THE ART OF THE CHRISTIAN PASTORATE:
SHEPHERDING THE BARNARDO HOME CHILDREN TO CANADA, 1867-1905

by

Alexandra Herman

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Sociology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

© 2013
Alexandra Herman

ABSTRACT:

This study investigates the techniques deployed by Dr. Thomas J. Barnardo in his child-saving initiatives in Britain and his systemized mass child migration scheme to Canada.

This study explores the pastoral relations between Barnardo and the children he admitted into his charity between 1867 until his death in 1905. This study analyzes the Christian pastorate power-knowledge nexus and the pastoral role occupied by Dr. Barnardo during his child-saving work. Most of the documentary materials upon which the analysis proceeds was obtained through my grandmother, who is a direct descendant of a British Home Child.

This study examines how Barnardo identified children from pauper parents and questions what specificities were invoked in an emigration programme that focused on pauper Anglo-British families. It explores how religious concerns were made compatible through the model of pastoral power. This study also looks at the gendered performativity of Home Children through collections of their personal stories and social worker records.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to a number of people for their support and advisement during my research. Firstly, I would like to thank Dr. George Pollard, my supervisor and mentor, for his understanding, wisdom, patience, enthusiasm and for pushing me farther than I thought I could go. I would also like to thank the many staff and graduate students in the Sociology Department at Carleton University who have also helped me during my time here. I am indebted to Paula Whissell, Graduate Administrator in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, for her unwavering support and encouragement. I am also grateful to my committee members Dr. Aaron Doyle and Dr. Connie Kristiansen who offered guidance and support.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family and friends for sticking by me through this long process, always offering love and support. To Matt, my partner, for always being there to listen and my parents for their continued encouragement throughout my academic career. I would especially like to thank my grandmother, Bessie Herman, for her numerous contributions in advocating on behalf of British Home Children.

*This thesis is dedicated to my great-grandmother, Violet Beard, a British Home Child
who sailed to Canada on August, 5th 1912 on the S.S. Corsican.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	v
List of Illustrations	vi
List of Appendices	vii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Establishing the Barnardo Programme, 1860s-1930s: The Emergence of Barnardo Home Children	11
Chapter 2: Revealing Truth through the Genealogical Analysis of Counter Discourses and Subjugated Knowledges	41
Chapter 3: A Feminist Genealogical Analysis of Canada's Home Children: Practices of Government and Practices of Self	59
Conclusion: Negotiating the Past	119
Appendices	137
Bibliography and Works Cited	142

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS:

Illustration 1	Before and After ‘Carte-de-visite’, 1915	31
Illustration 2	Before coming to a Barnardo Home, 1870	33
Illustration 3	Barnardo composite photograph ‘Mumps’, 1890	38

LIST OF APPENDICES:

Appendix A	Barnardo's Admittance Photo, 1920	137
Appendix B	Richmond senior relives life as a Barnardo child, 1999	138
Appendix C	Directions for Lads on Leaving for Situations, 1890	139

INTRODUCTION

“Well-planned and wisely conducted child-emigration, especially to Canada, contains within its bosom the truest solution of some of the mother-country’s most perplexing problems, and the supply of our Colonies’ most urgent needs... First, it relieves the overcrowded centres of city life and the congested labour-markets at home, while, at the same time, it lessens in a remarkable manner the burdens of taxation. Second, it supplies what the Colonies are most in want of – an increase of the English-speaking population... Third, it confers upon the children themselves unspeakable blessings... The change at the young and formative period of their lives... gives to each child whose character is good, and who is successfully absorbed into the colonial population, such an immediate prospect of an independent existence upon a higher plane as could hardly have been imagined as within its reach.”

(Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 154 [1907], quoting Dr. Barnardo)

The Government of Canada designated 2010 the “Year of the British Home Child” (Canada Post, 2010); by doing so it recognized the mass child migration phenomenon that brought thousands of children to Canada. Under child migration schemes enacted by the United Kingdom, an estimated 100,000 British children were brought to Canada from 1869 until the late 1940s, often to work as domestic servants and farm labourers (British Home Child Day News Release, 2010; Bagnell, 2001 [1980]; Parr, 1994 [1980]). The ancestral roots of these children are significant to Canadian nation-building; twelve percent of the Canadian population, today, can be traced as a

descendant of a Home Child¹ who was sent to Canada between 1869 and 1948 (cf. Canada Post, 2010; Corbett, 2002 [1997]). The largest segment of this migrating child population was known as Barnardo Home Children (cf. Corbett, 2002 [1997]; Wagner, 1979). An estimated 30,000 Home Children from the Barnardo organization emigrated from Britain to Canada (Kohli, 2003).

This study arose from my interest in understanding the history of British Home Children and the mass emigration schemes which brought them to Canada. These interests emerged from my ancestral connection to British Home Children as my great-grandmother, her twin sister, and younger brother had all emigrated from Britain to Canada under the British child emigration scheme during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. My great-grandmother never openly discussed her roots as a British Home Child. It was years later after she had passed away that my grandmother, her daughter, began uncovering a hidden past and connecting vague details she had held onto about her mother. It was through the help of Barnardo's After-Care Centre and Home Children advocacy connections that my grandmother was able to obtain official records. The official records disclosed the past of my great-grandmother, her twin sister and their younger brother as they had all emigrated from Britain to Canada under the MacPherson² agency on August 5, 1912. Their older brother had come to Canada earlier in 1908

¹ This particular segment of child emigrants "were given the collective label of 'Home Children'... it is the various institutions where the children were placed before they were sent to Canada, that are the 'Homes' being referred to here" (Morrison, 2006: 1).

² Annie Macpherson had an immense influence on Thomas Barnardo and his philanthropic endeavours in child migration to Canada. It was "as early as 1825 [when] the concept of emigrating homeless children from Britain into Canada was advanced by Honourable Peter Robinson and the Rev. Thomas Socket, both of whom suggested that destitute children be emigrated to Canada as agricultural labourers" (Corbett, 2002: 23 [1997]). In 1837 the emigration of British children to Canada was terminated for a brief period (Corbett, 2002 [1997]). By the late 1840s, Lord Shaftsbury encouraged the child emigration movement through his Ragged School movement when he "asked for state aid to meet the cost of sending Ragged School pupils to work on sheep stations in Australia" (Fletcher, 2005: 23).

through the Macpherson agency as well. This study developed out of my interest in understanding the contextual milieu invested in such an emigration scheme that brought my great-grandmother and her siblings to Canada.

Philanthropist and evangelical missionary Dr. Thomas J. Barnardo took great interest in children living in destitute areas of urban Britain, opening his first 'Home' for destitute boys in 1870 and officially opening his Girls' Village Homes in 1876 (cf. Wagner, 1979; Bready, 1932 [1930]). Barnardo contributed to the movement of child-saving between 1867 until his death in 1905 by founding his 'Homes' for destitute children and establishing a mass child migration scheme of his own during the 1880s (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]; Wagner, 1979). British 'pauper children' under the care of Barnardo between 1870 and 1905 were perceived as being 'saved' from the destitute industrialised cities of Britain (Parr, 1994 [1980]). The aim of the emigration scheme was often presented as an opportunity for pauper children to become 'productive' and 'valuable' citizens in Canada (cf. Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]; Fletcher, 2005; Parr, 1994 [1980]; Bready, 1932 [1930]).

Chapter one, "Establishing the Barnardo Programme, 1860s-1930s," provides an introduction into the contextual significance of British child-saving studies during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. To begin analyzing how Barnardo Home Children were made 'targets to be governed' (Dean, 1999) this study first looks at socio-historical studies concerning Barnardo and his emergence in 'child-saving.' Studies surrounding British Home Children include themes of problematizing and isolating 'pauper children,' the vulnerability and innocence of the British migrant child (Swain and Hillel, 2010) and the mechanisms and processes used to govern this population, including

the mass child emigration project inaugurated by Barnardo during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Studies have also included a socio-historical analysis of British philanthropic agencies that assisted in placing British child migrant apprentices in Canadian homes (cf. Kohli, 2001; Bagnell, 2001 [1980]; Parr, 1994 [1980]; Sutherland, 1978).

Chapter two, “Revealing Truth through the Genealogical Analysis of Counter Discourses and Subjugated Knowledges,” offers a theoretical framework concentrating on how Barnardo Home Children were formed and regulated as “subjects of government” (Petersen and Bunton (eds.), 1997: 175) in their administered migration from Britain to Canada. This chapter also highlights the importance of a gendered lens by turning to the work of Butler (1993) and her notion of performativity.

In Chapter three, “A Feminist Genealogical Analysis of Barnardo Home Children: Practices of Government and Practices of Self,” I connect the problematization of ‘pauper children’ with colonial projects through an analysis of official and authoritative programmes elaborated by Barnardo and the British government. This study begins by presenting the efforts made by Barnardo in child-saving during the late nineteenth century in an attempt to reveal how he was able to form his pastoral role amidst the backdrop of an evangelical and philanthropic child-saving movement. This section also expands its focus by looking at the lived experiences of British Home Children and the effects of pastoral power.³

The analysis chapter of this study examines biographical material offered by British Home Children and their descendants and autobiographical material written by

³ The concept of pastoral power and performativity will be further explained in chapter two.

British Home Children (see Corbett, 2002 [1997]). The analysis of this study uses examples of materials Barnardo Home Children were given on their journeys to Canada, such as a technical booklet, with directions to follow.⁴ This is an important document, written by the General Canadian Inspector and Superintendent, working on behalf of Dr. Barnardo in Canada, Alfred B. Owen (1890). The analysis chapter combines these materials with previous studies pertaining to Dr. Barnardo and Barnardo Home Children.

The conclusions of this study are aptly titled, “Negotiating the Past,” due to the counter-narrative ‘nature’ of this specific Foucauldian-feminist research on child-saving. The conclusions offer a counter-memory to these official moralizing and programmatic accounts. The main purpose of this study is to disrupt and dismantle the ideologies and discourses⁵ embedded within socio-historical and social understandings of the migrant ‘pauper child,’ such as, the image and identity of Barnardo Home Children and also Dr. Barnardo.

⁴ See Appendix C.

⁵ For the purposes of this study, ‘discourse’ refers to the production of ‘true’ statements (see Dean, 1999).

CHAPTER 1

ESTABLISHING THE BARNARDO PROGRAMME, 1860s-1930s:

THE EMERGENCE OF BARNARDO HOME CHILDREN

“Character is better than ancestry.”

(Rose, 1987:17, quoting Dr. Barnardo)

The 1860s to 1940s represents a significant time period in child-saving discourse emphasizing the formation and dissolution of mass British child emigration projects to Canada. This chapter presents a review of some socio-historical studies pertaining to child-saving during the period under analysis, using the example of Dr. Thomas Barnardo⁶ and his continued legacy in ‘rescuing’ children. This chapter examines how the social history of Barnardo Home Children⁷ and childhood during the late nineteenth

⁶ Barnardo was born on July 4th 1845 in Dublin, Ireland (see Wagner, 1979).

⁷ British children who immigrated to Canada in the late 1800s and early 1900s, under the care of Dr. Thomas J. Barnardo, were known as “Barnardo Home Children” (Harrison, 2003 [1979]). The movement included migrating children to British colonies, including Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa (see Swain and Hillel, 2010). Many philanthropic agencies during the late nineteenth and twentieth

century has been previously explored in scholarly studies. The aim of this chapter is to situate the efforts of the Barnardo philanthropic agency amongst the child-saving movement more generally, before providing a ‘governmentality study’⁸ (cf. Dean, 1994; Foucault, 1991a [1978]) of his programmes.

This chapter includes the following themes: problematizing the ‘pauper child,’⁹ the legacy of isolating the ‘social outsider,’ envisioning the ‘innocent child’ within child-saving discourse, the persuasiveness of the ‘destitute image’ and the British child emigrant as a ‘nation-builder’ in Canada.

The ‘Pauper Child’

The migration of British pauper children during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been well documented (cf. Parr, 1994 [1980]; Wagner, 1979). Such works describe the roles of Home Children in Canadian homes. Sutherland (1978) provides an analysis of child-rearing procedures in the Canadian child-saving system during the 1870s to 1920s, emphasizing the role of children as labourers in rural Canadian families. Autobiographical material of Home Children has been collected, notably by Harrison (2003 [1979]) and Corbett (2002 [1997]). Biographical material regarding Barnardo himself and his continued organization has been extensively compiled (cf. Fletcher, 2005; Rose, 1987; Wagner, 1979; Williams, 1966; Bready, 1932 [1930]; Batt, 1904), including

centuries emigrated British pauper children to British colonies, these children were broadly labelled as British Home Children.

⁸ The term ‘governmentality’ will be explicated in the following chapter.

⁹ Florence Davenport Hill and Fanny Fowke (ed.) (1889) discuss ‘pauper children’ in their work *Children of the State*. Davenport Hill and Fowke address children of impoverished families as ‘pauper children’ to distinguish a target population characterized by their low socio-economic status. This term is also used within British Poor Law Guardian reports and public discussions surrounding child poverty in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. British institutional reports also refer to children from lower-class families as ‘street arabs,’ ‘orphans,’ ‘strays’ and ‘destitute children’ (Fletcher, 2005).

personal memoirs published after his death (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]).¹⁰

These works contribute to the continual legacy Barnardo has in child-saving practices.

Studies have included the social history pertaining to juvenile labour movements structured and regulated by the Barnardo agency and other philanthropic agencies during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (cf. Kohli, 2003; Parr, 1994 [1980]; Parr, 1983). For example, Joy Parr (1994 [1980]) documents the Anglo-Canadian relations of the juvenile emigration movement during 1869 to 1924 in her book *Labouring Children: British Immigrant Apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924*. More recent studies have included discussions pertaining to the systemic imperialism of child-saving movements throughout the early twentieth century and the nature of the ‘child-citizen’ in contemporary social welfare practices (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Chen, 2005; Sherington and Jeffrey, 1998).

These studies contribute to the study of child-saving in that they are discourses on child-saving. Several studies have included an analysis of the child emigration movement from the 1860s to the late 1930s, particularly Barnardo Home Children. These works often focus on Dr. Barnardo, his philanthropic mission and allied organizational programme, even though Barnardo entered the movement after child migration was becoming more common in the late nineteenth century. These studies are relevant to the participation of the Barnardo organization in the mass child migration movement, which immigrated over 30,000 British children to Canada between 1882 and 1939 (cf. Corbett, 2002 [1997]; Rose, 1987). In total, over 100,000 children were sent to

¹⁰ Following his death, memoirs of Barnardo were compiled by his wife, Syrie Elmslie, and James Marchant, the Secretary of the National Memorial to Dr. Barnardo (see Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]).

Canada from Britain between 1869 and 1939, brought over by the Barnardo agency and similar organizations.

The subject of Canadian child immigrants during the 1860s to 1930s often involves complex themes of citizenship, childhood and social imperialism and the shifting relations between them (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Sherington and Jeffrey, 1998). Studies pertaining to the British child emigration project are also often “polemical in nature and concentrate on history principally in terms of perceived victims” (Sherington and Jeffery, 1998: xi). Controversy surrounding child emigrants includes cases of child mistreatment¹¹ and the more general accusation of “philanthropic abduction” (Sherington and Jeffrey, 1998: xi), involving the forcible separation of children from their families with the intentions of protecting the welfare of the ‘pauper child’ (see also Parr, 1994 [1980]).

Recent studies elaborate on the socio-political background in which child migration schemes originated and how the British Empire institutionalized and produced a large-scale child migration movement during the nineteenth century (see Swain and Hillel, 2010). Swain and Hillel (2010) explain the ‘nature’ of children and childhood was romanticized in the everyday life of middle-class British during the late nineteenth century, perpetuating notions of ‘innocence’ and ‘child welfare.’ Swain and Hillel (2010:

¹¹ The Poor Law Board sanctioned child emigration in Britain in 1870: “149 children were sent to Canada under the care of Miss Rye and Miss Macpherson” (Davenport Hill and Fowke (ed.), 1889: 131). In 1874, controversy erupted when “some unfavourable accounts of the condition of children which reached the Local Government Board caused them [the Poor Law Guardians] to institute an inquiry by their Inspector, Mr. Doyle” (Davenport Hill and Fowke (ed.), 1889: 131). The main criticisms made by Mr. Doyle were of “inspection and reports” of children when arriving to Canada, remarking “the work has rapidly outgrown the means provided for carrying it on” (Davenport Hill and Fowke (ed.), 1889: 131). The effect of the report made by Mr. Doyle “was the withdrawal from Poor Law Guardians of permission to emigrate pauper children” (Davenport Hill and Fowke (ed.), 1889: 131). This was a temporary hold on child emigration, but was met with emigration advocates providing lengthy reports praising established emigration homes in Canada. Davenport Hill and Fowke (ed.) (1889: 131) argue “there are great advantages in planting children in a new country while they are yet young enough to grow up its citizens.”

vi) explain how Victorian images of childhood were immersed in Christian ideology and middle-class ideals. The vulnerable ‘pauper child’ was a target of moral and economic reform, a social responsibility to protect. Swain and Hillel (2010: 64) add: “child rescuers developed a taxonomy of space in which geography determined destiny... the ordered, privatised spaces in which the middle classes lived were contrasted with the disorder of the slums which were a threat both to an idealised childhood and to the stability of the nation as a whole.”

In the late nineteenth century, philanthropists began to advocate for the emigration of children based on the poverty extremities experienced in Britain, often due to the overrun cottages and homes aiding pauper children (Parr, 1994 [1980]). In 1870, Barnardo was establishing his first ‘Home’ for boys in Stepney Causeway and in 1876 officially opened the Girls’ Village Homes (Rose, 1987). The work of child emigration during this time was pioneered by a social reformer, Miss Maria Rye, and, an evangelical missionary, Miss Annie Macpherson (Rose, 1987: 83). Barnardo trusted the aid of Miss Macpherson¹² to escort boys from his Home and the first boy he had rescued, Jim Jarvis, to Canada (Rose, 1987).

Population migration projects are not a new phenomenon, but have served as a technique to rid society of ‘undesirable’ subjects.¹³ These projects are linked to the

¹² Annie Macpherson is well known for her rescue work in the East End of London during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Bagwell, 1980). Annie Macpherson, “with the assistance of her two sisters, Rachel and Louisa, and a number of volunteers, would open four other homes for London’s orphans, waifs, and strays, taking into her care thousands of children, both boys and girls” (Bagwell, 1980: 22).

¹³ Foucault (1995: 298 [1977]) addresses the penal colonies in his work *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* stating: “There were penal colonies envisaged by the law of 1850: minors, acquitted or condemned, were sent to these colonies and ‘brought up in common, under strict discipline, and trained in agricultural work and in the principal industries related to it;’ later, they were joined by minors sentenced to hard labour for life and ‘vicious and insubordinate wards of Public Assistance’.” Foucault (1995: 298

imperial expansion of Britain, strengthening the peripheries through the expulsion of delinquents from the core. Child migration projects existed “as early as the seventeenth century, [as] unwanted vagabond children had been shipped out to the American colonies ... in the eighteenth century, women prisoners and their children, as well as child convicts, had been sent to the colonies by successive British governments” (Rose, 1987: 84).

The Barnardo agency became an effective component of the emigration project as “the largest and best known of the rescue agencies engaged in emigration” (Rose, 1987:83). The project of child migration was infused with notions of ‘childhood’ and ‘destitution’; these became central referents in the expanding network of power (Foucault, 2007 [1978]) that enabled such a movement of populations to exist. Studies pertaining to the nineteenth century, such as Aries (1962),¹⁴ often argue that, prior to the effects of industrialization and urbanization, children were perceived as miniature grown-ups, presumably due to a short life expectancy (Parr, 1994 [1980]). The expansion of industrialization transformed the way people worked in factory jobs, but not longevity for the working class, offering “paltry wages for agonizingly long hours, at jobs that children could not easily perform” (Fletcher, 2005: 16). Regardless, children from lower-class

[1977]) argues “charitable societies, moral improvement associations, organizations that handed out assistance and workers’ estates and lodging houses also practised surveillance ... [a] carceral network [that] reaches all the disciplinary mechanisms that function throughout society.”

¹⁴ Cultural historian Philippe Aries (1962) traced the history of childhood and interpreted how the ‘nature’ of childhood was constructed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The evidence used to support the construction of childhood in the analysis by Aries (1962) was demonstrated through the analysis of paintings, along with empirical research encompassing sexuality studies, the development of education and the history of children’s fashion and games, illustrating the introduction of childhood as an emerging concept (Hobbs et. al., 1999). Aries (1962) has been criticized for generalizations in his analysis of childhood; critics argue the interpretations made by Aries (1962) negate evidence in its entirety, in particular, arguing pauper children were absent from the analysis and only wealthy and powerful individuals were depicted in the paintings he analyzed (Hobbs et. al., 1999). Additionally, Aries (1962) negates experiences of women and girls, focusing on the disciplining experiences of boys.

families still were expected to labour beside adults, working “mines, brickyards, woolen mills and factories of all kinds from the time they were very young” (Kohli, 2003: 3).

Children were understood as a necessary source of income for British lower-class families and their small bodies were perceived as an asset for jobs that involved cramped spaces adults could not fit into (see Kohli, 2003: 3).

The constructivist account by Aries (1962) is relevant to this study of child-saving, particularly his interpretation of the institutional changes and the societal effects of constructing childhood. He views constructions of childhood as contingent on the effects of economic and social changes.¹⁵ Child-saving policy is formed on the basis of such constructions and “is about the practical inscription of ‘scientific’ discourse within specific policies and the means of administration of poverty” (Dean, 1991: 1).

Discourses about poverty and children became linked through child protection policy, such that the child became a governable object to be ‘intervened’ upon and morally ‘renewed’ (Swain and Hillel, 2010).

The unsafe jobs and excess display of poverty on the streets, such as children begging, caught the attention of many Christian middle class men, most notably: “Thomas Barnardo (1854-1905), Thomas Bowman Stephenson (1838-1912), Edward de Montjoie Rudolf (1852-1933) and Benjamin Waugh (1839-1908)” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 17).¹⁶ Contemporary scholars argue evangelical philanthropists, such as this circle

¹⁵ This viewpoint is criticized for concentrating on modern western Europe, as it negates constructions of childhood in other historical time periods, for example Ancient Rome, Ancient India, Ancient Greece among other classical civilizations (Stearns, 2011).

¹⁶ The evangelical network of these men will be explored in the subsequent analysis focusing on the evangelical connection to Barnardo. Victorian philanthropists had an “interconnected world” (Wagner, 1979: 39). The project of British child emigration was also influenced by “the Nonconformist industrialist Samuel Morley to the aristocratic Lord Shaftesbury and the brilliant, Lord Chancellor, Lord Cairns” (Wagner, 1979: 39).

of men, have romanticized the environment of the ‘destitute child’ in urban Britain much as the one described above, contributing to the public acceptance of removing and separating these children from their parents (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Murdoch, 2006).

Murdoch (2006) reflects on the child-saving discourses of philanthropic campaigns. She argues the negation of parents in the language surrounding child rescue policies circumvented issues of parental rights, for example, through the labels of ‘nobody’s children’ and ‘orphans.’ Murdoch (2006) uses records from the charitable bodies that enlisted children to support her claims, offering examples of parents placing children in the care of institutions due to financial stress, but who remained involved in the lives of their children through supervised visits or censored letters regulated by the sending agencies. Murdoch (2006) contends there has been a negotiation between parents and child-saving policies, revealing the moral regulation¹⁷ of poor families by the state and charitable organizations.

Poor single-parent families often used Barnardo Homes as a necessity for survival. Parr (1994: 29 [1980]) argues that in the late 1860s widespread economic distress was prompted by many factors: “the last epidemic of cholera struck London, its effects compounded by scarlet fever and small pox... bread prices were high... the winter of 1867 was exceptionally severe... and a financial crisis lay upon Britain.” These factors initiated a response from charities and consequently the child emigration scheme offered a “safety-valve” (Parr, 1994: 33 [1980]) for families, especially single mothers, suffering destitute circumstances.

¹⁷ ‘Moral regulation or ‘moral reform’ is often used as a blanket term that is frequently dismissed as a cover for class relations (Dean, 1991). It is the intention of this study to use ‘moral regulation’ to reveal the nexus of power surrounding its practices, such as class relations, but not exclusively.

Samuel Smith, a Member of British Parliament, wrote in the 1880s of the “foul sewage stagnating beneath ‘our social fabric,’ certain if untreated to cause ‘terrible disasters’” (Parr, 1994: 33 [1980]). Smith, a strong advocate for child emigration, stated “destroying the memories of pauperism in children and saving them from becoming as corrupted as their parents were before them” is a strong component of the emigration movement (Parr, 1994: 33 [1980]). Smith, like many who worked in the child emigration field, was a social conservative, with the main objective of “searching for policies that would relieve distress among the poor but not require Britain to change” (Parr, 1994: 34 [1980]). For Smith, like many child emigration advocates, the emigration scheme was not only a “safety-valve” (Parr, 1994: 33 [1980]) for economic distresses in families, but also the overcrowding slums and influences of urban Britain (cf. Parr, 1994 [1980]; Fletcher, 2005).

Isolating the ‘Social Outsider’

The socio-historical significance of the Barnardo agency and its participation in the large-scale British child emigration movement extends to the more general topic of philanthropy and controlling the child as an ‘outsider’ (Kendrick, 1990). Kendrick (1990) discusses the design of outsiders in his historical investigation of benevolence.¹⁸ Kendrick (1990) problematizes how contemporary child welfare is structured in Western societies and argues there is historical precedence for containing and isolating the ‘social outsider.’ The significance of the child as an ‘outsider’ is useful to this study of the

¹⁸ See *Nobody’s Children*, ‘Chapter 4: Outsiders by design: The History of Benevolence’ (Kendrick, 1990: 71). Kendrick (1990) discusses the work of Foucault (2001 [1965]), which he claims offers a genealogy of institutionalizing outsiders. Kendrick (1990: 72) cites the study written by Foucault (2001 [1965]) concerning the thirteenth century institutional buildings that were erected to incarcerate and isolate lepers. Foucault connects the confinement of lepers to the Western societal project of institutionalizing ‘outsiders’ from society (in Kendrick, 1990).

Anglo-British child emigration movement because it creates a foundation for inquiry, particularly, an analysis of how Barnardo Home Children were constituted in official child-saving discourses.

In Victorian Britain, public discourses¹⁹ surrounding Barnardo Home Children stigmatized them as “savages,” “waifs” and “street arabs” (Fletcher, 2005: 21); they were widely perceived as a threat to social stability. Unreformed children were believed to lack Victorian ideals of Christianity, to be prone to criminality and idleness (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Platt, 1977). Pauper children were widely believed to be incapable of becoming ‘good citizens,’ furthering the emergent Western nationalistic goals of child welfare (cf. Fletcher, 2005: 21; Janovicek and Parr (eds.), 2003). Changing views of childhood and child protection encouraged the public to view street children as a social responsibility; new methods of awareness surrounding the ‘pauper child’ inflamed the public and created a response to child poverty, a process of problematization²⁰ (Swain and Hillel, 2010). Victorian ideals were changing to include street children into a schooling system,²¹ to offer systematic training in preparation of a productive and healthy society; the opposition of the productive citizen to the delinquent child is a common theme (cf. Janovicek and Parr (eds.), 2003; Hendrick, 1990). There was a transformation taking place in how child poverty was perceived, as philanthropists countered the

¹⁹ Public discourses included ‘true’ statements circulated in the public sphere (Dean, 1999). Examples included pamphlets, newspapers and flyers.

²⁰ Foucault discusses the process of ‘problematization’ as: “how and why certain things (behavior, phenomena, processes) became a problem. Why, for example, certain forms of behavior were characterized and classified as ‘madness’ while other similar forms were completely neglected at a given historical moment; the same thing for crime and delinquency, the same question of problematization for sexuality” (in Borch, 2012: 7).

²¹ The Ragged School movement was initiated by evangelical Lord Shaftsbury in 1852 (Fletcher, 2005). Lord Shaftsbury argued the schools were opened “in order to afford gratuitous instruction to children of the poor who have no other way of learning to read the word of God, and are deserving of the support of Christians of all denominations” (Fletcher, 2005: 22).

prevailing view that poor children were ‘untreatable,’ thereby opening them as targets of regulation and state intervention (Dean, 1999).

Heywood (1959) asserts cholera epidemics heightened evangelists’ concerns regarding workhouses²² (in Kohli, 2003: 9). Lack of hygiene and the multitude of people in workhouses allowed for illness and disease to spread quickly; making workhouses a difficult and dangerous place in which to raise a family (cf. Fletcher, 2005; Kohli, 2003). It was during this time evangelical philanthropists began to see the constrained choices children and single parents had to face on the streets and in workhouses, predominantly the excessive destitution in the East End of London, England. Most children were not able to find shelter in the workhouses, based on discriminatory assumptions by local tax payers, who questioned whether these children were “migrant waifs and strays from other localities” (Fletcher, 2005: 18). Parents and children during this time did not want to live in the workhouses due to the stigma it produced and the constrained provisions it placed on families, but remained a necessary last resort of survival for many (cf. Kohli, 2003; Wagner, 1979).

Individuals who lived in workhouses were socially ‘marked’ as outsiders and labour choices were constrained by workhouse unions (Fletcher, 2005). Many street children turned to crime as a way to rebel against the institutional constraints imposed upon them because of their impoverishment. Many street children perceived crime as an easier way to survive, rather than taking the unsafe, risky jobs that were forced upon

²² In Britain during 1834, under the New Poor Law Act, workhouses were created for the “undeserving poor and their children to live in, paid for by local taxes raised by local Poor Law unions” (Fletcher, 2005: 16). Heywood (1959) asserts that the “inadequate and sometimes inhuman methods, which the poor law administrators used in order to fulfill their statutory obligations to the homeless and orphaned children were responsible for the development of alternative forms of care pioneered by humanitarians and philanthropists” (in Kohli, 2003: 9).

them by parents and workhouse masters (Fletcher, 2005). Hendrick²³ argues it was the rise of juvenile delinquency that perpetuated the changing attitudes towards children and childhood during the late nineteenth century. It is useful to note this genealogical change in childhood, because it asserts the interests of the nation in harnessing the potential ‘productivity’ of this large underclass, to make them dutiful citizens; this is what Foucault (1995 [1977]) calls the ‘disciplinary society.’

Child-saving and child migration became a state-philanthropic solution for children whom public authorities believed would either die on the streets of Britain or live a life of continual despair in extreme impoverished conditions (Fletcher, 2005). Migration to Canada would also make room for additional street children in workhouses and homes for the destitute, offering a somewhat healthier atmosphere than the overpopulated diseased slums of Britain (Parr, 1994 [1980]). Barnardo harnessed existing pastoral techniques²⁴ on an even bigger scale as new technologies became available to efficiently train British pauper children and send them to Canada. Creating a ‘spectacle’ of destitution in Britain eased the minds of the public and policymakers when maintaining an emigration scheme for pauper children as opportunities in Canada were perceived greater than in the slums of Britain.

Families and children were defined by their destitute circumstances and were categorized as ‘undeserving,’ perpetuating the Victorian stereotypes of the time; impoverishment was a situation reflecting the laziness of those who were labeled

²³ Harry Hendrick (1990) provides an analysis on juvenile delinquency in his work: *Images of Youth: Age, Class, and the Male Youth Problem, 1880-1920*. Hendrick (1997) also provides a guide on the history of childhood in his work: *Children, Childhood and English Society, 1880-1990*.

²⁴ The techniques of ‘pastoral power’ will be outlined in chapter three and further developed within chapter four.

“paupers” (Fletcher, 2005: 16). Victorian constructions sought to discourage the lifestyle of poor families and to encourage individuals to move out of their destitute status through individual initiative. The legitimacy of categorizing the poor into an ‘undeserving’ class was made through the means of ‘specialist expertise,’²⁵ prompting public approval in problematizing pauper children and ultimately forming a child emigration scheme.

In the nineteenth century public officials were asked to be more specific in prioritizing spending on social benefits and distinguishing services of the “deserving” and “undeserving” poor (Ginnis Fuchs, 2005: 198). Ginnis Fuchs (2005: 198) adds: “orphans, abandoned children, and married women with several young children whose husbands had become disabled, had died, or had abandoned them were generally the most deserving of poor relief.” Ginnis Fuchs (2005: 198) further details the categorization of the poor by stating “the able-bodied poor, customarily men, who would not work because they were dissolute, lazy, drunk, or debauched, were “undeserving”.” This categorization is dependent on gender roles as men were expected to be the ‘bread-winners’ and women were expected to raise children, after they were married (Ginnis Fuchs, 2005). Many of these poor relief categorizations are based on “middle-class prejudices that aimed to remold the poor into the ideal middle-class model” (Ginnis Fuchs, 2005). Dean (1991: 97) argues “the possibility of using poor relief to maintain or contribute to the maintenance of himself, his wife, and their children would be denied to the able-bodied poor adult male for almost the whole of the next century.”

²⁵ Miller and Rose (2008: 204-5) attribute the “authority of expertise” to the formation of the “liberal subject.” Miller and Rose (2008: 205) further explain: “In each case, experts in demanding that economic, familial and social arrangements are governed according to their own programmes, attempt to mobilize political resources such as legislation, funding or organizational capacity for their own ends.”

Dean (1991: 1) emphasizes pauperism as an ‘event’ and explores “relations between specific forms of theoretical and strategic knowledge,” which claim the “legitimacy and authority of scientific discourse” (Miller and Rose, 2008: 205). Dean (1991: 1) suggests “it is about the practical inscription of ‘scientific’ discourse within specific policies and means of administration of poverty” that is particularly interesting for studying the emergence of poverty as a problem-space for government. Dean (1991) argues there has been a renewed idea of ‘moral responsibility’ in contemporary western societies.

The 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act, also known as the New Poor Law, is significant in understanding “the relationship between the conceptualization of poverty in nascent economic discourse and forms of administration characteristic of state in the liberal mode of government” (Dean, 1991: 96). Dean (1991: 96) argues the “institutional configuration of relief” was constructed to detract individuals from seeking poor relief outside of workhouses and to deter the ‘able-bodied’ from receiving relief from the state.²⁶ The New Poor Law “establishes a domain of economic responsibility of both the state and of adult male individuals” (Dean, 1991: 100). The refusal of out-relief²⁷ for those labeled ‘able-bodied persons’ is legitimized “as a sanction against those who have failed to practice moral restraint, those who have been made their dependents, those

²⁶ Governors of the Union Workhouses were instructed through manuals, emphasizing the maintenance of discipline and cleanliness (Crowther, 1983). Charles Dickens is partly responsible for the abundant popular culture images of children overworked and starving in workhouses as illustrated in *Oliver Twist* (Crowther, 1983). Dickens is credited for his historical accounts of workhouses in advocating for child welfare through his literary figures.

²⁷ Out-relief was administered to people who did not receive relief through workhouses. It was a highly discouraged practice, as regarded in the 1834 Poor Law (Crowther, 1983). The primary source of relief during the nineteenth century was from the workhouse system (Williams, 1981). In the 1870s a (Williams, 1981: 93) “crusade against out-relief” had been initiated but had a different context than during the 1834 New Poor Law. Dean (1991: 115) argues “by the end of the eighteenth century...widespread failure of the institutional form of the workhouse to fulfil its elementary goals of profitable employment and the suppression of beggary and vagrancy formed the basis of pervasive disenchantment.”

whose existence is the result of this failure and those who are subject to no relations of responsibility and dependency as established in the marriage contract” (Dean, 1991: 100).

Escaping the diseased poorhouses was a feasible option for British pauper children as the child emigration movement offered an opportunity for a new life and, more significantly, an escape from extreme destitution in Britain. The legacy of institutionalizing and isolating impoverished communities as a mode of governance can be linked to philanthropic initiatives of emigrating children and removing them from pauper influences, namely the parents (Parr, 1994 [1980]). According to Dean (1991: 115), “the workhouse, which had once been seen as a place for the habituation of the Poor to the ways of patriarchal discipline and an industrious life, was now viewed as a scourge on the body politic.” Particularly for children, the workhouse was often viewed by philanthropists as a corrupt breeding ground for pauperism, “making the males unsuitable for outdoor occupations and leading the females into prostitution” (Dean, 1991: 115). By the late nineteenth century “workhouse manufactures were found to be unprofitable to such a degree that the cost of maintaining these institutions would constantly increase” (Dean, 1991: 115). Dean (1991: 115) argues “these charges are symptomatic of the fact that the old solutions, and perhaps the old problems, were no longer appropriate to the question of poor policy.”

The analysis provided by Kendrick (1990) reveals how poor policies were manipulated and reinforced by philanthropic agencies and reformers, such as Barnardo. Philanthropic organizations practiced out-relief for the poor separate from workhouses, stationing techniques of practice in charitable institutions that housed labeled ‘pauper’ or ‘destitute’ children. Children were often separated from parents when entering

workhouses and shared different living quarters when receiving relief (May, 2005).

Philanthropic rescue homes and parish workhouse schools were often a last resort for many impoverished families who could not afford the necessities of childcare (Parr, 1994 [1980]). Many children born in the urban centers of Britain during the 1890s had a life-expectancy of “only thirty-six years and one in four would not reach his or her first birthday” (Parr, 1994: 14 [1980]). The conditions of the slums consequently meant that boys and girls born into this environment were “shorter and thinner, weaker and less active than the average British child” (Parr, 1994: 14 [1980]). The conditions of economic hardship governed the lives not only of adults, but also of their children. It was the welfare of children that provided Barnardo with the justification necessary to establish a complex migratory programme and intervene on pauper parents and their children.

Socio-historical studies of child-saving contribute to our basic assumptions concerning child protection agencies (cf. Chen, 2005; Kendrick, 1990). Questions often include why the benevolent attempts of the state have failed (see Kendrick, 1990). Kendrick’s (1990) problematization of child protection, using the example of foster care, is useful in connecting the narratives of Home Children to the more general project of child welfare. Kendrick (1990) uses contemporary reflections of foster care that mirror the experiences of Home Children in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; this demonstrates why it is useful to elaborate on the socio-historical significance of the governance of children as an ‘outsider.’ Kendrick (1990) connects the history of benevolence to the Elizabethan Poor Laws and extracts contemporary notions of child-saving from social welfare policy. The perception of children as an ‘object’ to protect is

contextual (see Swain and Hillel, 2010), as it was not until 1878, in Britain, “when protective legislation raised the earliest permitted age for employment in all factories and workshops to 10; it went up to 11 in 1891 and again to 12 in 1901” (Fletcher, 2005: 16). The protective legislation in 1878 set precedence for further child-saving legislation, circulation of the programmatic discourse on child-saving, one which contained a variety of solutions to the problem of the child pauper; a population to be constituted and codified (cf. Miller and Rose, 2008; Dean, 1991).

Swain and Hillel (2010) acknowledge a historical continuum of social ills that have traditionally distressed ‘child rescuers’ and philanthropic organizations. The authors argue the historical pattern of child-saving is embedded within the Anglo-British child emigration movement and has extended to global patterns and justifications of child-saving initiatives (Swain and Hillel, 2010). Swain and Hillel (2010: vi) connect discourses pertaining to child-saving to present-day social issues by juxtaposing the child-saving policies of the British Empire to the “saving of Aboriginal and First Nations children [in Canada and Australia].” Swain and Hillel (2010) deconstruct child rescue as an “imperial endeavour,” which not only transported the Christian evangelical ideas of philanthropists, but also exported a specific category of children from the British Empire, Anglo-Saxon ‘pauper children.’²⁸

Swain and Hillel (2010: 174-175) add,

²⁸ Swain and Hillel (2010: 81) cite the work of Ruth Frankenburg (1993: 1) describing three elements of whiteness: “a location of structural advantage, of race privilege... a place from which white people look at ourselves, at others, and at society... [and] a set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked and unnamed.” Swain and Hillel (2010: 81) discuss the comparisons made in “the use of similar language to describe working-class Britons and Aboriginal, African, or other Indigenous peoples” but states “they were not thought of as the same.” Furthermore, Swain and Hillel (2010: 81) argue “child rescue literature encoded whiteness practice, designating non-European societies as ‘primitive’ in order to buttress the superiority of the colonising nation.”

while in the nineteenth century child rescue movement, which began in England and spread across and beyond her settler colonies, drew much needed-attention to the plight of children and made an unequalled contribution to the public and statutory recognition of their status as future citizens, the more negative aspects of its legacy should lead us to be wary of the quick solution in what is a very complex area.

The authors also deliberate: “the image of lonely, abandoned child at risk, however appealing, has been carefully constructed upon a denial or victimisation of the family and kin who, properly supported, are most likely to ensure its safety” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 175). The authors support a deconstructive approach on how the “naturalisation of child removal” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 149) seeped into discourses of child rescue and subsequently institutional practices and techniques of child welfare.

The Barnardo agency operated on the belief emigration to Canada and “boarding out”²⁹ (Harrison, 2003: 4 [1979]) of children was one of the best solutions to the overpopulated streets and workhouses in Britain. Barnardo insisted that “children and homes were regularly inspected by local committees set up for the purpose, usually based on the local church, and later by specially employed inspectors” (Fletcher, 2005: 25). Barnardo also insisted children would not be sent to a non-religious home, but rather a Christian home, which would make for a healthy citizen (Kohli, 2003). Although it seemed true in theory, to Barnardo and nineteenth century public opinion, that emigration to Canada would offer a better life, these children were also sent to Canada without being fully aware of the consequences and challenges that lay ahead, especially in being separated from their families (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Parr, 1994 [1980]).

²⁹ The system of ‘boarding out’ is interpreted in the memoirs of Dr. Barnardo as meaning, “the State, in order to prevent the children of beggars becoming beggars, boarded them out with respectable folk that they might grow up law-abiding citizens” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 186 [1907]). Mrs. Barnardo and Marchant (2007: 186 [1907]) further describe the system of ‘boarding out’ as “part of the great outdoor relief afforded by the State, and is much more largely adopted in Scotland than in England.”

Starkey (2011: 1033) reviews the work of Swain and Hillel (2010), emphasizing how the child rescuer “was transformed from an individual religious enthusiast into a national hero as a result of the process of rendering rescue a communal imperative by ascribing moral meanings to the body of the child.” Swain and Hillel (2010: 42) offer an analysis on the prevalence of child neglect in nineteenth century England and argue the “extensive descriptions of the bodies of children at risk are not simply illustrative, but constitute them as texts on which their vulnerability is written, a device already well-established in children’s literature.” Swain and Hillel (2010: 44) argue discourses of pity also contribute to the “gaze”³⁰ in child rescue literature, such as class and race relations. Home Children were imagined as the renewed English child, often featured in child rescue campaigns and reported as an object of sympathy and institutional reform (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Parr, 1994 [1980]). As Swain and Hillel (2010: 58) argue, pauper children became a national cause of British prosperity, “a body of a nation.” Conceptualizing the body of the child in discourses of pity and sympathy offers a legitimized ‘truth’ of converting and ‘saving’ children.

Swain and Hillel (2010) demonstrate the shifting of ideas about the nature of childhood and the rise of child protection concerns, such as, “the assumption that children were entitled to statutory protection” (in Starkey, 2011: 1033). The emphasis on unfit parents of the poor is a common theme, which helped perpetuate the rising assumption in statutory responsibility of child poverty in the nineteenth century³¹ (Swain and Hillel,

³⁰ Swain and Hillel (2010: 23) explain “while children in such illustrations are the objects of the gaze of the viewer, they rarely return that gaze, being positioned instead as subservient, looking sideways out of the illustration, up to an adult, or gazing heavenward to indicate both the ultimate help and reward.”

³¹ Swain and Hillel (2010: 3) note: “During the nineteenth century childhood was transformed. The child, regarded in law as little more than the property of the father, became by the century’s end, a citizen or potential citizen with a new status and added respect.”

2010). Child rescuers were able to legitimize their work based on the assumptions of child protection, the social responsibility to intervene and protect children from physical or moral dangers and society from potential delinquents (Swain and Hillel, 2010). The taken-for-granted knowledge of 'child protection' is enhanced in nineteenth century literature, publicized through books, house magazines, reports, children's literature and pamphlets engaging the general public with emphasized concepts of child-saving and childhood (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Ash, 2008; Koven, 2004).

Chen (2005: 3) indicates "child protection, also known as child-saving in its early history, emerged in the midst of social and moral reform in urban English-speaking Canada at the turn of the twentieth century." Chen (2005: 4) directs her socio-historical research on "child-saving in Toronto during the period from the late 1880s to the 1920s" and applying "the work undertaken by the Toronto Children's Aid Society." The main objective of the analysis carried out by Chen (2005) is to trace contemporary notions of child protection to earlier time periods. This is demonstrated through the use of Foucault and his "use of history to critique the present" (Chen, 2001: 11).

Chen (2005: 12) also highlights "confession, self-examination, and guidance are key techniques of pastoral power." Chen (2005: 12) hones in on the aspects of guidance and education "that were emphasized in child-saving work." Chen (2005) addresses how specific gender norms serve as an institutional form of moral regulation. Chen (2001: 260) emphasizes "the primary goal of child protection policy, i.e. "keeping kids safe," must be questioned... it pits mothers and children against each other as perpetrators and victims, and in effect subsumes child welfare under criminality." The issue of morality (see Dean, 1991) is apparent in discourses concerning pauperism and child-saving during

the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries coinciding with the moral regulation of parents, especially mothers (see Chen, 2005; 2001).

In her analysis of British child emigrants during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Murdoch (2006) argues Barnardo Home Children were inaccurately labeled. Murdoch (2006) contests the popular conception that Barnardo Home Children were orphans,³² a label constantly attached to this segment of children. The analysis Murdoch (2006) provides was genealogical in that it undermined this widely held ‘truth’ through finding that the majority of Barnardo Home Children had at least one living parent, often the mother, when their children were admitted into one of the Barnardo Homes. Barnardo justified his child rescue work based on the lack of “good character” (Murdoch, 2006: 33) parents of the child represented, extending his reasoning for intervening and removing children from pauper parents, the majority being single mothers. Murdoch (2006) emphasizes that those children who were often called ‘nobody’s children’ were depicted as ‘others,’³³ the outcasts’ offspring that could be morally restored through child rescue.

Murdoch (2006) also addresses the concepts of citizenship and identity, contributing to discourse regarding projects of national and imperial child-saving (see also Swain and Hillel, 2010). Murdoch (2006) argues the training of Home Children was embedded in a gendered identity, illustrating an imperialist agenda of class and gender

³² Even in contemporary campaigns of historical awareness Barnardo Home Children are often referred to as ‘nobody’s children.’ The ‘orphan imagery’ was prevalent in the 2010 British Home Children Campaign in Canada.

³³ Edward Said (1979: 332) argues the construction of identities involves “the construction of opposites and “others” whose actuality is always subject to the continuous interpretation and re-interpretation of their differences from “us”.” Said (1979: 332) further argues “each age and society recreates its “Others”...[and] identity of self or of “other” is a much worked-over historical, social, intellectual, and political process that takes place as a contest involving individuals and institutions in all societies.”

relations. Restoring the children of lower-class families was calculated as an elite response to pauperism (cf. Murdoch, 2006; Dean, 1991). Registering children into charitable homes was a building block for the national goal of restoring potential citizens and creating productive labourers, consequently separating children from what was perceived as a 'pauper influence' (Dean, 1991). Murdoch (2006) offers a useful study on poverty in Britain during the late nineteenth century, exhibiting the development of child-saving in an urban environment. Concepts of childhood and gender are reinforced within child rescue discourses, which will be further analyzed in chapter three. The genealogical discoveries of the child as an 'outsider' and an 'object' to be saved are crucial to the understanding of how the movement of British child emigration came into existence.

Joy Parr (1994 [1980]) emphasizes the theme of the productive citizen in her work by analyzing the British juvenile emigration movement during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Parr (1980: 109, 115) argues the experiences of British Home Children were often characteristic of rural Canadian children in the sense that children were a source of labour. Parr (1980: 62-72) also claims the emigration of children from Britain was an accepted practice even for the 'respectable poor.' Child migrants during this time were depicted as a societal benefit for the local economies, in particular rural expansion in Canada. Parr (1994 [1980]) analyzes the child emigration movement and is useful to this study as she reveals notions of childhood through uncovering records, including Barnardo technical booklets and discourse surrounding the regulation of child labour. Parr (1994: 12 [1980]) also offers an analysis of revivalist

evangelicals and the institutional innovations that were made to child rescue homes in the urban environment of Britain.

In later work, Parr (1990: 11) connects the feminist movement to the politics of private life, arguing “the character and precedence of class and gender identities are a matter of history, not universals but specificities.” It is the specificities in the British child emigration movement that reveals what Parr (1980: 153) evokes as “nation-building on the backs of children,” providing a deeper relationship in the development of Canadian child-saving policies and practices. Parr (1994 [1980]) addresses notions of Canadian citizenship and identity in her analysis of child migrants coming to Canada as labourers, apprentices and service workers. Parr (1994: 15 [1980]) argues “economic calculation forced itself upon family relations [and] in such crises parents were forced to place their children with parish and philanthropic institutions, some of which later sent on to Canada the distressed children first presented to them.” Parr (1994: 27 [1980]) argues most children who emigrated in the nineteenth century “were assisted to leave Britain by philanthropic institutions, English parish authorities and Canadian immigration departments.” The analysis also includes 1846-55, 1866-75 and 1881-90 as “periods of economic uncertainty and social tension” (Parr, 1994: 27 [1980]); these periods heightened the concerns of philanthropists and policy makers who feared civil disorder with the growing impoverishment of the working poor. Parr (1994: 27 [1980]) argues it was during this time that child emigration became a “safety-valve” (Parr, 1994: 33 [1980]) and fostered two reoccurring interests in juvenile emigration and apprenticeship, “the political concern for public safety and the religious concern for the salvation of individual working-class children.” Parr (1994: 27 [1980]) acknowledges public policy

was seldom separated from Christian missions during the Victorian period. Parr (1994 [1980]) links the totalizing concern for the safety of the public, political body, to the individualizing powers of the state.

Parr (1994 [1980]) also addresses how pauper children were expected to work in Britain, as apprentices, and when arriving in Canada, as labourers, illustrating elements of industrialization and rural expansion. The experiences of Home Children in Canada is compared to that of Canadian farm children during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, establishing similarities in labouring rural children and the project of rural expansion (Parr, 1994: 84 [1980]). Parr (1994: 84 [1980]) likens these placements to “firms” arguing “children took from the enterprise in supervision, clothing and food and were expected to repay their debts through their labour.” It was the outlook of opportunity in Canada and the issue of British overrun orphanages and workhouses that encouraged philanthropists and policy makers to sustain a programme of child migration.

Envisioning the Destitute Child

Barnardo engaged in practices of “photographic marketing” (Ash, 2008: 180) to increase public awareness surrounding pauper children in Britain and to raise funds for his ‘Homes’ and training schools during the late nineteenth century (Swain and Hillel, 2010). Barnardo compiled a photographic archive of children from his orphanages and used these photographs to raise awareness of poverty and its detrimental effects on pauper children in Britain. As shown in illustration one, Barnardo created postcards of dirty, poverty-stricken children ‘before’ coming to the orphanage and then contrasted that image with an ‘after’ photograph depicting the results of a well-dressed and good-mannered, ‘productive citizen’ (Ash, 2008; Koven, 2004). Barnardo claimed his

charitable advertising schemes were raising awareness concerning the destitution of innocent ‘pauper children.’ Barnardo “invoked childhood innocence to account for his benevolent interventions to house homeless/orphan children” (Ash, 2008: 180).

During the late nineteenth century photography became popular, in particular, the collection of “cartes-de-visite” (Ash, 2008: 181). Ash (2008: 181) explains: “the conventional cartes-de-visite circulated commercially produced images, for collection in specialty albums.” These photographs were usually portraits of “economic and political hierarchies such as, celebrities and royalty, as well as middle-class family and life, while excluding the poor and sick” (Ash, 2008: 182). The photographs used by Barnardo were unique among the collection of “cartes-de-visite” even though “idealized romantic drawings to represent the poor” (Ash, 2008: 182) was already established as a dominant artistic technique during the time.

Illustration two represents how Barnardo staged children in what he called “composite photographs” (Ash, 2008: 182); the staging of ‘destitute children’ was purposely manipulated before taken, making sure to dress the children in ragged clothes and dirty their faces to further the message of distress. The postcards used by Barnardo were designed to convey the message that pauper children do not possess the agency to protect themselves, nor do they choose to be in a lower and vulnerable class. The dichotomous imagery illustrated in Barnardo awareness campaigns interprets the ‘destitute child’ as a by-product of societal restraints, in particular, the over-population of urban Britain and negligent parents; a vicious cycle to be intervened upon and eventually extinguished for ‘national interest’ (Swain and Hillel, 2010).

(British Empire, 2013 [Accessed April 2013])

Illustration 1 An example of a “cartes-de-visite” Barnardo circulated in Britain during the late nineteenth century

The use of ‘staging children’ in photographs was an effective technique in soliciting charitable funds and state interest for the Barnardo agency, but not without controversy (Ash, 2008; Koven, 2004). The Barnardo agency has been recognized for its unique use of ‘spectacle’ within advert campaigns consequently invoking donations from the public and inciting public awareness around child protection (Ash, 2008; Koven, 2004). The medium will interpret the image of the child in a dualistic manner, comparing and contrasting the destitute image to that of a contributing member of society, for example, the middle class child against the ‘pauper influence’ (Parr, 1994 [1980]). A process well practiced at least since the eighteenth century; “public spectacles organized by charities operated in expressive domains that displayed the desired, reciprocal identities between generous benefactor and grateful beneficiary” (Ash, 2008: 184).

At the time when images were increasingly used in newspapers and magazines, American pragmatist Walter Lippmann (1965 [1922]) drew attention to the authority images have over the popular imagination. Lippmann (1965 [1922]) addressed the role of the ‘expert’ in the construction and alignment of ‘public opinion.’ The investigation on the emergence of the photographic image and the correlation with the perception of ‘public opinion’ asserts the mediation of the ‘social expert.’ The ‘expert’ is able to define the image and offer contextual interpretation through mediating the design of the image before the audience has time to grasp their own ‘linguistic’ interpretations (Butler, 1997). This is well addressed in the mediation of Barnardo and the images he ‘staged.’ Barnardo aspired to create an image of ‘destitution’ and the ‘victim child’ in efforts to generate public concern surrounding the pauper children he was rescuing.

(Neville, 2010 [Accessed April 2013])

Illustration 2 One of the ‘composite photographs’ staged by Barnardo

Lippmann (1965 [1922]) stressed that images hold symbolized meaning through moral codes and mediated ‘facts’; a moral code Barnardo honed in on when staging portraits of the ‘evolution’ from delinquent to reformed child (Ash, 2008).

Lippmann (1965: 71 [1922]) connects the emergence of the Industrial Revolution with moralized codes suggesting the imagery surrounding ‘progress’ and ‘perfection’ exude implications beyond what is offered as a simple photograph, but rather is weaved with political ideals considering class, citizenship and gender. Lippmann (1965: 71 [1922]) exemplifies that mechanical inventions and the notion of ‘progression’ are “suffused [with] the whole moral code.”³⁴ The “calculated displays of order – from anniversary day celebrations to Before-and-After cards – appealed to the potential benefactor’s sense of a child’s “natural” innocence no longer perverted by its (family) environment” (Ash, 2008: 184).

The impact of the earlier advertising strategies managed by Barnardo did not go unnoticed by the public and were seen as shocking for its time; “the controversy eventually culminated in an infamous court case in 1877” (Ash, 2008: 180). Public concern surrounding the photographs used by Barnardo during the 1870s caused heated debates surrounding the moral regulation and welfare of children under his care (Ash, 2008). Debates were initiated by philanthropic rivals who accused the work of Barnardo as “breaching the “natural” trust children have in adults” (Ash, 2008: 180). Ash cites Barnardo himself stating [1877]: “out of thirteen hundred photographs of destitute children... only nine were brought forward” (Ash, 2008: 180). Barnardo writes only one

³⁴ Lippmann (1965: 71 [1922]) describes the moral code as a ‘progressive’ American quality. Lippmann (1965 [1922]) discusses the idea of mechanical progress and the stereotypes surrounding American images as a statement of ‘going beyond’ and ‘ideal patriotism.’

was ruled as unfavourable against his organization³⁵ (Ash, 2008: 180). Barnardo argued it was “necessary to clean children up as soon as they arrived because they were so filthy and therefore they had needed to be re-dressed for the ‘before’ pictures” (Wichard and Wichard, 1999: 66).

The advertising techniques Barnardo utilized were not new tactics by any means as they were used within colonial discourses to create “categories and boundaries” in the staging of Aboriginal children (Lloyd, 2002: 26). Philanthropic fundraising techniques had unpredictable consequences for the social sphere of ‘child-saving,’ including dominant notions of child rearing and the ideal child, which were further maintained using the technique of imagery and projecting the ‘child’ as an ‘object of protection’ (Swain and Hillel, 2010). The implication of the earliest advertising techniques used by Barnardo created and maintained westernized ideals of ‘progression’ and were submersed within the techno-political schemas of the time, employing practices of regulation utilizing modern science as a propagating tool³⁶ (Miller and Rose, 2008). The photographic archive compiled by Barnardo objectifies the child consequently maintaining exclusive identities in images that were explicitly based on gender, age and

³⁵ In 1876, during a Christmas event organized by Barnardo opponents handed out leaflets “filled with spiteful accusations against Dr. Barnardo, alleging, among other things, that he ill treated and starved his children, clothed them in rags and dressed them up only when visitors came, used the funds of the organization for himself, and generally did very well on the proceeds” (Williams, 1966: 135). The group of opponents was led by Rev. George Reynolds, who also steered the Arbitration Tribunal against Barnardo in 1877 (Williams, 1966: 136). After nearly forty days of enquiry into the practices of Barnardo, “the Tribunal finally issued a report in which they affirmed that, although they did not deny that in some details of management there were occasionally points in which they did not entirely approve of the Doctor’s actions, the immense amount of good which he had accomplished so far exceeded any small mistakes he had made on the way, that there was not a shadow of a doubt that his Mission deserved whole-hearted respect and public support” (Williams, 1966: 136).

³⁶ Miller and Rose (2008: 204) attribute these techniques as “new technologies of liberal government.” Miller and Rose (2008: 208-9) further explain: “Expertise acquires powerful capacities, not only in linking deliberations in one place with actions in another, but also in promising to align the self-governing capacities of subjects with the objectives of political authorities by means of persuasion, education and seduction rather than coercion.”

class (Ash, 2008; Koven, 2004). Ash (2008: 187) cites Koven (2004: 116) arguing, “Dr. Barnardo was well aware of the contemporary debate regarding photographs as either objective documents or as subjective works of art. He argues Barnardo saw the dichotomy as false, since both conceptions of photography served his benevolent ends.”

Postman (1985) argues the photograph reasserted a ‘nature’ within science that redefined how norms are reproduced throughout society. The imagery used by Barnardo ‘reproduced’ the destitution of child poverty and reaffirmed the emerging moral consciousness surrounding child protection. The photograph of the ‘destitute child’ acts as a metaphor for knowledge and attributes to the rising philanthropic discourse surrounding the knowledge of British pauper children and practices of child-saving (Postman, 1985). Child migration offered a solution for philanthropists and was recorded in the Twenty-First Annual Report of the Poor Law Board between 1868-1869 as the “main secret for destroying hereditary pauperism” (Ash, 2008: 197).

The medium of philanthropic advocacy, used through newspapers, pamphlets and flyers, formulates the image of children disconnected from the realities surrounding the ‘true’ situation and producing one that is a ‘spectacle’ of destitution, as demonstrated in illustration three. Hedges (2009) argues contemporary culture has taken the ‘spectacle’ of the image to even farther lengths than just ‘merely’ staging a few children. Hedges (2009: 11) cites the work of Boorstin (1964 [1962]) and how the image has huge stakes in creating a means to an end. Boorstin (1964 [1962]) writes: “It must serve our purposes. Images are means. If a corporation’s image of itself or a man’s image of himself is not useful, it is discarded. Another may fit better. The image is made to order, tailored to us. An ideal, on the other hand, has a claim on us. It does not serve us; we serve it. If we

have trouble striving towards it, we assume the matter is with us, and not the ideal” (Hedges, 2009: 15). Utilizing an image as ‘spectacle’ invokes the dichotomous relationships Western societies rely on. The spectacle relies on the illusion of complete destitution and urgency, which Barnardo evoked in his photographic archive and public relations tactics practiced in everyday form (Swain and Hillel, 2010). The ‘public’ serve and strive towards child protection as a normative practice that has been tailored to us, through materials and everyday practices (Dean, 1991). These are the politics of everyday life (Dean, 1991).

The contemporary Barnardo agency is still evoking controversy utilizing ‘shockvertising’ and ‘spectacle’ techniques to expand social awareness around drug misuse, disabilities, youth crime, mental illness, sexual and domestic violence, poverty and homelessness (Ash, 2008). The Barnardo organization does not convey a simplistic agenda, but rather brands itself by invoking “an emotional dimension” (Sargeant et.al., 2008: 469). By doing so the Barnardo organization uses non-profit publicizing skills to convey a message that creates a reflexive response from supporters’ own emotions and engages in ideals of what a normalized childhood should look like, while also promoting practices of parenting standards (Sargeant et.al., 2008: 469). Postman (1985: 72) argues the photograph acts as an “objective slice of space-time” lacking a syntax. The epistemological bias formed in the design of the photograph does not evade the conclusions it will receive by the public (Postman, 1985).

(BBC News, 2005 [Accessed April 2013])

Illustration 3 An example of a photograph Barnardo staged portraying children
‘before’ they had entered one of his homes; a product of hereditary pauperism

Norms are perpetuated through cultural hegemonic forces, meaning these norms are structured and maintained by ruling class views influencing all spheres of social living and everyday life (see Olssen and Giroux (ed.), 1999). It is useful to look at the correlations of imagery used in the Western context of child immigration and how these ‘staging design projects’ have transcended into everyday practices and norms in contemporary use of imagery in child welfare projects. The use of the image as a power mechanism has had continuing effects; it is this analysis that is particularly interesting with a specific focus on ‘staging’ Anglo-British Home Children.

The history of Barnardo Home Children and the child migration programme during the time period under examination is concurrent with notions of child protection and childhood today (Chen, 2005). The genealogical method is “not simply a repetition of the idea that all histories are written from a particular viewpoint or perspective, because it is also concerned to come to terms with a history as practice, as a particular set of actions brought to bear on a particular material” (Dean, 1994: 15). The history of Barnardo Home Children and the project of British child emigration is an effect of “other practices of conservation and organisation” (Dean, 1994: 15). These practices are historically documented in the mass archival material recorded by the philanthropic organization, affiliated social services and Home Children themselves. The practices of training children as labourers and instilling Christian ideals had produced an organized programme of child migration, an institution of separating and exporting the pauper children of Britain.

The following chapters will explore how this programme of child-saving was possible under these “regimes of practice” (Dean, 1994) and how these socio-historical

resources serve present day child-saving endeavours. Child-saving discourses pertaining to the Barnardo organization encompasses a rich empirical domain in which to study the embodied performativity of child migrants; serving as a key socio-historical reference point for a practical feminist discourse, one that offers insights into how gender relations are formulated within the identity of the child as citizen (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Chen, 2008).

Barnardo ‘rescued’ over 60,000 children who were affected by poverty and those affected with disabilities from 1867 until his death in 1905 (Fletcher, 2005). After 1905 children were still immigrating to Canada with the help of the continued Barnardo organization and similar philanthropic organizations. This project thus far has been to argue that ideas surrounding child-saving play a significant role in contemporary child protection social policy as a discipline and as a practice. The problematization of ‘destitute children’ and colonial projects of emigration provides an analysis into the institutional and societal practices of poverty, the practices and policies of child-saving. Subsequent sections further a counter-memory to these official moralizing and programmatic accounts (Ramazanoglu, 1993). The literature discussed above will help this study focus on the real effects of colonial moral regulation programmes by looking at the subjective experiences of the governed, whilst emphasizing pastoral power.

CHAPTER 2

REVEALING TRUTH THROUGH THE GENEALOGICAL ANALYSIS OF COUNTER DISCOURSES AND SUBJUGATED KNOWLEDGES

“Brought into close contact with disorganised social life, he soon discovered a class of children more pitiable and neglected than any; pests of their neighbourhoods, never hearing a kind word, shunned, and cast out by all. And as he grew better acquainted with this singular understratum of society, his pity deepened, and the conviction grew up that these children might be brought round; and that it was not their fault.”

(Batt, 1904:150, Rev. John Herridge Batt interpreting the work of Dr. Barnardo)

The aim of this chapter is to configure a Foucauldian-feminist analysis to the study of the programmes directed at Home Children in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The aim of this study is to describe how Barnardo Home Children were formed and regulated as “subjects of government” (Petersen and Bunton (eds.), 1997: 175) in their administered migration from Britain to Canada. For this study, I

examine the socio-historical relations between the policies and interventions of the state, those of the philanthropic organization founded by Barnardo, and the lived experiences of the governed children.

I begin with a discussion of the methodological approach and concepts conceived by Foucault, situating this work as a governmentality study. The interests of this study extend beyond this and in the second section of this chapter I provide a feminist critique of Foucault and elaborate what a feminist genealogy encompasses (Butler, 2004; 1993; 1990). The topics I address in the critique of Foucault³⁷ include the negation of the gendered subject and the 'poststructuralist' feminist focus on the method of performativity (Butler, 1993). Through an analysis that contrasts official and authoritative child-saving discourses with the lived experiences of the Home Children themselves, I will test the possibility of reconciling the genealogical method introduced by Foucault with the Feminist political agenda.³⁸

The ambitious project of migrating over 100,000 Home Children from Britain in the context of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries involves "relations

³⁷ Foucault studied historical archives that were produced in 'patriarchal' historical time-periods, essentially the recognized 'history of the occidental modern west' beginning with the subjugation of women by the Greeks of antiquity, who excluded women from political space. The only time he could have addressed the modern feminist social movement was in his 'governmentality studies of liberalism,' his famous 1978-1979 lecture series (Foucault, 2007 [1978]; 2008 [1979]; Burchell and Miller (eds.), 1991). His concern in this lecture series was with German and American 'neo-liberal' programmes governing state-society relations, including Lippmann, Von Hayek, the Freiberg School and the Chicago School (Foucault, 2008 [1979]). These programmes do not make any mention of the female gender, thus the continued absence of gender in Foucault's lecture series. Macleod and Durrheim (2002) have examined how governmentality can be drawn upon by 'Foucauldian-Feminists.'

³⁸ Butler "developed the radical and politically far-reaching insight that identity is a contingent construction which assume multiple forms even as it presents itself as singular and stable" (Salih, 2004: 2). This study is interested in how the Feminist political agenda can not only probe regulatory regimes of normative heterosexuality but also, like Butler, other "identity norms [that] are taken up and subject positions assumed" (Salih, 2004: 2). Influenced by Butler, I aim to challenge these exclusionary norms, "and here the task is not simply to change language, but to examine language for its ontological assumptions, and to criticize those assumptions for their political consequence" (Salih, 2004: 36).

between specific forms of theoretical and strategic knowledge[s]” (Dean, 1991: 1) and the exercise of power (Foucault, 1983 [1982]). The programme of child-saving has effects in real life experiences, not always intended, nor directly aligned with the strategic discourses that attempt to structure this social reality (cf. Foucault, 1991a [1978]; Gordon (ed.), 1980).³⁹

The concept of governmentality⁴⁰ is useful for understanding socio-historical forms of “social control” and how specific knowledges become implicated in the practice of government, that is, through the exercise of power (cf. Burchell and Miller (eds.), 1991; Dean, 1999). This study is interested in how power is exercised through “veridical” discourses.⁴¹ Veridical discourses are “those discourses charged with the task of self-rectification and self-elaboration with the aim of finally reaching the truth” (Dean, 1994: 32). The programmatic dimension of these discourses becomes especially evident whenever the theme of child-saving is invoked; fueling the direction and guidance of ‘pauper children.’

Governmentality studies focus on the procedures and institutions that exercise power and rule (Foucault, 1991a [1978]). The specific form of power Foucault was discussing in his governmentality lectures was government, “the conduct of conduct” (Dean, 2009 [1999]: 21). Unlike forms of power that dominate the subject, government is enacted at-a-distance (Miller and Rose, 1992). It involves practical knowledges and different forms of rationality (Dean, 1999). It is a calculated exercise of power, which

³⁹ See ‘History of Sexuality’ (Foucault, 1990a [1976]) and ‘Afterword’ in *Power/Knowledge*’ (Gordon, 1980).

⁴⁰ Michel Foucault delivered a governmentality lecture series at the College de France in 1978-1979 (Dean, 1999). This study is interested in how we think about governing children and how this mobilizes certain normative conceptions of childhood and child welfare.

⁴¹ See ‘Questions of Method’ (Foucault, 1991b [1980]).

does not mean that it is harmless or benign. As Dean (1991; 1999) and Donzelot (1979) have shown, government frequently targets the impoverished and lower classes. Power is legitimized through authority (see Miller and Rose, 2008); the Barnardo organization enacts power because they are morally and materially legitimized as a child rescue home. Home children during the nineteenth century were targets for a child emigration scheme to commence and continue into the twentieth century as they were already threaded into the institutionalized homes established by Barnardo. When Home Children volunteered to immigrate to Canada, alternatives were certainly constrained if not nonexistent in Britain during this time.

The work of Foucault targets programmatic discourses: “the structured ways of knowing which are both produced in, and the shapers of, culture” (Ransom, 1993: 123). Programmatic discourses “function as sets of rules, and the operation of these rules and concepts in programmes which specify what is or is not the case” (Ramazanolgu, 1993: 19). Foucault (1980: 93) was adamant that in veridical discourses, truth was not only produced, but enacted in the exercise of power: “we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth.”

Foucault traces new forms of power in his work *Discipline and Punish* (1995 [1977]) arguing “power demands a form of analysis that is lacking in what he calls the juridical conception of power that dominates political theory” (Hekman, 2004). Foucault asserts “that power has become diffused” and “instead of emanating from a single source, it is spread throughout every corner of society, informing the social structure as a whole” (Hekman, 2004: 200). Foucault traces “the genealogy of these new forms of power, [which] leads him, first of all, to the Christian church in the Middle Ages” (Hekman,

2004: 200). It was during this time that Foucault argues “the practices of the church developed a kind of power that had the individual as its object... what he calls pastoral power” (Hekman, 2004: 200).

Foucault describes the Christian technique of pastoral power as “a complete accountability of the ‘shepherd’ for all the members of the pastorate, the ‘flock,’ the notion of obedience and self-control as a virtue of personal submission, the formation of an individualising knowledge, and the practice of mortification and a renunciation of the self and the world by oneself” (Dean, 1994: 183). Foucault (1983: 212 [1982]) characterizes pastoral power as a “form of power [that] applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him.” In his 1978-1979 lecture series on the study of governmentality, Foucault (1983 [1982]) identifies the emergence of pastoral power, a legitimate model for political rule,⁴² as a condition of possibility for the rise of the welfare state (Miller and Rose, 2008; Foucault, 2007 [1978]). The pastoral model

⁴² Pastoral power was not accepted by the Greeks of antiquity as a legitimate model for political rule (Foucault, 1983 [1982]). Foucault (1983 [1982]) notes how Plato refused the shepherd-flock model as not conducive to democratic polis. The Greeks adopted the model of what Foucault (1983 [1982]) calls “the city-citizen game,” which finds its ideal in the politics of the agora, where the interests of the polis were democratically decided. This political model was oriented towards the totality; the good of the whole political body. Pastoral power is different in that it considers the individual to be important. As Foucault (1983: 213 [1982]) explains in his essay, “The Subject and Power,” “since the sixteenth century, a new political form of power has been continuously developing. This new political structure, as everybody knows, is the state. But most of the time, the state is envisioned as a kind of political power which ignores individuals, looking only at the interests of the totality, or, I should say, of a class or a group among the citizens. That’s quite true. But I’d like to underline the fact that the power of the state, and that’s one of the reasons for its strength, is both an individualizing and totalizing form of power. Never, I think, in the history of human societies, even in the old Chinese society, has there been such a tricky combination in the same political structures of individualization techniques and of totalization procedures. This is due to the fact that the modern Western state has integrated in a new political shape, an old power techniques which originated in the Christian institution. We can call this power technique the pastoral power.”

represents the relationship of governors to govern as that of a shepherd and flock (Foucault, 1983 [1982]).⁴³

Pastoral power is a technique of power that organizes relations at the level of the individual and the population; it has permeated multiple state institutions that enact practices (Foucault, 2007 [1978]). In this model, individual members are in a relationship of docility and obedience to the ruler, who is committed to the salvation of the flock (Bernauer and Carrette (eds.), 2004; Hekman, 2004). To be able to guide and direct the flock, the shepherd has to know about each and every subject in their flock (Foucault, 2007 [1978]). This contributes to what Foucault (2007: 129 [1978]) calls the “paradox of the shepherd.” Pastoral power is oriented towards the accumulation of individualizing knowledges in order to then be able to ensure the salvation of the flock as a whole (Foucault, 2007 [1978]).

The method of governmentality and concept of pastoral power are useful to this study in the sense that Barnardo perpetuated the distinction between the ‘valuable’ child-citizen and the ‘destitute,’ where the latter became the object of government (Swain and Hillel, 2010). Governing the pauper population coincides with the moral regulation of pauper children and their parents. Again, this study can be situated as a specific socio-historical instance of the more general “policing of families” (Donzelot, 1979). Through philanthropic and moral campaigning, state institutions became aligned (Miller and Rose, 2008). With a governmentality study of Barnardo and his techniques and practices, I aim to reveal how child-saving policies were influenced by pastoral power and its model for the exercise of rule. Through the following analysis, I will also show how child-saving

⁴³ Also see ‘Security, territory, population’ (Foucault, 2007 [1978]).

becomes one of the many “competencies of the state” (Foucault, 1991a [1978]: 110).

This study emphasizes the state is one facet, or network, among many others, enacted on the ‘pauper child.’

A governmentality study of Barnardo programmes and alliances with the state only gives access to one account, that of official and authoritative discourses. The production of ‘truth’ is not only carried out by governors, but also the governed. The actual effects of government programmes need to be connected with the lived experiential accounts of the actors themselves (Butler, 1997). This type of work could be situated in what is typically understood as social history (see Parr, 1994 [1980]). Since it is so thoroughly infused by ideas on power and subjectivity, as used by Foucault, it could instead be framed as what Dean (1994: 6) calls a “critical and effective history.”

Following Foucault, Dean (1994: 21) urges sociologists to search for “historical resources to reflect upon the contingency, singularity, interconnections, and potentialities of the diverse trajectories of those elements that compose present social arrangements and experience.” Studying the mass migration of children from Britain to Canada during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries will allow us to establish the divergences and continuities in philanthropic and state practices of child-saving. In order to understand the current situation in child protection, sociologists can turn to history as a means of reflecting on present-day concerns (Dean, 1994), as demonstrated in the previous chapter. The socio-historical ‘event’ of child emigration becomes “critical” in that it can “make intelligible the possibilities in the present and so can yield to neither universalist concepts of rationality and subjectivity nor metanarratives of progress, reason, or emancipation” (Dean, 1994: 21).

Dean (1994: 200) closely follows Foucault in “the endeavour to know how and to what extent it might be possible to think differently, instead of legitimating what is already known.” Dean (1994) embraces the genealogical project, provided by Foucault, in that history becomes an instrument to reveal the taken-for-grantedness of the present. That is, history is a means for focusing on topics of present day concern, such as the role of the ‘child-citizen,’ not to mention contemporary and ongoing child-saving initiatives. Through a genealogy of practices and rationalities involved in the government of children, this study shows the often coercive and contingent beginnings of the child-saving apparatus enacted by the state; the history becomes ‘effective’ to the extent that it unsettles conventional ideas that philanthropy is beyond the state (cf. Chen, 2005; Dean, 1994). The state and philanthropic organizations have historically collaborated to intervene in the so-called private realm, such as, the state legislating child protection policies. Despite their good intentions and progressive visions, state officials often broke up families and effectively displacing thousands of Home Children during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (see Parr, 1994 [1980]). This vision was not only shared by the state, but also the philanthropic organizations who advocated for British child emigration policies and child-saving initiatives during this period.

As indicated in the previous section of this chapter, the analysis will be approached from a governmentality approach. By limiting this study to a ‘governmentality study’ of child-saving would be a disservice to the lived experiences of the “subjects of government” (Petersen and Bunton (eds.), 1997: 175); it only reproduces the official version, albeit with critical intent.

Feminist accounts of identity politics have frequently been entrenched in discussions of epistemological questions, such as those concerning the production and reproduction of knowledge (Bell, 1999). Foucault has attacked the epistemological quest that feminism had been prone to partake in. McNay (1992: 14) contends “the search for the origin of a particular historical phenomenon implicitly posits some form of original identity prior to the flux and movement of history.” The Foucauldian notion of historicism has appealed to feminist thinkers as it involves “the intellectual orientation which insists that ideas neither descend from a timeless heaven nor are grounded in the necessities of ‘nature,’ but develop out of the imaginations and intellects of historical human beings” (Bordo, 1993: 179-180). Foucault is not attempting to discover any universal truth about power or knowledge through the genealogical method, but asserts the more modest claim that these relations are historically contingent. Feminists are drawn to this notion that the assertion is amenable to change, with varying degrees of conscious direction (Bell, 1999).

With more and more feminists following genealogy, with its interest in counter-memory, subjugated knowledges, the growing prevalence of the Foucauldian conceptual ‘tool-box’ has amplified the problem with feminist discussions, definitely making it more complex with the introduction of the historical study of relations between power and knowledge (Bell, 1999; McNay, 1992). Such an orientation points feminists to the need to contest the production of true statements, ‘veridical discourses,’ in the domains of politics and ethics (Foucault, 2001 [1965]; Gordon, 1980). Given the problematic relationship Foucault has to truth, the difficulties some feminists would have in approaching his work is understandable, seeing as feminists are often to ground politics

in a truth, be it the totalizing power of patriarchy or, what is more important now, gender inequality (Butler, 1990). Feminist theories and philosophies are diverse, but they tend to be consistent in advancing some kind of politico-ethical program, for example gender equality, emancipation, etc. (Butler, 1990). The more advanced feminist approaches are concerned with the possibility of establishing a feminist identity outside of patriarchal power relations (Butler and Scott (eds.), 1992). How can we know how, let alone when, this will be achieved without recourse to an epistemology (Butler, 1990)? Despite the “objectification” of the historical conditions and practical effects of scientific and epistemological systems formulated by Foucault (Rabinow, 1984), feminists have embraced the genealogical method and added considerations of gender to such work (cf. Bell, 1999; Butler and Scott (eds.), 1992).

Throughout the discussion below, I detail the productivity of the relation between Foucault and feminism. This study argues how the ‘Foucault Effect’ on feminism has been positive when the dialogue acknowledges the important methodological insights made by Foucault concerning the genealogical approach to history (Butler and Scott (eds.), 1992).

Butler (1990) questions the totalizing use of patriarchy in feminist philosophical and sociological discourse. The concept of performativity was an attempt at giving restricted scope to the otherwise infinite expansion of the patriarchal sphere, as feminists used hermeneutics to interpret the existence of patriarchal relations in all human social relations (Butler, 1993). Butler (1993) proposed and ultimately carried out ‘post-

structuralist’⁴⁴ analyses inspired by Foucauldian insights into power, subjectivity and knowledge in an attempt to move beyond binary concerns in ‘gender’ and ‘sex’ analyses. ‘De-constructing’ gender dichotomies have long preoccupied feminism, in particular radical feminism (McNay, 1992). At the level of philosophical reflection, Butler (1993: xi) conceives of gender as a “constitutive constraint” conditioning of our everyday experience, “without which we would not be able to think, to live, to make sense at all.” Butler argues “the body is neither static nor self-identical but sometimes is lived and experienced in specific contexts” (Benhabib and Cornell (eds.), 1987: 128). Therefore, the body “becomes”⁴⁵ an experience of context, and gender an act of “corporeal style,” a project of performance, with which “gender reality is created through sustained social performances” (Butler, 2004: 115). Butler (2004) explains our ‘expressions’ or ‘practices’ fuse with these norms through practices of government and self, regulated through institutional powers and everyday life.

Butler (1993: 17) attends to how the notion of ‘sex’ is contoured into the materiality of the body “through a set of identificatory projections.” Butler (1993: 17) advises feminist research to focus on how “normative heterosexuality acts as a regime of ‘regulatory production’ which sets the limits of bodily intelligibility.” The ‘regulatory production’ of normative heterosexuality acts in a network of power relations committed

⁴⁴ Salih (2004:5) explains “while Butler sometimes identifies aspects of her work as “poststructuralist”, the designation does not adequately capture the multiplicity of her theoretical provenances, and to call Butler a poststructuralist (or a postmodernist – a label she does not consider appropriate) would elide the feminist, psychoanalytic, and Marxist frameworks within which her work is also located,” however, Butler (1993: 12) calls her work in *Bodies That Matter* “a poststructuralist rewriting of performativity as it operates in the materialization of sex.”

⁴⁵ Butler (2004: 23) discusses the supposition made by Simone de Beauvoir that “one is not born, but rather becomes a woman.” Butler (2004: 114) explains that “gender ought not to be construed as a stable identity or locus of agency from which various acts follow; rather, gender is an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a *stylized repetition of acts*.”

to the domination of the 'other.' The investigation into the 'performative expressions' of British child migrants will be attuned to the lived experience of the 'target' populations being governed.

The method of genealogy allows for an investigation of power and knowledge techniques that are inscribed in social policy, for example, the rise of child-saving and the ways that ideas and knowledges about 'pauper children' have constituted social policy and child welfare discourses and practices, and vice versa, throughout history. How was pastoral power exercised and embodied among the governed? The genealogical investigation also becomes infused with feminist concerns in its questioning of gender as a performative technique and practice (Butler, 1993; 1997). This approach allows me to explore the effects of power not on only social policy, but also on the experiences of Home Children. This analysis of this study looks at a particular moment in history demonstrating the specific issue of child migration and how it was established between the years 1867 and 1905.

The analysis asks how 'governmental rationality' (Dean, 1994: 176) is concerned with the practices of Barnardo Home Children. Dean (1994: 176) explains 'governmental rationality' as "rationality implicated in the exercise of governance." Dean (1994: 176) furthers this insight by explaining "there are continuities between the microphysics of power (and the political technology of body) and the concerns of government of nations, populations, and societies... there is a continuum established between both of these and the practice of ethics as a form of government of the self."⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Dean (1994: 178) furthers: "the themes of government and ethical practices of the self are thus two separate yet intricately interwoven strands of an increasingly worked out thought-space. It may be that

Practices of government and practices of the self are interdependent offering a unique genealogical investigation (Dean, 1994). Butler established that the “body as a source of knowledge comes in the forms of a figure (constituted in language) and materiality (literal) and for this reason it is both intelligible and affective” (Loizidou, 2007: 25). Butler (1990: 25) uses the method of performativity to emphasize how people are linguistic beings and how expressions of identity are “performatively constituted by the very “expressions” that are said to be its results.”

The role of the child rescuer has its own genealogy, which is deeply embedded in Christian evangelicalism and liberal practices of government (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Chen, 2005; Dean, 1994). This analysis indicates how poor relief in the nineteenth century exhibits personal submission and obedience to authority and, more importantly, involves the assemblage and deployment of a complex, governmental machine to inculcate this moral consciousness (Dean, 1994). The genealogical discoveries of the child as an ‘outsider’ and an ‘object’ to be saved are crucial to the understanding of how the movement of British child emigration even existed (Swain and Hillel, 2010). Dean (1994: 210) argues the nineteenth century illustrates a liberal mode of government which “presented itself as a mere adjustment to the bioeconomic laws which governed humankind and to the ethical consequences which followed.” The genealogy of the home child offers an entrance point into analyzing the “multiplicity of means” (Dean, 1994: 210) enacted onto the child migrant through their lived experiences.

It is important to distinguish genealogy from conventional histories, such as social history. In the latter, “history comes to operate around a logic of identity which is to say

practices of the self and practices of government mutually, presuppose, without every collapsing into, one another, even when they are superimposed in a particular manner, such as within institutional Christianity.”

that the past is interpreted in a way that confirms rather than disrupts the beliefs and convictions of the present” (McNay, 1992: 13-14). Merely remaining at the level of a governmentality study, as well as showing the knowledges, techniques and practices deployed to assemble and migrate populations, would make this work a reductive exercise. The feminism in this study requires me to retrieve a counter-memory, the lived, subjective experiences of child migrants, where a key aspect of their lived experiences that I find significant to focus on is the performativity of the child migrants in everyday life.

Any attempt to carry out work under the rubric of Foucauldian-feminism is going to be a significant challenge for analysis; as Ramazanoglu (1993: 5) cautions: “the interaction between Foucault’s penetration into the nature of power, and the grounding of feminist explanations in women’s diverse experiences, confront us with peculiarly difficult problems of explanation.” McNay (1992: 11) acknowledges how “Foucault neglects to examine the gendered character of many disciplinary techniques” and cites the work of Braidotti (1991: 87) arguing “sexual difference simply does not play a role in the Foucauldian universe where the technology of subjectivity refers to a desexualized and general “human” subject.” The problem of explanation can be approached through the methodology that Foucault would never come to formalize, that of genealogy (Dean, 1994: 14).

Butler (1990: 5) argues for a feminist genealogy “to trace the political operations that produce and conceal what qualifies as the juridical subject of feminism.” Adopting the genealogical approach “to what Butler calls ‘the compulsory order of sex/gender/desire’ to illustrate that this is a peculiar feature of our own societies – that

sexuality has become ‘the truth of our being’ and the basis of our identity” (McIntosh, 1991: 113). It is important to note that Butler does distinguish between “biological bodies and the socially constructed gender differences that are imposed upon them” (Munro, 2001: 551). More significantly, she argues that sex is also a socio-cultural construction “used to mask the political stakes of institutions of “phallogocentrism”⁴⁷ and compulsory heterosexuality in the regulated production of gender and desire” (Martin, 1991: 420). This argument is confirmed when Butler repeatedly shows historical examples of how “the heterosexualization of desire” is normalized by being connected to opposite “natural” sexes (Martin, 1991: 420-21). The compulsory norms of gender have also been regulated within institutional policies and procedures dictating a political citizenship identity (Butler and Scott (eds.), 1992). The analysis implies the regulation of identities is an effect of the compulsory heterosexual practices enacted by institutions and cultural norms (Butler, 1990). This point is useful to the analysis of child citizenship and the programme of child migration during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries because it forces this study to confront the patriarchal practices embedded in historical resources, but not as an exclusive power.

It is important to note that, for feminists embracing the work of Foucault, it is not just a matter of producing a woman-centered analysis, such as through a gender-centric analysis of power relations. Some feminist explanations of gender relations have been struggling to properly situate themselves within the understanding of power relations

⁴⁷ Phallogocentrism is a term used by Jacques Derrida referring to the ‘masculine’ as the core of Western discourse (Champagne, 1990). Therefore, phallogocentrism “implies that masculine biases are similarly inseparable from linguistic conventions, and these biases are profoundly related to the structures of metaphysics” (Childers and Hentzi (eds.), 1995: 225).

used by Foucault.⁴⁸ Foucault would consider patriarchy as a totalizing explanatory schema of the function of power in society much like capitalism, where power is viewed only in terms of its negative and repressive purposes (Ramazanoglu, 1993). Feminists have centered many of their theories on the ‘dominating’ power of patriarchy, but there is an important conceptual distinction between power and domination according to Foucault (Hindess, 1996: 99). Feminist analyses of patriarchy continue to be trapped in the conventional understanding of power, whereby power is a capacity that benefits the holder of power at the expense of those subjugated to this power. As Ramazanoglu (1993: 5) puts it, Foucault “conceptualised people’s experiences of domination and subordination as ‘effects’ of power rather than as proceeding from a specific source of power.” If this is true, we can follow Ramazanoglu (1993: 3) in her assessment that “feminist political practices are based on a misunderstanding of the power relations that feminism aims to transform.” This statement poses a significant challenge to contemporary feminist politics, hence the discord that ‘Foucault’ sometimes provokes among feminists.

The shift from traditional feminist thought has enabled contemporary feminists to “conceive the female body as a cultural statement about the context of gender [and] power relations” (Munro, 2001: 551). Dorothy Smith accredits the dialectic between Foucault, the female agent and the body to bringing into feminist academia “the notion of agency and subversion” (Munro, 2001: 551). Foucault has enabled feminists to move beyond the strict dominant rhetoric of universal notions of sex and gender (Bell, 1999;

⁴⁸ As Foucault says of his understanding, “Clearly it is to be a nominalist: power is not an institution, a structure, or a certain force with which people are endowed; it is the name given to a complex strategic relation in a given society” (Gordon, 1980: 236).

Butler, 1993; McNay, 1992). Analyzing the ‘effects’ of power on Barnardo Home Children would allow for an understanding into the norms and values we maintain in contemporary child rescue discourse.

In his lectures on the study of governmentality, Foucault (1983 [1982]) identifies the emergence of pastoral power, tracing it “to the Christian church in the Middle Ages” (Hekman, 2004: 200). Foucault argues pastoral power creates the “individual as its object” (Hekman, 2004: 200). It can be characterized by the following: “first, it was exercised over a flock of people on the move rather than over a static territory; secondly, it was fundamentally beneficent power according to which the duty of the pastor, to the point of self-sacrifice, was the salvation of the flock; and finally, it was an individualizing power, in that the pastor must care for each and every member of the flock singly” (Golder, 2007: 165). The concept of pastoral power is useful to this study “as the Western state takes on a radically new function, overseeing the individuality of its subjects, the locus of power is diffused beyond the state to the institutions of civil society” (Hekman, 2004: 200-1). The “central among these institutions is the family, the source of most gender socialization and gender” (Hekman, 2004: 201); the family as an institution was a key component in the project of British child migration during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Barnardo combined elements of pastoral power and performativity, linking these concepts to “individualising and totalising elements that construct human beings as both self-governing individuals within a self-governing political community and clients to be administered, governed, and normalized with respect to governmental objectives” (Dean,

1994: 209). This study is interested in how discourse controls and manages the bodies of ‘pauper children’ and the techniques of power chosen for their governance.

This chapter provides a theoretical framework to understand how Barnardo Home Children were governed under an emigration programme during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. That is, this chapter discusses the theoretical themes and issues that motivated the previous analysis of the existing historical research on the Barnardo organization, not to mention the subsequent study of first-hand accounts by Barnardo Home Children and their descendants.

CHAPTER 3

A FEMINIST GENEALOGICAL ANALYSIS OF CANADA'S HOME CHILDREN:

PRACTICES OF GOVERNMENT AND PRACTICES OF SELF

“The work of an intellectual is not to shape other’s political will; it is, through the analyses that carries out in his own field, to question over and over again what is postulated as self-evident, to disturb people’s mental habits, the way they do and think things, to dissipate what is familiar and accepted, to reexamine rules and institutions... to participate in the formation of a political will.”

(Moss et al., 2000: 251, quoting Foucault, 1990b: xvi [1988])

To this point, I have considered the genealogical method, as developed by Foucault in his study of governmentality, as it concerns concepts of power and knowledge, and how I may begin to apply these to social policy and other research sites. Then I suggested how feminist concerns transformed the genealogical approach through the use of performativity. Having the shared goals of salvation for the British Empire and its pauper children, the policies and interventions of the state accompanied and aligned with the efforts of the philanthropic enterprises formed by Dr. Barnardo.

The work of Barnardo in child rescue during the time period 1867 and 1905 represents a significant time when his pastoral practices and techniques were cultivated and administered in institutions and an emigration scheme, one focussed on regulating British ‘pauper children’ (cf. Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]); Parr, 1994 [1980]; Bready, 1932 [1930]). This study focuses on the early work of Barnardo as an evangelical missionary and his entrance in child rescue work, emphasizing the pastoral techniques operating in his ‘Homes’ for pauper children and the broader emigration scheme of sending Barnardo Home Children to Canada.

In chapter two, I presented a review of relevant studies pertaining to Barnardo Home Children and situated this analysis in the broader socio-historical field of child-saving concerning the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Britain. The literature review examined sources that have already dismantled ideologies and discourses embedded within historical and social understandings of the migrant ‘pauper child,’ the image and identity of the British home child. Themes, within the child-saving discourse studied, included: the problematization of the ‘pauper child,’ the legacy of isolating the ‘social outsider,’ envisioning the ‘innocent child,’ the persuasion of the ‘destitute image’ and the British child emigrant as a ‘nation-builder’ in Canada. This particular study concerning Barnardo Home Children contributes to offering an even more comprehensive knowledge of the mass child emigration programmes undertaken in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Research for this study consists of recorded histories by descendants of Barnardo Home Children through the use of two sources: previous secondary studies (Corbett, 2002 [1997]; Parr, 1994 [1980]) and primary research composed of the biographical

material offered by descendants of British Home Children (Church (ed.), 2003; Avery, 1999; Medel, 1998; Perry (ed.), 1993).⁴⁹ The research used for this analysis consists of the analysis of Canadian newspapers and “the Barnardo Guild Messenger,” formerly known as the “Guild Messenger,” a magazine published twice yearly, intended for Barnardo boys and girls and their families. This study also examines a technical booklet Barnardo Home Children were given as a code of conduct booklet to follow, an important document written by the General Canadian Inspector and Superintendent for Dr. Barnardo in Canada, Alfred B. Owen (1890).⁵⁰

These archives are combined with existing studies pertaining to the emigration scheme instructed by Barnardo, notably the works of Parr (1994 [1980]), Barnardo and Marchant (2007 [1907]), and Wagner (1979). Parr (1994 [1980]), especially, provides important records of the child emigration scheme with inspector notes and official records from the Barnardo agency between 1882 and 1924. Finally, I draw from the memoirs of Dr. Barnardo, which were compiled by Mrs. Barnardo and the Secretary of the National Memorial to Dr. Barnardo, James Marchant (2007 [1907]).

Foucault (2007 [1978]) characterizes Christian pastoral power as encompassing three qualities. First, “the pastorate is connected to salvation, since its essential, fundamental objective is leading individuals or, at any rate, allowing individuals to advance and progress on the path of salvation” (Foucault, 2007: 167 [1978]). Foucault (2007: 167 [1978]) elaborates “this is true for both individuals and for the community,”

⁴⁹ Newspaper articles, “Barnardo Guild Messenger” magazines, a technical booklet and personal social worker notes were obtained through my grandmother. These materials were systematically organized and labeled based on chronological order. These materials were also divided into themes of pastoral power including: obedience, personal submission and salvation.

⁵⁰ See Appendix C.

the shepherd guides both on their way to salvation through his methods of direction. For Barnardo, his adoption of the shepherd role in child rescue discourse began after his arrival to London, at the age of twenty-one, between the years 1866-1867. It is in London where Barnardo experiences his service as shepherd, with a responsibility to his flock, the destitute children in the East End of London (Foucault, 2007 [1978]). Foucault (2007: 179 [1978]) explains, “The sheep, the one who is directed, must live his relationship to his pastor as a relationship of complete servitude... but conversely, the pastor must experience his responsibility as a service, and one that makes him the servant of his sheep.” The following discussion reveals this twofold servitude.

Before 1866, Barnardo had originally planned to become an evangelical missionary in China (Wagner, 1979; Bready, 1932 [1930]). He arrived in London with the hopes of fulfilling his ambitions of participating in the ‘China Inland Mission’; to this end, he began his medical studies at London Hospital (Wagner, 1979). According to Wagner (1979: 20), “Barnardo’s few surviving letters reinforce the impression that his medical studies were only the means to an end and not an end in themselves; for at least three years his main objective was to get to China.” Barnardo had come to London originally to train for missionary work in China, but was publicly vocal about his differences⁵¹ with the preparatory course of study and prayer led by Dr. Hudson Taylor, an organizer of the China Inland Mission (Rose, 1987: 29). This difference ultimately ended the candidacy of Barnardo in the first China mission; it also gave him time to focus on his own child rescue mission in the slums of the infamous East End of London.

⁵¹ This was a contingent event that had enormous significance. Bready (1930: 87 [1932]) writes of Barnardo reflecting on his early missionary training for medical missions in China: “I now saw clearly revealed, the wisdom and goodness of God in what had already happened, and how unconsciously I was being prepared for this Home Mission enterprise.”

Barnardo records the challenges of accepting this servitude in his memoirs: “No man can serve two masters, and soon it became apparent that I had come to the parting of the ways, and that I must decide definitely what course I should ultimately take. Many of my advisers, among others Lord Shaftesbury⁵² himself, strongly urged me to give my whole life up to waif children... I seemed heartily to rejoice when the hour came at night when I could lay aside my studies, and the professional duties that grew out of them, to put on an old hat and an old coat and go forth searching the streets and lanes of the city for homeless waif children” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 75 [1907]). Barnardo would later reflect that his coming to London for the China Inland Mission was a stepping stone towards his ultimate pastoral mission in child rescue. Wagner (1979: 19) writes, “As later correspondence between Hudson Taylor’s representative and manager, W. T. Berger, and Hudson Taylor himself makes clear, it was Tom Barnardo’s strong Plymouth Brethren beliefs⁵³ – ‘peculiarities’ was the word used – and his unwillingness to accept

⁵² Barnardo and Marchant (2007: 92 [1907]) credit Lord Shaftesbury and his work before 1866 with improving the lives of pauper and working children in industrial society: “In 1840 the Earl of Shaftesbury brought in a Bill to improve the condition of climbing boys or little sweeps, but it was not until November 1864 that the Bill was passed. In August of the same year his Lordship moved for a Commission of Inquiry into the employment of children of poorer classes, who were engaged in irksome and unhealthy work in mines and collieries, in button factories, needle-making, pin-making, calico-painting, earthenware, porcelain, and hosiery industries. He brought serious indictments against each of these industrial enterprises, especially mines and collieries, and upon the highest authority he quoted numerous instances of such gross cruelty and injustice that the House of Lords was startled.” Shaftesbury would go on to advocate in 1856 the Reformatory and Refuge Union which established numerous Reformatory and Industrial Schools for boys and girls (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]). Shaftesbury is also accredited by Barnardo and Marchant (2007: 93 [1907]) for his contribution to The Sanitary Act of 1866, “which Lord Shaftesbury was largely instrumental in passing, [the Act] dealt with the question of overcrowding, fixed the number of persons who might occupy a house or part of a house let in lodgings, and provided for the registration of such houses, and for their inspection and cleanliness; thus at one blow breaking up the centres of infection.”

⁵³ Wagner (1979: 39-40) writes of millennialism, “the belief in the imminent Second Advent of Jesus Christ,” and its connection to evangelism: “Belief in the millennium was an integral part of Brethrenism. Barnardo, because of his association with the Brethren movement, held definite pre-millennium views, which meant that he believed that Christ’s Second Coming was imminent and would precede the millennium. (Post-millennialists believed that the Second Advent would be preceded by a thousand years of peace.) Millennial influence had a dual effect on those who believed its eschatological doctrines. In the

the necessity of ‘headship and government’ in the China Mission as well as his inexperience that made it impossible for him to be considered an immediate candidate for China.”

Rose (1987: 29-30) chronicles “from May 1866 until the summer of the following year we have only Barnardo’s evidence of activities.” Wagner (1979: 19) also explains: “His first two years in London are not well documented... he himself had some hand in obscuring facts as, in later years, he constantly referred to his work with children as having started in 1866, preferring to forget that in the early years he was known as an evangelist rather than as a philanthropist.” Barnardo and Marchant (2007: 62 [1907]) chronicled the experiences Barnardo faced in 1866 and 1867, describing how “as a medical student he gained admission into the houses of the poor [and] as a missionary he took occasion by the hand to preach the Gospel.”

Barnardo and Marchant (2007: 62 [1907]) also write of the devastating cholera breakout during 1866 in London; “the deaths, according to the Times report, were 5548, of which 3909 occurred in the East London district.” Barnardo, a student at the London Hospital, would attend to as many as sixteen deaths in one day (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 64 [1907]). Barnardo and Marchant (2007 [1907]) recall the affection and commitment Barnardo grew for the sick children of the East End when visiting them during this epidemic. They recall their admiration for Barnardo: “In the unselfish ardour of youth he loved the worst best, with that passion which takes delight in unselfish

first place they tended to believe that social change would only produce greater corruption in the world; therefore they did not look with favour on any sort of radical approach to social problems. But secondly, because they believed themselves to be living in an important age in history with only a limited time in which to achieve their objectives, their work had an urgency and a positive quality about it which was not matched by those whose time scales were longer.”

service, and which is capable of deeds so romantic as to appear in the common” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 64 [1907]). Thus, after having abandoned his China plans, Barnardo soon found his flock through the cholera epidemic; “the experience served as his university in social work” (Rose, 1987: 30). Barnardo confirmed this when he later chronicled that were it “but for the epidemic I should never have known Stepney and all its horrors” (Rose, 1987: 30).

In his first year in London “Barnardo found work teaching poor children in a ragged school in Ernest Street off the Mile End Road” (Rose, 1987: 32). Evangelism is crucial to the understanding of the ‘pastoral role’ Barnardo occupied, as the main belief system is to practice the Gospel, with the ultimate objective of salvation (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Wagner, 1979). Bready (1932 [1930]: 90) writes of the special ‘calling’ Barnardo felt when teaching in the Ragged Schools, citing Barnardo himself: “I want to reach *these*. They are laid upon my heart. I yearn over these poor souls who are as sheep going astray, having no shepherd. But what is to be done? How can they be effectively reached.” This adoption of the pastoral role reflects a characteristic identified so clearly by Foucault (2007: 126 [1978]), that the shepherd-flock relation is “defined by its beneficence; its only *raison d’être* is doing, and in order to do good. In fact the essential objective of pastoral power is salvation (*salut*) of the flock.” Barnardo, as the shepherd, was committed to benevolence and philanthropic aspirations as soon as he personally identified the need for salvation of ‘homeless waif children.’

Bready (1932 [1930]) writes Barnardo accepted the position of superintendent of the Ernest Street Ragged School soon after volunteering his aid. After accepting this position Barnardo was “conflicted with the conservative procedure of his colleagues;

chafing under their yoke he finally jumped the tracks – to “try out” his cherished ideas in a free field” (Bready, 1932: 62-3 [1930]).⁵⁴ Barnardo went on to open his own experimental Ragged School in late 1866; “it was initiated as sort of supplement [to the Ernest School], its chief labourers being undertaken at hours when the Ernest School Street School was closed” (Bready, 1932: 70 [1930]). The experimental Ragged School was located in Hope Place and had been used as a donkey shed, which Barnardo repaired for use as a Ragged School of his own (Bready, 1932 [1930]). Bready (1932: 94 [1930]) writes “there is no evidence that the donkey-shed school, *per se*, was a success; its life seems to have been brief, and had it not been instrumental in discovering Jim Jarvis, it probably would have been obliterated from the record of Barnardo’s work.”⁵⁵

Biographers (cf. Fletcher, 2005; Rose, 1987; Wagner, 1979; Bready, 1932 [1930]; Batt, 1904) trace the life-work of Barnardo in child-saving to a meeting in the winter of 1869 with Jim Jarvis. Jim Jarvis⁵⁶ is often recorded as “the first truly destitute child [Barnardo] had ever met” (Fletcher, 2005: 41) and a pivotal event that initiated the pastoral role of Barnardo in child rescue work. The account of this meeting is allegedly the precise moment when Barnardo had his “epiphany” that child rescue was his ‘calling’ (Fletcher, 2005: 41). Barnardo insisted this meeting date was in 1866 “to justify his claim to have started his charity work in that year but it seems more likely that the true

⁵⁴ Bready (1932: 93 [1930]) elaborates that a misunderstanding had happened between Barnardo and his colleagues at the Ernest Street Ragged School because of a letter Barnardo wrote to *The Revival* where he had referred to his own work at the Ragged School and appealed for funds for his new venture. Subscribers had been under the belief that their money sent would be under the direction of the Ernest Street Ragged School not Barnardo (Bready, 1932 [1930]).

⁵⁵ Wagner (1979: 27) recounts the story of the donkey shed writing: “It was first mentioned by Barnardo in 1900 in an account of his work entitled ‘How it all began,’ but there is no contemporary evidence for it.”

⁵⁶ Barnardo recounts his ‘calling’ into child rescue work in *The Christian* in an article entitled ‘How it all happened’ (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 77 [1907]). Wagner (1979: 30) writes, “The story now has its own status as part of Barnardo folklore.”

date of the meeting with Jim was during the winter of 1869-70” (Fletcher, 2005: 41).

Barnardo had tied his meeting with Jim to his evangelical belief of converting non-believers, the practice of guiding his flock to salvation (Foucault, 2007 [1978]). Saving destitute children and emigrating Home Children for Barnardo was the path to this Christian conversion and his own salvation, being the faithful shepherd caring for the flock.

Barnardo describes Jim as his first “genuine arab boy, utterly homeless and friendless” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 342 [1907]) and credits his life work in child-saving to his meeting Jim (Wagner, 1979). Barnardo recalls: “As the pale light fell upon the upturned faces of those sleeping boys, and as I realised the terrible fact that they were all *absolutely homeless and destitute*, and were almost certainly but samples of many others, it seemed as though the hand of God Himself had suddenly pulled aside the curtain which concealed from my view the untold miseries of forlorn child-life upon the streets of London” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 352 [1907]). Barnardo saw himself as encompassing the guidance and means for saving those who he labeled as ‘street-arabs’⁵⁷ from their destitute circumstances, presenting himself as the solution to their salvation. He would tell the story of Jim Jarvis many times throughout the course of his life, creating an ambiance of immediacy to his work in saving children (Wagner, 1979).⁵⁸

⁵⁷ Murdoch (2006: 25) explains the use of the social label ‘street arab’ and dates its use to the 1840s. Murdoch (2006: 25) further explains: “Descriptions of the London “street arab” demonstrate how reformers used the rhetoric of class, race, and nationality to distance children from their families and local communities... Reformers could categorize poor children as a race separate from the English and at the same time suggest that with intervention and assistance these urban youths, unlike their parents, could eventually evolve into English citizens.”

⁵⁸ Swain and Hillel (2010: 35) note “the gospel of child rescue was a discursive creation, the impact of which would be felt for generations to come.” Swain and Hillel (2010: 35) explain “child rescuers claimed a central role in [the discovery of the destitute child], positioning themselves as the ‘Christ-like rescuers’ who had saved ‘the nomad and wastrel children’.”

Wagner (1979: 26) writes of Barnardo and his first year in London as being a challenge: “besides the abortive attempt to found his own juvenile mission, 1867 also saw the publication of Barnardo’s first story.” Barnardo began publishing pamphlets⁵⁹ for public distribution and in July of 1867 he wrote to *The Revival* “of a deathbed conversion he had witnessed... his subsequent stories nearly all concerned children” (Wagner, 1979: 27). Barnardo would use these stories while preaching in the streets as a tool for converting non-believers to a path of salvation and eventually “began his work of the East End Juvenile Mission” (Wagner, 1979: 27).⁶⁰

Barnardo gained further widespread recognition in the East End of London as a street-preacher, where “the challenge of open-air preaching roused all the energy of his being” (Bready, 1932: 63 [1930]). Five years before he found his calling as shepherd, he had been decisively influenced by his conversion, and rebirth, as an evangelist in Dublin, Ireland in 1862 (Wagner, 1979; Bready, 1932 [1930]; Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]). Bready (1932: 53 [1930]) explains “the influence of the revival upon the vilest districts of Dublin was not insignificant; augmenting the labours of Ragged Schools and other missions, it sent a band of noble workers to grapple with the ghastly problems of slumdom.” Biographers refer to the “indomitable spirit” (Bready, 1932: 63 [1930])

Barnardo had as a street preacher, recalling stories of Barnardo speaking and selling

⁵⁹ Swain and Hillel (2010: 33) discuss the influence magazines and publication forms used by philanthropists had on social norms during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries arguing: “The magazines provided the child rescuers with an outlet through which they could define and redefine the services they were delivering.”

⁶⁰ The Barnardo organization was originally “entitled the ‘East End Juvenile Mission’; after the arbitration in 1878 the name was changed to ‘Dr Barnardo’s Homes and East End Juvenile Mission’; in October 1899 after incorporation, the organisation became the ‘National Incorporated Association for the Reclamation of Destitute Waif Children otherwise known as Dr Barnardo’s Homes’; after Barnardo’s death, the title was changed yet again to become ‘Dr Barnardo’s Homes: National Incorporated Association’” (Rose, 1987: 313). Again, “in 1988 the organisation changed its name from Dr Barnardo’s to Barnardo’s to reflect the contrast with its Victorian past and the last traditional style home closed in 1989” (Barnardo’s, 2012).

Bibles at public houses, citing one instance where Barnardo was physically assaulted after drunken bar patrons refused to pay for the Bibles (Bready, 1932: 66 [1930]).

Barnardo was removed unconscious from the public house and would later find out he had been severely bruised and broken two ribs (Wagner, 1979; Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]).

The earlier experiences of Barnardo as a street-preacher helps further explain how Barnardo so readily assumed the pastoral role, assuring “the salvation for all” (Foucault, 2007: 168 [1978]), even if that would mean sacrificing himself in the process. Barnardo benefited from his experiences as a preacher, and would dramatize his early challenge as a testament to his unrelenting service to God’s pastorate wherein “no individual sheep is a matter of indifference... not one sheep must escape this movement, this operation of direction and guidance leading to salvation” (Foucault, 2007: 168 [1978]).

Indeed, even when Barnardo was attacked in a public house, he did not want to cause harm to his attackers. “[He] was waited upon by a policeman to know if he would prosecute the ringleaders; but the inquiry was met by a categorical negative: “I have begun with the Gospel, and I am determined not to end with the law”” (Bready, 1932: 67 [1930]). Barnardo recalled: “I believe this incident... gave me a greater influence over the rough lads and girls of that quarter than I could have attained had I been preaching or teaching among them for years” (Bready, 1932: 67 [1930]). Thus, Barnardo took on the pastoral role of taking care of the whole community. The salvation of each sheep in the East End of London: this was his ultimate mission and philanthropic ‘calling.’

The pastoral mission Barnardo undertook was readily supported by other religiously-minded Londoners. That is, he was operating in conditions conducive to the

‘pastoral role,’ and he aligned others to the care of his flock through donations and endorsements (Foucault, 2007 [1978]). As noted by Wagner (1979: 39), “evangelicals responded enthusiastically to the idea that children, besides being rescued from a life on the streets, could, in a home, more easily be given religious instruction and taught the truths of the Gospel in hope that they might also find salvation.” The salvation of pauper children justified the “far-reaching and extensive system of charitable social work” (Wagner, 1979: 39) that Barnardo would eventually establish in the context of the Victorian philanthropic movement in the late nineteenth century. That is, Barnardo associated himself with a range of influential social members. Wagner (1979: 39) explains the “interconnected world” Barnardo dedicated himself to and immersed himself in, one which spanned from the “non-conformist industrialist Samuel Morley to the aristocratic Lord Shaftesbury and the brilliant Lord Chancellor, [and] Lord Cairns.”

Barnardo recalls receiving a letter, “the contents of that remarkable letter were to this effect: that the writer would provide £1000 for the furtherance of my scheme of child rescue if I felt able, for the present at all events, to give up thoughts I had entertained of China, and would be content to remain in England, and to establish in East London a Home for Waif and Stray Children” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 77 [1907]). The letter had been written by Samuel Smith, a well-known Member of British Parliament; he would become a close friend and supporter of Barnardo and his work (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]). Barnardo and Marchant (2007: 77 [1907]) connect this series of events like “a pebble thrown into the brook [creating] successive circles which reach the farthest shore.” The financial assistance Barnardo acquired made it possible for him to

guide the destitute children he would soon come into contact with, forming subjects to be governed under his direction.

Barnardo recalls his first public address at a Missionary Conference, which was held at the Agricultural Hall, Islington as another key event in fulfilling his pastoral role in child-saving (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]). It was at this conference that Barnardo filled in for a speaker who could not make the meeting; this gave him the opportunity to discuss his work in the East End of London and the Ragged Night School; Barnardo recalls this was where he received his first public money for his child rescue endeavors (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]). In his memoirs he wrote of receiving money from a servant-girl who had heard him speak of his experiences: “Here was a small gift, a humble one, and from a humble person. But it might be the seed of a great deal” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 81 [1978]). For Barnardo, this was yet another sign from God that he should follow his pastoral calling in child rescue work, writing: “I have never doubted since then that this was God’s way of showing me that He could by humble and unexpected instruments supply all that would be needed for any work which He gave me to do for Him” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 81 [1907]). Wagner (1979: 47) writes, “the twenty-seven farthings given him by the servant girl were to prove symbolic, for an analysis of Barnardo’s receipts over the years showed that the bulk of his support came from a vast number of small donations, an unusual source at that date.”

After his public address at the Missionary Conference, Barnardo received an invitation from Lord Shaftesbury to attend dinner (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]). Barnardo guided the group to the East End of London, where he found a large group of boys sleeping outdoors (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]). Barnardo recalls,

“When our awakened boys stood in a line we counted seventy-three individuals, big and little, old and young! But few of them had any covering on head and feet, and all of them were clad in poor and vilely-smelling rags” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 86 [1907]).

For Barnardo, approval of Lord Shaftesbury in his child rescue work was a significant moment for his entrance and of his pastoral role in the East End of London as he acquired more supporters of his cause (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]).

Wagner (1979: 48) notes the dramatization Barnardo uses when recalling this meeting with Lord Shaftesbury, “to imply, as Barnardo does in this story, that Shaftesbury was unaware of the problem of destitution among children until it was thus dramatically revealed to him, is enough to cast doubt on this version of the affair.”

Wagner (1979: 48) insightfully explains the meeting did take place, but “Shaftesbury had instructed Mr Gent, secretary of the Ragged School Union, to invite the leaders of fourteen or fifteen missions working in the East End to his house, in Governor Square, so that he might discover for himself the scope of their work and how it might be expanded.” During this meeting Barnardo was influenced by the evangelical network⁶¹ Shaftesbury invited him to attend, making this event a pivotal moment for Barnardo and his entrance into the pastoral role of child-saving.

The objectives of his early work offered a pastoral passage point into the work of child rescue (Foucault, 2007 [1978]). Barnardo was committed to his mission of saving destitute children from the East End after he had experienced firsthand the extremities of

⁶¹ During this meeting Lord Shaftesbury had many speakers, including Barnardo. Wagner (1979: 49-50) describes this meeting in her biographical account of Barnardo: “Among those who spoke were J.W. Orsman, whose work with Costermongers’ Mission had particularly interested Shaftesbury, and George Holland who, besides his ragged school work, had worked with Annie MacPherson to found a boys’ home in Hackney as well as helping her to establish her own ‘home industry’ in Spitalfields; William Booth was unable to attend through illness, but Catherine Booth spoke forcefully in his absence.”

poverty in urban Britain in the late nineteenth century (Wagner, 1979). In 1870,⁶² Barnardo formed a ‘philanthropic firm’ (Parr, 1994 [1980]), which eventually, was able to access a network of financial donors to support his own juvenile mission. His charitable institute grew rapidly as indicated by Wagner (1979: 38): “Within five years of his arrival in London his mission would be acknowledged as one of the largest and fastest-growing in the East End; within ten years, without the assistance of a committee or treasurer, he was handling sums in excess of £25,000 a year.” Thus, in addition to his connections with notable and established public figures, the formation of an “interconnected world” (Wagner, 1979: 39) bridged the evangelical revivalist movement of the nineteenth century with Victorian philanthropic endeavors (Wagner, 1979).

Foucault (2007: 167 [1978]) explains the second feature of the Christian pastorate as: “the pastorate is connected to the law, since for individuals and communities to earn their salvation, it must make sure that they really submit to the order, command, or will of God.” Batt (1904: 73), in his biographical account of Barnardo, explains “Dr. Barnardo himself looks upon conversion as the great end and aim of all. Without this spiritual regeneration he feels his work is but half done, and innumerable touching instances might be given of what we may well call the *spiritual relationship* existing between him and his children – a relationship based upon the fact that in the Homes themselves the children were first brought to knowledge of Christ, and regard the Founder as not only their best earthly friend, but also as having been in many cases their spiritual father.” The spiritual relationship Barnardo formed with Home Children and supporters of his cause was developed in his early missionary work as a Ragged School

⁶² Wagner (1979: 50) writes “it was towards the end of 1870 that Barnardo was able to open his home in Stepney.”

teacher and evangelist street-preacher, but also advocating for the removal and training of pauper children within his evangelical network (Wagner, 1979).

After falling ill for two months, in 1868, he also continued his medical studies with the China Inland Mission still as his ultimate goal, but was also continuing his evangelist mission work by holding “meetings in Pedley’s Orchard, but they soon became overcrowded; so with the help of one or two friends he rented two small houses in Hope Place and here, early in 1868, he began the work of the East End Juvenile Mission” (Wagner, 1979: 27). Wagner (1979: 28) quotes Barnardo writing: “To give some idea of the work going on, there are held weekly special services for children; Bible classes for men, women and children, mothers’ meetings, girls’ sewing classes, a special service attended every evening of the week by an average of 130 lads. A little church has also been formed, numbering to this date nearly 90 souls (adults). A day school is in formation and also a Refuge, to be nearly self-supporting, in which orphan lads in work will be boarded and lodged at a charge of three shillings weekly.” The work of the East End Juvenile Mission was divided into four rooms, “one cottage being used for boys and the other for girls” (Wagner, 1979: 27). Bready (1932: 97 [1930]) describes Barnardo as the “Shepherd of the flock” at the East End Juvenile Mission as he “baptized by Immersion” and preached every Sunday.

Barnardo immersed himself in the pastoral role and confronted the third characterization of the pastorate for he was “connected to the truth, since in Christianity, as in all scriptural religions, earning one’s salvation and submission to the law are, of course, conditional upon acceptance, belief, and profession of a particular truth” (Foucault, 2007: 167 [1978]). Foucault (2007: 183 [1978]) explains “the Christian

pastorate is not fundamentally or essentially characterized by the relationship to salvation, to the law, and to the truth. The Christian pastorate is, rather, a form of power that, taking the problem of salvation in its general set of themes, inserts into this global, general relationship an entire economy and technique of the circulation, transfer, and reversal of merits, and this is its fundamental point.” For Barnardo, the expansion of the East End Juvenile Mission brought his legacy of ‘Homes’ for pauper children and more importantly positioned his servitude as a global endeavor through mass child emigration through the means of pastoral power.

Bready (1932: 98 [1930]) explains Barnardo wanted to expand the East End Juvenile Mission to not just a programme only open on Sundays and two or three week-evenings but “dreamed of a mission with an Ever-Open Door and a programme for every day of the year.” Bready (1932: 98 [1930]) also describes the early realizations of Barnardo that many of the boys he taught needed “discipline and instruction in some trade; hence there arose the necessity of bringing them all under one roof, where the influences of school, mission, workshop and home, might be blended together, thus enabling them to face the world equipped for an honest career.” Barnardo had visited Annie Macpherson and her “Home of Industry” who directed boys to be industrious (Bready, 1932 [1930]). Under the guidance of Annie Macpherson, Barnardo sent “hundreds of his lads”⁶³ from the Ragged School and “laid down the principle that emigration of suitable persons to the British Colonies, particularly Canada, must be accepted as the chief remedy for unemployment” (Bready, 1932: 102 [1930]). It was during this time that Barnardo confirmed his pastoral role by sending children to Canada

⁶³ Jim Jarvis was included in this group of child migrants (Wagner, 1979: 102).

and engaging in his relentless mission of finding a permanent Home for training and housing pauper children.

These accounts above describe the pastoral entrance of Barnardo in the work of child rescue, and his self-reflexive position as the shepherd to the pauper children he came into contact with as his flock. The aim of analyzing these ‘passage points’ of ‘pastoral power’ was to give meaning to the institutionalization of the Christian pastorate and how Barnardo formed “a condition of Christian obedience” (Foucault, 2007: 174 [1978]) in his work in ‘saving’ child paupers and eventually forming a mass British child emigration scheme.

Equipped with financial means and support from prominent public figures, Barnardo opened his first Home,⁶⁴ in December 1870, and set about “knowing” his flock. One of three techniques to constitute “subjects of government” (Petersen and Bunton (eds.), 1997: 175), Barnardo divided his flock into three classes: “*First*, Good, steady and respectable lads in work, but needing a comfortable home, for which they can afford to pay, and wherein the influence around them will be of the highest order. *Second*, Lads desiring the willing to work, but for whom no opening could at present be found, and who, having no assured home, suffer more privation and misery than can well here be described. These lads are provided with work in the Home, and taught, as far as can be, the principles of self-dependence. *Third*, Wholly destitute lads, barefooted and ill-clad, whose poor wan faces and ill-nourished bodies betoken their previous histories. These lads, the waifs and strays of the East-End labouring population, will be clothed, fed,

⁶⁴ Barnardo realized that he could not expand Hope Place but needed another property to adapt to his mission; Barnardo procured 18 Stepney Causeway, a large property and “its cardinal function was to [serve] as a “Home” for destitute lads” (Bready, 1932: 102 [1930]).

housed, instructed in simple branches of needful work and taught trades” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 91 [1907]). Barnardo and Marchant (2007: 91-2 [1907]) explain the first class “was lost sight of in a few years, and the second also, save that it contains the germ of his Youth’s Labour House, established in years later when emigration or sea life enabled him to offer big lads a chance beyond the seas in his farm colony.”

Opening ‘Homes’ for pauper children allows for the shepherd-flock relationship to be institutionalized and extends a relationship of subordination not only from the flock to the shepherd but also the shepherd to his pastoral role of guiding his flock (Foucault, 2007 [1978]). The shepherd-flock relationship of Barnardo to the British pauper children he admitted into his ‘Homes’ and emigrated is solidified through the institutionalization of his own schemes; the East End Juvenile Mission acts by “a whole network of servitude” (Foucault, 2007: 184 [1978]) and is an effect of his pastoral passage into child-saving. The above accounts demonstrate the emergence of Barnardo into the servitude of ‘saving’ his Home Children.

As described in chapter two, the political and public position concerning “the condition of child life” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 92 [1907]) in Britain had taken a new shape in legislation during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In the memoirs of Dr. Barnardo (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 94 [1907]), the influence of this rationality is recounted: “Barnardo scented the air, and, consciously or unconsciously, filled his lungs to the full, and girded himself for his part in the reformer’s warfare, knowing that the moral forces fought on his side. The crimes against innocency which he had seen daily committed with impunity; the violent contrast between the East-end child of hunger and the West-end child of plenty, aroused his passion against injustice; and the

desire to save the victims, to remove this viper which had thrown itself upon the neck of east-end life, hurled him forward with an impetuosity which gave speed to the development of his multifarious agencies.” For Barnardo, his personal submission to child rescue was his ‘calling’ for salvation, and his flock were the destitute children of the East End of London (Swain and Hillel, 2010; Wagner, 1979).

Opening his first Home in 1870, known officially as a branch of the East End Juvenile Mission, enabled Barnardo, at twenty-five years old, to form his own power mechanisms of salvation, distributing these across his enterprises and advocating for the funding of ‘Homes’ and training schools for pauper children on his own terms. Bready (1932: 105 [1930]) writes of the great expansion Barnardo made after he had opened his first Home for destitute lads, “up till July, 1867, Barnardo made no appeal for public funds; after that date he furnished annual reports; and their perusal reveals a miracle. The first Report, covering July 15th 1867, till July 15th 1868, shows the Mission’s income to be £214 15s. During the succeeding twelve months it had mounted to over three times amount; the next year it was more than trebled again; while the year following the opening of the “Home” it was nearly £7,000. And, for the twelve months ending March 31st 1877, it reached £30,000.” The expansion of Barnardo Homes was directly associated with the work of Barnardo due to his singular role in the formation of these institutions.

Barnardo was in total control as a shepherd over his flock, writing himself: “Fellow believers desirous of helping the Mission’s work should remember, ere they do so, that their donations or subscriptions are to be forwarded to a *private individual*⁶⁵ –

⁶⁵ Italics are author’s emphasis.

that I have no Committee, Treasurer, Secretary or other than myself in the management of the financial affairs of the Mission – that their names will never appear in print; but that they will be written to, and their subscriptions or donations privately acknowledged by me” (Bready, 1932: 105-6 [1930]). Barnardo⁶⁶ maintained full control of the Mission and recorded “the books containing the accounts [could be seen] at all times by any donor desirous of doing so, *without the necessity of giving previous notice*⁶⁷” (Bready, 1932: 106 [1930]).⁶⁸ Having full control over his own institution allowed Barnardo to direct his flock individually through implementing pastoral techniques; this is exhibited in his methods of mass child migration, targeting a pauper child population to be ‘saved’ through principles of the shepherd-flock relationship.

Barnardo had been involved in evangelical mission work since arriving to London but recounts later in life of becoming interested in the temperance movement after Lord Shaftesbury had requested records of children in 1871 who were admitted by Barnardo and their cause of destitution (Bready, 1932 [1930]). Bready (1932: 108-9 [1930]) quotes Barnardo recalling this time: “I tabulated in special columns the various traceable causes... which led to the children becoming candidates for the Homes; and the astonishing fact emerged (doubly astonishing to me, because I was not then a total abstainer, nor even in sympathy with the Movement) that no less than *85 per cent*⁶⁹ owed their social ruin and the long train of their distresses to the influence, direct or indirect, of

⁶⁶ Barnardo and Marchant (2007: 95 [1907]) cite Barnardo describing his three financial principles in 1872: “First, we never beg money for the Lord’s work. Second, we do not go into debt; “Owe no man anything,” is the precept of our Master. It is His to command, ours simply to obey. Third, we do not publish the names and addresses of donors.”

⁶⁷ Italics are author’s emphasis.

⁶⁸ Barnardo maintained his role as sole director of the Homes (Bready, 1932: 153 [1930]) until 1877 when he faced the Arbitration Board who recommended “that a Committee be formed “to assist” the Director.”

⁶⁹ Italics are author’s emphasis.

the drinking habits of their parents, grandparents or other relatives.” The conversion of Barnardo to the temperance movement of the nineteenth century expanded his network within the evangelical philanthropic circle.

Wagner (1979: 38-9) explains “revival evangelicalism, with its emphasis on the deep sinfulness of men, taught only through conversion and repentance could man be saved.” The early work of Barnardo reveals the practices of conversion and repentance of not only himself as a shepherd leading his flock, but also the salvation of each member in his flock, the pauper children he admitted into his ‘Homes.’ Barnardo found himself at the center of the temperance reform movement in the 1870s, and would preach evangelical sermons outside the Edinburgh Castle, a public house which Barnardo had claimed was the “Citadel of Satan” (Wagner, 1979: 57). When it closed as a drinking establishment due to the pressures of the temperance movement, the Edinburgh Castle came onto the open market and “Barnardo was quick to seize the opportunity” (Wagner, 1979: 57).

For his early work in the temperance movement, Barnardo gained the support of Samuel Morley,⁷⁰ who was “president of a large number of temperance societies as well as being a generous supporter of the YMCA” (Wagner, 1979). Barnardo was also well connected to the cousin of Samuel Morley, “Rebekah Wilson of Sheffield, had married William Hind Smith, who was to become the YMCA’s most active provincial leader, and she had already founded sixteen temperance refreshment houses in the north which were known as ‘The British Workman,’ short for ‘The British Workman Public Houses’”

⁷⁰ Wagner (1979: 51) writes, “Shaftesbury relied heavily on Samuel Morley for advice as to which charitable undertakings he should support... Barnardo and Shaftesbury were much less close than might have been expected, and than Barnardo would have wished to imply.”

(Wagner, 1979: 57-8). William Hind Smith recounts meeting with Barnardo and describes “his thoroughness and his desire to excel and outdo all his coworkers” (Wagner, 1971: 58).

Barnardo was interested in the work of Rebekah Wilson, in particular, the refreshment houses she had started which had a mission hall attached to each; “Hind Smith declared that Barnardo was ‘charmed with the idea, and declared he would eclipse our work by going in for something on a much bigger scale, but keeping to the main idea’” (Wagner, 1979: 58). Barnardo raised funds from temperance reformers and evangelical followers to buy the Edinburgh Castle and form the ‘British workmen’s coffee palace,’ which he announced in *The Christian*.⁷¹ This was a pivotal moment for the popular recognition of the pastoral role eventually centered on Barnardo himself, as *the* shepherd of British pauper children. Wagner (1979: 61) asserts Barnardo was constantly seeking public approval and “the acquisition of the Edinburgh Castle was [his] first major success; it brought him public acclaim and gave his work a solid base.”

Barnardo and Marchant (2007: 103 [1907]) explain the “Edinburgh Castle became the People’s Mission Church and the first Coffee-Palace in the country. As a commercial undertaking it paid. Good meals were supplied to working-men, games and newspapers and temperance refreshments afforded opportunity for social intercourse, which still seems to be one of the reasons why men go to public-houses.” Barnardo, himself wrote, “I was convinced that there was a missing link in our temperance organisations so long as there was no point of reunion except [in] the public-house, where there was opportunity

⁷¹ Barnardo made this announcement in *The Christian* on February 13 1873 (Wagner, 1979: 320). Bready (1932: 89 [1930]) explains: “*The Revival* a little later changed its name to *The Christian*. Always it was a warm supporter of Barnardo’s work; Mr. R. C. Morgan, its editor, rendered Barnardo valiant personal aid.”

for the genial expanding of the social instincts” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 103 [1907]). Wagner (1979: 56) writes in her biographical account of Barnardo, that he “realised he needed a more efficient means of reaching those who frequented the pubs and beer houses.” The Edinburgh Castle would allow Barnardo to erect a mission tent in front, allowing two thousand people to listen to evangelists preach (Wagner, 1979). The former, ‘Citadel of Satan,’ an infamous and thriving gin palace, was soon to become actively involved as a place of temperance and a platform for Barnardo to preach about his firsthand experiences in the East End of London, particularly his work with pauper children (Wagner, 1979).⁷² It is during this time that Barnardo shaped his pastoral path in child rescue, primarily in the East End of London; leading himself and the pauper children he took in on a path to salvation.

Barnardo had pastoral influence during his ‘Tent Revival’ at the Edinburgh Castle “offering a social substitute to the public house” (Bready, 1932: 112 [1930]). The success of his temperance campaign had brought Barnardo recognition in evangelist circles.⁷³ Bready (1932: 109-10 [1930]) quotes Barnardo writing: “The result of such work was that large numbers of our dear working-folk took the temperance pledge. Nearly four thousand pledges were taken in the tent from persons in adult life, and these

⁷² Wagner (1979: 63) explains the importance of the time Barnardo spent at the Edinburgh Castle: “The great hall of the Edinburgh Castle provided a splendid setting for Barnardo’s mission church. Barnardo’s activities as pastor and minister have been much less well documented than his work for children. Yet for nine years he undertook all the pastoral duties associated with his church and did all the preaching.”

⁷³ Wagner (1979: 67) explains that the success of the Edinburgh Castle also brought controversy for Barnardo: “It was not only the publicans who lost out: the congregations of other local missions and churches were adversely affected as, attracted by the novelty and publicity, people flocked to the Edinburgh Castle, its interior bright with crystal gasoliers.” Those that felt threatened against Barnardo included “F.N. Charrington, whose Tower Hamlets Mission lost some supporters to the Edinburgh Castle, and an obscure Baptist minister, George Reynolds, whose small church, known as ‘the cave of Adullam’ had a congregation numbering less than thirty souls” (Wagner, 1979: 67). Parr (1994: 39 [1980]) writes: “Catholic dioceses adopted child emigration because they feared the effects of public or Protestant institutions upon the children of Catholic parents, but they could not afford to build enough separate facilities for their own youngsters in England.”

pledges were registered, and the persons carefully visited and looked after.” Wagner (1979: 60) writes during this time “the publicity that surrounded the work of the Edinburgh Castle had the effect of almost eclipsing for a time Barnardo’s work with the East End Juvenile Mission.” Although his legacy is often related to his philanthropic endeavors of opening ‘Homes’ and mass child emigration, Barnardo began his pastoral role as an evangelical missionary (Wagner, 1979; Bready, 1932 [1930]); Batt, 1904).

Barnardo was not fully engaged with child emigration in the 1870s, but did rely on the supervision of Annie Macpherson⁷⁴ in sending Home boys to Canada. It was not until August 10, 1882 when Barnardo sent his own group of Home boys to Canada (Barnardo and Marchant, (2007 [1907])). Barnardo was transfixed on making his organization thoroughly efficient and with that meant “an ever-open entrance to the Homes demands an ever-open exit” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 154 [1907])). An emigration scheme would fulfill the demands of training and housing the child pauper population that were continually filtering through his doors. The ‘pastoral role’ occupied by Barnardo allowed him to participate in philanthropic initiatives in the nineteenth century, which heavily relied on a responsible shepherd-priest role in effectively managing the child pauper population in Britain. The management of the child pauper population required an effective process of admission and departure, a system that Barnardo insisted on organizing himself (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907])).

⁷⁴ Barnardo refers to the work of Miss Macpherson in his memoirs, writing: “the first party of the child-emigrants from the homes left England in 1869 under her auspices” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 155 [1907])). Wagner (1979: 53) writes that Annie Macpherson was “the daughter of a Scottish Quaker teacher... [and] had been converted at a Revival meeting in London in 1861.” Miss Macpherson had also been appalled by the conditions of the East End of London after experiencing the destitution firsthand and opened her “home industry in 1868 and the following year she took her first party of children to Canada” (Wagner, 1979: 53).

In 1868, Barnardo argued in his first report “in favour of either emigration or employment for men, but pointed out that when women are employed, ‘they are taken away for the entire day from their families (many of whom are young) and the poor home, poor enough and wretched enough before, now becomes a place which only drives men to the public houses; and thus evil is done which no amount of money can ever really undo’” (Wagner, 1979: 71). Wagner (1979: 71) writes that “in spite of his bachelor status Barnardo was not deterred by the thought that difficulties might result from his working directly with girls, and the accounts for 1871/2 show that a fund for a home for orphan and destitute little girls had already been opened.” The work of Barnardo in the streets and alleys of East End London opened his eyes to the prevalence of juvenile prostitution due to the “chronic oversupply of girls in a highly restricted market” (Wagner, 1979: 71). The recruitment of both girls and boys for Barnardo Homes is significant to the pastoral role Barnardo takes on, as he is guiding all destitute children to salvation.

Barnardo opened a Home for girls after he married Syrie Elmslie⁷⁵ and adapted the idea of a cottage home system;⁷⁶ after this failed attempt⁷⁷ institutionalizing girls like the boys at the East End Juvenile Mission (Wagner, 1979). Bready (1932: 129 [1930]) writes “until 1873 no provision was made for the reception of girls... but experience

⁷⁵ Before being baptized Syrie was named Sara Louise Elmslie (Wagner, 1979). Fletcher (2005: 47) writes: “Barnardo blatantly used their wedding as an opportunity to publicise his wish to open a home for girls.”

⁷⁶ Wagner (1979: 80) explains: “Dr Wichern’s Rauhe Haus in Hamburg was based on this principle. Mr de Metz had founded the first reformatory institution for juvenile offenders in Mettrai, France, on the idea that children should be gathered into separate houses. The cottage home system had been advocated for the Poor Law by Mr Joseph Fletcher as early as 1851 in a paper submitted to the Statistical Society of London, but nothing had come of it. At the time when Barnardo was planning his Girls’ Village Homes, Mrs Meredith’s experiment at Addlestone and the home for little boys at Farningham were the only two examples to be found in England.”

⁷⁷ The first attempt Barnardo made in institutionalizing girls is recorded by Bready (1932 [1930]) as his experimental Girl-Rescue programme enacted in Barkingside, Essex. This would soon transform into a cottage home system adapted by Barnardo known as his Girls’ Village Homes.

forced upon him the conviction that until facilities were provided for the rescue of homeless girls his task was but half done.” Barnardo had adapted the cottage scheme for girls in 1875 to provide an atmosphere of the “cottage-mother and her family” (Bready, 1932: 133 [1930]). Bready (1932: 132 [1930]) writes: “twenty-nine years after its opening, it boasted nearly seventy cottages, many of which were, like the first, erected ‘In Memoriam’.”⁷⁸ The development of the Girls’ Village Homes⁷⁹ enabled Barnardo to individualize his pastoral responsibilities of guiding pauper boys and girls on their path of salvation through the means of instilling gendered techniques of training and boarding. Barnardo believed this path required children to be educated, trained and converted to evangelical beliefs.

The gendered techniques of training and boarding Barnardo Home Children were performed through the direction of Barnardo in his ‘Homes for Lads’ and ‘Girls’ Village Homes’ system. The techniques were aligned with “evangelicals’ public rhetoric” (Parr, 1994: 62 [1980]), segregating children based on their gender. Barnardo and his staff trained girls at his Village Homes to become “kitchen maids, dairy maids, laundry maids and cooks to meet the great demand everywhere for cleanly and instructed female servants” (Fletcher, 2005: 47). Wagner (1979: 83) notes Barnardo writing about these services: “The girls are taught to act all parts and to do everything, for we are our own servants, at Illford, our own chambermaids and charwomen, and our own cooks and

⁷⁸ Barnardo had received funds for the first Girls’ Village Homes after he published an article in *The Christian*. Bready (1932: 133 [1930]) describes this event: “The donor had read Barnardo’s appeal in *The Christian*, and, discussing the matter with his wife, they decided to erect a cottage to the memory of their own little daughter who recently had died.”

⁷⁹ Barnardo had established the Girls’ Village Homes after Syrie and himself had housed sixty girls at Mossford Lodge (Niven, 1994). Fletcher (2005: 48) notes after the failure of Mossford Lodge “Syrie’s official role in Barnardo’s charity work ended – though she never failed to support her husband behind the scenes.”

nurses; we sew and mend, and darn, and sweep, and dust; and positive training in all these feminine arts is no light task.” The emphasis of domesticity and domestic space for pauper children in English middle-class ideals and filtered into the techniques used by Barnardo in organizing his Girls’ Village Home and Homes for boys (Murdoch, 2006).

At his home for boys in Stepney, Barnardo directed what he called the “half-time system” (Wagner, 1979: 83). Barnardo divided days for boys “between school and training in a trade shop” (Wagner, 1979: 83). Barnardo would set aside time for play, “but all the household work was done by boys, who were taught to cook and wait at table, to make their beds, to clean their shoes and to fulfill any other duties, such as acting as messengers to the offices, that might be required of them” (Wagner, 1979: 84). Wagner (1979: 84) notes the conditions at Stepney for home boys were significantly “milder” compared to that at the labour houses in which Barnardo took older boys. The labour houses worked under a strict sixteen-hour day where “boys were roused at half past five and started work at six o’clock; with half-hour intervals for breakfast, prayers, dinner and military drill, they finally finished at half past six in the evening. After supper at seven, classes were held until nine fifteen, and finally after prayers the lights were put out at ten o’clock” (Wagner, 1979: 84). Wagner (1979: 84) notes the strong emphasis “in the moral value of hard work, both for [Barnardo] and for his children.” This moral value was instilled in Home Children through the means of pastoral guidance; Barnardo focused his techniques of guidance on industrial training and Christian teachings instead of advanced education for his Home Children (Wagner, 1979).⁸⁰

⁸⁰ Wagner (1979: 84) explains the education of Home Children, noting: “The three Rs were the chief subjects taught in class, with a little grammar, geography and history.” Wagner (1979) is referring to

Dr. Barnardo reported: “My own particular work has been to train boys and girls for employment in this country, but occasionally I have sent individuals abroad. I have not, however, attempted to do so on a large scale hitherto. My reason was not that I had any objection to the principle of emigration, but rather that I imagined that the task of sending out a large party would be a very serious addition to our burdens, and as the work was so well done by others I did not think it necessary to interfere. But recently the desirability of emigrating many more of my children has been brought before me in a way which assures me that I must no longer hesitate to enter the newly opened door” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 155-6 [1907]). Barnardo was aware of the constraints his Homes were experiencing due to the continual intake of children.

Emigration offered Barnardo a means to build his project of child-saving (Swain and Hillel, 2010). Swain and Hillel (2010: 109-10) note “emigration stories contrasted the squalor of conditions in British cities with the open, health-giving life in the colonies.” Nineteenth century child-savers focused on Canada as providing an “environmental change” for destitute children; “the new country was a place of opportunity and redemption” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 110). Swain and Hillel (2010: 110) explain “by the 1880s the ‘taint of heredity’ had to be more directly confronted.” Heredity was often cited as an “awful burden, but one that would be only added to by leaving children in a noxious environment” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 110). For Barnardo emigration provided a solution for ‘hereditary deficiencies’ in separating children from their pauper influences (Swain and Hillel, 2010). Barnardo wrote in 1902 “child emigration was the final stage of child rescue” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 112). Canada

reading, writing and arithmetic when noting the three Rs, a phrase often used in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

was depicted as a solution for pauper children to be transformed from being a “liability to a resource” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 121).

On August 10, 1882, “conducted by the Governor of the Boys’ Home, Stepney Causeway, his first organised party of fifty-one carefully selected boys, after a farewell meeting at the Young Men’s Christian Association, Aldersgate Street, the previous night, left Liverpool by the *Parisian* for Quebec” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 157 [1907]). The Governor recounts: “Dr. Stephenson, who was at that time the Governor of the Children’s Home, Bonner Road, Victoria Park, kindly placed his Distributing Home at Hamilton, Ontario, at our disposal, and from that home within a fortnight every lad was placed out, and for the most part in excellent situations. They were a fine set of boys from fourteen to seventeen years of age, and the pick of those who had been under training for several years” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 157 [1907]). This was a pivotal step for Dr. Barnardo, after opening his first home for boys twelve years prior to 1882, he was now devoted to an emigration scheme of his own.

Barnardo consumed himself with the first principle of ‘pastoral power’ as his ultimate aim was to assure the individual salvation of each pauper child in urban Britain (Foucault, 1983: 214-15 [1982]). The first group of children Barnardo sent to Canada in 1882 encompasses a ‘pastoral’ aim for the salvation of these boys to what Barnardo wrote himself “the virgin soil and pure atmosphere of our colonies” (Barnardo and Marchant, (2007: 156 [1907]). During this time Barnardo had not adapted his own emigration scheme, but did begin emigrating children through the services of Annie MacPherson stating, “occasionally I was forced, by the threatened interference of criminal or vicious relatives, or by consideration of health on the part of specially delicate children, to send

first one and then another, alone or in small groups, to service in South Africa or the Canadian Dominion” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 156 [1907]).

Barnardo justified his new found interest in an emigration scheme arguing Canada “offered more favourable conditions for the surplus juvenile population living in urban Britain” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 156 [1907]). Canada offered a “new world” (Foucault, 1983: 214 [1982]) to exist for pauper children; Barnardo saw the salvation of these children increasingly dependent on projects of emigration as his Homes and Village Homes in Britain were admitting additional pauper children.⁸¹ The economic advantages of having such a project exist in Canada was evident for British policy makers; “it cost less to equip, transport and place a child in Canada than it did to maintain a child for a year in a home, and a child might need to be kept in the home for several years before finding employments” (Wagner, 1979: 180).

These belief systems were organized by Barnardo and conducted through the means of his guidance and the appointment of Canadian Inspectors and staff. Barnardo formed distributing homes in Canada functioning to house staff⁸² and conduct operational duties (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]). Barnardo was extremely conscious of managing and organizing an emigration scheme that would offer his own evangelical pastoral insights, tailoring a scheme for his own interests and differentiating himself from

⁸¹ The first home for boys Barnardo opened in 1870 was able to accommodate sixty boys in five dormitories (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]). Barnardo expanded his child rescue project to include another Ragged School; as well “[Barnardo] enlarged old dormitories, built new workshops, rebuilt and fitted laundry and workrooms, started a city messengers’ brigade, brushmaking and bootmaking departments, a tract department for the sale of pure literature, whilst his wood-chopping brigade sold wood” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 95 [1907]). Barnardo and Marchant (2007: 124 [1907]) record the additional cottages built for the continuous entry of home girls: “In 1876 fourteen cottages, in 1878 eleven, in 1879 three, in 1880 three, in 1887 eighteen, in 1903 five, in 1904 eight, in 1905 three, in 1906 two were erected.” Barnardo and Marchant (2007: 127 [1907]) also note: “During the twenty-nine years from the opening until the Founder died, the Village Home had received and trained 8700 children.”

⁸² Barnardo enlisted superintendents in Canada to oversee his distributing homes. See Kohli (2003: 144) for further information regarding the superintendents of Barnardo receiving homes.

the work of others organizing child emigration schemes during the same time period (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]). What held Barnardo back in the past was that he could not have direct guidance over the Home Children after they arrived in Canada. It was not until Barnardo visited Canada himself that he was confident in establishing an emigration scheme of his own and directing his guidance through the means of Barnardo associates (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]).

Barnardo eventually sailed to Canada himself in 1884 and 1887 in order to see how his children were being treated firsthand and “lay the foundation of his emigration work” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 166 [1907]), undertaking his ‘pastoral role’ of assuring the ‘salvation’ of pauper children in Canada. Barnardo used emigration records to form a discourse concerning the safety of emigrating children to Canada to ease the minds of both the British and Canadian public and increase the safety of his ‘flock.’ An example of this is when Barnardo improved the situation of infant mortality among child emigrants. Barnardo outlined in his records that children under six were more susceptible to mortality when emigrating to Canada due to the harsh winters which “brought on respiratory tract” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 168 [1907]). In 1904 Barnardo reflects in his memoirs: “Our mortality during the seventeen months in which this experiment was tried of emigrating infants under five, [rose] to the rate of twenty per cent per annum, or at the rate of two hundred per thousand” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 168 [1907]). After acquiring medical advice from the Dominion of Canada, Barnardo records in 1904: “I resolved at once to alter my plans, and not in future to favour the emigration of children under six... during the next six months the rate fell to one per cent., or ten per thousand per annum; shortly afterwards it sank to nine per thousand, and since then it has

never exceeded eight per thousand per annum, even in years when several accidents to those who were engaged in various forms of manual labour were included” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 168 [1907]). This displays how Barnardo was capable of learning and adapting within his role as the ‘shepherd’ in order to guide the flock safely. This passage also indicates how Barnardo reflected on his pastorate influence and maintained his accountability to the emigrant children. He was fulfilling his calling even though there were setbacks.

Barnardo expressed his power as the shepherd during his visits to Canada in 1884 and again in 1887; he visited hospitals, receiving homes affiliated with his organization, the prisons, the House of Detention and reformatories (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 163 [1907]). What most impressed Barnardo about Canada as a settlement for British pauper children was the religious ties it exuded stating: “The kindly religious feeling of the great body of working people must be a powerful factor in the wellbeing of the whole country, and should make one long that yet more of the children who have been so carefully trained in our Homes should find their future home in Canadian families” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 165 [1907]). The salvation of children depended on the delegation of authorities in Canada to guide the mission set forth by Barnardo and he again visited Canada in 1890 spending three months “organising and re-organising at Toronto, Peterborough, and Manitoba” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 171 [1907]). Barnardo and Marchant (2007 [1907]) cite many stories of Barnardo and his ‘incessant personal care’ of each child he visited while in Canada, reflecting, again, the continuing maintenance of the pastoral role he had taken on with the Home Children.

Barnardo acts as an intermediary between Christianity and the flock, meaning he takes on the role of connecting the children he ‘saves’ to the ‘message’ and direction of Christianity. Foucault (2007: 124 [1978]) references the shepherd-flock relationship as one between “God to men.” Barnardo takes on the role of a prophet “who has received the flock of men from God, to whom they must return it” (Foucault, 2007: 124 [1978]). Foucault (2007: 125 [1978]) characterizes the role of the shepherd as not a power “exercised over a territory but, by definition, over a flock, and more exactly, over the flock in its movement from one place to another.” In the case of Barnardo, the role that he occupied as the shepherd-priest required him to directly supervise the undertakings of his flock who he had shepherded to a distant land, the emigration of Home Children to Canada.

Barnardo was aware of how “Canadian public opinion was naturally suspicious of the alien child – the more suspicious because some emigration agencies had brought ne’er-do-weels to the Colony, and others who sharpened the competition for employment” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 166 [1907]). To alleviate apprehensions concerning the practices of child emigration Barnardo “laid down six principles” for an emigration scheme (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 167 [1907]). These guidelines included: “First. – That no child shall be sent out manifesting criminal or vicious taint. Second. – That no child is to be sent out who is not at the time excellent in health, and without tendency to disease. Third. – That all such children (excepting, of course, the very young ones who go out for “adoption”) must have been passed through a period of the most careful training, not only in industrial pursuits, but also of a moral and religious character. Fourth. – That as regards all children who come up to the standard of the three

previous conditions, only the “flower of the flock” are to be sent to Canada. Fifth. – That upon reaching Canada all children are to come under the care of properly qualified persons connected with our institution on the Canadian side, by whom they are to be distributed carefully into well-selected homes; and that even then our work is not to be considered complete, but that regular communication shall be maintained with these children for years by personal visitation of experienced assistants, and by a system of written reports from the child and its employer. That careful statistics shall be kept showing frequent reports of their whereabouts, progress, and general welfare, until they have reached an age when they no longer require our supervising care. Sixth. – That if, spite of all these tests, precautions, and safeguards, it should be found by experience that some particular child, after having been placed out in Canada becomes definitely immoral or criminal, then every legitimate means is to be adopted to recover possession of that child, and to return him or her at the earliest opportunity to the old country” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 167 [1907]).

From this passage, Barnardo clearly conceives of his pastoral role through the training of a morally correct and disciplined flock, one that could, eventually, operate relatively autonomously (Foucault, 2007 [1978]); that is, outside of the immediate gaze of the Barnardo organization in the host families as Barnardo Home Children were either adopted or apprenticed in Canada (Parr, 1994 [1980]). The principles were also established to alleviate doubts about the moral character of Home Children coming into Canadian homes. The criteria of selection for sending Home Children to Canada were established by Barnardo ensuring the “flower of the flock” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 167 [1907]) would only be sent. Parr (1994: 111 [1980]) accounts: “of the

Barnardo children who eventually came to Canada 24 per cent first arrived at the rescue home with serious health problems.” Parr (1994: 111-12 [1980]) writes of “ringworm, catarrh and ophthalmia” circulating throughout the institutions run by Barnardo and how “it was exceptional for child immigrants to arrive in Canada in good health, notwithstanding the claims of pre-emigration medicals, doctors’ certificates and dockside inspections and the philanthropists’ affirmations that they sent abroad only the ‘flower of the flock’.”⁸³

Individuals within the ‘flower of the flock’ “are seen by Foucault as a product of disciplinary power: ‘The individual is no doubt the fictitious atom of an “ideological” representation of society; but he is also a reality fabricated by this specific technology of power that I have called ‘discipline’.” (Golder and Fitzpatrick, 2009: 20-1). Foucault develops the concept of disciplinary power⁸⁴ in an attempt “to isolate a modality of power which exceeded the logic of the state and which transcended the usual theatres of state power” (Golder and Fitzpatrick, 2009: 21). Foucault was concerned with how “discipline was a diffuse power which through its mundane attention to the minutiae of the quotidian could infinitely ‘extend beyond the limits of the State’ and its law” (Golder and Fitzpatrick, 2009: 21). During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, philanthropic and state norms pertaining to child-saving function as a disciplinary power targeting pauper children as subjects to be governed (Swain and Hillel, 2010; Dean,

⁸³ Parr (1994: 56 [1980]) notes “in central Canadian rural areas two groups spoke out publicly against child immigration: county sheriffs and gaolers, and country doctors who were Dominion members of Parliament.” These two groups “argued from a defensive position, sharing their constituents’ fears that rapid growth of the cities and the declining pre-eminence of agriculture threatened their political influence, their economic security, the vitality of their community institutions and their distinctive ways of life” (Parr, 1994: 52 [1980]).

⁸⁴ See Foucault (1990a) *The History of Sexuality: Volume I*. Foucault (1990a) “would later supplement this formulation of a disciplinary power of normalization with an account of a different technology of power... a technology of power he was to label ‘bio-power’.” (Golder and Fitzpatrick, 2009: 21).

1999). The emergence of administering governance over pauper children is present in both the individualizing techniques directed by Barnardo and also state legislation (Foucault, 1990a).

Barnardo had presented individualizing knowledges of pauper children, ensuring the ‘flower of the flock’ would be sent to Canada through inspection procedures. Through carefully compiled statistics and selection criteria for emigrating Home Children Barnardo was able to establish disciplinary mechanisms of ensuring that only the ‘flower of the flock’ would be sent. Corbett (1981: 29) chronicles techniques used for qualifying children for the “Canada List.” Corbett (1981: 29) explains “[children] were assembled at Stepney Causeway where they were tested, lectured and outfitted for the “great Canadian adventure”... any defect and the child was scratched from the list.” Children had to pass medical examinations before being sent to Canada and “Canada lectures and agricultural slides were presented” (Corbett, 1981: 30). Corbett (1981: 30) notes “until his death, Dr. Barnardo accompanied each emigration party to the departure docks.” Barnardo formulated these individualizing techniques through disciplinary methods of control, such as medical examinations, to augment and regulate his own emigration scheme.

The principles outlined by Barnardo found their way into contemporaneous legislation that extended the reach of non-state philanthropic institutions. Such legislation altered the form of ‘pastoral power’ and the scale at which an institution could govern destitute children. Barnardo takes on the role of the ‘shepherd’ governing his ‘flock’ of destitute children into a terrain of obedient subjects. The form of ‘pastoral’ power does not just involve the community of pauper children but each individual in

particular (Foucault, 1983: 214 [1982]). In order for Barnardo to exercise pastoral power he must practice techniques of governing pauper children; this is linked to the “production of truth” (Foucault, 1983: 214 [1982]) surrounding British destitute children and how the ‘flock’ is formed. The following sections outline the pastoral power techniques of individualization enacted on Barnardo Home Children and legislation is among them. British child protection legislation was highly effective in maintaining identities and everyday experiences guided by Barnardo.

The ‘social air’ of child protection was being reinforced by British Parliamentary legislature during the late nineteenth century. The Prevention of Cruelty Act to and Protection of Children (1889)⁸⁵ enabled Barnardo to fulfill his ‘pastoral’ role in child rescue work. Known as the first Children’s Charter, the protection Act of 1889 aided Barnardo, and the state, in intervening on ‘unfit’⁸⁶ parents (O’Halloran, 2009; Parr 1994 [1980]). The ‘pastoral net’ was cast over parents and their children; the technical criteria that rendered a parent ‘unfit’ during this time were based on the limitations of ‘pauperism.’ Swain and Hillel (2010: 13) argue it was during the late nineteenth century that the “child as citizen involved a limitation rather than an expansion of freedom or liberty, articulating what parents should do for children rather than what children could do for themselves.”

Barnardo takes on the role of the ‘pastor’; he is all knowing and all seeing and must intervene to protect his flock, even at the expense of the autonomy and privacy of

⁸⁵ The Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act 1889 is known as “the first ‘Children’s Charter’.” (Masson (et. al.), 2007: 31).

⁸⁶ The emerging role of separating children from ‘unfit’ parents is amplified in the late nineteenth century by both philanthropists and the state. The criteria in which determined a parent ‘unfit’ is controversial and contextual. The use of the term in the late nineteenth century was used by the state and philanthropists in removing children from their families, such as claims of physical abuse or neglecting to provide proper care (Swain and Hillel, 2010).

smaller familial units (Foucault, 2007 [1978]). Consequently, the first Children's Charter (1889) affected how Barnardo foresaw legislature as a means for advocating against pauperism, "behind the law is a rising level of public opinion and Christian sentiment, which means yet greater things in the future than in the past" (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 244 [1907]). The increased authority of the state over the 'child' reflects the widening net of 'pastoral' power (Foucault, 1983: 215 [1982]). Barnardo describes the Prevention of Cruelty Act to and Protection of Children (1889) as an opening for 'boarding out' and emigrating children stating, "parental authority [has been] pared down to more reasonable limits" (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 243 [1907]). The governance of children by the state facilitated the endeavors made by Barnardo in an emigration scheme for British destitute children by giving him further access to 'rescuing' children.

The Prevention of Cruelty Act to and Protection of Children (1889) included restrictions on employment of children, for example Section 3 details: "any person who – (a) causes or procures any child, being a boy under the age of fourteen years, or being a girl under the age of sixteen years, to be in any street for the purpose of begging or receiving alms, or of inducing the giving of alms, whether under the pretence of singing, playing, performing, offering anything for sale, or otherwise; or (b) causes or procures any child, being a boy under the age of fourteen years, or being a girl under the age of sixteen years, to be in any street, or in any premises licensed according to law for public entertainments, for the purpose of singing, playing, or performing for profit, or offering anything for sale between ten p.m. and five a.m.; or (c) causes or procures any child under the age of ten years to be at any time in any street, or in any premises licensed for the sale of any intoxicating liquor, or in premises licensed according to law for public

entertainments, or in any circus or other place of public amusement to which the public are admitted by payment for the purpose of singing, playing or performing for profit, or offering anything for sale, shall, on conviction thereof by a court of summary jurisdiction in manner provided by Summary Jurisdiction Acts, be liable, at the discretion of the court, to a fine not exceeding twenty-five pounds or alternatively, or in default of payment of the said fine, or in addition thereto, to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for any term not exceeding three months” (Prevention of Cruelty to, and Protection of, Children Act, 1889).

This statute created an even higher need for a parent to find suitable living arrangements for their children and supervision during the day; the legislature instilled a boundary on pauper parents and how they could earn a living to survive. Instead of focusing on parental rights of children, the state skewed its focus to the governance of the child by the state or an affiliated institution if intervention was deemed necessary. Barnardo had established an institution of reforming ‘pauper children’ from their perceived weak social ties in his institutions for boys and girls. The continual growth of the Barnardo Homes and Village Homes was extensive when the statute of Prevention of Cruelty to and Protection of Children Act (1889) was established as Barnardo recognized an “ever-open entrance to the Homes demands an ever-open exit” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 154 [1907]). The involvement of the state concerning child paupers gave leverage on guardianship of pauper children which Barnardo was able to extend to his emigration scheme of rescuing and accumulating his ‘flock.’

The British Prevention of Cruelty to and Protection of Children Act (1889) also included Section 5 detailing that “the disposal of a child by order of court” should be

placed in the safeguards of a 'fit' guardian (Parr, 1994: 65 [1980]). The objectives of the Barnardo organization provided systemic methods of relief designed "primarily for the saving of the children" (Barnardo and Marchant, (2007: 148 [1907])). The first Children's Charter (1889) offered Barnardo an opportunity to further his emigration scheme and principles by providing him with some legal authority, particularly, over resistant parents who were labeled 'unfit.' Parr (1994: 65 [1980]) acknowledges during this time "day care was difficult for both men and women left to raise children alone...widowers generally earned more and were thus better able to pay for help. They were also likely to remarry. The widow's predicament was considerably heavier, and more widows than widowers were forced to turn to Barnardo [and other philanthropic organizations]." The compliance of pauper parents to philanthropists was often an obligatory admittance due to economic restraints posed on them as opposed to moral grounds (Parr, 1994 [1980]).

The 'philanthropic abductions' were not uncommon, but just one facet of the the child rescue endeavors produced by Barnardo (see Parr, 1994: 69 [1980]). Barnardo had an 'open-door policy' making an emigration policy appealing as a continual cycle of British pauper children were being admitted into his institutions (Parr, 1994: 71 [1980]). The pastoral role of Barnardo required "a domain of strategies, techniques and procedures" (Miller and Rose, 2008: 62) through which to make an emigration programme operable. The techniques of pastoral power "reveal and construct norms and processes to which evaluations can be attached and upon interventions can be targeted" (Miller and Rose, 2008: 66). This is exhibited in the techniques and strategies Barnardo initiated when first sending children to Canada; this is illustrated in his reflections of sending children under six to Canada during the winter months. These norms and

processes are also reinforced through British child legislation enabling the pauper children themselves to be a target to be governed (Dean, 1999).

The Prevention of Cruelty to and Protection of Children Act (1889) reinforced the child rescue work Barnardo had established in his early career. This was significant to the mantra of having “ever-open doors” (Parr, 1994: 69 [1980]) at the Barnardo organization and removing children from their pauper familial ties. The first Children’s Charter (1889) soon was argued after the Tye and Gossage cases Barnardo was involved in. In 1891, the British Custody of Children Act was created “to include instances in which guardians had allowed children to be brought up long enough at another person’s expense ‘to satisfy the Court that the parent was unmindful of his parental duties’” (Parr, 1994: 69 [1980]). Parents who admitted children to one of the Barnardo homes were often designated as ‘unfit’ due to the very act of placing their child in a home in the first place. The meaning of ‘unfit’ guardianship during the late nineteenth century is broadly used and at the discretion of the courts (Parr, 1994 [1980]). By 1886, Barnardo had been reported to have “summoned to court eighty-eight times in custody cases of his self-proclaimed ‘high-handed’ methods” (Parr, 1994: 68 [1980]).

Two cases were of extreme significance in the ratification of the Custody of Children Act (1891).⁸⁷ The case of Harry Gossage caused heated debates among evangelicals and Roman Catholics with his admission into a Barnardo home (Parr, 1994 [1980]). Mrs. Gossage had consulted a Roman Catholic priest after receiving a detailed agreement from the Barnardo organization; the priest proceeded to send a letter to the

⁸⁷ Parr (1994: 69 [1980]) writes: “two of these cases received particularly wide public attention between 1889 and 1891 and resulted in path-breaking legislation.” Parr (1994: 69 [1980]) explains “in neither of cases did the judges or the press suggest that the parents were fit guardians.”

Barnardo organization insisting the child be transferred to St. Vincent's Home, a Roman Catholic agency in London (Parr, 1994 [1980]). The letter "enclosed ten shillings as a donation and commended Barnardo's great acts of charity" (Parr, 1994: 68 [1980]). The letter was received by the Barnardo organization and the donation was acknowledged, but the boy had already been sent to Canada (Parr, 1994: 68 [1980]). Furthermore, the Barnardo organization had arranged for the boy to be adopted with specific instructions from the adoptive parent that his location be unknown (Parr, 1994 [1980]). Mrs. Gossage did win the case as she "brought a writ of Habeas Corpus obliging Barnardo to return her son... [she] did not, however, secure the return of her son" (Parr, 1994: 68 [1980]).

These "philanthropic abductions" (Parr, 1994: 67 [1980]) can be related to the 'pastoral role' Barnardo maintained in his emigration scheme. The techniques and practices Barnardo engaged with during this time were predominantly justified on the basis of 'morals' but combining this idea to strategic techniques of creating an emigration programme, influenced the maintenance of expanding British child emigration abroad. Parr (1994: 62 [1980]) reveals in her work "11 per cent of Barnardo's young immigrants were admitted on moral grounds alone." Parr (1994: 67 [1980]) also records that "among the Barnardo emigrants between 1882 and 1908, 6 per cent of boys and more than 8 per cent of girls were shipped to Canada illegally, without their parents' consent. A further 3 per cent of boys and 6 per cent of girls were sent under court with the permission of the Home Secretary rather than that of their parents. Such extremes were rare, though given the moral concern of the child-savers, predictably less rare for young girls than young boys."

Parr (1994: 70 [1980]) explains nineteenth century evangelical methods of philanthropy involved a system of “kinship management,” much like the systemic approach of Barnardo. The evangelical mission concerning the philanthropic work of Barnardo was dependent on the guidance of pauper children and the assurance of them possessing that guidance. The admittance of children required a systemic disconnection of familial ties for pauper children (Parr, 1994 [1980]). The “system of kinship management” (Parr, 1994: 70 [1980]) also allowed for Barnardo to enter as the guardian, with sole responsibility and say over the children admitted into his ‘Homes for lads’ and Girls’ Village Homes. The sole responsibility of the children admitted required Barnardo to formulate a systemized intake and outake of children.

The pastoral role Barnardo undertook as shepherd was maintained when his Home Children immigrated to Canada. At a distance Barnardo was able to guide and direct his flock of Home Children through the procedures he had established in Canada. By 1888, Barnardo had established an annual emigration scheme and had opened three receiving Homes in Canada including: “Hazelbrae, Peterborough for girls only. 214 Farley Avenue, Toronto for young boys only. Industrial Farm, Russell, Manitoba, for old lads” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 170 [1907]). Barnardo was able to align himself with both the British and Canadian government and perform his pastoral techniques as “*action at a distance*”⁸⁸ (Miller and Rose, 2008: 60).⁸⁹

⁸⁸ Italics are authors’ emphasis.

⁸⁹ Miller and Rose (2008: 60) further this notion by discussing “*action at a distance*” as a “key characteristic of modern government.” Miller and Rose (2008: 60) explain “Liberal government identifies a domain outside ‘politics,’ and seeks to manage it without destroying its existence and its autonomy. This is made possible through the activities and calculations of a proliferation of independent agents, including philanthropists, doctors, hygienists, managers, planners, parents and social workers. And it is dependent upon the forging of alliances.”

In his memoirs, Barnardo writes: “The Acts for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children have thrown their aegis over the little ones in multitudes of households. The extreme reading of the words, “parental authority,” has been pared down to more reasonable limits. The Criminal Laws Amendment Act has taken girls of tender years under its protection. The Custody of Children Bill, which became law in 1891, have such protection to all who were seeking to rescue homeless waifs, as to render wholly unnecessary the repetition on my part of those acts of defence of childhood, a few years ago, brought down upon my devoted head much public odium, to say nothing of the penalties of the law” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 242 [1907]).

Barnardo was referring to the case of Harry Gossage and suggests with the Acts of Parliament, forceful removal of children by philanthropists, such as himself, is no longer a ‘needful’ action as children are now a target to be governed by the state. Barnardo wrote: “I count myself indeed happy in that I have witnessed and taken some small share in this silent but profound revolution – legislative and social – and I am deeply grateful to God for the workings of His Providence in this direction” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 244 [1907]). Barnardo was adamant that “behind the law is a rising level of public opinion and Christian sentiment,” thereby fostering the pastoralism of child-saving during this time.

In a letter written by Barnardo, during his visit to Canada in 1890, he wrote to Mrs. Barnardo concerning the conditions under which children were placed out, recounting the Canadian Inspector A. B Owen. Barnardo writes: “The form of agreement in use is drawn in simple language, and divested as far as possible of legal verbiage or technicalities. It is drawn between the representative of the Institutions in Canada and the

persons who receives the child, and recites the fact that that latter is a former inmate, and is at present under the guardianship of the Homes. The employer undertakes to receive the child for a period beginning and ending on specified dates; to provide for a period beginning and ending on specified dates; to provide is during that period with sufficient and proper board, lodging, clothing, and necessities, and to pay a stated sum of money at the expiration of the period to the representative of the Homes, in trust for the child and for its 'sole use and benefit'." These techniques are targeted on the British home child; immigrant children were given a technical booklet written by the Canadian Superintendent of Barnardo Homes, A. B. Owen, outlining these governing principles.

The technical booklet, 'Directions For Lads on Leaving For Situations'⁹⁰ (Owen, 1890) outlines ten procedures boys who have emigrated to Canada should undertake once placed in a home. These directions were to be read by each boy who emigrated. The first direction includes: "on leaving for your situation, two addressed Post Cards will be given you. One of these should be sent off as soon as you reach your destination, to let us know of your safe arrival; the other should be carefully put away, so that you will have it to use at any time if you have anything special to write about, and have any difficulty in getting paper and stamp" (Owen, 1890: 4). The guidance of children is dependent on their obedience and personal submission to Barnardo and his organization as signified in this first direction. Barnardo, as the shepherd, created a network in Canada to commit to the guardianship of his flock, the Home Children he emigrated.

The second direction of the technical booklet entails: "You will understand, that your engagement with your employer begins with a month "on trial." Towards the end of

⁹⁰ See Appendix C.

the month we should like you to write to us, to let us know whether you are happily settled in your place. If we hear nothing from either you or your employer to lead us to suppose [he] is not likely to keep you, we shall, at the end of the month, send him an agreement to sign, containing terms that we think are fair and reasonable, both to you and to him, and similar to those upon which our boys in Canada have been placed in past years” (Owen, 1890: 4-5). Parr (1994: 88 [1980]) notes apprenticed Home Children often changed locations while under the care of philanthropic organizations, explaining: “Barnardo girls moved an average of four times during their first five years in Canada, Barnardo boys an average of three times.” Parr (1994: 89 [1980]) further “children were moved in response to competitive demands for the services they could supply.”

The third direction reads: “Big boys are generally engaged for a year, receiving, in addition to board and lodging, so much money for the year, from which will be deducted whatever is spent in clothing, etc., during the year. The employer will keep a careful account of this expenditure and the boy should do the same, and should do his best to be careful and saving of his clothing, so as to have as much money as possible to come to him at the end of the year” (Owen, 1890: 6). Parr (1994: 87 [1980]) explains “children were moved from poor farming districts to more prosperous regions as they grew older and more experienced, that is, as their market value as workers increased.” The fourth direction presents an expectation of maturity of Home Children; the autonomy of the home child is a product of pastoral guidance.

The fourth direction entails: “Younger boys are engaged in longer terms, according to their age and size, our object being to secure for them a home where they will be settled and comfortable, taken care of and taught to work, until they are quite able

to go out and manage their own affairs. We, therefore, arrange for the employer to furnish board, lodging, clothing, and all that is necessary, such as he would for his own son, and then at the end of three years, or four years, or whatever it may be, he pays a lump sum clear of everything. This we find a far better plan for younger boys than to be changing and shifting every year or so, as it secures them a good home over their heads until they are able to for themselves, and when that time comes, it provides a nice little sum to act as a foundation on which to build future savings” (Owen, 1890: 7-8). These directions were made to guide and direct the children to become productive citizens and also a pastoral tool of keeping watch over the flock.

Directions two through eight focus on the maintenance of all financial accounts by the Barnardo organization and the perpetual guidance of Barnardo, the ‘good shepherd,’ as opposed to who Foucault (2007: 128 [1978]) calls the ‘bad shepherd’ as one who “only thinks of good pasture for his own profit, for fattening the flock that he will be able to sell and scatter, whereas the good shepherd thinks only of his flock and nothing else. He does not even consider his own advantage in the well-being of his flock.” Instead, these directions were governing techniques of pastoral power acting “with an essentially selfless and, as it were, transitional character.” The shepherd does not condone “force or fearful violence,” but rather through guidance and direction “the shepherd (pasteur) serves the flock and must be an intermediary between the flock and pasture, food, and salvation, which implies that pastoral power is always a good in itself.” The technical booklet serves as an intermediary mechanism between the shepherd and his flock, guiding their path to salvation (Foucault, 2007 [1978]). More importantly, the

Home Children are representatives of the pastoral guidance provided by Barnardo; a flock that must serve their shepherd.

The ninth direction cautions boys who run away from their place of stay: “The law provides punishment for doing this, and if a boy runs away, we shall be prepared to help his employer to take the necessary steps to enforce the law, and to make him come back, as for a boy to run away from his place is not only likely to lead him into serious trouble and mischief, but also brings discredit on the Home” (Owen, 1890: 13). The tenth direction reads: “You may, perhaps, have the privilege of attending school in the winter months, and, if so, we hope you will make the most of the opportunity, remembering how important and valuable education is to everyone who has to make his way in the world” (Owen, 1890: 14-15). These final directions establish guidance and care for Home Children and their future lives as ‘productive’ adults. The limitations addressed in these ten directions are established by Barnardo as an effect of pastoral guidance.

The ‘Directions for Lads on Leaving for Situations’ (1890) technical booklet enacts pastoral power on the individual which in turn “guides [the individual] towards an end and functions as an intermediary towards this end. It is therefore a power with a purpose for those on whom it is exercised, and not a purpose for some kind of superior unit like the city, territory, state or sovereign” (Foucault, 2007: 129 [1978]). The last two directions offer a ‘pastoral’ directive for Barnardo Home Children in their endeavors once arriving to Canada; guidance to stay on the path of salvation and represent the pastoral flock under the principles provided by Barnardo in their everyday lives. The mediator between the flock and the shepherd are the mechanisms Barnardo has in place

once Home Children arrive to Canada. These mechanisms include technical booklets, hymn and chorus books, inspector reports, letters and firsthand visits made by Barnardo (Parr, 1994 [1980]; Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]; Owen, 1890).

In 1886, Barnardo expanded his enterprises to include ‘Babies Castle’ as he had taken in baby girls at the Girls’ Village Homes, “on a ratio of one infant to each cottage” (Niven, 1994: 9); he was challenged with where he should house baby boys. Barnardo acquired two small houses from Theodore Moilliet to house sixty babies of both sexes (Niven, 1994). Barnardo recounts: “Babies – above all, neglected babies – cannot be dealt with rightly through the mere “by efforts” of institutions not specially devoted to their care” (Niven, 1994: 10). Babies Castle was opened to take in babies and children under six (Niven, 1994). Barnardo had now expanded his philanthropic enterprise to include his Home for boys in Stepney, the Girls’ Village Homes in Barkingside and now Babies Castle in Hawkhurst, fulfilling his pastoral role of tending to the flock of pauper children in its entirety. As the shepherd, Barnardo “does everything for the totality of his flock, but he does everything also for each sheep of the flock.”⁹¹ Foucault (2007: 128 [1978]) elaborates that “the shepherd counts the sheep; he counts them in the morning when leads them to pasture, and he counts them in the evening to see that they are all there, and he looks after each of them individually.” This presents a technique of individualization⁹² used by Barnardo in that he asserts his servitude to the whole flock while keeping track of each individual child (Foucault, 2007 [1978]).

⁹¹ Foucault (2007: 128 [1978]) explains the last feature of pastoral power as: “The idea that pastoral power is an individualizing power.”

⁹² See Foucault (2007: 184 [1978]) for further explanation of the Christian pastorate and the procedures of individualization implemented by the pastorate.

Towards the end of his life, the care of his flock was becoming strained; Barnardo “had even less time for those he considered incompetent, and his autocratic ways gave rise to many stories about him, not always favourable” (Wagner, 1979: 274). During his lifetime Barnardo had ‘rescued’ “59,384 children” (Fletcher, 2005: 62). Over 23,000 Barnardo Home Children had been boarded out and “at the time of his death more than half of some 8,000 children⁹³ in his care were being boarded out; the rest lived in 43 homes around the country [in Britain]” (Fletcher, 2005: 62).

Barnardo was persistent in his pastoral role up until his death in 1905. Barnardo “opened a sanatorium for young consumptives close by the Girls’ Village Home” (Fletcher, 2005: 60) in 1904. During his last year, he was “suffering deafness, repeated attacks of angina and a weakening constitution” (Fletcher, 2005: 60). Barnardo died at the age of sixty in 1905 leaving a network of pastoral power that continued to operate, without his supervision.

Parr (1994: 82 [1980]) explains “the experience of the rescue Home Children in Canada is well documented precisely because they found themselves as young immigrant workers, twice outsiders: beyond the help of kin and the solidarity of their own nationality.” These experiences as labourers, apprentices and service workers are documented “in letters and visitors’ and inspectors’ reports” (Parr, 1994: 82 [1980]). These stories demonstrate themes of pastoral power including obedience, personal submission and salvation. These themes translate into expressions of identity formation (Butler, 1993) and examples are demonstrated throughout the memoirs of Barnardo

⁹³ Fletcher (2005: 62) includes, “And of the 8,000 over 1,300 were disabled.” Barnardo and Mrs. Barnardo learned more about children with special needs after they had their daughter Marjorie who had been diagnosed with Down syndrome.

(Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]), biographical accounts of Barnardo (Wagner, 1979; Bready, 1932 [1930]; Batt, 1904) and of his organization (Fletcher, 2005; Rose, 1987). This study broadens the concept of pastoral power utilizing the method of performativity (Butler, 1997) to translate the experiences and expressions of Barnardo Home Children.

As mentioned in chapter three, Butler (1993: xi) conceives of gender as a “constitutive constraint” conditioning our everyday experience “without which we would not be able to think, to live, to make sense at all.” Butler (1993) is interested in how the body is “lived and experienced in specific contexts” (Benhabib and Cornell (eds.), 1987: 128).

Parr (1994: 82-83 [1980]) explains the work of Canadian farm children during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, writing that “an average 8-year-old boy began fetching wood and water for the house, gathering eggs from the hen-house, bringing cows in from the back fields, and feeding pigs. In addition, he probably did some housework and child-care, especially when the adults of the household were away. In the west, boys 10 to 13 rode with the herds to keep browsing cattle from feasting on unfenced crops. In the east, boys 12 to 14 learned to milk and, like their western peers, to drive a gentle working team in less demanding field tasks such as harrowing or raking. Boys 14 to 16 worked as men.” Parr (1994: 83 [1980]) writes girls began their work earlier, “from age 6 minding members of the family younger than themselves.” Parr (1994: 83 [1980]) explains, “From 8 to 12 they also swept, did dishes, set the table and began to learn simple cookery. Although British-Canadian conventions generally kept them from the fields, these younger girls did some outside work, leading horses with

loads of hay or hoeing and harvesting in market gardens.” The older girls aged 14 to 18 “did more heavy housework, cleaning floors and grates and stoves, and washed more clothes than the other women of the house. They did simple cooking and as they grew more trusted by the family helped as well in the cash-earning dairy and poultry enterprises of the farm.” A Barnardo girl who came to Canada in 1903 recalls finally being placed with a young woman and her mother, whom she spent fifteen years with, recollecting: “I loved to cut the wood with a cross cut saw securing the log with my foot, whistling away, happy as a lark” (Corbett, 2002: 81 [1997]).

Many Home Children kept their early life a closely guarded secret, David Lorente,⁹⁴ who founded the support network ‘Home Children Canada,’ explains: “Several told me they tore the page detailing their history out of the family Bible because they were ashamed. Other children were told not to play with Home Children, not to sit next to them at school and certainly not to invite them home” (Avery, 1999: L1). Expressions of shame are recounted by British Home Children, often recorded by their descendants, when describing early life in Canada (Clark, 2010; Avery, 1999; Medel, 1998). Home children provided cheap labour for Canadian farms but were often called “nobody’s children” (Medel, 1998: 2; Murdoch, 2006); labelled as outcasts from Britain. Stories of maltreatment are cited in chronicled reflections of British Home Children and “the Canadian Centre for Home Children estimates 65% of the children were subjected to physical, sexual or emotional abuse” (Clark, 2010: E6). The stories of Barnardo Home Children are eclectic and each British home child has a unique story of their own, but

⁹⁴ David Lorente was interviewed by the Barnardo Guild Messenger (Church (ed.), 2003: 6) for his volunteer work in promoting and supporting the British Home Children of Canada. Not only an advocate, Lorente also connects Home Children and their descendants with Barnardo’s child migrant team in After Care and helps trace family histories that are connected to a British home child (Church (ed.), 2003).

certainly a common denominator of each story is their expression of vulnerability in transitioning to Canada (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Parr, 1994 [1980]).

Corbett (2002 [1997]) chronicles stories of Home Children such as memories of their journeys to Canada and their experiences once arriving. Corbett (2002: 80 [1997]) documents the same Barnardo girl cited above recalling her journey to Canada in 1903: “Mr. A. B. Owen, the head Canadian man came to get us. We were so excited to get a ride on the boat that we didn’t worry much. As we came close to the Canadian shoreline the trees were splendid with colour and I remember saying, “Do trees grow like this in Canada?” I was ten years old. We arrived in Montreal and I can remember sitting on the floor in the Montreal Station, our bags scattered all around us. Finally, we arrived in Peterborough. We had trunks with our full name and number on the front and in the trunks we had clothes, a Bible, a Sankey Hymn Book and a toy.” The same Barnardo home girl recalls her first placement: “by 12 years old I had matured into young womanhood which frightened me terribly having no knowledge of it. My periods stopped and the farm woman accused me of playing around with the hired boy as we worked in the fields side by side. She took me to the village doctor and sent me back to Hazelbrae complaining that there was something physically wrong with me. The Hazelbrae doctor prescribed medicine and soon things were back to normal.”

The expressions shared by this particular Barnardo home girl articulate the shame of being an ‘outsider,’ having a lack of familial ties to guide her. Parr (1994: 116 [1980]) explains “moving frequently between situations, young apprentices were unlikely to develop compensating relationships with Canadian women.” Barnardo Home Children actively reconfigured gender norms and the concept of ‘the family’ (Dean, 1991) when

migrating to Canada, through performing their labouring duties and numerous transitions in placements (Parr, 1994 [1980]).

The British home girls were more susceptible to maltreatment than young women; “Miss Macpherson’s wards in southwestern Ontario lost good homes after they reached puberty because their mistresses feared the ‘great responsibility’ of governing the sexuality of such girls” (Parr 1994: 114 [1980]). Parr (1994: 115 [1980]) writes of situations where British home girls were sexually abused “by hired men, masters or their sons” and adds “resorts to court were rarely successful either in prosecutions for rape or in suits to establish paternity.” The home girls were often vague in their descriptions and the exact date(s) of the abuse and scared of the persecutions they may face when revealing the abuse (Parr, 1994 [1980]). These stories of maltreatment also accounts for the silence Home Children maintained concerning their childhood as adults (Swain and Hillel, 2010).

Parr (1994: 99 [1980]) writes, “British child-savers were surprised that their young people were only tolerated, not welcomed, in Canadian households.” Barnardo children had little understanding “about the circumstances which had separated them from their families, many felt shame or resentment toward their own kin and hence animosity toward their own kind” (Parr, 1994: 99 [1980]). Barnardo, and other emigrant sponsors, “looked past childhood inconveniences to the serious concerns of adulthood” (Parr, 1994: 123 [1980]). The isolation and disheartened experiences of Home Children were a price to pay for the entire ‘flock’ to be ‘saved’ in the eyes of Barnardo and other emigrant sponsors (Parr, 1994 [1980]). Later in their adulthood, a minority of British Home Children would seek restitution for their maltreatment in the Barnardo institution

and placements in Canada (Carr, 2002). One man who launched a class-action lawsuit against the Barnardo organization recalled: “They placed us on farms and the farmer was supposed to send us to school and to church... it never happened” (Carr, 2002: A9).

Parr (1994: 85 [1980]) explains “the uncommon feature among the child immigrants was that, unlike Canadian-born boarders, servants or apprentices, they did not stay with their own families or in an institution until they were 12 or 14 and near their adult strength.” The children also did not have knowledge the local children had in rudimentary tasks that were required of them (Parr, 1994 [1980]). Barnardo established stages for his Home children, referring to these as ‘boarding out,’ ‘board, clothing and school’ and ‘wage’ to help transition children into the labour force (Parr, 1994 [1980]). These stages were to help reimburse Home Children for their work and also breakdown ages and wage compensation. These stages corresponded to the age groups: ‘6 to 10,’ ‘11 to 14’ and ‘14 and up’ (Parr, 1994 [1980]). Philanthropic agencies during this time realized that the role of children in Canada during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was to supply labour therefore apprenticeship was preferred over adoption so that the British home child would be compensated for their work (Parr, 1994 [1980]).⁹⁵

The transition from being institutionalized in urban Britain to domestic life in rural Canada was a straining process for British Home Children (Parr, 1994 [1980]).

Florence Holtby,⁹⁶ at age eighty-seven, recalls the last time she saw her mother: “I clutched her dress so hard that when she pulled away, it tore” (Avery, 1999: L1). Holtby

⁹⁵ Parr (1994: 86 [1980]) furthers: “The rural proportion of the Canadian population declined during the era of child immigration from 80 per cent in 1871 to 50 percent in 1921. The impact of this decline was mostly marked in rural Ontario, where young men and women left their homes for better prospects in urban industry or the agricultural west.” Nonetheless, emigrant children were still in-demand as Canadian households used them to relieve everyday household chores (Parr, 1994: 86 [1980]).

⁹⁶ See Appendix A and B.

had been sent to the Girls' Village Homes in Basingstoke, Essex at the age of seven in 1920 and would sail to Canada in 1922 at the age of nine (Avery, 1999: L1). Holtby was first sent to a childless couple and recalls the husband being nice to her but the wife being resentful: "She made fun of the way I talked and wouldn't let me see my sister, even at Christmas" (Avery, 1999: L2). Holtby and her sister had been placed five kilometers apart in Cambellford, east of Peterborough (Avery, 1999). In total Holtby was placed in seven Canadian homes, her last placement recorded in 1930. The transition of placements also contributed to the isolation British Home Children experienced as expressed in their "irritated letters to the home's offices" (Parr, 1994: 101 [1980]).

The 'constitutive constraint' of pastoral power led children to be placed in vulnerable situations once arriving to Canada. The reflections and expressions of British Home Children in their experiences of childhood in Canada are linked to the lack of autonomy they had as British pauper children. The salvation and pastoral guidance of British Home Children was focused on their lives as adults. The pastoral guidance of Barnardo relies on themes of salvation, personal submission and obedience with the ultimate goal of his British pauper children to leave their situations of destitution and become productive adults. Swain and Hillel (2010: 159) suggest stories from British child emigrants often include "both a pride in their achievements and a resentment of the stigma which often accompanied an institutional childhood." The vulnerability of the child emigrant is shared in "survivor narratives, in family histories, published autobiographies and autobiographical novels, and evidence before government enquiries" (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 159). These expressions of both survival and resentment can be

traced to their governance as a pauper child through the pastoral techniques enacted on them.

The preceding analysis was concerned with how discourse controls and manages the bodies of ‘pauper children’ and the techniques of power chosen for their governance. The aim of this chapter was to provide a socio-historical study of Dr. Barnardo and Barnardo Home Children. This study undertook a feminist genealogical analysis, which involved a sociological analysis of programmatic and policy documents pertaining to the project of migrating children. This study explored these through the memoirs and biographical accounts of Barnardo, newspaper and journal articles pertaining to British child emigration, published literature by the Barnardo organization and a technical book supplied to children who migrated to Canada by the Barnardo organization.

Narratives chronicled by Barnardo Home Children (Parr, 1994 [1980]; Avery, 1999; Corbett, 2002 [1997]) provide meaning into the formation of child-saving practices in Britain and Canadian ideals and values of “the modern state” (Dean, 1994: 185).

Child-saving in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is connected to the “conception of the state” (Dean, 1994: 183) and how this rationality is united into the ‘conception of the self.’ The following research explored the relationship between practices of government and practices of the self (Dean, 1994: 216). As children were not always the concern of the state, philanthropists during this time were influential in changing how we now see the welfare of children (Parr, 1994 [1980]). The child becomes a ‘competency’ of the state as the networks surrounding the child during the nineteenth century constitute it as a governable ‘object’ (Swain and Hillel, 2010; Miller and Rose, 1992).

The study of governmentality allowed me to understand how “historical forms of the relation of self to self, that is, the development of reflexivity (the capacity for the monitoring of thought and conduct and the self-regulation of behaviours) can only be fully understood in relation to the development and transformation of modes of government” (Dean, 1994: 211). This study is interested in how Barnardo Home Children formed themselves “in relation to moral codes and universal prescriptions, laws and values” (Dean, 1994: 212) and how the Barnardo home child is “formed, and forms itself, within techniques and practices of power, self, and knowledge, or ethical, governmental, and rational practices” (Dean, 1994: 212). I did this through a feminist genealogical method.

Barnardo established the ‘shepherd-flock’ game within “the genealogy of the welfare state” (Dean 1994: 209). Barnardo combined elements of ‘pastoral power’ and ‘citizenship’ and linking these to “individualising and totalising elements that construct human beings as both self-governing individuals within a self-governing political community and clients to be administered, governed, and normalized with respect to governmental objectives” (Dean, 1994: 209). Barnardo establishes the ‘shepherd-flock’ game when he applies the “techniques and themes of the care of the self” (Dean, 1994: 209). Themes that encompass these techniques are “obedience, personal submission, and salvation” (Dean, 1994: 209). Themes of obedience, personal submission and salvation are embedded in discourses of child-saving and construct an identity surrounding the ‘pauper child,’ the British home child. The form of knowledge surrounding the complex practices of British child emigration in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries involves both governmentality and pastoral power. This analysis was concerned with the

ways in which these processes were exercised by Barnardo through his philanthropic agency and British legislation pertaining to ‘pauper children.’

CONCLUSION: NEGOTIATING THE PAST

“It is the resurrection of childhood, the revival of mirth, a glorious reformation! They have been emancipated from the dead weight of the past, from a life without hope, and their feet planted upon the rock of safety upon which these institutions are built. As from a block of rude stone the sculptor chisels a divine form, so from the waste material picked from the human refuse-heaps have emerged the most glorious manhood, the most exquisite womanhood. The turning of the rebel into a law-abiding citizen, thus steadily raising the character of the nation, beginning at the bottom, is a far-reaching reformation. It is the salvation of the democracy of the forgotten, and their initiation into privileges and responsibilities of citizenship; the silent upbuilding of the social body, which the nation is coming to recognise is going on in its midst, meagerly supported compared with its inestimable value to the race.”

(Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 255-56 [1907], quoting James Marchant from *Night and Day* [1904])

This study concerns child-saving practices and techniques enacted by Dr. Thomas Barnardo on the British children he migrated to Canada, known as Barnardo Home Children. To begin this study, I drew upon existing child-saving literature and then proceeded to introduce the method of genealogy. I identified several connections between pastoral power and the mass child migration project established by Barnardo. However, I also focused on the lived experiences of Barnardo Home Children and have considered the ways in which they articulate their identities in relation to pastoral and disciplinary modes of power.

This study is informed by the work of Michel Foucault, Mitchell Dean and Judith Butler. In particular, this study is informed by an analytical toolbox containing the

genealogical method of history (Foucault, 1991b [1980]), Foucauldian-feminist insights on power relations (Foucault, 1980; Bell, 1999; McNay, 1992), pastoral power as developed by Foucault (2007 [1978]) and the method of performativity as formulated by Butler (1993; 1990); thereby assisting in the investigation of the discursive ‘nature’ of child-saving and the pastoral role Barnardo fostered in governing ‘pauper children’ between 1867 to 1905.

Exploring the philanthropic initiatives of Barnardo and the lived experiences of British Home Children in the context of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries reveals a continual reconfiguration of the identity of the ‘pauper child.’ Utilizing socio-historical research, this study attempts to delve deep into the pastoral role of Barnardo and the lived experiences of his governed subjects. Particular interests are how Barnardo Home Children were treated on account of governing techniques and processes during the period 1867 to 1905. The analysis of this study engages with the “symbolic legitimacy and intelligibility” (Butler, 1993: 3) of the Barnardo organization and how the child migration scheme was exercised and embodied among the governed. This sociological inquiry offers an interdisciplinary focus into child-saving studies during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This study is also interested in how ‘governmental rationality’ was concerned with the practices and experiences of Barnardo Home Children (cf. Chen, 2001; Dean, 1994).

This study uses the example of Barnardo and the lived experiences of Barnardo Home Children during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to demonstrate how to undertake a Foucauldian-feminist analysis (cf. Bell, 1999; Butler, 1993; McNay, 1992). The aim is to show how the genealogical method, as developed by Foucault

(1991b [1980]), can be applied through this study of Barnardo and his involvement in the mass child migration movement between 1882 and 1905. This study draws primarily on an analysis of child-saving techniques and practices enacted by Barnardo, in order to trace the ways British Home Children, in particular Barnardo Home Children, are governed and with what effects (Dean, 1999) within the study of child-saving and in the actual lived experiences of the child migrants themselves.

The conceptual framework outlined for this study is guided by governmentality, pastoral power and performativity. Dean (1994: 179) explains governmentality as a study that “can be read as an attempt to displace the macro-micro division or to at least give explicit recognition to the relative nature of this distinction.” Dean (1994: 179) further states that “questions of the ‘how’ of power and rule, its mechanisms, its techniques, its strategies, its objectives and effects, can be asked of the ‘global’ forms of power just as they can be asked of the micropowers.” A governmentality study of the mass child migration scheme, organized by Barnardo, questions how the power and rule of the governed home child was enacted (Dean, 1994). To understand the mechanisms and techniques of power enacted on pauper children, I analyze how Barnardo took on a pastoral role within his child-saving work during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. I connect how Barnardo reflected on his guidance and role as the shepherd to his flock, highlighting the shepherd-flock theme presented throughout his memoirs (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]) and biographies written about him and his work (cf. Fletcher, 2005; Rose, 1987; Wagner, 1979; Williams, 1966; Bready, 1932 [1930]; Batt, 1904). This study also analyzes how pastoral themes of obedience, personal submission and salvation are demonstrated through techniques and practices enacted by

Barnardo and what the effects of these pastoral themes have on the formation of identities and lived experiences of Home Children.

Foucault (1991b: 74 [1980]) describes the genealogical method as “philosophical fragments put to work in a historical field of problems.” In his essay “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History,” Foucault argues that traditional history is a ‘transcendental teleology’; “events are inserted in universal explanatory schemas and linear structures and, thereby, given a false unity” (McNay, 1992: 13). In other words, a genealogical study examines how regimes of practices are historically related to regimes of truth (Foucault, 1991b [1980]). Genealogy involves the “the isolation of discontinuities [which] constitutes the starting point of genealogy” (Sawicki, 1991: 57). This study argues a change occurred in the way ‘pauper children’ were perceived in moral and political discourse becoming ‘targets to be governed’ (Dean, 1999; Foucault, 1991a [1978]) in the late nineteenth century. Namely, whereas they were once thought to be incorrigible, Barnardo and other philanthropists consciously worked to spread the view destitute children can be reformed through discipline and regimentation (Swain and Hillel, 2010). This study is concerned with material conditions, knowledges and practices that conditioned how these children became “subjects of government” (Petersen and Bunton (eds.), 1997: 175). I do this through the use of governmentality (cf. Miller and Rose, 2008; Dean, 1999; 1994).

Judith Butler (1993: 5) emphasizes ‘nature’ has a history “and not merely a social one, but, also, that sex is positioned ambiguously in relation to that concept and its history.” Feminists have struggled with the historical contestations of the concept ‘sex’ and often neglect how it is “covered over by the figure of the site or surface of

inscription” (Butler, 1993: 5). According to Butler (2004: 29), “the body is not understood as a static and accomplished fact, but as an ageing process, a mode of becoming that, in becoming otherwise, exceeds the norms, reworks the norm, and makes us see how realities to which we thought we were confined are not written in stone.” Butler (1997) reiterates how the body expresses its own linguistic meanings through her method of performativity (in Salih, 2013 [2002]). Butler (1997) uses performativity to emphasize how we are linguistic beings and how our identities are constituted through our performative practices and expressions (in Salih, 2013 [2002]). This study is concerned with how pauper children became a ‘target to be governed’ (Dean, 1999), emphasizing these techniques and processes through the mass child emigration scheme organized by Barnardo, but also through the lived experiences of Home Children. By doing so it looks at the maintenance of pastoral ideals involved in forming ‘British Home Children’ as viable subjects to be constituted (Butler, 1991).

Child-saving studies pertaining to Barnardo encompass a rich empirical domain in which to study the ‘embodied performativity’ (Butler, 1997) of child migrants; serving as a key reference point for a practical feminist study, one that offers insights into how the gendered identities of Barnardo Home Children are formulated and governed. The method of performativity enables research to focus on how British Home Children negotiated and asserted their identities as skilled migrant workers when coming Canada, while also at times resisting the institutional structures that brought them to Canada (cf. Swain and Hillel, 2010; Parr, 1994 [1980]). This study investigates the performative expressions of Home Children through the means of collected accounts by British Home Children (Corbett, 2002 [1997]; Avery, 1999) and collected material by descendants of

British Home Children (Church (ed.), 2003; Avery, 1999; Medel, 1998; Perry (ed.), 1993).

The objective of this study is to combine elements of feminist social history through the genealogical method, as conceived by Foucault (1991b [1980]), in an attempt to understand how during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries mass child emigration of British Home Children to Canada was constituted through social policy and what the effects of this governance signify (Dean, 1999). Through a sociological analysis this study questions how ‘governmental rationality’ is concerned with the practices of Barnardo Home Children. This study asks how pastoral power, as developed by Foucault (2007 [1978]), was exercised and embodied among the governed children.

Chen (2001: 15) explains “the genealogy approach seeks to document the marginalized elements of the past so as to show that the model of doing child protection work today does not have to be the only model.” The aim of this research was to understand how between 1882 and 1905 British child migration was constituted through techniques of pastoral power by Barnardo and ask with what effects (Dean, 1999). Chen (2001: 20) further indicates that “what has to be questioned is the particular form of rationality at stake.” Child-saving in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was influenced by pastoral modes of power and ultimately rationalized a mass British child migration scheme that targeted the children ‘pauper parents.’ It was through the method of genealogy that I was able to understand how governmental rationality was concerned with the practices of Barnardo and his Home Children.

The analysis of this study emphasizes how pastoral power was exercised and embodied among the governed British child ‘pauper’ population. This study was also

interested in how, during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, British child emigration to Canada was constituted through social policy and with what practical effects (Dean, 1994; 1999). This particular sociological research translates to an interdisciplinary topic offering a theoretical framework of analysis pertaining to child-saving discourses and further analysis pertaining to the lived experiences of child migrants. The aim of this study was to explore the practices of Barnardo between 1867 and 1905 and understand how techniques of the Christian pastorate translate to notions of citizenship and child-saving. Swain and Hillel (2010: 3) explain during the nineteenth century, “constructions of an ideal childhood” were primarily based on the dichotomous relationship of either the romanticized child or the child who was a product of “the grimmer realities of industrialising Britain.” The belief system of evangelicalism was embedded in nineteenth century discourse; “books and periodicals designed to support child rescue were part of a long tradition of writing for children which emphasised charity, class and Christianity” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 4). These themes are signified in narratives written by Barnardo and the lived experiences of Barnardo Home Children.

Concentrating on the time period 1867 and 1905, the aim of this research was concerned with how child-saving and mass child migration practices were formed and regulated. The purpose of this demonstration was to understand the roles of the ‘shepherd and flock’ in which Barnardo had developed prior to migrating children to Canada and throughout the emergence of the mass child migration scheme. I focus on the shepherd-flock relationship, which involves themes of salvation, personal submission and obedience (Foucault, 2007 [1978]). It is through these themes that I was able to better understand how techniques and methods of pastoral power operate. Additionally,

the analysis was concerned with themes of the guidance and conversion of British pauper children and the establishment of institutional homes and eventual emigration scheme guided by Barnardo.

Foucault emphasizes the problem of truth and asks: “What is history, given there is continually being produced within it a separation of true and false?” (Dean, 1994: 215). This study is not concerned with finding the truth behind allegations made against Barnardo but rather demonstrate how the feature of pastoral power is operated during the time period studied.

I have analyzed how ‘technologies of government’ were enacted as a mode of pastoral power (Foucault, 2007 [1978]); Chen, 2001). This study has analyzed ‘technologies of government’ pertaining to the mass child migration of British Home Children, such as narratives collected in memoirs and biographical accounts of Barnardo, newspaper and journal articles pertaining to British child emigration, published literature by the Barnardo organization and a technical book supplied to children who migrated to Canada by the Barnardo organization. It was through these resources that I was able to analyze key techniques of pastoral power: obedience, personal submission and salvation. These themes were not only evident in narratives pertaining to Barnardo but also the experiences of the governed subjects he instituted, Barnardo Home Children.

The pastoral themes of obedience, personal submission and salvation were evident in early narratives concerning the early evangelical mission work of Barnardo; revealing the emergence of his servitude to his flock (Foucault, 2007 [1978]). The pastoral passage of Barnardo is demonstrated by four events in 1867 and 1868, which further guided Barnardo towards his work in child-saving: “the first incident – the receipt

of £1000 – which he regarded as a turning-point of his life; the second – the discovery of his first Arab; the third – his first public address at the Agricultural Hall; the fourth – his invitation to dine with Lord Shaftesbury” (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007: 76 [1907]).

These early missionary events influenced Barnardo towards taking on the pastoral role through his ‘calling’ in saving the ‘destitute child.’ More importantly, these events are explored through an analysis of presenting the pastoral passage of how Barnardo established institutions for Home Children. Barnardo had positioned himself as the Christian pastorate, consequently rationalizing his own methods of intervening on behalf of the children he ‘saved’ and ultimately forming his ‘flock.’

Barnardo institutionalized his own emigration scheme in 1882 to accommodate the continual flow of children being admitted into his homes and also to expand his child-saving endeavors of removing ‘destitute’ children from urban Britain (Wagner, 1979). To undertake such a mass migration Barnardo had connected himself to “a whole network of servitude” (Foucault, 2007: 184 [1978]). Barnardo was adamant on developing an emigration scheme of his own and systemized training, education and housing for children who were first admitted into his homes before immigrating to Canada. As the Christian pastorate, Barnardo takes on the problem of the salvation of destitute children inserting his own techniques of “circulation, transfer, and reversal of merits” (Foucault, 2007: 183 [1978]). The institutionalized housing, training and education systems Barnardo structured “becomes the element through which the pastor’s power is exercised, by which obedience is practiced, by which the relationship of complete obedience is assured, and through which, precisely, the economy of merits and faults passes” (Foucault, 2007: 183 [1978]).

The Christian pastor exercises power through reconfigurations of children and childhood, in particular ‘destitute’ children and produces hidden truths enabling the practice of obedience⁹⁷ (Foucault, 2007: 183 [1978]). The techniques and strategies enacted by Barnardo, the Christian pastorate, attributed to “notions of conduct” (Foucault, 2007: 194 [1978]) regarding philanthropic agencies and the guided flock of ‘destitute’ children. Codes of conduct were enacted on British Home Children through apprenticeship guidelines, as exhibited in the analysis of a technical booklet given to each Barnardo Home Child who migrated to Canada. Codes of conduct were also instituted by the Canadian homes children were placed in. Apprenticeships of migrant children were favored over adoption as child labour during the period under study was an everyday reality in rural Canadian homes. Apprenticeships authorized ‘codes of conduct’ by both the employer and the British home child as guidelines were instituted in the form of indenture contracts, “making the economic foundation of the relationship explicit” (Parr, 1994: 87 [1980]).

Training for these Canadian placements was “strictly gendered” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 135). The early establishment of homes for boys focused on “existing street trades, controlling their earnings and providing them with food and shelter at nights” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 135). Barnardo also established workshops to sustain his institutional operations and offered more training opportunities for boys (Parr, 1994 [1980]). Training for girls at the Girls’ Village Homes at Ilford prepared girls “to be domestics in their adult life” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 135). After a failed attempt at

⁹⁷ Foucault (2007: 183) argues, “It is not salvation, the law, and the truth, but these new relationships of merits and faults, absolute obedience, and the production of hidden truths, which constitute, I think, what is essential and the originality and specificity of Christianity.”

institutionalizing girls like the boys, Barnardo instead adapted the ‘family model’ for his Girls’ Village Homes at Ilford (Bready, 1932 [1930]). As described in the previous chapter, “each cottage is a separate home, and each home has its own “mother,” generally a young vigorous widow of refinement, who directs, or rather leads, the affairs of the household” (Bready, 1932: 34 [1930]). Cottages often had a baby and an older sister of fifteen or sixteen years old (Bready, 1932 [1930]). These systems of housing, educating and training boys and girls exhibit how Barnardo disciplined his flock and established pastoral merits.

The pastoral expressions of British Home Children are represented in collected narratives by British Home Children and their descendants. These narratives offer a counter-discourse to the prevailing child-saving ideas of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The lived experiences of Barnardo Home Children translate to ‘practices’ of pastoral expressions. By this I mean pastoralism regulated and formed the identity of the British home child but had adverse effects on childhood experiences in Canada. I use narratives by British Home Children to demonstrate experiences of both appreciation and suffering during their institutionalized childhoods. Child rescuers, who sponsored child migrants to come to Canada, “looked past childhood inconveniences to the serious concerns of adulthood” (Parr, 1994: 123 [1980]). British child rescuers “measured the practical success of their mission by the proportion of young people they permanently separated from urban life and the labouring class, rescued from the chaos of the cities for the settled respectability of rural communities” (Parr, 1994: 124 [1980]). The personal obedience and conversion of each British home child was presented as a necessary means to ensure their salvation in adulthood. The effects of pastoral power, even though they

were enacted with good intentions, had placed children into vulnerable situations in which they were often taken advantage of.

Social attitudes towards emigrating British children during the early twentieth century has often been conceptualized as an imperial⁹⁸ endeavour “which assumed that the child at risk was both white and Anglo-Saxon, and as such entitled to a share in the racial and imperial privilege that this status involved, even though, in practical terms, that privilege was always moderated by class” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 124). The ‘privilege’ was a British heritage for the young ‘waifs’ in dire need, the opportunity for a better life in a new country (Swain and Hillel, 2010). Swain and Hillel (2010: 80) note the racialized imagery used by Barnardo and how it “functioned to shame and shock” in nineteenth and early twentieth century child-saving discourse. Swain and Hillel (2010: 80-1) note how “the racialised discourse of child rescue created an inner city in which race, class and tribe intertwined, embellished with such negative even threatening descriptors as ‘feeble and famished’, ‘ragged’ and predatory’.” Swain and Hillel (2010: 81) do caution that “the use of similar language to describe working-class Britons and Aboriginal, African or other Indigenous peoples did not mean, however, that they were thought of as the same.” The racialized child-saving discourses concerning British Home Children “did not undermine the implicit advantages of whiteness” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 83). Swain and Hillel (2010: 83) argue the racialized discourse served to indicate “the threat posed by urban degeneracy.” Racialized language to describe the children

⁹⁸ Parr (1994: 143 [1980]) explains: “In the years immediately before the First World War child emigration became an imperial work. In church weeklies, in the Christian and in the publications of the rescue homes charitable Britons were urged to combine their philanthropy with imperialism, their ‘love of children with a love of empire’, to think of child emigrants as ‘Bricks for Empire-Building’ and of the unsettled lands of the Dominion as the ‘natural heritage of the British race’.”

Barnardo 'saved' was explicitly used, as displayed in his narrative 'My first Arab' (Barnardo and Marchant, 2007 [1907]).

The analysis provided in this study raises questions about child-saving, conceptions of identity and modes of power (Chen, 2001) designed for targeting and governing British Home Children. Further research in the field of child-saving requires researchers to question "how governing practices involve multiple actors, practices, forms of power, and sites of politics that extend beyond, below, between, and across the territorial state rather than simply within it" (Rygiel, 2008: 216). This research translates into an example of how the assemblage of a mass British child migration scheme involved "a range of actors and practices that challenge the way we think about the relationship of governing and space and the location of politics" (Rygiel, 2008: 216). It also presents gender as a technique and strategy for institutionalizing and ultimately migrating Barnardo Home Children to Canada.

In addition, an analysis of current Barnardo's After-Care techniques and methods would enable an understanding of how techniques and strategies are still present in negotiating this history and identity of the British Home Child. More generally, further research into the history and present emergence of child welfare would enable a reconfiguration of what Chen (2008: 169) describes as the "birth of the child-citizen." It would be useful to expand on how British Home Children were reconfigured as Canadian child-citizens and further analyze collected narratives by Home Children and their descendants. Conceptualized as both a 'threat' and 'nation-builder,' the identity of the Barnardo home child has been continually reworked (Swain and Hillel, 2010; Parr, 1994 [1980]).

The limitations of this analysis are outlined in an interview with Foucault, entitled ‘Questions of Method’ (Dean, 1994: 215) encompassing four ideas: “how the production of the division between truth and falsity is fundamental to *our*⁹⁹ historicity; how this relation operates within those societies that call themselves ‘Western’ and that claim universal status for a knowledge that is constantly transforming; what historical knowledge can be expected of a history that undermines the truth-falsity division on which it depends; and finally, the general problem of truth.” The sociological analysis offered in this chapter does not “ground itself in truth” (Dean, 1994: 215). Rather, an investigation into the practices and techniques utilized by Barnardo offers an analysis into the formation of British Home Children and the “multiplicity of means” (Dean, 1994: 216) that is enacted on these governed ‘pauper children.’ This study was interested in the multiplicity of methods that were designed to regulate the identity of Home Children migrating to Canada through the modes of pastoral power and performativity.

The concept of the child-citizen is problematic and research requires asking “what are the effects of a child-centred ideology” (Chen, 2008: 174). Having shown that children were often forcibly separated from their parents, I believe this study to be only a starting point in asking what the practical effects of child-saving discourses are. Chen (2008: 169) argues “that the young are now considered to be a crucial element of the vitality of the population.” The migrant child within citizenship projects is not a new phenomenon but rather has served multiple means of justifying the interventions made by child-savers (Chen, 2008). The analysis was concerned with how Barnardo justified

⁹⁹ Italics are author’s emphasis.

intervening on British Home Children and what the effects of such an involvement had on the ‘flock.’

The Canadian childhoods of British Home Children were not the primary interest of British child-savers, as they were concerned with the productive value these children had in adulthood (Parr, 1994 [1980]). Parr (1994 [1980]) notes the difficulties case files of British Home Children pose to researchers. Parr (1994: 125 [1980]) writes: “Even the homes that maintained regular contact with their young wards did not follow them systematically after they completed their indentures.” Swain and Hillel (2010: 162) note “the magazines published by child rescue organisations rarely mentioned instances of failure or abuse, but traces have survived in newspaper articles and official reports.” Further research utilizing empirical sources pertaining to these instances would develop an even deeper insight into the effects of such strategies and techniques on the targeted British Home Child population.

Many British Home Children who immigrated to Canada often hid their past “bringing a further isolation by cutting connections with anyone who could betray their secret” (Swain and Hillel, 2010: 165). Unfortunately many of these hidden histories were never discussed when Home Children themselves were alive. Today, descendants of Home Children are seeking answers to their hidden family histories (Morrison, 2006). Morrison (2006: 2) explains “the subsequent establishment of a number of voluntary organisations such as Home Children Canada and Quarriers Canadian Family mark a relatively recent shift towards addressing, acknowledging, and commemorating the overlooked histories of child migration, child labour and social marginalisation.” The mandates of such organizations are to “record experiences of Home Children, re-value

and affirm their contribution to national history, help their descendants access records of their family history and origins, hold reunions, and involve themselves in web-based networks which link the descendants of Home Children to each other” (Morrison, 2006: 2-3). These techniques and strategies serve as a counter-discourse to the child-saving discourse of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd apologized on behalf of the Government of Australia in 2009 and the British Prime Minister Gordon Brown apologized on behalf of the United Kingdom Government in 2010 for the injustices migrant children faced between the late nineteenth century and until 1967 when the child migration scheme had been abolished (Hooper and Teh, 2010). The Canadian Government has not apologized for their involvement in the child migration scheme which sent over 100,000 British children to Canada. After Australia had first passed a motion to apologize, Canadian Immigration Minister Jason Kenney told CBC (2009) reporters “Canadians don’t expect their government to apologize for every sad event in history... we have laid out some criteria for that, and the reality is we haven’t seen a demand or an expectation for that.” Minister Kenney further indicated that “the difference between Australia and Canada is that in Australia it has been an issue of long-standing public interest” (CBC, 2009). Swain and Hillel (2010: 170) describe stories of exploitation from British Home Children who migrated to both Canada and Australia stating, “irrespective of whether they had emigrated or were placed out in their country of origin, children came to see themselves as ‘slave labour’, ‘chattles’ doomed by their inadequate education.” These self-reflexive narratives are an effect of the pastoral guidance that was enacted onto them through their institutionalized childhoods and continual governance as child labourers in Canada.

The Government of Canada did declare 2010 the “Year of the British Home Child.” Minister Kenney spoke of this acknowledgement: “The Government of Canada recognizes the hardships suffered by British Home Children and their perseverance and courage in overcoming those hardships. Over the next year, the Government of Canada will honour the great strength and determination of this group of child immigrants, and reflect on the tremendous contributions made by former Home Children and their descendants to the building of Canada.” While the Canadian Government did acknowledge Home Children through commemorative stamps and museum exhibitions they have not made any attempt to apologize for the involvement of the state in the migration scheme of British Home Children.

Swain and Hillel (2010: 2) insightfully argue “apologies are essentially symbolic, a public acknowledgement which reverses the previous understandings of the dominant group and validates the views of the survivors.” On state apologies, Swain and Hillel (2010: 2) added: “of themselves they produce no practical change, although they can create a climate in which such change can be negotiated.” The identity of the British home child has been historically negotiated to serve a contextual rationale in child-saving discourses. In other words, the identities of British child migrants are reconfigured to serve as a justification for techniques and practices enacted onto them (Chen, 2008). It is important to question “forms of rationality” and how they “depend on and operate through particular social and historical institutions, and the practices, techniques, strategies and modes of calculation that traverse them” (Dean, 1994: 59-60).

The aim of this study was to provide an analysis of child-saving discourses between 1867 and 1905 concerning the techniques and strategies enacted by Dr.

Barnardo onto the governed subjects he targeted, the ‘destitute’ children of urban Britain. Barnardo formed the ‘shepherd-flock’ relationship and combined elements of pastoral power and citizenship into his emigration scheme. I argue themes of obedience, personal submission and salvation are embedded in discourses surrounding Barnardo and his Home Children and are presented in the performative ‘practices’ of Barnardo Home Children. The forms of knowledges within complex techniques and strategies of British child migration in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries involve the pastoral guidance of child migrants. It is my hope that this study offers an analysis of how forms of rationality pertaining to the mass British child migration scheme relied and operated through pastoral power.

APPENDIX A

Barnardo's Admittance Photo: Florence Holtby, Age 7

Florence Holtby was admitted to Barnardo's on October 5, 1920. She sailed to Canada on the SS Minnedosa on September 14, 1922 arriving in Quebec on September 28, 1922 (Avery, 1999).

APPENDIX B

Florence Holtby and the Barnardo trunk she was sent with on her journey to Canada in 1922 (Medel, 1999).

BRAD MEDEL PHOTO

Florence Holtby still cherishes the trunk Barnardo Homes gave her before she left England in 1922. Along with the trunk she was given a Bible, copy of Pilgrim's Progress and a hymn book. Other Barnardo children made the trunks in a workshop in England.

APPENDIX C

'Directions for Lads on Leaving for Situations' (Owen, 1890).

This is the technical booklet home boys were given when migrating to Canada.

3. Big boys are generally engaged for a year, receiving, in addition to board and lodging, so much money for the year, from which will be deducted whatever is spent in clothing, etc., during the year. The employer will keep a careful account of this expenditure and the boy should do the same, and should do his best to be careful and saving of his clothing, so as to have as much money as possible to come to him at the end of the year.

4. Younger boys are engaged for longer terms,

6

according to their age and size, our object being to secure for them a home where they will be settled and comfortable, taken care of and taught to work, until they are quite able to go out and manage their own affairs. We, therefore, arrange for the employer to furnish board, lodging, clothing, and all that is necessary, such as he would for his own son, and then at the end of three years, or four years, or whatever it may be, he pays a lump sum clear of everything. This we find a far better plan

7

for young boys than to be changing and shifting every year or so, as it secures them a good home over their heads until they are able to do for themselves, and when that time comes, it provides a nice little sum to act as a foundation on which to build future savings.

5. If your employer will not sign the agreement and undertake to do what we consider reasonable and right for you, we shall be prepared to take steps to move you, but if you have a wish to remain or

8

there is some special reason for leaving you for a time, you will be told exactly how matters stand, and we shall take care that by some means or other you receive fair remuneration for your services.

6. As you have already been told, the first moneys due to you will be paid to us at the Home, not for us to keep or spend, or take from you, but to deposit for you in the Bank. A book will be sent you immediately showing what money you have

9

got, so that at any time you can draw the money if you require it, but in the meantime it will be gaining good interest for you. Our principal reasons for taking this trouble for you are: first, that we may know the amounts due to you are fully and punctually paid; and secondly, that the money which has been earned by hard work may not be foolishly wasted, but that, at least some of it, may be laid up as a store for the future.

7. You have promised to give a dollar a year to

10

the support of the Homes, and every Christmas time we shall write to remind you of this, when we shall hope you will get your employer to advance it to you and send it to us with a letter giving an account of your welfare and progress.

8. We wish you to remember that every agreement we make with an employer gives each party the right to end it at any time, by giving a month's notice; so that, if you do not do well your employer can send you back, and on the other hand, if you

11

are not being kindly and properly treated, we can take you away, and would do so at once. If, therefore, you are not satisfied and contented, you can write to us and state your grievances, and more than that, somebody representing the Homes will come especially to see you every year, and if you have anything to complain of, this gentleman will be prepared to hear all you have to say, and look carefully into the matter, and take any steps that are necessary.

12

9. All these precautions leave no excuse for any boy to run away from his place. The law provides punishment for doing this, and if a boy runs away, we shall be prepared to help his employer to take the necessary steps to enforce the law, and to make him come back, as for a boy to run away from his place is not only likely to lead him into serious trouble and mischief, but also brings discredit on the Home. One great cause of trouble with many boys is, that they let themselves be unsettled by

13

the mischievous influence of ill-natured persons, who are almost everywhere to be met with, but we hope you will be wise enough to refuse to listen to anything of the kind, and that you will look to us chiefly for advice and direction until you have become accustomed to the country and know how to act for yourself.

10. You may, perhaps, have the privilege of attending school in the winter months, and, if so, we hope you will make the most of the opportunity,

14

remembering how important and valuable education is to everyone who has to make his way in the world.

In conclusion, we hope that you will remember that you are starting out into life in a new country, with a character to gain or a character to lose, and that everything depends on yourself. You have the credit and reputation of the Homes to keep up, and we earnestly trust that you will resolve, by God's grace, that you will bring no discredit or blot

15

upon Dr. Barnardo and his work, but that year by year we may be able to send home good accounts of your conduct and progress, showing that you are growing up to be an honest, industrious, useful citizen.

16

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND WORKS CITED:

- Aries, P 1962, *Centuries of Childhood*, Random House, New York.
- Ash, S 2008, 'Heroin Baby: Barnardo's, Benevolence, and Shame', in *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 32(2), 179-200.
- Avery, R 1999, 'A home child's painful memories', in *The Toronto Star*, Jan.30, pp. L1-L2.
- Bagnell, K 1980, *The Little Immigrants: The Orphans Who Came to Canada*, MacMillan of Canada, Toronto.
- Barnardo, S and J Marchant 2007 [1907], *Memoirs of the Late Dr. Barnardo*, Hodder and Stoughton, London.
- Barnardo's, 2012 [Accessed April 2013], 'Barnardo's History: Frequently asked questions', Available at:
<http://www.barnardos.org.uk/what_we_do/who_we_are/history/resources_students_history.htm>
- Barnardo's, 2012 [Accessed April 2013], 'What We Do', Available at:
<http://www.barnardos.org.uk/what_we_do.htm>
- Batt, J H 1904, *Dr. Barnardo: The Foster-Father of Nobody's Children*, S.W. Partridge and Co., London.
- BBC News, 2005 [Accessed April 2013], 'Breaking the cycle of poverty', image available at: <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/4123676.stm>>
- Bell, V 1999, *Feminist Imagination*, Sage Publications Ltd., London.
- Benhabib, S and D Cornell (eds.) 1987, *Feminism as Critique: on politics of gender*, University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota.
- Bernauer, J and J Carrette (eds.) 2004, *Michel Foucault and Theology: The Politics of Religious Experience*, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Hampshire, England.
- Boorstin, D 1964 [1962], *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*, Harper Colophon, New York.
- Borch, C 2012, *The Politics of Crowds: An Alternative History of Sociology*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

- Bordo, S 1993, 'Feminism, Foucault and the politics of the body', in C Ramazanoglu (ed.), *Up Against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions Between Foucault and Feminism*, Routledge, New York, pp. 179-202.
- Braidotti, R (Translated by E Guild) 1991, *Patterns of Dissonance: A Study of Women in Contemporary Philosophy*, Routledge, New York.
- Bready, J W 1932 [1930], *Doctor Barnardo: Physician, Pioneer, Prophet*, Unwin Brothers Ltd., London.
- British Empire, [Accessed April 2013], 'Extracts from a report published in 1915 on the work of Dr. Barnardo's charity', image available at:
<<http://www.learningcurve.gov.uk/empire/g2/cs6/images/g2cs6s8a.jpg>>
- British Home Child Day News Release, 2011 [Accessed April 2013], 'British Home Child Day – September 28', Available at:
<<http://www.children.gov.on.ca/htdocs/English/britishhomechildday/index.aspx>>
- Burchell, G C Gordon and P Miller (eds.) 1991, *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Butler, J 1990, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge, London.
- Butler, J 1991, 'Imitation and Gender Insubordination', in D Fuss (ed.) *Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories, Gay Theories*, Routledge, New York, pp. 13-31.
- Butler, J 1993, *Bodies That Matter: on the discursive limitations of 'sex'*, Routledge, New York.
- Butler, J 2004, 'Variations on Sex and Gender', in S Salih (ed.) with J Butler, *The Judith Butler Reader*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Oxford, UK, pp. 21-38.
- Butler, J and J W Scott (eds.) 1992, *Feminists theorize the political*, Routledge, New York.
- Canada Post, 2010, 'Details/en détail', vol. 19, no. 3 (July to September 2010), p.18
- Carr, N 2002, 'Man sues agency that shipped him to Canada', in *The London Free Press*, June 19, pp. A9.
- Champagne, R 1990, *French Structuralism*, Twayne Publishers, Boston.
- Chen, X 2001, *Tending the Gardens of Citizenship: Child Protection in Toronto, 1880s-1920s*, Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto.

- Chen, X 2005, *Tending the Gardens of Citizenship: Child Saving in Toronto 1880s-1920s*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- Chen, X 2008, 'The Child-Citizen', in E F Isin (ed.), *Recasting the Social in Citizenship*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, pp. 162-186.
- Childers, J and G Hentzi (eds.) 1995, *The Columbia Dictionary of Modern Literary and Cultural Criticism*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Church, D (ed.) 2003, 'Priceless help', in *The Barnardo Guild Messenger*, summer, issue 325, pp. 6-7.
- Clark, G 2010, 'Shame lingers over children', in *The London Free Press*, May 29, pp. E6.
- Corbett, G 1981, *Barnardo Children in Canada*, Woodland Publishing, Peterborough.
- Corbett, G 2002 [1997], *Nation builders: Barnardo children in Canada*, Dundurn Press, Toronto.
- Cornish, J 2002, *Home Children: Canada's Little Immigrants*, Gander, Newfoundland.
- Crowther, M A 1983, *The Workhouse System, 1834-1929: The History of an English Social Institution*, Metbuen and co. Ltd, London.
- Csordas, T (ed.) 1994, *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Davenport Hill, F and F Fowke (ed.) 1889, *Children of the State*, Macmillan and Co., London and New York.
- Dean, M 1991, *The Constitution of Poverty: Toward a Genealogy of Liberal Governance*, Routledge, London.
- Dean, M 1994, *Critical and effective histories: Foucault's methods and historical sociology*. Routledge, United Kingdom.
- Dean, M 1999, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, Sage Publications Ltd., London.
- Donzelot, J 1979, *The policing of families*, Pantheon Books, New York.
- Durkheim, E 1964[1895], *The Rules of Sociological Method*, Free Press.
- Fletcher, W 2005, *Keeping the Vision Alive: The Story of Barnardo's 1905-2005*. Barnardo's Organization, Essex.

- Foucault, M 1980, 'Two lectures' in C. Gordon (ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* by Michel Foucault, Harvester Wheatsheaf, London.
- Foucault, M 1983 [1982], 'The Subject and Power', in H Dreyfus P Rabinow and M Foucault, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 208-228.
- Foucault, M (Translated by L Davis) 1984, 'Polemics, Politics, and Problematizations: An Interview with Michel Foucault', in P Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader*, Pantheon Books, New York, pp. 381-90.
- Foucault, M 1990a [1976], *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1: An Introduction*, Vintage, New York.
- Foucault, M 1990b [1988], 'The Concern for Truth', in L Kritzman (ed.), *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984*, Routledge, New York, pp. 255-270.
- Foucault, M 1991a [1978], 'Governmentality', in G Burchell, C Gordon and P Miller (eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 87-104.
- Foucault, M 1991b [1980], 'Questions of Method', in G Burchell, C Gordon and P Miller (eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 73-86.
- Foucault, M (Translated by A Sheridan) 1995 [1977], *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Random House, Inc., New York.
- Foucault, M 2001 [1965], in N Foskett and J Hemsley-Brown (eds.), *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, RoutledgeFalmer, New York.
- Foucault, M (Translated G Burchell) 2007 [1978], in M Senellart (ed.), *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the College de France 1977-1978*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Foucault, M (Translated by G Burchell) 2008 [1979], in M Senellart (ed.), *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France 1978-1979*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Ginnis Fuchs, R 2005, *Gender and Poverty in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

- Golder, B 2007, 'Foucault and the Genealogy of Pastoral Power', in *Radical Philosophy Review*, vol.10, no.2, pp. 157-176.
- Golder, B and P Fitzpatrick 2009, *Foucault's Law*, Routledge, New York.
- Gordon, C 1980, 'Afterword', in C Gordon (ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, Pantheon Books, New York, pp. 229-260.
- Harrison, P 2003 [1979], *The Home Children: Their Personal Stories*, J. Gordon Shillingford Publishers, Toronto.
- Hekman, S 2004, 'Feminist Identity Politics: Transforming the Political', in D Taylor and K Vintges (eds.), *Feminism and the Final Foucault*, University of Illinois Press, Chicago, pp. 197-213.
- Hedges, C 2009, *Empire of Illusion: The End of Literacy and the Triumph of Spectacle*, Nation Books.
- Hendrick, H 1990, 'Constructions and Reconstructions of British Childhood: An Interpretative Survey, 1800 to the Present', in A. James and A. Prous (eds.), *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood*. The Falmer Press, pp. 35-59.
- Hendrick, H 1997, *Children, childhood and English society, 1880-1990*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hindess, B 1996, *Discourses of Power: From Hobbes to Foucault*, Blackwell Publishers, Massachusetts.
- Hobbs, S and J McKechnie and M Lavalette 1999, *Child Labor: A World History Companion*, ABC-CLIO, Inc., California.
- Hunt, A and G Wickham 1994, *Foucault and Law: Towards a Sociology of Law as Governance*, Pluto Press, London.
- Janovicek, N and J Parr (eds.) 2003, *Histories of Canadian Children and Youth*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kendall, G and G Wickham 1999, *Using Foucault's Methods*, Sage Publications Inc., London.
- Kendrick, M 1990, *Nobody's Children: The Foster Care Crisis in Canada*, MacMillan of Canada, Toronto.

- Kohli, M 2003, *The Golden Bridge: Young Immigrants to Canada, 1833-1939*, Natural Heritage Books, Toronto.
- Koven, S 2004, *Slumming: sexual and social politics in Victorian London*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- Lippmann, W 1965[1922], *Public Opinion*, Free Press, New York.
- Lloyd, S 2002, 'Pleasing spectacles and elegant dinners: conviviality, benevolence, and charity anniversaries in eighteenth-century London', in *Journal of British Studies*, 41(1), 23-57.
- Loizidou, E 2007, *Judith Butler: Ethics, Law, Politics*, Routledge-Cavendish, New York.
- Macleod, C and K Durrheim 2002, 'Foucauldian Feminism: The Implications of Governmentality', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, vol.32, no.1, pp. 41-60.
- Martin, K 1991, Review: Marxist Feminist Theory, *Gender and Society*, vol.5, no.3, pp. 420-21.
- Masson, J and D McGovern and K Pick and M Winn Oakley 2007, *Protecting Powers: Emergency Intervention for Children's Protection*, John Wiley and Sons Ltd, Chichester.
- May, T 2005, *The Victorian Workhouse*, Shire Publications Ltd, Buckinghamshire.
- McIntosh, M 1991, Review [untitled], *Feminist Review*, no.1, Summer, pp. 113-14.
- McNay, L 1992, *Foucault and Feminism: Power, Gender and the Self*, Northeastern University Press, Boston.
- McNay, L 2000, *Gender and Agency: Reconfiguring the subject in feminist and social theory*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Medel, B 1998, 'Stigma kept parents silent on painful past', in *The Tillsonburg News*, Feb.13, pp. 2.
- Medel, B 1999, 'Richmond senior relives life as a Barnardo child', in *The Tillsonburg News*, Feb.11, pp. 2.
- Miller, P and N Rose 1992, 'Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government', *British Journal of Sociology*, vol.43, pp. 173-205.
- Miller, P and N Rose 2008, *Governing the Present*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

- Moss, P and J Dillon and J Statham 2000, 'The 'Child in Need' and 'the Rich Child': Discourses, Constructions and Practice', in *Critical Social Policy*, vol.20, no.2, pp. 233-254.
- Munro, V 2001, 'Legal Feminism and Foucault: A Critique of the Expulsion of Law', *Journal of Law and Society*, vol.28, no.4, pp. 546-567.
- Murdoch, L 2006, *Imagined Orphans: poor families, child welfare, and contested citizenship in London*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, N.J.
- Neville, 2010 [Accessed April 2013], '1866 Barnardo's Year', image available at: <http://www.goldonian.org/barnardo/1866_barnardo%27s_year.htm>
- Niven, P 1994, 'Thomas Barnardo 150 Years (1845-1995)', from the 150 anniversary of Dr. Barnardo, National Council of Barnardo, Old Boys and Girls, London.
- Olssen, M and H Giroux (ed.) 1999, *Michel Foucault: materialism and education*, Bergin and Garvey, Westport, CT.
- Owen, A B 1890, 'Directions For Lads on Leaving for Situations', technical booklet from Dr. Barnardo's Homes 214 Farley Ave., Toronto.
- Parr, J 1980, *Labouring Children: British Immigrant Apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924*, McGill-Queens University Press, Kingston.
- Parr, J 1983, *Canadian women on the move, 1867-1920*, New Hogtown P., Toronto.
- Parr, J 1990, *The gender of breadwinners: women, men, and change in two industrial towns, 1880-1950*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Parr, J 1994 [1980], *Labouring Children: British Immigrant Apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Perry, P (ed.) 1999, 'Twin tales', in *The Barnardo Guild Messenger*, summer, issue 317.
- Petersen, A and R Bunton (eds.) 1997, *Foucault, Health and Medicine*, Routledge, New York.
- Platt, A 1977, *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency*, The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., London.
- Postman, N 1985, *Amusing Ourselves to Death*, Penguin Books, New York.
- Prevention of Cruelty Act and Protection of Children, 1889, [Accessed April 2013], Available at: <<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1889/44/enacted>>

- Rabinow, P 1984, 'Introduction', in P Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader*, Pantheon Books, New York, pp. 3-29.
- Ramazanoglu, C 1993, 'Introduction', in C Ramazanoglu (ed.), *Up Against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions Between Foucault and Feminism*, Routledge, New York, pp. 1-25.
- Ransom, J 1993, 'Feminism, difference and discourse: the limits of discursive analysis for feminism', in C Ramazanoglu, *Up Against Foucault: Explorations of some tensions between Foucault and feminism*, Routledge, New York, pp. 123-46.
- Rose, J 1987, *For the Sake of the Children: Inside Dr. Barnardo's – 120 years of caring for children*, Hodder and Stoughton, London.
- Ryle, R 2011, *Questioning Gender: A Sociological Exploration*, Sage Publications Inc., London.
- Said, E 1979, *Orientalism*, Random House, Inc., New York.
- Salih, S 2004, 'Introduction', in S Salih (ed.) with J Butler, *The Judith Butler Reader*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Oxford, UK, pp. 1-17.
- Salih, S 2013 [2002], *Judith Butler*, Routledge, New York.
- Sargeant, A and J Ford and J Hudson 2008, 'Charity Brand Personality: The Relationship With Giving Behavior' in *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 37(3), 468-491.
- Sawicki, J 1991, *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, Power and the Body*, Routledge, London.
- Sherington, G and C Jeffery, *Fairbridge: Empire and Child Migration*, Woburn Press, Portland, Oregon.
- Skelton, T 2008, 'Children, Youth People, UNICEF and Participation' in *Global Childhoods* compiled by A Stuart, R Lund and T Kjørholt, Routledge, New York.
- Starkey, P 2011 [Accessed April 2013], review of *Child, Nation, Race and Empire. Child Rescue Discourse, England, Canada and Australia, 1850-1915*, (review no. 1033), Available at: <<http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/1033>>
- Stearns, P 2011, *Childhood in World History, 2nd Edition*, Routledge, New York.

- Sutherland, N 1978, *Children in English-Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth-Century Consensus*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Swain, S and M Hillel 2010, *Child, Nation, Race and Empire: Child Rescue Discourse, England, Canada and Australia, 1850-1915*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Wagner, G 1979, *Barnardo*, Weidenfield and Nicolson, London.
- Williams, G 1966, *Barnardo: The Extraordinary Doctor*, MacMillan and Company Limited, London.
- Williams, K 1981, *From pauperism to poverty*, Routledge and Kegan Ltd., London.
- Wichard, C and R Wichard 1999, *Victorian Carte-de-Visite*, Shire Publications Ltd., Buckinghamshire.