

CONTINUING TO PAY THE “PATRIOTIC  
DEBT”: THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE  
PENNSYLVANIA SOLDIERS’ ORPHANS  
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, 1893–1912

*Sarah Bair*  
*Dickinson College*

**Abstract:** In 1893 the Pennsylvania legislature approved funding to build a residential, industrial school designed to consolidate under one facility the thirty-year-old program for the care and education of Civil War orphans in the state. Two years later, the Pennsylvania Soldiers’ Orphans Industrial School opened on 100 acres of land in Scotland, Pennsylvania, a small village near Chambersburg and convenient to the Cumberland Valley Railway line. This article examines how the school’s mission and early history were shaped by several distinctive features, including its roots in an existing system for educating Civil War orphans, its chronic financial problems, and its lack of a single founder with a clear vision. Under the direction of a state-appointed commission, the school maintained a traditional focus on order, discipline, morality, and military structure while simultaneously seeking to employ emerging trends in industrial education and child welfare.

**Keywords:** Civil War orphan education; industrial education; PA residential schools; veteran-affiliated schools

*T*he Pennsylvania Soldiers’ Orphans Industrial School (Scotland School) opened on 100 acres of beautiful land in Scotland, Pennsylvania on June 3, 1895.<sup>1</sup> With a mission to give care and

protection to any remaining eligible Civil War orphans in Pennsylvania, the school provided academic and industrial training in an effort to develop disciplined, patriotic, and productive citizens.<sup>2</sup> Pennsylvania legislators who approved the creation of the school viewed it as a mechanism to consolidate under one facility the thirty-year-old program for the care and education of Civil War orphans in the state. At the time of its opening several other residential schools already operated within Pennsylvania to educate certain populations of dependent children, including three schools still under the auspices of Pennsylvania's system to care for Civil War orphans. Two of the best known schools outside of this system included Girard College, opened in 1848 in Philadelphia for poor, orphaned, or fatherless white boys, and the Carlisle Indian School, established by General Richard Henry Pratt in 1879 as the first of what would become many Indian boarding schools around the country.<sup>3</sup> The Milton Hershey School—originally named the Hershey Industrial School—opened for orphaned boys in 1909 and also shared a common historical context with the Pennsylvania Soldiers' Orphans Industrial School.<sup>4</sup> At the national level, several noteworthy industrial schools opened in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century as a result of the prominent and largely successful industrial education movement. Despite certain similarities to these schools, the Scotland School possessed distinctive features that shaped both its origins and subsequent history.

First, unlike schools built from the ground up, the Pennsylvania Soldiers' Orphans Industrial School grew out of a well-established, state-run system that by 1893 had been in place for thirty years.<sup>5</sup> With roots dating back to the deadliest days of the American Civil War, the school represented another step, albeit not an inevitable one, in Pennsylvania's ongoing commitment to the care of war orphans. The commitment began with Pennsylvania's wartime governor, Andrew G. Curtin, who, in an effort to recruit soldiers reluctant to join the Union cause, promised them that the state would take care of children orphaned by the war. Curtin remained true to his promise and, beginning in 1864, used a sum of \$50,000 previously donated by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company to support the war effort as seed money for orphan education.<sup>6</sup>

Governor Curtin considered several different approaches to handling the Civil War orphan question in his state, but ultimately decided on a statewide system for orphan care and education under the direction of a state superintendent appointed by the governor.<sup>7</sup> Although he recognized that gaining legislative approval and funding for such a system might be difficult, Curtin believed that it was the only way to ensure that vulnerable children received

proper care and were not subjected to the whims of local leaders or exploited for financial gain.

Curtin convinced the Pennsylvania state legislature to approve and fund an ongoing program to educate and care for children orphaned by the Civil War. Both he and his legislative colleagues believed that the system, set up to accommodate children between the ages of five and sixteen who were full or half orphans as a direct result of the war, would only be needed for a few years. Because the initial plan prohibited the enrollment of any children born after 1866, state leaders calculated that the program would come to an end no later than the early 1880s. Curtin believed that this short-term investment would be well worth the cost because it would pay a "patriotic debt" to fallen soldiers and would simultaneously strengthen the commonwealth by ensuring that the orphans would grow up to be respectable, self-sufficient citizens. Neither Curtin nor the legislators serving in 1864 when the initial plan was approved anticipated the long-lasting enrollment demands that ultimately shaped the program over the three ensuing decades.

Despite financial pressures in the postwar years and the state government's expressed goal of keeping the system targeted and manageable, the enrollment pressures that extended the system stemmed largely from a series of legislative actions that expanded the pool of eligible applicants to include children born after 1866 as well as those whose parents became disabled after the war.<sup>8</sup> As a result, by 1880 only about 100 children in the system had fathers who died while still in the military. The fathers of most of the children had either died after being discharged or had become sick or disabled as a result of the war. It was not uncommon for young men to go to war, to become sick or disabled as a result of the war, and to then have children long after returning home.<sup>9</sup> These changes meant that the expected enrollment decreases never came.

By the early 1890s, the Civil War orphan program in Pennsylvania had supervised a total of forty-three institutions across the state and had served almost 15,000 children at a cost of nearly \$10 million.<sup>10</sup> Legislators had a choice. They could either end the system, thus turning away needy children who met the same criteria as previously admitted ones, or they could find more efficient and cost-effective ways to continue it. Among those advocating for the continuation of the orphan education program, support began to grow for the construction of a centralized industrial school that could first meet the needs of Civil War orphans and then be converted to a manual training school for other destitute children once the last of the orphans had left the school.

Several other states, including Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois, had already established homes specifically for the orphans of Civil War soldiers, and, unlike in Pennsylvania, in these cases the states owned and operated the facilities directly.<sup>11</sup> To its credit Pennsylvania, with its decentralized system, took on the care of far more soldiers' orphans than other states did in the same period, but this costly system presented its own challenges and after three decades many legislators hoped to find a new way to keep the state's commitment to Civil War veterans and pay its "patriotic debt" to them and their children.

In order to determine the feasibility of an industrial school plan, the Commissioners of Soldiers' Orphan Schools set up a special committee in 1892 to explore options and to make a recommendation about how best to move forward. As part of its work, this committee sent members to visit a variety of industrial schools around the country, including: the St. Louis Manual Training School; the Indiana Soldiers' and Sailors' Orphans Home in Knightstown, Indiana; the Toledo Manual Training School; the Chicago Manual Training School; the University School and Jewish Orphanage in Cleveland, Ohio; the State Industrial School in Rochester, New York; Pratt's Institute in Brooklyn, New York; and the New York Trade School.<sup>12</sup> The school in Knightstown, Indiana, was the only one specifically geared to soldiers' orphans. Based on an examination of the various methods used at the schools, the committee issued a report with recommendations to the commission and to the state legislature on December 15, 1892. After reminding readers that many worthy and needy Civil War orphans remained to be cared for and that providing them with industrial training would benefit both them and the state, committee members recommended that Pennsylvania build an industrial school to accommodate up to 1,000 students. They further recommended that a committee of three be appointed to help prepare a bill for legislative approval and to help secure the required appropriations.<sup>13</sup>

As a result of this committee's work, Pennsylvania's Act of 1893 authorized the creation of the Pennsylvania Soldiers' Orphans Industrial School and approved funds needed to erect, equip, and maintain the school. According to the law, the school would be operated by the existing Commissioners of Soldiers' Orphan Schools until 1897 when new appointments would be made for two-year terms. This commission, established by the Act of 1889 to replace the state superintendent as the administrator of the Civil War orphan schools, comprised the governor, two state senators, three members of the state house, and five honorably discharged soldiers who were members of the

Grand Army of the Republic.<sup>14</sup> The new law authorized the commission to purchase 100 acres of land in an easily accessible location on which to build an industrial school that would care for and educate those children still being served by schools in the Civil War orphan education system. The law allowed the commission to continue to operate other schools until all children could be transitioned to the new school.

The Act of 1893 reaffirmed admissions requirements established under previous laws and outlined admissions preferences. The act required parents of applicants to have lived in Pennsylvania for five years prior to the date of application and mandated that applicants be under the age of fourteen. According to the law, they would be educated to the age of sixteen, but provisions were made for those students who would be fifteen or sixteen when the new school was completed to stay an extra two years if they would benefit from an industrial education. First priority for admission went to full orphans of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Civil War and were members of Pennsylvania commands or having served in other commands were residents of the state when enlisted. Second priority went to children as described above whose father may be deceased and mother living. Those children whose parents may either or both be disabled got third priority.

In addition to authorizing the purchase of land, the Act of 1893 made other specific appropriations. The law provided \$150,000 to build and furnish the school and \$10,000 for the education and maintenance of the children admitted to the new school for the year ending May 31, 1894. An additional \$50,000 was appropriated to care for and educate the children admitted for the year ending May 31, 1895.<sup>15</sup> Per capita rate of appropriation was not to exceed \$200. Finally, the law designated \$3,000 for the expenses of the commission, although it stipulated that commissioners were not to be paid a salary and could not have any financial involvement in any of the schools. At the time that the law was authorized, there were technically five schools still in the system, but two of them only housed one Civil War orphan each. The commission's annual report for 1893 showed 439 children in the system, 194 at Chester Springs, 92 at Harford, and 151 at Uniontown.

Although commissioners and legislators expected the number of 439 to decline in the years after 1893, it did not. As the superintendents of the industrial school would soon find out, by the time the last of the Civil War orphans made their way through the system, Pennsylvania found itself with orphans from the Spanish American War (1898–1902) who had similar needs. In fact, during the period from 1893, the year that the state authorized

the building of the Scotland School, to 1900, two years after the start of the Spanish American War, enrollment in the system began to climb again after dropping off sharply from 1886 to 1893. By May 31, 1897, 945 students attended the industrial school or one of the remaining feeder schools and by the same date a year later, the number rose to 1,127.<sup>16</sup> This pre-Spanish American War increase can most likely be attributed to the growing number of deaths among Civil War veterans who left widows unable to care for their children. Thus, in the first decade of the Scotland School's existence, school leaders needed to convince the state to invest in the industrial school not only to produce well-trained, self-sufficient graduates for the benefit of Pennsylvania's economy but also to consolidate the system and make it more cost effective for what turned out to be a growing number of students.

This question of cost and funding for the school, plaguing the original orphan education system since its inception, reflects another distinctive feature of the Scotland School. The struggle for public funding played a significant role in the development and administration of the school throughout its history and ultimately led to its closure in 2009. This was not the case for many other residential schools in Pennsylvania. Girard College, for example, was originally funded—and still is today—by an endowment created from the will of its founder and benefactor Stephen Girard, who died in 1831. In addition to other charitable causes in Philadelphia, Girard left \$5 million for the school, \$2 million of which was to be used for construction. In 1901 Milton S. Hershey, the chocolate company magnate, provided 486 acres of prime farmland in Hershey, Pennsylvania, and \$60 million in Hershey Chocolate Company stock for the creation of the Hershey Industrial School, later renamed the Milton Hershey School. The Hershey Trust Company was put in charge of the school trust, which was to fund the education of disadvantaged, orphaned children in perpetuity. The school remains open today. In 1918 the Carson College for Orphan Girls, later renamed the Carson Valley School, opened in the Philadelphia area. Although the vision for this well-known progressive school and orphanage was shaped most directly by progressive educator Elsa Ueland, who became its first president and then served for forty-two years, it was generously funded from the estate of Robert N. Carson, a Philadelphia entrepreneur who made his fortune in the street railway business.<sup>17</sup>

As residential schools, each of these institutions faced many of the same challenges as publicly funded institutions, and school leaders undoubtedly dealt with scrutiny and contention from trustees who themselves were often

subject to provisions within the benefactors' wills, but none of these schools ever confronted the kind of financial limitations and hardships that plagued the Scotland School throughout its history. The Carlisle Indian School, which opened in 1879, might present a more direct funding comparison, as it was financed through both private donations and public funds, but unlike the state-supported industrial school in Scotland, its public resources came from the federal government under the auspices of the Department of the Interior and the Department of War as part of a national-scale effort to use education as an instrument for assimilating American Indians. The Carlisle Indian School closed in 1918 when the federal government's Indian education program began to move away from the boarding school model. Scotland, like other state-funded residential schools around the country, faced constant threats of budget cuts, deferred plans, and pressures to be efficient.

The struggle to secure state funding, while difficult, was not unexpected. With a limited amount of tax dollars available and many worthy causes to consider, legislators appropriated money cautiously. For decades, advocates of the Civil War orphan education program, including its first and staunchest defender, Governor Andrew Curtin, appealed to legislators' sense of patriotism in the call to support the children of men who gave their lives to save the Union. Despite their caution, lawmakers showed sympathy to this argument by repeatedly funding and expanding the system in the thirty years after the war. Even as individual legislators changed, the notion of the "patriotic debt" continued. Lawmakers might have differed on details, but a general consensus existed that Civil War orphans deserved care and schooling. However, by the time they voted to approve the Act of 1893 establishing the Pennsylvania Soldiers' Orphans Industrial School, legislators had become increasingly concerned about how schools within the system spent state funds. Ironically, the events causing these concerns actually increased legislative support for the creation of an industrial school while simultaneously making members of the state legislature more wary of the ongoing financial burden it would entail.

The concerns grew in the 1880s due to a series of rumors of financial improprieties being carried out by several school managers within the orphan education system. Because the state did not own or operate any of the schools directly, the legislature appropriated funds to school managers and directed them to use the money only for the care of children and maintenance of the school.<sup>18</sup> While schools were supposed to provide legislators with detailed financial records each year, this practice was not always scrupulously followed. In 1889 the state legislature appointed a committee comprised of

three House members and two senators to investigate the financial operations of schools during the period from 1875 to 1889. On May 31, 1893, the committee issued its report based on detailed reviews of financial records and on subpoenaed testimony from a variety of witnesses.<sup>19</sup> Legislators expressed frustration with a lack of cooperation from school managers and their lawyers, which made it difficult for them to compile necessary evidence.<sup>20</sup> While they were unable to substantiate all of the allegations, committee members criticized many of the players involved. The committee report noted that the state treasurer acted in good faith based on the information provided by school leaders, but it was highly critical of individuals within the Department of Public Instruction who, in the committee's view, did not monitor the school leaders carefully enough.<sup>21</sup>

The committee's conclusion regarding the danger of state funds being misused by school managers provided one important incentive for the construction of a single industrial school owned and operated directly by the state. At the same time, it meant that this school would rely on financial support from a legislature that not only had other financial priorities but that had also grown weary of funding the orphan education program. Lawmakers had been assured at various points in the 1870s and 1880s that closure of the system was imminent, but the projections for diminishing numbers of students did not prove true.<sup>22</sup> Although committee discussions and legislative debates from the 1890s in Pennsylvania are not part of the published record, it seems likely that the suspected financial improprieties within the Civil War orphan education system in the period leading up to 1893 played a role in the state's reluctance to invest fully in the new school.

Finally, in addition to having roots in an existing system and confronting financial challenges, Scotland was distinctive from its peer institutions in Pennsylvania because it lacked a single founder with a unifying vision for the school. Histories of Girard College, the Carlisle Indian School, Milton Hershey School, and the Carson Valley School all begin with the stories of their founders, each of whom had a specific vision that shaped the development of their respective schools. The Scotland School, on the other hand, would have many individuals who profoundly shaped its 114-year history, but no single person could be credited with its founding. Instead, the Pennsylvania Soldiers' Orphans Commission, established in 1889, developed a plan for the school and made its case to the state legislature. As previously noted, the commission included the governor, two state senators appointed by the senate president pro tempore, three members of the state house appointed



by the Speaker of the House, and five honorably discharged soldiers who were members of the Pennsylvania Grand Army of the Republic (GAR). Members of the commission when the school was approved included: Gov. Robert E. Pattison, ex-officio; Gen. J.P.S. Gobin and Jacob Crouse as members of the Senate; William F. Stewart, Michael B. Lemon, and George W. Skinner as members of the House of Representatives; and Capt. George G. Boyer, Col. Thomas G. Sample, Gen. Thomas J. Stewart, Judge G. Harry Davis, and Col. Ezra H. Ripple as members of the Department of Pennsylvania GAR.

In many respects, the commission established quite conservative goals for the Scotland School. They sought to maintain and extend at Scotland several key aspects of the original system, particularly the emphasis on order, discipline, and military drill. Like their predecessors, they believed that this approach was especially appropriate for dependent children who would be less likely to learn the importance of self-discipline and hard work at home. As in the past, students at the new school would be expected to master an academic curriculum similar to what was being offered in common schools at the time, to receive religious and moral education, and to help maintain the school. All students, male and female, would be required to work whether it was in the kitchen, the laundry, the bakery, or on the school's farm. Essentially, the commissioners hoped to retain what they considered to be best nineteenth-century practices from their existing system.

Despite its natural conservatism, the commission also wanted to create a school that would be truly different from its predecessors in two fundamental ways. First, since Scotland was conceived as an industrial school, the commissioners envisioned a thriving industrial curriculum taught by well-trained teachers in fully equipped shops. Using the rationales being purported by the growing national movement for industrial education, the commissioners appealed to the legislature to adequately fund these new, ambitious goals. Second, in an attempt to be responsive to growing criticism among child advocates of institutional life for children, the commissioners proposed that Scotland establish a more nurturing community for its students than what previously existed in the Civil War orphan program. To achieve this end, they proposed a plan to house the children in a more homelike way, using the newly emerging cottage system rather than traditional large dormitories. In fact, the school's first plan called for sixteen cottages that could each house up to sixty students.<sup>23</sup> Both of these goals reflected important late nineteenth-century trends with respect to caring for and educating children. They would also prove to be extremely costly for the state.

The features that most distinguish Scotland from other similar schools in Pennsylvania (i.e., its emergence from an existing system, its ongoing financial struggles, and its commission-based leadership) provide a framework for understanding its early history. School records show that its Civil War roots and adherence to nineteenth-century traditions led school officials to make conservative choices with respect to academic and moral curriculum, discipline, and military culture. The school's constant financial pressures due to the state legislature's failure to ever fully match its rhetoric of support for veterans' children with adequate funding to provide that support limited what school leaders could do with infrastructure and programming. Finally, the commission's role in establishing the school resulted less in a singular and coherent vision and more in a broad range of goals that reinforced traditional values while simultaneously seeking to capitalize on emerging trends in education and child welfare. As with other aspects of the school, a lack of financial resources curtailed or delayed important parts of the commission's original goals.

### Opening the School

By the time the commission issued its annual report to the legislature in 1894, it had purchased 100 acres of land in Scotland, Pennsylvania, a small town approximately fifty miles southwest of Harrisburg, from state senator Alexander Stewart, for \$12,000.<sup>24</sup> The land, which was chosen for its proximity to the central part of the state and its location on the Cumberland Valley Division of the Pennsylvania Railroad, had originally been part of a 600-acre plantation called Corker Hill, owned by Alexander Thompson, the first permanent settler in Scotland.<sup>25</sup> With the land secured, the commission hired Thomas P. Lonsdale, Esq., of Philadelphia to design the first building and began accepting bids for its construction. John A. Burger and Son of Lancaster put in the lowest bid at \$76,986 and received the contract along with an additional \$30,000 to construct the power house and mechanical department and to install the boiler.<sup>26</sup> On March 13, 1894, the legislature appropriated an additional \$69,000 for the construction of the industrial plant. Despite heavy lobbying from the commission, the legislature approved no funds for cottages.

When the school opened on June 1, 1895, it could not accommodate all of the children from the three remaining schools. Instead, the 242 students

enrolled were mostly older children between the ages of twelve and fifteen who transferred to Scotland in order to receive some industrial training before exiting the system. The Act of 1893 only officially allowed children to stay in the system up to the age of sixteen, but in 1901 the legislature amended section 6 of that law to allow children to stay beyond their sixteenth birthdays. If they turned sixteen between January 1 and June 30, they could remain at the school until June 30. In 1905 the law was amended again to allow qualified students to stay in school until the age of eighteen. Although the school was open to boys and girls of all races, the vast majority of students during this early period were white.

The first group of students at Scotland came under the care of Gen. Charles L. Young, who took the reins as Scotland's first superintendent in 1895. Young shared duties with his wife, Cora, who served as the first head matron and as nurse, and with four teachers and a principal. Altogether the school employed thirty-three people that year, including a local doctor, J. J. Hoffman, who came three days per week to provide health services.<sup>27</sup> Young, who served only from June 1895 to May 1896, endured a difficult first year at Scotland and found himself on the receiving end of considerable criticism from Frank G. Magee, the commission-appointed school inspector.

In describing Scotland's first year, Magee bluntly stated, "There was assuredly a most noticeable lack of proper intelligence and ability in the general management."<sup>28</sup> He then went on to describe unrest and insubordination among the male students, frequent runaways, shabby clothing, and defaced property. He contrasted this with what he considered to be well-managed schools at Harford, Uniontown, and Chester Springs.<sup>29</sup> In August 1896 the commission hired James M. Clark to replace Young, but he fared little better, according to Magee. While the inspector credited Clark with improving discipline and orderly conduct among the students, he offered a sharp critique of his leadership with the teachers and staff and went as far as to say, "To the want of regard for the feelings and rights of subordinates and the extreme superciliousness of the superintendent, can be attributed many of the difficulties that militated against the best interests of the institution."<sup>30</sup> In his reports for both of these years, Inspector Magee offered warm praise for Scotland's first principal, M. L. Thounhurst.

Interestingly, when Clark was relieved of his superintendent's duties in August 1897, the commission replaced him with none other than Magee himself. Sadly, Magee had only a short time to prove that he could do better than his predecessors, for he died in April 1899, less than two years

into his term, and was replaced by Principal Thounhurst. In June 1900, however, Thounhurst, who had been part of the Civil War Orphan Program in various capacities for a long time and generally received high marks for his competence, moved from Scotland to Chester Springs, leaving the Industrial School without a superintendent once again. A month later, the commission appointed George W. Skinner as superintendent. He served for nine years, giving the new school some much needed stability and continuity in planning.

Early leaders spent considerable time trying to stretch limited state dollars to pay for the construction needed at Scotland that would allow the remaining schools to be closed. Burger and Son completed the initial building, housing all school operations other than the shops, and the industrial building prior to the school's opening, but many smaller building projects and capital improvements still needed to be completed after students arrived. By the close of 1897, a machine shop, forge shop, and pumping station had been built and renovations of the property's existing barn had begun. The school also put in a pond during the 1896–97 school year, spurring the beginning of a long tradition of winter ice-skating by the students. During the same year, Scotland added fire extinguishers and hoses and built a gun rack for firearms that the boys used in their military drills.<sup>31</sup>

Putting the fire equipment in place proved fortuitous, for on February 20, 1901, the school faced its first serious fire, which broke out behind the switchboard of the electric lighting plant in the engine room of the industrial building and destroyed the structure.<sup>32</sup> This fire, due to unknown causes, turned out to be the first real test of the fire apparatus, which worked well in keeping the fire from spreading. The system of hydrants and hoses saved the boiler room that was twelve feet away and the laundry room, thirty feet away. According to the head of Scotland's Industrial Department, it was a cold, windy night so school officials called the Chambersburg Fire Department to be sure that the fire did not spread to the main school building.<sup>33</sup> Unfortunately, the fire did destroy the electrical system and heating pipes passing through the engine room, meaning the school was without lights or heat for a short period of time and that some industries had to be temporarily relocated.<sup>34</sup> In total, the fire cost \$62,000, but the school only had an \$18,500 insurance policy on the building. The legislature authorized additional funding to rebuild the industrial plant.<sup>35</sup>

During the same year, the school faced its first major health crisis with a scarlet fever epidemic that affected seventy-four students. All of them

survived, but they had to be isolated in the farmhouse that was turned into a temporary hospital. The commission had called upon the state to fund the building of a hospital in their initial plans and school leaders had raised concerns about healthcare facilities in several of their early reports. In 1899, for example, the Medical Department noted the general inadequacy of the infirmaries and pointed to a discrepancy between the quality of the boys' and girls' facilities. Girls could only get to their infirmary by passing through the girls' dorm, thus exposing everyone to their illnesses.<sup>36</sup> The scarlet fever crisis increased the pressure to build a hospital at Scotland. By the spring of 1901, the school secured a contract of \$7,650 to build such a facility and construction got under way.<sup>37</sup> The building remained in use until 1960 when it was razed and rebuilt. As the school confronted all of these early infrastructure and health challenges, its teachers and administrators also began to work toward the broader goals of building on past practices and implementing new initiatives.

### Preserving the Past

Because none of the schools in the Civil War orphan education program prior to 1893 provided any kind of real industrial training, students spent their days engaged in some combination of basic academic work and physical labor or chores to support the running of their schools. From the outset, the commissioners wanted the industrial school to maintain an academic curriculum similar to what already existed. As a result, during the early years, students spent three hours in academic classes, three hours in industries, and one hour in the evening in study hall.<sup>38</sup> While the other schools remained open, most of the students coming to the industrial school were between the ages of twelve and fifteen, but by 1899 the school had been organized into four branches: primary, intermediate, grammar, and high school. Despite their ages, some students at the industrial school were listed in second grade. The lower branches included basic mathematics, reading, writing, and geography, whereas the high school curriculum included algebra, civil government, natural philosophy, geometry, literature, rhetoric, and bookkeeping.<sup>39</sup>

In addition to academic coursework, students at Scotland received moral and religious training. When Pennsylvania first established its system for the

education of Civil War orphans in the 1860s, the superintendents assigned children to schools based largely on geographic location, but they also took into account the religious affiliation of the children and when possible placed them in homes/schools connected to their own religions. Schools not affiliated with any particular religion still provided Bible study and moral training. This tradition continued at the industrial school. Even before the first chapel was built in 1907, the school held services on campus on Sunday afternoons conducted by a local Lutheran minister.<sup>40</sup> In addition, students participated in daily chapel exercises and attended weekly Sabbath school classes.<sup>41</sup>

Just as school leaders sought to promote character in their students through religious instruction, they hoped to instill patriotism and discipline by incorporating military drill, pageantry, and physical culture into the school. Beginning in its first year, the school was divided into two military companies that drilled on the oval area in front of the main school building twice per day, although they were hampered somewhat in their efforts due to muddy conditions as a result of both construction and bad weather.<sup>42</sup> Instructors considered physical conditioning to be an important part of school culture for both sexes, and girls participated in flag calisthenics drills each morning and also worked with dumbbells. The emphasis on fitness and military culture served several purposes. In one respect, school leaders sought to connect students to their military roots and to prepare them, the boys in particular, for military service should they choose to serve or be called upon to do so. During World War I, for example, annual reports to the state legislature stressed how well the school prepared its students for the demands of war. Phil Johnson, who served for ten years as the head of the Military and Physical Culture Department before being called himself to military service in April 1918, reported that over 160 recent graduates of the school were serving in the military in 1918 with many "winning rapid promotions" and at least two recognized for bravery by the French government. He also reported knowing of three female graduates in the US service: Emma Kerby and Anna Hoover serving as Red Cross nurses and Harriet Hoadley McDermott as yeoman in the Naval Reserves Radio Service. Johnson further noted with pride that no graduates who applied for military service had been rejected as unfit.<sup>43</sup>

In addition to preparing students for military service, Scotland's emphasis on drill, parades, and calisthenics created discipline, provided students with structure, and promoted patriotism. Not only were students expected to

arrive on time and complete drills each and every morning, but they were also expected to be precise in their movements and to practice routines until they achieved perfection. School officials believed that students coming from insecure and unstable homes would especially benefit from the structure that regimented drilling provided. The military program at the school also offered an excellent way for Scotland to build relationships with the surrounding community by participating in parades and in Memorial Day services at nearby cemeteries and by inviting local officials to attend their programs and exercises held at the school. In addition to performing in the neighboring towns of Chambersburg, Waynesboro, and Greencastle, Scotland students sometimes participated in parades in Harrisburg, the state's capital, as well.<sup>44</sup> In their annual reports to the commission, school leaders regularly included either local press clippings or their own accounts of how well Scotland students comported themselves in the community and how popular they were in parades and drills.

If military training provided one vehicle for establishing discipline and a sound work ethic, the school's requirement that all children work to support the school offered another. It was not uncommon at the turn of the century for orphanages and residential schools to provide students with food grown and harvested on their own property as a cost-effective measure. This practice also taught boys at the school about farm labor and food production. When purchased by the state, the Scotland property came with a barn, a house, and 100 acres of farmland. The barn was renovated in 1897, and, in this early period, students and teachers carried out most of the farming. By 1903 the farm produced \$1200 worth of products, almost all consumed by students.<sup>45</sup> That same year, the commission petitioned the state to purchase an additional forty-seven acres from the Stewart Farm in order to "square off" the farmland used by the school.<sup>46</sup> Students who did not work on the farm helped to support the school through cooking, sewing, laundering, maintaining the buildings and grounds, and performing daily chores. In the "Correspondent's Column" of the school newspaper, students made regular reports on their classmates' work and often doled out humorous praise. In a March 1897 column, for example, the correspondent writes, "Ross Edwards . . . has been in the business of cleaning pans for a number of months. . . . He will soon be an expert at the business. John Kane keeps the floor in good trim and he is an excellent doughnut fryer."<sup>47</sup> Students frequently shifted from one work detail to another in order to fill in for sick classmates or to offer additional help during busy times.<sup>48</sup>

#### CONTINUING TO PAY THE "PATRIOTIC DEBT"

The students' daily schedules further reinforced the order, routine, and hard work promoted by school leaders. The schedule, containing few variations over the years, went as follows:

6:00: Wake up, calisthenics for ten minutes, wash and dress for breakfast  
6:30: Breakfast followed by work detail  
8:00–8:30: Drill or Band  
8:45–11:45: School and Trades  
12:00: Lunch followed by free time  
1:00–4:00: School and Trades  
4:00–5:30: Sports and other extracurricular activities  
5:30: Dinner followed by free time  
7:00–8:30: Study Hour for older children  
9:00: Taps and Bed

On Saturdays, supervisors inspected the students' living quarters while they spent time cleaning and doing other chores. This schedule, minus the trades training, closely resembled ones used in most of the Civil War orphan schools prior to 1893. Neither the commission nor school leaders saw a reason to change this daily structure.

Despite a wide range of challenges in its first few years, Scotland largely succeeded in establishing basic practices preserving what the commission saw as the best of the nineteenth-century model of Civil War orphan education in Pennsylvania. The school's success with this aspect of the commission's goals can be attributed largely to two factors. First, most of the early leaders at Scotland, as well as most of the teachers at the school, came out of the existing orphan education system and felt comfortable maintaining the status quo. Many served in the military and supported both the military culture and the emphasis on morality, order, discipline, and hard work. In their view, these traditional practices supported the ongoing mission to pay the "patriotic debt" by not only caring for veterans' children, but also by preparing them for moral and productive lives. Although there were some questions about how to maintain the appropriate curricular balance once the school began to incorporate industrial training, these leaders also supported the basic academic curriculum that had been well established in the system. Second, once the school was built, this more traditional aspect of the commission's vision required few additional expenditures from the state legislature beyond what it had provided to the



system in the past. The commission's more ambitious goal to establish a strong industrial curriculum in a school with a true homelike environment proved to be more challenging.

## New Goals

Because the commission conceived of Scotland, first and foremost, as an industrial school, they hoped to capitalize on the growing momentum across the United States for industrial education. The movement in this direction stemmed from two important forces emerging in mid-nineteenth-century American society: the establishment of common schools in many parts of the United States and the shift in the nation's economy from one built on agriculture and the work of skilled craftsmen to one based on industry and mass production. Most educators recognized that the newly emerging public school system needed to be responsive to changing economic realities, but by the last quarter of the nineteenth century a growing number of critics argued that common schools were not doing enough to meet the needs of working-class children.<sup>49</sup> Even those recognizing the need for a workforce trained in industrial fields disagreed about how best to approach the task at hand and about how to handle the costs of establishing well-equipped shops within schools. By 1893, when the Soldiers' Orphans Commission in Pennsylvania sought to establish a curricular vision for its new school, three different, but sometimes overlapping, approaches to industrial education had emerged in US education and school leaders had to determine which would be best for Scotland.

The first approach sought to meet industrial society's need for well-educated engineers, architects, and chemists whose jobs would be not to engage in industrial labor themselves or even to oversee such labor, but, rather, in the words of Francis Walker, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in the 1880s, to "investigate the material resources of the country . . . and project operations for the development of such resources."<sup>50</sup> Some of the best-known schools devoted to this kind of scientific education included the Troy School of Civil Engineering, the Hoboken School of Mechanical Engineering, the Sheffield School of Civil and Mechanical Engineering, the Columbia School of Mining Engineering, the Boston Institute of Technology, the Worcester Free Institute of Industrial Science, and Dartmouth College's Chandler Scientific School and Thayer Engineering

School.<sup>51</sup> Although graduates of these schools generally worked in research and industrial design, some took administrative jobs and operated more closely to the actual production process. By the late 1870s many of the leaders at these engineering schools began to look for ways to more closely connect theory and practice for prospective engineers.<sup>52</sup> John D. Runkle, for example, became president of MIT in 1870 and by the end of the decade was advocating the Russian Model of industrial education with its emphasis on shop work for engineers.<sup>53</sup>

A second approach to industrial education, known as manual training, applied to the training of both engineers and other students, particularly boys, who might pursue a broad range of technical, mechanical, and industrial jobs. Advocates of this approach, found both in traditional public schools and in separate manual training schools, argued that students should be schooled in certain habits of mind that promote self-discipline and leadership and that establish general skills transferrable to a variety of professions rather than in any particular trade. Manual training focused more on the whole student and taught him, beginning at a young age, basic principles of physics and mechanics upon which both the natural and material worlds are based. Calvin Woodward, dean of the O'Fallon Polytechnical Institute of Washington University and head of its manual training school in St. Louis, Missouri, was perhaps the best-known advocate of this approach both for schools like his own and for K-12 public schools.

By the turn of the twentieth century, however, many industrial educators, in an effort to find more practical ways of educating the broad masses of students, male and female, toward gainful employment, began to shift away from the nineteenth-century emphasis on leadership and rising up through manual training with its focus on general intelligence and broad scientific principles. This led to a third approach to industrial education, one that supported training students for a particular trade. This model, similar to those in many European countries such as Switzerland with its watchmaking trade, tracked students into specific trades and then geared their training to that trade. It gained momentum in the 1890s and in the first decades of the twentieth century. As with the old apprentice model, students attending trade schools or completing trade programs within public schools were expected to know what jobs they wanted to pursue when they got out of school and to focus their educations on the skills needed for those particular jobs. For boys these might include areas such as electrical work, plumbing,

woodworking, pipe fitting, and shoemaking, among several others. The most common trades for girls included stenography, typewriting, and telegraphy along with domestic sciences such as cooking, laundering, and housekeeping. A few schools, such as the Carlisle Indian School, offered nursing, giving young women additional options.<sup>54</sup>

Many critics of industrial education lumped all other approaches together with trades training and argued that early career tracking undermined traditional American values such as freedom and social mobility and took time away from the primary mission of schools to provide moral and academic training.<sup>55</sup> Trade school proponents, including many engineers who supported this as the best educational model to ensure “competent mechanics and superintendents who could help to realize an engineer’s industrial dreams” saw this as a practical approach, especially for lower classes.<sup>56</sup> For the Commissioners of Soldiers’ Orphan Schools, there was never a question in 1893 as to the value of industrial education. In fact, from the beginning of the orphan education system, dating back to 1864, there had been a desire to incorporate some kind of trades training, but the lack of funding and the difficulty that would be incurred in trying to maintain fully developed programs in dozens of schools throughout the state kept this desire from ever being satisfied. Throughout the annual reports from 1864 to 1893, there are numerous references to wanting trade programs but, with few exceptions, they never developed.<sup>57</sup> Early reports lament the lack of industrial training, but also emphasize that the children were learning good work habits and self-discipline that would serve them well once employed. In the 1874 annual report, Rev. C. Cornforth, the state inspector for boys’ programs, suggests that, given their financial limitations, the schools should focus on finding the right training and employment opportunities for students once they left.<sup>58</sup>

By 1878, however, school leaders began to discuss the need for industrial education in earnest and first posed the idea of opening an industrial school. As an alternative to this expensive option, then Superintendent Wickersham proposed establishing a partnership with the Pennsylvania State College that would allow a certain number of graduates of the orphan education system to receive scholarships and pursue industrial training there.<sup>59</sup> The state at that time was already funding a similar program that gave scholarships to qualified graduates who wanted to attend some of Pennsylvania’s normal schools in preparation for careers in teaching. Despite these proposals, the state made no further moves toward any kind of systematic industrial education until the approval of its new industrial school in 1893.

Having visited schools with a range of approaches to industrial education during their exploration period in 1892, the commission ultimately encouraged the establishment of an industrial curriculum closely resembling the trade school model. In its initial years, when Harford, Uniontown, and Chester Springs remained open, Scotland received the older students who selected specific trades for their final years of schooling. As younger students were added to the school, they experienced an elementary curriculum that employed elements of the manual training model and then had an opportunity during middle school to explore several different trades before selecting their specialty. According to the superintendent's report for 1896, the girls' industrial curriculum provided training in stenography, typewriting, telegraphy, scientific cooking, dressmaking, and general sewing (sometimes also referred to as mending). In 1896 the boys' curriculum included printing, woodworking, and shoemaking with plans to add a machine shop, blacksmith shop, and plumbing and pipe fitting. They could also choose to work in the bakery or laundry. Plus all boys helped with electrical work and machinery around the school.

Among many other tasks, those working in the print shop began issuing a bimonthly school newspaper, the *Industrial School News*, on February 2, 1896. The newspaper included exchanges with many prominent newspapers and magazines around the country, including the *New York Times* and *Baltimore Sun*, as well as local papers in the Chambersburg and Harrisburg areas.<sup>60</sup> An early source of pride at the school, the print shop, by 1903 was making 1,300 copies of each edition of the *Industrial School News*; 850 copies went to subscribers, mostly GAR members, 150 to exchanges, and 300 to students at the school.<sup>61</sup>

By 1904 printing, tailoring, laundry, telegraphy, typewriting, and stenography were listed as options for both boys and girls.<sup>62</sup> Students at Scotland gained practical experience in their trades through their work at the school. Boys in the wood shop, for example, repaired everything from door frames to window screens and made basic furniture. On one occasion, they made twenty sleds for the children and on another made a large closet for football uniforms. Through these projects, large and small, students put their skills to practical use.<sup>63</sup> Those in tailoring and dressmaking made school clothing, aprons, and new dresses for young women leaving the school due to age. The baking department reportedly made 400 to 500 pounds of bread per day.<sup>64</sup> Although critics of the trades training approach to industrial education may have questioned the appropriateness of having students spend

such a large portion of their days “working” in one specific area, educators at Scotland believed that their students would benefit from leaving the school having mastered at least one trade. Despite reports of overcrowded shops and occasional shortages of equipment and materials during this early period, the school established a basic framework for trades training that remained intact for decades.

In addition to taking the Scotland School in a new direction with its trades program, the commission envisioned, through the cottage system, a more homelike model of education that would address the harshest criticisms of institutional living and reflect new understandings of child welfare. While still not widely practiced, the popularity of the cottage system for orphan asylums and industrial schools in the 1890s represented an evolution in how child advocates and school managers viewed what would be best for poor and orphaned children; the commission adopted this changing view. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, it was not uncommon for destitute children to be placed in almshouses with adults or for older orphans to be “placed out” as apprentices or household help in exchange for their care. Because almshouses were susceptible to a range of problems, including lack of safety and insufficient leadership as well as overcrowding and unsanitary conditions, child advocates began to look for institutional placements that could serve as alternatives for children and protect them from neglect, abuse, and improper influences.<sup>65</sup> Even with a growing recognition of these problems, however, almshouses continued to “care” for children, at least in limited cases, well into the twentieth century. In his 1930 book describing the history of care for dependent children, Henry Thurston points out that as of 1929 social workers continued to find children being raised in almshouses “with no chance to play normally or get the right food . . . shut up all day with a bunch of old women.”<sup>66</sup> Despite the stubborn persistence of almshouses for children, critics of the approach had been pushing alternatives for more than a century by the time Thurston made his observation.

By the mid-nineteenth century, construction of child-specific institutions, particularly orphanages, expanded considerably. In their research on orphan asylums in the nineteenth century, Downs and Sherraden provide data, based on estimates from US census reports, institutional records, and other sources, showing the number of institutionalized dependent children in the United States at various points between 1790 and 1910. By 1910, 126,600 children were being cared for in orphanages and only 3,600 in almshouses.<sup>67</sup> The shift reflected the growing sense that orphanages improved upon care provided

by almshouses designed for adults and, in many cases, upon the practice of "placing out" where children could be subject to exploitation. Despite the initial support for institutional placement as a benevolent and socially useful approach to raising orphaned and destitute children, concerns about the effects of these asylums and schools had begun to emerge by the late nineteenth century. Critics suggested that many of the institutions were too large, rigid, and impersonal and that they simply "warehoused" children without taking into account their innate needs for affection and home comforts.<sup>68</sup>

In addition, critics argued that children could not get the individual attention they needed in large institutional settings and that the order and strict discipline that characterized so many of the homes/schools produced individuals not adequately prepared to be independent, creative members of society. As they saw it, children in institutions lacked the affection and care that characterized healthy family relationships. Added to these concerns was the suggestion that asylums/schools were often costly and ineffective in meeting their original lofty goals to improve society by guiding children to be productive and upright citizens.<sup>69</sup> Defenders of childcare institutions recognized the legitimacy of some of these criticisms, but rather than support the elimination of institutions, a step considered both impractical and unnecessary, they sought ways to address concerns and make improvements from within the system. The cottage system became one of the most popular responses and was indicative of Progressive Era reforms in child welfare.

Although there are examples of institutions employing the cottage system as early as the 1850s, the model did not gain widespread support until the Progressive Era. The commission, in recommending in 1893 that the Scotland School adopt this plan, showed considerable foresight as criticisms of congregate institutions continued to grow in the ensuing decades. More than twenty years later, for example, when plans were being developed for the decidedly progressive Carson Valley School near Philadelphia, school leaders saw themselves on the cutting edge of progressive reforms when mandating the cottage system of housing for their students.<sup>70</sup>

Not surprisingly, implementing the cottage system proved to be expensive, and the Pennsylvania General Assembly refused to provide adequate funding for the construction of cottages in the early period. The school instead opened with only one-fourth the proposed number of students all housed in a single building, meaning that the remaining three schools could not be closed.<sup>71</sup> Construction on the cottages did not begin until 1927. Despite this initial setback, none of Scotland's early leaders gave up on this

aspect of the commission's vision, and they continued to push for movement away from the congregate living that characterized Scotland's early years.

Although Scotland's first students did not have the benefit of the cottage system, school leaders found other ways to build a sense of community and belonging among the students. Most notably, they developed an extensive extracurricular activity program. While many of the previous Civil War orphan education schools offered music programs and a few clubs and athletic opportunities, the Scotland School offered a wide range of options and allowed students to compete in sporting and music events against other schools. Music played an especially significant role in school life by the early 1900s. The school quickly formed a band as well as boys' and girls' glee clubs that had sixteen members and twenty members respectively by 1897 and a girls' band that had twenty-nine students by 1902.<sup>72</sup> The boys' band played at all school drill functions as well as in local parades and at GAR functions, but often had to turn down invitations to perform due to its popularity.<sup>73</sup> Scotland also welcomed guest bands at the school and early on hosted performances from neighboring schools such as the concert given by the sixty-piece Carlisle Indian School band on January 11, 1900.<sup>74</sup>

As with the music program, athletics at Scotland evolved and expanded over the school's first several decades, but at least a few teams, including football and baseball, were established within the first couple of years of the school's opening and found early success. On April 8, 1897, the school newspaper reported on Scotland's first home baseball game held the previous Saturday. Not only did the Scotland team beat a local Chambersburg team 15 to 10, but the students gained an opportunity for fun and celebration. The student reporter humorously described the response to the event, "The boys and girls of our institution were as happy over the afternoon's sport as though they had been sliding down a rainbow with a Star Spangled Banner in one hand and a yard of bologna sausage in the other."<sup>75</sup> Later that same season, the team reportedly defeated the Cumberland Valley Normal School by a score of 22 to 8.<sup>76</sup> Reporting on the strong sports program in 1912, Principal William Bambrick claimed that the school's teams won more than 80 percent of their games that year and that Scotland likely had a higher percentage of boys playing football and baseball than any other school in the country.<sup>77</sup>

Eventually Scotland would add numerous organized sports for both boys and girls and these programs would become a significant part of the school's culture. Even in its first few decades, the school stressed physical fitness and informal sports such as skating in the winter and swimming in the summer

as well as croquet and tennis for all students. While student participation in these sports and other extracurricular activities provided a sense of belonging and an avenue for support, it did not entirely mitigate the commission's concerns about the negative effects of congregate housing or decrease commissioners' desire to establish cottage living for students. This goal remained unfulfilled during Scotland's early history, despite the efforts of school leaders to convince the legislature that it would be both good for the students and cost effective.

### Moving Forward with One School

As Scotland's leaders, teachers, and coaches worked daily to establish the school's basic infrastructure and its curriculum and procedures, the question of how to close the other three schools remaining in the system continued to loom over the commission. Although Harford closed in 1899, each year the superintendents pressed the commission who, in turn, pressed the legislature to appropriate the funds needed to fully support the school's mission and to consolidate all operations under one facility. The superintendents argued on three grounds. First, despite the initial expenditures needed for construction, operating a single school, with or without cottages, would be much more cost effective in the long run because staff, facilities, and equipment would not need to be duplicated. The commission, in 1901, suggested that it would take approximately \$100,000 to equip the school for all 1,100 children left in the system and that the investment would pay for itself within four years. Second, the school would only be able to achieve the commission's initial vision of providing a homelike environment and a useful industrial education to all Pennsylvania veterans' orphans if new construction at the school was approved. Finally, with the decision in the Act of 1905 to extend the exit age from sixteen to eighteen, school leaders were finding it increasingly difficult to accommodate the students they already had, which led to reasonable complaints.

In June of 1906 Scotland housed 333 students in facilities originally designed for no more than 300. Overcrowding combined with the rising costs of meeting students' basic needs caused the commission to state that "such economy has necessarily reached the verge of parsimony" and to request that the per-pupil spending be raised from \$225 per year to \$250. Finally, on June 13, 1907, the Pennsylvania legislature approved funds to



enlarge the capacity of the school and construction began on a chapel and a girls' dormitory. The following year, the veterans' orphan program at Uniontown was closed down and students were moved either to Chester Springs or Scotland. In July 1911 the commissioners received approval to close Chester Springs the following June and to move the last of the orphans to Scotland. Because this would bring the total number of students at the school to well over 500, the decision was made to add on to the auditorium and to build a new two-story building that would be connected to the auditorium at each floor. This would allow the boys' dormitory to be in the original building and the girls to move to the new section off the other side of the auditorium.

When the new school year began in the fall of 1912 with all of the veterans' children in the system at Scotland, the school was filled to capacity, but officials hoped that they would be able to admit more children as students left the school due to age. This also marked the first time that the industrial school took on the care of young children, requiring changes in discipline and curriculum as well as staffing. Several members of the Chester Springs staff made the move to Scotland. In many respects the fall of 1912 marked a promising time for the school because at least one of the commission's major goals—consolidating the system at one facility—had finally been achieved. The commission fully expected that their work with veterans' children would soon be completed and that the school could then be used to meet the needs of other disadvantaged children in Pennsylvania. In a few short years, however, World War I dashed that hope as the state once again found itself with many children who were either orphaned by war or who found themselves in a host of difficult circumstances often resulting from war. They needed a home and the Scotland School gave them one as it would continue to do for children in veteran-affiliated families until its closing in 2009.

SARAH BAIR earned her BA in history from Albright College, MA in history from Shippensburg University, and PhD in curriculum and instruction from the Pennsylvania State University. In addition to the Scotland School, her research interests include educational history, women's history, and history curriculum in secondary schools. She is currently an associate professor of educational studies at Dickinson College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and resides in Gettysburg with her husband and two youngest children.

## NOTES

1. In 1895 the school opened as the Pennsylvania Soldiers' Orphans Industrial School, but it was often referred to simply as Scotland or the Industrial School. In 1924 the school was renamed the Pennsylvania Soldiers' Orphans School (see *Public Opinion*, August 27, 1970, 19). In 1951 the state legislature renamed the school The Scotland School for Veterans' Children in Public Law (PL) 350, passed May 24, 1951.
2. Although there are variations in wording, the school's mission was referenced in early publications such as the *Industrial School News* (the school's newspaper, later renamed the *Scotland Courier*) as well as in annual reports issued by the Pennsylvania Soldiers' Orphans Commission to the state legislature. School newspapers from 1897 to 1970 are housed in the Pennsylvania State Archives, Harrisburg, as part of Record Group (RG) 19. The annual reports by the Commission for the period from the school's founding in 1895 to 1918 and from 1921 to 1923 are also located in the State Archives as part of RG19. Beginning on August 15, 1923, reports are issued by a board of trustees rather than the Pennsylvania Soldiers' Orphans Commission.
3. For more information on Stephen Girard, founder of Girard College, see George Wilson, *Stephen Girard: America's First Tycoon* (Conshohocken, PA: Combined Books, 1995). For a history of the early years of the school see Cheesman A. Herrick, *History of Girard College* (Philadelphia: Girard College, 1927). David R. Contosta, in his *Philadelphia's Progressive Orphanage: The Carson Valley School* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), provides a useful overview of Stephen Girard's role in the founding of Girard College and how the school compared to the Carson Valley School established in 1918 for orphaned girls in the Philadelphia area. For information on the Carlisle School, see Hayes Peter Mauro, *The Art of Americanization at the Carlisle Indian School* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2011); Jacqueline Fear-Segal, *White Man's Club: Schools, Race, and the Struggle of Indian Acculturation* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007); Genevieve Bell, “Telling Stories Out of School: Remembering the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, 1879–1918” (PhD diss., Stanford University, 1998).
4. For a recently published history of the Milton Hershey School see James D. McMahon Jr., *Milton Hershey School* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2007).
5. For a full description of this system see Sarah Bair, “Making Good on a Promise: The Education of Civil War Orphans in Pennsylvania, 1863–1893,” *History of Education Quarterly* 51, no. 4 (2011): 460–85.
6. *Ibid.*, 464–65.
7. It should be noted that responses by states to the aftermath of the war coincided with both local volunteer efforts and a governmental response at the federal level. For discussion of the federal pension system for Civil War veterans and widows, see Amy E. Holmes, “Widows and the Civil War Pension System,” in *Toward a Social History of the American Civil War: Exploratory Essays*, ed. Maris A. Vinovskis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 171–95; Patrick J. Kelly, *Creating a National Home: Building the Veterans' Welfare State, 1860–1900* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 24–31, 52–62; Megan J. McClintock, “Civil War Pensions and the Reconstruction of Union Families,” *Journal of American History* 83, no. 2 (1996): 456–80; and Theda Skocpol, *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*

- (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992). For a description of programs in other states see the *Annual Report of the Superintendent for Soldiers' Orphans to the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania, 1872*, 30–31, Collection of Annual Reports, 1870–1918, Record Group (RG) 19, Pennsylvania State Archives, Harrisburg, PA; and James Marten, *The Children's Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 212.
8. *Annual Report, 1874*, 21.
  9. See *Annual Report, 1884*, v for an explanation of the enrollment status in the 1880s by E. E. Higbee who became the state superintendent of the Civil War orphan education system on April 1, 1881.
  10. *Annual Report, 1893*, 14.
  11. In his 1872 report, State Superintendent J. P. Wickersham provides a two-page excerpt (found on pp. 30–31) from a paper presented by Col. Robert B. Beath, Pennsylvania's Surveyor General, to the annual meeting of the Grand Army of the Republic, held in Cleveland, Ohio, in May of 1872 in which Beath outlines the efforts of individual states on behalf of Civil War orphans. Each of the states that operated a state-funded institution generally cared for between 200 and 300 children annually in their institutions by 1872. Iowa's program, which was initiated by a private association that later transferred "the property" to the state, listed the highest number at 718 children, but it is unclear whether they were housed in a single facility or in a variety of homes. By contrast, during the same year in Pennsylvania, the state was overseeing thirty-seven schools and close to 3,000 orphans.
  12. *Annual Report, 1893*, 9.
  13. *Ibid.*, 10.
  14. The decision to replace the state Superintendent for Soldiers' Orphans with a Pennsylvania Soldiers' Orphans Commission in 1889 stemmed from a series of problems and scandals that challenged the system in the 1880s during the tenure of Superintendent E. E. Higbee. For further discussion of the scandals see Bair, "Making Good on a Promise," 481–82.
  15. Although the law appropriated funds for the 1893–94 and 1894–95 school year, construction was delayed and the school did not open until June 3, 1895.
  16. *Annual Report, 1898*, 16.
  17. Contosta, *Philadelphia's Progressive Orphanage*, 7–38.
  18. For further discussion of the management of these schools, see Bair, "Making Good on a Promise," 482–84.
  19. The report can be found in the *Journal of the Senate, 1893*, vol. 2, May 31, 1893, 1661–1665. *The Journal of the Senate* is available in the Pennsylvania State Library, Harrisburg, in both hard copy and microfilm.
  20. *Ibid.*, 1665.
  21. *Ibid.*, 1663.
  22. Bair, "Making Good on a Promise," 472–74.
  23. *Annual Report, 1895*, 8.
  24. *Annual Report, 1894*, 8.
  25. See *Reveille to Taps, Yearbook for the Class of 1937*, the school's first yearbook, which includes a brief history of the school and "100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of SSVVC," a speech given to the Kittochtinny

## CONTINUING TO PAY THE “PATRIOTIC DEBT”

Historical Society to mark the one-hundredth anniversary of the school in June 1995, no author listed. SSVC Museum.

26. *Annual Report*, 1894, 8.
27. “100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of SSVC.”
28. *Annual Report*, 1896, 79.
29. Ibid.
30. *Annual Report*, 1897, 82.
31. Ibid, 103–6.
32. *Industrial School News*, 6, no. 2 (November, 21 1901): 3. School newspapers from 1897 to 1970 (37 volumes) are located in the Pennsylvania State Archives as part of Record Group 19.
33. *Annual Report*, 1901, 104.
34. Ibid., 104–5.
35. Ibid., 8.
36. *Annual Report* 1899, 120–21.
37. *Annual Report*, 1901, 3.
38. *Annual Report*, 1896, 97.
39. *Annual Report*, 1899, 111.
40. Ibid., 112.
41. *Annual Report*, 1911, 58.
42. *Annual Report*, 1896, 101.
43. *Annual Report*, 1918, 41.
44. *Annual Report*, 1899, 122.
45. *Annual Report*, 1903, 92.
46. Ibid., 8.
47. *Industrial School News* 2, no. 3 (March 11, 1897): 3.
48. The Correspondent’s Column, usually found on page 3 of the *Industrial School News* during the early years of the school’s history, frequently refers to students switching departments as needed.
49. Melvin L. Barlow, *History of Industrial Education in the United States* (Peoria, IL: Chas. A. Bennett Co., Inc., 1967), 31.
50. Francis A. Walker, “Industrial Education,” *Journal of Social Science, Containing the Proceedings of the American Association* (1869–1909) 19 (December 1884): 117.
51. Ibid.
52. Barlow, *History of Industrial Education*, 37–39; Berenice M. Fisher, *Industrial Education: American Ideals and Institutions* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), 68.
53. Runkle and several members of his staff attended the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia in 1876 during which they were introduced to the Russian system of workshop education, pioneered by Victor Della Vos of the Imperial Technical School of Moscow. The system, designed for engineers and draftsmen, was built around a system of graded shop work. See Barlow, *History of Industrial Education*, 38–39, and Fisher, *Industrial Education*, 67–68, for more on Runkle and the Russian Model at MIT.
54. For more on industrial education for women see Barlow, *History of Industrial Education*, 339–74.

55. Barlow, *History of Industrial Education*, 39; Walker, "Industrial Education," 117.
56. Fisher, *Industrial Education*, 71.
57. Although trades training was limited in the Civil War orphan system prior to 1893, a few schools established modest programs including a printing program at the Titusville School; printing, sewing, and knitting at Dayton School; and the establishment of a broom shop, shoe shop, and blacksmith shop at Uniontown. See Bair, "Making Good on a Promise," 477.
58. *Annual Report*, 1874, 35.
59. *Annual Report*, 1878, 3.
60. *Annual Report*, 1898, 116–17.
61. *Annual Report*, 1903, 101.
62. *Annual Report*, 1904, 6.
63. *Industrial School News* 6, no. 1 (February 14, 1901): 3; *Industrial School News* 6, no. 15 (May 8, 1902): 3; *Industrial School News* 10, no. 2 (September 28, 1905): 3.
64. *Industrial School News* 6, no. 1 (February 14, 1901): 3.
65. For a discussion of problems within almshouses see David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971), 193–99.
66. Henry W. Thurston, *The Dependent Child: A Story of Changing Aims and Methods in the Care of Dependent Children* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930), 207.
67. For more detailed information on the shift from almshouses to orphanages see Susan Whitelaw Downs and Michael W. Sherraden, "The Orphan Asylum in the Nineteenth Century," *Social Review* 57, no. 2 (1983): 273.
68. For a different perspective on nineteenth-century orphanages see Timothy A. Hasci, *Second Home, Orphan Asylums and Poor Families in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 65–68. Hasci suggests that orphan asylums never became the kind of rigid, custodial institutions that characterized prisons, reformatories, and mental hospitals.
69. LeRoy Ashby, *Saving the Waifs: Reformers and Dependent Children, 1890–1917* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1984), 4–5; Robert H. Bremner, ed., *Children and Youth in America A Documentary History*, vol. 2, 1866–1932 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), 285–88; Kenneth Cmiel, *A Home of Another Kind: One Chicago Orphanage and the Tangle of Child Welfare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 41–43; Rothman, *Discovery of the Asylum*, 237–64; Susan Tiffin, *In Whose Best Interest? Child Welfare Reform in the Progressive Era* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982), 64–76.
70. Contosta, *Philadelphia's Progressive Orphanage*, 13.
71. *Annual Report*, 1896, 96.
72. *Industrial School News* 2, no. 4 (March 25, 1897): 3; 6, no. 11 (March 13, 1902): 1.
73. *Annual Report*, 1903, 109.
74. *Annual Report*, 1900, 111.
75. *Industrial School News* 2, no. 5 (April 8, 1897): 3.
76. *Industrial School News* 2, no. 7 (May 6, 1897): 4.
77. *Annual Report*, 1912, 52.