Indian Missions, and the Western Evangelical Missionary Society “as a protest against the silence of other missionary agencies regarding slavery” (Richardson, 1986, p. vii). The leaders were staunch abolitionists who believed the gospel was a powerful weapon against slavery. Richardson continues:

... the American Missionary Association advocated political activity, insisted upon the essential antislavery nature of the Constitution, and was dedicated to purging the churches of the stain of slavery. (p. vii)

The organization worked internationally in Africa, Jamaica and other countries with need. They also provided clothing for slave refugees who had fled to Canada in the late 1840s, however, most of their work was targeted in the United States. Richardson reports that by the 1850s the American Missionary Association had over one hundred missions in the Northwest, Missouri, North Carolina and Kentucky. They began with forming American Missionary Association (AMA) churches and used these places to teach

Christianity and educational instruction. When the Civil War began, explains Richardson (1986):

... the AMA was probably more an antislavery than missionary society, yet its experience, organization, and fund-gathering capability enabled it to lead the way in providing systematic relief and education for slaves escaping from Confederate lines. (p. viii)

The earliest schools were elementary based. However, the American Missionary Association had ambitions to grow the schools to normal schools and colleges as States began to provide public education to all races. Richardson continues to note the American Missionary Association:

... early decided that blacks should eventually furnish their own teachers. No race, AMA officials thought, should be permanently dependent upon another race for its development. Though whites should assist, and initially would provide leadership and teachers, blacks must eventually play a major role in working out their future with their own educators and leaders. (p. viii)

The American Missionary Association certainly was not a perfect organization and had problems within but as far as mission organizations, the American Missionary Association was the most progressive in the assistance and recognition of black rights and needs through the Civil War and Reconstruction.

Because of the encounter on the train with the American Missionary Association representative Brown, without completing her second year at Salem Normal School, packed her things and headed to Sedalia, North Carolina to teach at Bethany Institute, an American Missionary Association supported school. After her first year in North Carolina

the American Missionary Association decided to eliminate the funding for the school. By 1902 Reconstruction had come to an end and private funds for primary education were waning. The American Missionary Association was refocusing their efforts toward Normal and Technical Training Schools. Brown had spent a year building relationships with members from both the black and white communities of Sedalia and doing a small bit of fundraising to support the needs of the school children. She had assumed the support of the American Missionary Association would continue but when she learned it would not Brown was distraught. Members of the community approached her beseeching Brown not to leave but to stay and teach. She accepted this challenge and realized the role of fundraising would be key to her mission.

Fortunately, Brown knew of other schools throughout the country that had been started by women and successfully run for the education of girls and minority children. Building on the shift in educational opportunities for women and minority students in the United States, Brown looked to these schools as models. Schools like Mount Holyoke, established by Mary Lyon for white, middle class girls in the North and Haines Normal and Industrial School in Atlanta, established by Lucy Craft Laney for black children were her inspiration. Brown reached out to other educators, black and white, developing friendships with other women in the field that would last throughout the years. Mary McLeod Bethune, founder of Daytona Educational and Industrial Institute in Florida, which later became Bethune-Cookman College, and Nannie Helen Burroughs, founder of the National Training School for Women and Girls in Washington D.C., which is still in existence today as a private Christian school bearing her name, were steadfast friends of

Brown as she built Palmer Memorial Institute. In a personal letter to Brown, Mary

McLeod Bethune writes:

Your work has been so distinctive. Your services have extended itself to people of all races, classes, and creeds. The reflection of your bountiful life are felt almost everywhere. Harriet Tubman, Sojourner Truth, Margaret Washington -- all of those who were sowing seeds when it costs so much more than it does now, must rejoice in the Glory Land over the great harvest that is now coming to Negro womanhood in America and throughout the World. (personal communication, June 12, 1947)

Brown's close friendships with other women doing similar work gave her a private space to share ideas about their success and frustrations.

The power of fund-raising, as these young educators discovered, was critical to sustaining their schools; and all agreed Charlotte Hawkins Brown had a talent for it. Wadelington and Knapp (1999) explain that one of the first things Brown decided to do at Bethany Institute was to solicit funds from her friend and mentor Alice Freeman Palmer and other Northern benefactors. "Brown composed a standard letter of appeal describing Bethany's needs and had pupils copy it" (p. 44). Hundreds of letters were produced this way and sent off to tentative prospects. Each time a contribution was returned both Brown and her students celebrated. Letters from Bethune to Brown occasionally note the enclosure of small amounts of money. In one letter Bethune writes:

I am very glad to inclose [sic] my check of \$5.00 as my contribution to the fund you are raising. I wish I could multiply it maney [sic] times for indeed I consider the work you are doing most essential and worthy. (personal communication, January, 8, 1921)

A letter Brown received from Mr. Henry W. Farnam of New Haven, Connecticut reads:

In reply to your letter, I enclose my check for \$20 for the Institute. This doubles my usual subscription, which I have increased on account of the increase in cost of living. (personal communication, January, 19, 1921)

The archives were full of similar letters to Brown confirming her intense letter writing campaigns for funds.

Between Brown's first and second year at Bethany Institute she went back to Boston with the determination of raising enough funds to support the school for one year. Unfortunately, that same summer Alice Freeman Palmer died while traveling overseas with her husband. Brown was extremely sad to lose her friend and mentor. She had hoped Palmer would open doors to donors interested in funding the education of black children in the South. Instead, Brown had to make her own way. Wadlington and Knapp (1999) describe Brown's fundraising efforts:

In Cambridge, she collected money, clothing, and furniture from a few African American churches and white friends. She then planned to visit resorts...to present a program including one or two jubilee melodies, a recitation of poetry by the contemporary African American poet Paul Laurence Dunbar, a ten-minute talk on Palmer, and a collection. (p. 46)

She had some success with these programs, gaining seventy-five dollars of her one hundred dollar goal. All the while she was doing this work she was in conversation with God, believing if He wanted her to continue her work in Sedalia, He would provide. When she finally reached her goal of one hundred dollars, Brown returned to Sedalia, North Carolina and immediately changed the name of the Bethany Institute to Palmer Memorial Institute to honor the memory of her dear friend. She knew this was the beginning of her philanthropic work.

Brown's fundraising skills developed as Palmer Memorial Institute grew. Wadelington and Knapp (1999) share a story that demonstrates Brown's devotion and tenacity in raising money for her school. During the summer of 1905 Brown traveled to Boston with plans of fundraising for Palmer Memorial Institute. The school was in the process of completing Memorial Hall and Brown needed to raise \$800 for the building. She felt this was a reasonable goal since she had been able to raise this much during her past summers in Boston. However, this summer she fell ill, overworked and exhausted, she found herself for nearly nine weeks in a Boston hospital. When she was released from the hospital she had only collected \$125 and it was nearly time to return to North Carolina. She made the decision to call on Charles Guthrie in New York at the St. Regis Hotel. She had received gifts previously from Mrs. Guthrie and had established a relationship with her through letter writing. When Brown arrived at the hotel Mr. Guthrie's valet informed her that Mr. Guthrie was not interested in supporting her school and that Mrs. Guthrie was the only one interested in her work but she was in Washington D.C. at the time. Wadelington and Knapp (1999) further explain:

Not knowing that the valet had refused her admittance without consulting Guthrie, Brown felt deep despair. After she prayed for guidance, an idea came to her. Brown sent a telegram to Guthrie asking to see him, and to her amazement, he agreed. She returned to the hotel and was escorted to Guthrie's suite by the very valet who had rejected her. Brown spoke at length to Guthrie, but he talked of everything but money. After a while, Guthrie finally asked casually what the building would cost. Brown told him \$800. As she departed, he presented her with the full amount. (p. 50)

Memorial Hall was completed and opened in the fall. Brown's tenacious spirit made her one of the best fundraisers among her friends. She understood the importance of one-on-one solicitations and must have been quite persuasive.

Charlotte Hawkins Brown had a vision for black children in the South. She envisioned equity in education; she intended the students at Palmer Memorial Institute to have an equal if not superior education to those of white children. One of her largest benefactors, Galen Stone, espoused a philosophy very much like her own. Smith and Wilson (1999) quote Stone, "I am not interested in educating and advancing Negroes, but in making American citizens, and I feel that they should be given the highest and best there is" (p. 247). This vision was not held by all of Brown's benefactors. Smith and Wilson (1999) explain Brown, in her politically savvy way, learned to hold her tongue when her donors warned her "to be more modest in her expectations for her race" (p. 247). She learned to live with double-consciousness. Du Bois (1903) writes:

It's a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness, - an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (p. 9)

Brown adhered to the concept of double consciousness; she experienced life as a black woman educated in the North who worked in the South and moved in and out of classes depending on what the circumstances required. The experience Du Bois describes as a black man are magnified through the lens of the black woman as triple or even quadruple consciousness.

Throughout her years as educator and philanthropist Brown was very aware of race and racial issues within the United States. In an earlier letter to her friend and benefactor Mrs. Carrie Stone, she writes of her experience as a teacher in the South with race stating, “You can never know, my dear friend, the prejudice that greeted me as a northern educated negro woman” (personal communication, March 10, 1921). This letter demonstrates there were discussions about race between whites and blacks. Brown felt comfortable enough with Stone to share her personal thoughts on race.

In another correspondence Brown responds to Mrs. W. E. Lowe of Elon College in North Carolina reprimanding the woman, obviously white, for not addressing her with proper etiquette. Brown writes:

Dear Madame:

Your enclosure and letter addressed to Charlotte H. Brown is before me. It is a pleasure to serve and I am glad that we could help you and ourselves. I was both surprised and grieved to find that I was serving a body of women who feel that my legal title ‘Mrs.’ is too good for me. I come across that so seldom in the fine white people with whom I deal, I scarcely know what to think when I get an envelope without title. I know it is a new thing to many white people, but intelligent Negroes resent being addressed by their names without title.

I trust that you will put yourself in my place and then judge.

Very truly yours, (personal communication, May 9, 1921)

And in a third correspondence to Mr. Max Loeb of Chicago, Illinois, Brown responds to a letter that must have questioned integrations of the schools. There is no date on the letter but there are references to World War II and the fighting in France placing the letter in the 1940s well after Palmer Memorial Institute was firmly founded. Brown asserts:

I have race pride, and proud of what my race has accomplished, and were it not for the advantages I know I secured thru [sic] receiving my training as provided for the youth of America rather than for any distinct group or class, I should stand for separate schools.

The greatest advantage is the opportunity it gives the youth of both races to know each other, it destroys that un-American spirit of superiority of the race because of color and fixes a common standard for superiority by character, intelligence and natural ability. (personal communication, n. d.)

These interactions demonstrate the double consciousness that Brown often had to take on; with one white friend she was able to confide and share her frustrations around race, in another situation Brown takes on the responsibility of correcting someone to assure respect for herself and other educated black women, and in a third defends her race and the integration of races in school.

During the time frame of the early 1920s, Brown served as the president of the North Carolina Federation of Colored Women's Clubs. She was asked to give a talk at the Annual meeting of the North Carolina Federation of White Women's Clubs in Charlotte, North Carolina. In her comments she discusses the problem of communication and understanding across the races, noting the black women with whom white women come into contact are generally the domestic help who are uneducated. Rarely are there conversations between educated white women and educated black women. She explains this is because both are so busy furthering their own causes that they have little time to connect. Brown (1920) states the educated black woman is "not seeking social intermingling but social justice" (p.1). She continues:

... they want respectful recognition of their womanhood in ordinary acts of courtesy and politeness due anybody in the white race...they want

cooperation with the white women in reaching the hundreds of negro women who labor day in and day out for the white people. (p. 1)

Brown is outlining out what it means to be an “advantaged member of a disadvantaged minority...” (Bates, 1989, p. 63).

One final example of Brown’s vision is found in a fundraising letter for Palmer Memorial Institute. The letter does not formally address anyone in particular but aimed at the “generous citizens of Greensboro”. Brown pleads:

We are all God’s children, our skins differ and our characteristics are somewhat dissimilar but thousands in both races are striving for harmony, mutual co-operation and understanding. (personal communication, December 8, 1920)

She continues to acknowledge the headlines in newspapers giving negative press to people of color and then she turns this around to share the good work that is coming out of Palmer Memorial Institute. She talks about one hundred recent graduates who are now working in a variety of positions such as teachers, pastors and nurses. She closes the letter with a challenge from a Northern donor to give \$15,000 to the school if \$30,000 can be raised locally. By promoting the positive attributes of her students and diminishing the negative Brown hopes to shift the perception of Southern whites.

While building Palmer Memorial Institute, Charlotte Hawkins Brown postponed her personal life. She waited to marry ten years after she started Palmer. When she did marry in 1911, she chose Edward S. Brown after a year of courtship. He was a Harvard student and boarder at the home of Brown’s mother in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Once they married Edward moved south to take up a teaching position at Palmer. However,

“Brown did not fit the stereotype of the submissive wife,” (p. 72) explains Wadelington and Knapp (1999). Edward left Palmer Memorial Institute after only one year and the couple divorced in 1916. Charlotte kept her married name throughout her life, although she married once more in 1923. The marriage to John W. Moses was annulled less than a year later. Although the post-Civil War societal structure began to allow women to function without a spouse it was still an anomaly for a woman to control her own finances and to live out her life without a spouse.

Following the Sankofa concept, Charlotte Hawkins Brown reached back to move others forward. Her passion for education enabled her to build Palmer Memorial Institute. She learned early on how to leverage her influence by gaining the support of wealthy donors of the North and those holding high political positions in the South. She befriended many wives of powerful men such as Lula McIver, wife of Charles Duncan McIver, first president of the State Normal and Industrial School for Girls (now The University of North Carolina at Greensboro). Her friendships with women enabled her to influence their husbands to support Palmer Memorial Institute both financially and through written support. At this time written endorsements held a lot of influence. Brown collected these letters of support when she could not get a financial commitment. In her work with the colored women’s clubs, Brown spoke with white woman’s clubs about race and race relations between black and white women. She built allies in the South and North, between men and women, and across races to move her agenda forward.

Of all the schools in this study, Palmer Memorial Institute never achieved full college status and no longer exists (Wadelington and Knapp, 1999). As noted earlier,

Palmer began as Bethany Institute under the direction of the American Missionary Association. One year after Charlotte Hawkins Brown accepted the teaching position at Bethany, the American Missionary Association withdrew funding. Determined to keep the school open, Brown began fundraising. In October 1902 the Alice Freeman Palmer Memorial Institute officially opened. In 1922 the high school department became accredited. In 1932 Palmer opened a junior college department in an attempt to elevate the standing of the school. Unfortunately, the junior college department remained open for only seven years. In 1937 the county established the first public schools for black children and as a result, Palmer received no public funding. In 1952 Brown relinquished her duties as president of Palmer and died nine years later in Greensboro, North Carolina. Despite attempts to revive the school, funding and mismanagement of funds became a considerable problem for Palmer. In 1971 the school closed after a large fire to one of the main buildings. Unable to secure funding to rebuild, the land was sold to Bennett College. The property changed hands several times before the State of North Carolina purchased the campus in 1987 to become the State's first historic site commemorating the work of Charlotte Hawkins Brown (Wadelington and Knapp, 1999).

Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church and Warren Wilson College. The beginnings of Warren Wilson College were not founded in a single gift or idea of one woman but rather supported by a group of women; The Presbyterian Church USA Woman's Executive Committee – later the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church. The Warren Wilson website explains:

The women of the church were concerned that many Americans in isolated areas were not receiving a proper education. The women decided to establish church supported schools in areas where there were no public services. (Warren Wilson College, 2010)

Before examining the establishment of Warren Wilson, originally Asheville Farm School, we need to understand the formation of women's societies. Prior to the Civil War women had little or no interaction in the public sphere. Within various denominations, women served as volunteers to the poor, sick and uneducated in the name of religion. However, this work was rarely recognized as work. Boyd and Brackenridge (1996) explain that the work of women in the Presbyterian Church was not mentioned in the official documentation for two decades. The first mention of women is in 1811 where they are recognized as "pious females."

There are many interpretations of why and how women first became interested in developing organizations. Boyd and Brackenridge (1996) note:

Mary E. Holmes, a Presbyterian educator... [said] Club life is nothing less than the organized anxiety of women who have become intelligent enough to recognize their own low social condition, and strong enough to initiate the forces of reform. (p. 4)

Although this may seem dismissive to women's clubs, the point Holmes makes about women recognizing their social status is critical. It is through the recognition of an unsatisfying situation that change may take place.

In 1879 the Woman's Executive Committee of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, later renamed the Woman's Board of Home Missions, began their work as a new organization under the Presbyterian Church. The group, made up of white

women mostly from financially privileged backgrounds, presented their mission through a formal letter explaining their “Plans of Work” and “Regulations” and asked that the information be disseminated to the wider church community. The work plan that Mrs. Green, Dunn, Schovel, Haines, Bedle, and Boyd presented to each pastor in a private letter states the object of the Woman’s Executive Committee:

... shall be to diffuse information, to identify, stimulate and superintend the work of the women throughout the Church of Home Missions in all its branches; including the raising of money for teachers’ salaries, the distribution of “boxes” and aiding such other objects as may be suggested or approved by the Board of Home Missions. (personal communication, January 7, 1879.)

Headquartered in New York, this group of powerful and very organized women took upon themselves the task of organizing an entire country of women volunteers and fundraisers within the Presbyterian Church. They had the foresight to see the power of women organized for a cause. This organization threatened some members of the Church leadership, which at the time excluded women from ordination, meaning they could not serve in the pulpit or as part of the ruling body of the Church. Boyd and Brackenridge (1996) explain:

Some leaders claim that women were purposively building a power base by designating their fiscal gifts in ways detrimental to the denomination’s budget, but no evidence in the operating principles of the various organizations substantiated such allegations. (p. 23)

The members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions explained in a number of undated letters and issues of *Home Mission Monthly* that it was their intention to continue

to support the collection plate each week and the additional support they were asking for mission purposes was above and beyond the weekly contribution to the church. From the Twenty-Third Annual Report of the Board of Home Missions (1893) the Society elucidates:

Some generous givers fear that the contributions to these societies diminish the regular gifts to the Board. It is possible that it may be the case in some instances. But, it is impossible for wives and daughters to talk about the great need of our country without broadening the view and increasing the liberality of their husbands and brothers. It is our firm conviction that the Woman's Societies swell rather than diminish the gifts of the churches to the Home Board. (p. 12)

Clearly, the women felt their work increased awareness and raised the giving level of Presbyterians despite the concerns of church elders.

In the early and mid-19th century a woman's place in the Presbyterian Church was not in leadership or pastoral roles; instead she was to be supportive and unassertive. Although many women taught Sunday school to children and ministered to the sick and needy, they remained passive in their church roles. However, there soon developed an awareness of the ability women had to give and get financial gifts on behalf of the Church. By the 1830s church officers were openly soliciting gifts from women (Boyd and Brackenridge, 1996). Women began seeing the benefit in these actions and strengthened their organizations within the church. As a result women who volunteered to administer funds gained access to large sums of money within their organization while gaining power through the management and distribution of the funds. Boyd and Brackenridge (1996) explain, "Concurrently, women involved with issues such as suffrage, temperance,

and abolition influenced women's perceptions of their roles and capabilities" (p. 7).

McCarthy (2003) notes similar findings:

(1) women's increasing visibility, numbers, and power within a geometrically expanding arrays of congregations; (2) their central economic role in these developments; (3) a ministerial profession uniquely dependent on their fundraising capabilities and good will; and (4) the growing number of predominance of a cluster of doctrines that stressed literacy, charity and advocacy – all of which encouraged evangelical laywomen to assume enhanced public roles. (p. 60)

As women were gaining agency within the Church they were also gaining ground outside the home. Boyd and Brackenridge (1996) and I too found no official Woman's Board documents discussing the issue of power or authority within the church openly. However, Boyd and Brackenridge located unpublished letters in record groups at the Presbyterian Historical Society that display, privately, the understanding and awareness of gender distinctions within the church. By the 1870s, which has been called "The Church Woman's Decade" the professionalism of the women leaders led them to demand empowerment in denominational matters. (Boyd and Brackenridge, 1996).

In 1898, the women who formed the Woman's Executive Committee within the Presbyterian Church asked that the organization be renamed to the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church and that the women have sole control over the finances they were raising. Prior to this the organization had turned all funds over to the Church and received a small portion for their mission work. However, the women were now demanding that they have control over the funds they raised to distribute to missions as they see fit. Boyd and Brackenridge (1996) comment:

The denomination's attorney argued on behalf of men's greater business experience. 'It once in a while happens that a man by Will may appoint a woman as executrix or trustee; never, however, save a few exceptional cases... unless joined by a man.' (p. 27)

Boyd and Brackenridge continue, noting the attorney placed great doubt that women could possibly run the financial affairs of their organization. This group of women had already proven the male leaders wrong. In the Twenty-Third Annual Report the Board of Home Missions (1893) explained their funding:

The sums of money received during the past year from the sources above named are:

From the Churches.....	\$293,145.64
From the Women's Missionary Societies.....	312,568.58
From the Sabbath-schools and the Y.P.S.C.E.....	47,074.28
From Individual Gifts.....	66,590.38
From Legacies.....	209,523.27
From Interest or Permanent and Trust Funds.....	13,663.12
Permanent and Trust Funds – for investment.....	<u>9,300.00</u>
	951,865.27
N.Y. Synodical Aid Fund and Sustention.....	<u>15,589.61</u>
	\$967,454.88

(p. 13)

As the Woman's Board's ability to sustain its missions grew so too did the women's confidence in the power they yielded.

As raising funds and managing the financial obligations of the organization offered this group of white northern women a means of power in the public sphere, they also brought this attitude to the work they did with their missions. One of the unfortunate results of philanthropy, if not applied in a thoughtful, transformational way, is that it can feel paternalistic. As well meaning as the women of the Home Missions were in their

work, the language used to describe the people of Western North Carolina demonstrates a clear power relation in which the women, through their philanthropic actions, see themselves superior to the people they serve. In a pamphlet produced by the Woman's Executive Committee of Home Missions, Miss Florence Stephenson (n. d.), principal of Girls' Home Industrial School at Asheville, the school which opened prior to Asheville Farm School for boys, opens with:

God has given the women of the Presbyterian Church the opportunity of making the future history of the Mountain Whites, Shall they remain as they are? Shall their false doctrines, their ignorance, their degradation, remain as a dangerous element in the nation? or shall they be educated and evangelized, and thus become a force to spread the gospel throughout this and other lands? (p. 3)

Stephenson demonstrated her belief that her values and religious doctrine are the only way to salvation. Her intolerance of those who are different from her or Other is undeniable going as far as to claim that the difference is “a dangerous element in the nation.” Here she fails to see the treatment she has received as a woman is similar to what she is imposing on the Mountain Whites. She continues to explain the “three grades of poor Whites” found in the South with the lowest class being the Mountaineers.

Stephenson writes:

You would not wonder that they are ignorant and degraded, that the faces of the women are pitifully sad and hopeless, could you understand how they are shut in from all the best things our bright world affords, and how wretchedly poor they are. (p. 5)

As with Emily Prudden's initial observations, Stephenson uses words which judge the situations of others, comparing her upbringing and lived experiences to those from the mountains of North Carolina. As we learned early in the historical overview, improved transportation allowed women to travel outside their home towns as missionaries or teachers enabling cultural experiences that were not available earlier. Recognizing these observations as new cultural experiences may lessen the impact of such descriptions, but they still imply a sense of superiority over those the Woman's Board of Home Missions serve.

But how and where did these women learn to give? Boyd and Brackenridge (1996) share a story in which, raised as a Presbyterian, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, "recalled her leadership of an association of young women in her family's church that provided fiscal support to a seminarian" (p. 7). The beneficiary of these gifts was later invited to preach at the church. His message spoke of the inferiority of women. One by one the women quietly left the church in protest led by young Elizabeth Cady. Boyd and Brackenridge acknowledge that this was not an isolated incident. Women were recognizing the power of the purse as well as the power they had in numbers. The concept of giving was developed through the church and family ties, but *how* the money was given quickly became a concern of women's organizations. Again Boyd and Brackenridge (1996) explain:

From its inception Presbyterian Church USA Woman's Executive Committee displayed great skill in disseminating information, devising new programs, recruiting missionary personnel, and securing contributions for home missions. (p. 24)

These women developed lines of authority, kept regular office hours and practiced book keeping for their programs. They filled a gap with their volunteer work that would not have been met otherwise. McCarthy (2003) explains:

As a result, women's participation in a wide array of church-related associational efforts was not only condoned, but actively encouraged by both the clergy and prominent laymen, helping to draw growing numbers of women into the public sphere and small-scale market activities after the beginning of the nineteenth century. (p. 60)

Although we cannot deconstruct each individual woman's experience as it relates to their moral biography, we can see how religion influenced the thoughts and actions of the women as a group. McCarthy continues:

... American Protestantism opened expanding opportunities for service provision and social advocacy, charity, and social reform – and a steadily proliferating universe of philanthropic initiatives. (p. 60)

Women were learning how to expand their sphere of influence through philanthropy.

As reported earlier, by the 1830s women of the Presbyterian Church were being openly solicited for program and mission support benefiting the poor, sick and uneducated. Boyd and Brackenridge (1996) quote the Western Foreign Missionary Society as saying:

In our extended connection are there not thousands of pious females to whom the moral and social degradation of the heathens (so painfully attested by the conditions of wives and mothers and orphan children in those lands) must make a strong appeal? (p. 6)

Targeting women as potential funders is not a new concept. Clearly it was a strategy in the early 19th century through the Presbyterian Church and other denominations.

As women were beginning to enter the public sphere through charitable work they began finding a voice in society. Knowingly or unknowingly, the leaders of the church were opening public spaces for women by asking them to support church related causes through financial and voluntary means. To demonstrate the strength developed by the Woman's Executive Committee of the Presbyterian Church. Boyd and Brackenridge (1996) divulge:

During the first fiscal year (1879- 1880), with seven salaried staff, and poor office facilities, the Woman's Executive Committee collected more than \$11,000...By 1890, the General Assembly noted that the women contributed \$40,000 more than all the Presbyterian churches... (p. 25)

through small pledges and gifts.

As women began to have more of a role in the public sphere through benevolent organizations and education they became more confident in soliciting each other. The Woman's Executive Committee produced a pamphlet titled *Our Aims for 1882 & '83*. This pamphlet outlines the goals of the Woman's Executive Committee in various regions of the country and discusses how much funding will be needed to support these initiatives. This example comes before the founding of the Asheville Farm School but as an example, it cites work in Alaska noting:

At Chilcat, Sitka, Hoonyah, Fort Wrangle, and Willard missions are established, and need to be sustained. Money is due upon building, and the furnishings required at Sitka, and at the new Home at Chilcat. (p. 319)

The women state what is needed, when dollars are due and where the equipment will be sent. In addition, the Woman's Executive Committee offers a full page titled *Methods of Raising Money* in which they write:

In addition to plans usually adopted by Societies, such as subscriptions, collectors, sale of work done, etc., the Woman's Executive Committee recommends the making of *Album Quilts* and... the use of *Mite Boxes*... (p. 318)

They continue to set forth instructions for "birth-day boxes" which celebrate birthdays through depositing a gift in a box for friends rather than gifts to the friend. Today we may think of this as making a gift to honor someone through on-line giving. Additionally, the members of the Woman's Executive Committee share envelopes which are explained as a way to collect contributions to the "cause of the Board of Home Missions" as well as bricks, which are to be purchased for the building of a church in Utah. The note closes with a plea, "Trusting that Christ Himself may so 'dwell in our hearts by faith' that we all may be 'rooted and grounded in love' to Him and to His cause..." Faith, once again, finds root in the giving. Women are learning to be philanthropic from one another, from their families and from the church. They are sharing the need and following up by asking for a gift—typical work of a fundraiser.

The Girls' Home Industrial School at Asheville was established by the members of the Woman's Executive Committee and running smoothly before Asheville Farm School was conceived. I was not able to identify through the Presbyterian Historical Society archives how the Woman's Executive Committee exactly learned of the need for the Asheville Farm School for boys but there is documentation stating it was established

in 1891 and a pamphlet produced from a letter from the principal of the Girls' Home Industrial School at Asheville (n. d.) titled, *Plea for the "Farm School" at Asheville, N.C.* Within this pamphlet Stephenson explains the need for a school for the boys in the community and highlights the small donations the students at the girls' school have made to start such a school. She notes, "... there are more boys than girls in nearly every family of Mountaineers. They are brighter in intellect and stronger in character" (p. 6). This comment as compared with her earlier comments on the mountain people, demonstrates Stephenson's acculturation to the area. After working as principal for the Girls' School she is able to identify with the people of the area and see their attributes as well as the work that needs to be done through education. She continues to believe that her work as a missionary is saving the lives of others. Stephenson closes this pamphlet by writing, "Those of us who are already here [in North Carolina] and see the need and the outcome of the work amount thus people cry unto the Lord... 'Thou hast given us a Southland, give us also springs of water' " (p. 8). I located multiple pamphlets in the archives published for the purpose of sharing the needs of the new school. Each piece tells a story about the school in a readable format asking for small contributions. In an historical overview of the school, it is noted that the first gift was made by a boy from Rochester, New York who heard about the appeal for the school at his Sunday school service through a missionary visit of Florence Stephenson, probably similar to what Biddle, Prudden and Brown heard in their home churches. One plea from Reverend Fox published by the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church (1898) begins:

It is ten years since the Board of Home Missions undertook work, in a practical manner, among the mountain people of the South. In a most wonderful way God planted the Home Industrial, a boarding school for girls in Asheville, N.C. This met the purpose so completely that there followed in 1892 the planting of the Normal and Collegiate Institute for the more advanced girls. Thus the girls were being provided for, while the boys – the husbands, the fathers, the citizens, the leaders in the church and State of the coming generation – were left in their poverty and ignorance without a door of hope. The logical necessity of work for the boys deepened the convictions of Christian workers. They said, “It must be done,” and they prayed accordingly. The sisters in school made most pathetic appeals in behalf of their less fortunate brothers. The dear Lord, Source of every blessing, saw the need, heard the prayers, measured the supply by the demand, and opened the door of opportunity for the boys planning the Asheville Farm School. (p. 3)

The last paragraph of the plea from Fox (1898) reads:

While we rejoice in the good work which is being done for the girls, we must press claim of the hundreds of boys for whom there is thus far no hope of redemption from a life of ignorance. As a matter of missionary economy would it not be wise to increase our capacity? (p. 12)

What a subtle way to ask for dollars to support the mission. The Woman’s Executive Committee learned early on what works for fundraising with women is to tell the story. They recognized that to motivate women as donors, the members of the Woman’s Executive Committee must share the urgency of need while helping women feel as if they are making an impact on the lives of others through their philanthropy.

The Woman’s Board of Home Missions had missions all over the country from Alaska throughout the West, and reaching well into the South, whose purpose was to convert the people to Christianity through education. As printed materials became more accessible, pamphlets were a popular way to spread the work of the Woman’s Board of

Home Missions. In one such pamphlet titled *Map Talk on Missions among Mountaineers of the South* the work in the southern United States is discussed. McAfee (1904) explains:

The Woman's Board is engaged in mission work in the mountain districts of the South, because such work is greatly needed, and is vastly important both from an intellectual and spiritual standpoint. (p. 3)

The pamphlet describes North Carolina as having similar "class of people" as in Kentucky, Tennessee and West Virginia, but because North Carolina is more accessible to visitors the projects in North Carolina have received the support of visitors, to the region. McAfee (1904) continues to explain, "The work is one having the dual purpose of saving souls and training the converts for consecrated Christian service and intelligent, patriotic citizenship" (p. 13). More specifically, the writer offers an update on the Asheville Farm School, precursor to Warren Wilson College, describing it as, "One of the brightest spots in all the Southland" (p. 20). The author describes the location of the school, the curriculum taught to the boys, as well as their chores and daily lived experience. McAfee continues:

Here they [the students] prove to be intelligent, patriotic citizens, and energetic, successful Christian workers. The good done at the Farm School is untold. Many a father and mother praise God for the Farm School, which has helped save their boys. (p. 21)

The pamphlet concludes with an appeal which begins with, "The mountain folk are worthy of our help" (p. 23) and closes by stating:

Their anxiety for the education of their children is more than matched by their eagerness to know and receive Jesus Christ as their personal Savior. Every prospect invites and encourages the Presbyterian Church, especially, to give them the help they so much need; and to give it now.
(p. 23)

The similarity to colonialism is amazing; the people of the mountains of North Carolina are promised education if they convert to Christianity, in this case Presbyterianism. The documentation of the conversion is written through the lens of the missionaries highlighting the success they have had with their work. This demonstrates the power relations established through this work paralleling lines of patriarchy and whiteness.

Warren Wilson College first opened its doors with a staff of three and twenty-five white, male students in 1894 as Asheville Farm School. The first graduating class was not until 1923. A post high school program in vocational training was added in 1936 and the junior college division was established in 1942. That same year Asheville Farm School and the Dorland-Bell School of Hot Springs merged bringing white girls to campus and changing the name to Warren H. Wilson Vocational Junior College and Associated Schools. The last high school class to graduate from Warren Wilson was 1957. The College remained a junior college until 1966 when it became a full four year college. Today Warren Wilson has approximately 940 full time undergraduate students from forty-seven states and twenty-six countries. The College fosters the concept of the triad, highlighting work, academics, and service. Building on the traditions of Asheville Farm School, the college continues on a path of environmentally responsible curriculum and living style by running their own farm and requiring students to participate in community service outside the college setting (Warren Wilson College, 2010).

Discussion and Analysis

Recognizing that historiography, as Raddeker (2007) reminds us, is a discourse of and with history, the stories shared above bring light to some very interesting perspectives on women, philanthropy and education. Through my analysis of the stories I discovered four main commonalities with all the women in the study. These relate to my research questions: 1) family, both immediate and extended, had great influence on the philanthropic actions of the women, 2) the concept of being asked to serve or give and learning to ask for the assistance of others, 3) visioning a better future for the next generation and 4) understanding and working with, in and around issues of power. Through these four commonalties each of the women or society seemed to further develop their moral biography through addressing issues of race, class and gender. Interestingly, but not surprisingly, none of the women used the word philanthropy to describe the work or gifts they offered, however, according to my (re)definition of philanthropy their work applies.

Support of family and friends. The women in this study all have families and friends who influenced their moral biography and how they learned to give of themselves through their talents and assets. I struggled with how to share these stories because although the stories are each unique, they are also layered and intertwined as they move through time. I begin with the common denominator of family. All the women in this study were brought up in Christian homes and had a deep faith in God. Although the mother is mentioned more often in autobiographical materials as being the one who influenced their moral upbringing, at times we find a father figure too. Emily Prudden's

father died when she was young, however, she reflects back on positive experiences of her father through a speech given at her home church. Charlotte Hawkins Brown had a stepfather who treated her as a daughter while she was growing up. A description of Mary Biddle's father as an upstanding Philadelphia citizen as described earlier in this study points to a parent who reinforced his values in his children. Because of the nature of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church as a group, it is impossible to know each family situation. However, certain memories of women being brought up in the church were found in the research such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton's experience leading young women out of the church when a young minister the group had supported through seminary school began to discuss the inferiority of women. These stories and situations reflect the importance the role of family had on forming ideas around philanthropy.

Earlier I stated the influence of family and extended family played a critical role in the development of a sense of philanthropy. This definition of extended family reaches to early education as well as to experiences in the Church. African American families have long had a familial relationship with the church and Charlotte Hawkins Brown's experience follows this pattern. Charlotte Hawkins Brown developed a strong self esteem early in life through her family and church experiences. She specifically points out several situations at her church which made a significant impact on her choices in life; one was when she gave a speech and received accolades from the congregation and a second when she heard the words of Booker T. Washington and Lucy Craft Laney. Collins (1993) explains:

In traditional African-American communities Black women find considerable institutional support for valuing concrete experience. Black women's centrality in families, churches, and other community organizations allows us to share our concrete knowledge of what it is like to be self-defined Black women with younger less experienced sisters. (p. 98)

As a young person, Brown must have received messages from older black women who supported and guided her into adulthood setting the framework which enabled Brown to give of herself.

The definition of family in the late 1800s and early 1900s often included a husband and wife, however, as women gained access to property, finances and education, there, too, a space developed that no longer required the support and protection of a husband. Prior to the Civil War, "Women who did not marry and have children were considered 'deviant' and 'peculiar.' Single women were often objects of pity, even to themselves" (p. 79) explain Smith and Wilson (1999). But women who received an education in the late 1800s often postponed marriage. According to Cott (2000), "More than half of college-educated women with full-time professional careers never married" (p. 390). Emily Prudden raised her sister's children and cared for her aging mother electing not to marry, instead focused later on her philanthropy. Charlotte Hawkins Brown married twice, neither relationship lasting. At a time when marriage was expected and sold as a necessity for womanhood, these women found fulfillment in their work. Mainstream history may lead us to believe that being a woman required a husband but the cultural restrictions were lifting. Women who received the education but did not want to marry or have a family often went in to missionary work as a teacher or began

settlements, as Jane Addams did in Chicago. Pollitt (1994) offers places of entry into the professional world by noting, “While some women took up the fight for the vote, equal rights and entry into professions, other women joined benevolent and philanthropic organizations” (p. 22). This combination of education and philanthropy allowed women alternatives to traditional family life; it allowed them to have a presence in society making influential decisions and seeing results without the necessity of marriage. Through education, philanthropy and possibilities of professional work marriage could now be a choice.

By shifting the views of marriage, women’s identity could also shift distinguishing the many varieties and possibilities of what a life might look like. By recognizing the work that Emily Prudden and Charlotte Hawkins Brown did without a husband when marriage was still highly valued, especially in the South, we begin to see what was once perceived as impossibility now becomes a reality.

Just a few decades before Prudden and Brown opened their schools, Mary Biddle gave her gift to support the founding of Johnson C. Smith University. As we have learned, very little information about Biddle is available; her presence within her family is practically invisible. In this situation the silence says more than the words. Luce Irigaray writes at length about the absence of women and how, through language, we lost our voice. In the introduction to *The Irigaray Reader*, Whitford (1991) explains the vision of the woman’s language that emerged through early feminist writing has:

... more to do with socially-determined linguistic practices, sexual differences in the generation of messages and self-positioning in language

vis-à-vis the other, all of which are possible sites for transformation, opening up the possibilities of women's distinct cultural identity. (p. 5)

By noticing the language and absence of Mary Biddle, or any women at all, in the Berks County historical archive we are able to open a space for her now.

In a later publication by Jordan (1911) which discusses Colonial and Revolutionary families from Pennsylvania, women are mentioned but relegated to a small paragraph at the very end of the family section, as if women and children were a second thought to the experiences of the men. Nicholson (1994) advocates for:

... a reconceptualization of discourse from that of a structure to that of a process of interaction. Such a reconceptualization brings with it a blurring of lines that have previously divided issues concerning the criteria for arbitrating claims of truth and falsity from issues concerning the context by which such criteria are established. (p. 85)

Bringing the experience of Mary Biddle forward allows for such conversation to begin. We are able to deconstruct the primary source to demonstrate the place of women in society highlighting the patriarchal views of the time. Although we may assume her family had an influence on her gift to Johnson C. Smith University we may never fully know the thoughts or reasons for Biddle's gift; we leave open the space for imagination.

Again, recognizing the extended family reaches beyond the traditional home, as we explore the influence of family on the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions, we must take into account the relationships among women in the Society at the time. When woman's clubs were becoming popular it was a space for women to come together and move a cause forward. The realization by women that men and women were

not treated with equity, and with black woman's clubs it was the idea of both women and people of color receiving unequal treatment, that motivated women to organize. Kourany, Sterba and Tong (1999) list several dichotomies in Cixous's writings and explain:

In Cixous's view, all of these dichotomies find their inspiration in the fundamental dichotomous couple – man/woman – in which man is associated with all that is active, cultural, light, high, or generally positive, and woman with all that is passive, natural, dark, low, or generally negative...Man is the self; woman is his Other. (p. 434)

The women who formed woman's societies recognized and rejected the notion of man as self and woman as other. They sought to push for woman as self, understanding that alone their voice was getting lost but together they could demand to be heard.

Whether family is found in the traditional home, the Church, or among friends, the impact and values of those who are near to us influences our understanding of the importance of philanthropy. It is essential to explore the early experiences of these women to gain a better sense of how they learned to give. The absence of voice and choice often says more than a well written biography. The concept of extended family embraces the sisterhood found in the club setting, the fellowship in a church hall, and the love of a parent all planting the seeds for social change through philanthropy.

Learning the need. One of the main elements in successful fundraising is sharing the need with potential donors. People do not give to something when they do not know about it. The fundraiser must share the need with the donor in a positive light, explaining how the donor will make a difference in the lives of others. With this in mind, each woman or society in the study was asked to support education through their philanthropy.

In addition, each woman or society understood the need for education, whether the students were black or white. All of the women learned of the need and gave of their time or their finances but some of the women also learned to ask others to support their school. Within this section we learn about being asked to give and asking others to give through the lives of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the women of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church. The "turning point moments" that Denzin (1989) describes in Chapter III is critical to this section. This is where the women had life altering experiences that moved them to their philanthropy.

Prudden had her life altering experience when she came to Brainerd Institute as a housemother at the request of her friend. She learned of the need through a long time trusted friend but the experience she gained by actually visiting the South herself ignited her philanthropy. Paton and Moody (2008) understand this idea well. They explain:

The most common method of learning about philanthropy is through the informal teachings of persons who are experienced in philanthropy. One reason informal teaching is so wide spread in philanthropy is philanthropy's emphasis on action. Action means experience, and experience in philanthropy is very personal and individual to most people. 'This is what I've done and this is what I've learned from it' is usually a more powerful teaching approach than a how-to manual based exclusively on theory or doctrine or a survey course on laws and techniques. (p. 23)

By walking around the community of Chester, South Carolina, Prudden experienced first-hand the needs of both black and white people in the South. She learned and then applied her learning through her giving. Collins (1999) uses a similar concept when discussing the difference between knowing and wisdom. She argues that black women must understand the difference because wisdom has led to their survival in a world based on

race, gender and class oppression while knowledge alone would never hold up. Although white and economically privileged, the experiences Prudden had at the Brainerd Institute opened her eyes to another culture. These experiences then offered new meaning to Prudden, allowing her to deconstruct her preexisting ideas of people in the South and enabling her to seek new knowledge (and wisdom) while (re)constructing new truths. Collins concept is also seen in the experiences of Brown and how she navigated her way as an educated black woman through giving and receiving in the South.

Of all the women in the study, Charlotte Hawkins Brown is perhaps the best example of learning to give and receive. Brown learned of the need for educated blacks from the North to work with Southern blacks to improve their condition through hearing speakers at her church such as Booker T. Washington. She recognized the best way to give back would be through education so Brown sought to become a teacher. When she was approached after only one year of teacher training and asked to serve as a mission teacher in North Carolina, Brown saw this as a way to serve others. Because of Brown's "concrete experience" as Collins (1999) would assert Brown understood the meaning of philanthropy, through she never named her work as such. At a young age, she had developed her own strong identity. Irigaray (1993) explains, "in order to obtain a subjective status equivalent to that of men, women must therefore gain recognition for their difference" (p. 46). Brown recognizes this difference through Du Bois' 1903 publication of *Souls of Black Folk* (2003) which describes the concept of "double consciousness", or rather, as in Brown's case, triple and quadruple consciousness as it pertained to a black woman from the South and educated in the North. She has a

wonderful way of navigating between race, class and gender to achieve her goals. As a young black woman born in the South but educated in the North she learned how to navigate these constructs. Throughout her schooling day as a minority student among her peers although she claims in her writings that this was not an issue. Brown (n. d.) writes about her school days recalling:

For the most part, my childhood was spent in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and knowing the surroundings as I do, it is hard to believe that I cannot recall a single incidents in my grammar-, high-, or normal school days in which I was, by gesture or word, made to feel or realize that I was any different from anybody else. I recognized the difference in the color of my skin and that of my classmates... But no student or teacher made me feel uncomfortable in anyway. I knew nothing of segregation; there were for me no barriers of which I was conscious. (p. 3)

Additionally, when she arrived in the South, although black, she was not trusted by the black Southerners due to her Northern accent. Southern whites did not know what to make of her as she had an education and could speak eloquently. The complexities she navigated were many. It is no wonder Brown was just as good at sharing her mission and need for Palmer Memorial Institute as she was receiving the support she needed to succeed.

It is not precisely clear how the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions learned of the need for a boy's school in Asheville but it is certain that they understood how to ask for money to support it. It was clearly documented several times throughout the Presbyterian Historical Society archives that it was believed there were many "pious women" who would be willing to support moral development and education

of people less fortunate. Much emphasis was placed on targeting women donors. Luce Irigaray (1999) might respond to this thought by stating:

To claim that the feminine can be expressed in the form of a concept is to allow oneself to be caught up again in a system of 'masculine' representations, in which women are trapped in a system of meaning which serves the auto-affection of the (masculine) subject. (p. 445)

By targeting women as donors, the Woman's Board of Home Missions was knowingly categorizing women into a subset of donors who may or may not identify with the causes of the organization. Even today, through this study, I have essentially naturalized a group of donors because of gender. It is important that I, as a fundraiser, acknowledge this categorization. While research in fundraising has determined that women and men give differently, it is critical that we (re)examine the research to verify the truth claims. Women are complex and multifaceted; and when we limit our assumptions about their giving we may be missing an opportunity.

Nonetheless, members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions were busy preparing pamphlets for distribution to other women, sharing the story of need for schools and churches across the country. They were embracing the new technologies that enabled print materials to be not only more readily available but through better transportation systems the materials could also reach a wider audience. Pamphlets similar to the plea from The Reverend Fox shared earlier were produced to distribute the need for support in a gentle way. Whereas historically, men have been asked to contribute to bricks and mortar; building libraries, universities and hospitals, women have been

asked to support social change, again feeding the claim of Irigaray that we are caught up in a binary system. Kaminski (2002) notes:

... women take a different approach to philanthropic giving, just as they have different styles of communication and management. This is a result of women's socialization in a society that has long had a double standard in economic, social and power structures. (p. 188)

Again, the recognition of the double standard for women and men donors is brought to our attention through the work of the Woman's Board of Home Missions. We also need to recognize that if there is a double standard for women's giving, women of color are further marginalized from the title of philanthropist.

When discussing women's boards, we can generally assume that membership consists of women who have some financial means, are well educated, and have a mission which may be educating the poor, bringing Christianity to rural areas or pressing forward issues of gender and/or race. hooks (2000) expresses:

Privileged feminists have largely been unable to speak to, with, and for diverse groups of women because they either do not understand fully the interrelatedness of sex, race, and class oppression or refuse to take this interrelatedness seriously. (p. 15)

This statement succinctly describes the work of the Northern white women in the South; they did not understand the connection between themselves as women and the oppressed groups they served. We see in the language used in their pamphlets to describe those they served; "ignorance", "without a door of hope" and "pathetic." However, in critiquing their language we must also remember that women had just recently stepped into the

public sphere. Prior to these recent experiences women's spheres were quite limited. I am not excusing the language and judgments women made, but offering an alternative view to assist the reader in understanding the limitations within the cultural construct as women were exploring their new role.

In addition to learning their new role as fundraiser, they also failed to see the connection between themselves and black women's clubs. As Charlotte Hawkins Brown pointed out in her talk to a white women's club, educated black and white women were so busy forwarding their individual causes that they forgot to take time to listen and support each other. The issue of race and woman's clubs will be further discussed in the following section on vision.

Finally, as any good fundraiser knows, one must take the time to let the donor know the gift is appreciated or in fundraising terms, the donor must be stewarded. Kaminski (2002) created a list of seven points to motivate women as donors and leadership volunteers. Number seven reads, "*Pay attention to stewardship. How you accept the gift, acknowledge the donor, and maintain the relationship is crucial*" (p. 194). In seeking spaces between what is recorded and what remains unsaid, we may only infer the reasoning behind Biddle's philanthropy and why it stopped after only one year. We know she gave because she was asked through a bulletin but did she stop because she felt her gifts were not appreciated? We will never know her reasoning, but, generally, once a person is in the habit of giving to an organization and is generally pleased with the giving process and acknowledgement they continue to give. Members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions were successful in maintaining loyalty to their causes by keeping in

touch with their donors as was Brown. The concept of appreciation of generosity is not new but it is very important no matter the race, class or gender of the donor.

In learning to give as well as receive, women must understand the politics surrounding them. When Emily Prudden arrived in South Carolina as a house mother she did so at the invitation of a friend. What she did not expect is that her experience would influence her work for the rest of her life and impact many children, both black and white, through educational philanthropy. Each woman has her story; what is critical to remember in this section is that as a subordinate group, women must rely on lived experiences to gain both knowledge and wisdom (Collins, 1999). Some women had more access to wealth, education, and power than others but all had been asked to give, whether through a friend, a pamphlet or by a stranger, and they chose to serve. It is here that we meet the turning point in their moral biography which has led to social change through their educational philanthropy.

Vision for a better future. Among the women studied, Biddle, Prudden, Brown, and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions had a vision for a better future, a more socially just society with access to education for all children. Whether it was for Freedmen, black children, white rural children or mountain men and boys, all of the schools were founded with the belief that education could elevate the individual from difficult circumstances. Having a vision for education and the improvement of lives means having an openness to possibilities. Bates (1989) reflects, "It had not occurred to me how much the capacity to combine new roles to create an innovative and integrated whole might depend on exposure to other culture" (p. 63). The women who built the

foundations for Johnson C. Smith University, Pfeiffer University, Warren Wilson College and Palmer Memorial Institute exposed themselves to other cultures. They widened their personal spheres, either intentionally or unintentionally, to make room for the unknown, the possible. Caputo (2001) writes, "... only when we are pushed to the limit of the possible, to the edge of the impossible, driven to extreme, which forces us to be at our best" (p. 109) can we then say we've had an experience. Caputo is discussing the idea that this experience on the edge, looking over the edge can be defined as religious but also as human experience. It is the tipping point that makes us act, enables philanthropy; it is Denzin's "turning point" and Schervish and Whitaker's "moral biography". Whatever name we choose to use, there is no denying the point when a conscious decision is made to give, we are able to see a better future through our giving; through our decision we make a leap of faith.

For Charlotte Hawkins Brown the leap of faith, her philanthropy, her vision is one of access and equity in education for all children, but particularly black children from her home state of North Carolina. While studying Brown's notes, letters and biographical information, I could see her struggle with race issues in the United States. Brown (1927) recalls her formative years noting, "My four years of high school work was uneventful except for the fact that I was not conscious of the difference in color and took part in all the activities of my class" (p. 13). The fact that she mentioned this at all is a clear signifier of her own awareness of race. Her statement is brief and layered between full explanations of her love for art, graduation and other benign concerns of a teenager. She expressed her difficulties and frustrations through letters to friends both black and white

and she spoke publicly about the lack of conversation between educated white and black women. But her primary concern was that her students earn a top quality education that equaled or surpassed that of white students and she achieved this goal. Palmer Memorial Institute was one of the best schools for black children in the country.

Despite the efforts Brown put forth to advocate for her race, sadly, hooks (2000) finds the situation has not changed in the academic world in sixty years when she asserts:

Often the white women who are busy publishing papers and books on 'unlearning racism' remain patronizing and condescending when they relate to black women. This is not surprising given that frequently their discourse is aimed solely in the direction of a white audience and the focus solely on changing attitudes rather than addressing racism in a historical and political context. (p. 13)

Brown sought to break down these barriers between women based on race but it seems we are still struggling with this today. Because of the way in which women came into the public sphere, in small increments, without fully understanding the relation between male and female and without understanding the interconnectedness between all oppressed groups until a much later time, perhaps we have submitted to the parallel construct of the patriarchy. Whitford (1991) explains in the introduction of *The Irigaray Reader* the difference between Simone de Beauvoir's vision for women and Irigaray's by writing:

In 1949, in *The Second Sex* she [de Beauvoir] subordinated feminism to socialism, and envisaged a totally transformed society in which women would have equal rights to education, employment and public life. (p. 24)

This is how Brown envisioned black and white relations; through equality of the races.

However, Whitford continues:

Irigaray, on the other hand, is positing an ‘other’ which would not simply be the ‘other of the same’ (and so a state to be transcended in the pursuit of ‘the same’), but a self-defined woman who would not be satisfied with the sameness, but whose otherness and difference would be given social and symbolic representation. (p. 24 -25)

Irigaray has opened the space for multiplicity; not just one or the other but many which is quite different from Brown’s vision but worthy of conversation.

Irigaray had similar ideas when it comes to shifting ideas about gender and I suggest her thoughts can also be adapted to race, class or other oppressed groups. As the quotation below is read, insert any other oppressed people over the word “women” and the principles hold true. Irigaray (1999) claims:

A long history has put all women in the same sexual, social, and cultural condition. Whatever inequalities may exist among women they all undergo, even without clearly realizing it, the same oppression, the same exploitation of their body, the same denial of their desire.

That is why it is very important for women to be able to join together, and to join together ‘among themselves.’ In order to begin to escape from the spaces, roles, and gestures that have been assigned and taught by the society of men. (p. 449)

Reading Irigaray’s perspective with a wider lens opens the dialogue that Brown began in 1920 and continues today. Brown had an agenda for social change; a vision in which black and white people, men and women worked together for the greater humanity. One final point on equality from a postmodern feminist perspective is that of Scott who comments on the debate between equality and difference. If equality means ignoring difference then we are missing the point. Scott (1988) writes, “The political notion of equality thus includes, indeed depends on, an acknowledgement of the existence of

difference” (p. 44). In seeking equality it is important to embrace difference and multiplicity understanding that because I am a woman, this is not all I am.

When Prudden looks around the foothills of North Carolina and sees extreme poverty she sees this through her lens of privilege. She thinks to herself that if she can remove girls from their homes and train them as her own, what she would be giving them would be better than what a mother could provide. This very notion is extremely classist; the terms she uses “pure” and “uplifting” to suggest judgment in how the children are currently being raised. Not only is Prudden unknowingly exhibiting classist tendencies but by visioning education for girls she is also reinforcing gender identity. Missionaries and others with the best of intentions came from the North and forced their cultural values on the families of the South, implying the ways of the North are better. The descriptive use of language in Prudden’s writings lends itself to open the discussion around how language sexualizes creating gender identity. Irigaray discusses the use of language and how it is sexualized distributing the feminine to lesser objects. This is not so obvious in English where we do not have the male/female pronouns and nouns but there still remain traces in the choices of descriptive words used. The use of “pure” and “uplifting” to describe a school for girls demonstrates the prescribed feminine identity. Irigaray (1993) explains:

So the same experience... might be expressed by different grammatical genders depending on whether the culture, the moment in History, valorizes a sex or not. Sexual difference cannot therefore be reduced to a simple extralinguistic fact of nature. It conditions language and is conditioned by it. It not only determines the system of pronouns, possessive adjectives, but also the gender of words and their division into grammatical classes: animate/inanimate, concrete/abstract,

masculine/feminine, for example. It's situated at the junction of nature and culture. (p. 20)

If we embrace the postmodern feminist thought, we know the masculine and feminine are simply cultural constructs and not facts of nature so the words "pure" and "uplifting" should not have a genderized meaning but in the context it does. Irigaray (1993) further explains:

A patient study of gender of words almost always reveals their hidden sex. Rarely is this not immediately apparent. And a linguist will be quick to retort that *un fauteuil* (a sofa) or *un chateau* (a castle) are not more "masculine" than *une chaise* (a chair) or *une maison* (a house). (p. 69)

Of course these terms have different meanings; a masculine (un) chateau is larger than the feminine (une) maison. To further support this concept of language and the hold it has on both historical and modern society Elam (1994) notes:

To take a fairly simple example, 'chairman/person' makes no difference in the patriarchal idiom, since the universal is always assumed to be masculine whether or not... it is specifically marked as 'man' or 'person.' In patriarchal terms, the difference makes no difference, and those who argue that it does should just shut up and stop complaining about such a silly linguistic convention. The injustice done to women cannot, therefore, even be registered in the patriarchal idiom – the case of the differend. (p. 33)

Prudden unknowingly participates in reinforcing gender and class roles through her language. We see this in the words she chooses to use as she describes those she serves. However, as she becomes more aware and integrated into the community she seems to acknowledge difference through the development of her schools in that when she develops

a school for white children, she also builds one for black children of equal quality in accommodation and curriculum. This understanding enables us to give breathing space to Prudden's comments about poverty and race knowing she is using the language available to her within her historical context, while observing her actions for social justice and change. Within the cultural context of the time, Prudden and the other women working in the mission schools did not have an understanding that their way may not be the best way for those they interacted with. At the time Prudden must have felt something within, her moral biography, which moved her to action with best intention. It is only now, over one hundred years later, that we have the benefit of critiquing the situation. As Raddeker (2007) reminds us, "knowledge is intertextual...meaning it draws upon (or works from) many knowledges, or existing 'texts' of discourse" (p. 21). We therefore need to appreciate the layers of language and meaning trusting that the women truly believed they were making a difference in society.

Again, if we explore the language used in pamphlets, letters, and informational documents, members of the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions assumed the people of the mountains were ignorant because they lacked formal education and had limited access to material things. The vision they held was for an educated Christian population in the South. Giroux (1991) comments:

Under the banner of feminist struggle and liberation, many contemporary feminists have unconsciously reconstructed the Eurocentric logocentrism they claimed they were attacking. In effect, while the center was being reconstructed as an affirmation of feminism in the service of an attack on patriarchy, it functioned to re-create existing margins of power while denying the voices of working class women, lesbians, and women of color. (p. 239)

And I would also add the poor and under-educated. Woman's Board of Home Missions members who were seeking space in the public sphere were doing it, knowingly or unknowingly, at the expense of others. They were replicating how they had been treated, creating a parallel societal structure to the already firmly established patriarchy. "Those mountain folk are worthy of our help," one pamphlet notes. McAfee (1904) continues to explain that they, the mountain people, are:

... entitled to our sympathy and help because they are Protestants to the core. Their mute appeal for help should meet with a response from every true-hearted American, because of the splendid service their ancestors rendered the country during the Revolution, and because of their loyalty to, and heroism in defending, the Union during the Civil War... But they have souls to save... Their anxiety for the education of their children is more than matched by their eagerness to know and receive Jesus Christ as their personal Savior. Every prospect invites and encourages the Presbyterian Church, especially, to give them the help they so need; and to give it now. (p. 23)

The work of the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions at the Asheville Farm School demonstrated their commitment to the mission of educating and converting individuals to the Christian faith. The vision of these women was to raise the status of people through religion and education. They believed that through education, equity may be achieved however, as we have seen before, they gave little thought to the importance of cultural difference. Scott (1988) asserts:

Placing equity and difference in antithetical relationship has, then, a double effect. It denies the way in which difference has long figured in political notions of equity and it suggests that sameness is the only ground on which equality can be claimed. (p. 46)

With the commitment the Woman's Board of Home Missions made to the Asheville Farm School, they were in turn seeking to create equity through education but perhaps missing the appreciation of difference. In doing so it placed the feminist agenda in an impossible situation. Scott then argues:

The only alternative... is to refuse to oppose equality to difference and insist continually on differences – differences as the condition of individual and collective identities, differences as the constant challenge to fixing those identities, history as the repeated illustration of the play of differences, differences as the very meaning of equity itself. (p. 46)

Ironically, Warren Wilson College is today known for difference; the school remains on the fringe of mainstream higher education with a focus on work, academics and service. Their own website describes the college as a place that “is not for everyone” and highlights that students must be engaged in work essential to the running of the school as well as actively involved in off-campus service work. This is not the traditional model for a college and attracts students who are seeking a non-traditional college experience.

The vision of equity in race, religion, education and class is a noble one; it is not an easy one. The women in this study sought a better future for the people of North Carolina believing it could be achieved through education. We have seen how best intentions are not always easily achieved and that there are many ways to achieve them. Language is a powerful tool that can be used knowingly and unknowingly to maintain the status quo. Our challenge now is awareness; we must be cognizant of language usage while opening ourselves to acceptance of difference to fully embrace change, if that is indeed what we want.

Power and philanthropy. As we recognized earlier, historically women have had a presence in the philanthropic arena but their work has remained highly invisible in the history books. Women have contributed to help the poor, assist the sick and educate the uneducated through both volunteering and giving financially. The fact that this work is not recognized as important philanthropy demonstrates a power dynamic between men who are known as philanthropists and women who are not. None of the women in the study identify as philanthropist, though each clearly is. Nonetheless, issues of power are seen throughout all the experiences of the women. It is most evident in the work of the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions, perhaps because their work was so vast and the organization encompassed many women's experiences. Any time there is a giver/receiver situation power presents itself.

The members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions demonstrated power in two ways, when they were seeking it within the Presbyterian Church and when they were distributing funds they had raised. When the women began gaining power through their fundraising and benevolent acts, this began to shift or upset the power structures leading to fissures in the construct. Cixous (1999) observes, "And we perceive that the 'victory' always amounts to the same thing: it is hierarchized. The hierarchization subjects the entire conceptual organization to man" (p. 440). Cixous identifies exactly the shift in the situation. Women who had previously been seeking power suddenly had some and were using it in the same hierarchy that had been used against them.

The inequalities with which women have sustained for years affect their relationships to other members of society. This is an excellent example; members of the

Woman's Board of Home Missions saw themselves as part of the dominant cultural ideology and viewed those they served as Other. hooks (2000) explains, "Like most men, most women are taught from childhood on that dominating and controlling others is *the* basic expression of power" (p. 87). hooks, like Irigaray, believes women would organize differently if there were a different value system. We have naturalized behavior of man/woman to such an extent there is little room for (re)inventing society. Irigaray (1999) advocates:

It clearly cannot be a matter of substituting feminine power for masculine power. Because this reversal would still be caught up in the economy of the same, in the same economy – in which, of course, what I am trying to designate as 'feminine' would not emerge. (p. 446)

In one way, the philanthropy of the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions opened women to the public sphere in positive way by offering more access and responsibilities, but in another it demonstrated the unfortunate side of power in which the women assumed a stance of superiority to those they served. Interestingly, it is when the women were *seeking* their place at the table that their power was more positive. When they are distributing the funds to missions, they take on the paternalistic and colonialist role that they resisted. Scott (1999) argues, "Political history has, in a sense, been enacted on the field of gender. It is a field that seems fixed yet whose meaning is contested and in flux" (p. 49). She suggests that if we treat the relation between male/female as problematic rather than known, then we have space to examine how gender is invoked and the possibility to reinvent the meaning. This, too, will enable us to bring forth the historically invisible stories of women encouraging dialogue.

Another example of power is found in race relations. Prudden, a white woman from the North, established schools with equal quality of both physical space and curriculum materials for black and white children in the South. As a white woman, she understood she could have only worked with white children and avoided conflict but she did not; she was determined to found as many schools for black children as she did for white children. At times she feared for the schools, but, as we learned, many continued for a long time providing important educational opportunities to students who might not otherwise have received it. She used her power as a white woman to force change.

Giroux (1991) adds:

Not only does postmodernism provide new ways to understand how power works in constructing racist identities and subjectivities, it redefines culture and experience within multiple relations of difference that offer a range of subject positions from which people can struggle against racist ideologies and practices. (p. 233)

Emily Prudden is a perfect example of this ideology; prior to her exposure to Southern culture she may not have been concerned with the lives of those considered Other.

However, after learning about the needs of the culture first hand she was able to move against the established social construct acting as an ally and assisting in opening spaces for others where there once were none.

Power and politics have long been linked together and none of the women understood it as well as Charlotte Hawkins Brown. She understood she was an outsider in both the black and white communities of the North and South. As an educated black woman, she was not trusted among the black community of the South because few were

literate and even fewer had any formal education; with her Northern accent and cultural knowledge she was an anomaly for Southern white. In the North, few young women, black or white had the privilege of attending higher education; Brown, as a black woman in a teacher training program was unique. Additionally, this small framed black woman was fearless when it came to fundraising, gaining the support of some very influential white men in both the North and, eventually, in the South. She strategically negotiated her space building allies among the white women of the Greensboro community. She and Lula McIver, wife of Charles McIver, president of the State Normal and Industrial School for Girls (now The University of North Carolina at Greensboro), became close friends. Through her friendship with Lula, Brown was able to secure letters of introduction and support to other whites in the community. Brown also established two boards for Palmer Memorial Institute, one comprising of three educated local black men and a second board of three white Northern men. She may have learned this strategy from hearing Booker T. Washington speak about working within the cultural framework to improve the status of her people. Her strategy benefitted her well in gaining the financial support she needed from her Northern donors while maintaining the support of both the black and white communities in the South. Collins (1999) full quote explains:

As members of a subordinate group, Black women cannot afford to be fools of any type, for our objectification as the Other denies us the protection that white skin, maleness, and wealth confer. This distinction between knowledge and wisdom, and the use of experience as the cutting edge dividing them, has been key to Black women's survival. In the context of race, gender, and class oppression, the distinction is essential. Knowledge without wisdom is adequate for the powerful, but wisdom is essential to the survival of the subordinate... (p. 97)

Brown, as well as the other women in this study, as members of a subordinate group, must rely on lived experience to teach them both knowledge and wisdom. Some had more access to wealth, education and power than others but all had been asked at some point to serve, to give. It is here that we meet the turning point in their moral biography which leads to social change through education.

Education was critical to Charlotte Hawkins Brown but issues of race and communication across the races was a high priority as well. As the president of the Colored Women's Club in North Carolina she felt it her obligation to reach out to the members of white women's clubs. Brown felt frustrated that the only interactions white women seem to have had with black women was as their domestic help. Collins (1993) comments:

Given that the general culture shaping the taken-for-granted knowledge of the community of experts is permeated by widespread notions of Black and female inferiority, new knowledge claims that seem to violate these fundamental assumptions are likely to be viewed as anomalies. (p. 94)

Brown worked to promote conversation between educated white and black women to lessen the dominant cultural view of black women. This is why it is critical to not only share these stories among academic peers but to insist that these stories are told in schools and become common knowledge woven into the fabric of history. If we want to eliminate the -isms from our cultural context we must educate.

Philanthropy is power. There are consequences for giving and receiving. As we have seen, the women in this study at times understood their power and used it to make changes. At times the influence of their work may not have been completely understood.

It is important to look back and approach their lived experiences with fresh eyes and new lenses to better prepare women philanthropists of today to make thoughtful changes to society through their philanthropic gifts. With education comes great responsibility. Once we know the issues, if we ignore them we continue to perpetuate the cycle. When we take action, when we start to give, we impact our moral biography.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the final chapter of this study, the impact and importance of historical research related to women is discussed. As demonstrated through this research, women have played a significant role in American philanthropy through their volunteer and monetary giving without recognition given to how their actions contributed to the development of American society. The stories of this work are not readily available for others to access as inspiration; and in some cases such as Mary Biddle, the story has all but disappeared. It is just as important to consider the missing information as it is to uncover the materials buried in archives to bring the stories to life. The impact the buried stories have on women's giving today is also addressed in this chapter. Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church all opened spaces for future women philanthropists. However, because these stories are not widely known, women have little access to those who helped transform education in North Carolina through philanthropy. Within this chapter, I will revisit the research questions and offer a synthesis on what has been learned. This chapter also includes recommendations for fundraisers work with women donors as well as for women philanthropists. There is still more that needs to be learned in the area of women, philanthropy and education. The chapter concludes with recommendations for further research.

Impact and Importance of Historical Study of Women

Knowledge is intertextual and multifaceted, meaning there are multiple truths woven together to create a history. However, often the truths of subordinate groups are left out or rejected leaving the space empty. History is then closed by official documents, stamps and seals and taught to the next generation missing the representation of whole groups of society. To truly understand an historical event, one must return to primary documents buried in archives, explore oral histories and seek untold stories, the pieces that were brushed over, and the angles that were never revealed. Returning to history allows us to better see ourselves in current times. It allows us to understand those who have walked before us and led the way by working against the grain to open spaces for the next generation. “Yet, history,” Raddeker (2007) explains, “is not material reality; it is not *the past* but representations of it, however many ‘facts’ (*references* to real events etc.) it may contain.” She continues, “Meaning is arbitrary... because it resides in language, not the real world it seeks to describe” (p. 23). Derrida (1992) would say that meaning is “‘undecidable’: not closed, definitive or final, but subject to contestation” (p. 27). This is exactly why history is so important. Although half the U.S. American population is women, many of our history books would lead us to believe that our nation’s history was formed solely by white men. However, when we learn the stories of women like Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the women of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church we learn that women of all races were creating history, influencing education, and pushing for social justice.

The impact of these untold stories tarnishes the concept of philanthropy. Women have been squeezed out historically, their work in the volunteer sector diminished to charity rather than philanthropy. When did it become accepted that a monetary gift is the only gift that makes a difference in the lives of others? The incredible philanthropic work of the women in the study made a difference to many individuals. Yet, their stories remain unknown to most Americans and even most North Carolinians. They remain historically marginalized because of their sex. This pattern of exclusion leads to continued marginalization of women in the field of philanthropy. The danger with suppressing stories of women's philanthropic work or reducing their work to charity or benevolence rather than philanthropy, is that it perpetuates the cycle of subordination and domination. Women's contributions then remain assumed rather than celebrated and the current patriarchal societal structure remains status quo. Young women grow up without examples of high impact, transformational women leaders. They learn about Andrew Carnegie and Bill Gates in school or through the media but few women achieve public status as philanthropists. Fortunately, women such as Meg Whitman, former president and CEO of E-Bay who gave \$30 million to Princeton University, Darla Moore, who added \$45 million in 2005 to her earlier gift of \$20 million to the University of South Carolina and Barbara Dodd Anderson who gave \$128 million to the George School in Newton, Pennsylvania in 2007 (Weber-Thrush, 2008) have taken their philanthropic work publicly and opened spaces for girls and women to see what a woman can do with focused philanthropy. Unfortunately, these names are still not widely known. Oprah Winfrey's fame and dedication to philanthropy has begun to open the narrow label of

philanthropist. Prior to Oprah, there have been few female names that enter the modern media with such philanthropic distinction, not to mention minority donors.

It is my job as a postmodern feminist scholar to bring situations that were formerly hidden or buried to the surface for dissection and then promotion. Because we know, as Raddeker (2007) reminds us, “One’s identity is... formed, and continually re-formed, through language/discourse, it does not precede language...” (p. 45-46). And if our identity is continually developing then we continue to be impacted by the stories to which we are exposed. Therefore, the impact of history on our lives is central to demonstrate the oppression of women within the patriarchal power structure in which we live. When we turn to history we discover new situations previously undiscovered. Through a new lens we see new possibilities. As Villaverde, Kincheloe and Helyar (2006) remind us:

There is an active engagement with history and self, a deep reflection and critique of one’s place in history and the social consequences of such, and the search for knowledge otherwise excluded, yet central to more equitable social change. (p. 315)

We must remain actively engaged in dialogue with historical situations constantly seeking to uncover the untold or invisible stories because they apply directly to our work today. If we do not know how we came to this place, how are we to lead the next generation to find their place? How are we to avoid marginalizing others when we don’t reflect on how it was done in the past? It is critical that we understand the impact patriarchy and power have had on the historical lives of women so that we may cognitantly embrace or reject societal structures.

Impact on Women and Educational Philanthropy

It is interesting, but not surprising, that Biddle, Prudden, Brown nor the members of the Woman's Board of the Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church considered their work philanthropic. Words I noticed in their identity claims were service, mission, and benevolence. The narrow definition modern society has given to both philanthropy and education squeeze women and minorities into or out of claimed space; squeezed out of claiming themselves as philanthropists because this space has been historically held by white males and squeezed into the role of teacher as educator because this has become a naturalized space for women. Andrea Walton (2005) explains:

... by thinking about education philanthropy in narrow terms – first equating philanthropy with large monetary donation and then by conceiving of education as only formal instructional activities associated with schools and universities – current scholarship has not 'seen' women's philanthropic action in education. (p. 4)

Our (re)defined definition of philanthropy stresses action and empowers women to see their gift, whether it is through a financial contribution or voluntary services, as philanthropic. If we are going to operationalize this more inclusive definition of philanthropy which celebrates not only dollars given but time spent then we need to demonstrate this commitment through actions. Institutions and fundraisers need to celebrate in meaningful ways the volunteers who give of their time as much as those who make large monetary contributions. At The University of North Carolina at Greensboro we have enabled scholarships and buildings to be named in honor of individuals who have given a large part of their life to the institute. For example, the science building on

campus was named to honor Dr. Patricia A. Sullivan who served as the first female president at UNCG. Her service and dedication to the university was rewarded through a unique naming opportunity. In addition, the university received a large anonymous donation and used a portion of the gift to establish a scholarship in the name of JoAnne Smart Drane and the late Bettye Ann Davis Tillman Sanders, UNCG's first two African American students admitted to the university. Drane has been a strong volunteer and advocate for this university throughout the years. Rather than simply recognizing large monetary gifts, universities and other institutions would be well served to acknowledge their volunteers as the philanthropists that they are through unique recognition opportunities. By doing this, it breaks apart the patriarchal structures of traditional male dominated giving and opens alternatives to celebrate a wider spectrum of giving.

We have seen how the larger contextual framework of the time period allowed for women to create agency where there was once none. From the earliest gift of Mary Biddle to the later work of Charlotte Hawkins Brown, we observed a change in recorded history resulting in a slight shift of power. Where there was once no recording of women's work there are now archives and books sharing the lives of earlier generations. For the history of Mary Biddle I had to rely on the stories told of her father and husband and the absence of her voice. Forty years later the letters and writings of Charlotte Hawkins Brown have been preserved and archived; much of this thanks to Brown retaining her materials and her family donating them after her death to archival libraries. By 1961, when Brown passed away, the value of her work had been witnessed and began to be appreciated. The philanthropy of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the women of the

Woman's Board of Home Missions strengthened capacity, collaboration, citizenship, service to others, integrity and the advancement of knowledge, empathy, respect and social responsibility making their work truly transformational. These qualities had previously been assumed as woman's work and not showcased as contributions to civil society. This left historical records to remain one sided, neglecting the involvement of half the population.

Again, Walton (2005) asserts:

Exploring the significance and variety of women's philanthropic action in education is important because both philanthropy and education were among the earliest spaces where women, though still acting in culturally prescribed roles, found opportunities to participate in the public sphere.
(p. 5)

As we saw in the historical framework of this study, in the late 1800s women were just beginning to emerge into the public sphere through activities like teaching and acts of benevolence through the church, which were nonthreatening to the established patriarchal system. We began to see as with the Woman's Board of Home Missions, women augmenting their influence in areas previously dominated by men, such as fundraising. Women began to find a voice and used this power in a variety of ways. They continue to grow this voice and at the same time continue to seek further public participation. We know that identity is fluid; once we have attained something the target moves and we search again. It is this way with philanthropy and women. We have seen the powerful work women have done in this sector, yet none of the women identified themselves as philanthropic; they considered the work that they were doing to be charity or benevolent

in nature, reflecting the assumptions of society that the work of women did not need to be acknowledged or recognized. Today women continue to discount their philanthropic work. Few women donors I work with would identify themselves as philanthropists, yet they are. By assuming work of women is just that, “women’s work” we do an injustice to their commitment to bettering society dismissing their power within society. We eliminate the contributions of half the population and continue to do so if we do not broaden our definition of philanthropy to be more inclusive of actions *and* gifts, talents *and* treasures.

When half the population is neglected, their contribution to educational philanthropy rejected, it is society that is missing the opportunity. When an organization or university advancement office forgets to include the woman when asking her husband for a gift, we are dismissing her as a potential partner or ally to the institute, as well as sending the message that she does not deserve a seat at the table. At The University of North Carolina at Greensboro we do a good job of including the woman when asking for a gift. Perhaps this is because the University appreciates its history as a woman’s college and is cognizant of the lack of inclusion in the past, therefore is more inclusive now. Whatever the reason this is not the norm. It is only in the last 15-20 years that advancement professionals have considered the woman as someone capable of making a major gift. Women control over fifty percent of the wealth in the United States and it will continue to rise as the Boomer generation dies out. Women also live longer retaining more of the family wealth. Taylor and Shaw-Hardy (2005) write, “Women are poised to become significant philanthropists as never before, ready to transform the world and

themselves in the process” (p. 3). When university advancement professionals exclude women and minority donors, knowingly or unknowingly, they are missing the possibility of engaging the next big donor and perpetuating the exclusivity associated with power and patriarchy.

As we review the impact this study has had on women and educational philanthropy this is an appropriate place to reflect on the original research questions and offer a brief summary for each. The answers to the questions are complex and multi-layered; they weave in and round and between one another as we have seen in the discussion in Chapter IV.

My first research question was, *historically, why are stories around women’s philanthropy invisible?* Through the stories of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church we now understand there *are* strong examples of the philanthropic work of women in American history. However, these stories are not widely known because they have not been included in textbooks or researched in a scholarly manner. Even Joel Spring, who is known to look at history with an alternative perspective, does not mention women in this capacity or their commitment and work in educational philanthropy, suggesting the notion of women’s work is deeply integrated into society and remains a problem. When we ignore the historical contributions of women we devalue their experience which leads to the invisibility of women’s philanthropic work. It removes their power and it discourages others to share their philanthropy publicly. Which brings us to the second question; *how do women define philanthropy?* None of the women in the study considered their work

philanthropic. We recognize now that the work of women in this arena has been regulated to terms such as charity or benevolence leaving philanthropy to define large monetary gifts, usually from white men, reinforcing patriarchy and power. We have seen how language has manipulated history and the stories that have been preserved. This is why my research is so critical. Women must have role models and mentors to learn from and to feel comfortable enough to identify themselves as philanthropists.

The majority of this study focused on answering the third research question; *how have women learned to be philanthropic?* We now have a better sense of how women learned to be philanthropic and how they used philanthropy in developing their moral biography. While doing so they also used their philanthropy to create space altering the power dynamics between men and women in society. They opened spaces for women to make social change in a very public way. Women learned to give at a young age through family, education and the church. With this background as a base, women then learned of the need because they were asked in some way to support the education of students. Whether the students were Freedmen, mountain boys or rural girls and boys, Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions learned of the need through a church bulletin, a friend, and personal observations. Some learned to ask others for gifts to support their work while others simply gave their time or their money. It was also discovered that each woman had a vision for a better future. The vision led their philanthropy with the belief that through their giving they could make a difference in the lives of others. And finally, the issue of power arose throughout the varied experiences. Because of socially constructed patriarchal roles during this time

period, power often influenced how the stories of these women were told or were not told. It influenced how they gave and how they received. Power also had an effect on how they implemented their giving as with the Woman's Board of Home Missions. Although the founding and development of Johnson C. Smith, Pfeiffer University, Palmer Memorial Institute and Warren Wilson College were very different, the research reflected commonalities in the journeys of the women to write their moral biography exploring and revisioning society.

The final research question was; *has the societal definition of philanthropy shifted in time and what are the benefits and concerns of this shift to woman's agency?* The concept of philanthropy has indeed shifted over time. Philanthropy, as we currently know it in the 21st century, brings to mind gifts of great wealth predominantly by white men such as Bill Gates or Warren Buffett. Oprah Winfrey only recently entered the arena as a woman of color opening the space to others through her example. However, prior to the Civil War early Americans defined philanthropy more inclusively. McCarthy (2003) explains:

... the term meant giving *and* volunteering, the personal excursions that large numbers of Americans regularly made into charity, communal self-help, and social reform, mingling their donated time and often modest sums for public ends. Rather than the privilege of the few, it was the practice and prerogative of the many. (p. 3)

I contend that this inclusive definition returns to mainstream culture so that we may recognize the valuable work being done to reshape society by individuals, many from

marginalized sectors. With regard to (re)defining philanthropy to where it once stood

McCarthy asserts:

Rather than the exclusive realm of privilege and wealth, it leads directly onto the public state on which men and women, rich and poor, black and white publicly contested for authority and power during the nation's youth. (p. 3)

By (re)opening philanthropy for all to participate we are opening spaces to contest authority and power which in turn will result in democratic social change.

Recommendations for Fundraisers

Recommendations for fundraisers are discussed separately from recommendations for philanthropists even though they work interdependently to achieve strategic, transformational change. There must be a positive relationship between the fundraiser and the philanthropist; more like a partnership in which the philanthropist has the vision of how she would like to see her resources support social change and the fundraiser who understands how to facilitate the interests of the philanthropist. Although my study is about women who supported education, the ideas may be applied to any organization which engages in fundraising.

Include women in the conversation. Professional fundraising is a high pressure job that demands high energy and good interpersonal skills. However, beyond building relationships with key constituents, the bottom line is the number of dollars raised. In the pressure to raise this money, fundraisers often forget to involve, or even consider, women in the decision making process. It is vital that the fundraiser include the spouse or partner in discussions around giving to end the assumptions established within a patriarchal

society which has traditionally left women out of financial discussions and decisions. Early conversations with partners and/or spouses together may reveal how philanthropic decisions are made within the family unit. Charlotte Hawkins Brown was very good at this. She understood that although many of the wives she knew did not work, they had influence over how the family funds were spent. Brown took her time building relationships with the wives of wealthy business men in both the North and South benefitting Palmer Memorial Institute enormously. Carrie and Galen Stone are perfect examples. Within Brown's personal papers there are many letters between Brown and Carrie Stone about Palmer Memorial Institute. These letters also contained more personal discussions too. There is no doubt Brown enjoyed the friendships she built with the wives of wealthy men, but there was a purpose behind them as well. Most fundraisers are personable people who know the importance of building solid relationships with their donors and the spouses or partners of those donors. Because women are often key decision makers in a family, if they are not included in the conversation about giving, not encouraged to give their time to the organization, there is little motivation for them to support the institution.

Shaw and Taylor (1995) discuss a number of barriers to woman and giving; one being women seem to give spontaneously rather than strategically. They comment, "Women tend to give out of their expendable income or sit down and write a check the moment they are moved by an issue" (p.110). hooks (2000) understands this and describes it in economic terms. She states:

Endless purchases of small items can lead to enormous economic profit and power. As consumers, women have power, and if organized could use that power to improve women's social status. (p. 95)

I contend this concept links directly to philanthropy in that if more women were strategic about their giving the impact could be powerfully felt. If women partnered with a successful fundraiser who would guide the donor to focused giving, be strategic about where they used their time and financial support there could be major social changes. It is the responsibility of the fundraiser to enable the donor to find her passion and ensure the donor fully understands and appreciates the significance of her giving. To do so the fundraiser should see him or herself as a catalyst between the donor and the institution. Rather than taking a check list of needs provided by the university leadership as giving options, the fundraiser needs to build the relationship with the donor to understand her interests. Penelope Burk's (2003) book *Donor-Centered Fundraising* discusses exactly this concept. By learning what the donor cares about the fundraiser can help create a vision for social change. Feminist epistemologies can and should lay the ground work for enabling this work to become much more meaningful to both the donor, the institute and the fundraiser. Charlotte Hawkins Brown demonstrates this epistemology of donor centered, feminist fundraising. She was asked to serve in Sedalia, North Carolina by a woman who listened to young Brown her talk about her passion for teaching in her home state of North Carolina. Palmer Memorial Institute became her primary focus for her philanthropy and she encouraged others to see her vision for social change and support the school with the same dedication and passion as she did. Brown dedicated her life to

her cause. If women were encouraged to find such focus for their passions we may see more directed giving plans.

Giving circles. Another tool fundraisers may want to consider when working with women is the use of giving circles. Giving circles can be organized in a variety of ways but the basic premise is a group of individuals pool their philanthropic funds, what they might give to an organization on their own, and decide as a group where and how the funds should be used. Rather than giving a one-time gift of \$100, the group makes a larger impact with a pooled gift of \$1,000. Bearman, Beaudoin-Schwartz and Rutnik (2006) support the idea of giving circles by explaining:

The power of the collective, the connectedness of the circle, the new relationships that participation brings, and the opportunities for skill building and education resonate with potential members. By pooling their resources, participants can even achieve a more significant impact with their charitable giving that they would as individuals, another important factor for women. (p. 116)

When women are brought into the conversation, the dialogue is much richer and the possibilities are many. Kaminski (2002) further explains:

... women take a different approach to philanthropic giving, just as they have different styles of communication and management. This is a result of women's socialization in a society that has long had a double standard in economic, social and power structures. (p. 188)

Giving circles offer another way of approaching women and asking for their involvement in a different way. The Woman's Board of Home Missions operated something similar to a giving circle in which women gave small amounts to support various causes. Rather

than the larger group making the choice to fund projects the central core group of the Woman's Board of Home Missions made the decision for funding projects and we saw the extremely powerful results.

Connect family. In addition to simply including women in the conversation, fundraisers should also remember to ask about family; not just immediate family but the family who raised the potential donor. As we have learned in this study, family influence has a large impact on women's philanthropic choices and how they learn to make these choices. If fundraisers fully understand the family's values they will be better able to facilitate involvement with their organization. If a donor comes from a family like Mary Biddle's, which seemed to value supporting others in need, then there may be a better chance that the potential donor would respond to the needs of the organization when asked. When it is clear that there is not a philanthropic family history it may mean approaching the potential donor with a different strategy. Prince and File (1994) explain that there are seven types of philanthropists: communitarians, devout, investor, socialite, altruist, repayer, and the dynast. All of these play different roles in how the fundraiser should relate based on their fundamental grounding in their belief in philanthropy. All seven styles of philanthropists, however, have a connection to how they were raised as children. It is crucial that the fundraiser understands what the donor's family values are around giving. It will benefit both the donor and the fundraiser to take the time and ask questions to gain this knowledge.

Point of entry. Members of the academy, including faculty, administration and fundraisers, work within the university world every day. Generally members of the

development staff hold an undergraduate degree and perhaps a graduate degree. Fundraisers work with alums and friends who generally have participated in the university environment as students but then have continued on to their chosen profession. This offers a different access point than those who remain in the university arena as staff or faculty. Scott (1999) eloquently explains:

Access has a physical connotation – approaching, entering, using. The idea of access is represented metaphorically as passages through doors and gates, over obstacles, barriers, and blockages. Accessibility is most often measured quantitatively – the number of individuals or members of a group who gain entry. While this kind of discussion has been useful and important for detecting discrimination or democratization, it has also drawn attention away from certain qualitative issues. How are those who cross the thresholds received? If they belong to a group different from the one already ‘inside,’ what are the terms of their incorporation? How do the new arrivals understand their relationship to the place they have entered? What are the terms of identity they establish? (p. 178)

It is essential for fundraisers to be cognizant of these issues, especially for women, minority and first generation college graduates. Graduates received a college diploma but what was the experience while on campus and how are they received as alumni? Because white males had access to higher education before women and minorities, the assumptions made about experience of women and minority students may be very different from the lived experiences of other alums.

Although, as we have seen, women have been involved in soliciting gifts for years, in a professional capacity until recently the work has been mainly done by white males. If we look at who is in the field now, it is mainly white females. It is not surprising then that over the last twenty years the focus to include and recognize women donors has

moved along side with the promotion of women fundraisers. Fundraisers need to be cognizant of *who* is being asked for gifts, keeping Scott's point in mind. As the enrollment of more women and minority students to historically predominantly white colleges and universities has increased fundraisers may want to reconsider how they interact with this new population of graduates. Is a group(s) of potential donors being ignored or neglected because development staff is not comfortable working outside their race or gender? This idea needs further consideration and research.

Vision. While working with women donors, fundraisers also need to understand the vision of the individual. We have learned that each woman or group of women in this study had a vision for social change. Women recognized through their work they could make changes in society that were being overlooked and oppressed within the existing structure. Because it was assumed women would care for those in need, their work was not celebrated or mentioned as a significant historical contribution to society when in fact they were laying the foundation. The women of this study recognized a need and connected with the community to provide their philanthropy. Kaminski (2002) explains, "Women are seeking a sense of connection with the institutions they fund, as well as a sense of partnership with the professionals they work with" (p. 194). Fundraisers need to unite the vision of the donor with that of the organization. It is also important to recognize when the organization's vision is not in alignment with that of the donor's and be able to let go or redirect. The more communication there is between donor and fundraiser the more opportunities arise to assist the donor in understanding the power of her contribution as a transformational gift to benefit social change.

The relationship between the fundraiser and the philanthropist is essential. It is the responsibility of any good fundraiser to include women in the discussion around philanthropy and to understand her family giving history. It is important to meet the donor where she is by engaging her as a volunteer or with a giving circle or other initial point of contact before asking for a large monetary donation. In order to build a sustainable relationship the fundraiser should also be cognizant of race, gender and other factors that may marginalize donors. This study has indicated that women who have a vision for social change and the determination to make change happen will do so in creative and unique ways. It is the job of the fundraiser to open the spaces for women and minorities to feel comfortable in coming forth and working with organizations to increase philanthropy. The fundraiser must feel comfortable enough within his or her identity to be able to engage others who may not be like him or her but have a vested interest in supporting the university. Additionally, the organization as a whole needs to consider how it is welcoming women and minority students. The experience a student, faculty or staff member has on campus will directly affect his or her giving in the future. It is imperative that the organization take responsibility for inclusion seriously. If there is no space for inclusion, women and minorities, as we have seen in this study, will find a way to see their vision unfold with or without the organization.

Recommendations for Philanthropists

Within this section, women donors are encouraged to embrace the term philanthropist, a space for younger women who want to participate in change is offered and a warning against the building of parallel systems is issued. At different times in their

lives women take on multiple responsibilities through obligations to work, family and social or community work. It is no different with their giving. This section addresses the concept of strategic giving which focuses philanthropy in one area to make a larger impact. I close with the idea of philanthropy as power; something all women should be aware of when making their gift, no matter how large or small the gift may seem.

The power of giving can be transformational as we have seen in this study. There are many ways to become involved with an organization through the expanded definition of philanthropy. Making a major financial contribution is certainly impactful but it is not the only way to make a difference; there are plenty of volunteer opportunities within an organization. Women who give of their time and talents need to learn to embrace the term philanthropist and the power that term holds. The term “philanthropist” has not been embraced by women because it has not been part of their identity. Women’s charitable work has been assumed within the patriarchal power structure of society without need for recognition and the language used to describe such work has excluded women. This is why my research is so essential; it brings light to the philanthropic work of women in American society that has previously not recognized the value of this contribution. In order for this important work to continue, younger women also need to be engaged in the giving process in meaningful ways. However, women of all ages and colors should be wary of creating a parallel giving system to that of men as we observed with the Woman’s Board of Home Missions. Luce Irigaray warns against this and encourages alternative ways of system building. Focusing on a vision and executing a giving plan may assist in changing the direction of women’s philanthropy and demonstrate an

understanding of the responsibility that comes with making a gift. All of these ideas will help to build a stronger reputation and position for woman as philanthropists.

Embrace the term philanthropist. My first and perhaps most important recommendation for women, who dedicate their time and financial resources to charity is to embrace the term philanthropist. Kaminski (2002) comments:

Women have emerged as leaders with a new approach in business, government, and the professions. Now they are poised to make a major impact with their philanthropy. They are passionate in their belief that education is key to providing opportunities for individuals and to advancing and improving society. (p. 194)

The term philanthropist was once inclusive of giving both time and financial means. As time moved on language has shifted turning the term into something exclusive and seemingly out of our reach for women and minority donors. But women and minorities now have the opportunity to redefine this word and to identify themselves as philanthropists. Many women have been taught that it is not proper to call attention to themselves and thus do not wish to be recognized for their giving. Shaw and Taylor (1995) assert, “Only by encouraging role models in our institutions and organizations will we be able to break this barrier down” (p. 110). Little by little, we are seeing more women embrace the idea of publicly pronouncing their giving to empower others to do the same. This is particularly important for the next generation of women donors if they are to restructure society so it is more equitable and just. If young women do not have role models to follow, how are they to know of the impact they can make? Unless young women were directly in contact with Emily Prudden and her schools, Prudden’s story was

lost to limited archival materials. It is critical that women share their philanthropic work proudly and make others aware of the gifts they offer in a public way. Women must learn to proudly acknowledge the work they do for others as philanthropy.

Younger donors. Young women who are just beginning their career or starting a family may not have as much time or financial resources as more established women but they still want to be involved and are passionate about making a difference.

Krishnamurthy (2005) discusses engaging younger donors noting, “They want to be engaged, they want to be at the table, they want to help frame the issues, and they want to work in collaboration with one another and other activists” (p. 280). No longer are volunteers satisfied with menial tasks, they want to know both their time and money are being used wisely. Women, especially younger women want to be at the table making decisions *with* the organization rather than being *reported to* because, until recently, women have not had a place in the decision making process. They are now demanding one; shifting from an exclusionary system of philanthropy to one which is more inclusive. Shaw and Hardy (1995) note a study of college students from the early 1990s conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles indicating, “that influencing social values, helping others who are in difficulty, participating in a community action program, and promoting racial understanding are concerns of greater importance to female students than male students” (p. 12). Still more research is needed in the area of philanthropy and young women but it is clear from my study highlighting women like Charlotte Hawkins Brown, that young women have the power to make significant change.

Avoid building parallel systems. As the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church established their office procedures for running the Board they created a system that mirrored that of men in corporate America. Walton (2005) explains:

... women used philanthropic means and the support of volunteer networks to augment their influence on the affairs of previously all-male institutions or male-administered institutions. (p. 6)

Women created parallel power structures as a way of entry to support their participation in the public sphere. Luce Irigaray and other postmodern feminist theorists caution against this strategy for creating space for women; rather they purported creating new systems and structures. As women's philanthropy has grown women have followed traditional patriarchal structures established by major institutions but they have also created new ways to support their work such as women assisted funds and giving circles. I encourage women philanthropists to consider non-traditional ways of giving in addition to the traditional ways of offering support. I am not suggesting women avoid supporting institutes that are grounded in the patriarchal system, rather I suggest that women begin to think more broadly for other options to support their causes. By thinking outside of the box we will further develop ways to be more inclusive in our philanthropy.

Strategic giving. The women in this study demonstrated strategic giving by focusing their philanthropy on a specific need, education. They understood that by contributing to education they would make a difference in the lives of others. Shaw and Taylor (1995) point out that today women, "... do little in the way of strategic giving" (p.

108). We live in a society where the need is great and the pull to give in many directions is tremendous. There have always been people who need support and there will always be organizations that offer such support but it is important that women understand why they are giving and focus their energy on their vision. This is especially important because women's philanthropic contributions, both financial and voluntary, have been assumed as part of women's work and absorbed into the naturalization of womanhood. In order for women to break this pattern they need to be focused in their giving to make the most impact. Brofman and Solomon (2010) talk about intentionality with giving. They write, "Intentionality is a special characteristic of the new philanthropy... donors make gifts that are meaningful to them, that connect at a deep level" (p. 21). Finding this intentionality or strategy creates meaningful philanthropy. Women especially need to take time on an annual basis to evaluate their giving year to year. This sort of reflection allows women to better align their giving with their values and interests and ultimately make more of an impact. Once a donor identifies her vision then she can focus her giving on a few organizations which support her cause, allowing for larger gifts of time and money, in turn making a larger impact.

Philanthropy is power. Through the exploration of the life experiences of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church it has been determined that philanthropic actions do indeed manifest power. The members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions demonstrated this through the schools they chose to support and how the schools were run. Charlotte Hawkins Brown kept firm control over Palmer Memorial Institute through the dollars she

brought to the school through her fundraising. Emily Prudden and Mary Biddle used their power, and finances, to establish schools for black children and men in the South at a time when education for black people was not always welcome. The actions of women matter and as we have seen, despite being buried in archives, the power of this work is undeniably transformational. They set examples of political and social resistance through their actions. When Emily Prudden was threatened by the white community for building a school for black children she did not back down but worked to maintain the school and did so for more than 25 years. When Charlotte Hawkins Brown lost funding from the American Missionary Association for her school she resisted the closure of the school and instead became a fundraiser and advocate for the black children of Sedalia, North Carolina. The Woman's Board of Home Missions may not have started a school of the mountain boys of Western North Carolina had the girls at the established school not brought this need to their attention. Once aware that there were limited opportunities for white mountain boys the society poured resources into the school resisting societal norms that did not value education as it was in the North. And all the women in the study operated at a time when women were just entering the public sphere. They confronted resistance to women having control over education and finances.

Sondra Shaw and Martha Taylor held focus groups with women of wealth centered on philanthropy. The results are fascinating. Shaw and Taylor (1995) quote Keller Cushing Freeman, one of the women in the study, observes:

By placing ourselves at a distance from the power and obligation inherent in wealth, we make its responsible use someone else's problem...
Traditionally, we have viewed stewardship of wealth as a masculine

obligation... [because] for most of recorded history, women have been dealt out of the power game. We have not had access to the mechanisms by which wealth is acquired, so we have had little claim to a voice in how wealth is distributed. (p. 108)

It is time women reclaim this voice. Shaw and Taylor (1995) assert, “When women do not lay claim to the power in money, they cede the responsibility to others, along with the ability to leverage action” (p. 108). By gaining an understanding of personal and family finances, women gain access to the conversation about philanthropy by focusing their vision women have the ability to make significant social change.

Women philanthropists are at the cusp of possibility. Women account for fifty-eight percent of college undergraduates (Strout, 2007). The Woman’s Philanthropy Institute at the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University (2009) reports, “As of 2008, women owned 10.1 million companies, employing more than 13 million people and generating about \$2 trillion in sales” (p. 3). Belkin (2009) recognizes in her New York Times article:

There are more women controlling more wealth in the U.S. than ever before. (Of those in the wealthiest tier of the country – defined by the I.R.S. as individuals with assets of at least \$1.5 million – 43 percent are women.) (The Way We Live Now section, para. 1)

Women philanthropists are positioned like never before to make significant meaningful social change if they understand and embrace their power to shift the societal structures to be more focused and inclusive in their philanthropy.

Recommendations for Future Research

This section calls for additional research in the area of women, philanthropy and education while making the research more available to practitioners in the fundraising field. There is much to be learned through academic and non-academic professional collaboration. In addition, more research is needed on, with and about minority philanthropists who, are a growing population and have the ability to make transformational changes with this giving. Finally, faculty need to understand the role of the fundraiser at their university to better partner in both research and in identifying students who may be interested in giving to the university.

More research on woman, philanthropy and education. Academic research in the area of philanthropy is fairly recent and therefore it remains limited. Research at the intersection of philanthropy, women and education is even more restricted. Shaw and Taylor (1995), long time advocates for women and philanthropy contend, “Only in the past decade have scholars come to accept that women’s absence from the pages of our history books does not mean that their participation was unremarkable” (p. 23). Based on my study of Biddle, Prudden, Brown and the members of the Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church I recommend more historical review of the philanthropic work women which influenced education in the State of North Carolina. Additionally, examining women’s micro-giving or undocumented gifts as well as socio-economic advantages or disadvantages that have enabled such philanthropy would be valuable research. Andrea Walton (2007) set the stage for scholarly research with her book *Women and Philanthropy in Education*. She established a compilation of essays,

which open the historical experiences of women engaged in educational philanthropy. This is an excellent beginning but more must be done. In order to challenge society and the patriarchal power structure which remains, we must understand how women before us made space available for change. How did those before us maintain and nurture their philanthropic work in the education arena while breaking barriers? What other stories are buried in the archives just waiting to be released to share the philanthropic work of women?

Making research accessible. In order for any of this research to address the issues of power and patriarchy in the field of educational philanthropy and to allow for changes within this structure we must bridge the gap between academic research and the work of fundraising practitioners. There is no point in engaging in research that has the potential to make transformational changes in our society if we are not sharing this new knowledge with those who are active in the field; the fundraisers and the philanthropists, academics and non-academics. Giroux (1991) comments:

... postmodernism must do more than reconstruct the theoretical discourse of resistance by recovering knowledge, histories, and experiences that have traditionally been left out of dominant accounts of schooling, everyday life, and history. Most importantly, there is a vital need for postmodernism to open up and establish public spheres among non-academic audiences and to work with such audiences as part of the struggle to fight racism and other forms of discrimination while simultaneously struggling to revitalize democratic public life. (p. 234)

By sharing this information across non-academic audiences we are not only fighting racism, as Giroux points out, but classism, gender discrimination and many other forms of oppression. It is essential that researchers and academics share their learnings in a

wide variety of venues to assist in making this information accessible and to shift the power structures to a more inclusive dialogue on philanthropic practices.

Minority philanthropists. If we lack research on philanthropy then it should be more evident that we lack research on the philanthropy of minority donors. The face of the professional fundraiser has changed from a predominantly white male to predominantly white female. There are now more white women working in this field than ever before. As a result, women and philanthropy has become a hot topic. As we seek new funding for our colleges and universities and other non-profit organizations we had better start working to understand our minority constituents. There needs to be more research in the area of how and where minority populations contribute their philanthropy. The research tends to regulate minorities to small sections rather than including them in the body of research. Marybeth Gasman from the University of Pennsylvania is currently leading the research on minority donors. As more is learned about the diverse donor pool, the practices of fundraisers should be examined. I would hypothesize that white fundraisers are more comfortable asking white donors for gifts which may result in less minority giving to traditionally white organizations. The same may be true with historically black organizations. If an organization truly wants to increase philanthropy among its constituents, it must consider how it deals with issues of race in addition to gender.

Faculty education. Finally, in the university community faculty education as to how the university advancement office works should be made available to faculty and staff. In my experience as a fundraiser and an academic researcher, I have noticed that the

work I do as a fundraiser is a mystery to the faculty. If there were a better understanding of the work in the development office, faculty may see development staff as allies. If this understanding were to happen there may be better communication and collaboration across the aisle benefiting faculty because 1) there would be someone sharing their work with potential donors, 2) benefiting the fundraiser because she would have more knowledge of the faculty work and 3) it would benefit both faculty and fundraiser to collaborate on academic and non-academic research and publications sharing current trends with different groups. This collaboration benefits the donors, fundraisers and scholars because it strategically aligns resources.

In conclusion, this study of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden, Charlotte Hawkins Brown and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church causes us to reflect on historical structures within society so that we may infer learnings on current work with women and educational philanthropy. Irigaray (1994) asserts:

Changing these habits is a long process, because it means changing attitudes, changing cultural climate, stereotypes and customs, and so on. Yet it requires immediate response... and we can all start respecting each other without forgetting who we are. (p. xvi).

My hope it is that this study allowed the reader to consider their approach to thinking about women's philanthropic work through the lives of women who transformed others through education. The stories of Mary Biddle, Emily Prudden and the members of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church give me hope for a stronger voice for women working toward social change through their philanthropy.

REFERENCES

- Aristotle. (1962). *Nicomachean ethics*. Translated by M. Ostwald. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merril.
- Atkinson, P. and Delamont, S. (2008). Analytic perspectives. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (3rd ed.), (pp. 285-311). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Bates, M. C. (1989). *Composing a life*. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Beecher, C. (1931). Essays on education of female teachers. In W. Goodswell (Ed.), *Pioneers of women's education in the United States: Emma Willard, Catharine Beecher and Mary Lyon*. (pp. 165-187). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Belkin, L. (2009). The power of the purse. Retrieved 3/12/2010 from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/23/magazine/23fob-wwln-t.html>.
- Boyd, L. A. and Brackenridge, R. D. (1996). *Presbyterian women in America: two centuries of a quest for status* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Brofman, C. and Solomon, J. (2010). *The art of giving: where the soul meets a business plan*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brooks, A. and Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2007). An invitation to feminist research. In S. N. Hesse-Biber and P. L. Leavy (Eds.) *Feminist research practice: a primer* (pp. 83-108). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Brown, C. H. (n. d.). *A biography*. Archives of Charlotte Hawkins Brown, Schlesinger Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Brown, C. H. (n. d.). *Some incidents in the life and career of Charlotte Hawkins Brown growing out of racial situations, at the request of Dr. Ralph Bunche*. Archives of Charlotte Hawkins Brown, Schlesinger Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Brown, C. H. (May, 1920). *What the negro woman asks of the white women of North Carolina*. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the North Carolina Federation of White Women's Clubs, Charlotte, NC.

- Brown, C. H. (1927). *A biography*. Archives of Charlotte Hawkins Brown, Schlesinger Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Brown, E. B. (1997). "What has happened here": the politics of difference in women's history and feminist politics. In L. Nicholson (Ed.), *The second wave: a reader in feminist theory*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Burk, P. (2003). *Donor-centered fundraising*. Chicago, IL: Cygnus Applied Research, Inc.
- Caputo, J. D. (2001). *On religion*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cixous, H. (1986). Soreties: Out and out: Attacks/ways out/forays (B. Wing, Trans.). In H. Cixous & C. Clement (Eds.), *The newly born woman* (pp. 63-134). Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press. (Original work published 1975).
- Cixous, H. (1999). Sorties. In J. A. Kourany, J. P. Sterba, R. Tong (Eds.), *Feminist philosophies: problems, theories and applications*, (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Collins, P. H. (1993). Toward an afrocentric feminist epistemology. In A. Jaggar and P. Rotherberg (Eds.) *Feminist frameworks: alternative theoretical accounts of the relations between women and men* (3rd ed.)(pp. 93-102). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Collins, P. H. (2003). Toward an afrocentric feminist epistemology. In Y.S. Lincoln and N. K. Denzin (Eds.), *Turning points in qualitative research: tying knots in a handkerchief* (pp. 47-72). Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.
- Collins, P. H. (2009). *Black feminist thought: knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Cott, N. F. (2000). *No small change: A history of women in the United States*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cowman, K. and Jackson, L. A. (2003). Time. In M. Eagleton (Ed.), *A concise companion to feminist theory* (pp. 32-52). Malden: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive biography: qualitative research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1-43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Derrida, J. (1992). *Given time: I. counterfeit money*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dill, B. T., McLaughlin, A. E., and Nieves, A. D. (2007). Future directions of feminist Research: Intersectionality. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research: theory and praxis*. (pp. 629-637). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Drezner, N. D. (2010). Fundraising in a time of economic downturn: theory, practice and implications – an editorial call to action. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 9(4), 191-195.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (2003). *The souls of black folk*. New York, NY: Barnes & Noble Classics. Originally published in 1903.
- Ebert, T. L. (1991). The “difference” of postmodern feminism. *College English*, 53(8), 886-904.
- Elam, D. (1994). *Feminism and deconstruction: ms. en abyme*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Emma Willard School (2011). *History: biographical overview*. Retrieved 1/10/2011 from: <http://www.emmawillard.org/about/history/ehwillard/ehwillard.php>.
- Evans, S. M. (1989). *Born for liberty: a history of women in America*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Fox, F. M. (1898). *Asheville Farm School*. Woman’s Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, [Pamphlet]. New York, NY.
- Fraser, N. and L. J. Nicholson (1990). Social criticism without philosophy: an encounter between feminism and postmodernism. In L. J. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/postmodernism*. (pp. 19-38). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Freedman, E. B. (2002). *No turning back: the history of feminism and the future of women*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

- Gannon, S. and Davies, B. (2007). Postmodern, poststructural, and critical theories. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research theory and praxis* (pp. 71 - 106). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gardner, C. V. (2006). *Historical dictionary of feminist philosophies*. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press.
- Gasman, M. (Ed.) (2010). *The history of U.S. higher education: methods for understanding the past*. New York: Routledge.
- Giddings, P. (1984). *When and where I enter: the impact of black women on race and sex in America*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Ginsberg, A, and Gasman, M. (Eds.) (2007). *Gender and educational philanthropy: new perspectives on funding, collaboration, and assessment*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Giroux, H. A. (1991). Postmodern as border pedagogy: redefining the boundaries of race and ethnicity. In H. A. Giroux (Ed.) *Postmodernism, feminism and cultural politics: redrawing educational boundaries*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Giving USA Foundation. (2008). *Giving USA* (53rd ed.). Bloomington, IN: Giving USA Foundation.
- Goldberg, M. (2000). Breaking new ground 1800-1848. In N. F. Cott (Ed.), *No small courage: a history of women in the United States* (pp. 179-236). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hands, A. R. (1968). *Charities and social aid in Greece and Rome*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Hickory Record (n. d.) *Miss Prudden spent life in working for others and was daughter of king*. Pfeiffer University Archives, Pfeiffer University, Misenheimer, NC.
- Home Missions (1893). *Twenty-third Annual Report of the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*. New York, NY.
- hooks, b. (2000). *Feminist theory: from margin to center* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Howell, M. and Prevenier, W. (2001). *From reliable sources: an introduction to historical methods*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University.

- Howie, G. (2008). Feminist generations: the maternal order and mythic time. In L. Irigaray with M. Green (Eds.), *Luce Irigaray: teaching* (pp. 103-111). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Huehles, F. (2005). Teaching as philanthropy: Catharine Beecher and the Hartford Female Seminary. In A. Walton (Ed.), *Women and philanthropy in education* (pp. 39-59). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Iggers, G. (1997). *Historiography in the twentieth century: from scientific objectivity to the postmodern challenge*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Irigaray, L. (1991). The power of discourse and the subordination of the feminine. In M. Witford (Ed.). *The Irigaray reader*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- Irigaray, L. (1993). *Je, tu, nous: toward a culture of difference*. (A. Martin, Trans.). New York, NY: Routledge. (Original work published 1990).
- Irigaray, L. (1994). *Thinking the difference: for a peaceful revolution*. (K. Montin, Trans.). New York, NY: Routledge. (Original work published 1989).
- Irigaray, L. (1999). Questions. In J. A. Kourany, J. P. Sterba, R. Tong (Eds.) *Feminist philosophies; problems, theories and applications* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Johnson C. Smith University (2009). *Quick facts*. Retrieved 8/14/2010 from http://www.jcsu.edu/redesign/administration/institutional_research/quick_facts.htm.
- Johnson C. Smith University (2010). *History of Johnson C. Smith University*. Retrieved 8/14/2010 from <http://www.jcsu.edu/redesign/about/history.html>.
- Jordan, J. W. (Ed.). (1911). *Colonial and revolutionary families of Pennsylvania: genealogical and personal memoirs*. New York and Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Company.
- Kaminski, A. (2002). Women as philanthropists. In M. J. Worth (Ed.) *New strategies for educational fund raising*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Kaestle, C. F. (1992). Standards of evidence in historical research: how do we know when we know? *History of education quarterly*, 32(3), 361-366.
- Keber, L. K. and De Hart-Mathews, J. (1987). *Women's America: refocusing the past* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Kent, S. (2000). *More than petticoats: remarkable North Carolina women*. Helena, MT: Falcon Publishing, Inc.
- Kourany, J. A., Sterba, J. P., Tong, R. (1999). Postmodern feminism. In J. A. Kourany, J. P. Sterba, R. Tong (Eds.) *Feminist philosophies; problems, theories and applications* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Krishnamurthy, K. (2005). The next wave: feminism, philanthropy, and the future. In E. Clift (Ed.) *Women, philanthropy and social change: visions for a just society*. Medford, MA: Tufts University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). Postmodernism? In H. R. Garvin (Ed.), *Romanticism, modernism, postmodernism* (pp. 136-141). Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Press.
- Indiana University Woman's Philanthropy Institute at the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University (2009). *Making philanthropy count: how women are changing the world*. Indianapolis, Indiana: J. L. Krotz.
- Leavy, P. L. (2007). Feminist postmodernism and poststructuralism. In S. N. Hesse-Biber, P. L. Leavy (Eds.) *Feminist research practice: a primer* (pp. 83-108). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McAfee, G. F. (1904). *Map talk on mission among the mountaineers of the south*. Literature Dept. of the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, [Pamphlet]. New York: NY.
- McCarthy, K. D. (2003). *American creed: philanthropy and the rise of civil society 1700 – 1865*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- McHugh, N. A. (2007). *Feminist philosophies A-Z*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, Ltd.
- Marilley, S. M. (1996). *Woman suffrage and the origins of liberal feminism in the United States, 1820-1920*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Miller, W. L. (1902, August 27). The founding of Biddle University: the site donated by a slave holder and money for the building from Philadelphia. *The Presbyterian*, (pp. 20-21, 24-25).
- Montgomery, M. L. (1886). *History of Berks County in Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia, PA: Everts, Peck & Richards.
- Moore, J. W. (1882). *School history of North Carolina: from 1584 to present*. New York, NY: American Book Company.

- Nicholson, L. (1994). Feminism and the politics of postmodernism. In M. Ferguson and J. Wicke (Eds.), *Feminism and postmodernism* (pp. 69-85). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Nicholson, L. (2008). *Identity before identity politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- North Carolina Independent Colleges and Universities. (2010). *Fast facts*. Retrieved 8/14/2010 from http://www.ncicu.org/fast_facts.html.
- Olsen, V. (2005). Early millennial feminist qualitative research: challenges and contours. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 235-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Parker, I. M. (1975). *The Biddle – Johnson C. Smith University story*. Charlotte, NC: Charlotte Publishing.
- Parramore, T. C. (1978). *Carolina quest*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice –Hall, Inc.
- Payton, R. L. and Moody, M. P. (2008). *Understanding philanthropy: its meaning and mission*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Pollitt, P. (1993). Learning freely: black education in North Carolina after the Civil War. *Now and Then, Summer*, p. 31-32.
- Pollitt, P. (1994). *Emily Prudden and her schools*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1994).
- Powell, J. N. (1998). *Postmodernism for beginners*. Danbury, CT: For Beginners, LLC.
- Prince, R. A. and File, K. M. (1994). *The seven faces of philanthropy: a new approach to cultivating donors*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Prudden, E. C. (1910). Paper. *In centennial history: historical addresses and manual of the Church of Christ, Congressional, in Orange, Connecticut*. Publisher unknown.
- Prudden, E. C. (1914). Emily C. Prudden: An autobiographical sketch. *The American missionary*, 5:12, p. 737-743.
- Raddeker, H. B. (2007). *Skeptical history: feminist and postmodern approaches in practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Richardson, J. M. (1986). *Christian reconstruction: the American Missionary Association and southern blacks, 1861-1890*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.
- Rudolph, F. (1962). *The American college and university: a history*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Russell, B. C. (1978). *The making of Pfeiffer College*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Russell, B. C. (2004). *Pfeiffer University: growth of a rural-urban university*. Misenheimer, NC: Pfeiffer University.
- Schervish, P. G. and Whitaker, K. (2010). *Wealth and the will of God: discerning the use of riches in the service of ultimate purpose*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Scott, J. W. (1988). Deconstructing equality-versus-difference: or, the uses of poststructural theory for feminism. *Feminist Studies*, 14:1 (Spring), p. 33-50.
- Scott, J. W. (1999). *Gender and the politics of history* (revised ed.). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Sears, J. B. (1990). *Philanthropy in the history of American higher education*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers. Originally published in 1922 by the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Shaw, S. C. and Taylor, M. A. (1995). *Reinventing fundraising: realizing the potential of women's philanthropy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sigerman, H. (2000). An unfinished battle 1848-1865. In N. F. Cott (Ed.) *No small courage: a history of women in the United States* (237-288). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sigerman, H. (2000). Laborers for liberty 1865-1890. In N. F. Cott (Ed.) *No small courage: a history of women in the United States* (289-352). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, J. A. (2006). In search of an ethic of giving. In W. Damon and S. Verducci (Eds.), *Taking philanthropy seriously: beyond the noble intentions to responsible giving* (pp. 13-26). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Smith, M. S. and Wilson, E. H. (1999). *North Carolina women: making history*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

- Sorber, N. M. (April, 2010). *Theory and socio-economic class: an agenda for higher education historians*. Unpublished paper presented at American Education Research Association, Denver, CO.
- Spring, J. (2005). *The American school 1642-2004* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Spring, J. (2006). *American education* (12th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Stephenson, F. (n.d.). *The mountain whites*. Women's Executive Committee of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, [Pamphlet]. New York, NY.
- Stephenson, F. (n. d.). *Plea for the "Farm School" at Asheville, N.C.* Woman's Executive Committee of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, [Pamphlet]. New York, NY.
- Strout, E. (2007). *Courting female donors: as women become wealthier, colleges learn to solicit gifts from them*. Retrieve 9/12/2010 from: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v53/i44/44q02101.htm>.
- Synnott, M. (2000). Burroughs, Nannie Helen (2 May 1879-20 May 1961), [African American] school founder. In *American National Biography Online*. Retrieved 1/15/2011 from: <http://www.libarts.uco.edu/history/faculty/roberson/course/4753/Biographies/3/4753Nannie%20Burroughs.htm>.
- Taylor, M. A. and Shaw-Hardy, S. (Eds.) (2005). *The transformative power of women's philanthropy*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Periodicals, Inc.
- The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (2010). *The history of UNCG*. Retrieved 6/13/2010 from: http://www.uncg.edu/campus_links/inside_uncg/inside_history.html.
- Waal, C. and Korner, B. O. (Eds.) (1997). *Hardship and hope: Missouri women writing about their lives, 1820-1920*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.
- Villaverde, L., Kincheloe, J., and Heylar, F. (2006). Historical research in education. In K. Tobin and J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Doing educational research* (pp. 311-345). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Wadelington, C. W. and Knapp, R. F. (1999). *Charlotte Hawkins Brown and Palmer Memorial Institute: what one young African American woman could do*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Wagner-Martin, L. (1994). *Telling women's lives: the new biography*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- Walton, A. (Ed.) (2005). *Women and philanthropy in education*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Warren Wilson College (2010). *About us*. Retrieved 7/22/2010 from <http://www.warren-wilson.edu/admission/facts.php>.
- Webber-Thrush, D. (2008). A gift of her own. *Currents: Council for Advancement and Support of Education*. (October), p. 32-35.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice & post structural theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Whitford, M. (1991). Introduction. In M. Witford (Ed.). *The Irigaray reader*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- Woman's Executive Committee of Home Missions (1882). *Our aims for 1882 & '83*. Presbyterian Historical Society Archives, Philadelphia, PA.
- Women in History (2011). Mary McLeod Bethune biography. In *Women in history: living vignettes of notable women in U.S. history*. Retrieved 1/15/2011 from <http://www.lkwpl.org/wihohio/beth-mar.htm>.
- Zinn, H. (1999). *A people's history of the United States: 1493- present*. New York, NY: HaperCollins Publishers.