

2006

Berkeley Women Economists, Public Policy, and Civic Sensibility

Mary Ann Dzuback

Washington University in St Louis, madzubac@wustl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/wgss>

 Part of the [Other Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dzuback, Mary Ann, "Berkeley Women Economists, Public Policy, and Civic Sensibility" (2006). *Women, Gender & Sexuality Studies Research*. 40.

<https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/wgss/40>

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Women, Gender & Sexuality Studies at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Women, Gender & Sexuality Studies Research by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

Berkeley Women Economists, Public Policy, and Civic Sensibility
Mary Ann Dzuback, Washington University
Civic and Moral Learning in America,
Ed., Donald Warren (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006)

Yielding to no one in her demand for thoroughness, precision, and objectivity in investigation, she has never cultivated . . . pleasure gardens for the favored few, walled off from the man on the street . . . She has done yeoman service in the common fields of daily life, trying to wring from the stubborn soil harvests of knowledge that the housewife and workingman can use.¹

The production of knowledge was a critical component of progressive reform in the early part of the twentieth century in the United States. For many social scientists, it was also a conscious manifestation of their moral and civic commitment to ensuring that democratic institutions became responsive to all citizens, from the poorest to those of the comfortable middle class in the face of corporate expansion and monopoly of labor and production and political officials more concerned with their own gains than with the daily problems of the citizenry. Women social scientists resolved the question of how to connect research to policy in particular ways between 1890 and 1940. Some remained closely involved with settlement houses, while others became researchers in such government-sponsored agencies as the Women's Bureau and the Children's Bureau, and still others conducted research for municipal charitable agencies, or with philanthropic organizations, including the Russell Sage Foundation. Many of them were reluctant to submit to the pressure to divorce scholarship from civic commitments, principally commitments to engaging in research that would address social and economic problems, and that would focus on women and families, pressure that was increasing in academic social science scholarship during this period. In fact, they based their research on the kinds of concerns explored in the social survey movement of the 1880s and 1890s. Such concerns were largely eclipsed as social science research became increasingly male-dominated, professional, and university-based just as 'objectivity' and 'science' took precedence over other ideals in

professional social science research after the turn of the century. This trend was particularly evident in economics, where, as Nancy Folbre and others argue, these ideals were "defined in highly gendered terms" among economists who questioned "not only the possibility, but also the desirability of female objectivity."²

The focus of this chapter is on why and how women economic scholars at Berkeley continued to connect their research to real problems in which they were deeply interested, and to see that research as legitimately possessing ethical dimensions. A central factor in the why aspect of their work rests on their conceptions of the purposes of social science research and how deeply embedded those purposes were in the understanding that social science should improve lives, communities, and the conduct of political, social, and economic institutions. Male scholars also believed in these goals, but women at Berkeley and elsewhere held these commitments well into the 1930s even as it became harder to do so and remain professional scholars in academic economics. Further, the Berkeley women, and some of their male colleagues, did not see their deep interest as an impediment to doing first-rate research. Women scholars at a number of institutions maintained this commitment—among them Susan Kingsbury at Bryn Mawr College, Sophonisba Breckinridge and Edith Abbott at the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration, and Amy Hewes at Mount Holyoke College. But the case of women scholars at the University of California at Berkeley illustrates particularly well how this commitment survived in a striving research university in which the criteria for valuing social science research shifted significantly between 1900 and 1940.

I focus on the Berkeley women for two reasons. First, unlike the others, the University of California at Berkeley was a public institution. But like other progressive universities in the early twentieth century, Berkeley shaped its culture to encourage teaching and research that met

state and other public needs, even as the claims of 'objectivity' and 'science' increasingly attracted researchers' allegiance. Its public character provided openings for justifying research and policy involvement in ways that may have been more difficult in private institutions. Second, where most women academic economists worked at women's colleges or in departments and schools of social work or home economics, the Berkeley case offers the unusual instance of women's participation in an economics department in a rising research university.³

Women economists at Berkeley developed a program of research and teaching that sustained policy reform commitments within the economics department. They did this even as the discipline increasingly went the way of academic social science—less reform-oriented over these decades, and more focused on developing theory and quantitatively based methodologies that were divorced from ethical concerns about poverty, industrial capitalism, labor, and employment by the middle 1930s. This phenomenon started having an impact on discussions about the Berkeley economics departments' direction by the late 1930s. These latter emphases in the discipline began to distance faculty research from both the social context of economic activity and state policymaking that specifically addressed underserved populations, including women. But the process was slowed in Berkeley's unusually liberal economics department by shared concern for the uses of social and economic knowledge among the women and some of their male colleagues, particularly those focused on labor and immigration. They believed that a central duty of social science scholars was to try to understand and address, through their research, social and economic issues that shaped real people's lives. There was a civic concern for laborers, the poor, the unemployed, children, women, and the living conditions of middle-class families and citizens of California and elsewhere, who faced uncertain economic and social

change. And they held that the state had an important role in redressing disadvantage created by industrial capitalism, gross inequities in the distribution of wealth, and unfair labor practices. As Dorothy Ross suggests "the new institutionalists [such as the economists in the 1910s and 1920s at Berkeley] were self-consciously left of the neoclassical mainstream."⁴

The women principally responsible for sustaining the policy orientation in the department were Jessica Peixotto, Barbara Nachtrieb Armstrong, and Emily Huntington. Peixotto remained in the department from 1904 until her retirement in 1935. Armstrong worked in the department from 1914 to 1919 as an assistant (during which time she also completed law school and practiced law), and 1919 to 1928 as a doctoral student in economics, and then instructor and assistant professor of law and economics. In 1928, she moved full-time to the law school, but continued work in economics and participated in committee and other work related to the economics department's activities. Huntington was an undergraduate at Berkeley who returned in 1928 after completing her doctorate at Harvard/Radcliffe, and remained until her retirement in 1961. They were joined by a number of women doctoral students and by women researchers who contributed to the social work program and to the department's research projects.⁵

These women formed effective strategies to secure space and support for their policy commitments in the department and to maintain them despite increasing pressure in the late 1920s to transform the department's composition and research agenda. First, as they moved into the department, they claimed an area of economic research that was not well developed in the department and then developed it. Moreover, they supported each other within the institution and fully involved themselves in departmental activities. Second, they developed the department's clinical program in social work, which was somewhat related to their work. The program enabled them to offer course work based on their policy research and to hire other

women to work in clinical as well as research, service, and teaching capacities. This increased the presence of colleagues dedicated to work in social economy, established an institutional justification for their own teaching and scholarship, and provided trained social workers for the state. Third, they received and sustained external as well as internal funding for their research. In addition, they disseminated their research to the relevant local, state, and federal government departments and offices. Aside from the clinical program, their strategies did not differ much from their male colleagues' in academia who were expanding on social science knowledge, developing new courses and programs, and using their research to contribute to policy making. But their case is unusual in that they were women doing this work within the male domain of the research university, in a period when most women scholars were employed by colleges that lacked many of the resources of universities, including funding, graduate students, and ready connections to the state or were located in municipal, state, and federal agencies. And it was unusual to the extent that they focused on what had been considered the private, and therefore less important, domain of economic activity, including the household, and on women in the work force.⁶

Social Economy, Social Research, and Policy Reform

Jessica Peixotto

Jessica Peixotto, with her colleague Lucy Stebbins, created the social economy program in economics at Berkeley. She was the second woman to earn a Ph.D., the first in political economy (1900), and the first appointed to a regular faculty position at the University of California. These distinctions were grounded in a strong and determined personality. Raised in San Francisco, Peixotto was the only daughter and oldest among five children in the Raphael and Myrtila Peixotto family. The Peixottos were Portuguese-American Jews with businesses in the

South who lived in New York where Jessica was born, until the end of the Civil War, and then migrated to California seeking a livelier economy to grow the family's wealth. Peixotto's father was actively involved in civic affairs and philanthropy in the city. He was also the family patriarch and held restrictive views of women's roles, so much so that he opposed Peixotto's continuing formal education after her graduation from Girls' High School. He believed that her proper place as the only daughter in this prominent San Francisco merchant family was at home, studying on her own or with tutors, and serving in a voluntary capacity in city clubs and social institutions, focusing on skills appropriate for housewives of the Peixottos' social class. She learned to make her own clothing, studied music and languages, and volunteered in a settlement house, where she interacted with some of San Francisco's most prominent women, including Phoebe Apperson Hearst. But this activity was not enough to feed her intellectual needs and social concerns. She persuaded her father to allow her to enroll at the University of California and finished the Ph.B. in 1894, at the age of 30. She immediately started doctoral work in political economy, working with Bernard Moses, whose training in the German historical school shaped her own research in French socialism. In 1896, she went to France to study. Initially she spent a few weeks taking a rest cure and "daily douches" (showers) to recover from neurasthenia, a common illness among middle-class women who had broader aspirations than housewifery and motherhood and who suffered from frustration at the lack of opportunities to pursue work of their own. Observing the French for the first time, she noted that young, middle-class French women were "mere puppets being prepared . . . for the matrimonial market," while, men, she thought, were too preoccupied with sensual and aesthetic concerns. She found rural farmwomen healthier than the men despite their dawn-to-dusk hard work. In the end, though, she thought "the position of women, mental, rather than anything else, makes your heart ache."⁷ Such

observations are telling in light of her later interest in creating and protecting places for women in the academy.

After research and study at the Sorbonne, she finished the doctorate in 1900. Her dissertation *The French Revolution and Modern Socialism: A Comparative Study of the French Revolution and the Doctrines of Modern French Socialism*, was published in 1901. In 1904, Benjamin Ide Wheeler, president of the university, asked her about her postdoctoral plans, and then suggested that she begin lecturing at the university. Perhaps reflecting on her own disinterest in marriage and hoping for a larger, more public opportunity, she accepted.⁸

Her appointment to the faculty was remarkable. Before the turn of the century, the university paid little attention to women students on campus--no dormitories, athletic teams, or facilities for social and cultural activities, and few clubs, existed for women, despite the fact that they made up nearly forty percent of the undergraduate student body. It was, in effect, a man's world. This was even more the case with faculty life. But Phoebe Apperson Hearst, the first woman regent of the University of California, insisted on making a place for women at Berkeley. She pressured the administration to hire women faculty and administrators and contributed funds for a women's gymnasium and other facilities and activities.⁹

In 1904 Wheeler appointed Peixotto as lecturer in the economics department and in 1906 he appointed Lucy Sprague, whose brother-in-law Adolph Miller chaired economics, as dean of women. Where Sprague had a powerful influence on the daily lives of students, building on Hearst's efforts to provide spheres of activity for women, Peixotto focused on locating a place for women's intellectual work in the social sciences at Berkeley. Their influence was complementary as well as mutually reinforcing; one major concern Sprague explored was professional roles for women beyond teaching, the occupation most female Berkeley graduates

chose. The two shared a house in their first couple of years on the faculty; on weekends Peixotto returned across the Bay to her family and Sprague visited her invalid father in Pasadena.¹⁰

Given Berkeley's historical resistance to women as equally deserving of access and power, and that Peixotto was the first woman appointed to what was to become a full-time position on the faculty at the University of California, one might ask why Wheeler invited Peixotto to join the faculty, particularly as Adolph Miller thought women's place was in the home. No doubt the encouragement of Hearst and the Association of Collegiate Alumnae moved him. The fact that she knew Peixotto from their civic work in San Francisco, and that she had a close friendship and advising relationship with Wheeler, no doubt contributed to his willingness to invite Peixotto to join the faculty. But Peixotto herself was an appealing candidate. With dark hair and blue eyes, she was an attractive, even elegant, woman of diminutive stature. (Upon registration in 1891 she was informed that students had to be at least eighteen years of age to enroll as undergraduates; she was twenty-seven at the time.) But she also was tenacious and determined. As the eldest of five children and the only female, she was accustomed to proving herself. Her work with Moses demonstrated her intellectual capabilities. Further, Wheeler did not have to contend with conflicting perceptions of married women's domestic roles when he asked Miller to find "a place for her," because, at forty, Peixotto remained unmarried. Her family's prominence in the city vouched for her respectability. Facile with languages and sophisticated in her cultural tastes, she fit well with the close-knit, but cosmopolitan social and intellectual climate of Berkeley in the early years of the century. In the end, she was so valued by the department, and successful with her teaching and research, that the university made a long term commitment by promoting her to assistant professor of sociology in 1907, associate

professor of social economy in 1912, and professor of social economy in 1918, the first woman full professor at the university.¹¹

This appointment in social economy carried with it certain nineteenth-century assumptions. The term had been coined by John Stuart Mill to characterize an area of study broader than political economy, according to Nancy Folbre, that would not just include wealth, but also ethical concerns. In the United States, the American Sociological Association's Franklin Sanborn designated it as the feminine branch of political economy concerned with "particulars" rather than generalizations. Berkeley was one of the few universities offering such study after the turn of the century. There both men and women studied political economy; but it was developed under Peixotto's instigation and guidance.¹²

Lucy Stebbins

When Lucy Sprague left the university in 1912, her former assistant Lucy Stebbins, another San Francisco native was appointed Dean of Women. Stebbins's father was pastor of the First Unitarian Church and had been involved in establishing the university's predecessor, the College of California. Stebbins studied at Berkeley for a time and finished her B.A. at Radcliffe. She had worked in a variety of social service agencies before returning to the university in 1910. She also held a position in the economics department, teaching a course in charities beginning in 1911, and was eventually promoted to a professorship in 1923, a position she held, with the deanship, until her retirement in 1941. Although Stebbins never developed into a scholar like Peixotto, her presence in the department and university suggested possibilities for women and offered Peixotto a female colleague who supported the program in social economy.¹³

The two, together with Sprague in the early years, helped to found the Department of Home Economics in the wake of the establishment of the American Home Economics

Association (AHEA, 1908) and in the context of President Wheeler's desire to establish educational options for women students that would better fit them for their primary role within households and families. Peixotto and Stebbins had a different motivation—to train women in sciences, where they were underrepresented at Berkeley, in accord with the larger goals of the leaders in the AHEA, which focused on domestic science. At Berkeley, this meant that students were expected to study "architecture, chemistry, drawing, economics, engineering, hygiene, physiology, political science, and textiles," based in theory and specific methodologies, and prepare to become reformers and professionals "outside the home." Peixotto, Sprague, and Stebbins also saw home economics as a way, in addition to the social economy program in economics, to introduce students to civic issues, such as public health, nutrition, and adequate housing. They hoped that the university would support a graduate department in the field, one that would not segregate women from men students and that would offer study based on a firm foundation in the liberal arts, sciences, and social sciences. When it opened in 1916, though, it was an undergraduate department that the administration designed in part to draw women students away from competition with men students in the other departments in the College of Arts and Letters at Berkeley. Peixotto and Stebbins nevertheless served on the department's curriculum committee and succeeded in attracting chemist-nutritionist Agnes Fay Morgan to head the department in 1914, a move that increased its emphasis in household science as opposed to household arts.¹⁴

Morgan and Stebbins and eventually Ruth Okey and others shared a number of characteristics: they were all committed to science as the basis of their research and teaching programs; they worked together to improve the climate for women students and faculty on campus; and they used their research for social improvement. The way one colleague

characterized Peixotto's work could apply to them all: "science in the service of humanity."¹⁵ In the case of the early women in the program, particularly Peixotto and Stebbins, their view of social science and academic responsibility were shaped as much by their previous work in settlements and other social service agencies and their direct contact with recent immigrants, people in poverty, and struggling working-class families facing constant economic crises and setbacks as by their commitment to a firm grounding in academic social science research. One could argue that the social service aspect of their experience helped them determine the significant problems to pursue in their research.

It was Peixotto's place and growing prominence in the economics department that lent credibility to her various efforts—in home economics, in civic activities, and in economic research. The department she joined exhibited intellectual as well as social compatibilities. She and her colleagues Adolph Miller and Wesley Mitchell moved in the same circle of friends, attending dinner parties and theater, camping in the Sierras, and sharing manuscripts and professional talk. Henry Hatfield, Carl Plehn, and eventually, Stuart Daggett, and Solomon Blum, were other economists in the department. According to Mary Cookingham's account, Mitchell, Plehn, and Blum were the economics faculty with whom Peixotto was most involved in her early years as a faculty member. Plehn's interest in government programs, Blum's experience with social work, and Mitchell's work on business cycles were relevant to her own research. The department had been fundamentally shaped by Bernard Moses and then Carl Plehn, both of whom had studied in Germany and witnessed debates about and implementation of social welfare and social insurance programs there. In 1902 the department split into history and economics, and Moses shifted into the history department. Adolph Miller became chair of economics; his work brought the study of business and commerce into the department. Stuart

Daggett in railroad economics, Solomon Blum in labor, Carleton Parker in the psychological elements of economic behavior, Ira Cross in labor and socialism, and Paul Taylor in labor economics, with Peixotto in social economy, shaped the department's programs and research emphases through the 1910s and 1920s.¹⁶

Among these men, she was considered an intellectual equal in her teaching, program development, and scholarship. Peixotto's work was not as much a break with neoclassical economics as it was a claim that social economy research was important in a field in which the emphasis was on public economic activity and productivity. Her work on women and children in the early years and her later shift to consumer economics focused on household income and spending represented her efforts to contribute to a research agenda that was largely carried out by women researchers and, as at the University of Chicago, kept within the bounds of social work and social administration programs. In Peixotto's case, though, it was well accepted within the economics department until the late 1930s.¹⁷

Peixotto's reputation as a researcher grew in 1906, when she examined the adequacy of relief efforts after the San Francisco earthquake and concluded that assistance was often too meager to lead to full economic rehabilitation of those who lost their homes and jobs. She then explored the role of the state in improving conditions of California children after the turn of the century, through its juvenile court system, its Board of Control to oversee treatment of indigent orphans, and its widows' pension law, all of which required coordination among local agencies and municipal and county governments. In surveying these, Peixotto developed expertise in state and local government, public welfare, and legislation.¹⁸

Peixotto used her research to pursue an activist agenda. Locally, she served on Berkeley's Commission of Public Charities. At the state level she was a member of the State

Board of Charities and Corrections, chairing the committees on children and on research, and wedding her academic and public policy interests by requiring research into children's lives prior to making policies. During World War I, she extended her service to the nation, as a member of the Council of Defense subcommittee on women and children, executive chair of the committee's child welfare section, and chief of the child conservation section of the council. She worked with others to enforce the Federal Child Labor Law by focusing on keeping children in school. Peixotto also organized California's first program of social work training, for Red Cross Home Service workers in 1917. The course eventually moved into the university as part of the graduate training offered in the economics department. These activities and her own research led her to believe that state intervention in the economy to insure public welfare was essential to protect the less fortunate in the United States.

As men and women joined the economics department over the next three decades, they contended as much with Peixotto's interests as with any other faculty member's. Ira Cross, labor economist who joined the department in 1914, remembered Peixotto as "a wonderful, charming, intelligent person," whose shared interests in socialism and social activism placed her on the liberal end of the department, along with Cross himself, Blum, and Carleton Parker. By 1911 when Stebbins joined the department, Peixotto had begun to develop a series of courses, including Contemporary Socialism, History of Socialism, The Control of Poverty, The Child and the State, Household as an Economic Agent, Crime as a Social Problem, and History of Economic Thought, which shaped the program in social economy in the department. Wheeler described this work as "the field of constructive and preventive philanthropy," when he hailed it as one of the two recent major developments in the department by 1912 (the other was railway economics).¹⁹

The growth of the social economy program opened the doors to women faculty as well as students. Lucy Stebbins's appointment is one such instance. In the 1910s Wheeler allowed Peixotto to seek out and appoint qualified women as assistants and lecturers. These recruits taught courses, graded papers, and, in some cases, finished master's degrees and doctorates. This was an unusual opportunity because the male faculty in the department rarely worked with female assistants. A few women came with the Ph.D. and stayed for a year or more; others came with bachelor's or master's degrees and stayed for a few years, teaching and doing research. Beyond these short-term academic appointments, the next real sign of commitment from the university to women in the program came in 1919, when Barbara Nachtrieb Grimes (later Armstrong) was appointed lecturer in law and economics.²⁰

Barbara Nachtrieb Armstrong

Armstrong was born in 1890 to John Jacob and Anne Day Nachtrieb and spent her childhood in San Francisco. An alumna of the university (A.B., 1913; J.D., 1915) she taught for a brief period in a one-room school and then practiced law for a few years with a classmate, Louise Cleveland. She served as an assistant in the department of economics from 1914 to 1919, and as executive secretary of the California Social Insurance Commission from 1915-1919. By the time she began lecturing in the two departments, economics and jurisprudence, she was working on her Ph.D. in economics. From a younger generation than Peixotto's, she was an outspoken feminist, and committed to research into government policies and programs for workers and their families. She finished her Ph.D. in 1921, was promoted to instructor in law and economics, assistant professor, and then associate professor in law in 1928. This was a major milestone for women--Armstrong was the first woman appointed to the faculty of a law school in the United States.²¹

By the time Armstrong joined the department in 1919, it had grown considerably and offered "an invigorating intellectual climate" to both faculty and graduate students. As Paul S. Taylor, a fellow graduate student and later a faculty colleague, noted, Berkeley, though often ignored by economists whose gaze was trained toward the East, was "no educational eddy or backwater." Taylor, like Armstrong, found an "element of tradition" there that confirmed his commitment to situate the study of economics within the real conditions of human activity; he focused on labor economics. In Armstrong's case, her study with Peixotto, Felix Flugel, and Cross helped develop her interest in social economy and labor and social legislation. She taught courses in the history of economics, the economic history of Europe, social insurance, and crime as a social problem, and worked on a massive study published after she moved full time to the law school at Boalt Hall. She was succeeded in the economics department by Emily Huntington, but continued her involvement in social economy by serving on committees and teaching graduate courses exploring the relationship between economics and family law, child labor law, and labor relations. Her book *Insuring the Essentials* (1932) was probably as important to the field of economics as Mitchell's *Business Cycles*, because it was a timely and major contribution to the debates over both minimum wage and social insurance legislation in the United States.²²

Armstrong's study compared United States minimum wage and social insurance policies with those in countries in Asia, Africa, the South Pacific, South America, North America, and Europe. She concluded that "except in the field of industrial accident provision, the United States is in the position of being the most backward of all the nations of commercial importance in insuring the essentials to its workers." In this plea to see all economic activity as part of a global economy, and to deal with the "urgent social problems" generated by "our economic

system," she defined the essentials as those programs that provided economic security to workers in the wage system of modern industry. Minimum wage, offering subsistence earnings, and social insurance, compensating for those periods when workers could not perform or find work, were the linchpins of an adequate government social economic program. Economists who made such claims perceived these kinds of programs as both antidotes to unrestrained capitalism and as necessary to maintaining a healthy capitalist economy. She found that Germany and Great Britain provided the most comprehensive programs to date, but they, too, had problems. Britain's, for example, offered too little, and were geared only to meet the bare needs of workers, not the needs of their families. Germany's addressed family needs, but were initiated by Bismark in the 1880s to respond early to Germany's industrialization in an authoritarian, rather than a democratic, political system. Consequently, the twentieth-century programs that evolved out of these of the nineteenth offered little choice to workers in such areas as selecting medical providers.²³

In the United States, minimum wage protection and workmen's compensation legislation had been enacted on a state-by-state basis, leaving many individuals and families dependent on a private charity system woefully inadequate to meet their needs, particularly during an economic depression. Armstrong suggested that one approach in the United States might be to begin by providing constitutional protection of minimum wage legislation for women workers, because they were "underpaid in greater numbers than men" and "even further removed from organized labor help." That effort could "pave the way for the acceptance of the principle of minimum wage for men." This work in social insurance earned Armstrong a national reputation. In 1934 she was appointed to the federal committee on economic security, directing the old-age security

study, and working with others to design the collection of laws that became the Social Security Act of 1935.²⁴

It is important to note that even as they grew professionally, the women faculty had significant family commitments in addition to their public service. Jessica Peixotto and Lucy Stebbins, for example, lived in Berkeley with their widowed mothers, Stebbins in a house on Durant Street, and Peixotto in the first faculty apartment house in Berkeley, Cloyne Court. Of a later generation, Armstrong balanced a demanding career as teacher and scholar with the responsibilities of wife and mother in the 1920s and 1930s. Peixotto, Sprague, and Stebbins likewise fulfilled their obligations as daughters, sisters, and aunts, while also developing the professional autonomy required by an academic career. Their mutual friendships extended to other women in the university: Agnes Fay Morgan in home economics, Olga Bridgman in psychology, Katherine Felton, of San Francisco's Associated Charities and a frequent lecturer in social economy. They included male colleagues and their families and students in their social activities: dinners, outings to the opera, hikes in the hills, and parties and picnics. On campus, the Women's Faculty Club became the hub of their social life. This network not only provided contacts from the university to the city and region, but also yielded research sites for students, a critical mass of men and women interested in social and economic reform, and the kinds of professional support necessary to maintain some power and voice in social and economic research and policy.

The Berkeley women manifested their civic commitments on the campus as well as in the state and nation. When Peixotto and Sprague first joined the faculty, they did not attend faculty meetings, not because they were barred from them, but because they feared they would alienate their male colleagues with their "conspicuous" presence. Sprague remembered that "most of the

faculty thought of women frankly as inferior beings," and were "solidly opposed" to women's presence on the faculty. This feeling of separateness or difference based on gender was further evident in the relegation of women to a corner of one room at the university's faculty club, restriction to visits only on special occasions, and admission only if they were accompanied by a male member of the club. Stebbins and Peixotto decided in 1919 that treatment of women at the Faculty Club was intolerable, and collected funds from family and friends to build a club for women faculty and administrators. Barbara Armstrong's sister Florence Nachtrieb Mel left a bequest to the club to help secure a place for professional women on campus. When The Women's Faculty Club was completed in 1923, women faculty and administrators, local professional women, and alumnae joined, and brought their families and friends to parties and other gatherings at the club.²⁵

Meanwhile, Peixotto continued working to enlarge the presence of women on the faculty. In addition to Stebbins, Armstrong, and the short-term appointments of research assistants and lecturers, Peixotto was responsible for bringing Emily Noble, Martha Chickering, and Emily Huntington into the department and the university. She did this in two ways, by developing a social work program in the department and by promoting research in social economy. Noble, for example, ran the social work program for a few years until she married Carl Plehn and was moved to another department. She was succeeded by Chickering, who completed her Ph.D. in economics and ran the program until it was moved into its own department in the late 1930s. Huntington was appointed as a full-time faculty member and researcher in social economy.²⁶

Emily Huntington

Armstrong frequently consulted Emily Huntington, who shared her interest in social insurance policy. Huntington, the third major woman scholar to be appointed to economics by

the university, was another Californian. Born in 1892 in Sacramento, she was raised in Berkeley. Her father was a physician on the faculty of the University of California. Against the wishes of her mother, but with the support of her father, she decided to go to college. Like Peixotto and Armstrong, she received her A.B. at Berkeley and had been a classmate of Armstrong's. Two years at the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics conducting a cost of living study, and, during World War I, assisting Peixotto when she was the executive secretary of the Women's Committee of the Council of National Defense in Washington, constituted her early experience with government agencies. After study for a year in the graduate department of social economy and social research at Bryn Mawr College and another year at the London School of Economics, she finished her graduate work through Radcliffe at Harvard. One of her classmates at Bryn Mawr, London, and Radcliffe was Eleanor Lansing Dulles, who later taught at Bryn Mawr and then worked at the Social Security Board in Washington in the middle 1930s and at the State Department in the 1940s and 1950s. Dulles remembered first seeing Huntington, "a handsome young woman wearing a blue serge suit and a Knox straw hat," on the Paoli local, a train out of Philadelphia, and hoping she was getting off at Bryn Mawr. She did, and they shared a lifelong friendship and intellectual interests.²⁷

Huntington's research included economics and policy, social insurance, consumer economics, and labor market and employment problems. She recalled that Peixotto, with whom she had studied at Berkeley, was probably the most continuous influence on her professional development—stimulating her interest in economics, particularly in her courses in poverty and household budgets, advising her to pursue graduate study, and helping her to find a position after finishing the Ph.D. in 1928. She worked with Susan Kingsbury and Anne Bezanson at Bryn Mawr, in social economy and industrial relations. Searching for better grounding in economic

theory, she and Dulles chose the London School of Economics, where they found the classroom climate less competitive than in American institutions and were exposed to the current thinking of reformers and social scientists including Beatrice and Sidney Webb and Harold Laski. She earned her doctorate at Radcliffe at a time when women experienced significant hurdles to doctoral study there. She recalled that women could not study at Harvard's Widener Library after 7:00 p.m., were not appointed to teaching assistantships, and generally were grateful for the opportunity to study with the economists at Harvard. Huntington took classes with Frank W. Taussig, who made all the women sit on one side of the room; Charles J. Bullock, who criticized women for being "illogical"; and Allyn Young, who was "warm and friendly." Young maintained a vocal concern for the social and economic complexities of modern industrial society, and urged his students to apply economic analysis to real problems, even in statistics courses. He worked closely with Huntington and Dulles in a mentoring role while they were at Harvard, no doubt helping to ameliorate the discriminatory treatment by other professors. To support herself while finishing her dissertation, she taught at Simmons College.²⁸

Huntington's dissertation, "Cyclical Fluctuation in the Cotton Manufacturing Industry," only narrowly presaged her various research and policy interests. At Berkeley, she was appointed instructor of economics in 1928, assistant professor in 1930, associate professor in 1937, and professor in 1944. Never married, like her more senior colleagues, Huntington had a wide circle of friends in Berkeley. She responded to numerous calls to public service in her professional capacity, as advisor to the California State Relief Administration in the 1930s, senior economist with the Department of Labor early in World War II, and director of Wage Stabilization at the National War Labor Board in San Francisco for the duration of the war. She was advisor to the California department of welfare and member of the California Industrial

Welfare Commission, also in the 1940s. After her retirement from the university in 1961, she worked with Barbara Armstrong to establish California's comprehensive health care law and was a member of the governor's Conference on the Aged. At the university, she served on numerous committees and, as a testament to her feminist leanings, was instrumental in gaining the admission of women to the university's Faculty Club.²⁹

Her work was, in part, shaped by her commitment to "the problems and deprivations of the low income population," an area of study that held "little interest" for economic analysts "until well into the 1930's." Her research in unemployment and cost of living was well received. *Doors to Jobs*, one of Huntington's most comprehensive studies, examined the organization of the labor market in California, with a focus on how workers found jobs from entry, or in the transition from school to work, to reentry, in the search for jobs after they were laid off. She noted a profound, but largely ignored problem that the depression economy exposed: "one of the most important and difficult problems—that of bringing together jobs and workers,; which had "not been attacked with the same vigor and determination" applied to other problems in economics. Upon examining the records of agencies that existed to place workers in the state, trade unions, and schools, she concluded that, aside from centralization of information for some occupational groups, little coordination among them was apparent. In short, after years of attempting to deal with crisis of the Depression, California still did not have state wide mechanisms to assist in placing workers in the state's labor market.³⁰

The Heller Committee and Social Economic Research

Where the social economy and social work program assured that women students and faculty had a place in the economics department's curriculum until the late 1930s, a committee Peixotto formed assured that women doing research in economics also had a place in the

department and the university and, as important, could extend their research expertise beyond the campus boundaries. The Heller Committee on Research in Social Economy was a crucial source of support for both Peixotto's and Huntington's work. It provided the funds and internal legitimacy that enabled Peixotto to expand studies in social economics, to contribute to the graduate curricular program in social service, and to employ research and teaching assistants for both programs. The committee sustained the authority of their work, allowing them to carry it forward through the worst years of the Depression. It also helped them acquire an external reputation. As a result of the research she conducted under the committee's auspices, Peixotto was known as one of the pioneers of consumer economics and was elected vice-president of the American Economics Association (in 1928).³¹

The Heller Committee began with a study by Peixotto to determine the adequacy of salaries paid to clerical, wage earning, and executive California state employees. Her close friend Clara Hellman Heller was so impressed with this work, in 1923 she initiated donations to the university for cost of living research. The committee's projects fit into three areas: quantity and cost budgets, published annually; income and expenditure studies; and special studies. The first two comprised cost of living investigations and bore some relationship to the third, research into such areas as care for the dependent aged and children, unemployment relief and the unemployed, California's labor market and problems of reemployment, the nutritive value of diets among particular population groups, and standards and methods of relief.³²

Peixotto's contribution to the studies began with an examination of professional families, challenging the taboo of that "romantic and shadowy domain of home life, 'hopelessly private,' 'sacred,'" in which middle-class professional families had been "shut away" making their budgetary decisions. Introducing psychologically and sociologically informed explanations of

consumer choice, she presented a case for "the American standard of living." Through this and other studies--of families ranging from lower middle class to those dependent on public assistance--she succeeded in placing economic decisions at the household level squarely within a widely shared social vision of American middle-class life. She used a novel methodological approach, interviewing and distributing questionnaires to housewives, an acknowledgement of their expertise and authority in household consumption. Her research took questions of the social value of "things" out of the realm of theory and into the arena of empirical research. In addition to Peixotto's research, the committee also supported Emily Huntington's in unemployment and unemployment relief and reemployment patterns in the state of California--all in the midst of the depression. As much as the course work in social economy, the Heller Committee research ensured that the economics department continued to foster scholarship in what was considered in mainstream economics less significant (and less masculine) areas of economic study: household income and economic decision making and women's employment and unemployment.³³

Conclusion

Berkeley afforded Peixotto and her colleagues a unique opportunity to contribute to shaping the institution and its programs and to contributing their ethical and civic concerns and their scholarship to that process. Between 1900 and 1930, the university made a definite transition in its commitments and its programs—from a largely teaching college of arts and sciences with some agricultural programs under its land grant mandate, to a research university with both state and private funding for faculty inquiry and a diverse range of programs for professional preparation and economic development in the state. The women faculty both rode this wave of change and contributed to it.³⁴

It is their contributions to shaping the study of economics as an ethical enterprise contributing to civic improvement that is of concern here. Crucial to this contribution was creating places for women in the teaching, research, and programs of the department. Peixotto, Stebbins, Armstrong, and Huntington played key roles as institution and program builders, role models, and scholars. More than their mere presence in the department, their acts and the support they generated among male colleagues defined their contributions to the civic sensibilities of the department's work. Those civic sensibilities in turn influenced learning at the state's flagship university for the first half of the twentieth century.

Peixotto created a significant place for women economists at the University of California during the four decades before her death in 1942, a place that expanded women social scientists' capacity to pursue research that influenced public policy debate and reform through the 1960s, until Huntington's retirement. One might ask: Why was it significant, particularly considering the fact that the University appointed no women to economics between the 1930s and the 1980s? To answer that question, we need to address what these women accomplished at Berkeley, in the field of economics, and in the public policy and reform arenas. Geraldine Clifford has suggested that one important reason for examining the history of women in higher education institutions is to analyze how they changed those institutions. Peixotto and her female colleagues at Berkeley transformed the economics department and the university in a number of ways that not only influenced how they could act on their civic obligations, but also increased the contributions of the university to social and economic research and policy in both prosperous and troubled times. Their presence in economics meant that male and female students had female academic professional role models. This proved to be a decisive influence on the men students, like Paul Taylor, Charles Gulick, and others who worked closely with them. Clark Kerr, who took four

seminars with her, recalled that her subject matter was not in the mainstream of classical economics, and that she spent a great deal of time with her students. In the bullpen of faculty desks in economics—open to students and faculty—she was "respected and accepted."

Moreover, the economics department was more diverse than most in the 1930s, he noted, in viewpoints and in gender. Their female mentors profoundly affected women who studied at Berkeley, many of whom went on to graduate degrees or social service work.³⁵

Emily Huntington remembered that by the late 1920s the department was composed of theorists, applied economists (in banking and finance), and social economists. In the 1930s, the theorists began to assert dominance, denying tenure to at least one social economist, and stressing methodology, particularly mathematically-based analysis. Huntington herself carried forward Peixotto's commitment to social problems in economics, problems she had first encountered under the tutelage of Plehn and Peixotto. The women economists at Berkeley, with their male colleagues, challenged the traditional areas, or the canons of economic study—the focus on finance, monetary theory, and processes of production in mainstream economics—by balancing the program with research and teaching in labor, consumption, and poverty, as well as social welfare. For them, this challenge was shaped by their intellectual interests, but also by their ethical concerns about how economic processes, systems, and effects should be understood. Alice O'Connor suggests that such efforts to develop "poverty knowledge" flew in the face of classical economics, which assumed that poverty was a natural outcome of economic processes. The researchers at Berkeley also refused to succumb to the theories developing in the 1920s that offered cultural rationales for group and individual poverty. Instead, they continued to see poverty and unemployment as systemic phenomena that occurred as a result of larger economic

and labor market forces, as well as the distribution of wealth—a "problem of political and social economy."³⁶

The social welfare program brought more women graduate students and faculty into the department at the same time that it allowed the university to claim that it was responding to local and state demands as a result of the depression. The research in social economics performed a similar function. Both programs, particular with Heller Committee support, created a network of women students and researchers devoted to examining how economic and social forces operated together to limit opportunities for single women, working families, the unemployed, and the struggling middle class. President Sproul routinely routed requests for assistance in the domain of social welfare or economic legislation to the women in social economics and to Armstrong.

The social economy program provided an intellectual basis for social work training in the department. When other schools were relying increasingly on psychiatric social work to supply the models of relief and counseling for the dependent, the social workers trained at Berkeley perceived their clients' problems as primarily rooted in larger social and economic contexts, often requiring government intervention and regulation. They derived this understanding of their work from the teaching and research of the social economists. This orientation toward research into and treatment of poverty persisted in the program despite the rise of psychiatric social work in many institutions, which took root in the 1920s and 1930s and gained ground increasingly after World War II. It pushed the professional training of social workers toward adjusting clients to their circumstances, rather than examining and attempting to reform the problems inherent in their circumstances. But research and teaching at Berkeley, Chicago, Bryn Mawr College, and a few other programs maintained a commitment to improving

clients' circumstances even as they prepared their students for individual case work and research in municipal and state agencies.³⁷

The women Peixotto brought into economics also influenced their male colleagues. Social economy constituted one of four areas of study in the department, including labor economics, economic theory, and economic history. Those in labor economics found among their female colleagues intellectual support and stimulation in course work and research that was complementary to their own. Added to the curriculum and research program in the department, social economy both broadened and grounded the department's treatment of economics. And it enabled a concern for ethics and civic commitments to balance the growing concern with theory and mathematics, while maintaining the norms of science, in the department's research and teaching. Clark Kerr remembered that when most departments were dominated by neoclassical economists, Berkeley's had liberals and radicals, as well as conservatives, more women, and much collegiality.³⁸

Finally, Peixotto and her network of female and like-minded male colleagues created spaces in the university in which women faculty and students were welcomed and, in varying degrees, influential. With respect to civic learning, this in itself was a signal contribution. Until the turn of the century, women students had been marginalized and largely ignored (aside from Hearst's philanthropic efforts to create dormitories and a gymnasium) despite making up nearly half the student body at Berkeley. By the 1930s, the university offered women faculty and students opportunities in both the regular curriculum and in areas of professional development and civic contributions to the state: home economics, law, social work, and social service, as well as the more traditional, but no less important, field of teaching. Although the university

continued to marginalize women in many ways, these programmatic spaces ensured women continuing bases from which to contribute social and economic reform.³⁹

By locating a social economy program within an economics department Peixotto and her colleagues created a space in the social sciences at Berkeley that directly connected economic research to the real problems and issues that affected Californians on a daily basis—how to live on limited income, how to gage reasonable wages, how to address unemployment and reemployment, how to help the poor become more integrated into local economies, how to develop social legislation not based in prejudice, but in rigorous research, how to understand the struggles of immigrants and other minority groups dealing with an economy that seemed to exclude them. All of these questions are critical to address in a democratic society where political citizenship cannot flower when economic citizenship is denied. The civic and moral implications of their work were carefully framed and guided by acceptable modes of social science research methods and analysis. But they were also informed by a strong sense of justice and fairness. Those excluded from the economy could not function fully in the political and social sphere. That in itself gave them considerable weight in policy discussions in the state of California and the nation.⁴⁰

¹ Wesley Claire Mitchell, "Foreword," in Ewald T. Grether, *et al.*, eds., *Essays in Social Economics in Honor of Jessica Blanche Peixotto* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1935), 1.

² Nancy Folbre, "The 'Sphere of Women' in Early-Twentieth-Century Economics," in Helene Silverberg, ed., *Gender and American Social Science: The Formative Years* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 37. Alice O'Connor, *Poverty Knowledge: Social Science, Social Policy, and the Poor in Twentieth-Century U. S. History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), chapter 1, on the social survey movement, women's roles, and the ethical and reform component of this social science research. Mary O. Furner, *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905* (Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky, 1975). Marianne A. Ferber and Julie A. Nelson, "Introduction" in *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*, ed. Ferber and Nelson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 11, on the objectivity question and how it was defined. An early version of this chapter was presented at the History of Education Society meeting in 1994 as "Berkeley Women's Economic Research." The author thanks Anil Belvadi, William F. Tate, and Donald Warren for their insightful comments on an earlier draft.

³ On women social scientists in a variety of venues, see Robin Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion of Reform, 1890-1935* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Mary Jo Deegan, ed., *Women in Sociology: A Bio-Bibliographical Sourcebook* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991); Ellen Fitzpatrick, *Endless Crusade: Women Social Scientists and Progressive Social Reform* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Rosalind Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982; Mary Ann Dzuback, "Social Research at Bryn Mawr College, 1915-1940," *History of Education Quarterly* 33 (winter 1993): 579-608.

⁴ Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 326. The masters and doctoral level dissertations completed at Berkeley in these years explored a range of topics, including labor movements and organization, immigration, history of California industries, agricultural economics, monetary issues, and other areas, but many focused on labor, often from a historical perspective, in line with institutionalist economic research. Of the 51 Masters theses finished between 1908 and 1940, 15 were done by women; of the 28 doctoral theses in the same period at least 3 were by women. In contrast, in the ten-year period between 1940 and 1950, only 5 of 33 Masters theses were completed by women, 3 in Home Economics, and 1 of 22 doctoral theses was completed by a woman. Thanks to Anil Belvadi for compiling this information for me.

⁵ See, for example, Mary Cookingham, "'Social Economists and Reform: Berkeley, 1906-1961,'" *History of Political Economy* 19 (1987): 47-65; Maresi Nerad, *The Academic Kitchen: Gender Stratification at the University of California*, Berkeley (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999).

⁶ One exception included women in the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago. But in that case, women faculty economists were in a separate school rather than integrated into a social science department proper. Abbott and Breckinridge were able to take advantage of funding that became available to University of Chicago social scientists in the 1920s, advise graduate students in social service administration, and conduct research, but

did not participate in social science department activities. See Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*; Fitzpatrick, *Endless Crusade*; and Folbre, "The 'Sphere of Women'," on the Chicago social scientists.

⁷ Jessica Peixotto to Millicent Shinn, 12 July 1896, Millicent Washburn Shinn Correspondence and Papers, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley (BL, UCB).

⁸ Henry Rand Hatfield, "Jessica Blanche Peixotto," in Grether, *et al.*, eds., *Essays in Social Economics*, 5-14; Mary Ann Dzuback, "Jessica Blanch Peixotto," *American National Biography*, ed. John Garraty (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999). She was the first woman full professor at the University of California.

⁹ Lynn D. Gordon, *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), chapter 2; Peixotto, "Phoebe Apperson Hearst," *University of California Chronicle* 21 (1919): 244-247.

¹⁰ Jessica Blanche Peixotto, Collected Works, University Archives (UA), BL, UCB; Joyce Antler, *Lucy Sprague Mitchell: The Making of a Modern Woman* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).

¹¹ Wheeler to Miller, May 5, 1903, Box 15, File 103, Presidents' Papers (Wheeler), UA, BL, UCB [hereinafter PP (Wheeler), 15:103]; "Biography," Personnel Files (PF) (Peixotto), UA, BL, UCB. Under "Data concerning marriage. (When, where, wife's name, children, etc)," she noted "Opportunities missed."

¹² Folbre, "The 'Sphere of Women'," 43.

¹³ "Lucy Ward Stebbins," *University of California In Memoriam, 1951-59*, 110-113, UA, BL, UCB.

¹⁴ Maresi Nerad, *The Academic Kitchen: A Social History of Gender Stratification at the University of California, Berkeley* (Albany: State University of New York (SUNY) Press, 1999), 35; see chapter 1 on the creation of the department. On home economics, see Sarah Stage and Virginia B. Vicente, eds., *Rethinking Home Economics: Women and the History of a Profession* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).

¹⁵ Mitchell, "Foreword," 1.

¹⁶ Cookingham, "Social Economists and Reform"; Ira Brown Cross, "Portrait of an Economics Professor," University of California Regional Oral History Office (UCROH), BL, UCB.

¹⁷ Cookingham, "Social Economists and Reform"; Lucy Sprague Mitchell, *Our Two Lives: The Story of Wesley Clair Mitchell and Myself* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1953), chapter 9; Folbre, "The 'Sphere of Women'."

¹⁸ Jessica B. Peixotto, et al., *San Francisco Relief Survey: The Organization and Methods Used after the Earthquake and Fire of April 18, 1906* (New York: Survey Associates, 1913); Peixotto wrote Part 5, "Relief Work of the Associated Charities from June, 1907, to June, 1909," pp. 279-318; see also Jessica B. Peixotto, "California's Children: Some Recent Steps in State Child-Welfare Work," *Survey* 36 (1916): 537-540; "The Children's Year and the Woman's Committee," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 79 (1918): 257-262; "Minimum Wage for Minors," in *Standards of Child Welfare* (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Children's Bureau, Bulletin, No. 60, 1919), 118-124.

¹⁹ Ira Brown Cross, "Portrait of an Economics Professor," 59, UCROH, BL, UCB.

²⁰ "Lucy Ward Stebbins," PF, UA, BL, UCB; and *In Memoriam, 1951-59*.

²¹ "Biography," PF, UA, UCB; "Barbara Nachtrieb Armstrong," *In Memoriam, 1977-79*, 11, 13; Roger J. Traynor, et al., "Barbara Nachtrieb Armstrong," *California Law Review* 65 (1977): 920-

936. Other sources will be so noted. Armstrong's feminism was of the equality feminism variety; she believed strongly that women were at least as capable as men of participation in academic and other professional work and ought to be rewarded on an equal basis with men. She also consciously made of herself an example and a mentor to other women in law.

²² Paul Shuster Taylor, in *Let There Be Light: Autobiography of a University, Berkeley: 1868-1968*, ed. Irving Stone (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970), 34, 35.

²³ Barbara Nachtrieb Armstrong, *Insuring the Essentials: Minimum Wage Plus Social Insurance - A Living Wage Program* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1932), 13, 554.

²⁴ Armstrong, *Insuring the Essentials*, 157. Edwin E. Witte, *The Development of the Social Security Act* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1962), on Armstrong's involvement.

²⁵ Lucy Sprague Mitchell, "Pioneering in Education," 42, UCROH, 1962, BL, UCB, and *Our Two Lives*, 193; Josephine Smith, in *The Women's Faculty Club of the University of California, Berkeley, 1979-1982*, ed. Suzanne B. Riess (UCROH, 1983).

²⁶ Emily H. Huntington, "A Career in Economics and Social Insurance," 34, UCROH, BL, UCB; Emily H. Huntington, *In Memoriam*, 1989, 61-64; and Emily H. Huntington, PF, UA, BL, UCB.

²⁷ Emily H. Huntington, "A Career in Economics and Social Insurance," UCROH, BL, UCB; Emily H. Huntington, *In Memoriam*, 1989, 61-64; and Emily H. Huntington, PF, UA, BL, UCB. Eleanor Lansing Dulles, *Chances of a Lifetime: A Memoir* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980), 84; Dulles dedicated her autobiography to Huntington.

²⁸ Huntington, "A Career in Economics and Social Insurance," 34. See also Dulles, *Chances of a Lifetime*, 87-103, on their experiences in London and at Radcliffe.

²⁹ Emily Harriet Huntington, "Cyclical Fluctuations in the Cotton Manufacturing Industry," (Ph.D. thesis, Radcliffe College, 1928); PF (Huntington), UA, BL, UCB, on her activities.

³⁰ Emily H. Huntington, "A Career in Economics," 40; *Doors to Jobs: A Study of the Organization of the Labor Market in California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1942), v. Huntington, too, was an equality feminist, believing that women should have opportunities equal to men's and be judged equally based on the merits of their performance.

³¹ Joseph Dorfman, *The Economic Mind in American Civilization*, Volume Five (5 vols.; New York: Viking Press, 1959), 570-578; Cookingham, "Social Economists at Berkeley."

³² Jessica Blanche Peixotto, et al., *Cost of Living Survey: Report to the California Civil Service Commission Relative to Cost of Living in California for Selected Family Groups* (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1923). Peixotto, Annual Report of the Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics, 1929-30, p. 4 (hereinafter HC Annual Report), PP (Sproul), 1930: 248, UA, BL, UCB. See also Huntington, "The Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics," January 20, 1943, PP (Sproul), 1943: 471, UA, BL, UCB. Much of the information regarding the committee's work is taken from annual reports of the Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics, PP (Campbell and Sproul), UA, BL, UCB. Other sources and documents will be so noted.

³³ Jessica B. Peixotto, *Getting and Spending at the Professional Standard of Living: A Study of the Costs of living an Academic Life* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1927), vii, viii. Emily H. Huntington, *Unemployment Relief and the Unemployed, 1929-1934* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939); Huntington, "The California Unemployment Insurance Law," *California Law Review* 24 (1935-36): 288-301, and "The Benefit Provisions of State Unemployment Insurance Laws," *Law and Contemporary Problems* 3 (1936): 20-35; and Huntington, *Doors to Jobs*. See also Morton Keller, *Regulating a New Economy: Public Policy and Economic Change*

in America, 1900-1933 (Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press), 10-11, on the new consumption economics in relation to institutionalist economic theory.

³⁴ On the University of California's history, see John Aubrey Douglass, *The California Idea and American Higher Education, 1850 to the 1960 Master Plan* (Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press, 2000); Henry F. May, *The Three Faces of Berkeley: Competing Ideologies in the Wheeler Era, 1899-1919* (Berkeley: University of California, 1993).

³⁵ Author interview with Clark Kerr, 14 May 1996. Geraldine Jonçich Clifford, "Shaking Dangerous Questions from the Crease: Gender and American Higher Education," *Feminist Issues* 3 (Fall 1983): 3-62; see p. 15, and "School/Teacher/University: Toward a New Framework for the History of Higher Education in the United States," Willystine Goodsell Address, American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, Georgia, April 14, 1993. It is important to note that one additional woman was appointed in the late 1930s: Catherine de Motte Greene (Quire), who had finished a Ph.D. in a German theory of accounting, who was never promoted above the assistant professor rank in accounting and simultaneously held the position of Associate Dean of Women (*University of California In Memoriam* (1977-1979), 88-89).

³⁶ See Emily H. Huntington, "A Career in Economics and Social Insurance," v. The essays in *Essays in Honor of Jessica Blanche Peixotto*, by former students, include topics such as the American Federation of Labor, the care of the indigent ill, British health and unemployment insurance, self-help cooperatives, unemployment relief, the changing functions of the American family, infant mortality, and historical analyses of various economic reformers. O'Connor, *Poverty Knowledge*, 25, 27.

³⁷ Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion*; Fitzpatrick, *Endless Crusade*; and Dzuback, "Women and Social Research at Bryn Mawr College" explore Chicago and Bryn Mawr's stance in relation to this trend in social work professional development. See James Leiby, *A History of Social Welfare and Social Work* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978); John H. Ehrenreich, *The Altruistic imagination: A History of Social Work and Social Policy in the United States* (Ithaca: Cornell university Press, 1985); Daniel J. Walkowitz, *Working with Class: Social Workers and the Politics of Middle-Class Identity* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999). Walkowitz suggests the impact of psychiatric social work training was not significant until after World War II, but I found courses added at Smith College, Bryn Mawr, and other schools as early as the 1930s.

³⁸ Author interview with Clark Kerr. For Peixotto's influence, see former student and colleagues' contributions to *Essays in Honor of Jessica Blanche Peixotto*, and Cookingham, "Social Economists and Reform."

³⁹ Huntington's work on unemployment and Armstrong's on the Social Security Act are cases in point. Peixotto's commendation on the honorary L.I.D. she received from the university read: "Chosen counselor of the State in matters concerning the protection of children and the care of the unfortunate; social economist marshaling stubborn facts in the service of mankind; comrade among students, inspiring teacher, true lover of humanity," *In Memoriam*, 1941, 25.

⁴⁰ See Alice Kessler-Harris, *In Pursuit of Equity: Women, men, and the Quest for Economic Citizenship in 20th-Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 1-18, for the argument about economic, social, and political citizenship.