Stony Brook University

OFFICIAL COPY

The official electronic file of this thesis or dissertation is maintained by the University Libraries on behalf of The Graduate School at Stony Brook University.

© All Rights Reserved by Author.

THE RELIGIOUS SISTERS OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD AND THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF SOCIAL WORK

A Dissertation Presented

by

MARGARET REGENSBURG

To

The Graduate School

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Social Welfare

Stony Brook University

December 2007

Copyright

Margaret M. Regensburg

2007

Stony Brook University

The Graduate School

Margaret M. Regensburg

We, the dissertation committee for the above candidate for the

Doctor of Philosophy degree, hereby recommend

acceptance of this dissertation.

Angel P. Campos, Ed.D.
Associate Professor and Executive Associate Dean, Social Welfare
Dissertation Advisor

Joel Blau, D.S.W.
Professor and Director of the Ph. D. Program, Social Welfare
Dissertation Chair

Richard Morgan, Ph.D.
Clinical Assistant Professor, Social Welfare

Winifred Doyle, CSJ, Ed. D. Administrative & Instructional Leadership
Archivist, Sisters of the Good Shepherd, New York Provincialate
Outside Member

This dissertation is accepted by the Graduate School

Lawrence Martin
Dean of the Graduate School

Abstract of the Dissertation

The Religious Sisters of the Good Shepherd and the Professionalization of Social Work

by

Margaret M. Regensburg

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Social Welfare

Stony Brook University

2007

This qualitative, retrospective study builds a conceptual model of the adaptation of church-related ministry of women religious to developing professional social work practice during the period 1857 – 1952. The case under exploration is that of the New York Province of the Religious of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd of Angers (known as the Good Shepherd Sisters). The Sisters built, financed, managed, and staffed charitable institutions that served tens of thousands of marginalized women and adolescent females. This social history of these Sisters and their work, including their contributions to child welfare, is set in the sociopolitical context of the one hundred and five years from their start in New York City, ending just prior to Vatican II. Primary sources consist of four unpublished social work masters' theses written by Sisters between 1936 and 1962, letters, unpublished papers, conference papers, and

books, from the archives of the New York Province. Using the principles of grounded theory, the researcher identifies and analyzes themes emerging from these sources reflecting modifications to their ministry consistent with changing standards in social work practice.

The study examines the effect of anti-Catholicism on developing social policy and social work professionalization, including the resulting impact on the ministry of the Good Shepherd Sisters in the New York Province. Other influences under analysis include the Sister Formation Movement, and social work graduate education.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES....viii

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE....1

Implications for Policy:....5

LIMITATIONS....6

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE....8

Catholic Institutional Resistance....11

Protestant Anti-Catholic Ideology....17

The Socio-Political Context....20

The Religious Roots of New York City Social Welfare....22

Private Sectarian Agencies....26

Moral Training in Secular Institutions....27

Catholic Social Welfare Movement in New York City....33

Homer Folks – Agent of Change....38

The Strong Commission Investigation....41

The Great Depression and the New Deal....45

CHAPTER II: RESEARCH QUESTION AND RESEARCH DESIGN....46

Data Collection....52

Data Analysis....52

CHAPTER III: THE NEW YORK FOUNDATION....54

The Organization....61

The Model for Practice 63
The First Mistress 64
Second Mistress 68
Funding and Oversight 69
CHAPTER IV: TREATMENT 77
Client Characteristics 77
The Physical Milieu 79
Religion 81
The Book of the Classes 81
Spiritual Welfare of the Sisters 82
Spiritual Welfare of the Children 83
Prayers and Catholic Practice 84
Education 85
Work and Vocational Training 88
Therapy 90
CHAPTER VI: FINDINGS 94
Modernizing the New York Provincialate 108
The Sister Formation Movement 109
The Good Shepherd House of Studies 110
Training the Group Mothers 118
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 121
BIBLIOGRAPHY 125

APPENDICES 142

APPENDIX i - THE SISTERS' WRITINGS 142

S. Kellogg manuscript -1936 142

S. Guggenheim - 1947 151

S. Andersen - 1948 153

S. Hart- 1959 164

S. Clines - 1962 176

APPENDIX II - Endnotes 180

LIST OF TABLES

2-1 Good Shepherd Sisters manuscripts……………………………………….56

2-2 Themes developed from Good Shepherd Sisters manuscripts………….57

2-3 Good Shepherd Sisters writings……………………………………….....59

5-1 New York Provincials…………………………………………………………124

5-2 Degrees earned by Good Shepherd Sisters as of 2006…………………125

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This is a qualitative, retrospective study aiming to build a conceptual model of the adaptation of church-related ministry of women religious to developing professional social work practice during the period 1857-1962. The case under exploration is that of the New York Province of the Religious of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd of Angers (aka Good Shepherd Sisters).

Founded by Sister, later, Mother, Mary Euphrasia Pelletier in Angers, France, in 1835, the order grew internationally. The Good Shepherd Sisters, initially semi-cloistered (Hildegard, 1961), took four vows at profession: poverty, chastity, obedience, and a vow unique to their order, zeal for souls. This last was the essence of their vocation, as Mother Mary Euphrasia founded the order to bring souls back to a life of grace and friendship with God (Hildegard, 1961).

When she died in 1868, Pelletier had founded 110 centers in 35 countries, including the United States. Pope Pius XII raised her to sainthood in 1940. Some consider St. Mary Euphrasia Pelletier (from now on, SME) as a Mother Teresa of her time. Today about 4272 Sisters of the Good Shepherd serve in sixty-seven countries on six continents, working to uproot injustice, especially toward women and children (Shepherd, 2007). Now, one hundred twelve women religious remain active in the New York Province of the Good Shepherd Sisters (Doyle CSJ, 2007), reduced from three hundred thirty (Markham, 2007) at the end of the period under study (1857 – 1965). The Congregation of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd affiliated with the United

Nations as a Nongovernmental Organization (NGO) in consultative status with ECOSOC (Economic and Social Council) in November 1996 (ECOSOC, 2006).

For the purpose of this paper, the author wishes to define certain terms. The term “Protestant”, or “Anglo-Protestant” refers to churches of the Protestant Reformation, such as Episcopal, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Methodist, and Baptist. From the time of the Reformation, they shared a deep hostility to Roman Catholicism. These included the convictions that the Pope represented the power of the Antichrist and the Roman Catholic Church was the “Whore of Babylon” discussed in the Book of Revelation in the New Testament (Bauman, 2002; Billington, 1935; Gienapp, 1985; Martin, 2000; McGreevy, 2003; Schultz, 2000; Zahn, 1957). The author uses the term “Catholic” interchangeably with “Roman Catholic” and does not refer to other Catholic churches, such as Ukrainian, Greek, or Russian Orthodox.

Finally, the writer defines “women religious” as women who feel called by God to commit themselves to Christ and to the Christian Community, who take vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience and live in a community patterned on the life and teaching of the founder of the community. Women religious do not own possessions, but give gifts and earnings to their community for all to share. Their ministry depends on the particular community to which they belong and the needs of the Church and its people. Examples of ministry are social service, education, the hospital and medical fields, faith formation, and work with the poor, elderly, and oppressed (Candidi, 2007). Formerly known as “sisters” or “nuns”, the women religious under study here provided services to sexually

exploited and other marginalized, socially maladjusted women and girls in New York City.

The research starts with their founding in 1857, ending in 1962 before the impact of Vatican II. The value of the study lies in explication of the steady growth and development of their services and its influence on social policy at the city and state level over one hundred eight years in the New York Province. Through good times and bad, the Good Shepherd Sisters kept a presence in the arena of human service provision to maladjusted women and adolescent females. The House of Good Shepherd was the only place in New York City where, under Catholic patronage, aberrant women and girls received both an education and vocational training designed for self-sufficiency. Today, they continue as social service providers for families and adolescents at risk, both in residential and community settings.

This research seeks to answer the questions: how did the semi-cloistered Catholic Good Shepherd Sisters, working in an institutional setting, adapt their practice over these years to comply with rapidly changing secular social work practice? How did the practice of the Good Shepherd Sisters affect social policy and the changing field of child welfare? The Sisters in this case study lived and worked in the New York Province during that time. The Province itself existed within and beyond New York City limits, building several institutions in Peekskill, Albany, and Troy, New York, to serve the growing population of females in their care, as well as in New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Vermont.

The researcher follows the literature review with a short history, based on primary and secondary sources, of the New York Province of the Good Shepherd Sisters beginning in 1857. A detailed analysis of the model of juvenile reformation detailed in the “Practical Rules,” (Pelletier, 1897) written by SME and embraced by the Good Shepherd Sisters, is next. The writer explores some major differences from and similarities to those used by state workers at the largest public juvenile reformatory of the nineteenth century, the House of Refuge (Pickett, 1969), founded in New York City in 1835. These similarities include referral sources, reasons for referral, ethnicity of the inmates, religious and moral orientation, as well as differences in institutional disciplinary practices. The information on the Practical Rules is from a primary source, the House of Refuge from published books and journal articles.

A description of the Sisters New York City expansion and changes up to 1930 follows. Since the first thesis available for analysis covers 1928 to 1949, the analysis of primary material begins there. The writer organized the balance of the dissertation by the major themes that emerged from the sisters’ writings: client characteristics, religion, education, vocational training, treatment, physical milieu, and funding and oversight. The researcher examined each manuscript for changes in Good Shepherd Sisters ministry and practice. A chapter detailing the practical steps taken to upgrade the education of all the New York Province sisters follows. The final chapter contains the conclusions and recommendations for future research.

The roles of religious institutes in public policy formation and social welfare development have undergone increased study in recent years (Ebaugh, 2002; Fitzgerald, 2006; Reichley, 2001). It is important that social workers acquire the knowledge base adequate to engage intelligently in this dialogue. Without education about religion's part in private and public life, the social worker is ill equipped to act as an agent for social change in the diverse community. This information is critical for a multicultural, competent practice. Consequences of a skewed and incomplete education are many. Above all, it makes the social work practitioner ineffective for work with consumers or agencies that value religious beliefs and norms outside Anglo-Protestant based secular systems.

The present-day student would benefit from evaluating the extent to which the ethno-religious Catholic model of service provision brokered the success of the immigrant. The model warrants study and perhaps, adaptation and implementation with immigrant groups (such as Middle Easterners and Latinos) strongly focused on religious values, customs, and beliefs (Ebaugh, 2002). Exploring Catholic immigrant resistance to mainstream Anglo-Protestant culture may provide valuable clues toward more sensitive professional practice, and possibly, movement toward social justice for today's immigrant groups.

Implications for Policy:

Implications for policy include:

- Explicating alternative approaches to ethnocentric practice. For example, providing a religious initiative to ethno-cultural

communities isolated because of language, immigration, and cultural issues that are a barrier to mainstream services.

- This study provides expanded perspectives for critical analysis of social policy. Without knowledge of the religious value conflicts underlying social policymaking at every government level, critical analysis is incomplete.
- Increased insight into religious social service provision provides greater understanding and may become the basis for fuller cooperation between secular and religious policy makers.
- The research illustrates a model for integrated practice between religious and secular professional social work practitioners.
- Increasing knowledge of United States social welfare history and the history of the part women religious played in developing welfare systems across the country

LIMITATIONS

This is a qualitative study using a small sample of archival material about events shaping the professional practice within the domain of women religious. These samples excluded works from laypersons and clergy. As a nonrandom convenience sample, it is not a candidate for statistical analysis. One cannot therefore, generalize these results to other congregations of women religious.

Social desirability bias permeates the archival material. The sisters, possibly out of loyalty and the norms of the times, wished to present their order in the best possible light. None of the archival material discusses conflicts or

problems between or among the sisters and any other organization or person, although it is present in secondary and tertiary material. The archival material reflects the assumptions and worldviews of the women who wrote them.

The researcher depended on women religious for her material. The priorities of the Good Shepherd Sisters place cataloging their archives after their many services to the community, keeping one women religious (from a different order!) as the archivist for the Province. The indexed archives of the New York Province Good Shepherd Sisters are small and incomplete. Often, material awaits indexing. On occasion, the researcher was not able to find certain archival material because it was missing, possibly housed at another site.

Prior to the mid-twentieth century, they did not record their achievements, or keep comprehensive records on the women who joined them, except a necrology. The annals in which they recorded events of significance, rarely included names or even dated the material. Even the locations of the burial grounds of many sisters who worked in the New York Province were lost because no one thought it important enough to keep records. This did not begin to change until after the Second Vatican Council.

Records of the residents consisted of large ledgers with the name and date of the child or women admitted and the date of discharge. The children's' case records begin around 1923. The researcher confirmed the sisters' writings with other sources, wherever possible, usually when they involved people or events outside the convent walls. Therefore, the researcher, recognizing these limits, chose to preserve the sisters' perspective.

A major strength of the study is that by using a qualitative approach the researcher discovered some unexpected findings. Adapting social work to Catholic theology, the part played by networking among women religious leaders, the impact of the Sister Formation Movement, and the vision of one social worker woman religious, serve to increase the researcher's understanding of how women religious empowered themselves to leadership in social welfare.

.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Sisters of the Good Shepherd of the New York Province built charitable institutions that served tens of thousands of women and girls in New York. They staffed, financed, and administered these institutions, under attack at times from male secular and religious bias. Their hard work equipped countless troubled female adolescents and young adults, immigrant and native-born, to live the American dream. They were among the first to teach self-sufficiency to women. Hundreds of women committed to God and social justice embraced the distinctive vocation of these Sisters.

Catholic women religious in the United States numbered just under 500 in 1830, but increased to over two hundred thousand by 1965 (Stewart, 1994), and remain about seventy-three thousand (LCWR, 2007). Of the four hundred and sixteen orders of women religious active in the United States today, fifty-six percent practice social work (USCCB, 1998).

The rise of feminism from the sixties to the present time has increased knowledge of the part women played in shaping public policy. However, the role of Catholic women, especially Catholic women religious, in influencing public policy needs exploration (Rogers, 1998). The role of Catholics in social welfare history texts remains tangential (Tentler, 1993). Graduate social welfare research on Catholic women religious is rare, and nonexistent on those engaged in social work (Fialka, 2003; Fitzgerald, 1992a, 1992b, 2006; Hoy, 1997; Kolmer, 1978; McNamara, 1996; Schneider, 1988; Stewart, 1994; Tentler, 1993). This is also markedly true of women's groups with a strong Catholic orientation, which have become of interest to historians over the last decade (Coburn, 1999). The growing work of feminist historians on the impact of Catholic women religious on United States social welfare has yet to find a place in social work education.

Current social welfare texts guide the student down a deceptively simple linear path. One advances neatly from Elizabethan Poor Laws, Charity Organization Societies, Hull House, the "heady" days of professionalization, the New Deal, the War on Poverty, and Reaganomics (Blau, 2003; Ehrenreich, 1985). The typical social work syllabus mirrors the text, failing to analyze foundational Anglo-Protestant beliefs and values dominating public policy during these times. Absent is the role of the Catholic institutions in responding to the needs of the poor and oppressed, as well as Catholic influence on formation of social welfare policy at local, state, and federal levels(Carlson-Thies, 2001; Reichley, 2001). Catholic resistance to the efforts of Anglo-Protestant charity workers and reformers remains undocumented in social welfare history texts

used in accredited undergraduate and graduate programs. Catholic ideologies are rarely subjects of scholarly social welfare analysis.

Complicating matters further, Catholic publications neglected the accomplishments of women, whether lay or religious. For example, every issue of the Official Catholic Directory from 1870 – 1940 listed priests by name, residence, and occupation (Oates, 1978). The same book listed only the names of the local convent superior and the number of sisters in the house. Church and secular histories alike focus on the areas of Church hierarchy and clergy (Oates, 1978). If not for the archival materials preserved by most communities of women religious, investigations of their work would be impossible. As it is, these archival materials vary in quality and completeness, limiting historical and social science research.

A comprehensive search of the literature produced few publications on the New York Province of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd. Exceptions to this are: a 1907 history of the New York foundation (Conway, 1910) and an updated history of the foundation published by the Archdiocese of New York for the foundation's centenary celebration (Coniff, 1957). The Sisters of the Good Shepherd are absent from published histories of houses of refuge (Pickett, 1969; Pisciotta, 1985) for troubled adolescent females (Alexander, 1995; Knupfer, 2001; Kunzel, 1993; Odem, 1995; Reeves, 1929; Rich, 1956).

Therefore, the writer researched topics influencing the establishment and expansion of the New York foundation of Good Shepherd Sisters in the literature

review, including the political and social contexts, and the Catholic response to them.

Catholic Institutional Resistance

The response of Catholics to the struggles of millions of immigrants with political, economic, social, and gender oppression covers about 300 years of American history. The achievements of these ethnically diverse immigrant communities in building powerful separate and parallel Catholic nineteenth century social welfare institutions are absent from the social welfare and social policy history texts used in most CSWE accredited schools. Excluding studies of Catholics in their social welfare analysis serves to erase the story of their cultural resistance to Anglo-Protestant oppression that resulted in building parallel welfare institutions (Fitzgerald, 1992a). The values of “deserving” and “undeserving” needy, with its attendant focus on the individual moral defectiveness of the poor, and the Anglo-Protestant norms on class, gender, race, ethnicity, and religion, permeated Anglo-Protestant charity organizations (Rosenberg, 1971). Catholics norms about the poor varied widely from those of Anglo-Protestants, a fundamental reason for conflicts about the best ways to help them. Assimilation was the Anglo-Protestant goal, while Catholics sought acculturation.

Catholic principles about charity form the philosophical basis for Catholic social work. It stems from the New Testament, particularly Matthew, Chapter 25 about the morality and conduct of believers concerning the less fortunate:

> “For I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, a stranger and you welcomed me,

naked and you clothed me, ill and you cared for me, in prison and you visited me.'

Then the righteous will answer him and say, 'Lord, when did we see you hungry and feed you, or thirsty and give you drink?

When did we see you a stranger and welcome you, or naked and clothe you?

When did we see you ill or in prison, and visit you?'

And the king will say to them in reply, 'Amen, I say to you, whatever you did for one of these least brothers of mine, you did for me.'

Then he will say to those on his left, 'Depart from me, you accursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels.

For I was hungry and you gave me no food, I was thirsty and you gave me no drink,

a stranger and you gave me no welcome, naked and you gave me no clothing, ill and in prison, and you did not care for me.'

Then they will answer and say, 'Lord, when did we see you hungry or thirsty or a stranger or naked or ill or in prison, and not minister to your needs?'

He will answer them, 'Amen, I say to you, what you did not do for one of these least ones, you did not do for me.'

And these will go off to eternal punishment, but the righteous to eternal life." (Doctrine, 1990)

Kerby outlines these principles in The Social Mission of Charity (Kerby, 1921):

"All policies, standards, and efforts must take into account the problems of inequality and strengthen the weak… (When) their own resources…fail. They must …stop…the savagery of competition before it reduces the weak to (helplessness). (This is) necessary to insure justice. …poverty is the problem of the individual… (And)…society…the State…and Christianity."

Again:

"The practical aims of charity are taken from the needs of the poor. The first of these aims is relief, the giving of food, clothing and immediate medical care as may be required. But…charity…never lacks foresight. It will aim to prevent recurrence of the need and to assure independence, self-reliance, and opportunity in order that they who suffer may gain normal strength. ….foresight goes much farther…It **discovers the social conditions and arrangements that single out the weak constantly and hurl them into poverty**. It feels the obligation to work for such social movements and conditions as will stop this process and offer protection against dependence **before** (author's emphasis) it strikes the poor. It will aim to spread knowledge of poverty, to sharpen the conscience of the strong, to build up public opinion, to strengthen the cultural forces and promote the legislation required to put an end to the poverty that is degrading and hopeless, and to bring relief and comfort where human wisdom cannot succeed in bringing justice and independence. ….the relation…between religion and charity is intimate…the service of the poor is imperative…, as it is the…expression of the mind of Christ… (stressing)...the spiritual nature of charity and the spiritual quality of the service to the poor."

Unlike the Anglo-Protestant view finding personal fault with the socially disadvantaged, Catholics emphasized environmental causes rather than personal character (Degeneffe, 2003). Charity, according to Catholics, was a spiritual imperative connected to everlasting salvation. Catholics believed that a business philosophy underlay "sectarian" charities, which had as their goal social control rather than the good of the poor (Brown, 2000). Sectarian reformers, rejecting "charity" as the benevolent impulses of the upper classes, demanded "justice", such as fair wages, child labor laws, and the like. Catholics, basing their concept of social justice in their tradition of charity, believed justice was a moral and legal guarantee of individual rights, based on the right to life. The "right to life" is a fully developed social welfare agenda which includes guarantees of a living wage, public health measures, social insurance, and a large role for the state in solving the problems of social welfare (Brown, 2000; Kerby, 1921). Also

included on this continuum are the immigration reform, anti-death penalty, and anti-abortion movements. Charity, in the Catholic sense, must also address the root causes of social and economic injustice. It advocates social interventions to address poverty, rather than individual punitive approaches. These different conventions of Catholic and Anglo-Protestant charity workers were fundamental to the organization, policy, funding, political advocacy, and techniques each used to respond to the crisis of poverty.

The anti-Catholic nativism of the antebellum (1830-1860) period is well-documented (Boyer, 1978; Burrows, 1999; Diner, 1989; Gienapp, 1985; McCaffrey, 1984; McGreevy, 2003; Rosenberg, 1971; Schultz, 2000). Nativism, as is the case with racism, served to oppress the target group to the economic and political advantage of the majority while blaming the target group for the resulting problems. Social welfare analysis on the role nativism played in forming parallel social welfare institutions is scant. Far from being in the past, anti-Catholicism infuses public debate today, in the areas of reproductive rights, scientific research, and sexuality. Without analysis of its history and consciousness of its effects, even in the current political climate, anti-Catholic bias affects social welfare education.

The researcher proposes four explanations for the persisting historical distortions. In the first, social welfare distances itself from its religious roots, originating with the midnineteenth century trend toward the casework method of “scientific philanthropy” and away from church-based charity organizations (Boyer, 1978; Bruno, 1957; Leiby, 1978; Rosenberg, 1971). When Dr. Flexner

(Flexner, 1915) evaluated the nascent field of social work and pronounced it "unprofessional," social work vigorously pursued the status and financial reward of a scientific profession. Mary Richmond's "Social Diagnosis" (M. E. Richmond, 1917) moved the field toward professionalization (Bruno, 1957; Leiby, 1978; Specht, 1994). After WWI, partly because of conservative backlash against social reform, social work turned to psychoanalysis, which became the foundation of social work policy and theory for the next 45 years (Specht, 1994). Social workers discarded moral and religious perspectives as guidelines for theory building and policymaking.

Second, the true role of the American social worker, the direct descendants of early nineteenth century evangelistic reformers, remains obscured, so Anglo-Protestant values continue their role as societal norms.

Third, Catholic dissent from these norms is marginalized. Of the top ten religions in the United States today, Catholics are in first place with sixty six point seven million members, outnumbering the next nine United States religious bodies taken together (fifty two million) (NCC, 2004). Catholics comprise twenty four percent of the United States population (NCC, 2004). Such a large body is significant enough to warrant a long overdue study of the impact of both their adaptations to and resistance of secular values and norms in social policy.

Lastly, the increased influence of postmodernism has driven religious perspectives from the public square (Bauman, 2002; McGreevy, 2003; Neuhaus, 1986). Beginning with Roe v. Wade (1974), liberals (including the field of social work) have opposed Catholic positions on abortion and homosexuality as

antifeminist and biased against the gay lesbian bisexual transgender community (Martin, 2000; McGreevy, 2003). Today, American Catholics may not be fully Catholic when present in the public square.

Social welfare history textbooks published before 1980 include the story of Catholic social welfare development in conflict with Anglo-Protestant self-interest (Bruno, 1957; Leiby, 1978). However, these accounts disappear in the texts from about 1980 on. Distortions and erasures of the historical record in social welfare texts disguise and misrepresent how central religion was to public life in the nineteenth century. The effects of these conflicts, some of which resonate in current social welfare issues, remain unanalyzed, depriving today's social policy analyst of necessary tools for study.

Related gaps in social welfare history include the paucity of literature exploring the influence of Catholic social service providers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries on developing state and federal social policy. These include the Society of St. Vincent de Paul and the National Conference of Catholic Charities. The gap widens around women religious, especially the work of Catholic women religious with adolescent females and women considered maladjusted by the mainstream society.

Important principles and ideals held by both Protestant Americans community and the Sisters of the Good Shepherd differentiated their responses to the delinquency of women and girls. This dissertation aims to narrow a gap in the history of social policy and social work, about the role of thousands of Catholic sisters in shaping female child welfare.

Protestant Anti-Catholic Ideology

Catholics had been a minority and a persecuted sect since the earliest colonial days. Throughout the original thirteen colonies, a virulent anti-Catholicism reigned, imported by Puritans and other English settlers from the ideological wars raging in Europe since the Protestant Reformation. Legislation limiting their rights and freedom supported the general hounding and harrying of Catholics, who constituted less than one percent of the colonial population. Prior to the American Revolution, Catholics were subjected to penal measures in all but three of the thirteen colonies, including Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New York (Horvat, 2007).

American Protestants between 1800 and 1860 feared the increased influence of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States accompanying European immigration. Protestants saw themselves as “true” Americans, bastions of democracy and a free republic. Contempt for and detestation of “Romanism” were “imbibed with the milk a Protestant child drew from its mother’s breast “(V. P. Lannie, 1970).

Several influential Americans, including eminent personages such as the Reverend Lyman Beecher and Samuel F. B. Morse, repeatedly warned of a papist alliance with European monarchies to conquer the United States. The alleged goal of these conspiracies was the eradication of democracy and imposition of the monarchy and ecclesiastical rule in the United States (Billington, 1935; V. P. Lannie, 1970; V. P. Lannie, and Diethorn, Bernard C., 1968). Morse, in his “Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States”, warned in

1835 that “there is good reason for believing that the despots of Europe are attempting by the spread of Popery in this country to subvert its free institutions” (V. P. Lannie, 1970; V. P. Lannie, and Diethorn, Bernard C., 1968). Thousands of Protestants, especially militant nativists, sincerely believed these tales, which seemed to look more plausible with the inpouring of Catholic immigrants. Catholic churches were cropping up everywhere, and Catholics themselves became more militant and confident in the public square. Immigrant Roman Catholic clergymen failed to understand the deeply entrenched Protestant culture, who believed their faith was synonymous with being “American” and “patriotic”, while labeling Catholics “foreign” and “papist”, that is, loyal to Rome (V. P. Lannie, 1970; V. P. Lannie, and Diethorn, Bernard C., 1968).

Beecher’s sermons on the need to save the developing West from the Papal invading armies contributed to mob violence in Charleston, Massachusetts, which burned the Ursuline convent there to the ground in 1834. Thousands of people in Baltimore rioted in 1839 for three days in an attempt to torch a Carmelite convent there. Five years later, mobs in Philadelphia killed thirteen people and left two Catholic churches and several Catholic neighborhoods in ruins. After the Know-Nothings targeted Catholics in the 1850’s, rioters in St. Louis killed ten people in 1854, and twenty more in Louisville in 1855 (V. P. Lannie, and Diethorn, Bernard C., 1968; Pagliarini, 1999; Schultz, 2000).

Masses of anti-Catholic literature circulated throughout the United States during this time. Between 1830 and 1860 this propaganda resulted in the

publication of over two hundred seventy books, twenty-five newspapers, thirteen magazines, and numerous pamphlets, almanacs, and gift books dedicated to the anti-Catholic cause. These materials focused on the major fears of Catholic aims and methods in the United States:

- The pope, a power hungry follower of Satan, colluded with European monarchies to conquer the United States and the rest of the world;
- Papal designs on the United States represented a distinct threat to the freedoms and democratic government enjoyed by Americans
- Priests, especially Jesuits, were papal soldiers in this endeavor, and would use any means to gain the papal ends;
- Individual Catholics had their primary allegiance to Rome and therefore owed unquestioning obedience to the pope, making them potential traitors (Billington, 1935; V. P. Lannie, 1970; Pagliarini, 1999; Schultz, 2000; Zahn, 1957).

Studies of the development of United States social policy that does not include the depth and breadth of Protestant bias against Roman Catholics distort the history of social welfare.

Native-born Americans held a low opinion of Irish Catholics in particular. The Irish Protestant, or Scots-Irish, was not subject to the same contempt as his counterpart, as they belonged to an approved, by American standards, church. Irish Catholics did not. Americans derided the Irish as lazy, papist, lustful and intemperate (Gienapp, 1985; Martin, 2000; McGreevy, 2003). Such traits as these did not conform to the rigidly held Puritan ethos of hard work, thrift,

moderation, and freedom from Rome (McCaffrey, 1984; Rosenberg, 1971). Irish immigrants, having survived Protestant British occupation, were well acquainted with these attitudes. For nearly 700 years, since it first invaded Ireland in 1169, the British had tried without success to uproot Irish culture, language, and religion (Woodham-Smith, 1962). The socio-political oppression of the Irish people left their country with Third World status in Western Europe. The Irish immigrant, therefore, came to the United States hostile toward and deeply suspicious of Protestant society (McCaffrey, 1984). Catholic response to this oppression was the development of a "siege mentality" which in the end became another obstacle in the upward ascendancy of millions of immigrants.

The Socio-Political Context

The organizations in existence for poor relief during the time of Irish immigration to the United States (1843 – 1857) evolved from the Bible Tract and Sunday school movements (Bruno, 1957; Rosenberg, 1971). These zealously Protestant entities developed directly from the "Second Great Awakening" (Rosenberg, 1971). This hugely popular evangelistic revivalist movement of the early nineteenth century shaped the foundations of United States social welfare policy. They focused on the moral improvement of the entire population, including the Catholic poor, that is, conversion to churchgoing, respectable Protestant beliefs and values. The charity worker of that era believed that Catholics were unable to achieve morality without conversion to Protestantism. The basic assumption of those who labored in the slums and ghettos was that moral

improvement and economic uplift went hand-in-hand (Rosenberg, 1971). The Calvinist foundation for American capitalism was central to the thinking of these charity workers: that industriousness, thrift, discipline, and materialism were virtues (Leiby, 1978; M. Weber, 2003). The moral conversion of the amoral poor would display itself through their exercising these virtues, bringing success to the individual and more stability to his community. Charity workers fiercely discouraged “almsgiving” and other forms of direct relief, such as the indiscriminate distribution of clothes and food. They condemned this as “Romanish”- a way of dispensing charity that discouraged the poor from seeking work. Although charity workers sincerely wanted to relieve poverty, they strongly believed these forms of relief encouraged dependency of the poor on the working and upper classes. Not least of all, the vision of the evangelicals was for a perfect society, following the salvation of all sinners. For these charity workers, focus on everlasting salvation was of uppermost importance (Rosenberg, 1971). Any work designed to aid the poor was a means to this end. Originally begun by clergy and lay volunteers, these movements, focused as they were on saving souls, only partly dedicated their efforts to reducing the problems of poverty.

The Depression of 1837 worsened the predicament of indigent New York City residents. The effects of this economic downturn lasted well into the 1840’s. The impact on the poor was so great that fear of a permanent pauper class gripped the city’s elite. Slums, crime, disease, vice, poverty, and unemployment were at dangerous levels. The leaders of the city feared anarchy and revolution

(Boyer, 1978). Illogically, they believed the urban poor both caused and became victims of the moral and social wickedness of the city (Boyer, 1978).

In the antebellum years New York City's population changed from mainly native-born to seventy five percent immigrant, and expanded from about two hundred thousand roughly to eight hundred thousand inhabitants (Boyer, 1978). Of these, a survey taken by the New York Association for Improving the Conditions of the Poor (AICP) put the number of homeless orphans at forty thousand (O'Grady, 1930). The slums of the city teemed with Irish Catholics. These were the lowest socio-economic class of Irish: Gaelic-speaking, illiterate, hungry, and sick, often exported from their starving country by British landowners who paid their passage (McCaffrey, 1984). Most were tenant farmers, restricted in Ireland from learning other trades. The immigrants, desperate to avoid death by disease and starvation, unwillingly left Ireland (McCaffrey, 1984).

The huge influx of immigrants overwhelmed the city's scant resources. Poverty, disease, and crime overwhelmed such infrastructures as existed for poor relief and health care (poorhouses, almshouses, and hospitals) (Boyer, 1978). The semi-rural atmosphere of the city transformed seemingly overnight into urban chaos.

The Religious Roots of New York City Social Welfare

Protestant charity workers claimed the title "reformer" when they wished to minimize the religious aspect of their work (Rosenberg, 1971). Their dreams of a perfect society gained by converting and saving all souls to God through Protestant religious revivalism, unified United States Protestants of the

nineteenth century. The Second Great Awakening of the late 18th century promoted this idea through all the media of the time: revivals, meetings, Bible Tract Societies, Sunday schools, newspapers, books, and traveling preachers (Boyer, 1978; Leiby, 1978). When engaged in charity work, evangelist Protestants consciously used charity as a means to this end: the hoped-for response from the object of charity was conversion to respectable, hardworking, churchgoing Protestants. Coming later (1843) with a "secular" appearance, the Association for the Improvement of the Poor (AICP) shared the same goals (Boyer, 1978; Leiby, 1978; Rosenberg, 1971). The 'secular' facade came from the business and social elite who comprised the board, all of whom belonged to Bible Tract Societies and Protestant congregations. Robert Hartley, the director for thirty-three years, brought his decade-long experience in the New York City Temperance Society to the position (Rosenberg, 1971). The AICP used tactics identical with that of the Bible Tract Societies to organize its work, and developed innovations such as the casework method and social survey (Rosenberg, 1971). The AICP, like its predecessors, sought the moral improvement of the poor, which would cause them to become hardworking, churchgoing Protestants. They focused on uprooting those issues they considered the basis of poverty: idleness, intemperance, gambling, extravagance, prostitutes, and early marriage (Leiby, 1978). Instead of preaching, however, they received training in giving "friendly advice" (Leiby, 1978).

The Charity Organization Society picked up from the AICP: they used the same investigational, antifraud, and social survey tools put into practice by the

AICP, the same “friendly visitor” tactics dispensing “friendly advice,” and casework. This, they believed, made them not only secular but also “scientific” in their approach to charity (Leiby, 1978; Rosenberg, 1971). They were staunch members of Protestant churches and Protestant women’s aid societies. Their focus was ever on the efforts individuals had to exercise to overcome their self-induced misfortune. In the early years, they made few efforts toward macro level changes. Later, in response to Catholic institution building, they sought macro changes by advocating state takeovers of charitable institutions and restricting funding to sectarian charities.

The child saver movement, founded in 1853 by Charles Loring Brace, attempted through the Children’s Aid Society to remove countless children living in a state of semi-savagery and running the streets in gangs, from the streets of New York City to “good” (that is, non-Catholic) homes. These children were refugees of the holocaust in Ireland (1845 – 1850). Later, he began sending some of these children to the West, to be “adopted“ by farmers desperately in need of labor. Brace’s efforts caused public outrage among Irish Catholics in New York, triggering institution building on a wide scale. In response, efforts by mainstream Protestants to regulate the conduct and care of these children intensified. Most reformers used the city and state legislatures to accomplish their aims. From 1865 to 1892, statutes passed about the care or conduct of children included:

1865 – Disorderly Child Act – permitted children to be committed by a magistrate on parental complaint without proof of a crime

- 1875 – Children banned from almshouses – without creating places where they could safely reside
- 1875- Parents patriae doctrine making children the “ward of the courts”
- 1877 – Act for the Protection of Children passed through the efforts of the New York City Society for the Protection of Children
- 1877 – 1892 – Codification of child welfare law with several statutes passed protecting the rights of children
- 1877 – Juveniles separated from adults in prison
- 1892 – Juvenile court cases separated and specialized (NYSPCC, 2000)

The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, founded in 1875, lobbied for the passage of most statutes in New York protecting the rights of children through the beginning of the twentieth century (NYSPCC, 2000). Unlike other reform groups of the day, they actively cooperated with the Good Shepherd Sisters when placing female children (Conway, 1910).

The Charity Organization Society came to dominate the social work field early in the twentieth century. Jane Addams and the settlement movement lost their status after the post-WWI “Red Scare” and Mitchell Palmer raids and never regained it (Davis, 1973, 2000). Mary Richmond and the COS continued to advocate the change of individuals through moral suasion. It was a natural progression from there to treatment through psychotherapy.

After WWI, the newly emerging profession entered the age of psychoanalysis, the new “perspective” of the next four and a half decades. Once again, social work focus centered on the flawed or damaged individual, who once “cured” would become an acceptable member of society. This was individual moral reform, the “next generation,” repackaged and relabeled as “therapy.” The long association of social work with direct clinical practice, no matter what the current theoretical fashion, still has as its goal the “re-formed” individual.

Private Sectarian Agencies

The New York State legislature approved two Protestant sectarian agencies at the same time and for the same purposes as the House of the Good Shepherd. The Protestant Sisters of St. Mary staffed the Episcopal House of Mercy, founded by Sarah Richmond, the widow of Rev. William Richmond, an Episcopalian priest, on 86th Street in New York in 1854 (J. F. Richmond, 1872). This institution, founded to aid “fallen women,” provided work training, but not education, to Protestant sex workers wanting a better life. The Episcopal Church managed it, including ministry by an Episcopal chaplain (LoMonaco RGS, 1975; J. F. Richmond, 1872; Services, 2006). The House of the Good Shepherd noted their “pleasant relations” with this home and other institutions staffed by the Episcopalian sisters (Conway, 1910).

The Magdalen Female Benevolent Asylum was located between 88th and 89th Streets, west of 11th Avenue, in New York City. A group of Presbyterian ministers headed by John McDowall founded it in 1830. After disbanding in 1832, several Christian women reorganized it into the New York Magdalen Society.

Women managed and fundraised for the institution from then on. Their goals included promoting moral purity, and providing asylum for females (ages 10 through thirty) recruited from the Tombs and other prisons. The Asylum provided religious services, Bible Study, some basic education, work experience, and training in a structured environment to sex workers sincerely seeking reform. Those who succeeded in the Asylum found employment with private families or returned to relatives (LoMonaco RGS, 1975; Major, 2004; J. F. Richmond, 1872).

Moral Training in Secular Institutions

This brief review of secular juvenile delinquent institutions in New York City is for the reader to compare with the descriptions later of the philosophy and methods employed by the Good Shepherd Sisters. Since the New York House of Refuge became the model countrywide for secular juvenile delinquent facilities, it seems the most suitable for this purpose, although their admission criteria excluded female sex workers. Following that is a review of the effect of "progressive" ideas on young women's training schools from around 1900 – 1929.

Private fundraisers combined with state efforts and founded the New York House of Refuge in 1824 to provide delinquent juveniles with an alternative to the poorhouse, workhouses, and penitentiaries of the day. The Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents, the private fundraising concern for the New York House of Refuge, showed a Protestant evangelical orientation in their annual reports (Rosenberg, 1971). It was the result of efforts by leading preachers and Quakers in New York to separate juveniles from adults in the

penitentiary as well as a place to take vagrant and neglected youngsters off the streets. The Refuge, as it came to be known, began as a private concern, but by the end of the century, became both state funded and state managed (Pickett, 1969).

The House of Refuge, as did most other ostensibly secular institutions of the day, actively sought to convert their charges (Boyer, 1978; Fox, 1996; Leiby, 1978; Rosenberg, 1971). They held regular Protestant Sunday services, as well as weekday and evening prayer services. Religion was the principal socializing tool used by these organizations (Boyer, 1978; Rosenberg, 1971). The curriculum included religious exercises and Bible study; combined with work and schooling these were the primary means of reformation.

The Refuge placed great emphasis on uniformity, strict routine, and rigorous discipline (Boyer, 1978). It carried the logic of the Sunday school further – from a weekly, two-hour experience to full-time. Shame was a principal disciplinary tool. Other incentives held sway over the children's motivation: conformers gained release more rapidly and received choicer apprenticeships. Many of those unable or unwilling to adapt went on a train to the Midwest or received apprenticeships to sea captains and went out to sea (Boyer, 1978; Leiby, 1978).

The Refuge organized children according to behavior and subsequently divided into a hierarchy of "classes". These were distinguished by dress, diet, labor, lodging, and recreation. The classes helped refuge officials keep discipline and reward or punish the children (Pickett, 1969).

The New York House of Refuge, in its second annual report, described a hierarchy of punitive measures used to control the children:

1. “Privation of play and exercise
2. Send to bed supperless at sunset
3. Bread and water for breakfast, dinner, and supper
4. Gruel without salt for breakfast, dinner, and supper
5. Chamomile, boneset, or bitter herb tea, for breakfast, dinner, and supper
6. Confinement in solitary cells
7. Corporal punishment, if absolutely necessary, or if awarded by a majority of boys, and approved
8. Fetters and handcuffs, only in extreme cases. “(Pickett, 1969)

Discipline in the NY House of Refuge changed beginning in 1827. A four-step badge system ran the gamut from “honor roll” to loss of Sunday dinner, solitary confinement, and possibly, a whipping. Nathaniel C. Hart, second Superintendent of the House of Refuge, openly scorned ‘new thinkers’ who opposed corporal punishment, quoting the Bible as his authoritative source (Pickett, 1969).

The institution admitted girls, as long as they were not “besmirched with guilt” that is, sex workers. However, the House of Refuge managers found girls more difficult to deal with than the boys, a problem eased only slightly when a Ladies Auxiliary (formed of the manager’s wives and some Quaker women) formed to help. Their support included teaching the girls Bible scripture, lectures on virtues and morals, and education on personal hygiene and housekeeping. For these women, preserving the girls’ virtue was their primary concern (Pickett, 1969).

In 1851, the Children’s Aid Society built the New York Juvenile Asylum, removing destitute and neglected children under the age of twelve from the New

York House of Refuge. After this, the Refuge cared only for those convicted of juvenile delinquency (Pickett, 1969). Indigent Catholic children formed most of the inmates at both institutions, although no Catholic priest could conduct services there (Brown, 2000).

By 1854, the House of Refuge had become the world's largest repository of delinquent children. The institution, by now classified as a reformatory, moved into new quarters on Randall's Island that year. For the first time, the Board of Managers wrote down the principles and bylaws for their system. These bylaws provided for seven standing committees, an Executive committee, and procedures for each of the officers, while defining the duties of the committees. The Indenturing committee had the most comprehensive guidelines, since it had the dual purpose of indenturing the children and seeing to their welfare (Pickett, 1969). The new quarters on Randall's Island allowed the Refuge officials to classify their charges by moral conduct, from (1) best behaved and most orderly boys and girls to (4) vicious, bad, and wicked. For the first time, a separate building housed the female residents (Pickett, 1969).

During the 1880's, the religious character of the refuge movement came under attack. The Archdiocese of New York condemned the Protestant monopoly on religious services for the largely Catholic children in the institution, the Protestant Board of Managers and officials, and the ban on visiting Catholic clergy (Pickett, 1969). Catholics won the legal right to conduct services in non-Catholic institutions in 1891 (Brown, 2000). The House of Refuge declined in popularity for the next several decades, becoming the subject of sensational

newspaper tabloids and criticized for poor performance. Social work trends toward cottage style houses, and changing approaches to the problem of juvenile delinquency, turned the Refuge into an anachronism.

By the 1920's, the young women moved to a cottage style reformatory near Hudson, NY, and in 1935, the Refuge finally closed, the remaining boys moved upstate to reformatories at West Coxsackie and Warwick.

In contrast to traditional training programs was that of Sleighton Farm, Pennsylvania, directed by Martha Falconer, superintendent from 1906 – 1918. Falconer incorporated progressive ideas into this institution for delinquent females, which her successors continued, becoming a model for girl's training schools across the country (Reeves, 1929). She organized the children into the cottage system, where a matron headed "families" of inmates, designed partly to socialize them. Falconer did away with guards, uniforms, and punishment such as flogging, food deprivation, and solitary confinement. She staffed the institution with college-educated women who developed academic training, culture, and recreation for the inmates. She placed much importance on the therapeutic and character building values of recreation, making it central to her approach to reformation (Odem, 1995). Falconer also introduced student government, which spread to many other institutions of its kind (Reeves, 1929). The central goal of the institution was to channel the young women's misguided sexual energy into preparation for lives as good homemakers and mothers (Odem, 1995; Reeves, 1929). Many of these "progressive" ideas had been a hallmark of the work of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd for over fifty years by then. However, the Sisters of

the Good Shepherd focused on teaching the young women skills by which they could become self-sufficient besides preparing them for marriage and parenting.

In the survey, “Training Schools for Delinquent Girls” (Reeves, 1929), the religious character of the fifty-seven schools in the sample varied according to the superintendent in charge. Nineteen of the schools provided one religious service (led by Protestant clergy) regardless of the denomination of the inmates. Forty-four required attendance at services. Forty-five conducted a weekly Sunday school within the institution. Only one did not provide for services at all. None of the training schools surveyed had a resident chaplain (Reeves, 1929).

Reeves concluded that different phases of their programs, for example recreation and student government, inculcated moral principles and values into the girls. Caseworkers and psychologists, she writes, correlated with other staff to make a well-rounded plan meeting the individualized needs of each girl. She supposed that a “modern” religious education, consisting of projects benefiting others, would do more to instill “religious” (spiritual) values than the patchwork of often incompatible services and Sunday schools provided by most of the institutions (Reeves, 1929).

When Reeves conducted her survey, corporal punishment no longer existed at most of the sampled schools. Training shifted from reactive, corrective, punitive actions, to proactive treatment, training and behavioral adjustment based on the psychology of the individual girl (Reeves, 1929).

Catholic Social Welfare Movement in New York City

New York State, including New York City, began contributing public funds to Anglo-Protestant private charities, mostly for education, beginning in the early nineteenth century. This practice dated back to the Dutch colonial period, when the Dutch government supported private charities so the colony would save on the expenses of funding and managing public charities (Burrows, 1999).

A rise in nativism countered New York's Catholic Bishop John J. Hughes' demands for parity in education. Consequently, parallel Catholic institution building started in 1850, after Hughes launched the parish-based parochial school system to meet the religious and educational needs of New York's Catholic children (Cohalan, 1983; Vandermeer, 1981). This institutional response quickly grew to include all aspects of Catholic social welfare, especially child welfare. Catholics of every economic class eagerly financed this alternative to Protestant evangelism in "nonsectarian" organizations that Catholics believed threatened their everlasting salvation (O'Grady, 1930).

The huge influx of mostly Catholic poor from Europe beginning in 1840 intensified the need for Catholic based social welfare services. Hughes began his administration in a New York City populated by three hundred ninety-one thousand people (Demographia, 2006; "Historical Census Browser," 2004), of which about a fifth (seventy-eight thousand) were Catholic (Cohalan, 1983). A decade later, the population increased to six hundred ninety-seven thousand (Demographia, 2006; "Historical Census Browser," 2004). A quarter of these (about one hundred seventy-five thousand) were Catholic.

As the leader of the New York diocese, Hughes successfully recruited almost all the major religious communities to New York City. He requested a new order of the Sisters of Charity (of Mt. St. Vincent), be founded to build orphan asylums and hospitals. He fundraised in the United States and Europe to achieve his vision of cradle-to- grave Catholic education and social welfare. Hughes built Catholic schools, churches, hospitals, cemeteries, orphanages, colleges, and a seminary. He supported forming the Emigrant Savings Bank and the Irish Emigrant Society, and the New York branch of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. He began building St. Patrick's Cathedral, arguably the high point of his career, in 1858 (Cohalan, 1983). When he died in 1864, 1.3 million people occupied New York City, of which approximately one-third were Catholic, five times the number at the beginning of his administration (Demographia, 2006; "Historical Census Browser," 2004). Catholics became the largest single religious denomination in the United States by 1865, a position held by them to the present day.

His successor, Archbishop (later Cardinal) John McCloskey, zeroed in on child welfare. He founded the New York Foundling Asylum (1869), after which infant mortality in the city decreased by half. He staffed and supported the Catholic Protectory (1873) the largest institution for children in the world (Cohalan, 1983; O'Grady, 1930). McCloskey doubled the number and capacity of the city's parochial schools, and increased the number of Catholic hospitals. The sixteen religious communities he recruited extended their care to the aged and sick. The first Catholic mental hospital in New York State, St. Vincent's (Harrison, New York) opened during this time (Cohalan, 1983; McCauley, 2005). When

McCloskey died in 1884, the Archdiocese of New York numbered over six hundred thousand Catholics, forty religious orders, and over 230 churches (Cohalan, 1983).

The lay Society of St. Vincent de Paul (aka Vincentians) led the Catholic response to the Protestant childsavers. The Children's Aid Society founded in 1853 by Charles Loring Brace and supported by most Anglo-Protestants in the city, removed Catholic children from the streets, placing them in "good" (that is Protestant) homes across the country (Leiby, 1978; Sutton, 1990). Catholic newspapers depicted the placing out system as a slave trade which auctioned Irish youth to the highest Midwestern bidder (O'Grady, 1930; Sutton, 1990). The protests of the Vincentians and all the United States Catholic bishops against the practice of sending Catholic children to Protestant reformatories or to non-Catholic homes met with success in New York State in 1875. That year the legislature passed a statute allowing the state to place children in Catholic institutions if their parents wished (Cohalan, 1983; Sutton, 1990). Catholics remained hostile to foster-care schemes for many years afterward. Vincentians watched local judges to ensure they enforced the law, and later, when juvenile courts were established, became volunteer probation officers (O'Grady, 1930; Sutton, 1990)

In 1874, New York voters ratified a State Constitutional Commission provision to stop state appropriations for any private organization except for "the education of the blind, deaf, and dumb, and for juvenile delinquents" (Folks, 1915). After that, the state granted appropriations only to the House of Refuge,

on Randall's Island. However, the constitutional Convention of 1894 adopted a provision permitting local governments to make appropriations to charitable institutions, as long as the institution complied with the rules and regulations of the Board of Charities. One effect was to shift the burden of support from the state to local governments (Folks, 1915). The other was for Protestants to organize their institutions as "nonsectarian" entities (Sutton, 1990). Catholic institutions were denied this subterfuge because women religious staffed them.

Irish Catholics dominated Tammany Hall beginning in 1866 with the ascendance of William Marcy "Boss" Tweed, eventually controlling New York City politics. Their "we take care of our own" attitude favorably affected Catholic institutions (Brown, 2000; McCauley, 2005). This was possible for two reasons: one, the New York State Board of Charities, empowered only to visit and inspect state, local, and private institutions, lacked enforcement powers (Millis, 1898). The Board appointed committees to inspect institutions, examine their records and contracts, and take complaints from the inmates (Millis, 1898). They submitted reports based on their findings to the State legislature and made policy recommendations. Secondly, prior to 1897 the New York City Department of Public Charities had no jurisdiction over payments of public funds to private institutions (Folks, 1901).

Early in the twentieth century, Catholic institutions received the greatest part of the city's charities budget. The funding scheme, which paid private agencies to provide services to the poor, caused political infighting and turf wars throughout the end of the nineteenth and into the twentieth century (Brown, 2000;

Cohalan, 1983; McCauley, 2005). Protestant institutions, which originally favored subsidies, changed their minds when Catholic institutions prospered (Leiby, 1978). They tried to evade the law by organizing under “nonsectarian’ auspices while simultaneously pushing strict enforcement against Catholic agencies (Leiby, 1978; O'Grady, 1930; Sutton, 1990). Reformers from the Protestant Charity Organization Society (COS), led by Josephine Lowell and the private State Charities Aid Association (SCAA) headed by Louisa Schuyler led the struggle. Lowell and Schuyler condemned “indiscriminate poor relief,” arguing that the poor became dependent on it rather than achieve self-sufficiency (Brown, 2000; Rosenberg, 1971). More importantly, for the House of the Good Shepherd, both organizations faulted Catholic child welfare institutions. They championed the cause of greater State oversight and promoted the practice of foster home placement for dependent children (Brown, 2000; Cohalan, 1983; Folks, 1900).

Vincentians joined the COS in New York City in the early 1890’s, hoping to establish cooperation, learn from their peers, and adapt their methods for Catholics (O'Grady, 1930; Sutton, 1990). Thomas Mulry, president of the Emigrant Savings Bank of New York City and a prominent member of both organizations, agreed in part with the COS method of placing children in foster care, that is, he considered placement into good Catholic homes more desirable than placement in institutions. In 1898, sponsored by the Vincentians, he founded the Catholic Home Bureau to find placements for needy and orphaned Catholic children (O'Grady, 1930; Sutton, 1990). Mulry reported in 1899 to the

National Conference of Charities and Corrections that religion was the top requirement for placement of Catholic children. Because Catholic foster homes were rather scarce, Mulry stressed the need for Catholic child caring institutions to raise Catholic children rather than place them in non-Catholic homes. However, the Catholic Home Bureau placed only about three hundred children yearly, leaving the Catholic city institutions to care for more than twenty thousand more (Brown, 2000). Mulry's membership in the COS combined with his influence in the Archdiocese of New York led to incorporating many of the COS ideas into the Catholic Charities programs after WWI (O'Grady, 1930; Sutton, 1990). These included employing full-time workers, centralizing charity agencies, and the value of social work training. Unfortunately, Mulry died unexpectedly in 1915, during the Strong Commission investigations.

Homer Folks – Agent of Change

In the person of Homer Folks, however, lay the path to political changes in the oversight and funding of private institutions for destitute, neglected, and delinquent children. Homer Folks (1867-1963) focused on social conditions in New York State throughout his long and prestigious career. A Michigan-born Harvard Doctor of Laws who once considered ministry, he was one of the first college graduates to choose social work for a career (Trattner, 1965). He was a "trailblazer" in reform movements for improving public institutions and promoting child welfare (Trattner, 1965). Folks believed New York City's practice of funding private children's institutions "an unfortunate example that has been very generally followed" (Folks, 1900). Throughout his life, he advocated for state

takeover of institutions for dependent children (Folks, 1900, 1901, 1915; Sutton, 1990; Trattner, 1965; Wallace, 1923). While Secretary of the State Charities Aid Association of New York, he played a key role in writing and then revising the Public Charities chapter of the Greater New York City charter in 1897 and 1901(Folks, 1901). The 1897 Charter placed all New York City children committed to private institutions under the jurisdiction of the New York City Department of Public Charities (separated from Corrections in 1895) (Folks, 1901; McCarthy, 2001). Even more significantly, the charter provided that money paid by the city for the care, education, and support of these children could not be used for any other purpose (Folks, 1901). These terms substantially lowered the numbers of destitute children committed to institutions (Folks, 1901) the following year. The new charter prevented institutions from pocketing the difference between the per capita payments from the city and their costs. Many times this difference enabled institutions to buy properties, on which they built larger structures with greater capacities, increasing the numbers of children they served. Homer Folks thought the institutional purchases and sales of prime New York City real estate enriched their owners (Folks, 1901).

The Public Charities revisions to the 1901 charter included:

1. Magistrates committing children for destitution to private institutions must notify the New York Department of Public Charities so they could investigate the case and report to the magistrate before the final decision.

2. The Commissioner of Public Charities had the power to place out these children in private families, either using agents from the department or another agency.
3. The Commissioner of Public Charities did not allow children to enter institutions failing State Board of Charities certification.
4. The Commissioner of Public Charities did not permit children to enter institutions outside the city of New York unless certified compliant with rules about fire protection by the State Board of Charities.
5. The City Magistrate must set up a separate court, in the same building as the charities department, for trials and commitments of all children under sixteen.

Public Charities became involved in placing children before, not after, finalization. They hoped they could put children in private family placements, saving the city money for their care. The State Board of Charities and the New York City Department of Public Charities both had jurisdiction over private institutions, including the power to divert admissions from the city. Physically locating a special juvenile court close to the Charities Department simplified investigations and placements.

Folks served as presiding officer over the 1909 White House Conference on Dependent Children, president of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections in 1911, and in 1913 as secretary on the first New York State Health Commission. He helped to reorganize the New York State Health Department

into the most progressive in the United States (Trattner, 1965). He was still serving as secretary for the State Charities Aid Association during the New York City charities scandals of 1914-1915.

The Strong Commission Investigation

The year 1914 saw New York City's budget for private charities, a trickle in the early nineteenth century, reach unprecedented heights at two million dollars yearly (Cohalan, 1983). Accusations flew from John Kingsbury, Commissioner of Department of Public Charities of the City of New York, charging the State Board of Charities with inadequate oversight and possible complicity with private charitable institutions (Brown, 2000; "Constructive Work Done by Kingsbury," 1914). The city was deeply in debt, borrowing money with great difficulty at high interest rates to meet budget needs. This led many to target the expense of charities, and after some political tussles, Kingsbury asked Governor Whitman of New York to investigate the State Board of Charities for improprieties (Brown, 2000; Cohalan, 1983; Fitzgerald, 2006; "New York Times: Whitman Orders Charities Inquiry," 1915). Advised by Homer Folks (a longtime opponent to publicly funding private charities) (Brown, 2000; "Folks Denies Plot in Charity Inquiry," 1916), Whitman appointed Charles H. Strong to head the inquiry (Fitzgerald, 2006).

In November of 1915, Strong began his investigation with a dual purpose: the first, to better organize the charitable institutions in the state (Brown, 2000; Gavin, 1962). Second, he wanted to examine the certification inspections made by the State Board of Charities in these institutions (Cohalan, 1983; "New York

Times: Whitman Outlines Charities Inquiry," 1915). During the investigation the State Board disclosed New York City paid $4.6 million yearly to private charities, of which $2.8 million went to Catholic institutions ("Admits State Fails to Inspect Asylums," 1916). More than half the budget of Catholic institutions came from the City of New York ("Admits State Fails to Inspect Asylums," 1916).

The Strong Commission report, issued in 1916, recommended reorganizing the State Board with paid professionals (Brown, 2000; Lane, 1916b). Other recommendations included the immediate erection of an institution for “defective” delinquents; the placing out of “normal” dependent children into foster homes; and creating a new Bureau for Dependent Children within the reorganized State Charities Board (Lane, 1916b). Of the ten child-care institutions cited as substandard, three were Catholic, the rest Protestant or secular. The Good Shepherd Sisters were not among them (Lane, 1916a).

The Archdiocese made strenuous objections to the nature of the inquiry ("New York Times: Bishop Assails Strong," 1916; "New York Times: Catholics Demand That Inquiry Stop," 1916; "New York Times: New Strong Attack By Father Farrell," 1916), specifically charging anti-Catholic bias (Brown, 2000; "New York Times: Subpoena Served on Father Farrell," 1916). The leader of New York’s Archdiocese, John Cardinal Farley, suspected the secret purpose of the investigation was to justify a takeover of all charity work by the city and state, cutting out private charities (Brown, 2000; Cohalan, 1983). (These fears came to fruition under the New Deal, when public agencies took over social service provision to noninstitutionalized children under sixteen.) He was aware, however,

of overcrowding in the understaffed Catholic child caring institutions (Brown, 2000) and that difficulties they had in meeting the new social welfare standards would create obstacles in getting funding in the future. Farley hastened the opening in 1916 of the second oldest Catholic social work school in the country (after Loyola in Chicago in 1914), the Fordham School of Social Service (Cohalan, 1983). He set up an office in Albany for Catholic bishops to check public policy in the New York State legislature (Cohalan, 1983) now known as the New York State Catholic Conference ("New York State Catholic Conference," 2004). Cathedral High School hosted the first classes for Catholics wishing to take civil service social work exams beginning in 1915. Farley urged Catholic social workers to take the civil service test for certification in New York City (Farley, 1917). He sponsored a Bishop's conference in January, 1917, to discuss the ramifications of the Strong commission recommendations (Conference, 1917). In a letter to S. Mary Raymond, Provincial in New York, he attached an extract of the minutes of the conference, requesting the immediate implementation of an aftercare program for residents completing the programs at Good Shepherd houses (Farley, 1917).

Catholic distrust of the investigation galvanized the Archdiocese to centralize the Catholic charitable institutions under its patronage (Brown, 2000; Cohalan, 1983; McCauley, 2005). A survey, the first of its kind in the Archdiocese of New York, began in 1919 under the new Archbishop, Patrick Hayes. He brought a wealth of experience from his service on the National Catholic War Council (later the National Catholic Welfare Conference, then the National

Conference of Catholic Charities, today known as Catholic Charities, USA) formed to coordinate fundraising during WWI. Hayes determined to study all the institutions and social welfare endeavors under Catholic patronage in his archdiocese (Brown, 2000). He put together a staff of paid experts, lay volunteers and some priests to work on the assessment. The survey resulted in a massive reorganization of formerly independent institutions and agencies, bringing them under the direct control of the Archbishop (Brown, 2000). Hayes hired professional social workers to revise institutional practices, and to design and carry out a child care initiative designed to keep dependent children in their homes, thereby reducing the numbers institutionalized (Brown, 2000). He encouraged Catholic social workers to train at Fordham. He opened a venereal disease clinic in the House of the Good Shepherd in 1920 (Cohalan, 1983; Kellogg, 1936), and the psychiatric clinic in 1922 at St. Vincent's Hospital (Cohalan, 1983).

An unanticipated outcome was the departure of lay volunteers, who found themselves displaced by the new, mostly clerical, leadership (Brown, 2000). The loss of lay volunteers left the Archdiocese to do the fundraising for the agencies under its control. In 1920, Hayes launched an annual Easter fundraiser for Catholic Charities which in its first year raised close to one million dollars (Cohalan, 1983). Catholic Charities influenced both public and private social service developments for more than two decades afterward (Brown, 2000).

In 1915, Homer Folks, now president of the New York State Probation Commission, proposed that the New York State Constitutional Convention "deal

with" both the failure of Catholic institutions for dependant children to move away from the city to the suburbs or rural areas and their failure to adopt the "cottage system" (Folks, 1915). New York voters rejected the proposed changes in the following referendum (Wallace, 1923).

The Great Depression and the New Deal

Catholics comprised three of Franklin D. Roosevelt's cabinet members and hosted FDR at the 1933 National Conference of Catholic Charities (Brown, 2000; Cohalan, 1983). Conversely, Catholic Charities fought expanding the federal government into social service provision of childcare. Though supportive of the New Deal policies (Reichley, 2001), especially the Social Security Act, Catholic Charities feared the outcomes of the proposed Aid to Dependent Children (ADC). Public agencies would manage the proposed funding to children under sixteen who lived in their own homes (Brown, 2000; Cohalan, 1983). Losing this political battle made the NCCC leadership read the handwriting on the wall and decide to adapt to the changing political climate. Catholic Charities in New York City expanded its focus into the needs of the elderly and into health care, to meet a wider variety of long-term needs. Begun during the Great Depression, these initiatives included the Catholic Youth Organization (CYO), St. Clare's Hospital, the Frances Schervier Home and Hospital, and St. Patrick's Home for the Aged, all of which are still active and in existence today, seventy years later.

CHAPTER II: RESEARCH QUESTION AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The researcher began with two questions. The first asks: “Did the women religious of the Good Shepherd Sisters in New York City influence social welfare policy in the areas of female delinquency by developing and providing women-centered services to vulnerable adult and adolescent females?” The second question asks: “How did social work professionalization influence the Sisters in turn?”

The researcher defines the beginning of social work professionalization with the development of “scientific philanthropy” by the Association for the Improvement of the Poor, formed in New York City in 1843. That year, Protestant expressions of charity began to move away from evangelism to paid, expert service provided by specialists. The definition of female delinquency used for this paper is any transgression of law and custom considered serious enough to cause arrest, or for families to seek assistance in managing a female’s behavior from outside agencies, including the courts. These transgressions include, but are not limited to, engaging in sexual commerce, alcohol and or drug addiction, vagrancy, and criminal behavior. As a hermeneutic inquiry, hypothesis developed and changed as the researcher analyzed primary and secondary sources.

The goal of the study was constructing a conceptual model of the adaptation of religious ministry to professional social work practice. Specific targets of the study included:

- The processes by which the women religious transformed the Good Shepherd Sisters service provision model to meet professional standards of practice.
- Adjustments to the community life following these changes.
- The meaning of these changes to the women religious.
- Their contributions to social welfare following these changes.

The researcher concentrated on extracting and analyzing adaptations in the interventions of the Good Shepherd Sisters in their ministry to the adjudicated females due to changing social work practice.

The dependent variable is “adaptations in the interventions of the Good Shepherd Sisters in their ministry to adjudicated females.” Good Shepherd Sisters dedication to mission, i.e., their motivation, is their fourth vow:

“ to zealously work for the salvation of souls.”(Pelletier, 1888)

The sampling frame was fifteen theses and dissertations in the New York Province archives. The samples drawn from these were those written by New York Province sisters for a Masters’ degree in social work, about New York Good Shepherd institutions, agencies, or populations served, on the institution or the order prior to Vatican II (1962-1965). This reduced the sample size to four (see Table 2-1).

Good Shepherd Sisters manuscripts - Table 2-1

AUTHOR	YEAR	TITLE	UNIVERSITY
Kellogg, S. M. o. t. R.	1936	Delinquent Adolescent Girls in a Good Shepherd Training School	Catholic University of America
Andersen, S. M. T.	1949	A Social History of Villa Loretto, Peekskill, NY 1928-1948	Fordham University
Hart, S. M. o. S. W.	1959	A Manual for a social agency treating delinquent adolescent girls: a functional guide for caseworkers at St. Germaine's Home, Peekskill, NY.	Fordham University
Clines, S. M. o. S. J.	1962	After-Care Adjustment: A follow-up study of the 41 delinquent girls discharged from St. Germaine's Home	Fordham University

The researcher framed a grounded theory through a line-by-line examination of the Sisters' literature, with analysis and reflection of the content. Thorough examination of these yielded eight major themes per Table 2 - 2 below:

Themes developed from Sister's manuscripts Table 2 - 2

THEME	CHAPTER	PAGE
Model for practice	III	71
Funding and oversight	III	77
Client Characteristics	IV	85
Physical Milieu	IV	87
Religion	IV	89
Children's Education	IV	93
Work and Vocational Training	IV	96
Therapy	IV	98

The researcher explicated the writings of the sisters in chronological order, theme by theme. Some of the manuscripts did not touch on every theme. The manuscripts discussed family problems, poor parenting, poverty, oppression, and exploitation as highly correlated to the incidence of delinquency and neglect, but did not take the discussion further.

Later, the researcher chose to expand the number of sisters' writings in the sample by including published and unpublished books, papers, letters, articles, and conferences by Good Shepherd Sisters involved in social work in New York institutions. This primary archival material ranges from 1948 – 1975 (see Table 2-2), fills in gaps, and answers some questions left by the manuscripts. The writings explained the work of the New York Good Shepherd

Sisters, from their own perspectives. The voices of the Sisters in their writings and manuscripts limited the research to their points of view.

The remaining primary material from this archive included two communications from the Archdiocese of New York. Other primary material, not written by the Sisters, included sixteen articles from 1862 – 1928 retrieved from the Historical Archives of the New York Times.

The researcher decided not to include the work of the Good Shepherd Sisters in other parts of the US, or internationally, based on the variations in. political, cultural, social, economic, and religious climates by region throughout the United States and the world. For example, State licensing, funding, and oversight of child welfare and juvenile reform institutions varied widely. New York State had a unique funding method for charitable institutions not found elsewhere in the nation.

Sisters of the Good Shepherd writings - Table 2.3

TYPE	TITLE	YEAR	AUTHOR
Book	Conferences and Instructions of Saint Mary of St. Euphrasia	1888	St. Mother Mary of St. Euphrasia Pelletier
Book	Practical Rules	1897	St. Mother Mary of St. Euphrasia Pelletier
Conference Paper	The Individualized Treatment of Delinquent Girls in an Institution	1948	Mary of St. Guggenheim
Letter	Petition of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd for an Extension	1955	Mary of St. Hildegard Parkham
NCCC Conference paper	Education of the Good Shepherd Sisters	1957	Mary of St. Hildegard Parkham
Unpublished article	Sisters of the Good Shepherd	1960	Mary of St. Hildegard Parkham
Unpublished paper	The Growth of a Staff Development Program	1961	Mary of St. Lawrence Flannery
Letter	Guide to the Catholic Sisterhood	1961	Mary of St. Hildegard Parkham
Unpublished article	Religious of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd	1962	Mary of St. Victoria Andreoli
Unpublished article	History of Villa Loretto	1975	Anonymous Good Shepherd Sister
Unpublished manuscript	A Configuration of Education: Origins of the New York House of the Good Shepherd	1975	Mary Paulette LoMonaco

Data Collection

The Provincialate granted access to the scholarly writings and the Good Shepherd archives, including the services of their archivist. The New York Times Historical Archives are accessible online through Proquest Historical Newspapers database. The researcher obtained consents from both interview subjects (see Appendix I) using an interview guide (see Appendix II). Subjects included two Sisters, a former Mother Provincial of the Good Shepherd Sisters, and the archivist for the order, a Sister of the Congregation of St. Joseph. Interviews were audio taped, using a digital voice recorder. Each tape-recorded the informant name before the interview. The researcher labeled and stored digital files on computer media; computer files were password protected. The code list, consent forms, and data are stored in a locked, separate, secure limited-access location. The researcher will destroy the digital files one year after completion of the study.

Data Analysis

The researcher manually analyzed all materials using inductive analytic procedures of grounded theory (Corbin, 1998). The researcher developed thematic categories in which to place the data. She then returned to the data to select as many added examples of the categories as she could find, ordering the examples into each category chronologically. The relationships between and among categories were examined, with an eye to developing explanations for those which may be incorporated into theory. Finally, the researcher described

and reported the categories and relationships. The researcher managed the bibliographic data and citations using the software EndNote, version X.0.2.

CHAPTER III: THE NEW YORK FOUNDATION

Two thousand seven (2007) marks the 150th anniversary of the New York City foundation of the Provincialate of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd. New York was not the first Good Shepherd convent in the United States, preceded by Louisville, Kentucky (1849), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (1850), and Cincinnati, Ohio (1857). Sisters volunteering from the motherhouse in Angers set up these convents at the request of the Bishops of their respective dioceses (St. Teresita RGS, 1938) . However, beginning in 1855, Bishop Hughes, of the Diocese of New York, opposed repeated requests by charitable Catholic laywomen for the Sisters of the Good Shepherd to staff a house of refuge in Manhattan (Conway, 1910; Doyle CSJ, 2006a; LoMonaco RGS, 1975).

Protestant middle class women were more likely than Irish Catholics to provide charitable support to sexually exploited women and girls. This difference lay in their different views of women's sexuality and varying beliefs about the separate women's spheres. The "cult of domesticity" dominated Anglo-Protestant literature on the family. The most highly esteemed role for Protestant women was that of wife and mother: her responsibility to provide a home that acted as both bastion against the evils of the "outside" world and a loving, religious environment in which to raise children. In this view, women's sexuality kept the hard working spouse from straying outside the home as well as being necessary for reproduction. Many Protestants viewed sexually exploited women and girls as victims of male oppression, an outcome of the sinful appetites of mostly unmarried, irreligious, intemperate men. Protestants believed women who did not

observe these norms were “unnatural”, and especially believed that of Catholic nuns and sisters.

Irish Catholics placed the responsibility on women and children for men’s sexual congress, even when forced. Catholics gave the virginity and chastity of nuns and sisters the highest status women could achieve. Catholics considered families who contributed a child to a religious congregation as especially blessed by God. These families enjoyed elevated social status in their parish community. The Church reinforced this ideal, placing the vocations of priests and nuns on a higher plane than that of married or single men and women. Additionally, Irish Catholics placed the responsibility for sexual behavior on women, believing that men had no control over their sinful sexual desires once aroused by women’s “seductive” behavior. Catholic women’s sexuality had legitimacy only as a means of reproduction. Irish Catholics considered sexually exploited women and children contemptible. Protestant women candidly wanted to discuss the issue, while Catholic clergy cautioned their flocks about the “monstrous power” of sexuality and encouraged them to avoid it (Fitzgerald, 2006).

Written accounts vary on the facts of Hughes’ opposition to the Sisters after finally giving permission for them to work in New York City (Brown, 2000; Cohalan, 1983; Conway, 1910; Doyle CSJ, 2006a; Fitzgerald, 2006; LoMonaco RGS, 1975; St. Teresita RGS, 1938). Some omit these facts altogether (Cohalan, 1983; St. Teresita RGS, 1938), while others (Brown, 2000; Conway, 1910; Fitzgerald, 2006; LoMonaco RGS, 1975) agree on Hughes’ original opposition, but disagree to its lasting effects. Most agree a Protestant prison matron

convinced Bishop Hughes of the spiritual benefit of a Catholic house of refuge. Only then did he consent to having the Good Shepherd Sisters come to New York City in 1857, commenting as he did that he believed women who had “lost their virtue” lay beyond redemption (Conway, 1910).

Four sisters opened a house rented by Catholic laywomen for $1000 yearly at 191 14th Street on October 2, 1857 (Doyle CSJ, 2006a). Possessions were scarce:“ a few mattresses and blankets, a frying pan,,, and two or three kitchen utensils” were all they had to start with (Anonymous, 1975; Doyle CSJ, 2006a). A special act of the New York legislature incorporated the house on November 1, 1858 (LoMonaco RGS, 1975). The housing proved inadequate within the year, by then sheltering twenty-five female children as well as the sisters and new novices (Conway, 1910; LoMonaco RGS, 1975).

Hughes, doubting the need for their services, and predicting their imminent failure, refused for another three years to allow building a convent, agreeing only on the stipulation that they find their own funding. He never held an annual collection for the Good Shepherd Sisters, as he did for his favorite charities, such as the Sisters of Mercy. However, in 1859 Hughes made a one-time contribution of about four thousand dollars from his annual jubilee collections (Coniff, 1957; Fitzgerald, 2006). His intransigence caused untold suffering to the women and children living in the tiny house, deprived of all but the basics of survival.

The House of the Good Shepherd by 1859 served seventy-five females. Having finally secured permission from the Bishop, the Sisters bought a new site

at E. 90th Street and the East River. Then considered “the country,” it is now the site of Gracie Mansion, home of the mayor of New York City (Doyle CSJ, 2004).. Then- New York City Police Commissioner Theodore Roosevelt became a firm and lifelong supporter of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd at this time (Coniff, 1957; Conway, 1910; Doyle CSJ, 2004).

The New York Convent sent five sisters to found the Boston house in 1867, and five more to found the Brooklyn mission in year following, 1868 (Conway, 1910; LoMonaco RGS, 1975; St. Teresita RGS, 1938). Within the next fifty years, New York Good Shepherd sisters set up foundations in Peekskill, Troy, and Albany, NY; Springfield and Boston, MA; Newark, NJ; Hartford, CT; and Providence, RI. Foundations in Trinidad, British West Indies, and Bogotá, Columbia were first authorized by the Motherhouse in Angers, and then staffed mainly with by Sisters from the New York Province (Coniff, 1957; Conway, 1910; Doyle CSJ, 2004; St. Teresita RGS, 1938). In 1931 they had forty-four houses in six provinces, headquartered at Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York City, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and St. Paul, nationwide (O'Grady, 1930).
See Table 3.1 for a list of all the New York Good Shepherd Provincials.

The sisters built and opened St. Joseph’s house (for vagrant and homeless young women) in 1869 (Conway, 1910; LoMonaco RGS, 1975). They gave the residents of St. Joseph’s class a combination of industrial training (sewing, knitting, embroidery, and laundry work) and provided for two to four hours of public school education daily (Conway, 1910; LoMonaco RGS, 1975).

In February, 1870 a survey of New York City institutions quoted the Superioress as saying they admitted twenty-nine hundred women and girls since 1857, and currently housed seven hundred “inmates” (J. F. Richmond, 1872). About three hundred of these were court referrals, and the house could accept some one hundred and fifty more (J. F. Richmond, 1872). Ninety sisters had completed the novitiate, twelve of whom were in Brooklyn and eleven in Boston, besides Touriere sisters (J. F. Richmond, 1872). The house now had seventy-one sisters to minister to the seven hundred children and run the house, besides the Touriere sisters.

By October of 1873, the House of the Good Shepherd in New York had received over four thousand people, either voluntarily or through the courts. In the year 1872-1873, they admitted over four hundred females, discharged four hundred and ten, while five hundred and forty-six remained in the house (Conway, 1910; LoMonaco RGS, 1975). By 1877, the New York Good Shepherd Sisters had cared for more than seven thousand two hundred persons (O'Grady, 1930).

Elbridge Gerry incorporated the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children in 1875, launching a wave of child protective legislation over the next decade. He became a great friend and referral source to the Good Shepherd Sisters (Conway, 1910).

Unfortunately, New York City’s commercial and industrial growth (including a cement factory right across the street) created foul smells and constant noise around the House. A search began for a new location in the

country with fresh air and a healthier environment. Its initial purpose was to serve as a rest home for sick children and invalid sisters (Coniff, 1957; Conway, 1910; Doyle CSJ, 2004). They bought the Craig estate (Mount Florence) in Peekskill in 1874, serving this purpose as well as providing fresh produce and dairy from the 75 acres of farmland for the over 500 children in the New York City House.

The sisters erected the first convent there in 1897, then a building for the "at risk" two to fourteen year old children. They placed these children in "St. Anne's Class," and moved them to Mt. Florence in 1904 (Coniff, 1957; Conway, 1910; Doyle CSJ, 2004). Gradually, they transferred the rest of the young women from 90th street to Mt. Florence, finishing in 1923. By the fiftieth anniversary celebration (1907) of the New York House of Good Shepherd, their annals reflected the following statistics:

- 13018 young women admitted: 8581 committed by the courts and 4457 "came of their own will"
- 7274 returned to family and friends
- 4672 "otherwise discharged" that is, probably placed
- 251 transferred to other institutions
- 369 deaths
- a "few" left without permission or sent out of state
- 491 remain at the House at present (Conway, 1910)

When the last New York City Good Shepherd Sisters moved to Peekskill in 1928 (Anonymous, 1975), the Mt. Florence location became their "Provincial House," or headquarters (Doyle CSJ, 2004). Women aspiring to the life of a

Good Shepherd nun would experience “formation” (professional training and development) here (Doyle CSJ, 2004).

As requested by the state, the Good Shepherd Sisters closed their dependent children program, redirected their efforts in 1913 to delinquent adolescent females aged twelve to sixteen, and reincorporated the house as “St. Germaine’s Home” (Doyle CSJ, 2004). They began to adopt casework methods in the early 1920’s (Brown, 2000). They erected a chapel between 1925 and 1927. In 1944, they built an annex to the St. Germaine’s home to provide for an overflow of “juvenile delinquents” (Anonymous, 1975). In 1947, in response to criticism, the sisters ended the commercial laundry; they moved the young women from the annex to St. Germaine’s Home and kept the annex open to referrals from Women’s Court. In 1952, they completed a gymnasium. They built an outdoor Olympic size pool, complete with cabanas, bathrooms, and showers (Anonymous, 1975). Finally, they erected a library to meet the needs of their elementary and secondary schools. (Doyle CSJ, 2004).

The Organization

The Superior General, elected by delegates from each country at a "General Chapter" (convocation) held every six years, directs the Congregation of Good Shepherd Sisters internationally. The delegates elect a Council to advise her. All the prior Superior Generals and all the Provincial Superiors have ex-officio seats at General Chapter. Imbued with the power to reject or support major changes, the delegates deliberate these only at General Chapter. The motherhouse is in Angers, France. The headquarters, known as the Generalate, is in Rome (Doyle CSJ, 2007; Flannery, 1961).

Forty provinces, each directed by a Provincial Superior, manage government at the local levels. Each province, in turn, may have several individual houses (convents). In 1961, the United States was comprised of seven provinces, including the New York Province, the subject of this study (Flannery, 1961). The New York Province alone, in 1960, cared for three thousand fifteen young women (Hildegard, 1960). In the United States in 1961, one thousand one hundred ninety-six professed Good Shepherd Sisters in fifty-two convents cared for four thousand two hundred and sixty five young women (Victoria, 1962).

Globally, in 1962, the final year included in this study, ten thousand Good Shepherd Sisters ran four hundred sixty three houses, containing one hundred

six thousand children (Flannery, 1961; Hildegard, 1961; Victoria, 1962). They described their work as:

> "…primarily the re-education and formation of character of girls with personality or behavior problems. (The Sisters believe) these youngsters are not juvenile delinquents but…children of God….(who) need love, understanding care and religious guidance." (Hildegard, 1961)

Criterion for admission into the order included:

- young women aged eighteen through thirty-five
- high school diploma
- good physical and psychological health
- good moral character and reputation (Hildegard, 1961)

Until 1955, Good Shepherd Sister-candidates first entered postulancy, a probationary period of six to nine months for new applicants (Hildegard, 1961). Postulants took the first step in religious life before entering the novitiate and receiving the habit. Postulancy gave the applicant some familiarity with and personal experience of the religious life of the Good Shepherd Sisters. It allowed the superiors of the community to gain better knowledge of the applicant. The postulant had an opportunity to develop characteristics qualifying her for acceptance into the novitiate. The word comes from the Latin "postulatum," a thing demanded, supplication, or intercession (Hardon, 2000). A novitiate of two years followed.

Novices gained formal admission to the Good Shepherd institute to prepare for eventual religious profession. The novitiate helped superiors to evaluate candidates properly for their aptness for the religious life. Novices

received the religious habit, including a white veil. They could leave or be requested to leave without stated reason during the novitiate. The word novice is from the Latin novicius: new; newly arrived (Hardon, 2000).

The novice then advanced to temporary professed status, making annual vows for three years before final profession (Hildegard, 1961). During this time she continued her theological studies (Markham, 2007). However, in 1955, the Provincial Superior in New York redesigned these requirements, which the writer explores in Chapter V.

The Model for Practice

The "Conferences and Instructions of Saint Mary Euphrasia," published in 1884 in English (Pelletier, 1888), was a collection of her teachings to the Sisters, compiled from notes that several of the Sisters had made. These notes were based on her regular conferences, given to the Sisters. It is a compilation of the Good Shepherd Sisters' model for practice. "The Practical Rules for Use of the Religious of the Good Shepherd for the Direction of the Classes" (Pelletier, 1897) were compiled in 1897. Known as "the Book of the Classes," it incorporated some of the teachings from the Conferences as well as the practices of the Sisters over the years. The foreword stated the book does not "propose new practices" but assured the continued observance of those practices passed on for the past sixty years (since 1837) (Pelletier, 1897). Thus, they were in effect at the 1857 founding of the New York City House. Good Shepherd Sisters continue to employ this book.

The Book explained the roles of the sisters who conducted the classes, that is, the reform program for the children. It sketched the chain of command, job descriptions, and boundaries between the women religious and the children. The book strongly highlighted the priority of religion, further explored in Chapter IV.

The First Mistress

Nineteen pages in the Book of the Classes discussed the First Mistress, six, the second Mistress, and a half page, the rest of the sisters. The First Mistress, later known as the Class (and finally, Group) Mother, had the second most powerful position in the monastery, second only to the Superioress. She supervised sisters working with the class over which she had charge. Her secular counterpart was the "houseparent". Since "First Mistress" is an outmoded term, the writer uses "Group Mother" going forward.

The introduction to the subject of the Group Mother firmly asserted the separation between the Religious and the classes under the Rule of the Institute (p.58). Catholics believed (before Vatican II) women religious had a greater degree of holiness than lay Catholics (Finke, 2005). Consistent with this elevation in spiritual status, women religious conducted themselves in public with great reserve, so as not to be a source of "scandal." To preserve this separation, a manager was needed to "*govern and direct in her* (the Superioress) *name"* (p. 58). Each "class" had a head appointed by the Superioress, which was the Group Mother, while supervising Assistant Group Mothers subdivided them into smaller groups. The Book of the Classes advised the Superioress: "…She (the Group

Mother) should be chosen with care, and after seeking inspiration through prayer to Jesus Christ…she should be harder working and an example to the others in virtue, faith, and dedication to her vocation, and motivated by *the compassionate charity of Our Lord* "(p.59). She was the director of the class and other mistresses were subject to her authority in any matter about their employment (but not to their spiritual lives). Wisely, SME insisted on only one Group Mother per class, or *"a thousand miseries"* would befall the Institute. She was firm on this point (p.59), instinctively recognizing the need for an organizational hierarchy to uphold order and avoid breakdowns in authority and service delivery. The major difference between a Group Mother and the Superioress was the latter had charge of the entire "monastery."

The Group Mother settled problems and handled troublesome children. The Superioress sent back to the Group Mother children who came to complain, to discourage breaks in the chain of command (p.60). The Superioress and Group Mother put on a united front (p.61).

The Group Mother gave the Superioress accounts of all events in the class, without revealing confidences of the children, unless it became necessary. This forerunner to clinical supervision probably reduced stress and provided an opportunity for helpful feedback. They did not tell the children about shared confidences, to keep them from feeling betrayed and violated and "so children (would) continue to make them." (p.61). The Group Mother watched the classes regularly. She was present from the time they arose in the morning through bedtime, especially during the evening meal   (p. 62). Observation of the children

was central to SME's method of gathering information to increase understanding of the child and mark her progress (or lack of it).

Sisters watched the children always, and were directed at night to "keep a light on at night for surveillance" without annoying the children. This theme appeared repeatedly throughout the Book of Classes and was a hallmark of the Good Shepherd Sisters method. The sisters supervised the children carefully, that is: "… go directly to class when it is time. Watch 'them' (the children) constantly; no sin or accident should occur due to lack of vigilance; show willingness to remain among the children: spending "long hours among her flock" will help to overcome difficult characters (p.54). SME wanted the children to experience the sister's dedication to them, helping especially to reach children who felt unwanted. The goal of the sisters' constant observation was constant assessment of each child, in her milieu, and provision of constant care and supervision that many of them had never known.

The Group Mother conversed daily with the children to "encourage, correct, and advise them" (p.62). She expected "absolute" obedience (p.75). She did not single children out for criticism, but discussed problems with the class as a whole. SME emphatically denounced harsh words, or excessive punishment, and banned corporal punishment altogether (Pp. 62, 63). She condemned the use of intimidation and fear to correct a child's behavior. If, for some reason a child needed a reprimand, the child's feelings were still first: Sister gave reprimands calmly, after some deliberation, and then not spoken of again, in "imitation of Jesus" (p. 64).

Under no circumstances was any sister to refer to the child's past. *"Even in private conversations, such allusions are to be avoided. There would be great danger in speaking to penitents of their past faults. It would scandalize them very much if you touched ever so lightly on certain matters; for they are persuaded that religious are far from conceiving any thought of such things"* SME (p.63). The prohibition forestalled unhealthy discussions of the past, removed occasions of sin (lingering on impure thoughts) from the sister and the child, and avoided shame and humiliation for the child. It acted as well to uphold the sister's rarefied holy status with the children. The children received new names on entry into the institution, to protect their anonymity. The new name, usually that of a saint, allowed them psychologically to leave the past behind and begin anew, and prevented their sometimes lurid histories from discovery by the others.

The Group Mother met weekly with the sisters under her supervision. She took reports, assigned tasks, trained and advised, and corrected them if needed. These meetings had ingredients of today's clinical supervision and case conferencing, except that no ever mentioned any child's past. Only the Group Mother and the Superioress knew the children's background. This high level of confidentiality worked to avoid prejudice, privacy violations, and to keep the staff and the children's focus on the here and now. The Group Mother kept strong boundaries and through emphasis on obedience, upheld order by ensuring the sisters did only as directed.

As the "face" of the monastery to the public, the Group Mother accompanied the children to the parlor for visits from family. SME directed she be

on time, dignified and polite to the parents, and discreet. “Failure to be kind and courteous causes bad feelings and may contribute to evil from the community” (an acknowledgment of the anti-Catholic community at large) (p.67).

Besides watching over the class whenever possible, the Group Mother saw some children in private who needed either encouragement or reprimand. The method for treatment, in this and all the other contacts the Group Mother had with the children, was the “compassionate charity” of the Good Shepherd. SME is emphatic: Group Mother is guide and mother.[1] The more ‘evil’ in a child the more compassion and interest Group Mother should have for them (p.70). Instead of rejection or isolation, the more troubled child received extra care.

Second Mistress

The Second Mistress was the assistant to the Group Mother and reported to her. Going forward, the writer uses “assistant Group Mother” to describe this role. She had to respect the chain of command (p.78). She sent errant children to the Group Mother, not the Superioress. She could not grant permission nor deliver punishment without the Group Mother’s consent (p. 79). Children could not confide in them, particularly anything about their prior lives (p. 79).

Assistant Group Mothers had authority in their classes. They were expected to keep control over the children without help. (In later years, however, several older women that completed their required stay at Good Shepherd stayed on, mostly as assistants to the group mothers (Doyle CSJ, 2007)). When Group Mother was present, however, the assistant Group Mothers deferred to her. In turn, the Group Mothers displayed confidence in the assistant Group

Mothers. They could never let the children see or sense disharmony between the Sisters, and always addressed a sister by her full religious name (p.81). They taught their charges to respect the hierarchy in the monastery.

Assistant Group Mothers had three goals: to work in concert with the Group Mother, keep good order, and “make good Christians” of the children. SME warned against trying to gain the children’s’ affection[2] (p. 80). The assistant Group Mother must “win over” natural leaders in the class (sublimation), but, “do not favor them; do not let them in any way act differently than allowed for the others” (p.82)

The other sisters who lived in the monastery could not speak to or interact with the children without permission.

Funding and Oversight

The Good Shepherd Sisters in New York came under the authority of their Generalate (headquarters) in Angers, France, and the Archdiocese of New York. Under the “corporate aggregate” system developed by Bishop Hughes in the 1840’s, the sisters organized their institutions as separate corporations. The Archdiocese did not own their property nor did it assume financial responsibility for the sisters, but the Vicar-General acted as overseer and adviser, and probably sat on their board of trustees (Doyle CSJ, 2006b; McCauley, 2005). The New York City Department of Charities and Corrections and the New York State Board of Charities (created in 1867) (Folks, 1900) enforced regulations, conducted inspections, and certified the institutions. The sisters began their institution building relying on faith, the generosity of donors, and self-sufficiency.

The flood of immigrant children coming into their care compelled them to look for financial aid outside the House of the Good Shepherd.

New York City Catholics were more readily able than Catholics in other regions to get public funding for institutions caring for poor Catholic children because of the massive influx of immigrants into the city. As the Irish grew influential in party politics and Tammany Hall, obstacles to funding for Catholic institutions began to disappear. Public funding trickled into Catholic institutions beginning in 1853, coming in such ways as land, cash, goods, or per capita payments (Brown, 2000). The House of the Good Shepherd relied, however, on contributions from the laity, the archdiocese of New York, benevolent societies, private business, and their own labor, to stay open (Conway, 1910). Not until 1863 did funds arrive from the City and the State of New York (Conway, 1910). New York State authorized cash subsidies in response to individual institutional petitions until 1873 (Brown, 2000), switching to per capita subsidies in 1875 (Bruno, 1957). The change to per capita subsidies recognized the Catholics' position that they cared for children who would otherwise be public charges (Bruno, 1957). With the funding, however, came oversight by two bureaucracies hostile to Catholic institutions: the New York City Department of Charities and Corrections and the New York State Board of Charities. The State Board certified charitable institutions meeting state standards.

The Good Shepherd Sisters bought in 1859 a site for a new House of Good Shepherd, at 90th Street overlooking the East River. The price was $36000. A private donor contributed $16000. The rest Hughes lent interest free (an event

unique in the history of the Archdiocese of New York) (Cohalan, 1983; Coniff, 1957; Conway, 1910; LoMonaco RGS, 1975). Several female benefactors contributed cash funds in 1861 for the sisters, from several hundred to five thousand dollars, much of which went for the chapel and chapel furnishings. A fair, planned to raise money for needed buildings on the property failed to raise the funds, because of the outbreak of the Civil War. The sisters struggled with heavy debt for the next several years as a result (Conway, 1910).

The Good Shepherd Sisters in New York City admitted seven women in 1861 as novices. It is unclear if they brought dowries with them. The dowry, in early history, was a source of income that gave the convent greater financial stability. Unlike their European-born sisters, American novices reflected the immigrant and economic status of their groups; consequently, many could not afford to bring a dowry (Coburn, 1999; Hoy, 1995; McCauley, 2005). In other orders with the same problem, the sisters would ignore the lack of a dowry to gain postulants. It is likely the Good Shepherd Sisters, charged with the care of hundreds of children, found the need for helping hands of greater importance than that of a dowry (Coburn, 1999; Hoy, 1995). As a result, economic hardships increased on the Good Shepherd Sisters in particular, who had few stable financial resources on which to draw.

Good Shepherd Sisters attracted women to their membership not through recruiting drives or advertising, but through their dedication to their mission. Catholic women wishing a life of meaningful and professional work at that time were, like most women, forced out of employment on marrying. As women

religious, they could expect to enjoy elevation in status within the Catholic community and a long professional career in one of the female vocations: teaching, nursing, or social service. In this respect, at least, a life of service within a community of women religious was at least as appealing as matrimony (Oates, 1978). Irish-American young women may have taken vows and entered religious communities after the example of the Irish sisters who staffed them. Their celibate life and esteem in the eyes of Irish Catholic families may have encouraged women to enter religious orders who otherwise would not have married (Diner, 1989).

In 1863, according to a letter to the motherhouse at Angers, the House of Good Shepherd contained forty-four sisters, one hundred fifteen penitents, one hundred twenty preservates, and twenty eight Magdalen contemplatives (Conway, 1910). Sisters worked to the point of exhaustion to make the house self-supporting, but were unsuccessful. Contributions from benefactors kept them on the margins of solvency. In response to a petition from the Sisters of the Good Shepherd in December 1862 ("The New York Times," 1862), New York City in March, 1863, compensated the House of Good Shepherd for the first time with a sum of five thousand dollars ("The New York Times," 1863). The mayor of New York vetoed the resolution as “an excessive amount” twice, once in 1862 and again in 1863. The Board of Aldermen overturned the second veto and sent the money ("The New York Times," 1863).

Early in 1864, Archbishop John Hughes died. The former bishop of Albany, John McCloskey, succeeded him. McCloskey became a friend and

advocate for the House of the Good Shepherd. The same year, a lay donor deeded six lots adjoining the convent over to the sisters. The Irish Emigration Society granted them four thousand dollars. McCloskey donated over nine thousand dollars from his Jubilee fund, collected over five thousand dollars in the thirty churches of the Archdiocese, and gave a public lecture netting another three thousand (Conway, 1910). The days of hardscrabble living under Hughes were over.

By the time a Catholic convert gave the six lots adjoining the convent at 90th St. to the Sisters, the children under care numbered two hundred and thirty-five. These included a "preservation" class, set up in 1860, consisting of young girls not delinquent but "at risk"(Conway, 1910; LoMonaco RGS, 1975).

Through a series of donations, grants, a small grant from New York City and a $20,000 appropriation from the New York State Legislature (Coniff, 1957; Conway, 1910; LoMonaco RGS, 1975), the sisters erected a new building on the site and opened it in 1865. They bought three cottages on 89th and 90th Sts., converting them into an infirmary, an orphanage, and for woman boarders. The Sisters were able to furnish it and retire all their debt as well. The Magdalens alone remained in the original cottage on the grounds (Conway, 1910).

In 1867, the New York State legislature named the house as a place of detention for homeless young women aged fourteen to twenty-one (the former limit later changed to eleven). After arrest on vagrancy charges, the young women could choose between it and a public institution.

The sisters' decision in 1873 to look for new property led them to a Peekskill estate comprised of over eighty-four acres. The Good Shepherds had fifty thousand dollars set aside, which they used to buy the property on October 9, 1874 (Doyle CSJ, 2006b). They bought roughly six more acres bordering that from 1906 to 1922, spending an additional five thousand one hundred and three dollars (Doyle CSJ, 2006b).

Good Shepherd Sisters received nearly twenty four thousand dollars from New York City in 1893 and 1894, eighteen percent of their one hundred thirty one thousand dollar budget. The rest the sisters and children earned by sewing, laundry, and other small businesses, and by receipt of donations (Fitzgerald, 2006). In 1896, New York City budgeted eighteen thousand dollars annually to the House of Good Shepherd ("The New York Times," 1896). 1897 saw a budgeted amount of forty-four thousand dollars ("The New York Times," 1897). In the beginning of the twentieth century, seven cents daily for education and seven more cents for vocational training supplemented the weekly $2.50 paid for every child referred by the city courts (Cohalan, 1983).

These increases reflected the growth of the New York City budget for charitable and public institutions (McCauley, 2005). The needs of the vastly increased population drove the budget upward from about a hundred thousand dollars yearly during the Civil War years to the millions of dollars in the 1890's ("The New York Times," 1896; "The New York Times," 1897).

The archdiocese consolidated all its different charities into "Catholic Charities" in 1920, no small part of which happened because of the Kingsbury

and the Strong charities investigations of 1915-1916. Catholic Charities oversaw the House of the Good Shepherd, St. Germaine's Home, and Villa Loretto, for the Archdiocese of New York. The state and city public welfare boards and the state and city departments of health, enforced regulations at each institution.

The sale in 1927 of the property at 90th Street netted two million, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars ("Catholic Sisters in Big Realty Deal," 1927). Court proceedings held to resolve title disputes revealed the Sisters had three million dollars in real estate (the Peekskill property). Their personal property came to one hundred thousand dollars, but they had one million seven hundred thousand dollars in debt ("Allows Home to Sell Site," 1928).

The federal government's expansion (Johnson, 1936) into social welfare during the Great Depression benefited the Good Shepherds programs. The federal government subsidized school lunches, while the United States Department of Agriculture supplied commodities (Andersen RGS, 1949).
In 1948, the New York City Department of Public Welfare paid monthly for the young women committed through the courts (Andersen RGS, 1949).

Most of the referrals came from New York City. Surrounding counties had "comparatively few such commitments(Andersen RGS, 1949). The Greater New York Fund through the "mediation of Catholic Charities" contributed toward meeting the institution's annual deficits ("New York Fund Help," 1951). Catholic Charities played a major role in closing the monetary gaps in the institutional budget (Andersen RGS, 1949). Catholic Charities also managed separate funds to the Good Shepherd Sisters for unmarried mothers, merit awards, and funds for

young women to “tide them over in the first weeks” following their successful discharge from the program. Miscellaneous donations to the Sisters and the institution supplemented their finances (Andersen RGS, 1949).

The sisters began to respond to the trend to cottage level care and to adjust to increases in court referrals by forming new groups while reducing the numbers of young women in groups. From 1953 through 1957, the sisters organized four more groups for the adolescent females in accordance to the recommendations of Catholic Charities and “Public Authorities.” All these groups consisted of referrals from Girls Term Court in New York City and wayward minors from the surrounding counties. At the same time, the sisters stopped accepting cases referred through Women’s court (Anonymous, 1975). In 1959, the children’s building underwent complete renovation to qualify for the cottage-type rates from the City of New York (Anonymous, 1975). The sisters set up six groups, limited to no more than thirty young women each. The renovation included six infirmary beds and two rest rooms for each group. The sisters increased the social work staff, lay help, aftercare staff, and psychiatric services and divided the schoolrooms to better accommodate the smaller groups.

CHAPTER IV: TREATMENT

Client Characteristics

Good Shepherd Sisters admitted Catholic “delinquent girls” between ages twelve to sixteen, regardless of race or color, as well as “neglected” children of the same ages in need of their programs (Emmanuel RGS, 1948, p. 3). Descriptions of the young women ran the gamut from “sex delinquents” and “promiscuous” (Kellogg, 1936, p. 72) to “antisocial character” and “maladjusted personality” (Andersen RGS, 1949, p. 54). Personality characteristics included: emotionally unstable, apathetic, indifferent, habitually disobedient, quarrelsome, sulky, disagreeable, defiant, disrespectful, restive, emotionally disturbed, and unpopular with the girls (Andersen RGS, 1949, p. 66; Kellogg, 1936, p. 59).

Deficits in religious training or differences in religious denomination appear in the sisters’ research throughout the period studied (Clines RGS, 1962, p. 32; Kellogg, 1936, pp. 44-45). The sisters believed that “complete lack of religious training and religious example given these young women before institutionalization” (Clines RGS, 1962, p. 32) factored heavily in their ““evil tendencies” or their “weakened…ability to cope” (Andersen RGS, 1949, pp. 117-118).

Limited intelligence characterized the young women as well. On measurement of their IQ’s, the young women’s scores ranged from “dull,” “borderline mentality,” to “feebleminded”[3]. Few residents had “normal” IQ’s (Kellogg, 1936, p. 60). Eventually the sisters set an admission criterion of IQ

seventy -five or above, reasoning that the school could not handle them and they "are a detriment" to the other children (Kellogg, 1936, p. 60). By 1962, the year of S. Clines study, ninety percent of the subjects had IQ's over seventy-five. Most of the young women suffered delays of one to three grade school years. S. Clines assumed the young women became emotionally disturbed before entering grade schools, which then handicapped their learning abilities and social skills. She believed the negative school histories of these young women played a large role in their "antisocial attitudes and defiance of authority" (Clines RGS, 1962, p. 59). Many of the children age thirteen and older left school with their negligible educations and found low paying, unskilled jobs such as domestic service, factory, and restaurant work (Kellogg, 1936, pp. 45-46).

Reflective of the changing ethnicity of New York's inhabitants, most of the young women studied in 1936 were native-born of foreign (largely Polish and Italian) (Kellogg, 1936, p. 21 & 71) parentage, coming mostly from urban areas. Almost half were from large families (Kellogg, 1936, p. 23). In fully half the cases the children were in single parent homes (Kellogg, 1936, p. 27). By 1953, New York City referred most of the young women at St. Germaine's Home, the largest part of whom were Puerto Rican and African-American (Shepherd, 1953).

S. Kellogg's data showed twenty-two percent of her subjects had venereal disease, twenty-eight percent were pregnant, and fifteen percent had head or body lice (Kellogg, 1936, p. 39). All her subjects were "sex delinquents," with "extensive" sexual experience (Kellogg, 1936, p. 47). Their charges included being "promiscuous," involvement with a "colored man," involvement with a

married man, incestuous relationships,[4] and unwed parenthood (Kellogg, 1936, p. 71). None earned a living by trading sex for money or goods (Kellogg, 1936, p. 47). Their average age was sixteen and a half years (Kellogg, 1936, p. 38). Other reasons for their committal included running away from home, stealing, truancy, drinking, vagrancy, and attempted suicide.

In 1949, S. Andersen decided that forty percent of the young women needed "intensive" psychotherapy (Andersen RGS, 1949, p. 103), reflecting psychoanalysis's influence on her social work education. She recognized the young women needed more than love and religion to change their lives. S. Hart's 1959 case manual redefines the population as "juvenile delinquents"(Hart RGS, 1959, p. 1). With psychoanalytic perspectives firmly entrenched, the young women were characterized as "acting-out" children suffering from "ego disturbances" – feeling helpless, worthless, and inadequate; with little self-concept, needing to feel acceptance[5] (Hart RGS, 1959, pp. 61-62).

The Physical Milieu

An arched gateway at the entrance to the grounds at Peekskill led to a stone bridge running across a stream connecting two pools, surrounded by weeping willows. Rare trees, flowers and shrubbery surrounded an artificial lake a short distance from the house (Shepherd, 1953, p. 4). The grounds were beautifully landscaped, rich in fruit orchards and vegetable gardens (Coniff, 1957).

Katherine Conway described the Peekskill St. Anne's house as having "exquisite order and cleanliness, with broad corridors, large windows, and well polished hardwood floors. The plumbing, heating, and electrical service was the latest technology could provide. The sister's assembly room was spacious and cheerful. The convent had the latest kitchen technology and telephone service" (Conway, 1910).

While surveying Catholic institutions across the country, Daniel Lord wrote the Good Shepherd Institute had "sunny, polished rooms where the walls lined with pictures and mottoes. Everywhere was neatness and order; bright airy classrooms; spotless kitchen; individual lockers for the children's belongings; plentiful baths and showers" (Lord SJ, 1924).

Cheerful residential units each contained complete living quarters and complete indoor and outdoor recreational facilities. The sisters supplied the young women with good clothes. Their living rooms contained radios and record players, while first-run movies ran there weekly (Coniff, 1957).

The chapel, "beautifully designed with separate seating for the Sisters and the young women, contained oak pews, statues, side chapels, and paintings." The Superior chose the statues in particular, for "their psychological effect on the weary and heavily burdened hearts who would gaze on them from time to time"(Andersen RGS, 1949, p. 66). Although the young women attended Mass "only" three or four mornings a week, they "…come into a religious atmosphere where the Grace of God…flows freely…" (Andersen RGS, 1949, p. 122). The sisters provided the classrooms, a fully equipped beauty salon, laundry room,

and kitchens with the most modern technology available.(Andersen RGS, 1949, p. 76; Emmanuel RGS, 1948). The laundry room was “large, light airy, and for domestic use only” (Andersen RGS, 1949, p. 66). The sewing room: “Pleasant, cheerful….equipped with fluorescent lighting and the latest model….electric sewing machines (p.66).(Andersen RGS, 1949, p. 66).

Religion

This section explores the place of religion as treatment, philosophy, and practice among the Sisters and toward the children. The writer discusses sections of the Book of the Classes (first published in 1886) to examine the methods used to train the Sisters for their ministry to the children and women in their care. It illustrates the depth of their commitment and the priority of their mission toward the children.

The Book of the Classes

Chapter one of the Book of the Classes defines the goal of the Congregation as “sanctifying souls.” [6] The Book directed the sisters in learning and using the tools needed for this endeavor. The sisters had a duty to “form (mold) hearts by instructing them.” The essence of their vocation was their fourth vow, defined as “to labor zealously for the sanctification of souls.” The sisters had to adjust the other three vows (poverty, chastity, obedience) if necessary to make the fourth vow the utmost objective of the Congregation (pg 1). SME stressed the primary nature of sanctification by making it the first paragraph in the book.

The fourth vow, however, was a contract between the sister and Mary (Mother of Jesus) from her first entrance into the congregation. Sisters would

labor in a “special manner” for converting sinners. In return, Mary would provide special protection as long as the sister was faithful to the contract (p.2). This special protection was against the contagion of corruption from the “penitents.” SME classified all the women and children as “penitents,” that is, sinners. The sisters needed to labor with an “ardent, active, vigilant zeal…boundless charity…taking the Shepherd of shepherds as a model” (p.2).[7] SME stressed repeatedly that sisters should “have a pure persevering zeal…a daily unwavering zeal, which recognizes no difference of persons or of country” (p.3). Good Shepherd Sisters took in female penitents regardless of race or creed.

Spiritual Welfare of the Sisters

Sisters applied themselves first to their own spiritual well-being to be worthy of her vocation (p.4). They belonged to God, without thought of self or of “creatures” (family, friends). Their goal was the highest degree of spiritual perfection attainable. They aspired toward spiritual advancement, using the tools needed for the work. Sisters modeled their faith, practiced humility, devotion, and charity and ungrudgingly sacrificed (p.5).

SME stressed prayer, Communion, pious reading of the office,[8] and examination of conscience[9] (p.8). She linked these to the quality of the sisters' work and for protection through the grace of God against evil. Since she worked from a moral, that is, “good v. evil,” practice model, she believed that these spiritual practices were key to staying fit for the work, outweighing talent in importance.

Today's social worker may mark the similarity here between SME's emphasis on spiritual fitness and the present-day emphasis on psychological health for those who work in child welfare. Both stress wellness for effective practice. Reflecting a democratic stance, SME directed "all in the Institute labor for salvation of souls (p.55)…. those who work in the bakery, laundry, garden, or with any office whatever, practice the fourth vow as much as superiors and Group Mothers of penitents. All tasks, no matter how humble, should be done with holy zeal; all are useful, none more than others (p.55)…. and must have common accord with the good of community" (p. 56). There may have been issues of class and status among the sisters, carried over from their secular lives. SME reminded them that these issues did not affect their ability to fulfill the fourth vow.

Spiritual Welfare of the Children

The Sisters believed that rehabilitation came about mainly through the spiritual transformation of the wayward. Absent this, any changes in attitude and behavior would be superficial and short-lived. Since winning over these transgressors was God's work, the sisters prayed to Him for help (p.10). SME advised particular forms of prayer, such as fasting, to find inspiration for dealing with penitents (p.11). Clearly, the sisters believed the success of the work with the children was not dependent solely on their efforts, but on the help of God. Externalizing the responsibility for success or failure helped the sisters keep optimism and hope in themselves and for the children. The children neither were credited nor blamed for their conversion, following Roman Catholic belief that

sinners were “drawn and moved by grace to respond to the merciful love of God” (Church, 2000).

Prayers and Catholic Practice

Once again, the instructions highlighted the central importance of prayer to the sister’s life (p.27). They taught the children “all the prayers that every Christian ought to know.” These included the Our Father, Hail Mary, Apostle’s Creed, the Ten Commandments, acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity, acts of Adoration[10], and the act of Contrition (Pp.27-28). The children were to know these by rote and understand the meaning of the words. In SME’s child-centered view, sisters would not overburden the children with prayer, mandate them to go to Mass or confession or keep them overlong at chapel. The institution rules required daily Mass and monthly confession, but the sisters could neither place obstacles to these on the children nor force them to go (Pp. 29-33). The children learned all the practices of formal Catholic devotion common in that day. However, SME forbade superstitious practices “guaranteeing” results (p.34).[11]

Sisters could not reward acts of piety, allow mechanical performances of piety, or let children act piously trying to gain (the sister’s) approval. “To save their souls, the children must come to love piety for themselves” (Pps.39-40). The child bore the responsibility for cooperation with Grace. No one could force compliance in this area. SME wanted the Grace of God, not the manipulations of sister or child, to lead the children to internalize devotional practices. Her goal was for each child to be empowered to make her own decisions about her spiritual welfare (p. 45).

Education

Education in the catechism and in Church history was necessary in forming a child's conscience (Practical Rules, p.13). SME suggested the children should memorize the catechism text. However, showing her sensitivity to a child's perspective, she warned, "… do not force it if they can't, as they will feel humiliated" (p.14).

The instructions clarify SME's insights into the human natures of the sisters and the children, while diverging from then-current pedagogy in her instructions about teaching. For example, SME recommended the use of concrete examples to explain the words of the catechism about Catholic dogma (pps. 17, 18). Pelletier understood the tendency of overzealous teachers to use fear to gain compliance and warned them not to do it by exaggerating what is venial or mortal sin (p. 19).[12]

Recognizing the dynamics of the classroom, she advised teachers to ignore unnecessary questions or objections "by the impious…these are better remembered than the answers" (pps. 18, 19). Rather than trying to inculcate an encyclopedic knowledge of Catholicism, she proposed training children thoroughly in the "principal points of religion" (p.19).

SME framed a child-centered perspective of childhood education. She advised teachers to "repeat the information many times so it is learned" (p.20). "Do not expect a child to become used to the words and ideas quickly" (p.20). Further, teachers must "especially question those children who are having difficulty" (p.21). Her educational philosophy predated John Dewey's writings,

and their application in education and child welfare, by more than fifty years (Dewey, 1903).

SME created child-centered schooling to keep the children's needs and feelings first. She warned teachers to "avoid questioning children incapable of learning in public. It is humiliating, painful for them, and tiresome for the others. Take these children aside and teach them to their level of comprehension" (p. 21). She counseled using the quicker children to tutor the slower ones under supervision (p.22). This had the extra benefit of empowering the tutors and provided an opportunity to increase their self-confidence.

Several themes run through the instructions on teaching: careful and diligent preparation of lessons, the usefulness of examples and explanations, kind, heartfelt (but not dramatic) deportment, truthfulness, not unsubstantiated hagiography,[13] and especially "solicitation of the children's welfare" (p. 23). Teachers used the Bible and the Lives of the Saints. To foster the interest of the children, they used Saint's stories from their countries and with their names (p. 24).

A gap in the Good Shepherd Sisters literature exists about the academic (excluding religious) education of the children during this time. SME wanted the children educated in subjects besides religion. "It is important that lessons of reading, writing and arithmetic be given regularly" (Pelletier, 1888, p. 376). Initially directed for the orphans and dependent children, it is unclear when it became the norm for all the children. By 1910, children younger than twelve

received four hours of basic schooling daily, the older ones only two (Conway, 1910).

The training school model incorporated the Correctional Education Programs by 1936 (Kellogg, 1936). Children attended school full-time, five days a week, until tenth grade, after which commercial and trades courses were available on-site. By 1945, the school included an academic (Regents) program and business training (Emmanuel RGS, 1948). The Principal, a Sister of the Good Shepherd, supervised ten secular and seven religious teachers, with a clerk for recordkeeping(Andersen RGS, 1949). The sisters continued to emphasize religious training.

In 1946, the New York City Board of Education designated Villa Loretto a “600 School”, P.S. 617, for emotionally disturbed pupils. The teachers supplied by New York City to teach the problem children received a higher salary and special training for the position (Andersen RGS, 1949). St. Germaine’s School received a P.S. 619 designation in the 1950’s (Hart RGS, 1959). Course offerings included academics, business, and semi-vocational areas. The residents attended school at St. Germaine’s through junior high. Secondary school pupils attended Peekskill High .

By 1962, the New York City Board of Education staffed P.S. 619 with sixteen teachers and a principal. The Sisters accepted some pupils scoring lower than 75 on the IQ test in the hope that they would improve once they worked on some language and emotional difficulties (Clines RGS, 1962).

Work and Vocational Training

From the middle of the nineteenth to the early twentieth century, the sisters trained the penitents in the work needed to support the institution. It is difficult to overstate how important work was for rehabilitating the early penitents (Pelletier, 1897, p. 127) . It was an integral part of rehabilitation at the House of the Good Shepherd. Work was part of character reformation aimed at the salvation of the children (Pelletier, 1897, p. 127). Its role as treatment did not emerge until early in the twentieth century.

Work kept the children busy and out of trouble, helped to pay for their support, and provided them with occupational skills after their release. Sisters trained the children to do work as if they made a living by it; the work itself chosen to parallel their "position in life" (Pelletier, 1897, p. 222).

SME gave several clear instructions about the children and work:

- Take extra trouble to train difficult children
- Make sure they learn what they will need after discharge, that is, to earn an honest living and "take their place one day at the head of a family"
- Teach them housework, mending, and cleanliness
- The needs of the child had precedence over the needs of the institution (that is, self-sufficiency, not institutional financial needs, drove vocational training)
- Regulations imposed by government authorities should be carried out conscientiously

- Inculcate habits of industry and thrift (Pelletier, 1897, pp. 220-221)
- Suit the work to the child's aptitude and age (Pelletier, 1897, pp. pp. 126-127)
- Employments sisters are in charge of vocational classes (Pelletier, 1897, p. 75)
- Know who is ill, make sure they get care, exempt them from work (Pelletier, 1897, p. 74).

These were child-centered, not institution-centered, goals and a novel model for families of the era. During the mid-nineteenth century, children served the needs of the family, not the other way around.

Child labor laws reduced the time children worked in training schools and reformatories by the 1930's (Kellogg, 1936). During the 1940's vocational classes assessed the student's aptitude and matched the student accordingly with vocational training. In addition to office practice and power machine operations, courses were offered in cooking, keeping house, sewing, arts and crafts, and beauty culture (Andersen RGS, 1949). By the end of the 1950's, the vocational goals became therapeutic: cooperation and task completion replaced self-sufficiency (Clines RGS, 1962).

Therapy

By 1936, the institute, still a congregate level of care, insisted on comprehensive case histories for children referred there, so staff could make an appropriate diagnosis for each child. In addition to the courts, referral agencies included the New York City Bureau of Social Service, the New York City Department of Public Welfare, and the New York City Humane Society. The Good Shepherd Sisters still accepted private applications from families. Court referrals constituted the majority of cases. Consequently, the Sisters cooperated with probation officers in many jurisdictions (Kellogg, 1936).

The "Practical Rules" continued to serve as the foundation of care. Additionally, theories on the effects of IQ, the family environment, and juvenile delinquency informed the therapy provided by case managers and social workers. The need for increased on-site psychiatric services was recognized (Kellogg, 1936).

By 1947, neglected as well as delinquent young women between the ages of twelve to sixteen met the criteria for admission to the 190 bed St. Germaine's Home. Public and private agencies constituted most of the referrals (Emmanuel RGS, 1948). IQ's below dull normal were disqualified, as well as young women requiring "intensive" psychotherapy, or cases who were suicidal, pyromaniac, or homosexual. New admissions went into a Reception unit for thirty days, to be studied closely while becoming acclimated to her new environment (Emmanuel RGS, 1948). After this, the residents went into one of eight groups of twenty

persons each, with a Group Mother and an Assistant Group Mother assigned to each (Andersen RGS, 1949).

Sisters believed the institutional placement better than foster care for this population, because in the residential milieu, they could provide holistic treatment: physical, mental, social, moral, and spiritual (Andersen RGS, 1949). Good Shepherd Sisters provided a highly structured environment, including five hours of school Monday through Friday, followed by vocational classes. Supervised recreation came after supper. Recreation included dancing, glee club, indoor and outdoor sports, summer camp, and movies. The residents attended Mass two to three mornings weekly plus Sunday, combined with nightly prayers. They could talk at all times. The Sisters allowed smoking, but treated it as a privilege and restricted it to the dining areas (Andersen RGS, 1949).

The Sisters prioritized health care. Staff included a registered nurse, dentist, dental hygienist and weekly visits from a medical doctor. By 1948, Catholic Charities Child Guidance Clinic supplied a psychiatrist and two psychologists monthly, which was far less than what the residents required. Both inadequate funding and shortages of psychiatric staff exacerbated these problems (Andersen RGS, 1949).

Good Shepherd caseworkers collaborated with parole and referring agencies for discharge planning and aftercare. Residents unable to return home after completing the program went to live at St. Helena's Residence on 17th St. in New York City. Catholic Charities made aftercare plans for adolescents in New York City and Brooklyn. The parole officers found employment for them. Parole

violators came back to the program for another six months, usually with better results. Follow-up studies showed that eighty-five percent of the residents succeeded at parole the first time, a period of about two years (Andersen RGS, 1949).

St. Germaine's began a Social Service department around 1923, keeping routine, mostly demographic, records on the residents. The Traveling Clinic of Catholic Charities Child Guidance began to offer part-time psychiatric and psychological services to the most disturbed young women during the 1930's. From the 1940's through the 1950's the Sisters hired caseworkers to provide direct services to some residents and to do home visits with their parents as part of discharge planning (Andersen RGS, 1949; Emmanuel RGS, 1948; Hart RGS, 1959). By 1956, realizing that nothing less than full-time services would meet the children's needs, St. Germaine's Home staffed and ran their own full-time psychiatric program, and discontinued their affiliation with Catholic Charities Child Guidance Clinics (Hart RGS, 1959).

In 1959, Sisters viewed their institutional setting as vital for the juvenile delinquent who could not be cared for at home or in foster care. The Sisters by this time were attending college as part of their formation; consequently, they used all the modern therapeutic methods of the allied health professions, consistent with the philosophy of their foundress that they always keep up with modern methods of childcare (Hart RGS, 1959).

The Sisters wrote their first casework manual in 1959, to formalize operating procedures, provide for "unity of practice", and clarify staff roles (Hart

RGS, 1959). The manual described the intake, admission procedures, the collaborative relationships among staff, parents, and the residents, and the caseworkers. It spelled out the mission and philosophy of the Institute. The manual illustrated the model of treatment used at St. Germaine's: "intensive individual study and treatment, employing professional specialists in religion, psychiatry, psychology, group work, case work, medicine, recreation, and education (Hart RGS, 1959).

By the early 1960's the Group Mothers were receiving formalized training. They were part of the treatment team that included social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists, and caseworkers. Aftercare workers transitioned residents and their families during discharge planning, and caseworkers assisted the young women in finding jobs and adjusting to life outside the institution (Clines RGS, 1962).

As it became more difficult to staff institutions of this size, the Sisters decided to go into community settings, where they continue to serve troubled adolescents and their families today in the five boroughs of New York City (Doyle CSJ, 2007).

CHAPTER VI: FINDINGS

Wealthy and middle class Protestant opposition to New York City and State funding Catholic child welfare institutions stimulated the growth of professional social work during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in New York City. When reformers acted to remove mostly Irish Catholic children from the streets into Protestant child welfare institutions and homes, they never expected the strength of the Catholic response. The period of 1850 to 1890 saw Catholic institution building on an unprecedented scale as Catholics sought to "save the immortal souls" of their children from Protestant influence.

The Good Shepherd Sisters opened their first house in New York during that time, moving twice to larger houses, in 1865 and 1874. In addition, they expanded the scope of their services, providing care for young female children who were orphans and preservates (what we call today "at risk") as well as the "sinners and penitents" (delinquent women and girls) they sought to save. Most of the population they initially served was Irish Catholic. The sisters believed that reformation of the children was impossible without complete immersion in daily Catholic religious practice. This included daily Mass, weekly confession, frequent devotions to Mary and the saints, and catechetical instruction.

The sisters strove for financial independence. They believed that for character reformation work was second only to religion in importance. Staff and children engaged in various occupations for eight hours daily, designed to be both vocational training and a source of income to the institution. However, the sheer numbers of children referred to their care made this impossible. Although

the institution made handmade goods, and ran a laundry service, the operating costs and needs of the children exceeded their earning ability. The staff cared for nearly three thousand children over thirteen years after 1857, seven hundred of whom remained in their institution in 1870. Seventy-one sisters ministered to these children then, a staffing ratio of 10:1.

Reformers in the nineteenth century saw the law, and especially the state, as the domain of reform (Pearson, 2006). In New York City and New York State, they sought to carry out their aims through the city and state governments. Activists interested in reducing crime and removing lawless children from the streets of New York succeeded in getting the "Disorderly Child" Act passed in 1865. The act allowed judges, magistrates, and justices of the peace to commit children based on a parental complaint, not just for crime. The numbers of children needing residential care increased, many of them young females who overcrowded the House of Good Shepherd. The net effect for the sisters was expansion – program and institution - to the 90th Street location and later to Peekskill in 1874. To help the children who were orphans or preservates, the sisters added "classes" (divisions), formed based on age and the care needed. Sisters carefully isolated the classes, including sleeping quarters, dining and recreation areas (Conway, 1910) away from the delinquent women and girls.

Besides the increased numbers of female children in their care, Good Shepherd Sisters felt the impact of early social work gains on their financial stability. Reformers lobbied Albany and New York City to restrict or abolish funding to sectarian institutions, with varying degrees of success. In turn, sisters

relied on lay Catholics to fundraise for them, and to petition the state and city governments for payments for the services they provided. However, the first payments from the city and the state did not arrive until 1863. From 1863 to 1875, the effect of the reformer's efforts was, in the end, to change government payments from a yearly grant to per capita basis and to restrict the use of the payments to childcare.

However, in 1875, pressure from lay Catholic social service organizations such as St. Vincent de Paul succeeded in getting legislation passed that required placement of Catholic children in Catholic institutions. Volunteers watched the sentencing of Catholic children in the courts, to ensure the judges kept the law. These activities led some volunteers from St. Vincent de Paul and other Catholic social service agencies to later employment as social workers and probation officers.

The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, founded in 1875, successfully lobbied the passage of the "Act for Protecting Children" in 1877. Two decades of child welfare reform to protect children's rights followed. Child neglect and parents patriae legislation with codification of children's laws in New York decriminalized children's deviant behavior. The successful passage of legislation separating juvenile and adult offenders came in 1877. Courts directed delinquent children to reformatories rather than jails, especially when a New York City Children's Court began proceedings in 1892.

The result for the Sisters of the Good Shepherd was increased numbers of delinquent female children and increased interaction with the courts, and the

SPCC (Conway, 1910). The SPCC brought children to the House of Good Shepherd, provided them transportation to and from court, and investigated the homes to which they were to return (Conway, 1910; NYSPCC, 2000). They developed a cooperative and respectful relationship with the sisters (Conway, 1910), and were likely the first secular social workers they met.

During the 1895 New York State Constitutional Convention, a group of reformers succeeded in having the chapter on charities amended to create a State Board of Charities. The Board inspected charitable institutions receiving state funding and certified them according to health, fire, medical, hygiene, and other standards. Failure to pass inspection resulted in suspended funding. In 1895, the City of New York separated the Department of Public Charities from the Department of Corrections, and in 1897 gave it jurisdiction over all New York City children committed to institutions receiving public funds. The City of New York also restricted the use of their funding to the care of the children. These statutes, all promoted by Protestant interests, served to place the House of Good Shepherd and other sectarian institutions under state and city scrutiny, to change their procedures to conform to state and city regulations, and be subject to unannounced inspections. For example, until this time, the House of Good Shepherd recorded only the names and dates of admission of their charges. Their failure to keep more thorough records was consistent both with their desire to maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of the residents, and with their practice of humility. The sisters believed that recording their accomplishments was at odds with the virtue of humility that required they be anonymous in their

work. Now, they needed to keep accounts of the monies spent, and maintain case records on the children.

As the era of legislative reforms ended, the progressive era (1890 – 1920) began. “Progressive” social work affected the Sisters of the Good Shepherd directly, through the efforts of the Catholic Archdiocese of New York and Catholic social work organizations. Thomas Mulry, a prominent member of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, started to attend New York City Charity Organization Society meetings around 1889 and joined in 1890. He believed that Catholic children needed family placement more than institutional care, and wanted to learn more about Mary Richmond’s “scientific charity,” foster care, and casework methods. In due course, other Vincentians joined the COS, and a spirit of cooperation developed between the two organizations. Now, Catholic “charity” work moved toward social work professionalization. Adapting Richmond’s theories to Catholic theology (Brown, 2000; O'Grady, 1930), Catholic charity workers began to professionalize.

Mulry set up the Catholic Home Bureau in 1898 in New York City, to find Catholic foster care placements for Catholic orphans. Besides the social workers from state and city agencies, social workers from the Catholic Home Bureau inspected the House of Good Shepherd in New York City and Peekskill and sent reports to the Archdiocese (Anonymous, 1907). These inspections included not only the physical plant, but also interviews with children assessing the appropriateness of their care (Anonymous, 1907).

After the turn of the century, the Good Shepherd Sisters relocated St. Anne's Home for Children and began transferring the 90th Street preservate children there. Children under twelve now attended school for four hours a day, older children for two, reflecting changing educational standards and needs in vocational training. The "Villa Loretto" Class, containing adjudicated females over sixteen, remained in New York City. In 1913, the Sisters transferred the preservates to other institutions and closed the women's department, retooling the program as St. Germaine's Home to accept adjudicated females aged twelve to sixteen years. This move points toward a decrease in the number of New York City Catholic children needing congregate care. The researcher believes the Catholic Home Bureau and Good Shepherd Sisters cooperated in this endeavor by placing Catholic children under their care in Catholic foster families. The Sisters redirected their work to reforming delinquent female children.

Thomas Mulry and other members of the St. Vincent de Paul Society founded the National Conference of Catholic Charities (NCCC) in 1910. The NCCC began a nationwide survey of Catholic charitable institutions that year. Shortly afterward, in 1913 and 1914, Catholic institutions in New York City came under attack by politicians and social work reformers asserting improprieties by the certifying State Board of Charities. The Governor appointed the Strong Commission to investigate, triggering outcries of bias and anti-Catholicism from the Archdiocese of New York. The Good Shepherd Houses passed inspection, but some other religious institutions did not. Cardinal Farley decided to gain control of all Catholic charities in the Archdiocese of New York. Copying the

method of the NCCC, he started with a diocesan survey to assess needs, eliminate waste, and avoid duplication of effort. On completion of the survey in 1919, Farley consolidated all Catholic charitable agencies under his control. The Archdiocese began funding the Good Shepherd Sisters and placed them under the supervision of Catholic Charities by 1920. Lay Catholic fundraising for the sisters' work declined afterward, as it did throughout the diocese.

Other changes Farley started after the Strong Commission included the requirement for Catholic social workers to take classes at Cathedral High School to pass the qualifying civil service exam (1915). He hastened opening Fordham's School of Social Service (1917) and wanted Catholics seeking a degree in social work to attend Catholic degree programs. He requested the Good Shepherd sisters begin aftercare for young women completing their program (1917).

Supervision by Catholic Charities brought several changes to the Good Shepherd Sisters. They adopted casework methods and expanded their lay staff. They opened a venereal disease clinic (1920), attended the National Conference of Catholic Charities (1920), and joined the Committee of Women Religious (Markham, 2007). For the first time, women religious who headed charitable institutions met to discuss their problems and devise solutions to them.

A traveling clinic from Catholic Charities began to provide psychological services, including IQ testing, for the adjudicated females (1922). In 1923, the sisters transferred the remaining young women from New York City to Peekskill, opening Villa Loretto (for young women aged sixteen to twenty-one years) in a building adjacent to St. Germaine's Home (for residents aged twelve to sixteen).

The same year, sisters started a “Social Services” department in St. Germaine’s Home, and brought New York City public schools into both facilities. Professional staff added new perspectives to the sisters’ practice and likely provided incentive for the Mother Provincial to send some sisters for a social work degree.

New York City merged all complaints against minors under “juvenile delinquency” in the 1924 Children’s Court act, changing the terminology for the adjudicated females. The sisters sold their 90th street property in 1927, and made Peekskill their New York Provincial headquarters the following year. Beginning around 1930, the sisters incorporated psychiatric and counseling services, using the part-time services of the Catholic Charities traveling clinic.

In 1936, the Sisters of the Good Shepherd in New York Province graduated their first social worker from the National School of Social Service in Washington, D.C. Sister Kellogg designed and conducted a program evaluation of the residents using statistical data from the institution’s records for her Master’s thesis. She stressed the sisters’ cooperation with probation officers, the children’s recreation, and religion. S. Kellogg accentuated the “moral status” of families on a continuum from poor to excellent, and theorized a connection between it and delinquency. In short, she was a social worker on a par with others of her era.

Since Catholic Charities provided needed services only part-time, the Good Shepherd sisters opened a full-time medical and dental clinic on their grounds by 1935. The adjudicated females, now termed “sex delinquents” and “promiscuous,” were first generation Italian- or Polish-American daughters of

immigrants. Good Shepherd sisters revised the admission criterion to exclude girls with IQ's of 74 or less, or violent psychiatric or emotional problems, or psychosis. They wanted residents who could benefit from their program, a change from their nineteenth century philosophy that led them to care for all they could hold. Other places existed now for treating the retarded, developmentally delayed, disabled, and the mentally ill.

During the Great Depression, the sisters urged the older residents to complete high school before leaving. Discharge planning included housing and employment. The sisters provided housing in a cottage on the grounds as well as in a house in Manhattan for those residents having no place to go. Probation officers and social workers from Catholic Charities helped the residents find employment.

Public school staffed by specially trained lay teachers headed by a Good Shepherd religious, operated five hours daily, five days a week until the ninth grade. Tensions arose from this arrangement; S. Kellogg wrote the sisters felt the teachers lacked the dedication and insights needed for working with this population. Some of this tension likely arose because the principal of the schools was a Good Shepherd sister, while the New York City Board of Education hired and paid the teachers. The Good Shepherd Sisters wanted to conduct their own school for the residents, but staffing shortages made that impractical.

On-site commercial (business) and trade courses came after ninth grade, including cosmetology. The cosmetology course included an on-site beauty salon, where, under a supervising cosmetology teacher, the student beauticians

styled hair and provided other beauty services for the residents. Religion remained the focus of reformation: residents attended daily Mass, and intensive immersion in devotional practices continued. The older residents worked no more than five hours a day, which continued to provide income for the institution.

In 1940, the sisters hired caseworkers to provide direct services to the children and their families. No longer limited to recordkeeping and counseling the more disturbed, the caseworkers introduced new facets to the continuum of care: individual counseling for all the residents, and for their families. The sisters committed to providing residents' families with education, support, and help. For the first time, they actively reached out to the families as part of their treatment. The researcher infers this change, coming as it did less than four years after S. Kellogg's thesis, as evidence of change on a micro level because of her clinical influence.

During WWII, and for two decades after, "juvenile delinquency" became a public concern again. In 1944, the sisters built an annex to St. Germaine's Home to hold the overflow of new admissions. In 1946, Dr. Frank O'Brien, Vice President of the New York City Board of Education, developed the "600" school concept for troubled and delinquent students. He designated Villa Loretto as P.S. 617 and St. Germaine's Home as P.S. 619.

The following year, the Good Shepherd Sisters created a "vocational division" through the tenth grade, for those students not entering academic or business high school programs. Vocational training had as its goal character

training and self-sufficiency. The sisters no longer used vocational training for income.

By 1948, the Good Shepherds referrals came through public and private agencies. Juvenile courts referred the adolescent adjudicated females to “child guidance” clinics, which in turn made referrals based on their assessments. As a result, the sisters insisted on complete intake information from the referral sources, and developed a Reception Unit. Instead of placing the new admissions directly into existing classes (groups), they remained in a small, separate class with a group mother observing and reporting on her observations. The sisters had a twofold goal: giving the new resident time to acclimate herself to the new environment, and assessing her ability to take part in the program. The sisters felt that their own observations supplemented the information in an intake assessment, giving them added insights into the new resident’s character. When the young woman felt ready to move on, she transferred to a regular class. The maximum length of stay in the Reception Unit was thirty days. The schools changed to full-time for all the residents without a diploma, adding Regents and business diplomas.

The sisters held weekly staff conferences with all who took part in the residents’ care. Discussions included evaluations, treatment planning, and discharge planning. They tightened admission criterion specifically to exclude severely mentally ill or retarded young women. Finally, in recognition of the changed times, and the sisters’ increased contact with the secular world, the Good Shepherds eliminated the “Touriere” (domestic) classification. This meant

that all sisters now took the fourth vow at permanent profession, all the sisters now wore the same habit, and no distinctions existed around the occupational status of Good Shepherd Sisters.

S. Andersen completed her thesis at Fordham in 1949. The following year, S. Hildegard began her studies in the MSW program at the University of Connecticut, Hartford, completing in 1952. In 1953, S. Mary Paul Janchill started graduate school for the MSW at Catholic University of America. The New York Mother Provincial, Mary of the Presentation, sent a new sister to graduate school as soon as possible after another had finished. Lack of financial resources available for this purpose limited her efforts.

S. Andersen reported several changes to the methods and programming of the New York Good Shepherd sisters. Caseworkers, besides their other duties, now issued reports on the residents' progress to "the appropriate agencies"; it is likely these included the referring agencies, probation, and Juvenile Court. Social workers provided intensive psychotherapy for the residents, who now had labels such as antisocial and maladjusted as well as delinquent. Group mother terminology replaced first and assistant Class Mother. Catholic Charities made aftercare plans for the Archdiocese of New York and Brooklyn Diocese referrals. Residents who completed the program but were unable to find housing boarded at the St. Helena's Residence on 17th St. in Manhattan until caseworkers found housing for them. Most residents now came from Puerto Rican and African-American families. The group mothers, sisters, and some staff, became bilingual.

The Sisters' emphasis on religious training remained the same. Religion as the primary tool of reforming character remained the main emphasis of the program. The sisters adapted their program to psychiatry, psychology, casework, counseling, and education but never changed their mission – bringing souls back to Christ. They believed these new tools were useful to them in that endeavor. Although residents no longer attended daily Mass, they went two to three mornings weekly plus Sunday. The sisters taught catechism as before, and immersed the residents in Catholic devotional practices.

Before 1955, sister formation included intensive spiritual development, including a thorough grounding in theology, followed by practical training. Sisters, mostly Group Mothers experienced in working with the delinquent young women, conducted the practical formation. They trained and supervised the newer sisters, who gradually assumed their responsibilities as they became ready.

Sisters did not attend college until after they permanently professed their vows. Group mothers did not attend college at all, unless they planned to change their occupation. Usually, sisters took courses toward their degree while working full-time. Those following a Master's in Social Work degree commonly requested a sabbatical to complete their education because of the unique requirements of graduate social work programs, including field placement. Sometimes the second year field placement was in a House of Good Shepherd, which allowed the sister to contribute her labor while earning her degree (Markham, 2007).

The first sisters to attend graduate schools for a Master's in social work did so after they had completed the postulancy, novitiate, and Juniorate, and had taken permanent vows. Initially, they attended Catholic colleges and universities, although this changed after the end of World War II (CUA, 2007). The National Council of Catholic Women, founded in 1920 as part of the lay organization of the National Catholic Welfare Service managed the National Catholic School of Social Service (NCSSS), in Washington D. C., from 1921-1947. This school was for women candidates studying social work. At that time, they were segregated from the School of Social Work for men, at The Catholic University of America. The NCSSS adopted Mary Richmond's casework model adapted to Catholic theology (Brown, 2000). In 1947, the schools merged into the Catholic University of America's National Catholic School of Social Service, which is still in operation.

The Provincial Superior matched the needs of the Provincialate with the talents, education, and (if possible) individual wishes of the sisters (Markham, 2007). Some of the first Good Shepherd MSW graduates advanced to leadership positions in the Good Shepherd New York Province.

The first thesis in this dissertation was finished at the National Catholic School of Social Service. Other universities attended by the New York Province Sisters for graduate social work degrees included Fordham University, Columbia University, University of Connecticut, Boston College, and the Catholic University of America.

Modernizing the New York Provincialate

Thirty-five year old Sister Mary of St. Hildegard was three years post Masters when the New York Province elected her Mother Provincial in 1955 (Markham, 2007). She was the first degreed social worker elected Provincial in New York Province. Raised in Vermont in a middle class Catholic family, she became attracted to the Good Shepherd order and the work while in her teens. Her parents supported her decision to enter the Good Shepherd order; however, they insisted she get her bachelor's degree before entering. She came to Peekskill as a postulant in 1938 (Markham, 2007). A dozen years later, she agreed to go for her MSW at Mother Mary of the Presentation's (the Mother Provincial) request, entering the program at University of Connecticut in Hartford in 1950 (Markham, 2007).

Returning to New York City after graduation, one of the local convents elected her as Local Superior. After her own election as Mother Provincial, she inherited Mother Presentation's building project (the Juniorate) as well as the administrative responsibility for the New York Province (Markham, 2007). Mother Hildegard's predecessor planned a formal structure for the Juniorate, a beautiful brick building on the grounds at Peekskill for the temporarily professed to study theology (Markham, 2007). She did not plan to revise the Juniorate program itself, maintaining it as the three-year study of theology and growth in spirituality it had always been.

Mother Mary of St. Hildegard had no training in architecture, contracting, or finances, areas helpful when erecting a new building.

Nonetheless, her experience as a Good Shepherd Sister and as a social worker led her to revise the purpose and organization of the Juniorate. She knew the changing times and standards for treatment threatened the apostolate of the sisters (Dwyer, 1967; Markham, 2007). She was also well aware of the changes taking place in religious orders throughout the country because of the Sister Formation Movement. This leader felt strongly that the Good Shepherd Sisters must change their methods and adapt their ministry to remain effective in their mission to troubled adolescent females (Hildegard, 1957; Markham, 2007).

The Sister Formation Movement

The Sister Formation Movement was a seminal (Quinonez, 1992) movement among women religious which began around 1949, developed from conferences held by the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA). Well before Vatican II, it started a process of change that laid the groundwork for transforming American sisters (Beane, 1993; Dries, 1993; Quinonez, 1992; Schneider, 1988). By 1953, the NCEA established the Sister Formation Conference (SFC) as a subcommittee. Initially focused on teaching sisters, it sought to modernize sister formation for all Catholic women religious, not least in professionalization (Beane, 1993; Dries, 1993; Quinonez, 1992; Schneider, 1988). It strove to make the sisters and their communities prepared to meet the challenges of the twentieth century and stressed renewal and education in their formation. More importantly, the SFC "advocated for integration of spiritual, intellectual, and professional disciplines in the initiation programs for newer members. It encouraged communities to increase the numbers of members sent

for masters and doctoral degrees, to staff the faculties needed to educate the younger members" (Quinonez, 1992). The "Sister Formation Bulletin," begun in 1954, was the instrument used by the SFC to disseminate ideas and information to the sisters. Ninety-nine point two percent of convent superiors made the Bulletin available to all the sisters in their house.

The SFC agenda had the approval of the Vatican. In 1950 Pius XII urged a renewal for Catholic religious which included "theological education and professional credentials for…professional work" and "the elimination of outdated customs and clothing that estranged them from those they served" (Beane, 1993; Quinonez, 1992). In September of 1951, the Pope held a series of meetings, all designed to encourage professionalism in Church ministry (Beane, 1993; Hildegard, 1957). In 1954, the pontifical institute, Regina Mundi, opened in Rome as a model for the "training, education, and formation of religious women in the sciences and disciplines" (Beane, 1993).

The Good Shepherd House of Studies

Mother Mary of St. Hildegard reconceptualized the Juniorate. She wanted it to be a learning center where new candidates would undertake two years of undergraduate study during their formation as Good Shepherd Sisters. So began the Good Shepherd House of Studies (Hildegard, 1957; Markham, 2007). Mother Mary of St. Hildegard's rationale had its basis in the example of the Mother General in France, her awareness of the great need for sister professionals in the New York Province, and in her own education and training (Markham, 2007).

As early as 1946, Mother Mary of St. Ursula, the Mother General in Angers, France, played a major part in setting up a two-year casework program at the Catholic University of Paris for institutional child care workers (Hildegard, 1957). In 1952, she implemented a program to help the Good Shepherd Sisters adapt their methods and techniques to serve the changing needs of those they served. Mother M. St. Ursula began a Juniorate program for intensive spiritual training and education in professions such as social work, nursing, and teaching (Hildegard, 1957).

In Peekskill, Mother Hildegard realized the old program of good physical care, vocational and academic training, recreational activities and immersion in religious atmosphere and instruction, although once useful, was “grossly inadequate” for the current population (Hildegard, 1957; Hollingsworth, 1964). The residents who came to the Good Shepherd Sisters were “very disturbed…and manifest a wide range of emotional illness…bordering on mental illness” (Hildegard, 1957). She knew most of young women presented with “grave personality disorders…requiring much individualized care” (Hildegard, 1957). She wanted the Good Shepherd programs to meet the changing needs of the delinquent female adolescent, who needed treatment for mental illness and personality disorders (Hollingsworth, 1964). Mother Hildegard thought it “critical” that Good Shepherd Sisters provide the necessary services for the young women referred to their care. These services included clinical diagnosis, individual psychiatric care, group psychotherapy, psychological testing, remedial specialists, and psychiatric casework. Helping these young women meant

providing them with a clinically oriented program (Hildegard, 1957). Such a program needed many professionally trained staff. However, the small number of new sisters made founding a college for them impracticable.

After visiting and studying the programs started by other religious orders, Mother Hildegard decided the Good Shepherds in New York needed an alliance with an educational institution of higher learning. The Good Shepherd House of Studies became an extension affiliated with the School of Education at Fordham University (Hildegard, 1955, 1957). In keeping with this revision, the new building contained classrooms, a science laboratory, and a library.

The students were young sisters with high school diplomas new to teaching in the community. They were divided into four groups: the first contained about ten postulants yearly, with the postulancy lasting nine months from September to May (Hildegard, 1955). The next three groups, each numbering about five to eight women annually, included the first and second year novices and first year Junior sisters (Hildegard, 1955). The school excluded first year novices from study, while combining the second year novices and first year junior sisters into one class.

The curriculum was the same for all, developed to give the sisters two years of undergraduate study at the House of Studies, which they could then finish at Fordham for a B. S. degree in Secondary Education, majoring in social studies (Markham, 2007). Besides the state requirement of seventy-five credits, the program included eight theology credits required by Fordham. Since the

treatment population was largely Spanish speaking, the sisters chose Spanish as the language requirement. Sisters took courses of three credits each.

Mother Hildegard included twelve credits in Sociology in the program. She wanted the sisters, because of their special work, to understand the causes and effects of the social conditions affecting the treatment population (Hildegard, 1955). She knew Fordham might not accept all these credits later for those who did not choose a concentration in sociology. However, Mother Hildegard wanted the sisters to have this relevant knowledge anyway (Hildegard, 1955).

The faculty met the Fordham requirement of minimum Masters Degree in the subjects they taught. Sisters on the faculty did not teach in the schools for the delinquent females, nor were the Mistresses of Novices and of Postulants on the faculty (Hildegard, 1955). This helped keep proper boundaries between the institutions. The faculty for theology and philosophy came from Loyola Seminary, a Jesuit college in Shrub Oak, New York (Hildegard, 1955; Markham, 2007). A sister trained in Library Science staffed the library, which was chaired by several department heads from Fordham's School of Education. The library met the requirements of the New York State Commissioner of Education, eventually holding collections numbering over ten thousand volumes (Hildegard, 1955; Markham, 2007).

Sisters of the Good Shepherd, from the oldest professed to the newest postulants, eagerly embraced Mother Hildegard's decision to have all who were able pursue a college degree (Dwyer, 1967; Markham, 2007). They enjoyed the full support of Francis Cardinal Spellman of the Archdiocese of New York. At the

building dedication on October 8,1957, he congratulated the sisters and spoke of the new program as an “enhancement” to the services they provided in the Archdiocese (Archdiocese, 1957).

By 1957, twelve sisters had completed graduate training in social work, majoring in psychiatric social work and group work. Sisters usually worked in family agencies for their first field placement. Second year placements were generally determined by the schools. Sisters did not do home visits, but did visit courts, schools, hospitals, clinics, and social service agencies. They attended professional meetings on local, state, and national levels (Hildegard, 1957).

Mother Mary of St. Hildegard looked for several characteristics when choosing a sister for graduate social work study. Among these were emotional maturity, secure vocation, solid theological and philosophical foundations, a warm and outgoing personality, and genuine interest in helping individuals with problems (Hildegard, 1957). She would place the candidate in casework, with in-service training under qualified supervisors, case conferences, psychiatric consults, and casework responsibility, the better to evaluate the candidate’s aptitude for the field. For graduate studies, Mother Hildegard looked for scholastic ability, general good health, and women under thirty-five (Hildegard, 1957; Markham, 2007). Due to limited financial resources, cost effectiveness was also a consideration.

Those who completed their graduate studies in clinical social work received qualified supervision for five years. If they could not find a supervisor in a Catholic Charities agency or among the Sister supervisors, the Good

Shepherds hired a qualified layperson (Hildegard, 1957). Often Good Shepherd sister social workers became full-time group mothers for a time, for the clinical experience. Sister social workers subscribed to professional journals, joined professional organizations, and attended conferences and institutes to stay current with the field.

New York Provincials of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd – Table 5.1

Term Start	Term Ended	No. of Years	Name	New Houses	Degree /Field
1874	1879	5	Mary of St. Magdalen Clover	NYC I, Boston, Brooklyn, Newark	
1879	1898	19	Mary of Loretto O'Brien	Troy, Albany, Springfield	
1898	1905	7	Mary of St. Gertrude Wilson	Hartford, Providence	
1905	1911	6	Mary of St. Francis Xavier McGenty		
1911	1919	8	Mary Divine Heart Spillane		
1919	1920	1	Mary of St. Benedict Connell		
1920	1929	9	Mary Good Shepherd Tellers	Wickatunk	
1929	1939	10	Mary St. Raymond Cahill	NYC II, Toronto	
1939	1955	16	Mary of the Presentation Hanigan	Ontario, Jamaica Plains, Randolph	
1955	1965	10	Mary of St. Hildegard Markham		Masters Social Work
1965	1974	9	Mary of St. Patrick Mulligan	Jamaica Estates	
1974	1983	9	Mary Victoria Andreoli		MA English, MA Psychology, PhD Psychology
1983	1989	6	Miriam Moroney		
1989	1996	7	Sheila Kelly		
1996	2002	6	Helene Hayes		MSW, Ph.D. Social Policy
2002			Yvette Arnold		

Table 5-2

Graduate Degrees Held by NY Sisters of the Good Shepherd as of 2006

# Degrees	Type	Discipline
6	ED	Administration and Supervision
3	MA	English
1	MA	History
3	MA	Pastoral Counseling
1	MA	Psychology
2	MA	Reading
5	MA	Theology
1	MLS	Library Science
1	MPA	Administrative Theory and Practice
1	MS	Bacteriology
1	MS	Criminal Justice
3	MS	Special Education: Learning Disabled
1	MST	Mathematics Education
1	MST	Secondary Education
3	MSN	Nursing
1	MSW	Social Work: Policy Analysis
4	MSW	Social Work: Psychiatric Casework
1	MSW	Social Work: School Psychology
17	MSW	Social Work
2	MSW	Social Work: Family and Community
1	Ph.D.	Policy Analysis and Planning
2	Ph.D.	Psychology

Training the Group Mothers

The Good Shepherd Sisters became social workers, psychologists, teachers, caseworkers, nurses, group workers, and occupational therapists. They used an interdisciplinary team of religious and laypersons, headed by a psychiatrist, drawing on the latest knowledge and methods available (Flannery, 1961). However, this clinical training was not enough. It did not cover the Group Mothers, who spent almost every hour of every day, (aside from the classroom) with the residents.

Although the Group Mothers were the most important people in the lives of the children at the institution, no training program existed for them in the United States (Flannery, 1961; Hildegard, 1957; Hollingsworth, 1964). In Europe, particularly France and Germany, two to three year formal training institutes existed for group mothers, setting them on a par with teachers, nurses, and social workers there (Flannery, 1961). The Mother General in Angers had participated in setting up the programs in Germany before WWII. In the United States, Good Shepherd group mothers received training in SME's principles while in the Novitiate from older, experienced, Group Mothers. Social workers provided in-service training and sisters attended lectures and staff conferences. Nevertheless, these did not meet their need for a uniform and thorough training program for their particular specialty in treating disturbed adolescents (Dick,

1966; Flannery, 1961; Hildegard, 1957; Hollingsworth, 1964; G. H. Weber, 1956). A change to the role of Group Mother was in the making: she was not simply a houseparent or custodial figure for the children, but part of the clinical treatment team as well (Dick, 1966; Hollingsworth, 1964; G. H. Weber, 1956).

The School of Social Work at St. Louis University rose to the challenge in 1955, at the request of the Mother General. Since 1946, they had conducted three-week summer programs for Group Mothers, limiting it to religious institutional personnel. They expanded this in 1952 to a thirty-hour course available to all houseparents in the St. Louis area. Now, the school agreed to set up a full time Institute of Child Care for Houseparents. The Good Shepherd community agreed to guarantee the minimum needed number of attendees with their Group Mothers throughout the country (Flannery, 1961).

A Good Shepherd sister, a social worker on the St. Louis faculty, prepared the curriculum. The coursework included Child Growth and Development, The Child in the Institution, and Character Development of the Child. The faculty advisory committee and the Director of the School of Social Services reviewed and approved it, and produced and mailed a brochure to institutions and state departments of welfare across the United States (Flannery, 1961).

The Institute opened in June 1957 for six weeks. The students were nineteen full-time Good Shepherd sisters and thirty part-time employees from institutions near St. Louis. When classes resumed the following February, all the Good Shepherd sisters returned, but the part-time students increased to forty-eight. The courses included: Emotional Problems of Children, Dynamics of Group

Living, The Role of the Houseparent, Preparation for Family Life, Recreation and Leisure Time, and Child Welfare Services (Flannery, 1961; Hildegard, 1957). The program offered full-time students supervised field placements through cooperating day nurseries in the St. Louis area. Later, institutions, including those run by the Good Shepherds in Peekskill, New York, provided supervised field placements (Flannery, 1961; Hildegard, 1957). By 1961, forty-two people graduated the Institute while the numbers of part-time attendees continued to increase. Students included social workers and program directors as well as houseparents. Lay attendees came to outnumber Good Shepherd sisters, achieving a goal of the program (Flannery, 1961). Good Shepherd Group Mothers found ways to change their methods without changing their principles through sharing of common problems in the group discussions. They came away with a sense of greater competence in the now-clinically oriented Good Shepherd programs (Hildegard, 1957).

Mother Hildegard ended St. Germaine's Home association with Catholic Charities Traveling Guidance clinic in 1956 and opened a full-time mental health and casework service there. She sent Group Mothers for training at St. Louis University in 1957.

In 1959, S. Hart finished her thesis, a caseworker manual. It is likely M. Hildegard suggested her thesis project, because the Good Shepherd Sisters needed to codify their policies and procedures for casework. Most caseworkers by then were women religious. Family casework was part of the program. An intake committee, consisting almost entirely of women religious treatment

professionals, used the interdisciplinary treatment team approach for admission, treatment, and discharge decisions.

M. Hildegarde renovated Villa Loretto and St. Germaine's Home in 1959 to qualify for cottage level reimbursement rates. Group sizes decreased, while the numbers of groups increased. The sisters changed vocational training to therapy, with goals of cooperation and task completion, and dropped self-sufficiency as impracticable.

S. Clines finished her thesis in 1962. She described Group Mothers as "religious with a professional background," and stated that mental health staff and treatment were major components of the program. The New York City Board of Education staffed the schools and appointed the principals, who were no longer Good Shepherd women religious. The sisters' mission remained the same, salvation of the children; however, they pragmatically used whatever secular means they could to achieve that goal. Attendance at Mass was compulsory for the residents only on Sunday; devotional practices were optional.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework the researcher developed from the material studied states that social work professionalization influenced the Good Shepherd Sisters directly and indirectly, on macro and micro levels. We begin with self-supported women religious using centuries old methods handed down by oral and written tradition for the care of females who deviated from societal norms. Their tools were their Catholic faith, hard work, compassion, and dedication to

their mission of bringing women and girls in their care to God. The effects of social work professionalization follow:

- Funding – changes in funding bring government oversight and eventually oversight by Catholic social service agencies
- Catholic social service leaders copy secular social work ideas and adapt them to Catholic theology
- Women religious utilize Catholic social work conferences, bringing new ideas back into the institution
- Laypersons from social service agencies bring professional ideas and methods into the institution
- Catholic graduate programs in social work become accessible to women religious
- A few women religious get graduate degrees in social work bringing what they learn back to the institution
- Women religious continually adapt to changing social work norms – they define their philosophy congruent with the philosophy of the emerging profession
- Women religious adapt to increased government oversight
- Religious leaders insist women religious get equal professional standing with lay professionals through education
- Women religious put a social worker in charge
- Social worker in charge incorporates college education in sister formation
- Women religious become professionals, including social workers

The single most important factor making it possible for these Catholic women religious to make use of social work theory was by adapting Mary Richmond's ideas to Catholic theology. Begun by Thomas Mulry, a St. Vincent de Paul volunteer, and expanded by the Catholic University of America, the adaptations legitimized social work methods for Catholic charitable institutions and organizations. It is likely that for unassimilated religious or faith based charity organizations the same process must take place before they will use secular social work methods.

Assimilation worked on the Good Shepherd Sisters as well. When S. Kellogg went to graduate school in 1934, sisters were mainly native-born Americans, as were the residents. They were, in many cases, second and third generation Americans, as opposed to the mainly Irish, German, and Italian born women in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It is reasonable to assume that American born women raised in American culture would accept American ideas and put them to use more readily than foreign-born persons.

Good Shepherd Sisters were quick to use the tools provided by social work professionals, needing only the opportunity to attend college to make them their own. Despite all the contact with secular perspectives, the sisters changed their means but not their end – to bring people back to God. Good Shepherd Sisters started many new programs and have contributed through scholarship and leadership to child welfare. Many in social welfare know the Good Shepherd's accomplishments; however, most of them are outside the scope of this paper. The researcher stopped the study at 1962, because by then, these

women religious had professionalized. In addition, the variables affecting the Good Shepherd Sisters from the actions of the Second Vatican Council (1962 – 1965) make analysis of the Sisters after 1962 a topic for future research.

Forty-five years later, Sisters of the Good Shepherd in the New York Province continue to improvise, adapt, create, and recreate social services and bring social justice to marginalized people throughout the New York metropolitan area and the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Admits State Fails to Inspect Asylums [Electronic (1916). Version]. *The New York Times*, S9. Retrieved 3/07/2007

Alexander, R. M. (1995). *The "Girl Problem": Female Sexual Delinquency in New York, 1900 - 1930* (1st ed.). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Allows Home to Sell Site. (1928, 11/28/1928). *The New York Times,* p. 21.

Andersen RGS, S. M. T. (1949). *A Social History of Villa Loretto, Peekskill, NY 1928-1948.* Unpublished Social history, Fordham University, New York, New York.

Anonymous. (1907). Continuation of the Annals of the Convent of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd at Mount Florence, Peekskill, NY. Unpublished Annals. New York Province of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd.

Anonymous. (1975). Villa Loretto, Peekskill, NY. Unpublished outline of history of Villa Loretto. Villa Loretto.

Archdiocese, N. Y. (1957). In Tribute to the Good Shepherd Sisters, *Inter Patres* (Vol. VII, pp. 1-2). New York City: Catholic Charities of Archdiocese of New York.

Bauman, P. (2002, May 2002). *Anti-Catholicism: The Last Acceptable Prejudice.* Paper presented at the Conference on Anti-Catholicism, Fordham University, NY.

Beane, M. N., Ph. D. (1993). *From Framework to Freedom* (1st ed.). Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.

Billington, R. A. (1935). Anti-Catholic Propaganda and the Home Missionary Movement, 1800-1860. *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 22*(3), 361-384.

Blau, J., and Abramovitz, M. (2003). *The Dynamics of Social Welfare Policy* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Oxford Press.

Boardman, A. C. (1955). *Good Shepherd's fold; a biography of St. Mary Euphrasia Pelletier, R.G.S.,foundress of the Congregatin of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd of Angers* ([1st] ed.). New York: Harper.

Boyer, P. (1978). *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920* (1st ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, D., and McKeown, Elizabeth. (2000). *The Poor Belong To Us: Catholic Charities and American Welfare* (1st ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruno, F. J., and Towley, Louis. (1957). *Trends in Social Work, 1874-1956 A history based on the proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Burrows, E. G., and Wallace, Mike. (1999). *Gotham: A History of New York to 1898* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Candidi, J. (2007). Youngstown Vocations. Retrieved 8/12/2007, 2007, from http://www.youngstownvocations.org/religiouswomen-definitions.htm

Carlson-Thies, S. (2001). Charitable Choice: Brining Religion Back Into American Welfare. *Journal of Policy History, 13*(1), 109-132.

Catholic Sisters in Big Realty Deal. (1927, 11/20/1927). *The New York Times,* p. 12.

Church, C. (2000). *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (2nd ed.). Washington DC: United States Catholic Conference.

Clines RGS, S. M. o. S. J. (1962). *After-Care Adjustment: A follow-up study of the 41 delinquent girls discharged from St. Germaine's Home in Peekskill, NY 1960.* Unpublished research, Fordham, New York, New York.

Coburn, C. K., & Smith, Martha. (1999). *Spirited Lives: How Nuns Shaped Catholic Culture and American Life, 1836 - 1920* (1st ed.). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Cohalan, R. M. F. D. (1983). *A Popular History of the Archdiocese of New York* (1st ed.). Yonkers, NY: United States Catholic Historical Society.

Conference, N. C. W. (1917, 1/25/1917). *Extract of minutes of Bishop's meeting.* Paper presented at the Bishops of the Province of New York, New York City.

Coniff, J. C. G. (1957). *The Good Shepherd Story* (1st ed.). Peekskill, NY: Graymoor Press.

Constructive Work Done by Kingsbury. (1914, 11/8). *New York Times,* p. 8.

Conway, K. E. (1907). *In the footprints of the Good Shepherd, New York, 1857-1907* (3rd ed.). New York City: Convent of the Good Shepherd.

Conway, K. E. (1910). *In the footprints of the Good Shepherd, New York, 1857-1907* (3rd ed.). New York City: Convent of the Good Shepherd.

Corbin, J. S., A. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research:Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

CUA. (2007). Manuscript Collections: National Catholic Welfare Conference. Retrieved 5/4/2007, 2007, from http://libraries.cua.edu/achrcua/ncwc.html#NCSSS

Degeneffe, C. E. (2003). What is Catholic about Catholic Charities? *Social Work, 48*(3), 374 - 384.

Demographia. (2006). City of New York & Boroughs:
Population & Population Density from 1790 (Publication no. http://www.demographia.com/dm-nyc.htm). Retrieved 03/02/2007, from Wendell Cox Consultancy: http://www.demographia.com/dm-nyc.htm

Dewey, J. (1903). Democracy in Education. *The Elementary School Teacher, 4*(4), 193-204.

Dick, H. R. (1966). Nature and Significance of Changes in the Houseparent Role in Institutions for Children. *Journal of Health and Human Behavior, 7*(3), 175-183.

Diner, H. R. (1989). *Erin's Daughters in America: Irish Immigrant Women in the Nineteenth Century* (4th ed.). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Doctrine, C. o. C. (1990). *The New American Bible* (paperback ed.). Washington D.C.: World Catholic Press

Doyle CSJ, S. W. (2004). *Sisters of the Good Shepherd 1874 - 1985 Mt. Florence, Peekskill, NY*. Paper presented at the Chapel Hill.

Doyle CSJ, S. W. (2006a). Let's Start at the Very Beginning: 1851 - Sept. 1857, *An Eye on the Archives* (Vol. #1, pp. 1-2). Good Shepherd Province House, Jamaica, NY: unpublished newsletter.

Doyle CSJ, S. W. (2006b). Trendy Transition: From the City to the Suburbs!, *An Eye on the Archives* (Vol. 5, pp. 1-2). Good Shepherd Province House, Jamaica, NY: unpublished newsletter.

Doyle CSJ, S. W. (2007). Interview (conversation ed.). Jamaica, NY.

Dries, A. (1993). Living in ambiguity: A paradigm shift experienced by the Sister Formation Movement. *Catholic Historical Review, 79*(3), 478.

Dwyer, R. J. F., SJ. (1967). Good Shepherd House of Studies termination (pp. 1-2). New York, NY: unpublished letter.

Ebaugh, H. R. (2002). Presidential Address 2001 Return of the Sacred: Reintegrating Religion in the Social Sciences. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 41*(no. 3), 385-395.

ECOSOC. (2006). List of nongovernmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council as at 31 August 2006 [Electronic Version], 92. Retrieved May 10, 2007 from http://www.un.org/esa/coordination/ngo/pdf/INF_List.pdf.

Ehrenreich, J. H. (1985). *Altruistic Imagination: A History of Social Work and Social Policy in the United States* (2nd ed.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Emmanuel RGS, S. M. (1948, October 9-13). *The Individualized Treatment of the delinquent girls in an institution.* Paper presented at the 34th National Conference of Catholic Charities, Boston, MA

Farley, J. C. (1917). Letter: "Aftercare for girls dismissed from Good Shepherd homes" (pp. 2).

Fialka, J. J. (2003). *Sisters: Catholic Nuns and the Making of America* (1st ed.). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Finke, R. S., Rodney. (2005). *The Churching of America, 1776-2005: Winners and losers in our religious economy* (2nd ed.). Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Fitzgerald, M. (1992a). *Irish-Catholic Nuns and the Development of New York City's Welfare System: 1840 - 1900*.Unpublished manuscript, Madison, WI.

Fitzgerald, M. (1992b). The Perils of 'Passion and Poverty': Women Religious and the Care of Single Women in New York City, 1845-1890. *U.S. Catholic Historian, 10*(1/2), 45-58.

Fitzgerald, M. (2006). *Habits of Compassion- Irish Catholic Nuns and the Origins of New York's Welfare System 1830-1920* (1st ed.). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Flannery, S. M. o. S. L. (1961). The Growth of a Staff Development Program. Unpublished Paper. Provincial Convent of the Good Shepherd.

Flexner, D. A. (1915). *Is Social Work a Profession*. Paper presented at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections.

Folks Denies Plot in Charity Inquiry [Electronic (1916). Version]. *New York Times*, *7/1/1916*, 11. Retrieved 3/07/2007.

Folks, H. (1900). *The Care of Destitute, Neglected, and Delinquent Children* (Digital ed.). New York City: The Charities Review.

Folks, H. (1901). The Charities Chapter of the Greater New York Charter. *American Journal of Sociology, 7*(2), 262-276.

Folks, H. (1915, Jan. 1915). *Charitable and Correctional Institutions and Public Health.* Paper presented at the Academy of Political Science in the City of New York New York City.

Fox, S. J. (1996). The early history of the court. *Future Court, 6*(3), 29-39.

Gavin, J. P. (1962). *The National Conference of Catholic Charities* (1st ed.). Milwaukee: Catholic Life Publications Bruce Press.

Gienapp, W. E. (1985). Nativism and the Creation of a Republican Majority in the North before the Civil War. *The Journal of American History, 72*(3), 30.

Guggenheim RGS, S. M. E. (1948, October 9-13). *The Individualized Treatment of the delinquent girls in an institution.* Paper presented at the 34th National Conference of Catholic Charities, Boston, MA

Hardon, J. A., SJ. (2000). *Modern Catholic Dictionary* (paperback ed.). Bardstown, KY: Eternal Life Publications.

Hart RGS, S. M. o. S. W. (1959). *A Manual for a social agency treating delinquent adolescent girls: a functional guide for caseworkers at St.*

Germaine's Home, Peekskill, NY. Unpublished Casework manual, Fordham University, New York, New York.

Hartman, G. V. (2000). A Time Line of the History and Development of Jung's Works and Theories (1902-1935) [Electronic Version]. Retrieved 5/29/2007 from http://www.voidspace.org.uk/psychology/jung_timeline.shtml.

Hildegard, M. M. o. S. (1955). Petition of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd for an Extension (pp. 1-4). unpublished.

Hildegard, M. M. o. S. (1957). *Copy of talk given at Communion Breakfast*. Paper presented at the National Conference of Catholic Charities.

Hildegard, M. M. o. S. (1960). The Sisters of the Good Shepherd. Unpublished article copy submitted for publication in Catholic News dated June 16, 1960.

Hildegard, M. M. o. S. (1961). Letter: Guide to the Catholic Sisterhoods in the United States (pp. 9).

Historical Census Browser (Publication (2004). Retrieved 3/05/2007, from University of Virginia: http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/collections/stats/histcensus/index.html

Hollingsworth, H. H. (1964). The Child-Caring Institution on the Move: Programs and Problems in Child Welfare. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 355*(Sep., 1964), 42-48.

Horvat, M. T. (2007, 11/19/2007). Let None Dare Call It Liberty: The Catholic Church In Colonial America. Retrieved 6/2007, 2007, from http://www.traditioninaction.org/index.htm

Hoy, S. (1995). The Journey Out: The Recruitment and Emigration of Irish Women Religious to the United States, 1812-1914. *Journal of Women's History, 6/7*(4/1), 34.

Hoy, S. (1997). Caring for Chicago's women and girls: the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, 1859-1911. *Journal of Urban History, 23*(3), 23.

Johnson, A. (1936). Professional Education for Social Work in the New Order. *Journal of Educational Sociology, 9*(5), 259-271.

Kellogg, S. M. o. t. R., RGS. (1936). *Delinquent Adolescent Girls in a Good Shepherd Training School.* Unpublished Research, Catholic University of America, Washington, DC.

Kerby, P., LL.D, William J. (1921). *The Social Mission of Charity* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.

Kevles, D. J. (1999). Eugenics and human rights. *British Medical Journal, 319*(7207), 435-437.

Knupfer, A. M. (2001). *Reform and Resistance: Gender, Delinquency, and America's First Juvenile Court* (1st ed.). New York: Routledge.

Kolmer, E. (1978). Catholic Women Religious and Women's History: A Survey of the Literature. *American Quarterly, 30*(5), 639-651.

Kunzel, R. G. (1993). *Fallen Women, Problem Girls: Unmarried Mothers and the Professionalization of Social Work, 1890-1945* (1st ed.). New Haven: Yale University.

Lane, W. D. (1916a). At the Bar of Childhood: Some Testimony from the Investigation of the New York State Board of Charities. *The Survey*(February, 1916), 3.

Lane, W. D. (1916b). Charity Patchwork and a Program: A Review of Commissioner Strong's Report. *The Survey*(November 1916), four.

Lannie, V. P. (1970). Alienation in America: The Immigrant Catholic and Public Education in Pre-Civil War America. *The Review of Politics, 32*(4), 503-521.

Lannie, V. P., and Diethorn, Bernard C. (1968). For the Honor and Glory of God: The Philadelphia Bible Riots of 1840. *History of Education Quarterly, 8*(1), 44-106.

LCWR. (2007). Leadership Conference of Women Religious Fact Sheet [Electronic Version], 1. Retrieved 4/24/2007 from http://www.lcwr.org/lcwraboutus/LCWR%20fact%20sheet.pdf.

Leiby, J. (1978). *A History of Social Welfare and Social Work in the United States, 1815-1972* (1st ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

LoMonaco RGS, S. M. P. (1975). *A Configuration of Education: Origins of the New York House of the Good Shepherd*.Unpublished manuscript, New York, NY.

Lord SJ, D. A. (1924). *Our Nuns: Their Varied and Vital Service for God and Country* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Benziger Bros.

Major, K. (2004). Criminalizing Seduction: Prostitution, Moral Reform and the New York Anti-Seduction Law of 1848 Retrieved February 8, 2007, from http://www.law.georgetown.edu/glh/major.htm

Markham, S. F. (2007). Personal Communication (interview ed.). Rensselaer, NY.

Martin, J. (2000). The Last Acceptable Prejudice? *America, 182*(10), 8-17.

McCaffrey, L. J. (1984). *The Irish Diaspora in America* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.

McCarthy, T. (2001). Penitentiary Origins in the City of New York. Retrieved May 15, 2007, from http://www.correctionhistory.org/html/chronicl/nycdoc/html/penitentiary2.html

McCauley, B. (2005). *Who Shall Take Care of Our Sick: Roman Catholic Sisters and the Development of Catholic Hospitals in NYC* (1st ed.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.

McGreevy, J. T. (2003). *Catholicism and American Freedom: a History*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company.

McNamara, J. A. (1996). *Sisters in Arms: Catholic Nuns Through Two Millennia* (1st ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Millis, H. A. (1898). The Law Relating to the Relief and Care of Dependents. VI. The State Organization and Supervision of Charities. *The American Journal of Sociology, 4*(2), 178-186.

NCC. (2004, 7-7-2005). Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches - 2004 *Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches* 1st. Retrieved April 4, 2006, from http://www.electronicchurch.org/

Neuhaus, R. J. (1986). *The Naked Public Square* (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

New York Fund Help. (1951, 5/23/1951). *The New York Times,* p. 9.

New York State Catholic Conference. (2004). Retrieved March 12, 2007, from http://www.nyscatholic.org/pages/home/home.asp

The New York Times. (1862, 12/9/1862). *The New York Times,* p. 2.

The New York Times. (1863, 3/27/1863). *The New York Times,* p. 4.

The New York Times. (1896, 12/29/1896). *The New York Times,* p. 2.

The New York Times. (1897, 10/13/1897). *The New York Times,* p. 12.

New York Times: Bishop Assails Strong. (1916, 3/13/1916). *New York Times,* p. 5.

New York Times: Catholics Demand That Inquiry Stop. (1916). *New York Times,* p. 9.

New York Times: New Strong Attack By Father Farrell. (1916). *New York Times,* p. 5.

New York Times: Subpoena Served on Father Farrell. (1916, 3/11/1916). *The New York Times,* p. 6.

New York Times: Whitman Orders Charities Inquiry. (1915, 11/19/1915). *The New York Times,* p. 18.

New York Times: Whitman Outlines Charities Inquiry. (1915, 11/20/1915). *The New York Times,* p. 7.

NYSPCC. (2000). 125th Anniversary: The New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children [Electronic Version], 1-24. Retrieved May 24, 2007 from http://www.nyspcc.org/beta_history/index_history.htm.

O'Grady, J. (1930). *Catholic Charities in the US: History and Problems* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Charities.

Oates, M. J. (1978). Organized Voluntarism: The Catholic Sisters in Massachusetts, 1870 - 1940. *American Quarterly, 30*(5: Special Issue: Women and Religion), 652-680.

Odem, M. E. (1995). *Delinquent Daughters: Protecting and Policing Adolescent Female Sexuality in the US, 1885-1920* (first ed.). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Pagliarini, M. A. (1999). The Pure American Woman and the Wicked Catholic Priest: A analysis of anti-Catholic literature in antebellum America. *Religion and American Culture, 9*(1), 97-128.

Pearson, S. (2006). "The Arm of the Law": Protecting Animals and Children in Gilded Age America [Electronic Version], 1-51. Retrieved May 26, 2007 from http://www.abf-sociolegal.org/armofthelawseminar.pdf.

Pelletier, M. d. S. E. S. (1888). *Conferences and instructions of Rev. Mother Mary of St. Euphrasia : foundress of the generalate of the Congregation of*

Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd of Angers. West Chester, NY: New York Catholic Protectory.

Pelletier, M. d. S. E. S. (1897). *Practical Rules for the Use of the Religious of the Good Shepherd for The Direction of the Classes by Sainte Marie de Sainte Euphrasia Pelletier*

(2nd ed.). St. Paul, MN: Provincial Convent Press.

Pickett, R. S. (1969). *House of Refuge: Origins of Juvenile Reform in New York State 1815-1857* (1st ed.). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Pisciotta, A. W. (1985). Treatment on Trial: The Rhetoric and Reality of the New York House of Refuge, 1857-1935. *The American Journal of Legal History, 29*(2), 151-181.

Quinonez, L. A., and Turner, Mary Daniel. (1992). *The Transformation of American Catholic Sisters* (1st ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Reeves, M. (1929). *Training Schools for Delinquent Girls* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Reichley, A. J. (2001). Faith in Politics. *Journal of Policy History, 13*(1), 157-180.

Rich, M. E. (1956). *A Belief in People: A History of Family Social Work* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Family Service Association of America.

Richmond, J. F. (1872). *New York and Its Institutions: 1609 - 1872*. New York, NY: E. B. Treat.

Richmond, M. E. (1917). *Social Diagnosis* (1st ed.). New York City: Russell Sage Foundation.

Rogers, C. G. (1998). Overlooked narrators: what women religious can contribute to feminist oral history. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies, 19*(3), 13.

Rosenberg, C. S. (1971). *Religion and the Rise of the American City: The New York City Mission Movement 1812-1870* (1st ed.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Schneider, M. L. (1988). American Sisters and the roots of change. *U.S. Catholic Historian, 7*(Winter), 55-72.

Schultz, N. L. (2000). *Fire and Roses: The Burning of the Charlestown Convent, 1834*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Services, E. S. (2006, 2006). About Us - Mission and History. Retrieved February 8, 2006, from http://www.essnyc.org/mission.html

Shepherd, S. o. t. G. (1953). Mount Florence School: St. Germaine's Home (pp. 8). Peekskill, NY: unpublished pamphlet.

Shepherd, S. o. t. G. (2007). Sisters of the Good Shepherd Vocations in North America. Retrieved 4/24/2007, 2007, from http://www.goodshepherdsisters.org

Specht, H. a. C., Mark E. (1994). *Unfaithful Angels: How Social Work Has Abandoned Its Mission* (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.

St. Teresita RGS, S. M. o. (1938). *The Social Work of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd* (1st ed.). Cleveland, Ohio: Cadillac Press.

Stewart, G. C. (1994). *Marvels of Charity: History of American Sisters and Nuns 1727-1990* (1st ed.). Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing.

Sutton, J. R. (1990). Bureaucrats and Entrepreneurs: Institutional Responses to Deviant Children in the United States, 1890 - 1920s. *The American Journal of Sociology, 95*(6), 1367-1400.

Tentler, L. W. (1993). On the Margins: The State of American Catholic History. *American Quarterly, 45*(1), 23.

Trattner, W. I. (1965). Homer Folks, the "Boodle Board" and Section 647. *The Journal of American History, 52*(1), 89-100.

USCCB. (1998). Pastoral Work Growing among Nun's orders: largest number of sisters still in education [Electronic Version], 2. Retrieved 4/27/2007 from www.usccb.org/comm/archives/1999/99-001.shtml.

Vandermeer, P. R. (1981). Religion, Society, and Politics: A Classification of American Religious Groups. *Social Science History, 5*(1), 3-24.

Victoria, S. M. (1962). Religious of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd. Unpublished article for submission to Catholic Youth Encyclopedia. Provincial Convent of the Good Shepherd.

Wallace, R. W. (1923). The New York State System and Its Problem of Reorganization. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 105*(Public Welfare in the United States), 113-118.

Weber, G. H. (1956). Clinical Approach to Selecting and Training Personnel for Institutions Serving Delinquents. *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 47*(1), 33-45.

Weber, M. (Ed.). (2003). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (3rd ed.). Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.

Woodham-Smith, C. (1962). *The Great Hunger: Ireland: 1845-1849*. New York: Penguin Books.

Zahn, G. C. (1957). The Content of Protestant Tensions: Fears of Catholic Aims and Methods. *The American Catholic Sociological Review, 18*(3), 205-212.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX i - THE SISTERS' WRITINGS

S. Kellogg manuscript -1936

The author's discussion used new ideas and up-to-date terminology, owing probably to her education at the Catholic University of America, School of Social Services. "Objective scientific study" replaced those of "fallen" or "ruined" women (p.1). In this study, "penitents" were "sex delinquents"; half were "promiscuous" (p.72).

The RGS judged religion of overriding importance in rehabilitating the delinquent young woman (p.15). They believed lack of religious training resulted in serious moral defects in the children. Instruction by priests, daily Mass, weekly confession, and celebration of religious feasts supplemented daily religious instruction (p.16). Fundamental to transforming their characters was intimate contact with religious practice. Children used prayer and devotional practices (stressing devotion to Mary) as coping mechanisms for alleviation of distress. They made Retreats twice yearly (p.17). The sisters placed great importance on membership in religious societies (p.18).

Four of the children studied were "Protestant" girls, including two "Negroes"; the rest were, at least nominally, Catholic. All were baptized, 46 confirmed. Eight came from "mixed" (based on religion) marriages. "No evidence was found that religion had any influence on any of their lives." (pp. 44-45)

S. Kellogg highlighted the modern and objective approach of the Practical Rules (p. 6), referring to the study of each individual child. She called it a training

school model, using manual work as the training. Further, the Practical Rules instilled a policy of growth and development for the nuns, thereby laying the groundwork for the nuns to use in progressive correctional education (p.8).

Correctional Education Programs (as the training program was now called)[14] consisted of physical education, academic and vocational education, personality adjustment and sharing group life; “but above all, religion” (p.10).

Academic elements included IQ and placement testing done for suitable academic placement. Children attended school 5 hours daily, five days a week, through the ninth grade. After that, on-site commercial and trades courses were available, including cosmetology. Schooling also included field trips to various sites (p13).

The author’s data analysis showed only one subject that completed the eighth grade. Thirty-seven young women stopped attending school at ages 14 -15. Further analysis showed many pupils overage for their grades. The author decided their difficulties in school had contributed to truancy, maladjustment, and delinquency. This study predated on-site public special “600”schools. Perhaps it contributed to the sisters’ willingness to bring them within the institution.

S. Kellogg concluded that half of the children had only a slight chance of “successful adjustment”. She described the subjects as largely “dull” or “borderline” mentality, with a “fair number of feebleminded.”[15] Only seven subjects had normal intelligence. She categorized thirteen of them as “feebleminded”, because of their low IQ scores. Of those remaining, she describes eight as “neurotic” and fifteen of “peculiar personality” (p.60). She did

not include definitions of these terms, possibly thinking they might be superfluous.

S. Kellogg recommended that the school should have an "understanding" with referring courts that they not commit "feebleminded" and "neurotic" children to the Good Shepherd training school. She found the young women in her study "exceedingly" limited in mental endowment, educational attainment, and occupational status, stressing their IQ status many times. She argued that the school "is not equipped" to handle them and they "are a detriment" to the other children (p.60). For the first time in the texts, one finds recognition that training schools were not the only answer to the problems of sexually delinquent girls. In addition, the author intimated that their religious program had no effect on these young women. Rather, those of normal intelligence and without personality disorders stood to benefit most from their program.

By 1936, the year of S. Kellogg's thesis, child labor laws and progressive ideas about children and their needs and abilities had found their application in schools and reformatories. In the Good Shepherd training schools, work lasted no more than 5 hours a day. S. Kellogg described work as ***therapeutic***. Employment provided needed vocational training, discipline, and order. Finally, work served as a source of income to the institution, which the writer reported lacked enough funding (p.14).

Of the 42 cases listing occupation, all were in unskilled low paying jobs. Eighteen were in domestic service, the rest in factory and restaurant work. The author states the low (entry) level of work is because of the minimal education

achieved by these students, of whom many had left school at ages 13 and up to work. When any income was welcome in these homes, because of the depression, the GSS promoted high school education and vocational training to heighten the youngsters' income potential. They also saw it as a way to keep them out of trouble. None had any vocational training before admission to the institution (pp. 45-46).

For the study, all the students received the same number of work assignments. S. Kellogg divided the study subjects into two "broad classes" (pp.55-56). Thirty four young women who responded to treatment comprised group I, while thirty young women who did not or could not adjust comprised group II. Group I seemed as if they "may adjust successfully in the community", but group two had a "poor prognosis" (p.55). In group I (which the author calls the "good" group), the researcher rated thirty-one of thirty-four subjects "fair" to "excellent". In group II, she rated sixteen of thirty subjects "poor to nonworking". Only nine measured "good", four "fair", and none excellent.

S. Kellogg described six of Group II as markedly emotionally unstable; four as apathetic and indifferent; and eleven more as habitually disobedient, quarrelsome, sulky, disagreeable, defiant, disrespectful, and unpopular with the girls (p.59)

S. Kellogg analyzed 64 subjects, aged 14 -20 years (p.38), discharged from Peekskill in 1934, collecting data from the case records in 1935. She cited growing recognition for courts to provide comprehensive case histories for adequate diagnosis (p. 4). The agencies besides the courts that referred children

to the institution included the NYC Diocesan Bureau of Social Service, the NYS Department of Public Welfare, and the NYC Humane Society. Some children entered upon private application from family members (p.10). The courts referred most of the cases in this study (p.10), characterizing all as “sex delinquents”, and fully half (33) as “promiscuous” (p.72). Because of these court referrals, the RGS cooperated with Probation officers of several jurisdictions and valued their relationships with them (p4).

Kellogg referred to “Practical Rules” as objective and modern in its approach (p. 6), especially that of careful and prolonged study of each individual child in every setting in the institution[16]. She described the Institute as congregate, not cottage, level of care (p.9). The children received a physical examination (including Wasserman) upon admission, and continued to receive a variety of health services, including medical and dental care, during their stay. The institute contained medical and dental clinics, a kitchen staffed with a nutritionist, and an infirmary. The sisters emphasized good nutrition, gymnastics, health education, and many indoor and outdoor recreation activities (p.11). Recreation included extensive indoor and outdoor play activities, by means of playgrounds, pets, and inter-group competitions. Outside organizations provided books for the library, moving pictures, concerts, and recitals.

S. Kellogg theorized that causation factors in juvenile delinquency were interrelated with the youngster’s family and environment (pp.1, 2). In her opinion, their families had the greatest influence on the child’s character formation (p.20). She complained that the case records contained insufficient information about

the families and environmental stressors (p.20). S. Kellogg tabulated available statistical data on the families, including geographic location, occupation, economic status, size, number of parents, and functioning. Variables used to determine level of functioning included level of moral standards, discord, and poverty. On the girls, statistical data included physical condition, mental condition (particularly IQ's), level of education, religion, occupation, prior institutional home experience, and delinquencies[17]

The data[18] on paternity found that native born girls of foreign (largely Polish and Italian [p.71]) parentage comprised the largest proportion of these girls (p.21). More girls came from urban, rather than rural, areas. Forty-three percent came from families of six or more children (p.23). S. Kellogg noted that poverty and other factors, not the size of the family itself, contributed to "tensions" in the family setting.19 Finally, she concluded that "broken homes"[20], although not a "cause" of delinquency, correlated with low socioeconomic status, family discord or low moral standards (p.27). Half the girls arrived from "broken homes".

She classified the families into three economic groups: (p.28)

1. Very poor – unable to live without assistance from outside sources
2. Poor – subsisting on father's meager or sporadic wages or mother is the wage earner for family
3. Comfortable – father employed with good wages

Two-thirds of the families met the criteria for “poor” (subsistence) or “very poor” (dependant). S. Kellogg observed that those homes were “filthy” (p.71), though the “comfortable” homes were “attractive and comfortably furnished (p.28)[21]

The researcher categorized occupational status as unskilled, skilled, no employment (p.29). The majority of the fathers were unskilled. The author concluded that a relationship existed between families’ economic status, size, and occupations. She termed the conditions a “handicap” to the subject girls (p.30).[22]

Consistent with categories established in “Five Hundred Delinquent Women” (Glueck, 1934), the researcher classified families into four groups: good, fair, poor, or bad. Incest, alcoholism, child abuse, homicide, assault, typified the “bad” homes, while filth, overcrowding, and infectious disease (but not immorality), characterized the ‘poor” homes. “Absence of wholesome ideals, but no delinquency”, typified “fair” homes. Because the “good” home evidenced “thrift, temperance, wholesome ideals, conventional sexual morality, and no delinquency among household members”, she concluded the problem lay in some defect in the child (pp.32 -34).[23] She cited the 1909 White House conference, “the central problem is the child” (p.36)[24] and “The Individual Delinquent” (Healy, 1918) that “delinquency is a personal reaction to a given environment”, to support this position.

The researcher asserted that the girls mental and physical “equipment, interests and attitudes, delinquent responses, education and experience must be “ascertained” (p.37). The data revealed more than half the girls enjoyed “good”

physical health, fourteen (22%) had syphilis or gonorrhea, eighteen (28%) were pregnant, and nine had head or body lice (p.39). Although their IQ scores averaged 73.6%, only seven girls (11%) met the criteria for “normal” IQ. Comparing these scores with IQ’s in other similar institutions, S. Kellogg concluded that all have a considerable number of “feeble-minded”, “borderline”, or “dull” girls (pp. 39-41). Only three girls spent time in prior institutions (p.47).

All girls in the study were “sex delinquents” (p.47). Their sexual experience “was more or less extensive”. The charges included being “promiscuous”, involvement with a “colored man”, incestuous relationships, unwed motherhood (two for the second time, [p. 71]), and involvement with a married man. None of them engaged in prostitution, that is, earned a living by trading sex for money or goods. (pp.47 – 53).[25] Their average age was 16.7, the median, 17 (p.38). Other charges included running away from home, stealing, truancy, drinking, vagrancy, and attempted suicide.

At the beginning of the study, the author concluded that half the girls had only a “slight chance of successful adjustment”. She divided the subjects into two groups. Group I included thirty-four girls who responded to treatment and Group II contained thirty girls who did not or could not adjust. The researcher defined the dependent variables as successful or unsuccessful adjustment, hypothesizing the better outcome with Group I.

In her analysis of the first group, S. Kellogg acknowledged eleven girls measured “feebleminded” on IQ tests but argued that their “cooperative spirit” made it possible for them to “do satisfactory work”[26]. She discussed two

successful cases discharged to “parole” after completing similar treatments. One failed, the other succeeded. The researcher admitted she could not predict who would successfully “adjust” after completing the program. It appeared, from the story of the failure, that perhaps some needed a very highly structured environment outside the institution (pp. 61-63).[27] S. Kellogg felt the RGS institution should undertake a “more scientific” study of individual girls, especially through psychiatric service. “Apparently psychiatric treatment would have benefited many of these children” (p.61).[28]

The average length of stay for children referred to the training school is two years. Of the sixty-four girls studied, 36 (56%) stayed less than two years. The remainder stayed from two to four years. Parents sometimes created problems when they inappropriately sought the early discharge of their children. Both the school and the parole agency decided on discharge criteria. The girls must demonstrate “progress in training and success of adjustment”. Other criteria included good health,29 appropriate home conditions, and employment. If the home conditions were bad, the RGS located housing for the girl. The parole officers found jobs for them (p. 65).

Thirty girls (47%) successfully completed the program. Twenty-two (34%) others were discharged because they “achieved their majority”- once they turned twenty-one, they were free to leave. Seven (11%) had to be transferred to a higher level of care. The remaining five (8%) were either discharged to their parents or discharged by court order.

As for the girls' adjustment, S. Kellogg devised five categories to describe the outcomes. "Doing well," meant no further delinquency, regular church attendance, and "normal lives." "Not doing well," meant a return to delinquency. "Return to RGS", "not applicable", and "unknown" comprised the rest. Of the twenty three girls "doing well", eighteen came from Group I. Of the ten "not doing well", four came from Group I. Five returned to RGS, of which only one came from Group I. The seven transfers comprised the "not applicable" category. Nineteen girls could not be found, making them "unknown", of which eleven came from Group I. Therefore, in Group I, 28% did well after discharge, while Group II showed only 8% doing well (p.67). This supported S. Kellogg's hypothesis.

S. Kellogg recommended the development of a more intensive and constructive "follow up system", particularly expanding parole into more thorough follow-up to extend the influence of treatment. She advocated that the institution employ more scientific methods of individual treatment. She favored as well discharging girls before age twenty-one to give them time to use the institution's help in adjusting to life outside (p.66).

S. Guggenheim - 1947

In a paper presented at the 1947 National Conference of Catholic Charities, S. Guggenheim stressed that RGS work is "primarily" a work of the salvation of souls, not "merely" social rehabilitation (Guggenheim RGS, 1948). For S. Guggenheim to have stress this fact shows how removed from the idea of "moral rehabilitation" her audience had come. The admission criteria were different from

that of 1936. They excluded those below dull normal level intelligence; those needing ***<u>intensive psychotherapy and treatment</u>***, or suicidal, pyromaniac, or homosexual young women (p.3). School had also expanded to include a complete academic high school program, with Regents and with business training. The vocational division had classes through 10th grade (p.4).

Staff adept at working with "that type of girl" then matched the needs of the students with a particular "employment" (vocational training). Initially, they received training in "character development", including housework and performing the activities of daily living. These are then expanded to include courses in cooking, canning, frozen foods, menu planning, sewing, mending, art, and crafts (pp.4-5). The sisters and their students made use of the most modern technology available. <u>The training prepared the young women for self-sufficiency after discharge</u>. They took "intensive" courses in office practice, power machine operation, and advanced specialized domestic science (p.5).

A dozen years, a Great Depression, and a WWII later, age, psychiatric, IQ, and religion criteria have shifted somewhat. RGS accepted Catholic "delinquent girls" between ages twelve to sixteen, regardless of race or color, as well as "neglected" children of the same ages in need of their programs. The institute contained 190 beds (p.3)

Public and private agencies in NYC and surrounding counties made most of the referrals (p.3)[30] The institute required a complete intake study from the referring agency (p.3). The admission criteria, quite differently than in the previous decades, excluded those below dull normal level intelligence; those

requiring intensive psychotherapy and treatment, or suicidal, pyromaniac, or homosexual girls (p.3).

Upon admission, the child was placed into the Reception Unit, usually for about one month, so that she might become acclimated to the environment and for the staff to observe and study her. Staff analyzed the child's nutritional needs, academic placement, personality and individual problems, and then made plans to "suit" them. When the child indicated readiness to accept the change, they were moved to the "Class" (p.4)[31].

S. Andersen - 1948

S. Andersen lamented a gap in the literature in her manuscript, writing that the RGS needed a developmental study of the Sisters beginning in 1857 until 1928.

A layperson wrote a book about the first fifty years of the RGS in NYC in 1910 (Conway, 1910). However, the major focus rested on the lives of the sisters and institution building, not on the adaptations of the sisters and the programs to a changing world.

By 1948, some more changes were in the making. A Good Shepherd Sister, now known by the young women as "Mother" and titled the "Group Mother" (Andersen RGS, 1949, p. p. 100) and her aide, another religious, supervised one each of five groups of young women. They had charge of their activities, material needs, and chief, but not final, role in intake and discharge of the young women and girls in her care. Terminology had changed (pp. 43-44): "First Mistress" was now "Group Mother" and "Second Mistress" is now "Second

Group Mother”. The Andersen text mentioned a “slight modification of the Cloister” because of “modern needs” by “later Generals of the Order (after MME)” (Andersen RGS, 1949, p. p. 46). In 1948, the Sisters voted to do away with the rank of “Touriere” sisters (Boardman, 1955, p. p. 257). Touriere sisters were those who interacted with the world outside the cloister. Separate Touriere sisters (black-robed) and choir sisters (white robed) no longer existed. Both groups of sisters became one (Boardman, 1955, p. p.257). Sometime before that, the use of the lattice grille, a visible symbol separating the sisters from the community, ended in the United States. Some convents saved it only for its value as a work of art (Boardman, 1955, p. p. 257).

Religion and spirituality began to blend in psychological language. References to “immortal souls to be saved” mingled with terminology such as “antisocial character” and “maladjusted personality” (p.54). This is the first text to introduce the word “psychology”, although the concept is clear in the Book of the Classes.

MME’s Practical Rules and the Conferences and Instructions continued to form the basis of Novitiate training (Andersen RGS, 1949, p. p. 47). In the former Provincial House in NYC, the sisters and children had separate chapels (Conway, 1910). Now, the RGS and the children used the same chapel (p.65) because of construction cost overruns (p.80). Beautifully designed with separate seating for the Sisters and the young women, they contained oak pews, statues, side chapels, and paintings (p.65). The Superior chose the statues in particular,

for “their psychological effect on the weary and heavily burdened hearts who would gaze on them from time to time” (p.66).

Mass was scheduled two to three mornings during the week, plus Sunday. This was a change from daily Mass of the 1930’s. However, the principal method to reform the young women remained the same. “A lack of religious training…is one of the principal drawbacks in successful rehabilitation” (p.99). Besides, the goal is clear: “(it is the) earnest endeavor of the entire personnel….to prepare the girl, physically and spiritually….to take her place again in …society” (p.109).Membership in Blessed Virgin Sodality was valued. The Sodality classified levels of membership based on merit. Membership was voted on by the girls as well as the Sisters. . This became a support group for the girls, as well as a source of socialization (Guggenheim RGS, 1948).

Although the young women attended Mass “only” three or four mornings a week, they “…come into a religious atmosphere where the Grace of God…flows freely…” (p.122). The chaplain, Group Mothers, and specially trained Sisters instructed the children in catechism. The young women, “deprived of their religious heritage” were “starving” for this “spiritual food” (p.100). The Chaplain conducted weekly confessions and confessions by appointment. A Jesuit priest visited monthly for “two days of recollection” (a mini retreat). Twice a year the young women went on a five-day retreat (p.100). Disciplinary training remained “mild and casual”; its goal was “character cultivation through the training, developing and strengthening of the will” (p.108).

Sisters kept the divisions of the young women into groups according to commitment: one group for minor offenses, the other for charges that were more serious. There were 40 in the first and 135 in the latter (p. 62, FN#1). As before, to preserve the confidentiality of each young woman, she received a new name, such as the name of a saint, or a virtue, or a religious mystery (p.119 & FN#1). "…with a new name they are to commence a new life….judged and esteemed only by their conduct in the house" (p.119 & FN#2). Their reason was the same: to keep serious offenders from unduly influencing the others. There was no discussion on the nature of the offenses.

The author strongly asserted that the "right relationship" with God was crucial to reformation (p51). Now the "complete program" needed physical, mental, social, moral, and religious components in an "inspirational" environment (p.51). Unlike their "work – play – pray" model, a holistic approach had gained importance, and as a result, more activities added, causing a decrease in the number and frequency of religious activities for the children. However, "….neither our latest literature nor current pedagogical theories, nor the tenets of modern social economy, are competent to aid a generation…(ignorant of) the fundamental truth…that in …Commandments and Beatitudes there is more of vital wisdom…and knowledge of man and his nature than in all the concepts of neo-paganism" (p.108). The author rejected the nonreligious current social sciences, believing this deficiency made them incompetent and incomplete.

The school workforce included ten secular and seven religious teachers, plus a school clerk for recordkeeping (p.44). The schedule ran for five hours a

day, five days a week. The principal was a Religious, but she was responsible to the New York City Board of Education. The NYC Board of Education appointed the school P.S. 617 in 1946, including it in the “600 School” [32] program for emotionally disturbed pupils. In these schools, public school teachers employed by New York City and specially trained to work with delinquents, taught the problem children. The writer comments that the teachers had to display an aptitude for this work and earned a higher salary.

Each girl received a screening for aptitude and preference about her desired course assignments during the year and given a week to change it (pp.88, 90). Young women not required to attend were nonetheless encouraged to finish their education there. Most did. They were all over 16 and by law not required to attend more than 2 hours daily, but 85% attended 5 hours every day anyway (p.89). Beauty culture students did their internships in the on-site salon thereby earning eligibility for the state licensing exam (p.89).

Each class lasted forty minutes. The girls rotated at the end of class. Instead of grade levels, teachers each headed a section. Those with a “language handicap” remained in one room for remedial work in reading, writing, arithmetic, English, and spelling with a specially trained teacher (p.91).

Expansion of educational and recreational programs did not signal a decline in RGS emphasis on religious training. “Psychiatrists would have us believe we are the product of our personality and behavior patterns… (They)...sought to emphasize the training of the intellect rather than that of the

will. Its fundamentals…are…erroneous, because they ignore the most powerful aids to character development – divine love and divine grace" (p.107).

That the Good Shepherd Sisters could not continue without public funding (p.48) was more than obvious to Sister Andersen when she wrote her thesis in 1948. The sisters had long ago dropped the increasingly impracticable ideal of self-sufficiency as more children entered the institution, overwhelming their scant resources.

In 1948, the New York City Department of Public Welfare paid monthly for the young women committed through the courts (P. 48). However, the federal government's expansion (Johnson, 1936) into social welfare during the Great Depression benefited the Good Shepherds programs. The federal government subsidized school lunches, while the United States Department of Agriculture supplied commodities (p.49).

Most of the referrals came from New York City. Surrounding counties had "comparatively few such commitments (p.48). The Greater New York Fund through the "mediation of Catholic Charities" contributed toward meeting the institution's annual deficits ("New York Fund Help," 1951). Catholic Charities played a major role in closing the monetary gaps in the institutional budget (p.48).

Catholic Charities also managed separate funds to the Good Shepherd Sisters for unmarried mothers, merit awards, and funds for young women to "tide them over in the first weeks" following their successful discharge from the

program (p.49). Miscellaneous donations to the Sisters and the institution supplemented their finances.

Statistical record keeping on education levels and IQ scores of incoming residents began in 1945. For 1945 – 1948, they showed:

a. 23% had 8th grade or less

b. 76% had some high school

c. ¼ % were college graduates

d. 10% had superior IQ scores, 85.5% average, 5% below average (IQ scores from 72- 94).

S. Andersen believed there was a correlation between education and delinquency, but admitted that some of the young women had low IQ's. She decided that IQ did not correlate with the girls' "evil tendencies" or their "weakened…ability to cope" (pp. 117-118)

The writer recommended that more RGS teach to lessen their reliance on public school teachers. She thought that the teachers viewed their work as a job, and were not dedicated to service like the Sisters (p.131).

The Sisters believed the work training chosen by the student was important to her "adjustment" and should be based on her needs, aptitudes, personality, and preferences (p.93). RGS trained in specialty work conducted classes in carding, spinning, dyeing wool, knitting, crocheting, weaving, sewing (including commercial sewing), laundry, cooking, housekeeping, and domestic arts. "Restless", "emotionally disturbed girls", or those "less robust" gardened and

worked outdoors. S. Andersen described the laundry room as “large, light airy, and for domestic use only” (p. 66); while “men employed at the institution” ran the commercial laundry. The sewing room: “pleasant, cheerful….equipped with fluorescent lighting and the latest model….electric sewing machines (p.66). The young women used these machines for vocational training (p. 66).

Vocational training also included “beauty culture”, typing and clerical skills, home economics, handicrafts (Pps.76, 91-94) Beauty culture was an addition to the vocational training program. It contained a fully equipped salon on the premises. The beauty salon allowed the students to finish their training internship, making them eligible to take the state cosmetology boards for licensure.

S. Andersen asserted the benefits of institutional placement over foster care for treating this population.[33] This setting included the “complete program” needed to rehabilitate the young women. This rehabilitation took place on several levels: physically, mentally, socially, morally, and religiously, within an “inspirational” environment (p.51)[34].

Good Shepherd Sisters studied the young woman unobtrusively, to understand her completely. During weekly conferences, the staff examined and analyzed her conscious and subconscious “preferences.” There was an initial interview, after which they placed the child in some work. Another type of learning followed each success, suited to the youngster’s ability (p.83. and FN#2 P. 82).[35]

Sisters used their own observations to evaluate the mental capacities of the young women, even though they knew the IQ of each. They believed that the residents' emotional capacity was usually of greater importance (p.83). Good Shepherd Sisters looked for mental disease and abnormality (p.84).

Good Shepherd Sisters simultaneously looked for causes of the young women's behavior and conducted treatment in large group settings, rather than individual sessions. They correlated group sizes to "Sister's ability" although the premise was that large groups worked better than small (p.84).[36]

Good Shepherd Sisters diagnosed the character of the young woman using observations of her in every activity of her daily life (p.84). The author cautioned that Sisters not familiar with "technical terms of the newest of sciences, Sociology" can use her same methods with same success as before (p.85)[37]

The sisters used three principal methods for helping the young women (P.85):

1. Eradication of objective, causative factors
2. Transference or substitution for destructive, ineradicable causes
3. Sublimation: a process of education of the young women's instincts, preferences, and tendencies according to accepted standards

They imposed a daily schedule (p.86). The young women attended Mass two to three mornings a week plus Sunday. They had school five hours a day, five days weekly, followed by vocational classes. They ate supper at 5:30 p.m., followed by night prayers. Supervised recreation came next, until lights out at

nine p.m. In the airy dorms, the young women got seven to eight hours of sleep nightly (p.102). The purpose of recreation was to “relax” the youngsters (possibly meaning to reduce tension and frustration) (p.94). Sisters allowed talking always. They allowed smoking, but the sisters handed out the cigarettes because smoking was both a privilege and a reward (p.94) and confined to dining area.

Sisters had little tolerance for idleness. They preferred recreation consist of activities rather than “relaxation.” The residents engaged in: roller skating, bicycling, ball games, summer camps, archery, plus all winter and summer sports available (pp. 95, 96). They had Drama and Glee clubs (both groups belonged conjointly to these) and dance classes (with a secular dance teacher) twice monthly. They watched movies once a week, plus holidays and special feast days, making it nearly four times weekly.

The disciplinary program adhered to SME’s admonition (pp.97-99): “Never use harsh measures…the great point is not to punish but to foresee faults and prevent them by surveillance…punishment should only be used as a last resort” Sisters were instructed to watch the residents “exactly” at all times and in all places (p.97). “The goal is not subjection, but formation of (permanent) habits, ideals, and moral principles….” (p.98).[38] Discipline was mild and lenient: loss of privileges, such as smoking, while the consequence of extreme insubordination was time in a quiet room. Sisters did not exercise corporal punishment, or punitive deprivation of meals (p.98). The stated goal of disciplinary training was “character cultivation through the training, developing and strengthening of the will” (p.108).

Health care was a high priority. A physician, scheduled for weekly visits, did a complete physical, including Wasserman, for each young woman at admission (p.101). A registered nurse assisted the doctor and oversaw compliance with the doctor's orders. A dentist came weekly, the dental hygienist monthly. A sister trained in nutrition developed individualized meal plans and ensured compliance with Health department regulations and food preparation standards (p.102).

One psychiatrist and two psychologists (supplied by Catholic Charities Child Guidance Clinic) visited monthly, even though nearly forty percent of the young women needed "intensive psychotherapy" much more often. Aggravating the need for services was both inadequate funds and a dearth of Catholic psychiatrists willing to provide services to these young women (p.103)[39].

Each youngster had a chance at parole at the end of the first year (p.103). A caseworker, in collaboration with the Sisters, wrote reports every three months for the judge and parole officer (p.103). Pre-parole conferences included the parole officers, caseworker, and sisters (p.104). A parole officer interviewed candidates for parole, that is, "girls who have consistently shown a pattern of fairly good behavior" (p.104). The parole officer then investigated the youngster's home (p.104). The superintendent and Group Mother decided, if the parole officer made a favorable report, to release the adolescent to her home. If the report was unfavorable, she went to live at St. Helena's Residence, a Good Shepherd Sisters-run boarding home on 17th St. in New York City[40]. The young women paid room and board there (p.104). One of the roles of the parole officer

was to find employment for the young women after discharge (p.104). Catholic Charities made aftercare plans for adolescents in New York City and Brooklyn (p.104)

Parole violators returned to Peekskill for a minimum of six months, usually with better results (p.105). S. Andersen's research showed that eighty-five percent were successful on their first parole, a period lasting two years (p.105).

S. Hart- 1959

The 1959 manuscript is a manual for caseworkers. Unlike the manuscripts examined before it, there is no history of the Order, biography of MME, or detailed description of the religious life of the young women (now called adolescents) in their care. This writer focused on religion as it applied to the caseworker at a Home of the Good Shepherd.

The focus on salvation was reiterated: "the total program…is used as means to an end, that is, the salvation of the soul of the girl who is sent to this Home of the Good Shepherd" (p.31). Religious instruction was part of the curriculum in the school program. The Group Mother and the chaplain provided for the spiritual growth of the child. For example, teaching the young women "the purpose of their creation" and how to "obtain their eternal reward" (p.31).

The manual addressed the "philosophy of the Order applied to the Caseworker". Philosophy is "the system which a person follows for the conduct of life" (p.34). The goal of the Order is "the sanctification of its members by the exact observance of their holy vows… (which are) distinguished from other orders by the vow of zeal for the salvation of the girl or woman sent to the Home

of the Good Shepherd…the object of their vocation" (p.34). Taking the vow is a sign of the strength of their love for the salvation of souls.

S. Hart quoted (p.34) from "saintly Mother Foundress" MME "….strive to bring them back to God; this is your vocation….A religious of our congregation can be esteemed but in proportion to her charity to our dear penitents and the fidelity with which she devotes herself to their salvation." (Conferences and Instructions of St. Mary Euphrasia Pelletier, p. 25). She expounds further that the Institute was "founded only through the love of souls" (p.34). RGS vocations follow the pattern of Christ, the Good Shepherd, seeking His help to do the work of "seeking the erring one that is lost." RGS use love itself to try to form Christian women to consciousness "of the purpose of their creation and direct their lives toward their Final End." The love of RGS is not enough because saving souls needs more love than humans have. MME considered the RGS as channels through which the Grace of God flows; they are instruments God uses to bring souls to Him (p.35).

In the first reference to the existence of lay caseworkers, S. Hart warns, "The caseworker at St. Germaine's, <u>BE SHE RELIGIOUS OR LAY,</u> (researcher's emphasis) must be attentive to this goal." Helping the young woman function more adequately, socially, and emotionally, disposed her to be better able to save her soul (p.35). Some of the means for the salvation of souls may be secular, but the spiritual goal is still primary.

The NYC Board of Education appointed the special school at St. Germaine's Home as P.S. 619. Girls continued academic, vocational, or semi-

academic courses. Children progressed at their own rate in classes of twelve or fewer. Course offerings included academics, home economics, typing, beauty culture, and industrial sewing (p.28). Junior high (middle school) students attended P.S. 619 at St. Germaine's Home. Senior High School students attended Peekskill High (p.29) S. Hart did not explain the change to outside school attendance for the older pupils.

The RGS tightened the admission criteria. They cutoff IQ levels at 75 or above, although sometimes considered IQ's of 70-75. The students had to display their ability to take part in junior high school and have a minimum 3rd grade education (p.43).

S. Hart placed greater emphasis on the therapeutic purpose of the vocational program, which now took place after school. Students underwent careful screening and placement with an appropriate group and sister consistent with their particular needs at this stage. The goal has changed from the self-sufficiency goals of 1948: for the older ones, the goal is working with others cooperatively. The goals for younger ones are completion of definitive tasks under individualized guidance (p.29). A photograph of students in a ceramics class is shown here.

Employment goals have also changed. S. Hart presented the regulations in Bureau of Child Welfare Inter-Agency Manual Section 33 for children employed while in placement.

1. Caseworker responsible for conformance with child labor laws (p.74)

2. Should also help child to budget, save, and meet expenses with earnings, in preparation for doing so after discharge.

3. Weekly earnings over $10 must be reported to Child Welfare. Half of anything earned over $10 should go to the cost of her care. (p.74)

This is different from the days when everyone worked for the survival of the institution.

The RGS based their admission decisions on both clinical and individual grounds, as well as consideration of treatment objectives and space availability (p.42). The Intake Committee[41] studied each referral. The following professionals made up the Intake Committee:

1. Chaplain
2. Superintendent
3. Intake Secretary
4. Supervisor of Group Life
5. Casework Supervisor
6. Program Director
7. Supervising Psychologist
8. School Principal[42]
9. By consult: attending MD and psychiatrist (p.42)

Criteria for admission comprised:

- Girls 12 – 16, baptized Catholics (per Social welfare laws and child welfare policy of NYS) displaying delinquent

behavior, with a primary diagnosis of emotional disturbance, and in need of treatment and the protective services of a semi-controlled and partially structured environment.[43]

- Girls judged delinquent or neglected from Children's Court and committed as neglected by the NYS Department of Welfare; direct transfers from other institutions; or private voluntary cases if referred through Catholic Charities (p.43)[44]
- Catchments included: all of NYC, Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester, Putnam, Dutchess, Orange, Rockland, Sullivan, and Ulster counties (p.43)[45]
- The child should be able to take part in junior high school have a minimum of a 3rd grade education, and have a 75 IQ or above, although 70-75 would be considered (p.43)
- Disabilities: minor orthopedic, minor visual and auditory handicaps, convulsive and other physical disorders controlled by medication, noncommunicable diseases, or arrested communicable diseases responding to treatment. (p.43) [46]
- Girls with behavior disorders, personality problems, "acting-out" disorders, neurotics, and girls with a slender hold on reality (p.44)[47]

The following list of exclusions further clarified the both admission criteria and the kinds of issues beyond the scope of care provided at the institute:

- No admissions allowed for temporary care or temporary shelter. The average stay increased to 20 months. (p.44)[48]
- No girls admitted from upper NYS dioceses unless clinically indicated (p.44)
- Children with severe orthopedic handicaps, seizures not responding to meds, diabetics needing special diets, or who were pregnant were not allowed[49] (p.44)
- The committee turned down psychotics or those needing a very structured environment; "actively aggressive homosexuals[50]"; organically brain damaged; "acting out" with suicidal or homicidal involvements; excessively violent or excessively destructive girls.

Referral sources were required to provide:

- reasons for the referral
- a social history of girl and family
- her school history
- the child's health history with current medical findings
- psychiatric history, including diagnosis and recommendations for treatment
- psychological study including IQ, present functioning, personality evaluations, and educational achievement grade (p.45)

The Intake Committee had the final decision about admission. They could defer, request more information, or deny admission, by a ‘clear majority vote.’ Parents or legal guardians were required to give consents for medical and dental care before admission. If the intake committee accepted the child, the referring agency got the date and time of admission. Parents could escort their children to admission (p.45). A bulletin board displayed the names of the accepted girls, their assigned caseworkers, and their scheduled date of arrival.

On admission, girls met with the admitting secretary to fill out forms. The Supervisor of Group Life and Supervisor of Casework were notified of their arrival (p.46). They introduced the girl to her caseworker and Group Mother and placed her in the reception group. The Group Mother, nurse, and admitting secretary completed the admission forms (p.46).

Work with the caseworker and the new prospect began the first day and continued with daily “interviews’ to speed the young woman’s adjustment. The caseworker contacted the family and scheduled monthly interviews to engage them actively in the treatment process and help them to take responsibility for helping their own child (pp.48, 51).[51] S. Hart included other instructions for filling out forms and filing them with the proper agencies.

The Thirty Day Study (p.49) awaited final approval. Its purpose was to “ensure a complete diagnostic workup in each child by all services within this period.” The intake committee reconvened on the thirtieth day to evaluate the findings. They made the final decision to allow the young woman to remain, defined the treatment goals more precisely, and, following more discussion and

“clearing”, assigned the responsibilities of each team member. The courts allowed sixty days for an agency to refuse a referral; however, meeting after 30 days gave the RGS extra time to resolve doubts about a particular child. The institute wanted the staff’s unanimous agreement on diagnosis and goals, treatment, and discharge planning as this resulted in greater success working with the juveniles.[52]

S. Hart portrayed a concrete example of the “Child-Centered Service” provided by the institution (p.50). She drew a female head in the center of a page surrounded by ten text boxes with arrows pointing from each box to the girl. Each box represented a service: psychiatric, psychological, group life, vocational, recreational, religious, medical, educational, group work, and casework.
The boxes did not touch one another, perhaps suggesting boundaries (or turf). Their direction, representing action, went toward the girl only. It is probable that S. Hart considered the program “child centered” because the services focused on changing the child.

S. Hart stressed good relations between the caseworker and staff, especially the Group Mother. She advised caseworkers to exercise care in casework with the child and her parents.

Caseworkers were often available to child during the early admission period. Once the child adjusted, she made appointments to see the caseworker[53] (p.54). Frequency of appointments depended on the child’s needs and the role of the caseworker on team. Caseworkers helped the child express her feelings and understand the reasons for her placement, while being encouraging. They

assured the child, and helped her see the advantages of her placement and the opportunity she had to live a normal life in the future. Caseworkers oriented the children and explained the phases of program to them[54] (p.55)

Caseworkers developed diagnostic impressions after several interviews with the child and the parents (p.55). They were required to make some diagnostic evaluation of parents as soon as possible[55] (p.57). They believed that diagnostic evaluations done after placement were more valid than those before[56]. The focus of diagnosis included: the child, her parents, the parent-child relationship, and other relevant areas (p.57)

Should the staff decide not to take the child, they had to do so early, well before the time limit of 60 days. These decisions seldom occurred.
The first staff meeting met to set the goals for the child using procedures that included the entire staff. The caseworker presented the diagnostic impressions and the staff chose the discipline to work with the young woman (p.58). If the caseworker was the appointed therapist, she taught the young woman to handle crises, manage her negative feelings, and grasp their significance. She also managed the child's resistance, such as superficiality and griping, and helped her develop suitable coping skills (P.59). The child began to achieve her goals when she learned to trust the staff, and then to believe in herself the way the staff believed in her (p.60).

Caseworkers figured out the connections between the child and her parent(s), and helped the child increase her understanding of them. The caseworker facilitated change in the parents, and told the child if this did not

happen. The child chose between living with her parents after completing St. Germaine's Home or making other plans for housing[57] (p.61).

S. Hart classified the young women into three categories:

1. "Ego disturbances" – those who felt helpless, worthless, and inadequate; had little self-concept, and needed to feel acceptance[58]. Treatment for these juveniles included:

- Short-term goals, with generous recognition for effort;
- Increase her social skills, and given the opportunity for experiences to broaden her perspective and enrich her social experiences;
- Development of her latent talents, using the considerable support from her caseworker to learn how to handle her anxiety, insecurity, and expectancy of failure [59](p.61)

2. "Weak superego" (p.62) - these young women used St. Germaine's Home highly structured environment instead of developing their own inner controls. They let go of their delinquent ways and became a group conformer instead of a troublemaker (p.62). The caseworker should help the child reach her feelings behind her previously delinquent actions and develop alternative behaviors. S. Hart believed this child was the most easily overlooked in an institutional setting.[60]

3. A pattern of disruptive behavior typified the "acting out child" (p.62). The strategy for these children was:

- The caseworker was not to act the disciplinarian, or to set rules, limits, or give or withdraw privileges – that was the role of the Group Mother;

- The caseworker would discuss the child's behavior and its cause with the child, work together to uproot the cause, and develop correct behavior in its place;
- The caseworker analyzed the young woman's behavior to the staff to help them work with the child (p.63).

Confidences were respected (except for the threat of harm to self or others). The child was encouraged to share confidences with Group Mother[61]. The juveniles were made aware the entire staff was working to help her. Caseworkers were cautioned never to share confidential information with those who did not need to know.

S. Hart believed it was important to find the causes of the child's behavior. Caseworkers studied their parental contacts discussing negative outcomes with the parents and their child. They encouraged frequent parental visits[62] (p.64). The caseworker kept records of each visit and incorporated them into the case record per the law[63].

The Group Mother set up the home visit if she felt it might have therapeutic value. Staff recommendations for home visits went through the Group Mother. However, the entire staff gave approval for the first home visit and for visits on major holidays (p.66.)[64]. The caseworker presented the results of the home evaluation, after which the staff discussed the value of the home visit for the young woman (p.66). If approved the caseworker cleared the home visits with the referring agency (p.67). The psychiatrist and medical doctor approved those young women under "intensive drug and other medical treatment" (p.67)[65]. The

caseworker explained the procedures for supervision during the visit, and the rules for returning on time (p.68). She had to interview the child immediately on her return. Finally, S. Hart outlined the procedures for reporting the appropriate referral sources and recordkeeping should the child "abscond" (pp.69-73).

Caseworkers scheduled progress and review reports every six months (p.75) during which time the staff reviewed the young woman's progress toward her treatment goals. This was also done immediately preceding discharge. The decision to vacate a commitment was made only if all other measures failed. It meant the child needed different care than that provided at Saint Germaine's. After the caseworker filed forms describing the reasons for the petition to vacate the court order committing the child to St. Germaine's Home, a court hearing was scheduled on the matter (p.75).

Caseworkers interviewed the parents immediately after their child's admission and frequently thereafter. They employed an encouraging and empathic manner to promote the parents' recognition of the part they played in child's difficulties and their need to change. Children felt encouraged when they realized their parents wanted to change, too. The caseworker helped the parents recognize their child's needs, the importance of their cooperation with Saint Germaine's, and their importance to the child.[66]

One of the most important tasks of the caseworker was integrating all phases of treatment into a workable whole. For instance, the Group Mother performed a mother's duties in the home. She was responsible for meeting many of child's basic needs. She reported to the caseworker on the child's adjustment.

The caseworker in turn, shared her understanding of the child's temperament and shed light on her conduct so the Group Mother did not assume responsibility for it while in placement (p.79). She prepared the Group Mother for likely behaviors so she could respond suitably. The caseworker was the link between the treatment person and the Group Mother when she was not the therapist (p.81).[67]

S. Clines - 1962

This manuscript, a follow up study of forty-one delinquent young women discharged from St. Germaine's Home in Peekskill in 1960 (Clines RGS, 1962) began with a quote from the Gospel about the Shepherd who looks for His lost sheep (p.1). S. Clines included a brief chapter on religion but made it clear in the second sentence "the brevity of space given to this topic does not belie its importance" (p.32).

The author placed heavy emphasis on the complete lack of religious training and religious example given these young women before institutionalization. Set in context next to the physical and emotional deprivations they suffered, she affirmed that a stay in an institution would not correct this. Rather, she hoped the exposure helped to "empower (them) to follow through" after discharge (p.32). The children were discouraged from idealizing the women religious who cared for them. The Sisters hoped, however, that the young women would connect the loving care of the sisters with that of Mary or of God (p.34).

The young women were required to attend Mass on Sunday and holy days, but attendance was "optional" during the week (p.33). Other devotions are

"open to those who wish to attend". A chaplain lived there full-time, who presided over a "day of recollection" several times a year. Those who had not received First Communion and Confirmation attended special instruction classes besides the daily religious instruction given by the Group Mothers (p.33).

The results of the follow-up study on the question of religious practice suggested that fewer than half the young women kept any religious practice and almost none of them belonged to a parish. The author attributed this to the young women's return to situations where religious norms were not valued and to the rebellious attitude of adolescents to their perceived authority of religion (pp. 36-38). These results were compared with surveys on general church attendance and with those found in a 1957 Glueck survey on church attendance by delinquents. In both cases, the author found her delinquent subjects to be typical of their counterparts in the rest of the country (pp.39-40).

The NYC Board of Education staffed the "600" school at St. Germaine's Home with sixteen teachers and a principal. Unlike 1948, a religious no longer held the job of principal, although it is unclear when this change took place. Ninety percent of the 41 young women in S. Clines' study had IQ scores over 75. RGS accepted four scoring 65-74 because of the possibility the scores would improve once some language and emotional difficulties improved (p.22). Most of them lagged 1-2 years behind school grade, some as many as three years (p.30). The school continued to offer academic, business, and vocational courses, from the sixth through the twelfth grades. The author does not mention if their high school students attended Peekskill High School (p.21). Because the study subjects were

described as having difficulty returning to normal school after discharge, it is questionable whether they attended an outside secondary school while at St. Germaine's Home.

S. Clines believed most of the children in this study had histories of negative school experiences that had some bearing on their "antisocial attitudes and defiance of authority" (p.59). She thought their early preschool years handicapped them with emotional disturbance, which caused them to fail in basic academic skills. Eventually becoming truant, they moved to the margin of school life. They had difficulty making and keeping friends (p.60). Social and cultural "conflicts" such as valuing earning ability over educational attainment, left parents unwilling or unable to encourage the child or deal with truancy. The child got transferred (with her reputation) from one school to the next, as she fell further and further behind in class work (p.60). Of nine young women attending school after discharge from St. Germaine's Home, only one graduated high school. S. Cline charges the failures of the rest to several reasons, including low IQ, "intrapsychic conflicts" (p.61), and difficulties adjusting to normal school life.

In 1962, S. Clines described St. Germaine's Home as "a treatment oriented institution" (p. 18), a "nonprofit" incorporated in NYS in 1923. The only criteria mentioned was that which excluded those below dull normal intelligence.

She described the treatment as group living under care and guidance of Group Mothers who were Sisters with a professional background in dealing with disturbed youngsters (p.20). They made conscious use of group dynamics in influencing behavior of individual girl.

A treatment team provided the clinical services including diagnostic conferences, six-day psychiatric services, and individual and group psychotherapy. Psychologists conducted testing. Seven psychiatric social workers, two social group workers, two aftercare workers, and four case aides provided casework services. Caseworkers met regularly with the young women, and coordinated with family and community service agencies. The Clinical Director, a psychiatrist, coordinated mental health treatment services (p.20)

Two dentists, two medical doctors, and three registered nurses provided health care services. The RGS used St. Vincent's Hospital in the NYC area, and Peekskill Hospital as needed for St. Germaine's Home (p.21)

Recreation was planned with therapeutic goals (p.21). The main goal was for the young women to develop interests for productive use of their leisure time after discharge. Recreation included sports, handcrafts, art, ceramics,, holiday events, summer camp, trips, and outings.

Discharge planning began on admission to St. Germaine's Home. Aftercare workers met with the young women for several interviews before discharge, visited the families, and explained aftercare services (p.21). Casework supervision after discharge guided the young women in finding employment and adjusting to family and community life (p.7).

APPENDIX II - Endnotes

1The children called the sisters “mother” and sisters called the children “my child.”

2 Sisters counseled second mistresses against approval seeking, or friendship with the children. They maintained professional and personal boundaries at all times.

3 Later called mentally retarded (Kevles, 1999)

4 The author details several instances where men or families forced the girls into sex, however only the girl is held accountable, or in need of reform. However, removal from the home served as rescue in these cases, as it was extremely unlikely the girl would go home after completing the program.

5 S. Hart, possibly thinking it is superfluous, does not say what school of psychoanalysis she followed, but one may assume it was Jungian, since Carl Jung lectured at Fordham in 1912 (Hartman, 2000). Jungian psychoanalysis, having a spiritual component, was more agreeable to Catholicism than Freud was. She did not include citations in her case manual.

6 “Sanctifying souls” i.e., to restore one to spiritual wholeness.

7 The Shepherd is that of the New Testament Gospel, John 10:11-18, where Jesus Christ refers to Himself as the Good Shepherd who lays down his life for his sheep.

8 The Office is a book of prayers that coincides with hours of the day and feasts of the Catholic calendar.

9 Although examination of one’s conscience had as its goal preparation for confession and absolution, it entailed self-reflection, necessary for good social work.

10 Special prayers to say before the exposed Eucharist

11 SME forbade superstitious practices with a veneer of Catholicism that masked attempts to manipulate God. For example, personals in today's newspaper and in emails that urges specific prayers or rituals for one's intention, "never known to fail."

12 Venial sin impedes one's relationship with God; mortal sin destroys it. (Catechism of the Catholic Church, 2nd ed., 1997)

13 SME was referring to ever circulating, unsubstantiated hagiography such as stories of miracles, supernatural events, visions, and so on, all unsanctioned by the Church, but seen by many as examples of sanctity toward which Catholics might strive.

14 See Journal of Correctional Education, v.54 no.1, pp. 5-13, March 2003 for a chronology of the correctional education reform movement

15 later called mentally retarded (Kevles, 1999)

16 Nearly forty years after publication, and one hundred years from their formulation by MME, it continued to form the basis for the sisters' work with the children

17 It appears that the author kept current with then-current psychiatric practice.

18 S. Kellogg gives environment a place in correlative factors of girls' delinquency (p.22). The statistics are frequency analyses and percentages, none are more sophisticated probability stats, besides, as the author notes, the data is incomplete.

19 The idea of limiting family size through artificial means is not consistent with Catholic belief, so this may bias her conclusions. Besides, birth control pills are almost three decades in the future.

20 Single parent homes

21 She does not say why this is important, although cleanliness was highly prized by the RGS.

22 The author tries to correlate societal conditions to the delinquency of girls

23 This may be evidence of researcher's bias, because she did not hold the middle-income families responsible for the "bad" character of their daughters. It is

possible that middle-income families were better able to hide these problems from investigators.

24 It seems the author was unwilling to commit to a stand on nature vs. nurture, perhaps reflective of the debate in the field. However, the RGS focused on the individual, not having the family available for counseling, at this time.

25 The author details several instances where the girls were forced into sex by men or families, however only the girl seems to be held accountable. Or at least in need of reform.

26 The author however makes no more mention of these girls, so one does not know if they adjusted successfully.

27 Later follow up studies attempted to correlate characteristics of success and failure after discharge.

28 This is a powerful statement about the need for psychiatric evaluation in addition to the close observation already practiced in accordance with the Practical Rules. Indicates a willingness to incorporate new technology into existing practice.

29 They would not be discharged if they had venereal disease.

30 Now courts referred to agencies, which did the evaluations and intakes, and then referred to treatment.

31 This is a big departure from previous procedures. Before the “Reception Unit” the children went directly into a Class under the mentorship of an older, experienced resident. A reception unit provided staff an opportunity to assess the appropriateness of the referral.

32 This was a program started in 1946 under Dr. Frank O’Brien, Assoc. Superintendent of the NYC BOE, New York City Youth Board. It was designed to put all emotionally disturbed adolescents in NYC schools in a “600” designation school staffed by specially trained personnel. See Kauffman, 1993

33 Tension existed between Catholics who preferred institutional care and social workers who believed foster care was better. The Catholic preference also had

historical roots in the need to “preserve the Faith” of the girls who might otherwise be placed in non-Catholic foster homes.

34 Such a holistic perspective presages the biopsychosocial model.

35 Practical Rules continue to form the basis for treatment.

36 This may also reflect staffing problems, possibly a shortage of sisters leading to a large ratio of clients to sisters in group settings.

37 Why did the author quote from S. Teresita (p.92) here? This sentence does not fit with everything else she had written. This statement, especially in light of her earlier premise that they need new ideas in order to remain useful, puzzles me. Was there pressure on this Sister to be “loyal” to the old ways or old sisters?

38 The goal being not surrender, but developing an inner locus of control.

39 Possibly a reflection of male bias toward this population.

40 Today known as the Euphrasian Residence at the same location.

41 The intake committee was the gatekeeper for the institution.

42 #2 through #8 were RGS.

43 As opposed to a mental institution or foster care, I think.

44 They no longer admitted children privately from families. The families had to go through Catholic Charities first. I wonder whose idea that was.

45 These are the Archdiocese of NY, and the Diocese of Brooklyn. In 1957, the Brooklyn Diocese created the Diocese of Rockville Center on Long Island to encompass Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Prior to 1957, RGS worked with two dioceses.

46 This is the first reference to disabilities, possibly because polio victims sought admission; also, many children had sexually transmitted diseases.

47 Although the DSM-I was published in 1952, I did not find any reference to it in the sister’s writings through 1962.

48 Later on, RGS converted the Euphrasian residence for temporary housing of delinquent adolescent females. The length of stay increased because the top admission age was now 16. The girls could not “age out” until they were at least 18 years old.

49 Pregnant girls were admitted in the 1930's, no mention is made of them in the 1940's manuscripts, by 1959 they are no longer taken, possibly because teen unwed pregnancy not a criminal offense anymore.

50 They did not exclude lesbians, only those that acted out with girls in the institution: a "no fraternizing" policy.

51 A big change from before – now the family is included in the treatment. This may possibly be the seed for the Center for Family Life established in 1978.

52 These steps seem to be insurance against ineligible girls and problems with staff that may interfere with the child's treatment.

53 These are much more highly defined descriptions than in earliest accounts.

54 This process helped to establish trust and bond with child and caseworker.

55 Possibly the result of influence by Harry Sullivan "Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry," 1953

56 S. Hart makes no comment on why, but probably because the child resided with them now, and the parents interviewed a few times.

57 An empowering step for the child and a sign of the changes in the legal status of the parent-child relationship since the 19th century.

58Psychoanalytic, but who is her source? What school of psychoanalytic theory is she following? Where are her citations?

59 Very frustrating not to have footnotes or citations of the sources for this material. There is a bibliography in the back, but it is not cited in this material. Perhaps a study of the bibs is needed to determine the specific school of thought.

60 A far remove from MME's practical rules about never discussing former life of child

61 This is another departure from earlier practice, when the Group Mother focused the child on the here and now and discouraged confidences, except in the confessional.

62 This is still another departure from earlier practice, when families and parents were viewed as disruptive and saboteurs of the child's treatment.

63 Perhaps changes in the law caused the “frequent visits”

64 Everyone shared power and responsibility for the children.

65The first reference to psychotropics I have seen in the manuscripts.

66 A consistent theme throughout the writings has been the RGS belief that parents play a major role in their child gone wrong.

67 This seems like clinical supervision. In addition, the only one who talks about this to the Group Mother is the caseworker, who at that time is likely to be another RGS. This may be for better facilitation of treatment, or because some Group Mothers may have found it difficult to work with secular professionals. The author does not say why.