"That's just the way it was, but we were happy there:"

Holiday Celebrations at The BC Protestant Orphan's Home from 1910-1960

By Savannah Eckardt

Supervised by Georgia Sitara

A Graduating Essay Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements, in the

Honours Programme

For the Degree of

Bachelor of Arts

In the

Department

of

History

University of Victoria

7 March 2022

Table of Contents

Introduction

The present work will discuss the historiography of twentieth century orphanages in North America and how that literature relates to Victoria's local context. Ultimately, I have chosen to focus on holiday celebrations at the BC Protestant Orphan's Home as holidays were a positive experience of Victoria's local orphanage according to its former residents. This story arose from a two-part desire first to write about children as dynamic and agentive beings, and second to do research of local significance.

The idea of writing about children as agentive beings with experiences and processes as complex as adults' has been an interest of mine that has arisen over years of various course work. It began with studies that have explicitly dealt with the way adults think and write about children, how children are assigned different roles, assumed capacities and capabilities, and rights than adults, and how children negotiate these assignments and assumptions about themselves. Topics that have approached children and childhood in this way have sparked a desire to highlight the ways in which young people are complex, resilient, intelligent, agentive, and strong individuals, even though adults have not tended to write about them this way.

My first encounter with children written about in this way in historical writing was in Sheftel and Zembrzycki's article "'We Started Over again, we were Young": Postwar Social Worlds of Child Holocaust Survivors in Montreal."[1] In their work, Sheftel and Zembrzycki shared authority over the research process with child Holocaust survivors by using oral histories to direct how their stories are told and prioritized aspects of their experience that they believed to be significant.[2] In doing so, it becomes clear that age was an important axis in their nexus of

---

[1] Anna Sheftel and Stacey Zembrzycki. "'We Started Over again, we were Young": Postwar Social Worlds of Child Holocaust Survivors in Montreal," *Urban History Review* 39, no. 1 (2010): 20-30.
[2] Ibid, 21.

experience because they were children becoming adults, integrating into a new society, and were silenced because they were at the bottom of a survivor-hierarchy[3]. Therefore, in telling their own stories, child survivors prioritized the physical and temporal spaces they carved out for themselves in Montreal in which they socialized, networked, and rebuilt their lives.[4] Giving attention to the ways in which young survivors rebuilt their lives suggests not that the postwar era was easier for young people, but that their "difficulty was coupled by an impetus to move forward," and so constitutes an important example of survivor agency and complexity of experience that does not seek to minimize trauma but show that "nightmares and parties are part of the same story."[5] Thus, the present research was inspired in part by Sheftel and Zembrzycki's work to demonstrate the complexity of experience in childhood by highlighting positive aspects of a difficult experience. One does not often think of being a child Holocaust survivor as a positive experience, however the process of rebuilding social lives and meaningful relationships was important to these individuals to show that they were not passive victims but rather had an active role in shaping their experiences, which in their adulthood did include some positive memories. Similarly, my work does not focus on the difficulty of growing up in an orphanage, nor portray children as passive victims of their circumstances, but rather focuses on the complexity of experiences that children navigate.[6] It is not my intention to say that the experience of the BC Protestant Orphan's Home was an easy childhood, but rather that it was a

---

[3] Ibid, 22.
[4] Ibid, 21-22.
[5] Ibid, 22.
[6] For more information on the ways children have been written about as passive, developmental projects in history, see the section on how childhood and child agency have been conceptualized historically in the Western world, theories and typologies of childhood throughout history, and the unique social and historical concepts in which theories of childhood and child agency have developed in: Ute Haring, Reesa Sorin and Nerina J. Caltabiano, "Reflecting on Childhood and Child Agency in History," *Palgrave Commun* 5, no. 52 (2019): 1-9.

site of complex experiences for the young people who lived there that involved both nightmares and parties.

In pursuit of this goal in a local context, Dr. Georgia Sitara had directed me towards the Victoria Archives office for a specific collection of newspaper articles and other related material on the topic of orphanages. Unfortunately, when the time came to begin research, the archives were not accessible due to COVID-19 restrictions and so I was provided with a handful of scans of clipping from this collection and redirected to the online edition of the *British Colonist* (also called *The Daily British Colonist*, the *Daily Colonist*, and other variants) that includes editions from its first issue in 1858 to December 1980. From this database, my research began. Given the vast collection of newspaper articles available on the online database, I utilized the advanced search option to narrow my results to issues published between 1910 and 1960, and including the words "orphan," BC Protestant Orphan's Home," "Cridge," "Christmas," "Holiday," "Thanksgiving," "Halloween," and/or "party." Moreover, the Summons tool on the University of Victoria Library website yielded more recent publications using the advanced search for newspaper articles including keywords "BC Protestant Orphan's Home" and "Cridge Centre." Given the targeted nature of my searches through the archives, I compiled stories of nostalgic alumni meetings, generous donations of money, supplies, and entertainment from individuals in the community, and fun parties with music, games, presents, and candy for the children to enjoy. My findings do not reflect the absence of maltreatment in the Home or reports of abuse in the newspapers, but rather my intent to find stories about positive experiences during the holidays. In short, what these targeted searches provided was textual evidence about holidays having stood out in the memories of previous orphanage residents and how the local news source reported these holiday events. Thus, with the goal to highlight positive aspects of the difficult experience

of living in an orphanage as guided by the memories of the young people who experienced it, this research took on the topic of holiday celebrations at the BC Protestant Orphan's Home from 1910 to 1960.

Given that this research focuses on the experiences of children in the Home from the early to mid twentieth century, it is important to briefly note the significance of this time frame. First, orphanages did not spontaneously appear in 1900. Aggregate care of dependent children in a collective living space—a recognizable orphanage—is a longstanding approach to the challenge of dependent children, with records of organizations with these characteristics going back to late fifteenth century Europe.[7] A twentieth century orphanage, however, was part of a vast collection of these organizations that intended to provide food, lodging, and secular and religious education to needy children which were then institutional rather than home-like in character and structure due to increasing capacity demands, congregate living systems, and strict regimentation practices.[8] Second, orphanages in the twentieth century were comprised of various children in need, rather than just catering to the child of two deceased parents. A dependent child for reasons of poverty, parental death, neglect, delinquency, disability or otherwise may have been cared for in an orphanage; consequently, many children in orphanages had living family members including siblings and one or both parents.[9] Third, toward the close of the twentieth century, orphanages were subject to change. The 1960s specifically was the era to which

---

[7] Hanneke van Asperen, "The Gates of Charity: Images of City and Community in the Early Modern Dutch Orphanage," *Journal of Urban History* 43, no. 6 (2015): 1001.

[8] Marian J. Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression: Orphanages and Orphans in Cleveland," *Journal of Urban History* 26, no. 4 (2000): 440; Howard Markel, "Orphanages Revisited: Some Historical Perspectives on Dependent, Abandoned, and Orphaned Children in America," *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine* 149, no. 6 (1995): 609.

[9] Marshall B. Jones, "Decline of the American Orphanage, 1941-1980," *Social Service Review* 67, no. 3 (1993): 462; Matthew A. Crenson, *Building the Invisible Orphanage: A Prehistory of the American Welfare System* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 17; Nurith Zmora, *Orphanages Reconsidered: Child Care Institutions in Progressive Era Baltimore* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994), 3; Wayne E. Carp, "Two Cheers for Orphanages," *Reviews in American History* 24, no. 2 (1996): 278.

traditional orphanage care finally began to fall: following decades of reform efforts and negotiation amongst those concerned with childcare, the traditional orphanage began to disappear due to increased demands for professionalization and specialization, investigations into internal practices and evaluations against contemporary standards of care, and the transition to more "modern" structures of care, that is, the foster care system.[10] Therefore, the early to mid twentieth century is an interesting period in the history of orphanages because of the prevalence of orphanages that were uniquely institutional in structure and character, the controversy surrounding the institutional nature of them, and their eventual demise in favour of other forms of substitutive care.

The BC Protestant Orphan's Home was no exception to the characteristics of orphanages in this time period. The history of the Home has been written by Vernon Storey, Terry Worobetz, and Henry Kennedy in their book *The Home: Orphans' Home to Family Centre, 1873-1998.* The book published by the Cridge Centre for the Family tells the story of the Home from the early life of its founder, Edward Cridge, to its navigation of religious conflicts, reform efforts, changes in childcare professions, in house social structures, and private funding efforts, to its transformation from an orphanage to the Cridge Centre for the Family. Since its opening in 1873, the purpose of the Home set out in its constitution was "to receive and to provide a home for Orphan, destitute and other children, under the age of ten years, requiring such care; and to educate them in the Protestant Faith, and instruct them in the elements of secular knowledge."[11] By the turn of the century, the phrase "under the age of ten years" had been dropped, formally allowing children of any age into the new brick building for congregate living that could house

---

[10] Vernon Storey, Terry Worobetz, and Henry Kennedy, *The Home: Orphans' Home to Family Centre, 1873 to 1998* (Victoria, BC: The Cridge Centre for the Family, 1999), 123-124.
[11] Ibid, 42.

up to 100 children at a time.[12] Thus, throughout the early to mid twentieth century, the BC Protestant Orphan's Home at any given time housed dozens of needy children—orphaned, destitute, or otherwise—in a collective living space that provided basic necessities of care and education. Throughout the years of controversy in childcare, the Home remained relatively consistent in its structure and function due to its status as a private institution. Indeed, these early- to mid-century years were the golden years of the Home, termed "the Barner Years" after the beloved matron Ada Barner.[13] Ms. Barner worked as a matron at the Home from 1927-1963, the most successful years of the orphanage according to the Home's records and recollections from previous residents due to Ms. Barner's nurturing care for individual children, effective disciplinary methods that kept order in the Home, tireless fundraising efforts, and her overall presence that transformed the environment from "an orphanage [to] a children's home."[14] The Barner years concluded upon her retirement in 1963 and were immediately succeeded by a decade of deteriorating care, accusations and investigations into internal care practices of her successors, and inspections by the Welfare Department before the orphanage succumbed to external pressures and transformed its structure and function into the more "modern" Cridge Centre for the Family.[15]

Therefore, the BC Protestant Orphan's Home features in the following research as a local example of themes and trends in orphanage literature, including positive aspects of the experience of growing up in an orphanage using holiday celebrations as an example. Upon tracing the history of orphanages and how historians have written about them, a microscopic approach to orphanages is favoured for the purposes of the present project because it focuses on

---

[12] Ibid, 42, 65.
[13] Ibid, 91-93.
[14] Ibid, 93.
[15] Ibid, 120-124.

the varied experiences of individuals and groups involved.[16] Moreover, it is shown that recurrent ideas about community involvement in the care of dependent children permeate literature on orphanages for its effect on how children experience and evaluate orphanage care. Therefore, ideas about community involvement and reciprocity are the focus of the bottom-up approach to Victoria's BC Protestant Orphan's Home throughout the twentieth century. In doing so, local newspaper articles from two distinct time frames—namely, 1910 to 1960 and the late 1990s to 2000s —are analyzed to show the ways in which the community was involved in the care of children at the BC Protestant Orphan's Home and how former residents of the Home recall these experiences. Specifically, holidays and recreational activities are highlighted as means of community involvement that stood out in adults' positive memories of their childhoods in the Home from 1910-1960.

The History and Historiography of Orphanages

The history of orphanages in the twentieth century has been approached from one of two perspectives. First, the macroscopic perspective which yields a historiography that tells the story of experts, professionals, policy makers, reformers, and orphanage managers responding to growing dissatisfaction amongst themselves with institutionalism and the abuses associated with it. Later in the century, the literature on orphanages in the twentieth century was complicated with a proliferation of studies with a bottom-up approach. There is general agreement and

---

[16] The language on this kind of approach to historical topics is varied in the literature. Terms such as "microscopic" and "bottom-up" referring to the approach, and "microhistory" referring to the result are found throughout the literature—as well as "macro-" and "top-down" counterparts. Deeper explanation of the historiography can be found in Howard Zinn's influential *A People's History of the United States* or Staughton Lynd's *Doing History from the Bottom* Up. I have chosen to use the terms "microhistories" to mean histories of narrower focus written "from the bottom up" and "macroscopic perspective" for histories written about broader trends.

consistency in the literature on twentieth century orphanages in North America concerning four main and interrelated topics, namely: what constitutes an orphanage and orphan, the usage of orphanages in response to the socio-economic climate, reform efforts, and means of discipline and defiance. The following section will navigate these topics as the history of twentieth century orphanages is outlined. At the same time, both micro- and macro-historical approaches are discussed below first in terms of their distinct rhetorical narratives, and second with respect to two significant thematic similarities, that is the powerlessness of the child and community reciprocity.

From the Macroscopic Perspective

First, from the macroscopic perspective, the narrative of twentieth century orphanages is inseparable from the practice of institutionalism and changing attitudes towards it. Here, 'changing attitudes' does not represent the opinions of those actually living and working within the institutions, but rather reflect the top-down narrative coming from policy makers, experts, and figure heads. The theme of institutionalism from the perspective of those facilitating it dominated twentieth century discussion about orphanages as well as the later secondary literature about it. The following section will discuss broader trends in attitudes towards institutionalism and a top-down perspective of orphanages' responses to it, thus constituting an overview of the history of twentieth century orphanages from a macro perspective. The institutional rhetoric of the twentieth century may be best understood by focusing on two periods of change: first, the Progressive Era from the 1890s to about 1920, and second, from the Great Depression to the Second World War.

The nineteenth century was host to a proliferation of orphanages that culminated in simultaneous dependency on and condemnation of orphanage care and stimulated structural changes throughout the Progressive Era. The social changes associated with massive industrialization, immigration and urbanization coincided with disease epidemics such as cholera, the Catholic mission to rescue children from poverty, Protestant relief agencies, family dislocation, and a series of economic downturns; thus, as orphanages were the only option for dependent children, the number of orphanages skyrocketed.[17] Because some of the most adversely affected North Americans were the poor, the establishment of orphanages was intended to provide food, lodging, education, and moral stability for children of impoverished, often single parent, families, not solely children with deceased parents.[18] Consequently, by 1900 the number of orphanages and families dependent on orphanages had peaked and, because this was the only option for relief for dependent children, showed no signs of downturn. Yet, at the same time, public welfare administrators and private reformers denounced institutional care for children as jail-like, over-crowded, and unsanitary that resulted in children's negative moral and psychological development.[19] Indeed, by the turn of the twentieth century, 'institutionalism' referred to the collection of mental and moral disabilities that were supposedly imposed upon inmates locked away in an asylum.[20] The Progressive Era therefore gave rise to a trend that would last for much of the twentieth century: simultaneous dependency on and condemnation of institutionalized care for children.

---

[17] Madelyn Freundlich, "A Return to Orphanages?" *Adoption Quarterly* 9, no. 1 (2005): 1; Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression," 439; Markel, "Orphanages Revisited," 609.

[18] Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression," 440; Markel, "Orphanages Revisited," 609.

[19] Freundlich, "A Return to Orphanages?" 1; Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression," 441-442; Richard B. Mackenzie, "Orphanage Alumni: How They Have one and How They Evaluate Their Experience," In *Rethinking Orphanages for the 21st Century* (California: Sage Publications, 1999), 105; Carp, "Two Cheers for Orphanages,**"** 277; Markel, "Orphanages Revisited," 609.

[20] Crenson, *Building the Invisible Orphanage,* 113.

Thus, faced with the contradiction of needing yet condemning institutional care, experts and reformers of the Progressive Era were forced to reframe the dilemma of the dependent child. The historical necessity and dilemma that faced those concerned with childcare asks what society ought to do about the persistent presence and plight of the dependent child.[21] The answer to this question, then, depends on each era's understanding of childhood, individual responsibility to care for a child, and what constitutes care for a child.[22] In the nineteenth century, under the conceptual regime of the asylum, the answer was the orphanage. The nineteenth century may be considered the regime of the asylum for its mechanisms employed to deal with problem populations of the era such as the insane asylum, penitentiary, reform school, poor house, etc.[23] The regime of the asylum assumed inviolability of individual character and its susceptibility to environmental influences, so the creation of the asylum was an admission of the inability to control the social environment by creating an artificial environment that could be managed to appropriately structure social experiences and individual character.[24] Progressive Era thinkers, however, operated on a new set of assumptions that proposed to reform society itself to create the kind of environment which would produce upstanding citizens.[25] The attack on orphanages was therefore part of a catalogue of change in institutional vehicles for policies of relief and reform designed to create a child-friendly society in which families would be assured of the values and characters of future citizens by integrating the unfortunates into society then regulating that society to protect the vulnerable and troubled from society, and vice versa.[26] The

---

[21] Howard Goldstein, *The Home on Gorham Street and the Voices of Its Children* (Tuscaloosa, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1996), 95.

[22] Ibid, 96.

[23] Crenson, *Building the Invisible Orphanage*, 18.

[24] Ibid, 19.

[25] Crenson, *Building the Invisible Orphanage*, 19; Zmora, *Orphanages Reconsidered*, 11; Markel, "Orphanages Revisited," 609.

[26] Crenson, *Building the Invisible Orphanage*, 18-20.

condemnation of orphanages as isolating, punitive institutions was therefore a marked development of an ambitious new conception of social reform.

The new conception of social reform is exemplified by the 1909 White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children in that it indicated the direction of expert opinion that would dictate institutional management in the following decades. The Conference's delegates reached several resolutions that demanded adequate medical care for needy children, meticulous record keeping by childcare organizations, state supervision and inspection of childcare facilities, and perhaps most importantly, protection of the sanctity of the family by providing families with financial support, removing children from the home only as a last resort, and placing children in an institution only when home- and family-like care options (such as extended family and foster care) have been exhausted.[27] The shifting attitudes among North American experts about reform and responsibility to the child exemplified at the Conference are indicative of a larger belief during the Progressive Era of reforming society itself in that the state ought to assume control over children and their environment to protect and ensure the innocence of the child.[28] Such attitudes are those of– as social justice historian and social control theorist, Anthony Platt, describes them– the 'Child Savers.'[29] Platt disputed liberal scholars' portrayal of Progressive social reformers as humanitarians who used the courts to bring moral order to a society undergoing radical change in the wake of industrialization, immigration and urbanization; instead, he characterized these reformers as self-conscious middle- and upper-class men and women who worked with capitalists to control the masses in the interest of self

---

[27] Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression," 438; Crenson, *Building the Invisible Orphanage*, 14-15.

[28] Zmora, *Orphanages Reconsidered*, 11; Jon Lawrence, and Pat Starkey, *Child Welfare and Social Action from the Nineteenth Century to the Present* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2001), 7.

[29] Miroslava Chávez-García, "In Retrospect: Anthony M. Platt's the Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency," *Reviews in American History* 35, no. 3 (2007): 466.

preservation.[30] In their pursuit of social control– that is, the planned and programmed way society (meaning the state, experts, professionals, and reformers in this case) responded to expected and realized deviance as it appears in many forms under many labels– the Progressives constructed delinquency and deviancy in ways that criminalized certain people, were corrupt and unjust, and reproduced inequalities.[31] It is no surprise, then, that youth from the lower, "dangerous classes" were targeted. New policies and practices were devised that were aimed at monitoring and correcting certain kinds of youth behaviour under the rhetoric of preserving the positive right of citizens, especially children, to achieve freedom through living in a society that cultivated full human development– hence the name the Child Savers.[32] Platt and other social control theorists continued from the 1960s onward to divulge the ways in which the voices of social control and liberal reform (that is, the middle class and capitalists) blurred the distinction between dependent and delinquent children to institutionalize problematic youth, reinforce the status quo, and regulate expendable members of society.[33] Mclaren, Menzies, and Chunn, for example, employ the concepts of *social control*– that is, the planned and programmed way society responds to expected and realized deviance, *moral regulation*–multidirectional and mundane control via public, private and personal moralizing discourses that inspire condemnation or support to animate control practices, and *governmentality*–the interdependencies between external civilizing processes and internal self constitution– to analyze modes of social control as instruments for suppressing and policing individuals and activities labelled as socially deviant in BC throughout the twentieth century.[34] In short, the Progressive

---

[30] Ibid, 466.

[31] Chávez-García, "In Retrospect: Anthony M. Platt's the Child Savers," 466; John MacLaren, Dorothy E. Chunn, and Robert Menzies, *Regulating Lives: Historical Essays on the State, Society, the Individual, and the Law* (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2002), 9.

[32] Chávez-García, "In Retrospect: Anthony M. Platt's the Child Savers," 466-467.

[33] Ibid, 469-470.

[34] MacLaren, Chunn, and Menzies, *Regulating Lives*, 11-14.

Era sought a new kind of reform that aimed to improve the entire social environment of society by identifying, isolating, and correcting deviance in order to protect and properly cultivate (or simply, 'save') the future upstanding citizens.

In practice, the influence of the Child Savers' rhetoric was realized in the micropolitics of institutional management. Despite growing criticism of institutionalism, there remained comparatively strong structural support for private orphanages and charities in the US and Canada compared to Europe because of a muted political history of socialist parties bent on class struggle or a bureaucratic state intent on consolidating its authority; therefore, influence over social policy fell to existing charitable institutions that developed the expertise, organizational arrangements, and administrative capacity for welfare.[35] Child welfare policy was thus formulated in charity workers' responses to expert criticism and prescriptions, the difficulties of running orphanages, and the call for creating alternatives to institutional care.

Through orphanage management and charity workers, the Child Savers' initiative was translated into an effort to make institutions less institutional. Orphanage administrators of the Progressive Era attempted to manipulate the traditional structure and function of the institution to mimic family life: they eliminated the most abusive manifestations of traditional institutionalism such as shaved heads and marching, prohibited corporeal punishment, advocated for greater freedom to develop individuality, encouraged natural and spontaneous play, changed their names from "orphanage" or "asylum" to "Homes" for children, and altered the physical environment to a more home-like physical space that lacked fencing, allowed for decoration, and encouraged freedom of movement.[36] Essentially, Progressive reformers relied on orphanages to protect children from the perils of poverty and consequent deviancy and so demanded the control and

[35] Crenson, *Building the Invisible Orphanage*, 27-29.
[36] Ibid, 114-116.

regulation of an institution yet denounced the institution for its jail-like conditions. Therefore, the orphanage managers responded by attempting to keep the institution for its purpose but make it less institutional.

From the macroscopic perspective, the second period of development in institutional rhetoric occurred from the Great Depression to the Post War Era. This period is characterized by crises of financial means and institutional goals as orphanages attempted to provide care for more children with less money and emerging professionalization pressures.[37] Like the demand/condemnation paradox of the Progressive Era, the Great Depression had a two-fold effect on the expectations of orphanages. Orphanages were depended on to care for the increasing numbers of needy children resulting from the Great Depression; however, orphanages were experiencing their own financial crises from the Depression and were given no relief due to the condemnation of institutionalism throughout the Progressive Era.[38]

Simultaneously, there grew the sentiment that orphanages were no longer intended for poor children. This ideology was circulated through formal public settings (such as in the articulation of the new function of institutional care as being the provision of individual attention to badly behaved or disturbed children in temporary care), in expert literature stating children in institutions were disproportionately disturbed, public reports from orphanages of higher ratios of disturbed children, and public opinion which held that children in substitutive care were no longer simply less fortunate but rather disturbed.[39] "Disturbed" children, not unlike the Child Savers' characterization of "deviant" children, referred to those with emotional and behavioural problems who need to be isolated and treated by medical professionals.[40] Although the language

---

[37] Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression," 439.
[38] Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression," 444; Jones, "Decline of the American Orphanage," 463.
[39] Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression," 442-443; Jones, "Decline of the American Orphanage," 464-465.
[40] Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression," 445; Jones, "Decline of the American Orphanage," 466.

switched from deviant to disturbed, correctional to treatment-oriented, the same children—poor

children—remained in institutions. Public opinion and formal reports using that language of

disturbed children in orphanages created a sort of feedback loop: despite being stigmatized for

housing disturbed children, orphanages were still necessary to help struggling families, so

parents and social workers learned to emphasize emotional and behavioural problems over

poverty to get children admitted into orphanages, resulting in reports of higher numbers of

disturbed children in institutional care.[41] Moreover, expert opinion had continued to shift into the

conviction that direct services and support for families, boarding out, foster homes, and adoption

were developmentally favourable options for needy children.[42] These were not viable options,

however, because there were simply not enough foster families or families looking to adopt.[43]

Amidst the seemingly plentiful other options, experts then began to question whether institutions

were stepping up to aid troubled children, or rather, as the reported ratios would have one

believe, the children were troubled because they were in an institution.[44] Thus, throughout the

Great Depression, Homes for children were expected the care for the increasing numbers of

dependent children and filled beyond their capacity whilst subject to their own financial crises

without support because they had been stigmatized once again as insufficient and unhealthy

environments for children.

By the end of the Depression, orphanage management met the demand of providing

treatment for "disturbed" children. Because, according to the experts and public opinion,

children who were merely impoverished could supposedly be supported through family financial

---

[41] Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression," 445; Jones, "Decline of the American Orphanage," 466.
[42] Freundlich, "A Return to Orphanages?" 1; Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression," 444; Jones, "Decline of the American Orphanage," 467.
[43] Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression," 444.
[44] Ibid, 445.

aid or substitutive care in a foster home, then the only children needing institutional care were "disturbed." For the institutions, this meant a shift toward treatment-oriented care that required the professionalization and specialization of orphanage spaces and staff; and for many children in orphanages, this meant leaving the Home and entering the foster care system.[45] Aside from the dislocation and disruption of families caused by the Second World War that briefly lowered admission standards and filled orphanages beyond capacity yet again, the interwar and post war eras saw several measures designed to dismantle institutions for children by returning orphanage residents to their natal families or distributing them by foster care or adoption.[46] In contrast to the less-institutional institutions of the Progressive Era, this broad movement toward deinstitutionalization sought to "rely less upon the unnatural, artificial human interventions called institutions… to no longer shelter children from society, but to integrate them into it."[47] Orphanage administrators thus followed suit guided by popular rhetoric: children ought to remain with their family, or if absolutely necessary, with another family, except disturbed children who should be placed into specialized and temporary care.

In short, the history of twentieth century orphanages through the macroscopic lens traces the shifts of expert, policymaker, and public opinion as they simultaneously demanded the services of orphanages and belittle the care provided. Ultimately, the critiques were heard by orphanage managers who responded with two distinct types of deinstitutionalization: first, with no other option for dependent children, the attempt to make institutions less institutional, and later the shift to treatment-oriented care for disturbed children so all others would be removed from the institution and placed in alternate, more family-oriented substitutive care. Given the

---

[45] Jones, "Decline of the American Orphanage," 468-470.
[46] Morton, "Surviving the Great Depression," 451; Crenson, *Building the Invisible Orphanage*, 18.
[47] Crenson, *Building the Invisible Orphanage,* 234.

social, political, and economic turmoil of the twentieth century, it is easy to assume that the above changes were unplanned offshoots of great forces of modernization; yet this assumption ignores the fact that these changes were part of a calculated response to economic, professional, and social pressures.[48] The significance of this top-down narrative of reform instruction being translated down to the individual orphanages is that it emphasizes the fact that these changes were carefully planned.

The Rise of Microhistories

Beginning in the 1970s, new voices entered the discussion of twentieth century orphanages to complicate the narrative. That is, the voices of the microscopic perspective. The microscopic approach entered the historiographical spotlight as a tool for the new social history that sought to emphasize social structures, interactions and experiences of different groups instead of focusing solely on the figureheads of history.[49] In its pursuit of meaningful history from the ground up, the microscopic perspective addresses major critiques of the macroscopic approach, although the two approaches do share significant overlap. Thus, the following section will first highlight the main critiques of the macroscopic lens that historiographers have raised and how social historians address such critiques with a microscopic lens, then discuss the narrative differences between the two perspectives, and finally, address important thematic similarities between the two approaches.

---

[48] Neil Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth-Century Consensus* (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 1976): x.
[49] Chávez-García, "In Retrospect: Anthony M. Platt's the Child Saver," 470; Carp, "Two Cheers for Orphanages," 278.

In essence, the macroscopic approach to the history of orphanages has been critiqued for simplifying, overgeneralizing, and using social control theory as its main theoretical framework. More recent scholarship from the new social history era argues that there are many variations, ambiguities, exceptions, and paradoxes of institutional life that frustrate the reduction of experiences to the roles of agencies of social control that do not distinguish ideological objectives of institutions from their accomplishments from the perspective of those institutionalized.[50] The result of such reductionism is an intellectual history about movers and shakers—the experts, professionals, policy makers, reformers, and orphanage managers— enacting unidirectional change resting on official reports and institutional facilitators that lacks a sense of how these institutions actually functioned and the perspective of the residents and poor families who used these institutions.[51] Thus, in the simplest terms, what the microscopic contributes to the story of twentieth century orphanages is neglected contestation and negotiation of institutional change, and the ignored experiences of those within the institution.

In critiquing the top-down approach, the microscopic view brings clarity and dynamism to the story of twentieth century orphanages first by focusing on the identities of and motivations attributed to institutional managers. While the macroscopic perspective provides a historical account of orphanage staff readily accepting prescriptions from triumphant reformers, scholarship with a narrower lens shows these institutions were not so monolithic.[52] Studies that allow for the experiences and motivations of those actually working within orphanages show that most were experienced and professionally trained childcare workers who were genuinely concerned with the welfare of children and interested only in providing surrogate care until they

---

[50] Howard Goldstein, *The Home on Gorham Street and the Voices of Its Children*, 95; Zmora, *Orphanages Reconsidered*, 2.
[51] Carp, "Two Cheers for Orphanages," 278.
[52] Carp, "Two Cheers for Orphanages," 282; Markel, "Orphanages Revisited," 609.

could return home, not long-term institutionalization for the purposes of social control or moral reform.[53] Schlossman's 1977 *Love and The American Delinquent* for example uses local newspapers and court records to understand the experiences of youth and orphanage operations and argue that neither were simply top-down control mechanisms, but rather an experience of active negotiation involving youth, their families, and institutional workers and practices.[54]

The process of reform was therefore a more multidirectional process of compromise, negotiation, and contestation. During the Progressive Era, orphanage managers selectively embraced some changes that were in their own interest whilst refuting some of the Progressive's larger goals. For example, orphanages accepted the reformers' motion to make institutions less institutional and more family-oriented while simultaneously refuting efforts to completely replace institutional care with family placement by implementing the cottage plan system.[55] The cottage system was widely advanced in the early twentieth century as a superior, more home-like arrangement wherein a group of smaller cottage-style houses would replace the existing congregate system.[56] Embracing the cottage system allowed institutions to appease reform efforts whilst satisfying their own goals of preserving the institution and providing children with sufficient care. Indeed, many accounts from within the walls of the orphanage cottages concern the efforts of staff to strongly encourage relationships between resident children and their families to preserve family ties over long years of separation, relax institutional controls such as uniforms and sex segregation, cultivate individualism, encourage play, provide privacy, upkeep clean and healthy spaces, supply nutritionally adequate meals and sufficient clothing, facilitate

---

[53] Chávez-García, "In Retrospect: Anthony M. Platt's the Child Savers," 469; Wayne E. Carp, "Orphanages: The Strength and Weakness of a Macroscopic View," *Reviews in American History* 27, no. 1 (1999): 107-108.
[54] Chávez-García, "In Retrospect: Anthony M. Platt's the Child Savers," 470-471; Steven L. Schlossman, *Love & the American Delinquent: The Theory and Practice of "Progressive" Juvenile Justice, 1825-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977).
[55] Carp, "Two Cheers for Orphanages," 282.
[56] Crenson, *Building the Invisible,* 134.

social adjustment and emotional development, and provide access to vocational training and

extracurricular activities poor children would not otherwise experience.[57] Expert critiques and

reform efforts of the early twentieth century therefore cannot fully and accurately represent the

experience of contemporary orphanages. The microscopic perspective allows the previously

neglected negotiations, efforts, and motivations of institutional operators to be understood as

equally complex and influential as concurrent reform efforts.

Similarly, the second major difference of the microscopic approach is it allows for the

experiences of children and poor families to be a part of the story via its contribution of *hidden*

histories and exposure of narrative hierarchies. The rediscovery of *hidden histories* refers to the

effort to uncover shocking accounts of abuse that can often be left out of the public narrative, as

well as the effort to reemphasize the disadvantaged position of those who have hidden histories

as lived experience and discursive constructions.[58] In doing so, intersectionality becomes

important to understanding the experience, construction, and hierarchical organization of that

position. Feminist work in the 1980s and 1990s, for example, criticized earlier macro-historical

works using social control framework for simplifying the role of women and experiences of girls

and young women[59]. The resulting scholarship therefore sought to reemphasize the experiences

of young women and how gender informed juvenile social welfare systems by analyzing

individual orphanages, families, and young girls' lives. In doing so, feminist studies

demonstrated how the lives of working-class families and their daughters were not simply

dictated by reformers but that there was a triangulated network of struggles and negotiations

---

[57] Goldstein, *The Home on Gorham Street and the Voices of Its Children,* 104-105; Zmora, *Orphanages Reconsidered,* 137-138; Carp, "Two Cheers for Orphanages," 279-280; Markel, "Orphanages Revisited," 609.
[58] Lawrence, and Starkey, *Child Welfare and Social Action from the Nineteenth Century to the Present*, 1.
[59] Chávez-García, "In Retrospect: Anthony M. Platt's the Child Savers," 469-472.

among parents, daughters, and institutional officials.[60] Furthermore, the microscopic perspective illuminates how these hidden histories, even once uncovered, are systematically placed at the bottom of a narrative hierarchy. Sheftel and Zembrzycki's work with child Holocaust survivors in Montreal, for example, demonstrates how hidden histories like the experiences of children can be placed at the bottom of a hierarchy and therefore hidden in resulting historical narratives. The study gives a platform to share their experiences in their own terms to child survivors who were not viewed as "real victims" and were thus silenced by adult survivors, the larger prewar Jewish community, and Montreal as a whole.[61] A narrower lens allows for hidden histories and experiences to be heard in the terms of those who are silenced and therefore guides analysis of overlooked experiences and oversimplified roles in ways that allow those in a disadvantaged position, such as the poor and children, to be a part of the story in an active and agentive role.

By narrowing the historical lens, previously unseen contestation and unheard voices complicate the top-down narrative in ways that allow for a more complex understanding of people, places, and experiences that had been so readily labelled as fundamentally bad in association with institutionalism. As will be further demonstrated in later sections, the strength of the microscopic perspective is its insistence on the big influence of small voices. The voices of individuals and the understanding of how voices are filtered through intersectional experience with factors such as age, gender, racial, immigration status, etc. is crucial to understanding any story, including that of twentieth century orphanages. This perspective adds to the dominant top-down narrative by saying that although these changes were planned, they were not unidirectional, readily accepted without question, nor uniformly implemented, experienced, or

---

[60] Ibid, 472-473.
[61] Sheftel and Zembrzycki, "'We Started Over again, we were Young,'" 21.

remembered. Rather, orphanages of the twentieth century were shaped by the individuals within their walls as much as they shaped those individuals.

Finally, the two narrative perspectives share a handful of similarities. First, there are some superficial similarities that bridge together the historiography of twentieth century orphanages, such as the general composition and structure of orphanages from the Progressive to postwar eras. For example, scholars looking through either lens have agreed that what constitutes an "orphan" has rarely meant a child of deceased parents as we understand it to mean today, but instead a dependent child for reasons of poverty, parental death, neglect, delinquency, or otherwise.[62] Similarly, within narratives from both historiographical traditions, there is a transition from the structure and language of traditional asylum-style institutionalism to a less recognizable institution that is home- and family-like with use of familial language and structural changes such as the cottage plan, then a swing toward professionalization and specialization, and concluding with the eventual downfall of traditional orphanage care in favour of foster care and adoption.

What is more interesting, however, is the thematic similarities between the two perspectives because the overlap indicates enduring significance. Namely, the powerlessness of the child and the pervasive sense of community underlay much of the literature on twentieth century orphanages. The twentieth century, according to historian Neil Sutherland, was host to great improvements in health, welfare, and education that affected the lives of children unevenly and so poverty, discrimination, neglect, and abuse persist despite all efforts.[63] What persists above all, he argues, is the powerlessness of childhood: "the contingency at its very base that

---

[62] Jones, "Decline of the American Orphanage," 462; Crenson, *Building the Invisible Orphanage*, 17; Zmora, *Orphanages Reconsidered,* 3; Carp, "Two Cheers for Orphanages," 278.
[63] Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society*, vii.

makes children ever and always at the mercy of those who are stronger."[64] While Canada made itself into an industrial nation in an effort inextricably tied to economic, political and social changes, and new ways of perceiving and behaving, new institutional arrangements flowed from these broader changes which included a new set of social policies on the child.[65] These policies governed rearing the child to protect them from the perils of industrial capitalist society, and to protect them from becoming a burden on society.[66] This theme of powerlessness of the child is consistently evoked throughout both micro- and macro-historical narratives. From the language and philosophies of child-saving to individual orphanage workers' efforts to protect and cultivate the development of children into well-adjusted members of the community, children are, at every step and every level, at the mercy of those who are stronger, bigger, and louder. Consequently, a silencing occurs and the implication for historiography is that children's stories are often lost.[67] One of the ways historians confront the notion of powerlessness of children is to include the experiences and perspectives of children that show them as agents of history, and the smaller scale of microhistories can facilitate this effort. The language of protection persistent in both narrative approaches to twentieth century orphanages therefore points to the need to address this powerlessness and give attention to the silenced stories, through microhistories, for example.

Another recurrent theme in the literature is the experience of being a part of a community, an orphanage's reciprocity with its surrounding community and the need to highlight community reciprocity. In all types of literature on twentieth century orphanages, the importance of community reciprocity consistently comes up as a key theme to the experience and function of orphanages. Timothy Hasci's hugely influential *Second Home: Orphan Asylums and*

---

[64] Ibid, vii.
[65] Ibid, x.
[66] Ibid, x.
[67] Sheftel and Zembrzycki, "'We Started Over again, we were Young,'" 21.

Poor Families in America, for example, takes a macroscopic view of American orphanages from 1800 to the Great Depression to answer questions about the function of and types of care in institutions, and trends of growth and decline of asylum care. The most original contribution of Hasci's macroscopic piece is his idea that by 1900 the categorical types of antebellum orphanages all evolved into 'integrative institutions' that attempted to integrate children into the community and emphasized providing a home-like atmosphere.[68] Similarly, memoirs from orphans that chronicle a firsthand experience of day-to-day life in an institution, the specific buildings and playgrounds, personal relationships, and the individual personalities who comprised residents and staff, all invoke a strong sense of community within the orphanage and with the larger community. Edward Rohs' memoir *Raised by the Church: Growing up in New York City's Catholic Orphanages,* for example, tells his story about how he was raised in five different Catholic Homes across the state of New York. Throughout his book, Rohs details the relationships with asylum staff, other inmates, his peers at school who lived outside the Homes, local businesses, community role models, various organizations and community leaders who donated to the Homes, and many more.[69] In writing about his personal experiences, Rohs traces his development as an individual and his relationships to others and the community through specific crystalizing moments that, for him, stand out as important memories of what it means to grow up as both an orphan in an institution and as a member of a larger community. What it means to be an orphanage resident and a member of a community therefore emerges as a meaningful experience that has much to contribute to the story of twentieth century orphanages.

---

[68] Carp, "Orphanages," 107.

[69] Edward Rohs, and Judith Estrine, *Raised by the Church: Growing up in New York City's Catholic Orphanages*, (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011).

Thus, building upon existing literature reviewed here, the following analysis intends to use a microscopic lens to look at the experiences of children in a particular orphanage, The BC Protestant Orphan's Home, as it existed in a context of the powerlessness of the child to highlight the depth and complexity of experience via their experience of community.

Community

"Take the Gift of my Child and Return Something to Me"

The notion of a strong and mutually beneficial relationship between an orphanage and the community within which it is situated is not a unique phenomenon characteristic of twentieth century North America. Indeed, ideas about orphanages protecting children, promoting cultural and communal continuity, and providing material, social and emotional support can be observed in transcultural and transhistorical contexts. Orphanages from seventeenth century Netherlands, twentieth century Cleveland, modern day West Africa and South Asia, in Islamic traditions, and back to today's American political landscape have all concerned themselves with community reciprocity of orphanage care.

The persistent themes of orphanage care across continents and centuries concern an orphanage's ability to foster a sense of belonging within the institution and wider community, give access to better material and educational resources, and provide a structured, loving environment. An orphanage's role in the community, and vice versa, was a point of responsibility and pride for the Dutch from fifteenth to seventeenth centuries. The iconography of Dutch 'gates of charity'– decorative edifices installed around the main doors of orphanages to represent the function of the orphanage to the community– demonstrates the responsibility of the

city as a benefactor, the expectations of citizens, and the effects of charity on the community.[70] By the seventeenth century, gates of charity became a recurring element that reflected the increased role of the city in poor relief with images of poor children reading or praying in city colours or other identifiers of their benefactor.[71] The images of poor children wearing the colours of the city benefitting from moral education helped to portray orphans as virtuous members of the urban community and convey the importance and success of charity to the community.[72] Gates of charity therefore emphasized and glorified the sense of community belonging of Dutch orphanages as a two-way street, meaning that the community helps the orphanage with the collective effort given to care for poor children and, in turn, the orphanage helps the community by cultivating virtuous citizens raised with good moral education and literacy (rather than delinquents left to their own devices) as members of the community.

Moreover, orphanages facilitating a sense of belonging to the greater community and within themselves have been equally important to the wellbeing of inmates of the orphanage and the success of the orphanages. Orphans in today's West Africa, for example, reveal an intense need to belong and connect their positive experiences in the orphanage directly to the orphanage's ability to satisfy their need for belonging.[73] Similarly, according to traditional Islamic doctrine, for example, an orphan is a child who cannot care for themselves and thus must be provided with strong relationships, shelter, good education, rights, and love affection for them to grow into proper citizens.[74] Orphanages in Islamic cultures, therefore, have been built in a way that is conducive to neighbouring residents so that they can most easily fulfill their Islamic duty

---

[70] Asperen, "The Gates of Charity," 1000-1002.

[71] Ibid, 1005-1011.

[72] Ibid, 1007-1011.

[73] Joana Salifu Yendork, and Nceba Z Somhlaba, ""Exiled Life, or Home Away from Home?" Exploring Ghanaian Orphan Narratives of Orphanage Placement," *Africa Today* 62, no. 2 (2015): 31.

[74] Rizal Sofian., Syed Iskandar Arffin., and Azari Mat Yasir, "Orphanage Welfare and Care Centre as Integration with Community," *Arts and Design Studies* 13, (2013): 31.

of providing protection and love to children.[75] The key to this Islamic design then is permeability– meaning the extent to which an environment allows people's access to it.[76] Islamic orphanages thus facilitate community involvement in the institution by making the orphanage easily accessible from mainstream public areas, creating an interplay between public and private spaces in location and building design, and generating activities and inviting other community children to play.[77]

Amid growing popularity of Western volunteer tourism in Southeast Asia, orphanages in Cambodia are similarly trying to articulate orphanages as a two-way street via emphasized cultural continuity and communal reciprocity.[78] The structure of orphanages is bounded but not constrained, continuous with the community and village life in sights, sounds, and smells, consistent with traditional Buddhism, and gives children access to different kinds of environments with opportunities for exploration and solitude.[79] Children here are thus treated as developing, equal members of the community who need access to freely explore the same environment, traditions and expectations as everyone else. Moreover, children and their parents are both positively inclined towards orphanage care because of the superior education and nutritional opportunities provided by the institution.[80] At the same time, there is an expectation of reciprocity. As community resources are available to orphanage children like public school, clinics, and opportunities for friendships with larger peer groups, children in the orphanage have responsibility to return something to the community like perform at festivals and share

---

[75] Ibid, 31-32.
[76] Ibid, 32.
[77] Ibid, 32-35.
[78] Kathie Carpenter, "Continuity, Complexity and Reciprocity in a Cambodian Orphanage," *Children & Society* 29, no. 2 (2013): 85.
[79] Ibid, 88-90.
[80] Ibid, 85.

orphanage resources like classes, library access, play spaces, etc. with children from outside the institution.[81]

As these transhistorical and diverse cultural examples suggest, the importance of community to the experience and success of an orphanage is a pervasive trend in orphanage care. Caring for dependent children is not so much a unidirectional act of selfless donation to a static figure of the needy and helpless child; rather, caring for dependent children is a reciprocal and complex relationship. As the people of Kilimanjaro understand it, caring for a dependent child is to "'take the gift of my child and return something to me.'"[82] From this perspective, children are understood as a gifts and resources to be gained and given: when you are given a basket, put something in return into the basket to show thankfulness, and as a result, the basket having been an object of multidirectional exchange is fuller and mutually beneficial.[83] In other words, children are well of knowledge and potential, so a dependent child in the care of another person/institution is to give that person/institution a gift of opportunity and potential, which they receive and enrich, and then the child is released and enriches the community in return. This means that there is an implication of give and take, both in an immediate sense (meaning dependent children are not simply leeching community resources) and in a later, grander sense (meaning the child will grow into a successful, well-adjusted citizen). In the simplest terms, there is a pervasive, longstanding understanding of caring for dependent children as an investment of material, social, and emotional support from the community for which there is an expectation of reciprocity from the children as members of the community.

---

[81] Ibid, 92.

[82] Amy Stambach and Aikande C. Kwayu, "'Take the Gift of My Child and Return Something to Me: On Children, Chagga Trust, and a New American Evangelical Orphanage on Mount Kilimanjaro,'" *Journal of Religion in Africa* 43, no. 4 (2013): 380.

[83] Ibid, 380-381.

Like the above examples, the relationship of investment and return between a community and its dependent children was one of the main factors that shaped the experience of orphanages for children in twentieth century North America. Both primary and secondary sources on twentieth century orphanages in North America offer examples of how orphanages fostered a reciprocal relationship between the children and community including fundraiser events, auxiliary clubs, children's performances, alumni associations, parties, summer camps and day trips, recreational sports, sponsored excursions, and many more. The ways in which individuals and entire communities organized to invest in the care of dependent children was closely tied to the positive memories of twentieth century orphans who cite a sense of community belonging and involvement. In essence, these communities took the gift of a child, enriched them with material and mental support in ways for which children felt gratitude, remembered fondly, and consequently grew into a successful citizen that was able to return something and contribute to the community.

For citizens of Victoria, taking the gift of a child was advertised as the duty of a responsible, caring, and capable citizen, as Canadians were purported to be, and was therefore a point of pride in Canadian mythology, and personal and national fulfillment. On the eve of a century of peace between the United States and Britain in 1913, for example, *The Daily Colonist* (now *The Times Colonist*) wrote that it is this period of peace that "made the progress of Canada possible… to develop in ourselves and our children a Canadian spirit," and so "there is… much talk of giving aid to the Empire.".[84] Given that "in all our cities a great work is going on in the saving of children," we ought to offer these services to the Empire: "there are orphan children…and for these society must provide… it is a disgrace to civilization that these have not

---

[84] "Matters of Moment in Women's Realm: Help for Children," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 26 Feb 1913, 8.

always had the support their aims deserved" therefore, the "good mothers and fathers… rich men and women" ought to care for needy children for the sake of the Empire.[85] Moreover, during the First World War, public declarations in the local newspaper of collective responsibility of caring for dependent children took on explicitly patriotic language: "to train up good citizens for this Canada of ours," wrote *The Daily Colonist* in 1917, "is the most patriotic act that married men and women can do."[86] Therefore, in language consistent with colonial mythology of the time, citizens of Victoria were urged to care for the children in part as their responsibility as good Canadians, and for the gift that would be returned.

The promise of reciprocity from the child immediately and in a grander sense of cultivating and integrating good citizens was the promised investment return. *The Daily Colonist* urged able citizens to help with the care of dependent children because it was rewarding. Upon receiving the care they needed, the dependent "little boy or girl soon learns to be useful, and, when kindly treated, will in almost every case repay the love bestowed upon him or her."[87] Similarly, many caregivers "have received from such children, not only affection, but material help when greatly needed," and have "found the chances that the child will become a useful member of society are many times greater."[88] It seems, then, that Victorians in the twentieth century were tasked with the duty to uphold the integrity of their Empire and local community by helping needy children grow into successful members of a household, community, and Empire.

A particularly interesting and understudied example of how communities were involved in the care of dependent children is holiday celebrations. Holiday celebrations provided the opportunity for recreation and play outside of the daily routine, the giving of personal gifts and

---

[85] Ibid, 8.
[86] Maria Lawson, "In Women's Realm: Homes for Children," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 4 July 1917, 8.
[87] Ibid, 8.
[88] Ibid, 8.

practical donations, and engagement with adults and other children outside of the institution. Moreover, institutionalized children fondly remember and later cite holidays as a source of comfort, fun and bonding, and opportunity for community engagement. Thus, the following section will focus on themes of community involvement in holiday celebrations at the BC Protestant Orphan's Home.

Holidays at the Home

Holiday celebrations at the Home are a significant point of discussion because they involved several elements of community engagement and are fondly remembered and cited by former residents as significant parts of their experience in the Home. Moreover, by highlighting a happy part of the Home experience as indicated by the memories of the previous residents themselves, holiday parties illuminate a positive hidden history. A positive hidden history is important because positive memories and experiences can get hidden in the bigger narrative just like the horrific, abusive ones have been. Because orphanages were under attack for much of the last century as part of anti-institutionalism aims, positive aspects of orphanage care have been lost or underrepresented. Therefore, the present section uses holiday celebrations at the Home as an example of community involvement that was a positive experience for many children in the Home and is underrepresented in orphanage literature and so gives a voice to the depth and complexity of local orphans' experiences.

As previously discussed, play was an important concern for twentieth century orphanage operators for reasons of "normal" childhood development and integration into society. Play and recreational activities became important aspects of orphanage operation early on and

accompanied several changes throughout the century, such as the shift to the cottage plan which

led to bigger, more functional play spaces like ball diamonds, playgrounds, and gymnasiums.[89]

Play spaces on orphanage grounds and access to communal recreational activities like youth

clubs, singing and dancing classes, arts, sports teams, movies, and museums were a point of

pride for the orphanages as they were considered developmentally and socially advantageous for

these otherwise disadvantaged children and useful for the purposes of integrating the children

into the community.[90] Providing holiday celebrations had long been a part of this effort, indeed:

"long before most asylum children were attending public schools or making regular trips outside

for entertainments, holidays served as an important connection to the world beyond the asylum's

walls."[91] Holiday celebrations involved generous donations of orphanage supplies, gift giving

traditions for the children, entertainment from visitors, big meals and desserts, visits from family,

and other fun activities that strengthened the bond between the children and the community as it

was all facilitated by personal and monetary contributions from individual donors in the

community, auxiliary organizations, and orphanage staff.[92]

   At the BC Protestant Orphan's Home, holiday celebrations had two main and interrelated

objectives that contributed to their meaningfulness: donations and engagement. First, because

orphanage care lacked government funding, the material and monetary support of community

donors was crucial to the function of orphanages in providing material resources to children. The

Home retained its status as a private institution throughout much of the twentieth century so it

could continue to operate on the religious basis stipulated in its founding purpose free from

---

[89] Timothy A. Hacsi, *Second Home: Orphan Asylums and Poor Families in America* (Harvard University Press, 1997), 198-199.
[90] Ibid, 199-204.
[91] Ibid, 208.
[92] Ibid, 204-208.

government influence and professionalization pressures; consequently, the Home operated entirely on public donations.[93] Of uniquely local significance was the annual Pound Party, an institution started by the Home's founder Bishop Cridge as a day to be held on the king's birthday for donations that comprised a main source of support for the orphans.[94] In 1926, for example, "the orphanage was in gala attire and the children elated to be at the event… orphanage officials were [likewise] particularly pleased with this year's donations, as they consisted mostly of the important and nonparishable commodities such as flour, sugar, salt, soap, matches, tea, and cereals."[95] In the weeks leading up to the annual Pound Party, the newspaper would remind locals that "the home receives no grant from the city or government and depends entirely on the generosity of the public" and so to keep the upcoming event in mind.[96]

More widely enjoyed holidays were also a significant source of donations for the Home, particularly Christmas. Christmas at the Home brought in donations of all kinds: individual gifts, monetary and material donations, and donations of time and entertainment. Individual gifts such as toys, candies, and clothing were given to the children for their personal use and pleasure; similarly, cheques and bags of food and supplies were dropped off to the orphanage that would sustain the lot of them for the upcoming year.[97] However, it was the donation of time from individuals and organizations in the community that provided the most opportunity for engagement and were consequently remembered decades later.

In essence, individuals in the community made holiday celebrations possible, fun, and memorable. Local individuals and organizations engaged with holidays at the Home in a variety

---

[93] Storey, Worobetz, and Kennedy, *The Home*, 91.
[94] "Orphanage Holds Large Reception," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 4 June 1926, 20.
[95] Ibid, 20.
[96] "Pound Party is Arranged," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 18 Sept 1935, 8.
[97] "Santa Claus Brings Gifts to Orphans," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 30 Dec 1922, 8; "Eighty Children Guests at Government House Party," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 15 Dec 1944, 6.

of ways that made celebrations possible, from funding or fundraising, to organizing, to participating in entertainment. Funding and fundraising efforts were made throughout the community with different levels of engagement required. Some well-to-do citizens and local shops would donate food or decorations– or simply write a cheque– in contribution to the Home's parties.[98] Meanwhile, others who were eager to participate but with less resources at their disposal required fundraising efforts to contribute. The Junior Auxiliary to the BC Protestant Orphanage, for example, was a local organization that fundraised to make possible holiday parties at the Home. The Junior Auxiliary was a group of young women, many of them former orphans, who helped the staff at the Home, raised funds, visited sick children, brought household items, and generally cared for the residents.[99] For instance, the fashion show and afternoon tea hosted by Miss Sheila Graves of the Junior Auxiliary in 1943 from which "the entire proceeds will provide Christmas gifts and winter comforts for the children at the orphanage."[100] Similarly, the Victoria College Council held a raffle at their own event, the proceeds from which were ceremoniously gifted to the orphans in birthday hats to buy blankets for the Home.[101] Additionally, prominent businesses donated their space to the children's parties. The Government House and Empress Hotel, for example, both donated for the evening their space and services as a venue for the holiday celebrations.[102] Not only did the venues supply extra staff necessary to facilitate these large events free of charge, but they also functioned as an inviting space to gather where the lines between orphan and "normal" child, orphanage and community were blurred.

---

[98] "Santa Claus Brings Gifts to Orphans," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 30 Dec 1922, 8.
[99] Storey, Worobetz, and Kennedy, *The Home*, 110.
[100] "Social and Personal: Will be Commentator at Fashion Show," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 3 Nov 1943, 6.
[101] "College Council Fetes Orphans," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 12 Jan 1957, 15.
[102] "Orphans Romp in Empress," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 15 Dec 1957, 28.

Moreover, effort from local individuals and groups also went towards organizing the holiday celebrations. Individuals donated their time for months in advance to organize entertainment for the upcoming celebrations. Leading up to the Christmas celebrations of 1922, for example, "Mr. Pollard, who [had] given so generously of his time to the training of the children, visiting the home every Saturday, directed them in their singing… [and] Miss Parfitt, who has been equally kind in assisting at all the practices for the last few months, coming to play the accompaniments."[103] The Junior Auxiliary again was involved in this level of engagement. The local newspaper reports that the Auxiliary gathered at their monthly meetings to determine net proceeds of the last month, how that money ought to be spent, and who oversaw that spending.[104] It was determined in April of 1941, for example, that the sum of $36.15 from the last month "will go towards buying clothing for the children and furnishings for the home. Plans were made to give children an Easter party at the Home, and Miss Davina Dingwall is in charge of the committee making these arrangements… [and] Three birthdays were reported for the month of April. Miss Margot Hughes will visit the home the purposes of taking the gifts."[105] Along with big holidays like Christmas, Easter and Thanksgiving, birthdays in the Home were always celebrated, usually with cake, ice cream, and games.[106] The Junior Auxiliary was committed to organizing celebrations at the Home throughout the year, and the local paper was equally committed to reporting the generous actions of specific benefactors, not unlike the Dutch gates of charity. The celebrations were thus made possible by meticulous planning efforts over months by volunteers in the community.

---

[103] "Santa Claus Brings Gifts to Orphans," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 30 Dec 1922, 8.
[104] "In the Realm of Women: Orphanage J.W.A." *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 4 April 1941, 7.
[105] Ibid, 7.
[106] Storey, Worobetz, and Kennedy, *The Home*, 116.

Perhaps the most impactful means of contribution was participation in the actual parties. Adults and children from outside the Home were also invited to participate in holiday celebrations as they would provide entertainment, food, and opportunities for socialization in ways that lowered the boundary between the grounds of the BC Protestant Orphan's Home and Victoria. Adults would accompany the children in the Home on excursions or provide entertainment. On Christmas day of 1915, "under the auspices of the Island Automobile Association," for example, "the little ones of the Protestant Orphanage [were] taken for a two-hour round the city and vicinity in motors [and] each of the children [were] given a Christmas present."[107] Similarly, for Thanksgiving of 1954 "Philip Chan, Victoria branch president of the Canadian Restaurant Association" organized a luncheon wherein "city restauranteurs [would] desert their cash registers and… provide all the food, serve the meal, and wash the dishes" for the Protestant Orphanage children.[108]

A particularly fun way adults were invited to participate in holiday celebrations was not just to provide the food or entertainment, but to be the entertainment themselves. Volunteer entertainers such as storytellers, magicians, and Santa Clauses became a staple of the Home's Christmas celebrations that were fulfilled by different community members each year. Children gathered around Reverends William Stevenson and A.B. Owen at the 1922 Christmas party for stories about Santa Claus and old Christmas traditions.[109] Moreover, "Mr. William Harkness, whose "magic" delighted [the children] when white rabbits, oranges and candles appeared unexpectedly from apparently empty boxes," volunteered his services for the 1936 Christmas party, for which "the children's excitement knew no bound."[110] The role of Santa Claus was

[107] "City News in Brief," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 25 Dec 1915, 6.
[108] "Big Eyes—Big Appetites, Too," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 10 Oct 1954, 1.
[109] "Santa Claus Brings Gifts to Orphans," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 30 Dec 1922, 8.
[110] "Children From Orphans' Home Spend Happy Time," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 24 Dec 1936, 8.

filled every year by anyone from a friendly neighbour such as Brigadier Sutherland Brown in 1936 to the Lieutenant Governor Frank Ross in 1958 who "presented each child with a king-sized package, [which] by an odd coincidence contained just what the children had been hoping Santa would bring."[111] Not even the wave of measles that made its way through the Home in 1954 would halt the volunteer Santa's visit: "Teddy, 5, Danny, 1, and Linda, 21 months, were beaming last night as Santa took time out from the annual Christmas party which the other 40 children at the orphanage were attending, to nip upstairs with an armload of gifts."[112]

Children from outside the Home were likewise invited to participate in the holiday celebrations. Other needy children, such as those from the Children's Aid Society, as well as their more fortunate peers from school who were accompanied by their parents to the parties were invited to play alongside the children in the Home and enjoy the festivities.[113] Although the gifts from Santa at these particular events were given only to the children of the Home, they and their schoolmates "played [together] in the garden, enjoying the treat of hearing the band play, or talking to some of the guests" and, given their inclusion at the party, they were "seemingly as happy and as healthy, and certainly as promising little citizens for Victoria."[114] Holidays were thus an opportunity for children to socialize with their peers and adults from outside the Home in a playful environment in which festivities overshadowed socio-economic boundaries and stigma they may have experienced elsewhere.

The children in the Home also participated in providing entertainment for the parties as a reciprocal gesture of gratitude to those who made the parties possible. Most commonly, the

---

[111] "Children From Orphans' Home Spend Happy Time," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 24 Dec 1936, 8; "Wouldn't Miss it for the World," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 21 Dec 1958, 27.
[112] "Santa Spots Spotted Tots," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 18 Dec 1954, 32.
[113] "Orphanage Holds Large Reception," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 4 June 1926, 20; "Eighty Children Guests at Government House Party," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 15 Dec 1944, 6.
[114] "Orphanage Holds Large Reception," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 4 June 1926, 20.

children performed song and dance for the attendees of the holiday celebrations. The celebrations

often "opened with an entertainment by the children, whose singing of the sweet old carols was

greatly enjoyed as the audience of grown-ups packed the dining hall."[115] The evenings would

also conclude with "the appreciation of the children charmingly conveyed in enthusiastic

clapping, cheers… Christmas songs… [and] dance."[116] Furthermore, holidays also invoked ideas

about longer-term reciprocity. For example, only one boy from the Home was reported missing

from the 1958 Christmas party because "he is too old for 'kids' party anyhow. He is an 18 year

old school boy who works in a downtown department store part time. While the other children

were receiving their special Christmas presents he was helping sell Christmas presents at the

store."[117] This report echoes the idea that the children of the BC Protestant Orphan's Home were

enriched by their experience of community care and grow into citizens able to give back to the

community by later participating on the preparation end of holiday traditions.

In Hindsight

The focus in this research on community reciprocity at the BC Protestant Orphan's Home

was inspired by the theme in secondary literature, as mentioned, and more recent publications in

local news sources that indicate the importance of holidays and a sense of belonging to the Home

experience. In the late 1990s to early 2000s, articles published in the local newspaper *The Times

Colonist* and *Report Newsmagazine* BC edition included the voices of former residents of the BC

Protestant Orphan's Home that support the idea that the Home fostered a sense of belonging

---

[115] "Santa Claus Brings Gifts to Orphans," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 30 Dec 1922, 8.
[116] "Children From Orphans' Home Spend Happy Time," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 24 Dec 1936, 8.
[117] "Wouldn't Miss it for the World," *Daily Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 21 Dec 1958, 27.

amongst residents and to the larger community in ways that are fondly remembered. Former residents recall holiday celebrations, peer relationships, and recreational activities with other children and adults in the community that suggest their experiences of the Home were personal and varied.

The articles published from the late 1990s to early 2000s include former residents of the BC Protestant Orphan's Home citing memories specifically of holiday celebrations. In the letter published by Peter Salmon entitled "A Salute to the Orphanage," for example, Salmon recalls his experience of being born in the Depression and raised at the orphanage. The context of his public letter was to express gratitude to the Home and to the matron, Ada Barner, who cared for him as a child. One of the specific memories that made it into the brief publication was about the Christmas of 1938. "All the children were invited to the official residence of the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia on Rockland Avenue," Salmon recalls, where they "had some snacks followed by the usual Christmas party. [And he] received a pen and pencil set as [his] gift."[118] Of the memories that stand out from his day-to-day experiences, Salmon recalls the Christmas party as an example of the care he received as a member of the Home and, even after many years, he "still has the original invitation to the party."[119] Similarly, in the article "Orphans Gather at Anniversary," life-writer Grania Litwin reports the events of the alumni reuniting at the 125th anniversary of the BC Protestant Orphan's Home. One invitee, Linda Dobson, recalls: "We used to come here for parties and presents every Christmas… We were well looked after and I had a beautiful time."[120] Other alumni, siblings Maxine and Steve Harris, remember "a big bonfire at halloween [*sic*], pony rides in the grounds. Every child's birthday was celebrated," as

---

[118] Peter Salmon, "A Salute to the Orphanage – Photos Courtesy the Cridge Centre – by J.F. (Sandy) Carmichael," *Times Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 1 Aug 1995, 2.
[119] Ibid, 2.
[120] Grania Litwin, "Orphans Gather at Anniversary," *Times Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 27 Mar 1999, 1.

Maxine says, "it was a good childhood… I'm very grateful for that."[121] Additionally, former

resident Bruce McLay describes the high quality of his childhood experience in the Home for an

article entitled "Orphanage Raised Many Successful Citizens" by pointing out that "local

businesses and charity groups lavished attention on the home's residents at Christmas

time…[they] had a Christmas party every single day starting from the 15th on."[122] Given that

these articles intend to highlight positive memories of the children's Home experience, it is

significant that memories of Christmas, Halloween, and birthday parties were drawn upon. This

lends merit to the idea that holiday celebrations were positive and noteworthy aspects of the

experience of growing up in an orphanage.

 Moreover, the collection of publications from the 1990s to 2000s about local orphanage

care includes examples of community involvement in a broader sense. At the anniversary party,

Maxine Harris remembered that although they experienced some stigmatization and

ostracization, overall, they had a good time: "[we] kids were picked on, that's just the way it was,

but we were happy there…We went to Government House, the Shriners Circus, the Ice Capades

and always had the very best seats in the house. We were treated as special people."[123] Salmon

remembers other kinds of activities like "the afternoon matinees…church and Sunday school

every Sunday… a basketball court and the older boys taught us basketball, soccer, etc."[124]

McLay similarly remembers recreational activities facilitated at the Home such as "trips to the

movies and hockey games."[125] Adults in the community participated in orphanage care "by

offering some service to the home," as Salmon remembers, "one father had three children in the

---

[121] Ibid, 2.
[122] Susan Danard, "Orphanage Raised Many Successful Citizens," *Times Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 29 Sept 1996, 1.
[123] Litwin, "Orphans Gather at Anniversary," 1.
[124] Salmon, "A Salute to the Orphanage," 2.
[125] Danard, "Orphanage Raised Many Successful Citizens," 2.

home and, as he was a barber, would cut all the boys' hair as required."[126] The various alumni remember the ways in which the Home made an effort to have the kids involved with the community beyond the orphanage grounds, and for that they are grateful.

Ultimately, the recollections of holidays and recreational activities as means of community involvement tie into the narrative of long-term reciprocity as each newspaper article makes an argument for the experiential and developmental benefit of orphanages as substitutive care given that the children grow into successful, contributing members of society capable of giving back to the community. According to the orphanage's rules and regulations of care and minutes from operators' meetings over the years, to raise a successful and contributing member of society meant anything from keeping young girls out of prostitution, facilitating orphans' education to become nurses, policemen, and members of parliament, and raising children that will one day grow into adults of alumni associations and auxiliary clubs that can donate time and money to the home that raised them.[127] Each article makes a point of saying that the children of the BC Protestant Orphan's Home are grateful for the care they received in the Home, had strong relationships within the orphanage with staff and other children, felt a sense of belonging in the larger Victoria community, and consequently grew into successful citizens. In Salmon's letter, for example, he expresses gratitude for his "year at the home was one of [his] fondest… for giving [him], and many other children, an opportunity to restart a life which somehow got temporarily derailed."[128] After establishing his own personal success as a local developer, McLay similarly says: "it was a great home… I think it gave you a good, sound beginning… and many did well for themselves, becoming prominent leaders in their communities… A lot of

---

[126] Salmon, "A Salute to the Orphanage," 2.
[127] Storey, Worobetz, and Kennedy, *The Home,* 44, 110-112.
[128] Salmon, "A Salute to the Orphanage," 3.

outstanding businessmen came out of here."[129] Dick Thompson, for example, who has since

earned a Ph.D. in social work and often has the responsibility of placing children in the home he

was raised or in foster care says of his experience in the Home that he "had friends in the home

and in the schools and community. We learned moral values, as well as a work ethic… it was

probably the best thing my mother could have done" for him after his father passed away.[130] In

the same fashion, Charles Ellington expresses gratitude for the Home first for caring for him

when his father was injured in the First World War and his mother couldn't afford to feed him as

the youngest of five children during the Depression, and second for the institution offering him

employment early on in his adulthood as a member of the board of directors.[131] Ellington went

on to serve twenty-five years as a board member of the Home, which felt to him like he "could

give back to the society for all that was done for [him]."[132] Finally, in the most explicit fashion,

McLay is cited in another article entitled "Maybe Dickens was Wrong: The Idea is Growing that

Orphanages Did a Better Job Than Foster Homes" that argues that a community led orphanage

experience is ultimately better for the child and the community long-term. "I'm a poor orphan

boy, but I've done as well as anyone in Victoria," says McLay, "those foster children have been

moved around so much they don't trust anyone after awhile; they've had no discipline or curfews

or the loving, caring women I grew up with. We had stability, so everyone became bonded one to

another, like a big family… We'd have a better quality child at the end."[133] McLay, as an

"entrepreneurial father of four," serves as his own example of an orphanage-raised child turned

---

[129] Danard, "Orphanage Raised Many Successful Citizens," 1.
[130] Candis McLean, "Maybe Dickens was Wrong: The Idea is Growing that Orphanages did a Better Job than Foster Homes," *Report Newsmagazine (British Columbia Ed.)* 10, no. 23 (1999): 2.
[131] Charles Ellington, "Orphanage Became Cridge When it Took in Families, Not Just Kids," *Times Colonist* (Victoria, BC), 29 June 2008, 2.
[132] Ibid, 2.
[133] McLean, "Maybe Dickens was Wrong," 2.

successful, contributing member of society that gives back to the community.[134] The aspect of taking a gift and returning it is therefore important to how an orphanage functions and how its success is measured.

In short, caring for dependent children conceptualized as "take the gift of my child, and return something to me" is a pervasive theme that informed twentieth century orphanages in Canada. In Victoria specifically, to take in a dependent child was a gift of potential as much as a responsibility to enrich the child, so that child may later return something to the community. This initiative took the form of community members involving the children of the BC Protestant Orphan's Home in the community via holiday parties and recreational activities. Consequently, some former residents of the Home recall their experience of the orphanage as positive in ways that allowed them grow into successful, well-adjusted citizens that may now give back to the community that cared for them by pursuing fulfilling careers that stimulate the local economy, working at the Home that raised them, organizing and attending alumni events, practicing social work for today's dependent children, and maintaining and forming healthy relationships with family they grew up with in the Home and the families they have since made.

Conclusion

The present work has discussed the historiography of twentieth century orphanages in North America and how that literature relates to our local context. Upon tracing the history of orphanages and how historians have written about them, microhistories were favoured for the purposes of the present project because they focus on the varied experiences of individuals and

---

[134] Ibid, 1.

groups involved. From both a top-down and bottom-up perspective, however, the theme of

community is evident in both approaches, which indicates its enduring significance. Recurrent

ideas about community involvement in the care of dependent children permeate literature on

orphanages for its effects on how children experience and evaluate orphanage care and for this

reason, themes of community belonging and reciprocity were the focus of the present bottom up

approach to Victoria's BC Protestant Orphan's Home throughout the twentieth century.

On the theme of community, the main focus has been that there exists a longstanding,

mutual expectation of involvement and reciprocity between an orphanage and the community

with which it is associated. In essence, citizens of a community are expected to participate in the

collective responsibility of caring for dependent children, for which they will be rewarded

immediately as individuals and over time as a community that gains respectable citizens. One

interesting example of how communities are involved in the rearing of dependent children is

through holiday celebrations. Holiday celebrations were an important part of the orphanage-

community relationship because they were a connection to the social world beyond orphanage

walls. Moreover, investigation from the bottom-up perspective shows that children who grew up

in orphanages later cite holiday celebrations as positive experiences in their childhood.

To that end, holiday celebrations for the children of the BC Protestant Orphan's Home

became the focus of this research. Publications from the local newspaper, *The Daily/Times

Colonist*, from two distinct periods served as the main source material for this research. First,

articles published in what was then called *The Daily Colonist* from 1910 to 1960 were analyzed

to provide examples of the ways in which various sectors of the community were involved in the

orphanage's activities, particularly holiday celebrations. In doing so, holidays have stood out as a

significant means of community involvement and positive experiences of growing up in the BC

Protestant Orphan's Home from 1910 to 1960. The considerably long date range under analysis speaks to the nature of holiday parties as a significant tradition that endured many changes throughout much of the twentieth century. Comparatively recent articles published in *The Times Colonist* from the late 1990s to early 2000s then served as a reference point for the enduring significance of community involvement and evidence for the importance of community involvement by featuring the voices of former Home residents citing their fond memories of holidays and recreational activities amongst the greater Victoria community. Furthermore, some publications go so far as to explicitly say that it is because of these positive experiences and relationships that children in orphanages will grow into happier, healthier, and more successful adult citizens than children in other forms of substitutive care. Such claims about the comparatively higher success of adults who grew up in orphanage versus foster care therefore argues for the idea of long-term reciprocity for the collective community benefit.

In short, the present research contributes to existing literature on twentieth century orphanages with a local Victoria example that is guided by those who experienced it and allows for their positive hidden histories to be a part of the story. While it is not my intention to say that growing up in an orphanage constitutes an easy childhood or that abuse did not happen, it is my belief that the history of orphanages in the twentieth century has been largely guided by anti-institutionalism rhetoric and, consequently, some voices speaking of their positive memories have been underrepresented as meaningful representations of the experience of life in an institution. In other words, this is not to say that life in the Home was an objectively positive experience but rather that the unfortunate experience of being in a Home that struggled to meet the most basic of needs such as blankets and flour was animated in a way that was fun for children and, in their adulthood, they do remember some positive aspects of these circumstances.

A bottom-up approach has thus highlighted the memories of adults of their time as children in the Home that attempt to put parties and nightmares in the same story as equally complex parts of experience.[135] It is my hope, then, that this work advocates for a different way of talking about children: that is, a way that allows children to be understood and written about as complete beings with diverse, complex experiences that they construct, understand, and represent in their own ways.

---

[135] Sheftel and Zembrzycki, "'"We Started Over again, we were Young,'"" 22.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Daily Colonist. (Victoria, BC), 1910-1960.

Times Colonist. (Victoria, BC), 1995-2008.

McLean, Candis. "Maybe Dickens was Wrong: The Idea is Growing that Orphanages did a
      Better Job than Foster Homes." *Report Newsmagazine (British Columbia Ed.)* 10, no. 23
      (1999): 48-52.

City of Victoria Archives. File AC4-CL-01606.

Secondary Sources

Asperen, Hanneke van. "The Gates of Charity: Images of City and Community in the Early
      Modern Dutch Orphanage." Journal of Urban History 43, no. 6 (2015): 1000-1020.

Carp, Wayne E. "Two Cheers for Orphanages.**"** *Reviews in American History* 24, no. 2 (1996):
      277-284.

Carp, Wayne E. "Orphanages: The Strength and Weakness of a Macroscopic View." *Reviews in*
      American History 27, no. 1 (1999): 105-111.

Carpenter, Kathie. "Continuity, Complexity and Reciprocity in a Cambodian Orphanage."
      Children & Society 29, no. 2 (2013): 85-94.

Chávez-García, Miroslava. "In Retrospect: Anthony M. Platt's the Child Savers: The Invention
      of Delinquency." *Reviews in American History* 35, no. 3 (2007): 464-481.

Crenson, Matthew A. *Building the Invisible Orphanage: A Prehistory of the American Welfare*
      System. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Freundlich, Madelyn. "A Return to Orphanages?" *Adoption Quarterly* 9, no. 1 (2005): 1-11.
Goldstein, Howard. *The Home on Gorham Street and the Voices of Its Children*. Tuscaloosa,
      Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1996.

Hacsi, Timothy A. *Second Home: Orphan Asylums and Poor Families in America*. Harvard
      University Press, 1997.

Haring, Ute., Sorin, Reesa., and Caltabiano, Nerina J. "Reflecting on Childhood and Child Agency in History." *Palgrave Commun* 5, no. 52 (2019): 1-9.

Holman, William Roger. *The Orphans' Nine Commandments.* Fort Worth: TCU Press, 2009.

Jones, Marshall B. "Decline of the American Orphanage, 1941-1980." *Social Service Review* 67, no. 3 (1993): 459-480.

Lawrence, Jon., and Starkey, Pat. *Child Welfare and Social Action from the Nineteenth Century to the Present*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2001.

Mackenzie, Richard B. "Orphanage Alumni: How They Have one and How They Evaluate Their Experience." In *Rethinking Orphanages for the 21st Century*, 103-126. California: Sage Publications, 1999.

MacLaren, John., Chunn, Dorothy, E., and Menzies, Robert. *Regulating Lives: Historical Essays on the State, Society, the Individual, and the Law*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2002.

Mafumbate, Racheal., Constantine, Maxwell., and Musingafi, Chando. "The Psychology of Wellness and Orphanage: Interrogating Wellness Perspectives, Models and Dimensions in Community Relations." *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* 4, no. 28 (2014): 105-112.

Markel, Howard. "Orphanages Revisited: Some Historical Perspectives on Dependent, Abandoned, and Orphaned Children in America." *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine* 149, no. 6 (1995): 609-610.

Morton, Marian J. "Surviving the Great Depression: Orphanages and Orphans in Cleveland." Journal of Urban History 26, no. 4 (2000): 438-455.

Rohs, Edward., and Estrine, Judith. *Raised by the Church: Growing up in New York City's Catholic Orphanages*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2011.

Schlossman, Steven L. *Love & the American Delinquent: The Theory and Practice of "Progressive" Juvenile Justice, 1825-1920.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Sheftel, Anna and Stacey Zembrzycki. ""We Started Over again, we were Young": Postwar Social Worlds of Child Holocaust Survivors in Montreal." *Urban History Review* 39, no. 1 (2010): 20-30.

Sofian, Rizal., Arffin, Syed Iskandar., and Yasir, Azari Mat. "Orphanage Welfare and Care Centre as Integration with Community." *Arts and Design Studies* 13, (2013): 31-37.

Stambach, Amy., and Kwayu, Aikande C. "Take the Gift of My Child and Return Something to Me: On Children, Chagga Trust, and a New American Evangelical Orphanage on Mount Kilimanjaro." *Journal of Religion in Africa* 43, no. 4 (2013): pp. 379-395.

Storey, Vernon., Worobetz, Terry., and Kennedy, Henry. *The Home: Orphans' Home to Family Centre, 1873 to 1998.* Victoria, BC: The Cridge Centre for the Family, 1999.

Sutherland, Neil. *Children in English-Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth-Century Consensus*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Yendork, Joana Salifu & Somhlaba, Nceba Z. ""Exiled Life, or Home Away from Home?" Exploring Ghanaian Orphan Narratives of Orphanage Placement." *Africa Today* 62, no. 2 (2015): 27-42.

Zmora, Nurith. *Orphanages Reconsidered: Child Care Institutions in Progressive Era Baltimore*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994.