

AMERICAN VOLUNTARISM: AN ANTI-HISTORY  
WITH ANTI-HEROINES

Lucille Kuehn  
Assistant to the Vice Chancellor of  
Student Affairs for Program Development  
University of California, Irvine

Prepared for Women: Resource for a Changing World  
An Invitational Conference, April 17 & 18, 1972

Colloquium C: Work and Society

Radcliffe Institute, Radcliffe College  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

AMERICAN VOLUNTARISM: AN ANTI-HISTORY  
WITH ANTI-HEROINES

Lucille Kuehn

INTRODUCTION

It is extraordinary that a uniquely American phenomenon --voluntarism--has been omitted from much of American history. This sin of omission is compounded by sins of commission. Rarely have historians, sociologists, or even the "pop" free-lance writers, whose observations compose part of social history, given the appropriate value to voluntarism as a social force in history. Furthermore, there seems to be a parallel pattern of omission in history between lack of documentation of volunteer participation and the lack of documentation of the contributions of women and an accurate assessment of their motivations./1

It would be wise to share a mutually acceptable definition of voluntarism before we discuss the subject. One which I particularly enjoy is developed by Ann Stenzel and Helen Feeley in Volunteer Training and Development, an unusual manual which stresses the continuous learning aspect of volunteer service.

Voluntary associations are those in which a person is free to participate or not, as he chooses. They are open to persons who share a common interest or purpose. The volunteer builds his own policy and directs his own activities within the framework of the association. Voluntary organizations have a double responsibility. They provide service or further a cause for community betterment while they provide an opportunity for members or volunteers to share in their purpose by helping directly or indirectly with programs.

Perhaps because more women than men compose the volunteer force and because there are more women's organizations than those of men,<sup>/2</sup> this neglected aspect of history is generally the result of the fact that until recently American historians "have paid scant almost absent-minded attention to the history of women."<sup>/3</sup> There are, however, other contributing factors which have resulted in perpetuation of a mythology about American women rather than a history of women.

Inextricably involved in the matter of the absence of women and voluntarism from American history are the issues

of the status of women, self-perceived as well as evaluated by others, and the value placed on volunteer activity. The traditional indices for measurement of status or social mobility are education, occupation and income. A more current and accurate measurement of the status of women should also incorporate unremunerated volunteer activity. It is interesting to note that one major potential source of redefinition, the President's and the 50 state Commissions on the Status of Women, have focused on four primary areas for study and reform activity: family law and policy, health and welfare, labor standard, social insurance and taxes./4 Despite the fact that these commissions are manned (or womanned) by volunteers, even here the study of voluntarism has been incidental to other considerations. Their oversight as well as that of historians may be attributed to the fact that voluntary organizational activity is not accorded the same value that paid employment elicits/5 --a fact that finds support in the aforementioned traditional indices of status. However, a comparison of labor force participation by women in 1968, 28,697,000./6 with total numbers of people who served as volunteers, almost 55 million in 1969./7 elicits the following logic: (1) that the exclusion of voluntarism as an integral part of American history can no longer be accepted by virtue of the numbers of people involved, (2) that this oversight if continued affects males as well as females and (3) although there is no available numerical breakdown by sex for volunteer participation there is repeated evidence that more women than men are volunteers, thus, at a minimum, the figure would be something over fifty-one percent of 55 million, or 28 million. Therefore, the criteria for measurement of achievement and status of women must not be confined to economic indices or labor force participation but should also include volunteer participation. This has not been the case as shall be shown. For the purposes of this paper and in keeping with the theme of the conference "Women as a Resource", we shall confine ourselves to the study of female volunteer participation. In doing so let us examine more closely the myth of female non-achievement and its possible origins.

The charge has been made, and through continued repetition it has almost assumed an aura of truth, that women in America reached their zenith in 1921 after their successful seventy year battle for the Nineteenth Amendment and that they have been in a state of retreat ever since. Supporting evidence for this thesis that women since 1921 are non-achievers is found essentially in an economic interpretation of history and sociology associated with superficial psychological analysis. A primary and widely used source are the statistics found in the 1965 Handbook on Women Workers.

They have been the statistical base for quotation by the leading "popular" writers on women: Betty Friedan, Morton Hunt, William O'Neil, Andrew Sinclair, Caroline Bird as well as the source for many femlib tracts and pamphlets. These statistics deal solely with cumulative and proportionate numbers of women, compared to men, engaged in different categories of paid occupations. They also relate education and training to employment. They reveal the comparative incomes and earnings of men and women. As they fall back upon the traditional indices of status--education, occupation and income--they are indeed dramatically devastating when they show proportionately:

1. Fewer women than in 1921 on college faculties and in academic administrative positions,
2. Fewer women in top industrial administrative and managerial positions commanding top salaries than in 1921.

The 1965 edition of the Handbook of Women Workers is appropriately bound in a red cover. I submit that in effect it is a red herring. While these statistics provide the most comprehensive studies of women vis-a-vis the labor force, they hardly tell the complete history of women and their achievements outside of the labor force.

Aileen Kraditor, a historian writing in 1968, points out that as late as this date--only four years ago--except for biographies and accounts of activities of suffragists, there were only two scholarly works on the role and status of women in American history--Eleanor Flexner's Century of Struggle (Cambridge, Mass. 1959) and Andrew Sinclair's The Better Half (New York, 1965).<sup>/8</sup> Thus if there seems to be a syndrome of overdependence on the statistical studies of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, this may be due to the fact that there is little else as source material about women or their history.

Gerda Lerner, another historian, observes that "the literature concerning the role of women in American history is, with a handful of exceptions, topically narrow, predominantly descriptive and generally devoid of interpretation... that most of the work done by historians in recent years has been preoccupied with the women's rights movement in its legal and political aspects." She adds that "the problem of how women fit into history, how one is to conceptualize their role, and how one is to evaluate their contributions remains to be solved."<sup>/9</sup>

Let us examine some selected but representative works

from history, sociology and the "pop" press to gain insight into the problem and, perhaps, develop some solutions.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHIC ESSAY

The problem of perception or historical myopia may be due to the fact that voluntarism has been indigenous to the American scene all through the history of this country from the landing of the Pilgrims when settlers volunteered to help each other for survival through the current efforts of the war on poverty./10 Perhaps we have been too close to perceive this singular phenomenon. However, foreign visitors to this country have noticed this unique facet of American life. Let me quote two: Alexis de Tocqueville and Gunnar Myrdal.

Tocqueville, writing on America in 1840, observed "Nothing...is more deserving of our attention than the intellectual and moral associations of America."/11 He could understand the political and industrial associations. But he knew no precedent for the phenomenon of the American voluntary organization. He found in what he felt to be "the most democratic country on the face of the earth... the highest perfection of the art of pursuing in common the object of their common desires applied to the greatest number of purposes."/12

Similarly, Gunnar Myrdal in The American Dilemma observed that "it is natural for the ordinary American when he sees that something is wrong to feel not only that there should be a law against it, but also that an organization should be formed to combat it."

It is interesting that both Tocqueville and Myrdal noted the role of the American woman as few historians have. Insofar as the omission of women from history is concerned a few voices have indeed been raised in alarm. One of the earliest to express concern was Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., who after an examination of textbooks took his colleagues to task in 1928 because he could not discern whether women had ever made any contributions to American progress that were worthy of record./13 Mary Beard, another historian noted in 1945 that "the personalities, interests, ideas and activities of women have not received an attention commensurate with their energy in history."/14 Aileen Kraditor observed in 1968, "Since women wrote as little history as they made, it is not surprising that historiography faithfully reflected their exclusion from those events historians considered important enough to record."/15

David Potter, investigating the historical aspects of

alienation in the United States, wrote "if we based our social generalizations upon the experience of women rather than men, we might drop the familiar observation about the decreasing independency of Americans in their occupational pursuits." He observed that for women "there is a far greater meaning, measure of independent and self-directed work than there was in the past." He cautioned that a "serious fallacy results when generalizations derived from the experience of American men are applied indiscriminately to the American people in such a way as to exclude the experience of American women."/16 Potter also noted that business and professional men have resigned their cultural responsibilities to women and then have gone on to disparage literature and the arts because "these pursuits in the hands of females, began to seem feminine." He paid homage to women who have done more than their share to keep community life alive. He, at least, and at last acknowledged voluntarism as a way of life for American women.

The first scholar I found who interrelates the problem of the status of women with its resolution through volunteer activity was the eminent sociologist, Talcott Parsons. He wrote in 1942 that in a certain sense the most fundamental basis of the family's status is the occupational status of the husband and father...that this is the principal source of strain in the sex role structure of our society since it deprives the wife of her role as a partner in a common enterprise."/17 He suggested that a way out of this predicament was "through the cultivation by women of cultural interests, educated tastes, services, interests and humanitarian obligations in community welfare."

In order to give a balanced picture, let me present another viewpoint on women as volunteers written in the same year that Talcott Parsons made his observation. In his vituperative protest against war, The Generation of Vipers, Philip Wylie made a self-styled survey of moral want in which he lashed out at certain American institutions--among them, women. He considered one aspect of the activity of American women to which no other chronicle of their status at that time paid heed--their organizations. It is interesting to include his appraisal, even if negative:

Woman is organization minded. Organizations, she has happily discovered, are intimidating to all men, not just to mere men. They frighten politicians to sniveling servility and they terrify pastors; they bother bank presidents and they pulverize school boards. Woman has many such organizations, the real purpose of which is to compel an abject compliance of her environs to her personal desire./18

The concern about status is not confined to the sociologist. Richard Hofstadter, the historian, developed his "status loss thesis" as a root source of progressivism./<sup>19</sup> He suggested that middle-class intellectuals had been cut off from the center of power and authority in American society, and that their own loss of status and power in turn better made them understand the point of view of those who never had power to lose.

Eleanor Flexner, in her 1959 preface to A Century of Struggle, a brilliant history of the women's rights movement in the United States, suggests that the changes in the status of American women derived from the same forces that transformed our country from a small, undeveloped and unexplored agrarian culture to one in the forefront of wealth, industrialization and international responsibilities. Women and men, played many roles in that transformation. Women have not been presidents, inventors, generals or business leaders, but mothers and homemakers, producers, reformers and eventually voters. She writes that the "roles of women will continue to evolve along with all the changing social relationships in a society kept dynamic by the accelerating pace of scientific discovery and technological growth."/20

Another historian who acknowledges the problem of status for women is Gerda Lerner. She observes that "when the work of men became work for money and society adopted money standards as its measure of value and worth, the unpaid labor of the housewife was again degraded, and her status...lowered."/21

Morton Hunt, a free-lance writer, who has capitalized on women as a subject for his best-selling books, observed in 1962 that "Since American society accords status and prestige primarily on the basis of paid positions...club and volunteer activities...fail to be highly valued or compelling."/22 He views volunteer activity by women primarily as a useful device to channel aggressions away from the home and to decrease the need for rivalry with the husband. His more positive contribution to social history is his delineation of the "split-career" phenomenon exemplified by women.

That same year the sociologist Murray Hausknecht proposed the thesis in his book The Joiners that the *raison d'être* of organizations no longer exists./23 He supported his thesis with two reasons: one, today's (1962) problems are area and regional in scope and, therefore, solutions depend on resources beyond the capacity of the local community; and, two, government is now performing many of the functions previously handled through volunteer organizations; thus, there is no need for them.

In supporting his thesis, Mr. Hausknecht failed to grasp the potential of a united national effort of many local units of an organization working in concert for the same purpose. The League of Women Voters and the American Association of University Women are typical of the types of efforts he has overlooked. Both are prime examples of voluntarism by middle-class, mature, educated women. The League of Women Voters, it can be noted, has grown from 50,475 members in 1940 to 100,316 in 1950-51 to 170,000 in 1970-72. In addition, voluntarism, rather than being replaced by government, has been hailed and given impetus by the Nixon administration's initiation of a Cabinet Committee on Voluntary Action and the establishment of its service arm, the Office of Voluntary Action. A new partnership between the public and private sectors of government has also been enhanced through legislation which encourages the use of volunteers in the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, Labor, Health, Education and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity./24

One of the more recent scholarly historical works on women as a social force in history is William O'Neil's Everyone Was Brave: The Rise and Fall of Feminism in America. Essentially his thesis belongs in the camp that it took seventy-two years of battle for women to get the vote but that, once gained, the vote has accomplished little for women. In O'Neil's thinking the institutions of marriage and the family, "as presently conceived", are among the chief obstacles to feminine equality. He observes that in both the 20's and the 60's sexual freedom has had little effect on the life styles of women. In both periods divorce as a substitute for marriage reform has been the preferred solution. He feels a "movement," ideology and organization, if not social and political revolution, are necessary to achieve equality.

His interpretation of the 20's is that it was an era when "the private vision took precedence over the social will..." The outburst of the 20's according to his insights, repudiated the grand causes and glorious rhetoric of Progressivism. In his analysis femininity, not feminism, was increasingly the watchword as the old cult of domesticity re-emerged. He writes that the essence of feminism has been its steady drive to narrow the gap between the sexes and to have women play masculine roles insofar as possible./25 Of course, he finds little of value in voluntarism for women.

Inherent in his logic seems to be the implication that equality or equal rights is a zero sum game between the

sexes. If one wins the other loses. I take the opposite position: that in equality and self fulfillment of women, men will become more truly equal and fulfilled themselves in the real issues of life rather than getting bogged down in the stereotypical myths of sexual difference.

O'Neil, while he regards himself as a radical historian, hoists himself on his own petard by falling into the trap laid by traditional historians who have built upon each other's false foundations in depicting the 1920's as a period of disenchantment, gross materialism, hedonism and political reaction. He ignores an impressive body of recent research which reveals there was a larger validity and viability to the reform impulse in the decade before FDR than is usually acknowledged. This impulse found its greatest outlet in volunteer organizational activity.

Clark Chambers in Seedtime for Reform takes note of this fact as a major thesis of his book when he delineates the private voluntary efforts in social welfare and reform. Further, he attributes much of the New Deal reform to the groundwork that had been spaded in the 1920's./26 His is the kind of singular research with analysis, trends and relationships that immediately commands respect. Insofar as its contribution to excellence in the history of American women is concerned, this book almost stands in a class by itself. While the author never sought purposefully to highlight the contributions of women in the time period covered in Seedtime of Reform his scholarly inclusion of their efforts along with those of man leads to a new totality in the writing of history heretofore not available. How different, more objective and more replete is Chambers' history of the settlement house movement and Jane Addams compared to Christopher Lasch in The New Radicalism in America.

Because voluntarism is intrinsic to a responsible democratic form of government and serves as a primary catalyst for evolutionary social change,/27 Lasch's thesis that "modern radicalism or liberalism can best be understood as a phase of the social history of intellectuals"/28 merits inclusion in this bibliographic discussion. The major thesis of this paper is to document that it is in the volunteer sector that women have made their most important and dramatic contributions to American history--an area of achievement that has been unmeasured or undervalued for the most part. Thus, Lasch's analysis, and how he handles the contribution of women, is relevant.

Lasch claims that the bête noire all intellectuals of necessity have in common is revolt against the New England

tradition and "everything associated with the cultural ascendancy of the middle class." What in particular does the intellectual revolt against as typified by middle class values? To Lasch, a combination of patriarchal authority and the sentimental veneration of women, the conventional family which bred an over-privileged, over-indulged, and, in the examples he chooses for biography, over-educated confused and rebellious child--particularly the female child. While Lasch recognizes the contributions of selected atypical women through their volunteer activities--Jane Addams, Mabel Dodge Luhan, Josephine Dixon, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Alice Schreiner and Margaret Sanger--he literally "does them in" for doing "good deeds." Through superficial psychological analysis of their background and possible motivations he develops nine generalizations about the female volunteer which run the gamut from the trauma of the death of a father, an unhappy marriage or no marriage, protracted neurasthenia, alienation from the mother, selfish personal need, displacement of basic feminine instincts, to penis envy and/or general hostility toward men.

A more contemporary but equally pejorative view of the women who volunteer was advanced by Doris B. Gold in 1971. She defines "the phenomenon of voluntarism...as one of the oldest, most subtle, most complicated ways in which women have been disengaged from the economy with their own eager cooperation."/29 Ms. Gold, described as a free lance writer, editor and active community service volunteer in Long Island, New York, writes "from a feminist and/or progressive unionist point of view voluntarism is clearly exploitative." While she does accord value to the volunteer effort, she, too, speculates on some of the conscious and unconscious motivations of the volunteer, e.g. a misdirected search for power or alliance with symbols of power, a continuation of the home-based tastes of mothering and maintenance into the larger society, a step in the direction of a changed self-image, a socially acceptable way to opt out of paid employment, a way of keeping up with a husband's achievement track record.

The final potential nail in the allegorical coffin of voluntarism that I wish to bring to your attention is hammered by the National Organization of Women at their fifth National Conference in September of 1971. At that time they passed a resolution on voluntarism distinguishing between those activities which they feel serve to maintain women's dependent status and those activities which are change directed. The former they see as service oriented voluntarism. This they feel seeks to complement insufficiently funded social services with non-paid labor in order to alleviate social ills for it "blunts the pressure for more equal

distribution of the nation's wealth, by meeting the unrest which threatens the economic privileges and power of the well-to-do."/30 Members of the NOW National Task Force on Women and Volunteers analyze the impact of the proliferation of women's organization between 1890 and 1920 as a deterrent to women gaining "real" power, earning "real" money or becoming freed of their economic dependence on men. They ascribe to the "volunteer mystique" a reinforcement of the second class status of women, another instance of the on-going exploitation of women, a device by which jobs are taken from the labor market, a device which buttresses the structures which are keeping women in a subordinate role--all of which is antithetical to the goals of the feminist movement and thus detrimental to the liberation of women. However, if voluntarism is change-directed, they have no quarrel with this kind of self-expression.

A dissenting view is presented by another member of NOW, Dr. Eva Schindler-Rainman, who is consultant to voluntary and governmental organizations. She counters that there have been significant changes to alter the entire image and fabric of the volunteer world for men, women and youth participate in a vast variety of significant tasks in this democracy: social action, decision making, organizational change and development, training as well as direct service to the patient, client, consumer and others. She can find no evidence of exploitation in voluntarism; rather she finds a major influence for change. She is the first to observe that status no longer depends solely on income, that "men's and women's importance to and in society are measured by their voluntary contribution of ideas and energy to the society ...when most service is in the social action area." She observes that woman's status is enhanced by her voluntary participation in and contribution to the many facets, decisions, problem solutions and activities of a democratic society. She notes that some of the most active volunteers are also employed./31 Helen Astin in The Woman Doctorate in America offers supporting evidence. Her study sample reveals that close to half participated in church or religious groups, about one-fourth were involved in the activities of parent-teacher associations, and an impressive number were also in civic, social, political and educational organizations./32

I complete the bibliographic chronology with one of the most recent works, but unhappily end on a sour note. At long last a male historian has written a book about women which even includes an entire chapter on "Women's Organizations"/33. A simple content analysis reveals only one-tenth of the chapter is devoted to volunteer activity different from or in addition to that which previous histories of American

women have stressed. His superficially brief review of voluntarism since 1930 attributes to the professionalization of social work and the emphasis on home and family a dramatic reduction of women's involvement in American public life. Not only is this analysis quantitatively and qualitatively erroneous, but the author develops another thesis, to which he gives no substantive evidence, that the energy for female emancipation derives for the most part from strong fathers./<sup>34</sup> Here again, as well as in other parts of the book, we find evidence of superficial psychological and sociological analyses. While the book is indeed present-minded, once more the full dimension of women's roles and status remains to be developed.

### CONCLUSION

Can 55 million volunteers be wrong? If we must put a dollar value on voluntarism in order to add another important dimension of measurement it is estimated that by 1980 volunteer activity will contribute \$30 billion annually to the economy if it is counted as part of the gross national product./<sup>35</sup> Of course this does not include what volunteer participation adds to personal development or what highly trained specialists can provide by way of enrichment to the volunteer sector in addition to their participation in paid occupations. Thus we have the weight of numbers, some indication of economic worth as well as a minimal philosophical basis to establish the importance of a unique facet of American life.

It has not been the purpose of this paper to present a history of voluntarism in America, but rather to suggest that history begin to incorporate in an appropriate manner this compelling and consuming aspect of American life. This brief bibliographic chronology serves to delineate some supporting evidence in behalf of (1) more complete history, (2) new methodological tools for analysis of women's roles, status and motivation for choice in participatory opportunities in American private, public and economic life, and (3) the development of more sensitive indices for measurement of status, power and value of social force in history. History reflects society just as society reflects history. Therefore there is a reciprocal responsibility for scholarship with integrity to correct omissions as well as distortion. Women can serve both as a resource which demands this correction as well as a resource with the proper skills and tools to assist in the corrective process.

It is interesting to note that the recent issue of Time magazine devoted entirely to "The American Woman" contains

seventeen categorical topics, not one of which is on the subject or issue of voluntarism. Once again the methodology used is to cite the numbers of women working and their earnings compared to those of men in various paid occupations in order to display the dysfunction in the labor force with patterns of inequality delineated by sex difference./36

Lest you be misled by the statistics which reveal that vast hordes of women are joining the labor force, I believe it important to establish some criteria to measure the quality of work related to the quantities of women newly engaged in work. The completely detailed story is one of underutilization and underemployment in relation to education, background and training. It has been demonstrated that almost equal numbers of women are in both the labor force (28 million) and in the volunteer force (28 million) in America. The question remains to be answered as to whether their volunteer jobs and their paid work provide appropriate opportunity.

Recently hundreds of new titles of new books for and about women have been added to publishers' lists from the press of "feminist radicals hoping for a rich marriage of commerce and cultural revolution."/37 Time observes that many of these writers operate on a number of assumptions that are questionable and sometimes simplistic, that in ignoring history, in being statistics-prone, in involving the individual's right to absolute self-expression, in preaching that a rejiggered environment can cure all hereditary ills, Women's Lib writers are doing themselves and their readers a great disservice./38 I submit that while there is impetus and momentum for evolutionary social and political change, there is also a compelling urgency for responsible and accountable scholarship and research.

However, history alone cannot bear the burden. Psychoanalysis has demonstrated that there is no unified human will "but that direction emerges from conflicting tendencies emanating from different layers in the personality. This fact is as important for the understanding of history as it is for the understanding of the individual personality."/39 Certainly a new methodology is needed to properly record and analyze the contributions of women to history in order to get below the myth level on which we currently operate. Thus there is need for an interdisciplinary partnership in anthropology, sociology, economics, psychology and psychoanalysis as well as history in order to assess and analyze scientifically the trends, the components, the motivations and the opportunities for choice in a changing world.

In keeping with this need, higher education must assume a more dynamic responsibility and responsiveness not only in research about women but in the teaching and curriculum it provides for women. If, as has been demonstrated in this paper, voluntarism is so much a part of the life of the educated woman and increasingly a part of the life styles of the disadvantaged themselves, either as an interstice in a split-career, incorporated with a paid occupation or instead of remunerated activity, shouldn't higher education offer background and training so that women may achieve greater fulfillment as they utilize their skills in meaningful work with or without pay?

The broad spectrum of bibliographic selections presented in this paper serve to delineate the problem of how women have not fit into history. Until we, as women, accept responsibility for involvement in the solution, we will remain a "problem." One of the major problems all historians face as Toynbee suggests, is bridging the gap between human beings and institutions--finding the link between personal and group expression. The challenge of documenting, validating and assessing voluntarism--individuals working in groups--is certainly part of this problem. The history of women is no longer confined to the battlefields of the feminist movement. Women as a group are being joined by women as individuals who in a democratic society are making choices among different life styles. The written history of women, always as dramatic and complex as the subject itself, must change in accordance with these choices.

## FOOTNOTES

- /1 James and Marge Schultz, An Annotated Bibliography of the Literature on Volunteering, Center for Voluntary Action (Washington, D.C., October 1970). This publication, one of the most comprehensive on the subject, offers six bibliographic categories with twenty-two sub-headings on twenty-nine pages. Under the category "Volunteers: Philosophical, Historical and Evaluative Statements" the only histories listed are an unpublished Master's thesis on the history of volunteers in social welfare and Tocqueville's Democracy in America written in 1840.
- /2 Murray Hausknect, The Joiner (New York, 1962), p. 16 ff.
- /3 Gerda Lerner, "Women's Rights and American Feminism", The American Scholar (Vol. 40, Number 2, Spring 1971), p. 235.
- /4 1969 Handbook on Women Workers, Women's Bureau Bulletin 297 (Washington D. C. 1969), p. 294-299.
- /5 Morton Hunt, Her Infinite Variety (New York, 1962) p. 250.
- /6 1969 Handbook on Women Workers, p. 17.
- /7 People Helping People, U. S. Volunteers in Action, U. S. News and World Report (Washington, D. C. 1971).
- /8 Aileen S. Kraditor, Up From the Pedestal (Chicago, 1968) p. 5.
- /9 Gerda Lerner, "Women's Rights and American Feminism", The American Scholar (Vol. 40, Number 2, Spring 1971) p. 236.
- /10 James R. Tanck, The Volunteer Action Effort at Michigan State University, 1968.
- /11 Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, II (New York, 1945), p. 110.
- /12 Ibid., p. 106.
- /13 Arthur M. Schlesinger, New Viewpoints in American History (New York, 1928).
- /14 Mary R. Beard, Woman As a Force in History (New York, 1946).

- /15 Aileen S. Kraditor, Up From the Pedestal (Chicago, 1968), p. 3.
- /16 David M. Potter, "American Women and the American Character," American Character and Culture, ed. by John A. Hagan (DeLandy, Florida, 1964), pp. 65-84.
- /17 Talcott Parsons, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States," American Sociological Review, No. 7, Oct. 1942.
- /18 Philip Wylie, Generation of Vipers (New York, 1942), p. 190.
- /19 Richard Hofstadter, The Age of Reform (New York, 1955), p. 251-2.
- /20 Eleanor Flexner, A Century of Struggle (New York, 1971), p. xii.
- /21 Gerda Lerner, "Women's Rights and American Feminism," The American Scholar, Vol. 40, No. 2, Spring 1971, p. 245.
- /22 Morton Hunt, Her Infinite Variety (New York, 1962), p. 248-50.
- /23 Murray Hausknecht, The Joiners (New York, 1962), p. 16 ff.
- /24 People Helping People, U.S. News and World Report (Washington, D.C., 1971).
- /25 William O'Neil, Everyone Was Brave (Chicago, 1969), pp. 295-359.
- /26 Clark A. Chambers, Seedtime of Reform (Ann Arbor, 1967).
- /27 Arnold Rose, Theory and Method in Social Sciences (Minneapolis, 1954). He observes that responsible citizenship in a democracy implies unremunerated activity in behalf of the community and participation in the institutions through which the community carries on its life. According to him, voluntary organizations play a major role in American democracy by providing three major functions: they prevent a concentration and centralization of power; they help individuals in understanding the political process; they are mechanisms for social change. p. 51.
- /28 Christopher Lasch, The New Radicalism in America.

- /29 Doris B. Gold, "Women and Voluntarism," Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran, Women in Sexist Society (New York, 1971), Chap. 23.
- /30 Kerstin Joslyn and Letitia Sommers, Members NOW National Task Force on Women and Volunteers, "The NOW Women on Volunteerism--Exploitation", Voluntary Action News, December 1971.
- /31 Ibid.
- /32 Helen S. Astin, The Woman Doctorate in America (New York, 1969), p. 97.
- /33 Page Smith, Daughters of the Promised Land (Boston, 1970), p. 340.
- /34 Ibid., p. 274.
- /35 Harold Wolozin, "Volunteer Manpower in the United States in Federal Programs for the Development of Human Resources", A Compendium of Papers Submitted to the Subcommittee on Economic Progress of the Joint Economic Committee (Washington: 90th Cong., 2nd sess., 1968), p. 209.
- /36 Time, March 20, 1972.
- /37 Ibid., "Lib and Let Lib", p. 99.
- /38 Ibid., LA 13.
- /39 Benjamin B. Wolman, ed., The Psychoanalytic Interpretation of History (New York, 1971), p. 10.